

"Artificial Intelligence" and Data Science

statistics and lots of data

Brian D Goodwin, PhD January 13, 2020 Milwaukee School of Engineering

Image: https://bernardmarr.com/

Brian D Goodwin, PhD



Marquette University







BD Goodwin, CR Butson. (2015). J Neuromodulation

Medical College of Wisconsin



There are many paths, but here is mine

- Undergrad: BS Mech. Eng. at MSOE 2009
 - Coding/programming
 - Control systems
 - Finite element modeling (or FEM; also, FEA)
- Started a Masters in Biomedical Eng. at MU ...
- Decided to just do a PhD about 6 months into my Masters
 - PhD took 5.5 years
 - Specialized in neuroscience and computational science
- Stayed in research to do a postdoctoral fellowship at MCW
 - Fellowship was about 2 year (could have been longer)
 - Specialized in biomechanics, signal processing, and machine-learning
- Transitioned into industry at IT consulting firm in the "Data & AI" space
 - 3 years
 - Specialized in cloud solution architecture, machine-learning, and optimization
- Recently accepted an offer from an AI company, Synthet^{ai}c
 - Using AI to generate synthetic datasets: large datasets that represent and characterize rare events

A few thoughts on mechanical engineering

- (I'm obviously biased, but) I think a BSME sets you up for success
- Examples: the PI's I worked under and the CTO at Synthet^{ai}c
- Problems with "condensed concentrations/majors" (in my opinion)
 - Biomedical Engineering
 - Mechanical Eng.
 - Electrical Eng.
 - Systems Physiology
 - Materials Science & Biocompatilibity
 - Data Science
 - Computer Science
 - Statistics
 - Signal processing
 - Mathematics and Lin. Alg.
 - General Engineering
 - Data Engineering

What is potentially ahead for you

- Industry
- Academia
- How do I get the position I want?
 - Competence, but many of the competencies needed for a given job (especially your first one) are learned *on the job*.
 - At the end of the day, stories and relevant/novel contributions will land you the type of engineering job you want
 - Craft your stories accordingly
 - Question asking!

Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation and Magnetism in Medicine

(Nuclear) Magnetic Resonance Imaging



Magnetoencephalography (MEG)



Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation



Idris Z, et al. 2013 (Chapter 2, "Clinical Management and Evolving Novel...", Lichtor T)







r Prescriptive Therapy

40

E-field and Brain Stimulation



Computational Neuroscience and HPC





Patient-specific Modeling Pipeline Results





Human Subject Comparison



Biomechanics and Multi-channel HF Signals







Biomechanics and Multi-channel HF Signals





Acoustic Emissions from Bone Fracture Events



Goodwin, et al. "Acoustic Emission Signatures During Failure of Vertebra and Long Bone." Annals of Biomedical Engineering, 2017.

Business, **Tech**, and **Science** News Text Sources: The Economist; Wall Street Journal; Science (AAAS); Reuters; BBC



What industry thinks about Data Science



Data science is perceived as many things...



Cloud Solution Architecture



Statistics! Question...

- 1 in 1000 products are defective
- QC performs a defect test that has a 95% accuracy;
 - i.e., a 95% true positive rate and 5% false positive rate
- The test never fails to identify a defective product (false negatives are impossible)
- QC tests a product at random, and the test is positive (indicating defective product)

What is the probability that the product is *actually* defective?

We are poor intuitive statisticians

An answer in plain words:

- If 1000 randomly selected billets were tested...
- Then 50 parts will test positive (5% false positive rate)
- But only 1 of them is *actually* defective.
- Therefore, $\frac{1}{51} \approx 0.02$ or 2%

Answer...

D: positive defect test defect: part is actually defective

p(defect) = 0.001p(normal) = 0.999p(D|defect) = 1.00p(D|normal) = 0.05 Human intuition is really expensive, yet it's error prone in 2 delicate environments:1) one requiring use of statistics and2) one where many variables are interacting with each other.

 $p(D) = p(D|defect)p(defect) + p(D|\sim defect)p(\sim defect)$ p(D) = 1.00 * 0.001 + 0.05 * 0.999 = 0.05095

 $p(defect|D) = \frac{p(D|defect)p(defect)}{p(D)} = \frac{1.00 * 0.001}{0.05095} = 0.0196 \approx 2\%$

A Caveat...

"But the cleverest of algorithms are no substitute for human intelligence and knowledge of the data in the problem."

- Brieman and Cutler, UC Berkley, inventors of the Random Forest ML algorithm.

https://www.stat.berkeley.edu/~breiman/RandomForests/cc_philosophy.htm



At the end of the day: it's a function



Why Estimate f?

The system, *f*, has **predictive power** (prediction). The system, *f*, has **explanatory power** (inference).

Say you have some system that produces an output

$$Y = f(X) + \epsilon$$

But it's impossible to know all of the factors (X features) that influence Y, let alone the exact function, f. So, we try to estimate this:

$$\hat{Y} = \hat{f}(X)$$

A more tangible (supervised learning) example...



A more tangible (supervised learning) example...

Learning or "Training" set

	variable_a	variable_b	labels
1	0.54444248	-0.3646484	0
2	1.10292398	3.0249860	0
3	0.99040419	-1.2835897	0
6	-0.24228152	4.0610301	1
7	0.24556087	1.9519334	1
8	0.52413679	3.1674849	1

Validation	or	"Testing"	set
		0	

4	-0.75436252	2.5110819	0
5	1.56692947	3.2313980	0
9	-0.02794355	0.5639772	1
10	-0.72091824	3.5863003	1

	variable_a	variable_b	labels
1	0.54444248	-0.3646484	0
2	1.10292398	3.0249860	0
3	0.99040419	-1.2835897	0
4	-0.75436252	2.5110819	0
5	1.56692947	3.2313980	0
6	-0.24228152	4.0610301	1
7	0.24556087	1.9519334	1 1
8	0.52413679	3.1674849	1
9	-0.02794355	0.5639772	1
10	-0.72091824	3.5863003	1

Neural Network



See: <u>https://playground.tensorflow.org/</u>



-6



X_2

Model Performance





Machine Learning & Estimating a $f(\mathbf{x})$

- Supervised Learning
 - Classification problems; e.g., classifying images, anomaly detection, etc.
 - Features have a known class and you want to predict the class for a new set of features.
- Unsupervised Learning
 - Data clustering
 - No known labels
 - Grouping data points with similarities among their features.
- Reinforcement Learning
 - Neural Network or Deep Learning
 - Optimizing the performance of some action
 - Common in Robotics













Models

Compute

Data







PROGRESSIVE GROWING OF GANS FOR IMPROVED QUALITY, STABILITY, AND VARIATION

Tero KarrasTimo AilaSamuli LaineJaakko LehtinenNVIDIANVIDIANVIDIANVIDIA and Aalto University{tkarras,taila,slaine,jlehtinen}@nvidia.com



Karras, T. et al., 2017. Progressive Growing of GANs for Improved Quality, Stability, and Variation. In ICLR 2018. pp. 1–26.

Improving intra-operative process in neurosurgery Hollon, et al. 2020, Nature.



Intraoperative diagnostic prediction (~15 s)









Mastering the game of Go without human knowledge

David Silver¹*, Julian Schrittwieser¹*, Karen Simonyan¹*, Ioannis Antonoglou¹, Aja Huang¹, Arthur Guez¹, Thomas Hubert¹, Lucas Baker¹, Matthew Lai¹, Adrian Bolton¹, Yutian Chen¹, Timothy Lillicrap¹, Fan Hui¹, Laurent Sifre¹, George van den Driessche¹, Thore Graepel¹ & Demis Hassabis¹



Figure 6 | **Performance of AlphaGo Zero. a**, Learning curve for AlphaGo Zero using a larger 40-block residual network over 40 days. The plot shows the performance of each player α_{θ_i} from each iteration *i* of our reinforcement learning algorithm. Elo ratings were computed from evaluation games between different players, using 0.4 s per search (see Methods). **b**, Final performance of AlphaGo Zero. AlphaGo Zero was trained for 40 days using a 40-block residual neural network. The plot shows the results of a tournament between: AlphaGo Zero, AlphaGo Master (defeated top human professionals 60–0 in online games), AlphaGo

Lee (defeated Lee Sedol), AlphaGo Fan (defeated Fan Hui), as well as previous Go programs Crazy Stone, Pachi and GnuGo. Each program was given 5 s of thinking time per move. AlphaGo Zero and AlphaGo Master played on a single machine on the Google Cloud; AlphaGo Fan and AlphaGo Lee were distributed over many machines. The raw neural network from AlphaGo Zero is also included, which directly selects the move *a* with maximum probability p_a , without using MCTS. Programs were evaluated on an Elo scale²⁵: a 200-point gap corresponds to a 75% probability of winning.

Silver, D. et al., 2017. Mastering the game of Go without human knowledge. *Nature*, 550, p.354.

Design Optimization



- Constrained optimization
 - Design constraints
 - Optimizing for specific circumstance (e.g., lap speed on a specific course)
 - Structural engineering and optimization
- Reinforcement learning
 - Massive parameter space
 - Simulation environment for quantifying outcomes