Reg-DGM

Deep Generative Modeling on Limited Data with Regularization by Nontransferable Pre-trained Models

Yong Zhong 12 , Hongtao Liu 12 , Xiaodong Liu 12 , Fan Bao 3 , Weiran Shen 12 , Chongxuan Li 12

 ¹Gaoling School of Al, Renmin University of China, Beijing, China
 ²Beijing Key Lab of Big Data Management and Analysis Methods, Beijing, China
 ³Department of Computer Science Technology, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

June 9, 2023

Outline

Research Background

Method

Convergence Analyses

Implementation

Experiments

Research Background

Introduction

- GANs produce poor samples with limited data.
- The problem is shared by other DGMs.

Related Work

- Data augmentations.
- · Designing new losses.
- Transferring a pre-trained DGM.

Method

Motivation

Inspired by the bias-variance dilemma, we propose a complementary framework **Reg-DGM**, which leverages a pre-trained model to reduce the variance of training a DGM with limited data.

Our Method

Let *x* denote the real or fake sample, $p_d(x)$ denote the distribution of real data, $p_g(x)$ denote the generator's distribution, $\mathbb{D}(\cdot||\cdot)$ denote a proper statistical divergence, and $\mathcal{R}_f(x) : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ denote the loss from the per-trained model *f*, we can define our objective loss function:

$$\min_{\rho_{g}(x)} \mathbb{D}(\rho_{d}(x)) || \rho_{g}(x)) + \lambda \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \rho_{g}(x)} [\mathcal{R}_{f}(x)],$$
(1)

where $\lambda \geq 0$ is a hyperparameter to control the relative weight of the two terms.

Method

A Prototypical Gaussian-fitting Example

The data distribution is a (univariate) Gaussian $p_d(x) = \mathcal{N}(x|\mu^*, \sigma^2)$, where σ^2 is known and μ^* is the parameter to be estimated. A training sample $\mathcal{S} = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is drawn i.i.d. according to $p_d(x)$. The hypothesis class for p_g is $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathcal{N}(x|\mu, \sigma^2) \mid \mu \in \mathbb{R}\}$. The regularization term in Eq. (1) is $\mathcal{E}_f(x) := -\log \mathcal{N}(\hat{\mu}_{\text{PRE}}, \sigma^2)$, i.e., $p_f(x) = \mathcal{N}(x|\hat{\mu}_{\text{PRE}}, \sigma^2)$.

Proposition 2.2

Let $\beta = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda+1}$ be the normalized weight of the regularization term. In the Gaussian-fitting example, if $\max\left\{\frac{\sigma^2 - m(\hat{\mu}_{\text{PRE}} - \mu^*)^2}{\sigma^2 + m(\hat{\mu}_{\text{PRE}} - \mu^*)^2}, 0\right\} < \beta < \min\left\{\frac{2\sigma^2}{\sigma^2 + m(\hat{\mu}_{\text{PRE}} - \mu^*)^2}, 1\right\}$, then the following inequalities holds:

 $\label{eq:MSE} \text{MSE}[\hat{\mu}_{\text{REG}}] < \min\{\text{MSE}[\hat{\mu}_{\text{MLE}}], \text{MSE}[\hat{\mu}_{\text{PRE}}]\}.$

Convergence Analyses

Analyses in the Non-parametric Setting

Theorem 3.1

Under mild regularity conditions in Assumption A.1, for any $\lambda > 0$, there exists a unique global minimum of the problem in Eq. (1) with the KL divergence. Furthermore, the global minimum is in the form of $\rho_g^*(x) = \frac{p_d(x)}{\alpha^* + \lambda \mathcal{E}_f(x)}$, where $\alpha^* \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 3.2

Under mild regularity conditions in Assumption A.1, for any $\lambda > 0$, there exists a unique global minimum of the problem in Eq. (1) with the JS divergence. Furthermore, the global minimum is in the form of $p_g^*(x) = \frac{p_g(x)}{e^{\alpha^* + \lambda \mathcal{E}_f(x)} - 1}$, where $\alpha^* \in \mathbb{R}$.

Convergence Analyses

Analyses in the Parametric Settings

Theorem 3.3 (Convergence of Reg-DGM (informal))

Under standard and verifiable smoothness assumptions, with a high probability, Reg-DGM with a sufficiently wide ReLU CNN converges to a global optimum of Eq. (1) trained by GD and converges to a local minimum trained by SGD.

Implementation

Base Model

StyleGAN2, adaptive discriminator augmentation (ADA), and adaptive pseudo augmentation (APA).

Pre-trained Model

ResNet, CLIP image encode, and FaceNet.

Energy Function

The energy function is defined by the expected mean squared error between the features of a generated sample and a training sample as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}_f(x) := \mathbb{E}_{x' \sim \rho_d} \left[\frac{1}{d} ||f(x) - f(x')||_2^2 \right]. \tag{3}$$

Experiments

Benchmark Results with Limited Data

Table 1: Median FID \downarrow on FFHQ and LSUN CAT and mean FID \downarrow on CIFAR-10. [†] and [‡] indicate the results are taken from the references and <u>Karras et al</u> (2020) respectively. Otherwise, the results are reproduced by us upon the official implementation (<u>Karras et al</u>, (2020), <u>Ulang et al</u>, (2021).

Method	FFHQ		LSUN CAT		CIFAR-10	
	1k	5k	1k	5k	50k	
Transfer (Wang et al, 2018)	21.42	12.34				
Freeze-D (Mo et al., 2020)	19.77	12.69				
DA [†] (Zhao et al, 2020a)	25.66	10.45	42.26	16.11	8.49	
InsGen [†] (Yang et al., 2021)	19.58					
GenCo [†] (Cui et al., 2021)	65.31	27.96	140.08	40.79	8.83 ± 0.04	
DA + GenCo [†] (Cui et al., 2021)					6.57 ± 0.01	
ADA + bCR [‡] (Zhao et al, 2020b)	22.61	10.58	38.82	16.80		
$R_{\rm LC}$ [†] (Tseng et al., 2021)	63.16	23.83			8.31 ± 0.05	
ADA + R_{LC}^{\dagger} (Tseng et al., 2021)	21.7				2.47 ± 0.01	
APA [†] (Jiang et al), 2021)	45.19	13.25				
StyleGAN2 (Karras et al., 2020b)	103.66	52.71	186.55	115.16	7.16 ± 0.12	
Reg-StyleGAN2 (ours)	75.99	37.77	107.02	63.10	6.56 ± 0.14	
ADA (Karras et al, 2020a)	22.26	12.64	41.81	16.76	3.07 ± 0.08	
Reg-ADA (ours)	20.05	11.95	36.17	15.91	2.95 ± 0.05	
ADA + APA (Jiang et al, 2021)	19.71	8.84	24.09	11.79	2.64 ± 0.08	
Reg-ADA-APA (ours)	17.88	8.02	21.88	11.27	2.58 ± 0.04	

Experiments

Ablation of Pre-trained Models and Pre-training Datasets

	CLIP				FaceNet	
Method	FFHQ-5k		LSUN CAT-5k		FFHQ-5k	
	FID	KID	FID	KID	FID	KID
StyleGAN2 (Karras et al), 2020b) Reg-StyleGAN2(ours)	$52.71 \\ 40.98$	$39.52 \\ 27.56$	$\begin{array}{c} 115.16\\ 42.04\end{array}$	$100.57 \\ 26.21$	$52.71 \\ 38.80$	$39.52 \\ 23.38$
ADA (Karras et al), 2020a) Reg-ADA(ours)	$\begin{array}{c} 12.64 \\ 11.09 \end{array}$	$5.17 \\ 3.91$	$\begin{array}{c} 16.76 \\ 14.15 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 8.13 \\ 6.72 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 12.64 \\ 11.37 \end{array}$	$5.17 \\ 4.01$
ADA+APA (Jiang et al), 2021) Reg-ADA-APA(ours)	8.84 8.18	2.76 2.26	11.79 10.47	4.86 4.68	8.84 8.21	2.76 2.37

Table 2: Median FID \downarrow and the corresponding KID $\times 10^3 \downarrow$ using a pre-trained CLIP or FaceNet.

Experiments

Qualitative Result



(a) 100-shot Obama (FID 39.53)

(b) FFHQ-5k (FID 11.69)

Figure 3: Samples from the Reg-ADA, truncated ($\psi = 0.7$) as in prior work (Karras et al), 2020a).

Thanks for your attention.