

View Reviews

Paper ID

3417

Paper Title

Learning by serialization

Reviewer #1

Questions

1. Please provide an "overall score" for this submission.

5: Marginally below the acceptance threshold. I tend to vote for rejecting this submission, but accepting it would not be that bad.


2. Please provide a "confidence score" for your assessment of this submission.

3: You are fairly confident in your assessment. It is possible that you did not understand some parts of the submission or that you are unfamiliar with some pieces of related work. Math/other details were not carefully checked.

3. Please provide detailed comments that explain your "overall score" and "confidence score" for this submission. You should summarize the main ideas of the submission and relate these ideas to previous work at NIPS and in other archival conferences and journals. You should then summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the submission, focusing on each of the following four criteria: quality, clarity, originality, and significance.

This paper presents a method for performing density estimation over structured data by serializing that data into sequences and then applying standard RNN models. The method must account for the multiple ways to serialize data structures such as sets, trees, and graphs. When generating training serializations for a given data item, the method samples these serializations such that properties of the data structure are respected (e.g. set elements occur only once). The RNN training procedure also includes a form of regularization to encourage hidden states formed by processing structurally-equivalent subsequences to be similar. Given a test instance from the domain, its probability under the learned model can be obtained by approximately marginalizing out its different possible serializations. The method is evaluated on modeling trees, time series data, and several UCI datasets, where it is compared against standard models for these data types.

I am on the fence about this paper. Its stated goal--replacing different model architectures for different structured data types with standard sequence models via serialization--is a noble one and worth pursuing. There are some good ideas put forth here, and the experimental results suggest that on average, this serialization-based approach performs about as well as existing alternatives. That said, I

 I have some concerns about the paper. For one, I find the exposition dense and difficult to follow in places, with notation and design decisions insufficiently motivated. It also alternates between very formally precise and vague; I am not sure that the work could be replicated, given the current exposition. I also wonder whether the method lives up to its promise of replacing different specialized models with one common sequence framework--after all, each new data structure requires the definition of a (potentially complex) serialization scheme. Perhaps this is less work than creating a whole new model architecture, but it is not clear. Finally, I find the choice of some of the evaluations a bit odd. These concerns are elaborated upon below. Overall, while I feel like this work pursues an important direction and offers some intellectually interesting contributions, I'm not entirely convinced that it's up to NIPS publication standard in its current state.

Line 136: "We then adapt equation 1" -- Equation 1 has not been defined yet as of this point.

Line 194: "We summarize in Algorithm 1..." -- You need to mention that Algorithm 1 is in the supplement, not the main paper.

Exposition around Equation 3 is quite difficult to follow. What's the motivation here?

I question the value of introducing the measure μ (which complicates this exposition) when it is later, eventually, revealed to always be uniform.

Line 231: This paragraph is confusing. On the one hand, I found it too vague, e.g. "we can, for example, keep track of the number of (uniform) random choices we make (eg in the exploration of a 235 tree) and obtain similar statistics" -- there is too little detail given here for this idea to be reproducible. On the other hand, it's not clear where this 'counting' of possible outputs even comes into play--Equation 10 doesn't appear to use these counts, so when and where do they matter?

Equation 10: How does one obtain a property ϕ_j for a given serialization a_j ? A serialization might respect multiple properties, yes? Algorithm 1 doesn't seem to describe this at all.

I have mixed feelings about the choice of evaluations. The tree experiments are a good choice for evaluating this method. The UCI datasets and the time series data are a bit of an odd choice: there are standard, well-established models for these types of data, and I wouldn't characterize these data as "structured" in the way that the paper narrative emphasizes. It seems a bit of a stretch to apply the idea of serialization to this data by essentially randomizing the order of elements within vectors. Also, given the recurring use of unordered sets as an expository example in the paper, I expected to see some experimental result for set-structured data.

4. How confident are you that this submission could be reproduced by others, assuming equal access to data and resources?

1: Not confident

Reviewer #2

Questions

1. Please provide an "overall score" for this submission.

4: An okay submission, but not good enough; a reject. I vote for rejecting this submission, although I would not be upset if it were accepted.

2. Please provide a "confidence score" for your assessment of this submission.

3: You are fairly confident in your assessment. It is possible that you did not understand some parts of the submission or that you are unfamiliar with some pieces of related work. Math/other details were not carefully checked.

3. Please provide detailed comments that explain your "overall score" and "confidence score" for this submission. You should summarize the main ideas of the submission and relate these ideas to previous work at NIPS and in other archival conferences and journals. You should then summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the submission, focusing on each of the following four criteria: quality, clarity, originality, and significance.

The reviewed paper proposes a procedure for encoding structured data to multiple, equivalent representations during training, claiming improved performance against alternative approaches which do not enforce multiple equivalent representations.

As it stands, the results are unconvincing due to lack of comparison to existing work on structured data - nearly all results beyond the synthetic task compare to 1 previous model (DRNN). The results do appear

convincing over DRNN in the small scale experiments performed, but the paper under review doesn't test on DRNN's arguably most compelling setting - machine translation. Comparison to TreeESN is decent, but given the large number of differences between ESN and purely learning based models it is not clear that the experimental results back up the claim that performance improvement is due solely to reduced overfitting / better representation learning due to the encoding and not solely from smart data augmentation and a larger effective capacity, as competing methods of encoding could also benefit from data augmentation. While it can be argued that smart data augmentation is a feature of the method, these benefits should be separately analyzed.

Comparison to "Grammar as a Foreign Language" (Vinyals et. al) or other learning driven NLP tasks driven by tree structures could directly prove out the claim on a well tested experimental testbed. Alternatively, comparison to recursive neural network methods would be another area to explore, or comparison to experiments seen in Grammar VAE or one of the many recent papers on molecule generation such as <https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.08786>.

Graph convolutional networks (see the work of Thomas Kipf, or Gated Graph Sequence Networks) are another place to compare directly to a larger body of prior work. "Random walk" embeddings ala DeepWalk, Perozzi et. al. are a simple method, and showing that the proposed encoding method outperforms random graph walk would provide another comparison. Leveraging the abstract syntax tree (AST) in program synthesis (as hinted by DRNN) would be yet another way of comparing to existing work in a recent subfield of generative modeling with numerous methods, while still testing out the claim "the fact that we map the instances to multiple and equivalent sequences over which we learn brings, as we will demonstrate, significant advantages when it comes to overfitting avoidance." against a larger variety of comparison models.

As it stands the proposed method is interesting but does not embed itself very well in the larger research subfield, comparing against only 1 other method for nearly all tasks. A better empirical test suite for this model would greatly strengthen the claims and methodology, especially given the many options for comparison. The supplementary material is very useful, and with larger experiments and better comparison in the same direction **I think this will be a strong paper.**

4. How confident are you that this submission could be reproduced by others, assuming equal access to data and resources?

3: Very confident

Reviewer #4

Questions

1. Please provide an "overall score" for this submission.

4: An okay submission, but not good enough; a reject. I vote for rejecting this submission, although I would not be upset if it were accepted.

2. Please provide a "confidence score" for your assessment of this submission.

4: You are confident in your assessment, but not absolutely certain. It is unlikely, but not impossible, that you did not understand some parts of the submission or that you are unfamiliar with some pieces of related work.

3. Please provide detailed comments that explain your "overall score" and "confidence score" for this submission. You should summarize the main ideas of the submission and relate these ideas to previous work at NIPS and in other archival conferences and journals. You should then summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the submission, focusing on each of the following four criteria: quality, clarity, originality, and significance.

The paper introduces a serialization method for complex data structures (such as sets, trees, and

graphs). Serializations are sampled in such a way that they are “representative” of their respective data structures, in a sense that they capture both structure and invariances.

The writing is clear and there are only a few minor typos or language issues. The overall presentation of the proposed method is however quite dense and I think a figure or two with an illustration of a serialization of a specific data structure (including properties and weight measures) would go a long way in making the paper more accessible. Further, since Algorithm 1 seems to be central to this approach, it would be good to move it from the supplementary material to the main paper.

The proposed idea is developed in much detail and novel formalism is introduced to great extent. Overall the technical details look sound to me, but I couldn't verify every single detail (due to time limitations, as I was asked to provide a backup review). I think the idea has some merit and might serve as an interesting baseline for structures, where no specific structured models are immediately available (although I cannot immediately think of an example).

As motivation, the authors argue that serialization allows one to use a single method (serialization + sequence learning) for learning on arbitrarily structured data, instead of having to design special neural network architectures, such as tree-structured neural networks for tree-structured data. However it seems to me as if the proposed serialization approach comes with a lot of additional design choices that have to be adapted to the specific data structure, such as the properties “O” on sequences and the weight measure μ which shall be adapted to reflect the equivalence constraints of the data structure.

Serialization, however, comes potentially with a large overhead in terms of computation: in order to cover all neighborhoods in, e.g., a graph, many paths have to be sampled, leading both to computational overhead and to potentially large variance in gradient updates. Furthermore, recurrent models applied to these serializations first have to “learn” these invariances, whereas we have an abundance of models for complex data structures (such as graphs, trees, or sets) [e.g. Gilmer et al., Neural Message Passing for Quantum Chemistry (ICML 2017) for graphs (and trees), and Zaheer et al., Deep Sets (NIPS 2017) for sets] that reflect these invariances in their model architecture. Can the authors maybe provide an example outside of common structures such as sets, trees and graphs where this approach might be useful and where no specialized neural architecture exists?

In terms of experiments, a large focus seems to be on overfitting vs. underfitting. It seems to me that the RNN baseline in Figure 1 is overparameterized. Since S-RNN has to spend capacity on learning the invariances of the data, it would be fair to tune the hyperparameters of each model separately to find the best tradeoff between over- and underfitting. In that respect I find this experiment inconclusive.

For the tree task, the TreeESN baseline seems rather exotic. Why not compare to TreeLSTMs (Tai et al., Improved Semantic Representations From Tree-Structured Long Short-Term Memory Networks, ACL 2015)?

I think a better experimental test-bed would be an explicit comparison against recent state-of-the-art graph neural networks / message passing neural networks (e.g. Gilmer et al., Neural Message Passing for Quantum Chemistry (ICML 2017)) on graph classification or node classification benchmarks (e.g. the ones used in Kipf & Welling, Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks, ICLR 2017). Or otherwise move to structures (e.g. grammars or regular expressions) where only few neural architectures have been developed so far.

In conclusion, I think this idea has merit, but is not ready for publication in the current stage. I recommend focusing especially on improving both the exposition and the experimental evaluation.

Minor comment:

- The following sounds quite vague and should probably be re-worded: “S-RNN practically will never see an instance twice due the combinatorial complexity of the serialisation generation and can keep on

training practically forever with no overfitting." (lines 276-278)

4. How confident are you that this submission could be reproduced by others, assuming equal access to data and resources?

2: Somewhat confident