Learning how to explain neural networks: PatternNet and PatternAttribution Kindermans et al. 2017 (Google Brain, TU Berlin)



Florian Kleinicke

Universität Heidelberg kleinicke@stud.uni-heidelberg.de

June 7, 2018



Which area was the most important for the neural network to classify the image?

Trivial approach: look at the weights and the influence of every pixel

Example





Figure: In first line total data compared to signal. In the second line the attribution of the used signal to the decision.

Overview



- Linear Model
- Signal estimators
- Quality measurements
- Experiments and Results

A Linear Model



$$egin{aligned} oldsymbol{x} &= oldsymbol{s} + oldsymbol{d} & oldsymbol{s} = oldsymbol{a}_s y, & ext{with } oldsymbol{a}_s &= (1,0)^T, & oldsymbol{y} \in [-1,1] \ oldsymbol{d} &= oldsymbol{a}_d \epsilon, & ext{with } oldsymbol{a}_d &= (1,1)^T, & oldsymbol{\epsilon} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu,\sigma^2
ight) \end{aligned}$$

x is total data **s** is the signal **d** is the distractor y is the output (classification) \mathbf{a}_s and \mathbf{a}_d are directions of spread information. goal is to extract information y from **x** multiply **x** with weight vector (filter) $\mathbf{w} = [1, -1]^T$



Dependency of \boldsymbol{w} and \boldsymbol{d}



Figure: \mathbf{w} is dependent on distractor \mathbf{d} , not the signal \mathbf{s}

Other approaches take \mathbf{w} as importance measure. But it highly depends on the distractor. Detecting \mathbf{a}_{s} has to been learned from data.



Signal estimator $S_x(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$

Attribution
$$r = \mathbf{w} \odot S_x(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{d}$$

Distractor is present - output noisy



Assumption: Signal varies in direction of \boldsymbol{w}

Signal estimator
$$S_w(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbf{w}}{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}} \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}} \mathbf{w} y$$

Attribution
$$\mathbf{w} \odot S_w(x) = \frac{\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{w}}{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}} y$$

Doesn't reconstruct optimal solution for previous linear example.



Distractor
$$\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{x} - S(\mathbf{x})$$
 should be 0.
 $cov[y, \mathbf{d}] = 0 \Rightarrow cov[\mathbf{x}, y] = cov[S(\mathbf{x}), y]$

Using the linear estimator $S_a(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a}\mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{x} \ (= \mathbf{a}_s y)$ $cov[\mathbf{x}, y] = cov[\mathbf{a}\mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{x}, y] = \mathbf{a} \times cov[y, y] \Rightarrow \mathbf{a} = \frac{cov[\mathbf{x}, y]}{\sigma_y^2}$



Linear estimator with two cases.

 $\mathbf{x} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \mathbf{s}_+ + \mathbf{d}_+ & \text{if } y > 0 \\ \mathbf{s}_- + \mathbf{d}_- & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right.$

$$S_{\mathbf{a}+-}(\mathbf{x}) = \left\{ egin{array}{cc} \mathbf{a}_+ \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x} & ext{if } \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0} \ \mathbf{a}_- \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x} & ext{otherwise} \end{array}
ight.$$



Another reminder from statistics: $cov[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}] = E[\mathbf{p}\mathbf{q}] - E[\mathbf{p}]E[\mathbf{q}]$

In positive regime:
$$cov[\mathbf{x}_+, y] = cov[S(\mathbf{x})_+, y]$$

 $E_+[\mathbf{x}y] - E_+[\mathbf{x}]E_+[y] = E_+[S(\mathbf{x})y] - E_+[S(\mathbf{x})]E_+[y]$
Use $S_{\mathbf{a}+}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a}_+\mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{x}$

$$\mathbf{a}_{+} = \frac{E_{+}[\mathbf{x}y] - E_{+}[\mathbf{x}]E_{+}[y]}{\mathbf{w}^{T}E_{+}[\mathbf{x}y] - \mathbf{w}^{T}E_{+}[\mathbf{x}]E_{+}[y]}$$

For \mathbf{a}_{-} analogous

Attribution



Describes the influence and relevance for the output For linear model $\mathbf{r}_{input} = \mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{a}_s y = \mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}$

For more complicated case Deep Taylor Decomposition

$$r_i^{output} = y, \qquad r_{j \neq i}^{output} = 0, \qquad \mathbf{r}^{l-1,i} = \frac{\mathbf{w} \bigodot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)}{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}} r_i^l$$

PatternAttribution is a Deep Taylor Decomposition, extended around distractor with negative attributions determined by ReLUs.

 $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x} - S(\mathbf{x})_{+-} = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}_+ \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}$

$$\mathbf{r}^{l-1,i} = \frac{\mathbf{w} \bigodot (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}_+ \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x})}{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}} r_i^l = \mathbf{w} \bigodot \mathbf{a}_+ r_i^l$$

Approaches





Figure: Illustration of explanation approaches.

Quality



Keep in mind: $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{d}$ $\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x} = y$, $\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{s} = y$, $\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{d} = 0$;

And a small reminder from statistics:

$$corr(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q}) = rac{cov(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{q})}{\sqrt{\sigma_{\mathbf{p}}^2 \sigma_{\mathbf{q}}^2}}$$

The Quality measure, depending on signal estimator $S(\mathbf{x})$:

$$\rho(S) = 1 - \max_{\mathbf{v}} \operatorname{corr}[\mathbf{v}^{T}(\mathbf{x} - S(\mathbf{x})), \mathbf{w}^{T}\mathbf{x}] = 1 - \max_{\mathbf{v}} \operatorname{corr}[\mathbf{v}^{T}\mathbf{d}, y]$$
$$= 1 - \max_{\mathbf{v}} \frac{\mathbf{v}^{T} \operatorname{cov}[\mathbf{d}, y]}{\sqrt{\sigma_{\mathbf{v}^{T}\mathbf{d}}^{2}\sigma_{y}^{2}}}$$



Implementation with the Lasagne library, trains in Theano. Data: ImageNet, rescaled and cropped to 224x224 pixels Used network: pre-trained VGG-16

Signal estimators trained on first half of training set v used for quality estimator trained on second half. Official validation set of 50000 samples used for validation



VGG16-network - several days training of 4 GPUs Linear and two-component estimators - 4 hours training Quality estimator - 1 day training signal estimator on Tesla K40

afterwards individual explanations are computationally cheap





Figure: Comparing different signal estimators in each layer. Higher is better





Figure: Averaged most relevant image patches. Higher decay is better.





horn — horn (0.98)

Figure: Compare different signal estimators and it's attribution



goldfish goldfish (1.00)

Kerry blue terrier giant schnauzer (0.47) 32



Input







function

_ _ _ _ _ _

Gradient











Summary



- Showed a interesting approach to learn what areas are of interest
- PatternNet works perfectly for linear model and good for real images
- Requires additional time for training, but is computationally cheap for individual explanations

Discussion



- a few formulas were unnecessarily complicated
- It's hard to tell if comparison is to other methods fair or there is something better around
- easy to build a minimal model that self proposed method is optimized for

Learning how to explain neural networks: PatternNet and PatternAttribution Kindermans et al. 2017 (Google Brain, TU Berlin)



Florian Kleinicke

Universität Heidelberg kleinicke@stud.uni-heidelberg.de

June 7, 2018