Explaining Sequence-Level Knowledge Distillation as Data-Augmentation for Neural Machine Translation

Mitchell A. Gordon
Johns Hopkins University
mitchg@jhu.edu

Kevin Duh
Johns Hopkins University
kevinduh@cs.jhu.edu

arXiv:1912.03334v1 [cs.CL] 6 Dec 2019

Abstract

Sequence-level knowledge distillation (SLKD) is a model compression technique that leverages large, accurate teacher models to train smaller, under-parameterized student models. Why does pre-processing MT data with SLKD help us train smaller models? We test the common hypothesis that SLKD addresses a capacity deficiency in students by "simplifying" noisy data points and find it unlikely in our case. Models trained on concatenations of original and "simplified" datasets generalize just as well as baseline SLKD. We then propose an alternative hypothesis under the lens of data augmentation and regularization. We try various augmentation strategies and observe that dropout regularization can become unnecessary. Our methods achieve BLEU gains of 0.7-1.2 on TED Talks.

1 Introduction

The recipe for success in modern machine learning involves training big neural networks on big data. This is especially true in Neural Machine Translation (NMT), where models regularly take weeks to train and cost gigabytes of disk space. Attempting to reduce this bloat has led to much research on model compression (Bucila et al., 2006), which takes large networks and makes them smaller. Small models can save money on compute time, deploy on mobile devices, and, optimistically, give us insight into the nature of our learning tasks and the limitations of our optimization algorithms.

We need model compression, in general, because small neural networks tend to be harder to train than big ones. In an ideal world, our models would size themselves (Murray and Chiang, 2015), and our optimization algorithms would find the best weights possible, no matter what hyperparameters we pick. However, explanations for why stochastic gradient descent (SGD) on big neural nets works so well remain elusive, although significant steps are being taken (Vidal et al., 2017; Gunasekar et al., 2017).

Here, we investigate a compression technique called sequence-level knowledge distillation (SLKD) and attempt to discern why it improves the performance of small models. We hypothesize that, contrary to common belief, SLKD does not always address a capacity deficiency in models by removing problematic data points. Instead, we think it can act like regularization, guiding SGD towards generalizable solutions by placing more data points on the teacher's learned manifold.

2 Background

Machine Translation Successful machine learning starts with a good loss function, which is both art and science. The loss function determines what our ideal world looks like and ultimately what our models learn.

For example, consider the usual machine translation task: we have some pairs of source and target sentences $(\mathbf{t_i}, \mathbf{s_i})$ from a data distribution $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})$ such that $(\mathbf{t_i}, \mathbf{s_i}) \sim \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})$. Sentences are sequences of words $\mathbf{s_i} = [s_1, ..., s_I]$, $\mathbf{t_i} = [t_1, ..., t_J]$ with vocabulary ν. We'll denote the space of all target sentences as $\mathbf{t} \in \tau$. Now, we want our model to learn some probability distribution $p_\theta(\mathbf{t} \mid \mathbf{s})$. What should $p_\theta(\mathbf{t} \mid \mathbf{s})$ look like? We might define a loss function:

$$L_{\text{NLL}}(\theta) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{J}\sum_{k=1}^{|\nu|} \mathbb{1}\{t_j = k\} \times \log p_\theta(t_j = k \mid \mathbf{s_i}, t_{<j})$$

Which is the usual auto-regressive negative-log likelihood. It's minimized when $p_\theta(\mathbf{t} \mid \mathbf{s})$ assigns high probability to our observed data. This is a good start.

Word-level Knowledge Distillation In knowledge distillation (Hinton et al., 2015), we are given a teacher model $q(\mathbf{t} \mid \mathbf{s})$ that is already a decent approximation of our data distribution $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{t} \mid \mathbf{s})$. Usually the teacher is an ensemble of models, or just a higher-capacity version our student. Since $q(\mathbf{t} \mid \mathbf{s})$ is good, we want to craft a new loss function to make $p_\theta(\mathbf{t} \mid \mathbf{s})$ look like $q(\mathbf{t} \mid \mathbf{s})$. Kim and Rush (2016) give us two ways to do this. If our teacher is auto-regressive, we can easily write:

$$L_{\text{WORD-KD}}(\theta) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{J}\sum_{k=1}^{|\nu|} q(t_j = k \mid \mathbf{s_i}, t_{<j}) \times \log p_\theta(t_j = k \mid \mathbf{s_i}, t_{<j})$$

which minimizes the cross-entropy between p_θ and q at each position j in the target sequence. This is called word-level knowledge distillation, and now we can take some linear combination of L_{NLL} and $L_{\text{WORD-KD}}$ to learn from both our teacher and our data at the same time.

Sequence-level Knowledge Distillation It would be nice, however, to learn not only the local word distributions of q, but also the sequence-level distributions. We want something like this:

$$L_{\text{SEQ-KD}}(\theta) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{\mathbf{t}\in\tau} q(\mathbf{t} \mid \mathbf{s_i}) \log p_\theta(\mathbf{t} \mid \mathbf{s_i})$$

which is a function of all of q, not just the values of q conditioned on the target prefixes we observe in training. Unfortunately, this exponential summation is intractable. Kim and Rush (2016) approximate $L_{\text{SEQ-KD}}$ with the mode of q, and approximate the mode with beam search. We encourage detail-oriented readers to refer to the original paper for further explanation.

Finally, this gives us the sequence-level knowledge distillation procedure: (1) train a big teacher model, (2) translate the source sentences with beam search, (3) train a student model on the source sentence and teacher translation pairs. Using this, (Kim and Rush, 2016) show an improvement of up to 4 BLEU on WMT English-German.[1]

3 Experiment Setup

Before running our experiments, we face the non-trivial problem of selecting the appropriate hyper parameters for our teacher and student models. How big is big enough? And at what size does performance degrade? To our knowledge, the only decent way to answer these questions on a given dataset is through grid search.

We start with an architecture known to produce reasonable results on the TED German-English dataset[2] and grid search our way down.[3] We train each model for 100 epochs and measure the tokenized BLEU validation score.

For our LARGE teacher architecture (9M parameters), we select a 1-layer encoder, 1-layer decoder Bi-LSTM architecture with 256 hidden and embed units. We randomly select a SMALL architecture (1.4M parameters) from those with less than 8M parameters[4] and use it as our student model. Interestingly, although the SMALL architecture has $\frac{1}{5}$th the number of parameters of the LARGE architecture, the only difference between the two is the BPE vocabulary size (10k vs. 500).

Teachers are trained for 100 epochs. To ensure each student gets equal compute time, we set the same max number of checkpoints (each 4000 updates) for models of the same size. All models are trained using the Sockeye seq2seq framework (Hieber et al., 2017) and averaged over 3 trials.

4 The Multi-Modal Hypothesis

But why does SLKD perform well? Kim and Rush (2016) hypothesize that student models are too low-capacity to fit the noisy training data and that by "denoising" the data, capacity is freed up to model more important parts of translation space (which are intuitively around the mode of the teacher distribution). While the mode of the teacher distribution seems to have special properties, we challenge the capacity assumption below.

A similar interpretation is that SLKD reduces multi-modality in the data (Gu et al., 2017). The teacher simplifies the data linguistically, replacing rare translations of phrases with more consistent ones. They also assume that the model is too low-capacity to deal with more complicated translations, and that by removing "problematic" examples, the model will only learn things that generalize well (Dakun Zhang, 2018).

[1] There's also something called "sequence-level interpolation", which involves taking a sample from the teacher beam that's close to the gold translation. For simplicity, we'll ignore that here and perhaps return to it in future work.

[2] Downloaded from http://www.cs.jhu.edu/~kevinduh/a/multitarget-tedtalks/.

[3] Appendix Figure 2 shows the grid search results, plotting validation scores against number of parameters.

[4] As a POC, we did the usual SLKD method on all student candidates and found an average improvement of 2.2 BLEU.

Another explanation for why knowledge distillation works in general is "dark knowledge", a term coined by Hinton. However, this theory addresses the case when the full teacher distribution is available to the student, which is not true for SLKD. Furthermore, (Kim and Rush, 2016) showed that word-level and sequence-level distillation are roughly orthogonal and probably improve student models in different ways.

Here, we examine the multi-modal hypothesis more closely. By constructing experiments with mixed multi-modal data, we find that it fails to fully explain our empirical results.

5 Testing the Multi-Modal Hypothesis

We aim to answer the following question: does training on "simplified" SLKD data free up capacity in our SMALL model, so that the model can focus on fitting important parts of translation space?

We train a LARGE model on the original training bitext ("base" data) as an SLKD teacher and use it to re-translate the TED source data, producing a "kd" dataset. We then compare training SMALL students on three kinds of data: base, kd, and the concatenation of the two (base+kd). Assuming the multi-modal hypothesis is true, we would expect that base+kd, being more varied than the original base dataset, would pose more challenges for the student.

Dataset	Trial 1	Trial 2	Trial 3	Avg
base	25.99	25.84	25.72	25.85
kd	26.94	27.14	27.12	27.07
base+kd	26.96	27.49	27.39	27.28

Table 1: Test BLEU of student models trained on different datasets for 30 checkpoints. Single trials with different student architectures are also plotted in Appendix Fig 3.

From our experiments, we see kd datasets indeed have smaller vocabularies (Table 2), but SMALL models have no problem fitting both "noisy" and "denoised" data concatenated together and can do so with equal amounts of compute time. Our difficulties with this TED data lie not with the capacity of our students to fit the data, but with our ability to find generalizable solutions.

6 Data Augmentation Hypothesis

We think that the multi-modal hypothesis is not the full explanation of SLKD performance; to explain the base+kd results, we additionally propose a data augmentation hypothesis: SLKD data adds something to datasets that makes it easier to learn generalizable solutions. We attempt to test and possibly improve this hypothesis with the following two additional data augmentation strategies and two different training conditions:

	Avg # Tok	Avg # Vocab
base	2.94M	51k
kd	3M	44k
base+kd	6.14M	70k

Table 2: Average number of tokens and vocabulary size for baseline, kd, and base+kd target datasets.

Back-Translation We train a second LARGE teacher in the opposite direction (English-German).[5] We translate the TED target sentences with the backtranslation teacher to produce a third "BT" dataset, which we use to augment the KD and baseline datasets.

Best 2 We also experiment with using more of the teacher's beam. We produce two versions of the data: one with the best translation from beam search and the other with the second best. We combine these to form the best-2 dataset, which we use to augment the baseline dataset.

Longer Training We test if gains from SLKD can be recovered if baselines are given enough compute time. We train for 100 checkpoints, rather than 30, and find that our results remain unchanged.

Less Dropout Finally, we test if adding SLKD data can replace the usual regularization techniques. We experiment with turning off dropout on students, which lets them overfit the training data.

7 Testing the Data Augmentation Hypothesis

We show the results (BLEU and perplexity averaged over three trials) in Table 3. We see some surprising results:

- Further augmenting datasets does slightly improve performance in SMALL students.

[5] We call this teacher a "backtranslation teacher" for brevity, although backtranslation typically refers to supplementing parallel MT data with mono-lingual data (Sennrich et al., 2016).

[6] Contrary to the results observed by (Kim and Rush, 2016), we see significant gains when increasing the beam search size from 1 to 5.

	SMALL Students				LARGE Students	
	w/ Dropout		No Dropout			
Dataset	BLEU	$\text{PPL}_{\text{Train}}$	BLEU	$\text{PPL}_{\text{Train}}$	BLEU	$\text{PPL}_{\text{Train}}$
baseline	26.79	4.86	25.37	4.24	31.75	4.99
kd	27.70	2.17	26.45	2.09	30.38	1.93
base+kd	27.74	3.53	27.84	3.02	32.52	3.33
base+kd+bt	27.87	3.41	**28.38**	2.93	**32.99**	3.29
base+best-2	**27.92**	3.12	28.03	2.64	32.59	2.73

Table 3: The tokenized test BLEU scores (Beam=5)[6] and BPE train perplexities for student models trained on concatenations of datasets. SMALL students are trained for 100 checkpoints, rather than the initial 30.




Figure 1: BPE validation curves of models trained on augmented datasets.

- Augmented datasets do not require more training time than baselines, but instead converge faster. (Figure 1)
- Turning off regularization magnifies the gains from data augmentation in SMALL models, but hurts baseline and SLKD performance.

It seems like SLKD can do the job of regularization, pulling SMALL models towards simple, generalizable solutions. We see that when using this technique, more data is better.

We further repeat the experiments using a LARGE student: this student has the same size and hyperparameters as the teacher (also known as BANs (Furlanello et al., 2018))[7], but is trained from scratch on the SLKD/augmented data. We observe that these augmented data also help LARGE students generalize better.

But how does SLKD regularize? In general there are two different ways of doing regularization. The usual way is restricting the complexity of the model (via dropout, L2, etc.). However, consider the case in which the true generating function $G(x)$ of the data (or at least an approximation, like our teacher model) is known. An alternative way of regularizing would be to generate many more data points along the manifold G defines. Then any naive, overfitting model would be naturally pulled towards the "true" solution.

Furthermore, we think this alternative way of regularizing is more appropriate for model compression than dropout. While regularizing via dropout can help generalization, it does so at the cost of model capacity.[8] Since our models are already under-capacity, this hurts performance. Regularizing via SLKD, however, helps the model generalize without restricting model capacity, which is why we see such gains when turning off regularization.[9]

8 Limitations and Future Work

We investigated different hypotheses for why SLKD works and found that the conventional multi-modal hypothesis does not explain all the results. We proposed a complementary data augmentation hypothesis and showed that SLKD may work as an implicit regularizer.

We're continuing to experiment with different datasets, language pairs, and model architectures (read: Transformers), where these results might change. We are interested in determining if the multi-modal hypothesis might still explain the gains from SLKD in any of these cases, or whether the regulatory effect of SLKD is the main contributor of increased performance in all cases.

[7] Born Again Networks applied word-level knowledge distillation students of the same architecture, but to our knowledge, no one has attempted this with SLKD

[8] Dropout has been characterized as training an "ensemble of sub-networks" (Baldi and Sadowski, 2013).

[9] But why does regularization hurt models trained on just SLKD? There might not be enough data to fully outline the manifold of $G(x)$. We think if we used the teacher on more data, this result would change.

References

Pierre Baldi and Peter J Sadowski. 2013. Understanding dropout. In C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K. Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, pages 2814–2822. Curran Associates, Inc.

Cristian Bucila, Rich Caruana, and Alexandru Niculescu-Mizil. 2006. Model compression. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Philadelphia, PA, USA, August 20-23, 2006*, pages 535–541.

Jean Senellart Dakun Zhang, Josep Crego. 2018. Analyzing knowledge distillation in neural machine translation. In *2018 International Workshop on Spoken Language Translation, IWSLT 2005, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, October 24-25, 2005*, pages 68–75.

Jonathan Frankle and Michael Carbin. 2019. The lottery ticket hypothesis: Finding sparse, trainable neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Tommaso Furlanello, Zachary Chase Lipton, Michael Tschannen, Laurent Itti, and Anima Anandkumar. 2018. Born-again neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018*, pages 1602–1611.

Jiatao Gu, James Bradbury, Caiming Xiong, Victor O. K. Li, and Richard Socher. 2017. Non-autoregressive neural machine translation. *CoRR*, abs/1711.02281.

Suriya Gunasekar, Blake E Woodworth, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Behnam Neyshabur, and Nati Srebro. 2017. Implicit regularization in matrix factorization. In I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*, pages 6151–6159. Curran Associates, Inc.

Felix Hieber, Tobias Domhan, Michael Denkowski, David Vilar, Artem Sokolov, Ann Clifton, and Matt Post. 2017. Sockeye: A toolkit for neural machine translation. *CoRR*, abs/1712.05690.

Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeffrey Dean. 2015. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. In *NIPS Deep Learning and Representation Learning Workshop*.

Yoon Kim and Alexander M. Rush. 2016. Sequence-level knowledge distillation. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1317–1327. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Kenton Murray and David Chiang. 2015. Auto-sizing neural networks: With applications to n-gram language models. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2015, Lisbon, Portugal, September 17-21, 2015*, pages 908–916.

Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016. Improving neural machine translation models with monolingual data. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 86–96. Association for Computational Linguistics.

René Vidal, Joan Bruna, Raja Giryes, and Stefano Soatto. 2017. Mathematics of deep learning. *CoRR*, abs/1712.04741.

A Grid Search




Figure 2: Grid search results on TED de-en over RNN hyperparameters. Note the performance drop around 5M parameters. This is analogous to some work done in network pruning, where models fail catastophically after passing some pruning threshold (Frankle and Carbin, 2019).




Figure 3: We train some 1-layer encoder 1-layer decoder Bi-LSTMs on both the base dataset and the concatenated base+kd dataset. Each point represents an architecture with different hyperparameters. All points are single trials. In all architectures, the performance of models trained on base+kd equals or exceeds the performance when trained on just base. BPE=[10000,750,500], num-hidden,num-embed=[64,128,256]

A.1 Grid Search Parameters

As supplied to sockeye.train:
"–num-words" (BPE) = [30000, 20000, 10000, 7500, 5000, 1000, 750, 500, 250]
"–num-embed" = [512, 256, 128, 64]
"–num-layers" = [2, 1] (This how many layers in both the encoder and decoder **each**.)
"–rnn-cell-type" = [lstm, gru]
"–rnn-num-hidden" = [512, 256, 128, 64]

Note: some entries are missing in this grid. For example, for BPE less than 10000, we neglect training with embed size of 512 and num-hidden size of 512. This was somewhat arbitrary, since the grid search was done in two separate batches (none of the first batch showed a definite correlation between size and performance).

A.2 Selected LARGE Architecture

The model with the best BLEU validation score:
"–num-words" (BPE) = 10000
"–num-embed" = 256
"–num-layers" = 1
"–rnn-cell-type" = lstm
"–rnn-num-hidden" = 256

A.3 Selected SMALL Architecture

Randomly selected from models with fewer than 8M parameters:
"–num-words" (BPE) = 500
"–num-embed" = 256
"–num-layers" = 1
"–rnn-cell-type" = lstm
"–rnn-num-hidden" = 256

A.4 Other Hyperparameters

"–max-seq-len" = "100:100"
"–word-min-count" = "1:1"
"–checkpoint-frequency" = "4000"
"–batch-size" = "4096"
"–keep-last-params" = "3"
"–disable-device-locking",
"–decode-and-evaluate" = "-1"
"–decode-and-evaluate-use-cpu"
"–initial-learning-rate" = "0.0003"
"–label-smoothing" = "0.1"
"–batch-type" = "word"
"–optimizer" = "adam"
"–gradient-clipping-threshold" = "1.0"
"–gradient-clipping-type" = "abs"
"–learning-rate-reduce-factor" = "0.7"
"–learning-rate-reduce-num-not-improved" = "8"
"–learning-rate-scheduler-type" = "plateau-reduce"
"–learning-rate-decay-optimizer-states-reset" = "best"

“–learning-rate-decay-param-reset”
“–loss” = “cross-entropy”
“–embed-dropout” = “.0:.0”
“–encoder” = “rnn”
“–decoder” = “rnn”
“–rnn-attention-type” = “dot”
“–rnn-dropout-inputs” = “.1:.1”
“–rnn-dropout-states” = “.1:.1”

A.5 Less Regularization

When turning off dropout, we set
“–rnn-dropout-inputs” = “0:0”
“–rnn-dropout-states” = “0:0”