## Towards Interpretable Deep Learning for Natural Language Processing

Roy Schwartz

#### University of Washington & Allen Institute for Artificial Intelligence

December 2018





## (Deep-Learning-Based) AI Today

**Allen**NI P Machine Comprehension Textual Entailment Semantic Role Labeling Coreference Resolution Named Entity Recognition **Constituency Parsing** Dependency Parsing **Open Information** 

WikiTableQuestions Semantic Parser









- backpropagation
- stochastic gradient descent
- PyTorch, TensorFlow, AllenNLP
- 🖆 state-of-the-art



- backpropagation
- 🕼 stochastic gradient descent
- PyTorch, TensorFlow, AllenNLP
- 🖆 state-of-the-art
- $\mathbb{R}$  architecture engineering





- backpropagation
- 🕼 stochastic gradient descent
- PyTorch, TensorFlow, AllenNLP
- 🖆 state-of-the-art
- **I** → architecture engineering



- 🖆 backpropagation
- stochastic gradient descent
- PyTorch, TensorFlow, AllenNLP
- 🖆 state-of-the-art
- **I** architecture engineering



### Weighted Finite-State Automata

- widely studied
- 🖆 understandable
- interpretable
- informed model development



- 🖆 backpropagation
- stochastic gradient descent
- PyTorch, TensorFlow, AllenNLP
- 🖆 state-of-the-art
- **I** architecture engineering



#### Weighted Finite-State Automata

- widely studied
- 🖆 understandable
- interpretable
- informed model development
- **I** low performance



- 🖆 backpropagation
- stochastic gradient descent
- PyTorch, TensorFlow, AllenNLP
- 🖆 state-of-the-art
- architecture engineering

#### Weighted Finite-State Automata

- widely studied
- 🕼 understandable
- interpretable
- informed model development
- R low performance

## Deep Learning Models for NLP: Overview

Case Study: Sentiment Analysis



## Deep Learning Models for NLP: Overview

Case Study: Sentiment Analysis



## Deep Learning Models for NLP: Overview

Case Study: Sentiment Analysis



### Overview

- Background: Weighted Finite-State Automata
- Neural Weighted Finite-State Automata
- Existing Deep Models as Weighted Finite-State Automata
  - Case Study: Convolutional neural networks

### Overview

- Background: Weighted Finite-State Automata
- Neural Weighted Finite-State Automata
- Existing Deep Models as Weighted Finite-State Automata
  - Case Study: Convolutional neural networks

## Background: Finite-State Automata

Regular Expressions (Patterns)



## Background: Finite-State Automata

Regular Expressions (Patterns)



**Pattern**: such a great talk



- (Weighted) pattern: such a great talk
  - Weights are typically pre-specified



- (Weighted) pattern: such a great talk
  - Weights are typically pre-specified
- ► The score of a sequence is the sum of transition scores



- (Weighted) pattern: such a great talk
  - Weights are typically pre-specified
- ► The score of a sequence is the sum of transition scores



- (Weighted) pattern: such a great talk
  - Weights are typically pre-specified
- ► The score of a sequence is the sum of transition scores



- (Weighted) pattern: such a great talk
  - Weights are typically pre-specified
- ► The score of a sequence is the sum of transition scores



- (Weighted) pattern: such a great talk
  - Weights are typically pre-specified
- ► The score of a sequence is the sum of transition scores

### Overview

- Background: Weighted Finite-State Automata
- Neural Weighted Finite-State Automata
- Existing Deep Models as Weighted Finite-State Automata
  - Case Study: Convolutional neural networks

### Overview

- Background: Weighted Finite-State Automata
- Neural Weighted Finite-State Automata
- Existing Deep Models as Weighted Finite-State Automata
  - Case Study: Convolutional neural networks

## Motivation: Soft Pattern Matching

- such a great talk
  - such a <u>wonderful</u> talk, such a lovely talk

## Motivation: Soft Pattern Matching

- such a great talk
  - such a <u>wonderful</u> talk, such a lovely talk
- ► Naive solution:



## Motivation: Soft Pattern Matching

- such a great talk
  - such a <u>wonderful</u> talk, such a lovely talk
- ► Naive solution:



- Problem: not scalable
  - what a great talk, such <u>an</u> <u>awesome</u> talk



$$\underbrace{\mathbf{s}_0}_{\mathsf{great}/0.3} \underbrace{\mathbf{s}_1}_{\mathsf{s}_1} \underbrace{\mathsf{s}_1}_{\mathsf{s}_1} \underbrace{\mathsf{s}_1} \underbrace{\mathsf{s}_1}_{\mathsf{s}_1} \underbrace{\mathsf{s}_1}_{\mathsf{s}_1} \underbrace{\mathsf{s}_1}_{\mathsf{s}_1} \underbrace{\mathsf{s}_1}_{\mathsf{s}_1} \underbrace{\mathsf{s}_1}_{\mathsf{s}_1} \underbrace{\mathsf{s}_1}_{\mathsf{s}_1} \underbrace{\mathsf{s}_1} \underbrace{\mathsf{s$$

- Step 1: word  $\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ 
  - Word embeddings
  - Similar words are encoded in similar vectors



- Step 1: word  $\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ 
  - Word embeddings
  - Similar words are encoded in similar vectors
- Step 2: Accept all word vectors

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{s}_{0}}_{\mathsf{s}_{0}} \xrightarrow{\mathsf{great}/0.3} \underbrace{\mathbf{s}_{1}}_{\mathsf{s}_{1}} \xrightarrow{\mathsf{s}_{0}} \underbrace{\mathbf{s}_{0}}_{\mathsf{s}_{0}} \xrightarrow{\forall \mathbf{v}/\mathbf{f}_{\theta}(\mathbf{v})} \underbrace{\mathbf{s}_{1}}_{\mathsf{s}_{1}}$$

- Step 1: word  $\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ 
  - Word embeddings
  - Similar words are encoded in similar vectors
- ► Step 2: Accept all word vectors
- Step 3: weights:  $\mathbf{f}_{\theta} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ 
  - These functions favor specific words
  - $\theta$  parameters are learned

- Neural transitions accept all words,
- but favor specific words



- Neural transitions accept all words,
- but favor specific words
- ► Example 1: great
  - ► high score: great, awesome, good
  - Iow score: bad, child, three



- Neural transitions accept all words,
- but favor specific words
- ► Example 1: great
  - ► high score: great, awesome, good
  - Iow score: bad, child, three
- ► Example 2: the
  - high score: the, a, an
  - Iow score: car, love, well



### Neural Weighted Finite-State Automata Schwartz et al., ACL 2018

v – word vectors  $\theta = (\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)$  – learned parameters



▶ Neural WFSAs accept any sequence,<sup>1</sup> but prefer certain sequences

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Pending length constraints

### Neural Weighted Finite-State Automata Schwartz et al., ACL 2018

v – word vectors  $\theta = (\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)$  – learned parameters



Neural WFSAs accept any sequence,<sup>1</sup> but prefer certain sequences

#### • Example 1: *such a great talk*

- high score: what a great talk, such an awesome talk
- Iow score: such a horrible talk, such a black cat, john went to school

#### <sup>1</sup>Pending length constraints
### Neural Weighted Finite-State Automata Schwartz et al., ACL 2018

v – word vectors  $\theta = (\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)$  – learned parameters



► Neural WFSAs accept any sequence,<sup>1</sup> but prefer certain sequences

- Example 1: *such a great talk* 
  - high score: what a great talk, such an awesome talk
  - ► low score: such a horrible talk, such a black cat, john went to school
- Example 2: is not very exciting
  - ► high score: is not particularly exciting, are not very inspiring

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Pending length constraints

# Training Procedure

Formally

#### End-to-end training:

- Input

  - Word embeddings: word  $ightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$
  - Training data: pairs of <document, sentiment label>
- Output
  - Parameter values:  $\theta$

# Training Procedure

Formally

#### End-to-end training:

#### Input

- $\blacktriangleright \quad \underbrace{ s_0 \qquad }_{s_0} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_0}(v) \qquad }_{s_1} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_1}(v) \qquad }_{s_2} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_2}(v) \qquad }_{s_3} \underbrace{ s_3 \qquad }_{f_{\theta_3}(v) \qquad } \underbrace{ s_4 \qquad }_{s_4} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_3}(v) \qquad }_{s_5} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_3}(v) \qquad }_{s_5} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_3}(v) \qquad }_{s_6} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_3}(v) \ }_{s_6} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_3}($
- Word embeddings: word  $ightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$
- Training data: pairs of <document, sentiment label>
- Output
  - Parameter values:  $\theta$

#### Test:

#### ► Input

- $\blacktriangleright \quad \underbrace{ s_0 \qquad }_{s_0} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_1}(v) }_{s_1} \underbrace{ s_1 \qquad }_{s_2} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_1}(v) }_{s_2} \underbrace{ s_2 \qquad }_{s_3} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_3}(v) }_{s_4} \underbrace{ s_4 }_{s_4} \underbrace{$
- Word embeddings: word  $ightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$
- ► Learned parameters: θ
- New data: <document>
- ► Output
  - Prediction: <sentiment label>

# Training Procedure

Formally

#### End-to-end training:

#### Input

- $\blacktriangleright \quad \underbrace{ \underset{0}{\overset{0}{\underset{0}}} \underbrace{ \underset{0}{\overset{0}{\underset{0}}} \underbrace{ \underset{0}{\overset{0}{\underset{0}}} \underbrace{ \underset{0}{\overset{0}{\underset{0}}{\underset{0}}} \underbrace{ \underset{0}{\underset{0}}} \underbrace{ \underset{0}{\underset{0}}{\underset{0}} \underbrace{ \underset{0}{\underset{0}}} \underbrace{ \underset{0}{\underset{0}}{\underset{0}}} \underbrace{ \underset{0}{\underset{0}}} \underbrace{ \underset{0}{\underset{0}} \underbrace{ \underset{0}{\underset{0}}} \underbrace{ \underset{0}{\underset{0}} \underbrace{ \underset{0}{\underset{0}}} \underbrace{ \underset{0}{\underset{0}} \underbrace{ \underset{0}} \underbrace{ \underset{0}}$
- Word embeddings: word  $\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$
- Training data: pairs of <document, sentiment label>
- Output
  - Parameter values:  $\theta$
- Standard training procedure
  - Backpropagation
  - Stochastic gradient descent

#### Test:

#### ► Input

- $\blacktriangleright \quad \underbrace{ s_0 \qquad } \quad \underbrace{ f_{\theta_0}(v) }_{S_1} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_1}(v) }_{S_2} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_2}(v) }_{S_2} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_3}(v) }_{S_3} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_3}(v) }_{S_4} \underbrace{ s_4 }_{S_4} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_3}(v) }_{S_5} \underbrace{ f_{\theta_3}$
- Word embeddings: word  $ightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$
- ► Learned parameters: θ
- New data: <document>
- Output
  - Prediction: <sentiment label>

Informed Model Development

 $\mathbf{s}_0$  $\mathbf{s}_1$  $\mathbf{s}_2$  $\mathbf{s}_3$  $\mathbf{s}_4$ 

Fixed length: such a great talk

Informed Model Development

 $\mathbf{S}_1$  $\mathbf{s}_2$  $\mathbf{s}_3$  $\mathbf{s}_4$  $\mathbf{S}_0$  $\mathbf{s}_4$  )  $\mathbf{s}_0$  $\mathbf{s}_1$  $\mathbf{s}_2$  $\mathbf{s}_3$ 

Fixed length: such a great talk

Self loops: such a great, wonderful, funny talk

Informed Model Development



 $\underbrace{s_0} \xrightarrow{s_1} \underbrace{s_2} \xrightarrow{s_3} \underbrace{s_4}$ 

Fixed length: such a great talk

Self loops: such a great, wonderful, funny talk

Epsilon transitions: *such* \_ *great shoes* 

Informed Model Development



 $\overbrace{s_0} \longrightarrow \overbrace{s_1} \overbrace{s_2} \longrightarrow \overbrace{s_3} \longrightarrow \overbrace{s_4}$ 



Fixed length: such a great talk

Self loops: such a great, wonderful, funny talk

Epsilon transitions: such great shoes

. . .

#### ► They are **neural**

- Backpropagation
- Stochastic gradient descent
- PyTorch, TensorFlow, AllenNLP

#### ► They are **neural**

- Backpropagation
- Stochastic gradient descent
- PyTorch, TensorFlow, AllenNLP
- Coming up:
  - Many deep models are mathematically equivalent to neural WFSAs
    - ► A (new) joint framework
    - Allows extension of these models

#### Overview

- Background: Weighted Finite-State Automata
- ► Neural Weighted Finite-State Automata
- Existing Deep Models as Weighted Finite-State Automata
  - Case Study: Convolutional neural networks

#### Overview

- Background: Weighted Finite-State Automata
- Neural Weighted Finite-State Automata
- ► Existing Deep Models as Weighted Finite-State Automata
  - ► Case Study: Convolutional neural networks

#### Case Study: Convolutional Neural Networks (ConvNets) A Linear-Kernel Filter with Max-Pooling



#### Case Study: Convolutional Neural Networks (ConvNets) A Linear-Kernel Filter with Max-Pooling



#### Proposition 1: ConvNet Filters are Computing WFSA scores Schwartz et al., ACL 2018



# Proposition 1: ConvNet Filters are Computing WFSA scores Schwartz et al., ACL 2018

$$\blacktriangleright \mathbf{f}_{\theta_j}(\mathbf{v}) = \theta_j \cdot \mathbf{v}$$



# Proposition 1: ConvNet Filters are Computing WFSA scores Schwartz et al., ACL 2018

• 
$$\mathbf{f}_{\theta_j}(\mathbf{v}) = \theta_j \cdot \mathbf{v}$$
  
•  $s_{\theta}(\mathbf{v}_1 : \mathbf{v}_4) = \sum_{j=1:4} \mathbf{f}_{\theta_j}(\mathbf{v}_j) = \sum_{j=1:4} (\theta_j \cdot \mathbf{v}_j)$ 



# ConvNets are (Implicitly) Computing WFSA Scores!

ConvNet : 
$$S_{\theta}(\mathbf{v}_{1} : \mathbf{v}_{d}) = \sum_{j=1:d} (\theta_{j} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{j})$$
 (1)  
Neural WFSA :  $s_{\theta}(\mathbf{v}_{1} : \mathbf{v}_{d}) = \sum_{j=1:d} (\theta_{j} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{j})$  (2)

# ConvNets are (Implicitly) Computing WFSA Scores!

ConvNet : 
$$S_{\theta}(\mathbf{v}_{1} : \mathbf{v}_{d}) = \sum_{j=1:d} (\theta_{j} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{j})$$
 (1)  
Neural WFSA :  $s_{\theta}(\mathbf{v}_{1} : \mathbf{v}_{d}) = \sum_{j=1:d} (\theta_{j} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{j})$  (2)

Benefits:

✓ Interpret ConvNets

✓ Improve ConvNets

# A ConvNet Learns a Fixed-Length *Soft*-Pattern! Schwartz et al., ACL 2018



- ► E.g., "such a great talk"
  - what a great song
  - such <u>an</u> <u>awesome</u> <u>movie</u>

- Language pattern are often flexible-length
- ► such a great talk
  - such a great, funny, interesting talk
  - ▶ such great <u>shoes</u>

- Language pattern are often flexible-length
- ► such a great talk
  - such a great, funny, interesting talk
  - ▶ such great <u>shoes</u>

Convolutional Neural Network:



$$S_{\theta}(\mathbf{v}_1:\mathbf{v}_d) = \sum_{j=1:d} (\theta_j \cdot \mathbf{v}_j)$$

- Language pattern are often flexible-length
- ► such a great talk
  - such a great, funny, interesting talk
  - ▶ such great <u>shoes</u>

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{S}_{0}}_{such} \underbrace{\mathbf{S}_{1}}_{a} \xrightarrow{a} \underbrace{\mathbf{S}_{2}}_{great} \underbrace{\mathbf{S}_{3}}_{s} \xrightarrow{talk} \underbrace{\mathbf{S}_{4}}_{s}$$

- Language pattern are often flexible-length
- ► such a great talk
  - such a great, funny, interesting talk
  - ▶ such great <u>shoes</u>



- Language pattern are often flexible-length
- ► such a great talk
  - such a great, funny, interesting talk
  - ▶ such great <u>shoes</u>



- Language pattern are often flexible-length
- ► such a great talk
  - such a great, funny, interesting talk
  - ▶ such great <u>shoes</u>





# Sentiment Analysis Experiments



# Sentiment Analysis Experiments



# Sentiment Analysis Experiments



#### Sentiment Analysis Results Schwartz et al., ACL 2018



#### Sentiment Analysis Results Schwartz et al., ACL 2018



#### Sentiment Analysis Results Schwartz et al., ACL 2018



#### Interpreting SoPa Soft Patterns!

▶ For each learned pattern, extract the 4 top scoring phrases in the training set

▶ For each learned pattern, extract the 4 top scoring phrases in the training set

| Highest Scoring Phrases |  |   |  |
|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| Patt. 1                 | mesmerizing<br>engrossing<br>clear-eyed<br>fascinating | portrait of a<br>portrait of a<br>portrait of an<br>portrait of a |  |



▶ For each learned pattern, extract the 4 top scoring phrases in the training set

| Highest Scoring Phrases  | Highest Scoring Phrases   |
|--|---|
| Patt. 1 mesmerizing portrait of a engrossing portrait of a clear-eyed portrait of an fascinating portrait of a | Patt. 2honest,and enjoyableforceful,and beautifullyenergetic,and surprisingly |



▶ For each learned pattern, extract the 4 top scoring phrases in the training set

| Highest Scoring Phrases  | Highest Scoring Phrases  |
|--|--|
| Patt. 1 mesmerizing portrait of a engrossing portrait of a clear-eyed portrait of an fascinating portrait of a | $\left  \begin{array}{ccc} Patt. 2 \\ Patt. 2 \\ \end{array} \right  \begin{array}{c} honest & , & \text{and enjoyable} \\ forceful & , & \text{and beautifully} \\ energetic & , & \text{and surprisingly} \\ unpretentious & , & charming_{SL} \\ \end{array} \right  , & quirky \end{array}$  |
|  | $(s_{1}) \xrightarrow{(i)} (s_{1}) \xrightarrow{(i)} (s_{2}) \xrightarrow{(i)} (s_{2}) \xrightarrow{(i)} (s_{3}) \xrightarrow{(i)} (s_{4}) \xrightarrow{(i)} (s_{$ |






#### More expressive WFSA

#### 



## Many Existing Deep Models are Neural WFSAs!

Peng, Schwartz et al., EMNLP 2018

| Mikolov et al.<br>Balduzzi and Ghifary<br>Bradbury et al.<br>Lei et al. | arXiv 2014<br>ICML 2016<br>ICLR 2017<br>EMNLP 2018 |  |
|---|--|--|
| Lei et al.  | NAACL 2016   |  |
| Foerster et al.   | ICML 2017  |  |

# Many Existing Deep Models are Neural WFSAs!

Peng, Schwartz et al., EMNLP 2018

| Mikolov et al.<br>Balduzzi and Ghifary<br>Bradbury et al.<br>Lei et al. | arXiv 2014<br>ICML 2016<br>ICLR 2017<br>EMNLP 2018 | $s_0$ $s_1$             |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| Lei et al.  | NAACL 2016   | $(s_0)$ $(s_1)$ $(s_2)$ |
| Foerster et al.   | ICML 2017  |                         |

# Many Existing Deep Models are Neural WFSAs!

Peng, Schwartz et al., EMNLP 2018



 Six recent recurrent neural networks (RNN) models are also implicitly computing WFSA scores

### Developing more Robust WFSA Models



Lei et al. (2016)

Mikolov et al. (2014) Balduzzi and Ghifary (2016) Bradbury et al. (2017) Lei et al. (2018)

### Developing more Robust WFSA Models



#### Sentiment Analysis Results Peng, Schwartz et al., EMNLP 2018



### Language Modeling Results

Peng, Schwartz et al., EMNLP 2018





#### Deep Learning

- 🖆 backpropagation
- stochastic gradient descent
- PyTorch, TensorFlow, AllenNLP
- 🖆 state-of-the-art
- architecture engineering

#### Weighted Finite-State Automata

- widely studied
- 🖆 understandable
- interpretable
- informed model development
- R low performance

### Work in Progress 1: Are All Deep Models for NLP Equivalent to WFSAs?

- Elman RNN:  $\mathbf{h}_i = \sigma(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}_{i-1} + \mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{b})$
- ▶ The interaction between  $h_i$  and  $h_{i-1}$  is via affine transformations followed by nonlinearities
  - Same for LSTM MAN
- Most probably not equivalent to a WFSA





#### Deep learning: model engineering

















 $S_1$ 

**S**2



 $S_4$ 











Schwartz et al., CoNLL 2017; Gururangan, Swayamdipta, Levy, Schwartz et al., NAACL 2018

| Premise    | A person is running on the beach |  |  |
|------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Hypothesis | The person is sleeping           |  |  |

**Textual Entailment** (state-of-the-art ~90% accuracy)

Schwartz et al., CoNLL 2017; Gururangan, Swayamdipta, Levy, Schwartz et al., NAACL 2018

| Premise    | A person is running on the beach          |  |
|------------|---|--|
| Hypothesis | The person is sleeping $\overbrace{?}{?}$ | entailment<br>contradiction<br>neutral |

**Textual Entailment** (state-of-the-art ~90% accuracy)

Schwartz et al., CoNLL 2017; Gururangan, Swayamdipta, Levy, Schwartz et al., NAACL 2018



**Textual Entailment** (state-of-the-art ~90% accuracy)

AllenNLP Demo!

Schwartz et al., CoNLL 2017; Gururangan, Swayamdipta, Levy, Schwartz et al., NAACL 2018



**Textual Entailment** (state-of-the-art ~90% accuracy)

- ► The word "sleeping" is over-represented in the training data with contradiction label
  - annotation artifact
- State-of-the-art models focus on this word rather than understanding the text

Schwartz et al., CoNLL 2017; Gururangan, Swayamdipta, Levy, Schwartz et al., NAACL 2018



**Textual Entailment** (state-of-the-art ~90% accuracy)

► The word "sleeping" is over-represented in the training data with contradiction label

#### annotation artifact

- State-of-the-art models focus on this word rather than understanding the text
- Models are not as strong as we think they are

## Long Term Vision







### Long Term Vision

- ► Explainable models
- Unbiased models







#### Special Thanks to...











Special Thanks to...







#### Special Thanks to...













#### Neural WFSAs as Sequence Encoders



#### Neural WFSAs as Sequence Encoders



back to main














# SoPa Complexity

- ► Running the Viterbi (1967) algorithm on a sequence of n tokens and a WFSA of d states typically takes O(d<sup>3</sup> + d<sup>2</sup>(n))
- We only allow zero or one  $\epsilon$ -transition at a time  $\Rightarrow O(d^2(n))$
- We only allow self-loop and main path transitions  $\Rightarrow O(dn)$
- Scores on all patterns can be computed in parallel
  - $\blacktriangleright$  GPU optimization further reduces the observed runtime to be sublinear in d

# Interpreting SoPa

Visualizing Sentiment Predictions

- Leave-one-out method on all patterns
- ▶ Visualize the spans with the largest (**positive**) and (*negative*) contribution

#### **Analyzed Documents**

it's dumb, but more importantly, it's just not scary

While its careful pace and seemingly *opaque story* may not satisfy every moviegoer's appetite, the film's final scene is soaringly, transparently moving

#### LSTMs Exploit Linguistic Attributes of Data Liu, Levy, Schwartz et al., RepL4NLP 2018, best paper award



Non-linguistic task



#### LSTMs Exploit Linguistic Attributes of Data Liu, Levy, Schwartz et al., RepL4NLP 2018, best paper award



Uniform
Unigram
5gram
10gram
50gram
Language



- Non-linguistic task
- Although they weren't designed that way, LSTMs do much better when trained on language data









#### Recurrent Neural Networks: Hidden States



#### Recurrent Neural Networks: Hidden States



# Multiple Variants of Recurrent Neural Networks

- ► Elman (1990)
- LSTM (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997)
- ▶ GRU (Cho et al., 2014)
- SGU (Gao and Glowacka, 2016)
- RAN (Lee et al., 2017)

- SCRN (Mikolov et al., 2014)
- T-RNN (Balduzzi and Ghifary, 2016)
- RCNN (Lei et al., 2016)
- Q-RNN (Bradbury et al., 2017)
- ISAN (Foerster et al., 2017)
- SoPa (Schwartz et al., 2018)
- SRU (Lei et al., 2018)

# Multiple Variants of Recurrent Neural Networks

- ► Elman (1990)
- LSTM (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997)
- ▶ GRU (Cho et al., 2014)
- SGU (Gao and Glowacka, 2016)
- RAN (Lee et al., 2017)

- SCRN (Mikolov et al., 2014)
- T-RNN (Balduzzi and Ghifary, 2016)
- RCNN (Lei et al., 2016)
- Q-RNN (Bradbury et al., 2017)
- ▶ ISAN (Foerster et al., 2017)
- SoPa (Schwartz et al., 2018)
- SRU (Lei et al., 2018)

- What do different RNN variants have in common?
- ► What are they learning?
- Can we improve them?

- ► A simple, competitive RNN
  - Draws inspiration from physics and functional programming

$$\blacktriangleright \mathbf{h}_i = \mathbf{z}_i \cdot \mathbf{h}_{i-1} + \mathbf{u}_i$$

•  $\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{u}_i$  are non-linear parameterized functions of  $\mathbf{v}_i$ 

- A simple, competitive RNN
  - Draws inspiration from physics and functional programming
- $\blacktriangleright \mathbf{h}_i = \mathbf{z}_i \cdot \mathbf{h}_{i-1} + \mathbf{u}_i$

•  $\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{u}_i$  are non-linear parameterized functions of  $\mathbf{v}_i$ 

• Let  $\mathbf{x}_i = [\mathbf{x}_i]_k$ :

 $\mathbf{h}_n = \mathbf{z}_n \cdot \mathbf{h}_{n-1} + \mathbf{u}_n$ 

- ► A simple, competitive RNN
  - Draws inspiration from physics and functional programming
- $\blacktriangleright \mathbf{h}_i = \mathbf{z}_i \cdot \mathbf{h}_{i-1} + \mathbf{u}_i$

•  $\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{u}_i$  are non-linear parameterized functions of  $\mathbf{v}_i$ 

• Let  $\mathbf{x}_i = [\mathbf{x}_i]_k$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h}_n &= \mathbf{z}_n \cdot \mathbf{h}_{n-1} + \mathbf{u}_n \\ &= \mathbf{z}_n \cdot (\mathbf{z}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{h}_{n-2} + \mathbf{u}_{n-1}) + \mathbf{u}_n \end{aligned}$$

- ► A simple, competitive RNN
  - Draws inspiration from physics and functional programming
- $\blacktriangleright \mathbf{h}_i = \mathbf{z}_i \cdot \mathbf{h}_{i-1} + \mathbf{u}_i$

•  $\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{u}_i$  are non-linear parameterized functions of  $\mathbf{v}_i$ 

• Let  $\mathbf{x}_i = [\mathbf{x}_i]_k$ :

$$egin{aligned} \mathbf{h}_n &= \mathbf{z}_n \cdot \mathbf{h}_{n-1} + \mathbf{u}_n \ &= \mathbf{z}_n \cdot (\mathbf{z}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{h}_{n-2} + \mathbf{u}_{n-1}) + \mathbf{u}_n \ &= \mathbf{z}_n \cdot (\mathbf{z}_{n-1} \cdot (\mathbf{z}_{n-2} \cdot \mathbf{h}_{n-3} + \mathbf{u}_{n-2}) + \mathbf{u}_{n-1}) + \mathbf{u}_n \end{aligned}$$

- ► A simple, competitive RNN
  - Draws inspiration from physics and functional programming
- $\blacktriangleright \mathbf{h}_i = \mathbf{z}_i \cdot \mathbf{h}_{i-1} + \mathbf{u}_i$

•  $\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{u}_i$  are non-linear parameterized functions of  $\mathbf{v}_i$ 

• Let  $\mathbf{x}_i = [\mathbf{x}_i]_k$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h}_n &= \mathbf{z}_n \cdot \mathbf{h}_{n-1} + \mathbf{u}_n \\ &= \mathbf{z}_n \cdot (\mathbf{z}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{h}_{n-2} + \mathbf{u}_{n-1}) + \mathbf{u}_n \\ &= \mathbf{z}_n \cdot (\mathbf{z}_{n-1} \cdot (\mathbf{z}_{n-2} \cdot \mathbf{h}_{n-3} + \mathbf{u}_{n-2}) + \mathbf{u}_{n-1}) + \mathbf{u}_n \\ &= \dots \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left( \mathbf{u}_i \prod_{j=i+1}^n \mathbf{z}_j \right) + \mathbf{u}_n \end{aligned}$$

# Weighted Finite-State Automata!



# Weighted Finite-State Automata!



- ► Soft Pattern: W
  - Ignore the self-loops for simplicity

# Weighted Finite-State Automata!



- ► Soft Pattern: W
  - Ignore the self-loops for simplicity

$$\blacktriangleright \ \mathfrak{S}_2 \ (\mathbf{v}_1:\mathbf{v}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left( \mathbf{f}_{0,i}(\mathbf{v}_i,\theta) \prod_{j=i+1}^n \mathbf{f}_{1,i}(\mathbf{v}_j,\theta) \right) + \mathbf{f}_{0,i}(\mathbf{v}_n,\theta)$$

#### Strongly-Typed RNNs are Rational! Can Be Computed Using a Set of WFSAs

$$\mathbf{h}_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left( \mathbf{u}_i \prod_{j=i+1}^n \mathbf{z}_j \right) + \mathbf{u}_n$$
$$S_2(\mathbf{v}_1 : \mathbf{v}_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left( \mathbf{f}_{0+1}(\mathbf{v}_i, \theta) \prod_{j=i+1}^n \mathbf{f}_{1+1}(\mathbf{v}_j, \theta) \right) + \mathbf{f}_{0+1}(\mathbf{v}_n, \theta)$$

Work in Progress 3: Make your own Deep Model!





Work in Progress 3: Make your own Deep Model!





David Balduzzi and Muhammad Ghifary. 2016. Strongly-typed recurrent neural networks. In *Proc. of ICML*.

James Bradbury, Stephen Merity, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2017. Quasi-recurrent neural network. In *Proc. of ICLR*.

- Kyunghyun Cho, Bart van Merrienboer, Dzmitry Bahdanau, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. On the properties of neural machine translation: Encoder-decoder approaches. In *Proc. of SSST*.
- Jeffrey L Elman. 1990. Finding structure in time. Cognitive science, 14(2):179–211.
- Jakob N. Foerster, Justin Gilmer, Jan Chorowski, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, and David Sussillo. 2017. Intelligible language modeling with input switched affine networks. In *Proc. of ICML*.
- Yuan Gao and Dorota Glowacka. 2016. Deep gate recurrent neural network. In *Proc.* of ACML, pages 350–365.
- Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 1997. Long short-term memory. *Neural Computation*, 9(8):1735–1780.
- Kenton Lee, Omer Levy, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. Recurrent additive networks. arXiv:1705.07393.

- Tao Lei, Hrishikesh Joshi, Regina Barzilay, Tommi Jaakkola, Kateryna Tymoshenko, Alessandro Moschitti, and Lluís Màrquez. 2016. Semi-supervised question retrieval with gated convolutions. In *Proc. of NAACL*.
- Tao Lei, Yu Zhang, Sida I. Wang, Hui Dai, and Yoav Artzi. 2018. Simple recurrent units for highly parallelizable recurrence. In *Proc. of EMNLP*.
- Tomas Mikolov, Armand Joulin, Sumit Chopra, Michaël Mathieu, and Marc'Aurelio Ranzato. 2014. Learning longer memory in recurrent neural networks. arXiv:1412.7753.
- Marcel Paul Schützenberger. 1961. On the definition of a family of automata. *Information and Control*, 4(2-3):245–270.
- Roy Schwartz, Sam Thomson, and Noah A. Smith. 2018. SoPa: Bridging CNNs, RNNs, and weighted finite-state machines. In *Proc. of ACL*.
- A. Viterbi. 1967. Error bounds for convolutional codes and an asymptotically optimum decoding algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 13(2):260–269.