# Generative neural networks

Sigmund Rolfsjord

#### Practical

INF5860 - searching for teaching assistants (spring 2019)

https://www.uio.no/studier/emner/matnat/ifi/INF5 860/v18/ Overview of wasserstein GAN:

https://medium.com/@jonathan\_hui/gan-wasser stein-gan-wgan-gp-6a1a2aa1b490

#### Generating data with deep networks

We are already doing it.

- How to make it "look" realistic
- What loss function can we optimize



#### Autoencoders

- A neural network transforming the input
- Often into a smaller dimension



#### Autoencoders

- A neural network transforming the input
- Often into a smaller dimension
- Then a decoder network reconstructs the input

# Old idea Modular Learning in Neural Networks 1987, Ballard



# Autoencoders - Generating images

- A neural network transforming the input
- Often into a smaller dimension
- Then a decoder network reconstructs the input

- With different values of Z, you can generate new images



#### Autoencoders

- A neural network transforming the input
- Often into a smaller dimension
- Then a decoder network reconstructs the input
- Restrictions are put on **z** either through loss functions, or **size**

- Often used with convolutional architectures for images





#### Autoencoders

- Restrictions are put on **z** either through loss functions, or **size**
- Often minimizing I2 loss:

$$L(x) = (x - x^*)^2$$



#### Autoencoders - Semi-supervised learning

- The encoded feature is sometimes used as features for supervised-learning



#### Autoencoders - Compressed representation



You don't have control over the features learned:

- Even though the features compress the data, they may not be good for categorization.







Pixel wise difference may not be relevant.

 Pixel wise a black cat on a red carpet, can be opposite from a white cat on green grass



Pixel wise difference may not be relevant.

- Pixel wise a black cat on a red carpet, can be opposite from a white cat on green grass
- The image is compressed through blurring, not concept abstraction



You don't have control over the features learned:

- Even though the features compress the data, they may not be good for categorization.
- Where should you sample Z?
  - Values of Z may only give reasonable results in some locations



# Variational Autoencoder

Find the data distribution instead of reconstructing simple images

- Assume some prior distribution
- Use the encoder to estimate distribution parameters
- Sample a **z** from the distribution and try to reconstruct



## Variational Autoencoder - loss function

Find the data distribution instead of reconstructing simple images

Often

- L2 loss between images
- KL-divergence between estimated distribution and prior distribution
  - Typically unit gaussian



#### Variational Autoencoder - loss function

Find the data distribution instead of reconstructing simple images

Often

- L2 loss between images
- KL-divergence between estimated distribution and prior distribution
  - Typically unit gaussian

Alternatively:

- Decode image distribution
- Loss is then the log likelyhood of the inputed image, given the outputted distribution.



#### Variational Autoencoder - loss function

Find the data distribution instead of reconstructing simple images

- Force similar data into overlapping distribution
- To really separate some data, you need small variance
  - You pay a cost for lowering variance
  - Have to be weighted by gain in reconstruction
- You train the network to reconstruct "any" input
- Interpolating between samples should give viable results



Sample from distribution

Encoder



## Variational Autoencoder

Interpolating between samples should give viable results



**Deep Feature Consistent Variational Autoencoder** 

#### Variational Autoencoder - forcing sematics

Interpolating between samples should give viable results

We can insert specific information to do semi-supervised learning, and force the embedding to be what we want.



**Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network** 

#### Variational Autoencoder - compression

Perhaps not surprisingly, autoencoders work well for image compression.



End-to-end Optimized Image Compression

#### Variational Autoencoder - forcing sematics

Interpolating between samples should give viable results

We can insert specific information to do semi-supervised learning, and force the embedding to be what we want.

![](_page_21_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_4.jpeg)

Transformation-Grounded Image Generation Network for Novel 3D View Synthesis

# Variational Autoencoder - Clustering

- One option is to use k-means clustering on the reduced dimension
- An alternative is to make your prior distribution multimodal
- So your encoder has to put the encoding close to one of the K predefined modes.

![](_page_22_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### Variational Autoencoder - modelling the data

- Can be good at modelling how the data varies
- Generated results are often some sort of averaged images
  - Works well if averinging photos works

666 6 Do. 6 000 6 5 в 6 6 a 6 5 5

# Generative adversarial networks (GAN)

- Two competing networks in one
- One Generator (G)
- One Discriminator (D)
- Generator knows how to change in order to better fool the discriminator

![](_page_25_Figure_5.jpeg)

- Input of generator network is a random vector
- Sampled with some strategy

![](_page_26_Figure_3.jpeg)

Discriminator maximizes:

$$rac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m \log D(x^{(i)}) + rac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m \log(1-D(g_ heta(z^{(i)})))$$

Generator minimizes:

$$rac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m \log(1-D(g_ heta(z^{(i)})))$$

![](_page_27_Figure_5.jpeg)

Discriminator maximizes:

$$rac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m \log D(x^{(i)}) + rac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m \log(1-D(g_ heta(z^{(i)})))$$

Generator minimizes:

$$rac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m \log(1-D(g_ heta(z^{(i)})))$$

How do you know that you are improving?

![](_page_28_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_7.jpeg)

# What does *z* mean, if anything

The network is trained to:

- Generate a feasible image for all possible values of *z* 

![](_page_29_Figure_3.jpeg)

## A manifold representation view

- Since all *z* are "valid" images, it means we have found a transformation from the image manifold to pixel space

![](_page_30_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_3.jpeg)

## A manifold representation view

- Since all *z* are "valid" images, it means we have found a transformation from the image manifold to pixel space
- Or at least an approximation...

![](_page_31_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_5.jpeg)

# Moving along the manifold

- Small changes in input generally generally give small changes in output
- This means that you can interpolate between *z* vectors and get gradual changes in images

![](_page_32_Picture_3.jpeg)

# Moving along the manifold

- Similar results as variational autoencoder
- Interesting arithmetic effects
- May be an effect of the way networks effectively stores representations... *shared*
- Still some work to find representational vectors

![](_page_33_Picture_5.jpeg)

# Looking into the Z-vector

- Manual work to find "glasses" representation etc.
- Need multiple examples

![](_page_34_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### Conditional image generation

![](_page_35_Figure_1.jpeg)

(a) StackGAN Stage-I 64x64 images This bird is white with some black on its head and wings, and has a long orange beak This bird ha yellow belly tarsus, grey wings, and b throat, nape a black face

This bird has a<br/>yellow belly and<br/>tarsus, grey back,<br/>wings, and brown<br/>throat, nape with<br/>a black faceThis flower has<br/>overlapping pink<br/>pointed petals<br/>surrounding a ring<br/>of short yellow<br/>filaments

![](_page_35_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_6.jpeg)
#### **Generated** images



#### **StackGAN**

#### Generated images

This bird is white with some black on its head and wings, and has a long orange beak

This bird has a This flower has yellow belly and overlapping pink tarsus, grey back, pointed petals wings, and brown surrounding a ring throat, nape with of short yellow a black face filaments

(a) StackGAN Stage-I 64x64 images

(b) StackGAN Stage-II 256x256 images

(c) Vanilla GAN 256x256 images





#### **StackGAN**

#### Generated images



**StackGAN** 

#### InfoGAN - Unsupervised

Add code: Input a code in addition to the random noise



#### InfoGAN - Unsupervised

- 1. Add code
- Guess c: Let the discriminator network also estimated a probability distribution of the code (given G(x,c))



#### InfoGAN - Unsupervised

- 1. Add code
- 2. Guess c
- Favors generated images that clearly show it's code



Adding a regularization loss, basically guessing code:

 $\lambda L_I(G,Q)$ 

8  $\boldsymbol{Q}$ 6 8 6 8 5 ь 345678 9 9 9

(a) Varying  $c_1$  on InfoGAN (Digit type)

(b) Varying  $c_1$  on regular GAN (No clear meaning)

8 3 3 3 3 3 З 3 3 ⊰ 3 ≺ ≺ --4 5 0

(c) Varying  $c_2$  from -2 to 2 on InfoGAN (Rotation)

(d) Varying  $c_3$  from -2 to 2 on InfoGAN (Width)

# (a) Azimuth (pose) (b) Elevation





(a) Azimuth (pose)

(b) Presence or absence of glasses



(c) Hair style

(d) Emotion

At least seems to work for data with clear modes of variance.



#### A manifold representation view

- Unfortunately it is not representing the whole manifold
- Not even your dataset





# Generative adversarial networks (GAN)

**Problems and improvements** 

#### A problem with standard GAN approach

- Imagine that the distribution in the eye of the **Discriminator** is overlapping
- So green is the true population
- Then the **Discriminator** know that it should *enhance* features moving the generated to the left
- The **Generator** know it should enhance features moving the distribution to the right



#### A problem with standard GAN approach

We can view adversarial learning as trying to move the output distribution of the **discriminator**.

The **generator** moves the distribution to overlap with the real images.



#### But what about this scenario?



#### But what about this scenario?

- Overlap is less than noise level



#### But what about this scenario?

- The discriminator cannot improve because it is already "perfect" 0 loss
- There are no "small-step" that can improve the generator
  - Of course we know it should move to the right...
  - But *gradient descent* can only see in very small steps (short sighted)



 Don't use a standard classification loss (softmax cross-entropy)



Wasserstein GAN

- Don't use a standard classification loss (softmax cross-entropy)
- 2. Simply let the generator maximize the distance from the mean of the generated examples for each real sample



Wasserstein GAN

- Don't use a standard classification loss (softmax cross-entropy)
- 2. Simply let the generator maximize the distance from the mean of the generated examples for each real sample
- Without constraints this would favour to just to spread everything out (large weights)



Wasserstein GAN

- Don't use a standard classification loss (softmax cross-entropy)
- 2. Simply let the generator maximize the distance from the mean of the generated examples for each real sample
- Without constraints this would favour to just to spread everything out (large weights)
- 4. Clip the weights with a constant to avoid this.



Wasserstein GAN

Discriminator loss:

- Simply making output from *true images* give high values and from *false images* low values



Generator loss:

- False images should give high values
- Putting the examples where the *true images* are.

**Discriminator loss** 

$$g_w \leftarrow \nabla_w \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_w(x^{(i)}) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_w(g_\theta(z^{(i)})) \right]$$

Generator loss

$$g_{\theta} \leftarrow -\nabla_{\theta} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} f_w(g_{\theta}(z^{(i)}))$$

#### WGAN - Nasty gradient clipping

- WGAN performance is very dependent on the clipping constant
- Clipping the weights will drastically increase training time



Improved Training of Wasserstein GANs

#### WGAN - Nasty gradient clipping

- WGAN performance is very dependent on the clipping constant
- Clipping the weights will drastically increase training time
- Adding an additional cost to the gradient size, improves this
- Restricting the "movement" of the discriminator



$$L = \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} \sim \mathbb{P}_g} \left[ D(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{x} \sim \mathbb{P}_r} \left[ D(\boldsymbol{x}) \right]}_{\text{Original critic loss}} + \underbrace{\lambda \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} \sim \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}}} \left[ (\|\nabla_{\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}} D(\hat{\boldsymbol{x}})\|_2 - 1)^2 \right]}_{\text{Our gradient penalty}}.$$

#### Improved Training of Wasserstein GANs

#### Improved WGAN blog post

# Generative adversarial networks (GAN)

More examples

 Unpaired images from two different domains



<u>Unpaired Image-to-Image</u> <u>Translation using</u> <u>Cycle-Consistent</u> Adversarial Networks

- 1. Unpaired images from two different domains
- 2. Use image from one domain as Z



- Unpaired images from two different domains
- 2. Use image from one domain as Z
- Generate image from the other domain



<u>Unpaired Image-to-Image</u> <u>Translation using</u> <u>Cycle-Consistent</u> <u>Adversarial Networks</u>

- Unpaired images from two different domains
- 2. Use image from one domain as Z
- Generate image from the other domain
- 4. Align images with cycle consistency loss



Cycle consistency loss:

 $\mathcal{L}_{\text{cyc}}(G, F) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_{\text{data}}(x)}[\|F(G(x)) - x\|_1] \\ + \mathbb{E}_{y \sim p_{\text{data}}(y)}[\|G(F(y)) - y\|_1].$ 

 $\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(G, F, D_X, D_Y) = & \mathcal{L}_{\text{GAN}}(G, D_Y, X, Y) \\ &+ \mathcal{L}_{\text{GAN}}(F, D_X, Y, X) \\ &+ \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\text{cyc}}(G, F), \end{aligned}$ 

Unpaired Image-to-Image Translation using Cycle-Consistent Adversarial Networks CycleGAN blog









#### An awesome application - A case study

- Using GAN for photo editing
- A reverse mapping from image space to closest point on manifold



#### Finding the closest point on the manifold

- Train a network to predict the embedding of a generated image
- Use that network to find an embedding z
- Optimize/train that *z* vector to minimize *mean squared error*





#### Profit!



Church

Church

Natural Outdoor
# GANs still have problems with context

On more complex image domains (ImageNet), GANs often show problems with context. Multiple heads, legs and deformed figures.



Figure 10: ImageNet 256 × 256 generations using an EBGAN-PT.

Energy-Based Generative Adverserial Networks

# Attention to improve context

- For each pixel location, compute an attention map
- 2. Multiply each attention map with input features
- Use attention in top layer of both generator and discriminator
- 4. Train GAN as normal



### Self-Attention Generative Adversarial Networks

Non-local Neural Networks

# Attention to improve context

Inspection of attention maps for generator:

- For generating legs, the model looks at both the length and neighbour leg
- Looks at relevant context...



### Self-Attention Generative Adversarial Networks

Non-local Neural Networks

# Self-Attention GANs - examples



#### Self-Attention Generative Adversarial Networks

### Self-Attention GANs - Tuning and increasing batch size



Large Scale GAN Training For High Fidelity Natural Image Synthesis

# GANs - Fun, but difficult

### Fun:

- Give a lot of opportunities
- Losses that are otherwise impossible or hard

### Hard to train

- Discriminator win
- Training longer can make it worse
- Bigger models can be worse than smaller
- More data, does not improve the model