Deep Learning and Mixed Integer Optimization

Matteo Fischetti, University of Padova



(Deep) Neural Networks (DNNs)

 Machine whose parameters w's are organized in a layered feed-forward network (DAG = Directed Acyclic Graph)



• Each node (or "neuron") makes a weighted sum of the outputs of the previous layer and applies a nonlinear activation function



Modeling ReLU activations

Recent work on DNNs almost invariably only use ReLU activations



- Easily modeled in a MI(N)LP as $w^T y + b = x s$, $x \ge 0$, $s \ge 0$
 - plus the bilinear condition $x s \leq 0$
 - or, alternatively, the indicator constraints

$$\left. egin{array}{c} z=1
ightarrow x \leq 0 \ z=0
ightarrow s \leq 0 \ z \in \{0,1\} \end{array}
ight\}$$

The DNN is a 0-1 MILP (for fixed w's)

$$\min \sum_{k=0}^{K} \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} c_j^k x_j^k + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} \gamma_j^k z_j^k$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_{k-1}} w_{ij}^{k-1} x_i^{k-1} + b_j^{k-1} = x_j^k - s_j^k$$

$$x_j^k, s_j^k \ge 0$$

$$z_j^k \in \{0, 1\}$$

$$z_j^k = 1 \rightarrow x_j^k \le 0$$

$$z_j^k = 0 \rightarrow s_j^k \le 0$$

$$lb_j^0 \le x_j^0 \le ub_j^0, \qquad j = 1, \dots, n_0$$

$$lb_j^k \le x_j^k \le ub_j^k$$

$$\overline{lb}_j^k \le s_j^k \le \overline{ub}_j^k$$

$$k = 1, \dots, K, \ j = 1, \dots, n_k.$$

Application: Adversarial problems



















Fig. 2 Adversarial examples computed through our 0-1 MILP model; the reported label is the one having maximum activation according to the DNN (that we imposed to be the true label plus 5, modulo 10). Note that the change of just few well-chosen pixels often suffices to fool the DNN and to produce a wrong classification.





















Fig. 3 Adversarial examples computed through our 0-1 MILP model as in Figure 2, but imposing that the no pixel can be changed by more than 0.2 (through the additional conditions $d_j \leq 0.2$ for all j).



Adversarial Problem

Trick the DNN by changing few well-chosen pixels

Solvable to proven optimality (for small DNNs) in a matter of seconds/minutes by using a black-box MILP solver

	basic model				improved model			
	%solved	%gap	nodes	time (s)	%solved	%gap	nodes	time (s)
DNN1	100	0.0	1,903	1.0	100	0.0	552	0.6
DNN2	97	0.2	77,878	48.2	100	0.0	11,851	7.5
DNN3	64	11.6	$228,\!632$	158.5	100	0.0	20,309	12.1
DNN4	24	38.1	$282,\!694$	263.0	98	0.7	68,563	43.9
DNN5	7	71.8	193,725	290.9	67	11.4	76,714	171.1

Table 1 Comparison of the basic and improved models with a time limit of 300 sec.s, clearly showing the importance of bound tightening in the improved model. In this experiment, the preprocessing time needed to optimally compute the tightened bounds is not taken into account.

Fig. 4 Pixel changes (absolute value) that suffice to trick the DNN: the four top subfigures correspond to the model where pixels can change arbitrarily, while those on the bottom refer to the case where each pixel cannot change by more than 0.2 (hence more pixels need be changed). To improve readability, the black/white map has been reverted and scaled, i.e., white corresponds to unchanged pixels $(d_j = 0)$ while black corresponds to the maximum allowed change $(d_j = 1$ for the four top figures, $d_j = 0.2$ for the four bottom ones).

For more information...

Slides available at http://www.dei.unipd.it/~fisch/papers/slides/

Paper:

M. Fischetti, J. Jo, "Deep Neural Networks as 0-1 Mixed Integer Linear Programs: A Feasibility Study", 2017, arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.06174 (accepted in CPAIOR 2018)

