

Active Learning by Learning

Hsuan-Tien Lin, National Taiwan University
based on joint work with Wei-Ning Hsu, *AAAI '15*

This Webinar is provided to you by
IEEE Computational Intelligence Society
https://cis.ieee.org

IEEE Computational Intelligence Society

IEEE Advancing Technology for Humanity

About Me

Professor
National Taiwan University



Chief Data Science Consultant
(former Chief Data Scientist)
Appier Inc.

Co-author
Learning from Data

Instructor
NTU-Coursera Mandarin MOOCs
ML Foundations/Techniques





Apple Recognition Problem

Note: Slide Taken from my "ML Techniques" MOOC

- need **apple classifier**: is this a picture of an apple?
- gather photos under CC-BY-2.0 license on Flicker (**thanks to the authors below!**) and **label them as apple/other for learning**

(APAL stands for Apple and Pear Australia Ltd)

Dan Foy
`flic.kr/p/jNQ55`

APAL
`flic.kr/p/jzP1VB`

adrianbartel
`flic.kr/p/bdy2hZ`

ANdrzej cH.
`flic.kr/p/51DKA8`

Stuart Webster
`flic.kr/p/9C3Ybd`

nachans
`flic.kr/p/9XD7Ag`

APAL
`flic.kr/p/jzRe4u`

Jo Jakeman
`flic.kr/p/7jwtGp`

APAL
`flic.kr/p/jzPYNr`

APAL
`flic.kr/p/jzScif`

Apple Recognition Problem

Note: Slide Taken from my "ML Techniques" MOOC

- need **apple classifier**: is this a picture of an apple?
- gather photos under CC-BY-2.0 license on Flicker (**thanks to the authors below!**) and **label them as apple/other for learning**

(APAL stands for Apple and Pear Australia Ltd)

Mr. Roboto.
`flic.kr/p/i5BN85`

Richard North
`flic.kr/p/bHhPkB`

Richard North
`flic.kr/p/d8tGou`

Emilian Robert Vicol
`flic.kr/p/bpmGXW`

Nathaniel McQueen
`flic.kr/p/pZv1Mf`

Crystal
`flic.kr/p/kaPYp`

jfh686
`flic.kr/p/6vjRFH`

skyseeker
`flic.kr/p/2MynV`

Janet Hudson
`flic.kr/p/7QDBbm`

Rennett Stowe
`flic.kr/p/agmnrk`

Active Learning: Learning by ‘Asking’

but labeling is **expensive**

Protocol ⇔ Learning Philosophy

- batch: ‘duck feeding’
- **active: ‘question asking’** (iteratively) —query y_n of **chosen** $\mathbf{x}_n$



active: improve hypothesis with fewer labels (hopefully) by asking questions **strategically**

Pool-Based Active Learning Problem

Given

- labeled pool $\mathcal{D}_l = \left\{ (\text{feature } \mathbf{x}_n \text{  }, \textbf{label } y_n \text{ (e.g. IsApple?)}) \right\}_{n=1}^{N}$
- unlabeled pool $\mathcal{D}_u = \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_s \text{  } \right\}_{s=1}^{S}$

Goal: design an algorithm that iteratively

1. **strategically query** some $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_s$  to get associated $\tilde{y}_s$
2. move $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_s, \tilde{y}_s)$ from $\mathcal{D}_u$ to $\mathcal{D}_l$
3. learn **classifier** $g^{(t)}$ from $\mathcal{D}_l$

and improve **test accuracy of** $g^{(t)}$ w.r.t **#queries**

how to **query strategically**?

How to Query Strategically?

by DFID - UK Department for International Development;
licensed under CC BY-SA 2.0 via Wikimedia Commons

Strategy 1

ask **most confused** question

Strategy 2

ask **most frequent** question

Strategy 3

ask **most helpful** question

do you use a **fixed strategy** in practice? ☺

Choice of Strategy

Strategy 1: **uncertainty**	Strategy 2: **representative**	Strategy 3: **exp. error reduction**
ask **most confused** question	ask **most frequent** question	ask **most helpful** question

- **choosing** one single strategy is **non-trivial**:







- human-designed strategy **heuristic** and **confine** machine's ability

can we **free** the machine ☺
by letting it **learn to choose** the strategies?

Our Contributions

a philosophical and algorithmic study of active learning, which ...

- allows machine to make **intelligent choice of strategies**, just like my cute kids
- studies **sound feedback scheme** to tell machine about goodness of choice, just like what I do
- results in **promising active learning performance**, just like (hopefully) the bright future of my kids ☺

will describe **key philosophical ideas** behind our proposed approach

Idea: Trial-and-Reward Like Human

by DFID - UK Department for International Development; licensed under CC BY-SA 2.0 via Wikimedia Commons

K strategies:
$\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \cdots, \mathcal{A}_K$

→ **try** one strategy

→ "goodness" of strategy as **reward**

→ K strategies

two issues: **try** and **reward**

Reduction to Bandit

when do humans **trial**-and-**reward**?

gambling ☺

K strategies: $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \cdots, \mathcal{A}_K$ → **try** one strategy → "goodness" of strategy as **reward** → K strategies

K bandit machines: $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2, \cdots, \mathcal{B}_K$ → **try** one bandit machine → "luckiness" of machine as **reward** → K bandit machines

—will take one well-known **probabilistic bandit learner (EXP4.P)**

intelligent choice of strategy
$\Longrightarrow$ intelligent choice of **bandit machine**

Active Learning by Learning

K strategies:
$\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \cdots, \mathcal{A}_K$

→ **try** one strategy

↓

"goodness" of strategy as **reward**

→ K strategies

Given: K existing active learning strategies

for $t = 1, 2, \ldots, T$

1. let EXP4.P **decide strategy $\mathcal{A}_k$ to try**
2. **query the $\tilde{x}_s$** suggested by $\mathcal{A}_k$, and compute $g^{(t)}$
3. evaluate **goodness of $g^{(t)}$** as **reward** of **trial** to update EXP4.P

only remaining problem: **what reward**?

Ideal Reward

ideal reward after updating classifier $g^{(t)}$ by the query $(\mathbf{x}_{n_t}, y_{n_t})$:

$$\text{accuracy } \frac{1}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{M} [\![y_m = g^{(t)}(\mathbf{x}_m)]\!] \text{ on } \textbf{test set } \{(\mathbf{x}_m, y_m)\}_{m=1}^{M}$$

- **test accuracy** as reward: area under query-accuracy curve $\equiv$ cumulative reward



- test accuracy **infeasible** in practice: labeling **expensive**, remember? ☺

difficulty: approximate test accuracy **on the fly**

Training Accuracy as Reward

test accuracy $\cancel{\frac{1}{M}\sum_{m=1}^{M}[\![y_m = g^{(t)}(\mathbf{x}_m)]\!]}$ infeasible, naïve replacement:

$$\text{accuracy } \frac{1}{t}\sum_{\tau=1}^{t}[\![y_{n_\tau} = g^{(t)}(\mathbf{x}_{n_\tau})]\!] \text{ on } \textbf{labeled pool } \{(\mathbf{x}_{n_\tau}, y_{n_\tau})\}_{\tau=1}^{t}$$

- **training accuracy** as reward:
  training accuracy $\approx$ **test accuracy**?
- not necessarily!!
  —for active learning strategy that asks **easiest** questions:
  - training accuracy **high**: $\mathbf{x}_{n_\tau}$ easy to label
  - test accuracy **low**: not enough information about **harder instances**

training accuracy:
too **biased** to approximate test accuracy

Weighted Training Accuracy as Reward

training accuracy $\cancel{\frac{1}{t}\sum_{\tau=1}^{t}[\![y_{n_\tau} = g^{(t)}(\mathbf{x}_{n_\tau})]\!]}$ biased,
want **less-biased estimator**

- **non-uniform sampling** theorem: if $(\mathbf{x}_{n_\tau}, y_{n_\tau})$ sampled with probability $p_\tau > 0$ from data set $\{(\mathbf{x}_n, y_n)\}_{n=1}^{N}$ in iteration τ, in **expectation**

$$\textbf{weighted}\ \text{training accuracy}\ \frac{1}{t}\sum_{\tau=1}^{t}\frac{1}{p_\tau}[\![y_{n_\tau} = g(\mathbf{x}_{n_\tau})]\!] \approx \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N}[\![y_n = g(\mathbf{x}_n)]\!]$$

- with **probabilistic query** like EXP4.P:
weighted training accuracy $\approx$ test accuracy

weighted training accuracy:
less biased approx. of test accuracy on the fly

Active Learning by Learning (Hsu and Lin, 2015)

K strategies:
$\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \cdots, \mathcal{A}_K$

→ **try** one strategy

↓

"goodness" of strategy as **reward**

→ K strategies

Given: K existing active learning strategies

for $t = 1, 2, \ldots, T$

1. let EXP4.P **decide strategy $\mathcal{A}_k$ to try**
2. **query the $\tilde{x}_s$** suggested by $\mathcal{A}_k$, and compute $g^{(t)}$
3. evaluate **weighted training accuracy of $g^{(t)}$** as **reward** of **trial** to update EXP4.P

other possible **rewards**?

Human-Designed Criterion as Reward

(Baram et al., 2004) COMB approach:

bandit + **balancedness** of $g^{(t)}$ on unlabeled data as reward

- why? human criterion that matches classifier to **domain assumption**
- but many active learning applications are on **unbalanced data!**
  —assumption may be **unrealistic**

existing strategies: active learning by acting;
COMB: active learning by acting;
ours: active learning **by learning**

Comparison with Single Strategies

UNCERTAIN Best



vehicle

PSDS Best



sonar

QUIRE Best



diabetes

- **no single best strategy** for every data set: choosing needed
- **ALBL** consistently **matches the best**: similar findings across other data sets

ALBL: effective in **making intelligent choices**

Comparison with Other Bandit-Driven Algorithms

ALBL ≈ COMB



diabetes

ALBL > COMB



sonar

- **ALBL** > ALBL-Train generally
  —**importance-weighted** mechanism needed for correcting biased training accuracy
- **ALBL** consistently **comparable to or better than** COMB
  —**learning performance** more useful than human-criterion

ALBL: effective in **utilizing performance**

Summary

Active Learning by Learning

- based on **bandit learning** + **less biased performance estimator** as reward
- effective in **making intelligent choices**
  —comparable or superior to the best of existing strategies
- effective in **utilizing learning performance**
  —superior to human-criterion-based approach

open-source tool developed: `https://github.com/ntucllab/libact`



Wait! Discussion and more!

Discussion for Theoreticians

weighted training accuracy $\frac{1}{t}\sum_{\tau=1}^{t}\frac{1}{p_\tau}[\![y_{n_\tau} = g^{(t)}(\mathbf{x}_{n_\tau})]\!]$ as reward

- is reward unbiased estimator of test performance?
  no for learned $g^{(t)}$ (yes for fixed g)
- is reward fixed before playing?
  no because $g^{(t)}$ learned from $(\mathbf{x}_{n_t}, y_{n_t})$
- is reward independent of each other?
  no because past history all in reward

ALBL: tools from theoreticians
+ **wild/unintended usage**

Have We Made Active Learning More Realistic? (1/2)



Yes!

open-source tool `libact` developed (Yang, 2017)

`https://github.com/ntucllab/libact`

- including uncertainty, QUIRE, PSDS, . . ., **and ALBL**
- received $>$ 500 **stars** and continuous **issues**

"`libact` is a Python package designed to **make active learning easier** for real-world users"

Have We Made Active Learning More Realistic? (2/2)

No! (Not Completely!)

- single-most raised **issue**: hard to install on Windows/Mac
  —because several strategies requires some C packages
- performance in a recent industry project:



—**uncertainty** sampling **often suffices**; ALBL **dragged down by bad strategy**

IEEE Computational Intelligence Society

"`libact` is a Python package **designed to make active learning easier** for real-world users"

IEEE

Other Attempts for Realistic Active Learning

"learn" a strategy **beforehand** rather than on-the-fly?

- transfer active learning experience (Chu and Lin, 2016)

—**not easy to realize** in open-source package

other active learning tasks?

- NLP (Yuan et al., 2020)
- reinforcement learning (Chen et al., 2020)
- annotation cost-sensitive (Tsou and Lin, 2019)
- classification cost-sensitive (Huang and Lin, 2016)

many more needs to be satisfied: mini-batch, multi-label query, weak-label query, etc.

Lessons Learned from Research on Active Learning by Learning

1. **scalability bottleneck** of artificial intelligence:
   choice of methods/models/parameter/. . .
2. think outside of the **math** box:
   'non-rigorous' usage may be **good enough**
3. easy-to-use in design $\neq$ **easy-to-use in reality**

IEEE Computational Intelligence Society

Thank you! Questions?