

Templates for scalable data analysis

1 Introduction to Big Learning

Amr Ahmed, Alexander J Smola, Markus Weimer

Yahoo! Research & UC Berkeley & ANU

Thanks

Mohamed Aly

Joey Gonzalez

Yucheng Low

Qirong Ho

Shravan Narayanamurthy

Amr Ahmed

Jake **Eisenstein**

Choon Hui

Shuang Hong Yang

Eric Xing

Vishy Vishwanathan

James **Petterson**

Markus Weimer

Sergiy Matyusevich

Vanja Josifovski

MAGIC Etch A Sketch SCREEN in machine learning • Systems to run the algorithms • Response batch/online/interactive Compression MAGIC GODDEN IS OF ALLEY THE STUDIES OF THE REAL PRAME

Classification

Spam Filtering

From: bat <kilian@gmail.com> Subject: hey whats up check this meds place out Date: April 6, 2009 10:50:13 PM PDT To: Kilian Weinberger Reply-To: bat <kilian@gmail.com>

Your friend (kilian@gmail.com) has sent you a link to the following Scout.com story: Savage Hall Ground-Breaking Celebration

Get Vicodin, Valium, Xanax, Viagra, Oxycontin, and much more. Absolutely No Prescription Required. Over Night Shipping! Why should you be risking dealing with shady people. Check us out today!
http://jenkinste.ga.u.3.blogspot.com
The University of Toledo will hold a ground-breaking celebration to kick-off the UT Athleti

Savage Hall renovation project on Wednesday, December 12th at Savage Hall.

To read the rest of this story, go here: http://toledo.scout.com/2/708390.html

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

Spam Filtering

Spam Filtering

Function representation

 $f(x, u) = \langle \phi(x), w \rangle + \langle \phi(x), w_u \rangle = \langle \phi(x) \otimes (1 \oplus e_u), w \rangle$

(corresponds to multitask kernel of Pontil & Michelli, Daume)

• Reduce to binary classification problem and classify with

 $sgn f(x, u)$

Function representation

 $f(x, u) = \langle \phi(x), w \rangle + \langle \phi(x), w_u \rangle = \langle \phi(x) \otimes (1 \oplus e_u), w \rangle$

(corresponds to multitask kernel of Pontil & Michelli, Daume)

• Reduce to binary classification problem and classify with

 $sgn f(x, u)$

- 100-1000 million users
- 10-1000 messages per user
- Distributed storage and processing
- Real-time response required
- Implicit response

$$
\underset{w}{\text{minimize}} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \max(0, 1 - y \langle w, x \rangle) + \frac{\lambda}{2} ||w||^2
$$

Ontologies

Catala, Dansk, Deutsch, Español, Français, Italiano, † 44 m., Negerlands, Poiski, Русский, Svenska..

Become an Editor | Help build the largest human-edited directory of the web

- 10k to 1M categories
- Few instances per category
- Hierarchical structure (top level more important than leaf)
- Category selection arbitrary
- Low entropy on leaves
- **Often several** ontologies in use

Copyright @ 2012 Netscape

Ontologies

Become an Editor | Help build the largest human-edited directory of the web

• 10k to 1M categories

- Few instances per category
- Hierarchical structure (top level more important than leaf)
- **Category selection** arbitrary
- Low entropy on leaves
- **Often several** ontologies in use

Copyright @ 2012 Netscape

5,018,902 sites - 95,017 editors - over 1,010,596 categories

Gene Ontology DAG

Ontologies

- 1000s of categories
- High error rate (impossible to learn them all)
- Structured loss (count common top level categories)
- Good strategy is additive function class

$$
f(x,y) = \sum_{y' \in \text{path}(y)} \langle w_{y'}, x \rangle
$$

Need efficient decoding on tree

• Alternative - obtain ontology automatically

YAHOO!

YAHOO!

Generative Model

Generative Model

What can we cluster?

What can we cluster?

Topic Models

The William Randolph Hearst Foundation will give \$1.25 million to Lincoln Center, Metropolitan Opera Co., New York Philharmonic and Juilliard School. "Our board felt that we had a real opportunity to make a mark on the future of the performing arts with these grants an act every bit as important as our traditional areas of support in health, medical research, education and the social services," Hearst Foundation President Randolph A. Hearst said Monday in announcing the grants. Lincoln Center's share will be \$200,000 for its new building, which will house young artists and provide new public facilities. The Metropolitan Opera Co. and New York Philharmonic will receive \$400,000 each. The Juilliard School, where music and the performing arts are taught, will get \$250,000. The Hearst Foundation, a leading supporter of the Lincoln Center Consolidated Corporate Fund, will make its usual annual \$100,000 donation, too.

Latent Dirichlet Allocation; Blei, Ng, Jordan, JMLR 2003

YAHOO!

SINGAPORI
AIRLINES

Destination City : 0 Sal

Children (2-11): Infants

Reed Help? View Book A Flight G restau

(a) Must travel on these dates

> SIA Holidays **sin/tolidays** → Hotel Booking

 $\overline{\cdot}$

TO 000 000 CONTT

Disco living

GSUNTEC

Chijmes, a premier lifestyle destination in Singapore

ARA

Copyright @ 2006 Chijmes. All rights reserved.

Departure City

Feedback | Terms & Conditions

NORE DETAIL

VISITOR

YAHOO!

ALUMNI

Singapore

Topic Models

Clustering & Topic Models

Clustering ?

group objects by prototypes

Clustering & Topic Models

group objects by prototypes decompose objects into prototypes $\overline{Y_{A}H}$

Clustering & Topic Models

Clustering & Topic Models

clustering: (0, 1) matrix topic model: stochastic matrix LSI: arbitrary matrices

Many more

- Regression inventory, traffic, reserve price, elasticity
- Novelty detection abuse, change in traffic, server farm
- Entity tagging keywords, named entities, segmentation
- Collaborative filtering recommend related movies, books, songs
- Inferring structure from data trees, DAGs, segmentation boundaries, user models

Optimization & inference problems (horrible oversimplification)

• Supervised problems

$$
\underset{w}{\text{minimize}} \sum_{i=1}^{m} l(x_i, y_i, w) + \lambda ||w||^{\alpha}
$$

goodness of fit and complexity penalty

- convex problem
- solve subproblem and merge works well
- Unsupervised problems
	- nonconvex problem (looks similar)
	- fast synchronization required

Hardware

• NOT High Performance Computing

• Consumer hardware Cheap, efficient, not very reliable

The Joys of Real Hardware

Typical first year for a new cluster:

- \sim 0.5 overheating (power down most machines in \leq 5 mins, \sim 1-2 days to recover)
- ~1 PDU failure (~500-1000 machines suddenly disappear, ~6 hours to come back)
- \sim 1 rack-move (plenty of warning, \sim 500-1000 machines powered down, \sim 6 hours)
- ~1 network rewiring (rolling ~5% of machines down over 2-day span)
- \sim 20 rack failures (40-80 machines instantly disappear, 1-6 hours to get back)
- ~5 racks go wonky (40-80 machines see 50% packetloss)
- \sim 8 network maintenances (4 might cause \sim 30-minute random connectivity losses)
- ~12 router reloads (takes out DNS and external vips for a couple minutes)
- ~3 router failures (have to immediately pull traffic for an hour)
- ~dozens of minor 30-second blips for dns
- \sim 1000 individual machine failures
- ~thousands of hard drive failures

slow disks, bad memory, misconfigured machines, flaky machines, etc.

Slide from talk of Jeff Dean

Google

http://static.googleusercontent.com/external_content/untrusted_dlcp/research.google.com/en//people/jeff/stanford-295-talk.pdf

CPU

- 8-32 cores
- Memory interface 20-60GB/s
- Internal bandwidth >100GB/s
- >100 GFlops for matrix matrix multiply
- Integrated low end GPU

Sandy Bridge Microarchitecture

RAM

- High latency (100ns for DDR3)
- High burst data rate (>10 GB/s)

- Avoid random access in code if possible.
- Memory align variables
- Know your platform (FBDIMM vs. DDR)

<http://www.anandtech.com/show/3851/everything-you-always-wanted-to-know-about-sdram-memory-but-were-afraid-to-ask>

GPU

- Up to 512 cores / 200W
- Tricky to synchronize threads
- 1-3GB memory (Tesla 6GB)
- 1 TFlop
- Memory bandwidth > 100GB/s
- 4GB/s PCI bus bottleneck

Storage

- Harddisks
	- 3TB of storage (30MB/\$)
	- 100 MB/s bandwidth (sequential)
	- 5 ms seek (200 IOPS)
- SSD
	- 100-500 MB storage (1MB/\$)
	- 300 MB/s bandwidth (sequential)
	- 50,000 IOPS / 1 ms seek (queueing)

Switches & Colos

- Big switches are expensive
- Switches have finite buffers
	- many connections to single machine
	- dropped packets / collisions
- Hierarchical structure
	- more bandwidth within rack
	- lower latency within rack
	- lots of latency between colos

recent development on 'flat' networks

Numbers Everyone Should Know

 0.5 ns L1 cache reference 5 ns Branch mispredict L2 cache reference 7 ns 100 ns Mutex lock/unlock Main memory reference 100 ns 10,000 ns Compress 1K bytes with Zippy 20,000 ns Send 2K bytes over 1 Gbps network 250,000 ns Read 1 MB sequentially from memory 500,000 ns Round trip within same datacenter 10,000,000 ns Disk seek Read 1 MB sequentially from network 10,000,000 ns 30,000,000 ns Read 1 MB sequentially from disk 150,000,000 ns Send packet CA->Netherlands->CA Google

Slide from talk of Jeff Dean

http://static.googleusercontent.com/external_content/untrusted_dlcp/research.google.com/en//people/jeff/stanford-295-talk.pdf

Distribution and Balancing

Concepts

- Large number of objects (a priori unknown)
- Large pool of machines (often faulty)
- Assign objects to machines such that
	- Object goes to the same machine (if possible)
	- Machines can be added/fail dynamically
- Consistent hashing (elements, sets, proportional)

symmetric (no master), dynamically scalable, fault tolerant

Hash function

- Mapping from domain X to integer range [1..N]
- Indistinguishable from uniform distribution
- n-ways independent hash function
	- Draw h from set hash functions H at random
	- For n instances in X their hash $[h(x_1), ... h(x_n)]$ is essentially indistinguishable from n random draws from [1 ... N]
- For many cases we only need 2-ways independence

$$
\text{for all } x, y \ \Pr_{y \in H} \{ h(x) = h(y) \} = \frac{1}{N}
$$

In practice use MD5 or Murmur Hash for high quality [https://code.google.com/p/smhasher/](https://sites.google.com/site/murmurhash/)

Argmin Hash

• Consistent hashing

$$
m(\text{key}) = \operatorname*{argmin}_{m \in \mathcal{M}} h(\text{key}, m)
$$

- Uniform distribution over machine pool M
- Fully determined by hash function h. No need to ask master
- If we add/remove machine m' all but O(1/m) keys remain

$$
\Pr\{m(\text{key}) = m'\} = \frac{1}{m}
$$

• Consistent hashing with k replications

$$
m(\text{key}, k) = k \text{ smallest } h(\text{key}, m)
$$

$$
m \in \mathcal{M}
$$

- If we add/remove a machine only O(k/m) need reassigning
- Cost to assign is $O(m)$. This can be expensive for 1000 servers

- Fixing the $O(m)$ lookup
	- Assign machines to ring via hash h(m)
	- Assign keys to ring
	- Pick machine nearest to key to the left
- O(log m) lookup
- Insert/removal only affects neighbor (however, big problem for neighbor)
- Uneven load distribution (load depends on segment size)
- Insert machine more than once to fix this
- For k term replication, simply pick the k leftmost machines (skip duplicates)

ring of N keys

- Fixing the $O(m)$ lookup
	- Assign machines to ring via hash h(m)
	- Assign keys to ring
	- Pick machine nearest to key to the left
- O(log m) lookup
- Insert/removal only affects neighbor (however, big problem for neighbor)
- Uneven load distribution (load depends on segment size)
- Insert machine more than once to fix this
- For k term replication, simply pick the k leftmost machines (skip duplicates)

ring of N keys

- Fixing the $O(m)$ lookup
	- Assign machines to ring via hash h(m)
	- Assign keys to ring
	- Pick machine nearest to key to the left
- O(log m) lookup
- Insert/removal only affects neighbor (however, big problem for neighbor)
- Uneven load distribution (load depends on segment size)
- Insert machine more than once to fix this
- For k term replication, simply pick the k leftmost machines (skip duplicates)

ring of N keys

- Fixing the $O(m)$ lookup
	- Assign machines to ring via hash h(m)
	- Assign keys to ring
	- Pick machine nearest to key to the left
- O(log m) lookup
- Insert/removal only affects neighbor (however, big problem for neighbor)
- Uneven load distribution (load depends on segment size)
- Insert machine more than once to fix this
- For k term replication, simply pick the k leftmost machines (skip duplicates)

- Fixing the $O(m)$ lookup
	- Assign machines to ring via hash h(m)
	- Assign keys to ring
	- Pick machine nearest to key to the left
- O(log m) lookup
- Insert/removal only affects neighbor (however, big problem for neighbor)
- Uneven load distribution (load depends on segment size)
- Insert machine more than once to fix this
- For k term replication, simply pick the k leftmost machines (skip duplicates)

D2 - Distributed Hash Table

- For arbitrary node segment size is minimum over (m-1) independent uniformly distributed random variables $\Pr\{x \ge c\} = \prod \Pr\{s_i \ge c\} = (1 - c)^{m-1}$ *m i*=2
- Density is given by derivative $p(c) = (m-1)(1-c)^{m-2}$
- Expected segment length is $c=$ (follows from symmetry) 1 *m*
- Probability of exceeding expected segment length (for large m)

$$
\Pr\left\{x \ge \frac{k}{m}\right\} = \left(1 - \frac{k}{m}\right)^{m-1} \longrightarrow e^{-k}
$$

- Assign items according to machine capacity
- Create allocation table with segments proportional to capacity
- Leave space for additional machines
- Hash key h(x) and pick machine covering it
- If failure, re-hash the hash until it hits a bin
- For replication hit k bins in a row
- Proportional load distribution
- Limited scalability
- Need to distribute and update table
- Limit peak load by further delegation (SPOCA - Chawla et al., USENIX 2011)

- Assign items according to machine capacity
- Create allocation table with segments proportional to capacity
- Leave space for additional machines
- Hash key h(x) and pick machine covering it
- If failure, re-hash the hash until it hits a bin
- For replication hit k bins in a row
- Proportional load distribution
- Limited scalability
- Need to distribute and update table
- Limit peak load by further delegation (SPOCA - Chawla et al., USENIX 2011)

1

2

3

4

- Assign items according to machine capacity
- Create allocation table with segments proportional to capacity
- Leave space for additional machines
- Hash key h(x) and pick machine covering it
- If failure, re-hash the hash until it hits a bin
- For replication hit k bins in a row
- Proportional load distribution
- Limited scalability
- Need to distribute and update table
- Limit peak load by further delegation (SPOCA - Chawla et al., USENIX 2011)

- Assign items according to machine capacity
- Create allocation table with segments proportional to capacity
- Leave space for additional machines
- Hash key h(x) and pick machine covering it
- If failure, re-hash the hash until it hits a bin
- For replication hit k bins in a row
- Proportional load distribution
- Limited scalability
- Need to distribute and update table
- Limit peak load by further delegation (SPOCA - Chawla et al., USENIX 2011)

1

2

3

4

- Assign items according to machine capacity
- Create allocation table with segments proportional to capacity
- Leave space for additional machines
- Hash key h(x) and pick machine covering it
- If failure, re-hash the hash until it hits a bin
- For replication hit k bins in a row
- Proportional load distribution
- Limited scalability
- Need to distribute and update table
- Limit peak load by further delegation (SPOCA - Chawla et al., USENIX 2011)

1

2

3

4

- Assign items according to machine capacity
- Create allocation table with segments proportional to capacity
- Leave space for additional machines
- Hash key h(x) and pick machine covering it
- If failure, re-hash the hash until it hits a bin
- For replication hit k bins in a row
- Proportional load distribution
- Limited scalability
- Need to distribute and update table
- Limit peak load by further delegation (SPOCA - Chawla et al., USENIX 2011)

Random Caching Trees (Karger et al. 1999, Akamai paper)

- Cache / synchronize an object
- Uneven load distribution
- Must not generate hotspot
- For given key, pick random order of machines
- Map order onto tree / star via BFS ordering

Random Caching Trees

- Cache / synchronize an object
- Uneven load distribution
- Must not generate hotspot
- For given key, pick random order of machines
- Map order onto tree / star via BFS ordering

e.g. memcached

More stuff

- Map reduce (e.g. Hadoop)
- Online streaming (e.g. S4, Dryad, Storm)
- NoSQL Database (e.g. pnuts, bigtable)
- Fault tolerant (key,value) storage (e.g. dynamo)
- Smart file system layout (e.g. ceph, GFS2)

Batch

deployment

- Data generated independently
	- Editors label data
	- Recorded log files
- Learning algorithm
	- Often invoked from scratch
	- No influence on data source
- **Deployment**
	- No direct influence on learning

data source by a linference

• Ignores influence on source

Online

- Data generated independently
	- Editors label data
	- Incoming log files
- Learning algorithm
	- Update happens in (near) realtime
	- Adapts to changing data source (good for spam, attacks, news)
- **Deployment**
	- No direct influence on learning
	- Ignores influence on source

Interactive / Explore & Exploit

- Data is response to current model
	- **Story recommendations**
	- Personalized news ranking
- Learning algorithm
	- Update happens in (near) realtime
	- Adapts to changing data source
- **Deployment**
	- Predictive uncertainty influences exploration
	- Value of information & current payoff

MAGIC Etch A Sketch SCREEN in machine learning • Systems to run the algorithms • Response batch/online/interactive Compression MAGIC GODDEN IS OLAN THE STANDARD OF THE CARD IS AND
MAGIC Etch A Sketch SCREEN Compression hashing for limited memory Benegated CLIO AIRY MCModel of Texas 4MAGIN SCREEN IS ALASS SENTIME TO REAL PROPERTY OF THE SCREEN IS A MORE SENTIME SENSOR PEACH OF THAME

Personalized Spam Classification

Personalized Spam Classification

• **Primal representation**

 $f(x, u) = \langle \phi(x), w \rangle + \langle \phi(x), w_u \rangle = \langle \phi(x) \otimes (1 \oplus e_u), w \rangle$

Kernel representation

$$
k((x, u), (x', u')) = k(x, x')[1 + \delta_{u, u'}]
$$

Multitask kernel (e.g. Pontil & Michelli, Daume). Usually does not scale well ...

Problem - dimensionality is 10⁶ x 10⁸. That is 400TB of space

Personalized Spam Classification

• **Primal representation**

$$
f(x, u) = \langle \phi(x), w \rangle + \langle \phi(x), w_u \rangle = \langle \phi(x) \otimes (1 \oplus e_u), w \rangle
$$

Kernel representation

$$
k((x, u), (x', u')) = k(x, x')[1 + \delta_{u, u'}]
$$

Multitask kernel (e.g. Pontil & Michelli, Daume). Usually does not scale well ...

Problem - dimensionality is 10⁶ x 10⁸. That is 400TB of space

• Function evaluation

$$
f(x) = \sum_{i} w_i x_i + b
$$

$$
f_{\text{hash}}(x) = \sum_{i} \sigma(i) w[h(i)] x_i + b
$$

• Kernel

$$
k(x, x') = \sum_{i} x_i x'_i
$$
 collisions

$$
k_{\text{hash}}(x, x') = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[\sum_{i:h(i)=j} x_i \sigma(i) \right] \left[\sum_{i:h(i)=j} x'_i \sigma(i) \right]
$$

Approximate Orthogonality

We can do multi-task learning!

Direct sum in Hilbert Space

Sum in Hash Space

Spam classification results

Lazy users...

Results by user group

Results by user group

Results by user group

Even more

- Fast graph comparison
	- Extract subgraph signatures
- Avoiding to implement dynamic data structures
	- Ontologies (hash ontology path labels)
	- Hierarchical factorization (hash context)
	- Content personalization (hash source, user, context)
- Collaborative filtering
	- Compress many users into common parameter vector
- String comparison (kernels)
	- Generate sequence with mismatches, hash and weight e.g. dog becomes {(dog,1), (*og, 0.5), (d*g, 0.5), (do*, 0.5)}
- Replace w[complicated key] by w[h(complicated key)]