

Fostering Diversity in Spatial Evolutionary Generative Adversarial Networks

Jamal Toutouh

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA, USA
toutouh@mit.edu

Erik Hemberg

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA, USA
hembergerik@csail.mit.edu

Una-May O'Reilly

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA, USA
unamay@csail.mit.edu

Abstract—Generative adversary networks (GANs) suffer from training pathologies such as instability and mode collapse, which mainly arise from a lack of diversity in their adversarial interactions. Co-evolutionary GAN (CoE-GAN) training algorithms have shown to be resilient to these pathologies. This article introduces Mustangs, a spatially distributed CoE-GAN, which fosters diversity by using different loss functions during the training. Experimental analysis on MNIST and CelebA demonstrated that Mustangs trains statistically more accurate generators.

Index Terms—generative adversarial networks, co-evolutionary algorithms, neural networks

I. INTRODUCTION

Generative adversarial networks (GANs) have emerged as a powerful machine learning paradigm for the task of estimating a distribution function underlying a given set of samples [1]. The successes of GANs in generating realistic, complex, multivariate distributions motivated a growing body of applications, such as realistic image generation [2], video prediction [3], and text to image synthesis [4].

A GAN consists of two neural networks (NN), a generator and a discriminator, which apply adversarial learning to train their weights against each other (formulated as a minmax optimization problem). The discriminator is trained to correctly discern the “natural/real” samples from “artificial/fake” samples produced by the generator. The generator is trained to transform a random input into samples that fool the discriminator. GANs are notoriously hard to train, frequently showing pathologies such as mode collapse or vanishing gradients [5], [6].

Co-evolutionary training (CoE) has shown to be resilient to the GAN training degenerative behaviors by evolving two populations of NNs (one of generators against one of discriminators) towards convergence while keeping genome diversity [6]. This article summarizes our previous research [7], in which we proposed a CoE GAN training method named MUTation SpaTial gANs (**Mustangs**). **Mustangs** combines the ideas of two successful GAN training approaches that foster diversity by applying different strategies: Evolutionary GAN (E-GAN), which injects diversity by applying three different NN mutations [5], and Lipizzaner, which applies a spatially distributed cellular CoE training [8]. The main aim of this research was to show that combining ideas from both training methods improve diversity, and therefore, is better than either one of them.

II. MUTATION SPATIAL GANS TRAINING

Mustangs applies a spatially distributed CoE to train GANs. It evolves two populations, $P_u = \{u_1, \dots, u_T\}$ a population of generators and $P_v = \{v_1, \dots, v_T\}$ a population of discriminators to create diversity in genomes spaces. Both populations (P_u and P_v) are distributed on the cells of a two dimensional toroidal grid [6]. The fitness \mathcal{L} of each generator $u_i \in P_u$ and discriminator $v_j \in P_v$ are assessed according to their interactions with a set of discriminators from P_v and generators from P_u , respectively. The fittest individuals are used to generate the new of individuals (generators and discriminators) by applying mutation. The new individuals replace the ones in the current population if they perform better (better fitness) to produce the next generation.

Instead of applying the CoE in an *all-vs-all* flavor, the cell’s *neighborhood* defines the subset of individuals (sub-populations) of P_u and P_v to interact with and it is specified by its size s_n . In our study, we use a five-cell neighborhood, i.e. one center and four adjacent cells. In **Mustangs**, each neighborhood (sub-population) performs an instance of the CoE to update its center cell with the fittest NN after each training epoch. Besides, the fittest individuals are sent to the neighborhood cells to update the sub-populations of the grid.




Fig. 1. Mutation used in **Mustangs**.

At the time of writing the article, CoE applied the mutation based on stochastic gradient descent (SGD) to create the offspring by minimizing only one objective/loss function, which generally attempts to minimize the distance between the generated fake data and real data distributions according to a given measure [8]. Instead, **Mustangs** generates the offspring by an applying SGD-based mutation that randomly picks a giving training objective function (see Fig.1). **Mustangs** applies mutations introduced by E-GAN [5]: *Minmax mutation* (BCE), *Least-square mutation* (LSE), and *Heuristic mutation* (HEU).

III. EXPERIMENTAL ANALYSIS

This section summarizes the main outcomes of the empirical analysis shown in our previous work [7]. **Mustangs** was evaluated on two common image data sets: MNIST and CelebA. The experiments took into account: **GAN-BCE**, a standard GAN which uses BCE objective; **E-GAN**; a spatial CoE that applies each one of the objective functions, **Lip-BCE**, **Lip-MSE**, and **Lip-HEU**; and **Mustangs**. All evaluated methods used the same computational budget.

The Frechet inception distance (FID) was evaluated to assess the accuracy of the generated fake data [9] and the total variation distance (TVD) for diversity.

Table I shows the best FID values on MNIST. **Mustangs** has the lowest (best) median. All the spatially distributed methods are better than **E-GAN** and **GAN-BCE**. The results indicate that **Mustangs** is robust to the varying performance of the individual loss functions (lowest deviation). This helps to strengthen the idea that diversity, both in genome and mutation space, provides robust GAN training. A ranksum test with Holm correction confirms that the difference between **Mustangs** and the other methods is significant at confidence levels of $\alpha < 0.01$.

TABLE I
FID MNIST RESULTS (LOW FID INDICATES GOOD PERFORMANCE)

Algorithm	Mean	Std%	Median	IQR
Mustangs	42.235	12.863%	43.181	7.586
Lip-BCE	48.958	20.080%	46.068	4.663
Lip-MSE	371.603	20.108%	381.768	104.625
Lip-HEU	52.525	17.230%	52.732	9.767
E-GAN	466.111	10.312%	481.610	69.329
GAN-BCE	457.723	2.648%	459.629	17.865

Table II summarizes TVD results on MNIST. The methods that provide genome diversity generate more diverse data samples than the other two analyzed methods. The three algorithms with the lowest (best) FID score (**Mustangs**, **Lip-BCE**, and **Lip-HEU**) also provide the lowest (best) TVD values. The best TVD result is obtained by **Lip-HEU**.

TABLE II
MNIST TVD RESULTS (LOW TVD INDICATES MORE DIVERSITY)

Alg.	Mustangs	Lip-BCE	Lip-HEU	Lip-MSE	E-GAN	GAN-BCE
TVD	0.180	0.171	0.115	0.365	0.534	0.516

Figure 2 illustrates how spatially distributed CoE algorithms produce robust generators that provide with accurate MNIST samples across all the classes.



a) **Mustangs** b) **Lip-BCE** c) **E-GAN** d) **GAN-BCE**

Fig. 2. Sequence of samples generated of MNIST dataset.

Table III summarizes FID the results on CelebA. **Mustangs** provides the lowest median FID. **Lip-BCE** and **Lip-HEU** provide median and mean FIDs close to the **Mustangs** ones. However, **Mustangs** is the most robust (see deviations).

TABLE III
FID CELEBA RESULTS (LOWER IS BETTER)

Algorithm	Mean	Std%	Median	IQR
Mustangs	36.148	0.571%	36.087	0.237
Lip-BCE	36.250	5.676%	36.385	2.858
Lip-MSE	158.740	40.226%	160.642	47.216
Lip-HEU	37.872	5.751%	37.681	2.455

Figure 3 illustrates a sequence of samples generated by the best generators in terms of FID score of the most competitive two training methods, i.e., **Mustangs** and **Lip-BCE**. As it can be seen in these two sets images generated, both methods present similar capacity of generating human faces.



(a) **Mustangs** (b) **Lip-BCE**

Fig. 3. Sequence of samples generated of CelebA.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

The research carried out showed that GAN training can be improved by boosting diversity. **Mustangs** tested on the MNIST and CelebA datasets showed the best accuracy, robustness, and high diversity in label space. This research was the root of other published studies [10], [11].

REFERENCES

- [1] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio, "Generative adversarial nets," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2014, pp. 2672–2680.
- [2] Z. Gan, L. Chen, W. Wang, Y. Pu, Y. Zhang, H. Liu, C. Li, and L. Carin, "Triangle generative adversarial networks," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017, pp. 5247–5256.
- [3] X. Liang, L. Lee, W. Dai, and E. P. Xing, "Dual motion gan for future-flow embedded video prediction," in *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, vol. 1, 2017.
- [4] S. E. Reed, Z. Akata, S. Mohan, S. Tenka, B. Schiele, and H. Lee, "Learning what and where to draw," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2016, pp. 217–225.
- [5] C. Wang, C. Xu, X. Yao, and D. Tao, "Evolutionary generative adversarial networks," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 921–934, 2019.
- [6] A. Al-Dujaili, T. Schmiedlechner, E. Hemberg, and U.-M. O'Reilly, "Towards distributed coevolutionary GANs," in *AAAI Symposium*, 2018.
- [7] J. Toutouh, E. Hemberg, and U.-M. O'Reilly, "Spatial evolutionary generative adversarial networks," in *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*, ser. GECCO '19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, p. 472–480.
- [8] T. Schmiedlechner, I. N. Z. Yong, A. Al-Dujaili, E. Hemberg, and U.-M. O'Reilly, "Lipizzaner: A System That Scales Robust Generative Adversarial Network Training," in *the 32nd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2018) Workshop on Systems for ML and Open Source Software*.
- [9] M. Heusel, H. Ramsauer, T. Unterthiner, B. Nessler, G. Klambauer, and S. Hochreiter, "GANs trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a nash equilibrium," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.08500*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2017.
- [10] J. Toutouh, E. Hemberg, and U.-M. O'Reilly, "Data dieting in gan training," in *Deep Neural Evolution*. Springer, 2020, pp. 379–400.

- [11] —, “Analyzing the components of distributed coevolutionary gan training,” in *International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature*. Springer, 2020, pp. 552–566.