Computational Methods in Astrophysics

Dr Rob Thacker (AT319E) thacker@ap.smu.ca

ANNs: Motivating factors

Many problems have no obvious algorithmic solutions

- e.g. face recognition, handwriting
- Even if there were an algorithm it could still be exceptionally difficult to code
- The solutions derived in neural networks are often vastly different to hand-written serial approaches
 - Especially so for highly complicated nets
 - Indeed we frequently simply don't know what the algorithm is
- We anticipate neural networks will be able to become good at processes brains are good at
 - But that also means they will be poor at direct computations like arithmetic, but that doesn't matter...

History: Artificial Neural Networks

- Artificial models of of biological neurons conceived in 1940s – McCulloch & Pitts propose their model
- 1949 Hebb's proposes theory of learning in terms of synapse plasticity
- 1957 Perceptron algorithm is developed by Rosenblatt at Cornell
- 70s becomes clear that there are fundamental limitations to "single layer" perceptrons
- 80s New "back propagation" learning methods for multilayer perceptrons discovered, field takes off again
- 2000s SVM etc reduce popularity of ANN, but advent of deep learning again renews interest

Biological neurons



- 3 key parts body, dendrites and axon
- Dendrites branch and thin, axon usually remains thick
- Dendrites or cell body receive signals (via synapses)
- Axon transmits to other neurons (via synapses)

Biological neurons & brains

- Human brains have 80-90 billion neurons
 - 19-23 billion in cerebral cortex
- Each neuron may be connected to up to 10,000 others
- Typical frequency of firing is around 10 Hz, can go as high as 100 Hz
- Neurons maintain a –ve bias voltage (-70 mV) in their resting state giving them a membrane potential
 - Depolarization (to +ve bias) occurs via influx of Na+ ions
 - K+ ions then flow out to repolarize
 - This change in potential is propagated down the axon via the same depolarization/repolarization
 - Takes 0.002 seconds...



What is an ANN?

Definition due to Hecht-Nielsen:

- ...a computing system made up of a number of simple, highly connected processing elements, which process information by their dynamic state response to external inputs...
- Needs to be input layer and output layer
 - Can also be hidden layers
- Weights can be trained by minimizing error
- Can be hardware, or algorithmic
- Largest simulation yet performed 160 billion parameters



Why are ANNs so popular? Drawbacks?

- As long as a problem can be broken down into an appropriate set of numerical inputs and outputs it should be possible to do some kind of training
 - But to do this optimally requires carefully processing the data set first (avoiding redundancies, statistical outliers etc)
- ANN are good for problems with a large number of degrees of freedom
 - Images, speech etc.
- Drawback: if sufficiently complex, they are a black box
 - Getting a logical understanding of the classification method is frequently very difficult although "rule extraction" algorithms do exist
- Also difficult to "fine tune"

Brains vs computers

- Brains and computers process in remarkably different ways
- 10⁹ transistors in single CPU but 10¹⁴ in biggest supercomputers
- Compare that to 10¹⁴-10¹⁵ synapses, 10¹¹ neurons in brain
 - Neurons are more directly connected (1 to 10,000) than CPUs but this distinction is moot IMHO
- Brain is remarkably fault tolerant computers fail quite easily (try spilling coffee!)
- Brains process in a strongly parallel way computers tend to be serial (with exceptions for parallel algorithms)
- Adaptivity: Brains can learn not even clear what it means for a serial computer to do that
- Evolution: Brains took millions of years to reach this point of evolution, computers a few decades

Deep Learning

- ANNs have consistently increased in complexity
- Deep learning is a logical extension of this trend, and corresponds to networks with five or more layers

Layers are trained in response to one another

2012 paper by Hinton et al (U. Toronto CS) gave breakthrough performance on a number of data sets

■ The key promise of the method is in unsupervised learning

- The notable ability of these system is to uncover difficult to detect structure and commonality
- Humans learn in a similar way, although we do need some elements of supervised learning
- Notice that it is quite distinct from SVMs which try to factor out complexity with a single transformation

McCulloch-Pitts

Wji

 A_{-}

- First mathematical model of neuron
- Output Y_j is fire (1) or not fire (0)
- Inputs can be weighted excitatory (>0) in inhibitory (<0)
 - Traditionally exciting weights are labelled a, inhibitory weights labelled b (but watch for different notations)
 - Neuron fires if sum of weights*inputs exceeds threshold

 θ - the activation threshold



McCulloch-Pitts – logic models

The MP model can implement AND, OR and NOT gates



Traditional to add extra input at +1 with specific weight
Let's look at this in a little more detail

MP models to the Perceptron – things to consider

- What kind of data can they discriminate?
- Consider the pattern space of inputs for an AND gate



MP models to the Perceptron – things to consider

- Transition point at $I_1+I_2 = 1.5 \Rightarrow I_2 = 1.5 I_1$
- Decision boundary -1 slope, intercept 1.5

I₁ I₂ Y 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 1 1

Linearly separable problems will work More inputs generalizes to higher dimensions



A simple non-linearly-separable data set: XOR

Consider the exclusive OR

Y=0I₁ I₂ Y **Y=1** 0 0 0 0 1 1 I_2 1 0 1 1 0 1 No single line can split the data – XOR can't be formed by single layer MP neuron

Perceptrons

- Perceptrons (1958, Rosenblatt) generalized MP model
- Weights can have different values
- Generalized output to go from [-1,1] but this isn't a big difference
 - We will work with [-1,1] from now on
 - Note there are also different transfer functions that can be chosen – more later
- But the key difference was adding in the concept of learning via a learning rule

Perceptron – Learning algorithm

This will be a supervised learning situation

For the dth case we have a true value of t^d , while the system output o^d (we called it Y before) n

 $A_j = \sum W_{ji}I_i$

- Define error = t^d - o^d
- In response to an error what do we want?
 - Suppose $t^d=1$ o^d=-1, so error is +ve
 - The output is too low => increase sum to increase output
 - If input I_i is +ve increase W_{ii}
 - If input I_i is -ve decrease W_{ii}
 - Suppose $t^d = -1$ o^d = 1, so error is -ve
 - The output is to high => decrease sum to decrease output
 - If input I_i is +ve decrease W_{ji}
 - If input I_i is –ve increase W_{ii}
- If there is no error, then no need to do anything!

Perceptron – How much to adjust by?

- There is no obvious value to change the weights by
- But only makes sense to change non-zero inputs, so include I_i value in the adjustment formula
- Also the t^d-o^d determines direction of correction
- So then we need one last factor that determines the size of the correction the so-called "learning rate" α

$$W_{ji} \leftarrow W_{ji} + \alpha I_i^d (t^d - o^d)$$

Learning rate usually small, say 0.1

But we have to do this *repeatedly* for different inputs until they classify correctly

Perceptron – How much to adjust by?

• Need to consider what initial W_{ii} values should be

- No obvious answer, so it is best to put the system in a 'random' state by assigning random values to W_{ii} initially
- Repeat as previously suggested but consider d examples together

$$W_{ji} \leftarrow W_{ji} + \alpha \sum_{i} I_i^d (t^d - o^d)$$

- If training cases are linearly separable and the learning rate is sufficiently small, this will converge
 - It is a gradient descent along the error surface
- Multiple examples on web show this training in progress (e.g. to an AND gate)
- But what about non-linearly separable? Need a different approach

Gradient descent/Adaline/Delta Rule

What about a "best fit" methodology?

■ No surprise that we can do that via a squares minimization approach

$$E_{j} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d}^{d} (t^{d} - o^{d})^{2}$$
$$E_{j} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d}^{d} (t^{d} - f(\sum_{i=1}^{n} W_{ji}I_{i}^{d}))^{2}$$

- Notice if f is not differentiable (step function!) so we can't differentiate this formula to find minimum (threshold dropped for ease of notation)
- Can think about changing f, or substituting A_j rather than output value
- ADALINE=ADAptive LINear Element (Widrow & Hoff 1960)

Differentiate

Using A_j rather than the full output then gives $E_j \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d} (t^d - \sum_{i=1}^{n} W_{ji} I_i^d)^2$

We want to differentiate w.r.t. to the weights so for ease of notation we'll drop the j from now on

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial W_k} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_d 2(t^d - \sum_{i=1}^n W_i I_i^d) \frac{\partial}{\partial W_k} (t^d - \sum_{i=1}^n W_i I_i^d)$$
$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial W_k} = \sum_d (t^d - \sum_{i=1}^n W_i I_i^d) (-I_k^d)$$

- K

Steepest descent

- Gradient defines direction of most rapid change in a field
- Take negative of that value to get descent toward minimum & multiply by scaling factor *α*

$$\Delta W_k = \alpha \sum_d I_k^d (t^d - \sum_{i=1}^n W_i I_i^d)$$

Thus update as:

$$W_k \leftarrow W_k + \alpha \sum_d I_k^d (t^d - \sum_{i=1}^n W_i I_i^d)$$

Convergence properties compared

- Suppose problem is linearly separable
 - Perceptron learning will converge to unique linear separator
 - Steepest descent is not guaranteed to do so
- Suppose system is not linearly separable, will the minimum be found?
 - Perceptron learning cannot guarantee the minimum
 - Steepest descent will converge to the global minimum
- How do outliers influence results?
 - Perceptron same weight for all
 - Steepest descent have progressively larger influence
- How do correctly classified points influence training?
 - Perceptron no influence
 - Steepest descent strongly positive values have even larger impact

Minski & Papert 1969

- Perceptrons became popular despite their obvious limitations in single layer implementations
- M&P concluded that perceptrons are insufficient to construct generally intelligent machines
 - In essence general intelligence relies upon non-linearly separable hypotheses
 - What features of an object are used? Locality? Or global properties?
 - e.g. connectedness cannot be captured by local features alone need global features
- Global features corresponds to potentially huge space
- But at time not clear how to make high level features sufficiently adaptive
- Evolution of backpropagation methods helped to do this

Multi-layer networks

Organize into inputs, hidden units, and outputsLinks (edges) go from one layer to the next



Single hidden layer – two inputs, two outputs

Each input has an edge to the each hidden layer unit

Each hidden layer unit has an edge to the output units



Every edge has a weight, so need to label appropriately

Describing weights

As in single layer, weights are parameters to be trained
Use two index notation "from-to" for each w



What to do about transfer functions?

- Each element in hidden and output layers has inputs and an associated transfer function f
- Assume output of each unit is $o_i = f(\Sigma w_{ii}I_i)$
- We could again use the step-activated function, but non-differentiability is limiting
- Simple linear function is differentiable but doesn't have rapid transition properties
- Are there differentiable alternatives? Of course! 🕲

Sigmoid

Simple, continous differentiable function than transitions between 0 and 1 in well behaved way

$$g(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x}}$$



 $\frac{dg(x)}{dx} = g(x)(1 - g(x))$

Can include a bias too

Error & gradient descent

- For a two output model the error for input d will be the sum of the squares, E^d=0.5*(t^d₅-o^d₅)²+0.5*(t^d₆-o^d₆)²
- This can be differentiated and chain rule used twice

 $\frac{\partial E}{\partial w_{ij}} = \frac{\partial E}{\partial o_j} \frac{\partial o_j}{\partial net_j} \frac{\partial net_j}{\partial w_{ij}}$

Where $net_{j} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} w_{kj} o_{k} \text{ so that } \frac{\partial net_{j}}{\partial w_{ij}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial w_{ij}} (\sum_{k=1}^{n} w_{kj} o_{k}) = o_{i}$

More analysis

Derivative of o_i wrt net_i is

$$\frac{\partial o_j}{\partial net_j} = \frac{\partial}{\partial net_j} g(net_j) = g(net_j)(1 - g(net_j))$$

That is why differentiability of transfer function is required

For E differentiated wrt o_j – straightforward if o_j is a direct output

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial o_j} = o_j - t$$

More analysis

If o_j is not an output unit then need to consider E as a function of all units, L=u, v,..., w receiving input from $\frac{\partial E(o_j)}{\partial o_j} = \frac{\partial E(net_u, net_{v_j} \dots, net_w)}{\partial o_j} = \sum_{l \in L} \left(\frac{\partial E}{\partial net_l} \frac{\partial net_l}{\partial o_j}\right)$ $\frac{\partial E(o_l)}{\partial o_j} = \frac{\partial E}{\partial o_l} = 0$

 $\frac{\partial E(o_j)}{\partial o_j} = \sum_{l \in L} \left(\frac{\partial E}{\partial o_l} \frac{\partial o_l}{\partial net_l} W_{jl} \right)$

Can combine to get...

Back propagation



See http://mattmazur.com/2015/03/17/a-step-by-step-backpropagation-example/ for a great step-by-step example on the network we've used

Summary

- Neural network theory begins from simple building blocks of the MP model
 - Generalize to perceptrons
 - Then onward to multi-layer systems
 - Train by minimizing an error function no surprise
- Training of linear separable systems is optimized using perceptron, but if not linearly separable steepest descent is better
- For multi-layer networks steepest descent methods can be applied, but analysis becomes recursive over layers