

Learning by random walks in the weight space of the Ising perceptron

Haiping Huang¹ and Haijun Zhou^{1,2}

¹*Key Laboratory of Frontiers in Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*

²*Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics China, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*

(Dated: December 22, 2018)

The weight space of the Ising perceptron is explored by a random walk process where single weight flips are performed until the new presented pattern is learned. In this learning protocol, patterns are added sequentially and previous learned patterns (constraints) should be kept satisfied. Random walks are carried out until no solutions can be found. By this protocol, we are able to evaluate the overlap distribution of different solutions found on the same learning instance, and we show that solutions are far apart in Hamming distance even at small loading, implying that well-separated clusters form in the weight space. Adding the constraint that the stability of each learned pattern should be maximized before another new pattern is presented, the evolving fraction of frozen weights can be computed and shows that the simple random walk process will get trapped by the exponentially many suboptimal states. However, we suggest an additional rule by which a finite energy barrier involving only the barely learned patterns is crossed, then the remarkable improvement of learning performance is observed. This strategy, namely `WalkLearning`, is simple to implement in practice and most efficient for solving the learning problem of moderate system size.

PACS numbers: 05.40.-a, 75.10.Nr, 84.35.+i, 89.70.Eg

I. INTRODUCTION

A single-layered feedforward network or simple perceptron serves as an elementary building block of complex neural networks, and is the basic structure for learning and memory [1]. N input units are connected to the output unit with continuous or discrete synaptic weights. The learning task is to find a set of optimal weights such that an extensive number of random input patterns can be correctly mapped to the desired output. The Ising perceptron with binary (± 1) weights is inherently simpler for large scale electronic implementations and more robust against noise than the perceptron with real-valued weights. However, training the Ising perceptron is known to be an NP-complete problem where the average computation time entailed to find a solution grows exponentially with the number of weights to determine. A complete enumeration of all possible states of weights is practically limited to the small size system up to $N = 25$ [2–4]. Therefore, designing efficient algorithms based on various heuristics remains an attractive subject in this field [5–11].

The continuous perceptron with synaptic weights subject to the spherical constraint has been well studied by Gardner and Derrida [12, 13]. Using the replica method, they obtained the critical storage capacity of the network $\alpha_c = 2.0$ beyond which the correct classification of random input patterns is no longer possible. The weight space of the continuous perceptron is convex and thus connected, with the consequence that the reliable algorithms exist to find the optimal synaptic weights, such as Minover algorithm capable of producing optimal stability [14], AdaTron algorithm [15], etc. When the synaptic weight is constrained to take binary values, the storage capacity dramatically decreases. The replica symmetric calculation of the capacity based on Gardner’s approach yields $\alpha_c = \frac{4}{\pi}$ violating the upper bound given by the information theory or annealed approximation $\alpha_c \leq 1$ [16]. Krauth and Mézard later showed that the correct solution can be obtained within the one step replica symmetry broken ansatz equivalent to the zero entropy condition where the vanishing replica symmetry entropy determines the critical storage capacity $\alpha_c \simeq 0.83$ [17, 18]. This theoretical limit of capacity has been confirmed by numerical simulations of small size systems with an extrapolation to $N \rightarrow \infty$ [2, 3, 16]. However, the complete enumeration of all possible configurations is computationally infeasible especially for an extensive number of input units. In contrast to the continuous perceptron, for the Ising perceptron, we do not know general learning algorithms to find the compatible synaptic weights. This is intimately related to the fact that the weight space is broken up into a huge amount of disjoint ergodic components [19]. Solutions from distinct components differ in a very significant fraction of their weights. We define each connected component as a cluster where any two solutions are connected by a path composed of successive single weight flips [20, 21]. The incident suboptimal states act as dynamical traps for the local search algorithms. As α tends to α_c , the typical overlap between two solutions does not approach unity rather tends to around 0.5, indicating that solutions are widely dispersed in the weight space even near to the critical capacity. The complex structure in the weight space results in the hardness of resolution, however, attention has been paid to algorithmic issues. Köhler suggested an adaptive genetic algorithm achieving the storage capacity $\alpha_c \simeq 0.7$ for $N = 255$ [5]. The simulated annealing was applied to




FIG. 1: (Color online) The sketch of the Ising perceptron and random walks in the corresponding weight space. (a) N input units (open circles) feed directly a single output unit (solid circle). Weights $\{J_i\}$ take binary values ± 1 and are able to store $P = \alpha N$ random input patterns $\{\xi_i^\mu\}$. The output is given by $\sigma^\mu = \text{sgn}\left(\sum_{i=1}^N J_i \xi_i^\mu\right)$. $\mu = 1, 2, \dots, \alpha N$. (b) A typical random walking path (indicated by arrows). The open circle represents the configuration satisfying t patterns, the black one $t - 1$ patterns and the gray one $t - 2$ patterns. The edge connecting two configurations indicates these configurations differ in only one weight.

search for perfect solutions by Horner [19], nevertheless, critical slowing down of the search algorithm was observed as expected due to the presence of exponentially many small ergodic components in the weight space. Drawing the advantage that efficient algorithms exist for the continuous perceptron, an alternative approach is to clip the continuous weights trained in the corresponding continuous perceptron [7, 22–24]. However, not all synaptic weights can be correctly predicted by clipping. For all uncertain weights, complete enumeration should still be adopted. Recently, the fully distributed message passing algorithm was applied to find optimal weights for large systems with $\alpha \simeq 0.7$ [9]. Its efficiency can be ascribed to the existence of a sub-exponential number of large clusters in the weight space [21]. A neurobiologically plausible on-line learning algorithm inspired from the belief propagation algorithm was proposed in Ref. [10]. Hidden discrete internal states are added to the synaptic weight with an additional rule that transitions between the internal states are purely meta-plastic in order to stabilize the barely learned pattern. This rule is responsible for the pronounced efficiency of this on-line learning algorithm.

Our prime concern in this paper is the study of the weight space of the Ising perceptron by simple random walks, motivated by recent progresses made in the study of constraint satisfaction problems [25–28]. Ardelius *et al* proposed chains of satisfiability problems where clauses are added sequentially and showed that the solution space is shrinking as a function of constraint density. Zhou developed a stochastic local search process named SEQSAT to probe the solution space landscape of random K -SAT problem [26]. SEQSAT satisfies a K -SAT formula in a sequential fashion, and walks randomly by single spin flips in a solution cluster of the old sub-formula until the new clause is satisfied. He found that solution communities emerge within single solution clusters. The entropic trapping of these communities accounts for the observed glassy behavior of SEQSAT. He also claimed that the homogeneity-breaking transition occurs before the ergodicity-breaking transition. Regarding the Ising perceptron, a recent work by Obuchi and Kabashima [21] demonstrated that the weight space is equally dominated by exponentially many clusters of vanishing entropy and a sub-exponential number of large clusters. In this paper, we propose a sequential learning protocol where each pattern is presented in a sequential manner with the additional requirement that all previous learned patterns remain to be learned during the subsequent learning. Random walks are performed by single weight flips in the weight space until no solutions are found. Using the overlap measure of similarity between different solutions found by our random walk procedure, we show explicitly that solutions are widely dispersed in the weight space even at small network loading, consistent with the one step replica symmetry broken ansatz [17]. As observed in our simulations, all weights are frozen when the number of presented patterns exceeds some threshold. Although this loading is much smaller than the theoretical limit, the local search has to be terminated due to the dynamical arrest by suboptimal states separating the solution clusters. However, the algorithmic performance could be improved by crossing a finite energy barrier only involving those barely learned patterns. This learning protocol, namely **WalkLearning**, is shown to be efficient for solving learning problem of moderate system sizes and at moderate values of loading, and provide insights into understanding the weight space of the Ising perceptron from the algorithmic standpoint.

The paper proceeds as follows. The random classification problem is defined in Sec. II. Several strategies of learning by random walks are presented in Sec. III. In Sec. IV, experimental study of learning algorithms is carried out. The overlap distribution of solutions as well as performances of different local search algorithms is reported. Summary and discussion are given in Sec. V.

II. THE RANDOM CLASSIFICATION PROBLEM

For the Ising perceptron depicted schematically in Fig. 1 (a), N input units are directly coupled to the single output unit with binary synaptic weights. The perceptron learns to classify P (scales as αN where α is termed the storage capacity or the network loading) random input patterns into two categories. Given a set of inputs-output associations $\{\{\xi_i^\mu\}_{i=1}^N, \sigma^\mu\} (\mu = 1, \dots, P)$, the output is determined by

$$\sigma^\mu = \text{sgn} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i^\mu J_i \right) \quad (1)$$

where $\{J_i\}$ are binary synaptic weights and $\{\xi_i^\mu\}$ are the random input patterns. Both inputs and outputs are generated independently and randomly, according to the distribution in which the element takes ± 1 with equal probability $\frac{1}{2}$, then synaptic weights are modified, in such a way that P given input patterns are mapped onto the desired outputs $\{\sigma^\mu\}$. The learning problem can be considered as the task to find an optimal set of synaptic weights to fulfill

$$\sigma^\mu \sum_i J_i \xi_i^\mu / \sqrt{N} \geq \kappa \quad (2)$$

where positive κ ensures the large basin of attraction for each pattern [17]. This problem can be efficiently solved by using belief propagation algorithm iterated on a densely connected factor graph where each pattern serves as a constraint and each synaptic weight as a variable node [9].

Owing to the symmetric Boolean transfer function Eq. (1), the desired output for each pattern can be assumed to be +1 without loss of generality. Meanwhile, we prescribe odd value of N to avoid ambiguity for the output (1) and define the stability field for each pattern as $E_\mu = \sum_i \xi_i^\mu J_i$. To ensure the local stability of each pattern, in analogy to (2), we introduce a stability parameter $\Delta \geq 1$ such that $E_\mu \geq \Delta \forall \mu$. Input patterns with $E_\mu = 3$ are stable against a single weight flip. In our current scenario, the pattern with $E_\mu = 1$ is referred to as the barely learned pattern on which a single weight flip may lead to an error.

III. LEARNING BY RANDOM WALKS

The random walk process has been used to find solutions of constrained satisfaction problems as a local search algorithm in a series of works [25–32]. It searches for the solution by moving in the configuration space by small steps where one or a few variables are flipped. Various strategies have been developed to improve the performance of the algorithm [33, 34] and to study the properties of the solution space landscape [25–28].

Within our current context, random patterns are generated in a sequential manner for the perceptron. Once a new pattern is presented, random walking starts from a random initial configuration in the space of synaptic weights (for a typical path, see Fig. 1 (b)) until the new pattern is satisfied or the upper bound of learning time is saturated. More precisely, one of the flippable weights is chosen randomly and then flipped, thus the original configuration is moved to a new one which may correctly classify the pattern. During this process, all previous learned patterns remain to be learned. Due to the stochasticity of this local search process, reverse of one selected weight can lead to increased or decreased stability field of the new pattern, however, the stability field will reach $E_\mu = 1$ in the end or the preset maximal number of learning time for each pattern is exceeded. The learning time is measured in the unit which consists of N proposed flips. In this random walk setting, just one weight is allowed to be flipped each time, hence we call this process single weight flip (SWF), straightforward to generalize to double weight flip (DWF) where two of the flippable weights are singled out and their states are reversed subsequently. To illustrate our methodology, we denote $e_i^\mu = J_i \xi_i^\mu$, as a result of single weight flip (e.g., $J_i \rightarrow -J_i$), then obtain a new stability for μ -th pattern,

$$E'_\mu = E_\mu - 2e_i^\mu. \quad (3)$$

For the unit with $e_i^\mu = -1$, the negation of its weight will increase E_μ by 2, hence we denote additionally an irrelevant set (Iset) to contain all these units. As random walking proceeds, both stabilities of presented patterns and corresponding Isets are updated.

SWF enables one to evaluate the overlap distribution of solutions found on the same set of patterns with fixed α . In general, by random walking in the weight space, different random initial configurations would lead to different solutions to the same problem instance. In order to check whether the weight space is ergodic or not, we introduce the overlap between two distinct configurations \mathbf{J} and \mathbf{J}' ,

$$q = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N J_i J'_i. \quad (4)$$

The reduced Hamming distance can then be obtained as $d_H = \frac{1}{2}(1 - q)$ whose distribution characterizes the geometric structure of the weight space. The typical value of the overlap near to α_c is given by replica symmetric calculation $q \simeq 0.56$ [17], signalling that solutions are far away from each other as α tends to its critical value.

To evaluate the evolution of the fraction of frozen weights during the sequential learning, one should maximize stability fields of all learned patterns before the presentation of another new pattern. Upon maximizing these fields, the frozen weight is identified as the one whose negation results in unsatisfaction of at least one of previous learned patterns. In addition, we can assume a certain fraction r of all presented patterns are learned with this stability maximization procedure (MaxStability).

SWF, as a local search algorithm, will get stuck in enormous metastable states, which is observed when all weights become frozen at a loading much smaller than the theoretical limit. However, a finite energy barrier can be crossed if only the barely learned patterns are involved, and this strategy will be shown to be more efficient than SWF. We call it **WalkLearning** working as follows:

WalkLearning algorithm

INPUT: the set of patterns to learn; a maximal number of learning time T_{max} for each pattern.

OUTPUT: the final achieved capacity and the set of all compatible synaptic weights.

1. Randomly generate an initial configuration of synaptic weights.
 2. A new pattern is presented:
 - 2.1 Pick one of flippable weights at random and flip it. Then update the stability fields of all the presented patterns and their corresponding Isets;
 - 2.2 Repeat 2.1 until the new pattern is learned.
 3. Repeat 2 until the preset learning time is saturated.
 4. Remove the barely learned patterns temporarily, and go back to label 2. If the number of newly-added patterns equals to that of barely learned ones, all barely learned patterns are immediately presented once again (denoted as relearning):
 - 4.1 If all these patterns are learned, go back to label 2;
 - 4.2 Else: go back to label 1.

Else: go back to label 1.
 5. If relearning succeeds at least one time, then return the final achieved capacity as well as the set of all compatible synaptic weights and stop.
-

The halting criteria for **WalkLearning** is that relearning succeeds (all barely learned patterns are learned again) at least one time. We do observe the success of relearning in our simulations and this success is able to boost the storage capacity, nevertheless, it is a rare event that relearning succeeds more than three times. The **WalkLearning** algorithm can also be used to learn a given set of patterns and it stops when these patterns have been learned.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF LEARNING ALGORITHMS

Learning by random walks is simulated on single problem instances in this section. Different strategies introduced in Sec. III are discussed. Comparison of their learning performances for various system sizes is presented in Fig. 2. The learning time for each pattern takes a cutoff 1000. The capacity exhibits approximately an exponential decay with increasing system size, thus performances of these strategies depend explicitly on the number of weights to determine. Despite this drawback, **WalkLearning** is observed to be efficient for moderate system sizes of order $N \simeq 1000$, and achieve mean capacities $\alpha \simeq 0.494$ for $N = 101$ and $\alpha \simeq 0.226$ for $N = 1001$. This is thanks to the fact that a finite energy barrier only involving barely learned patterns is crossed. Once a finite number of barely learned patterns are relearned successfully, the capacity is boosted to a higher value. In our simulations, the capacity can even be increased




FIG. 2: (Color online) The storage capacity achieved by random walks versus the system size N . Data points are averages over various number of independent runs depending on the system size (400 runs for the smallest N and 10 runs for the largest N). Significant improvement is achieved by **WalkLearning** where a finite energy barrier is crossed.




FIG. 3: (Color online) Histograms of reduced Hamming distances between solutions found by SWF on the same problem instance. 100 solutions are found for $N = 101$ with $\alpha \simeq 0.35$, $N = 1001$ with $\alpha \simeq 0.15$, $N = 501$ with $\alpha \simeq 0.15$ and $N = 1001$ with $\alpha \simeq 0.20$ respectively. Gaussian fits are also performed.

more than two times, which makes **WalkLearning** the best of all existing strategies. The worst one is obviously DWF performing even more poorly than SWF. We may envision that, in a single solution cluster, the weight space can not be probed sufficiently by DWF which is soon trapped by some suboptimal state. We conjecture that solutions in the cluster visited by DWF is sparsely-connected, and this cluster is very small and apt to disappear as the loading increases. However, by crossing a finite energy barrier, the configuration in the weight space can be moved to the region where more patterns can be learned. On the other hand, as indicated in Fig. 2, by maximizing the stabilities for a certain fraction of patterns, MaxStability performs slightly better than SWF at the expense of more computational time. In addition, its performance is not affected by the fraction, thus we choose $r = 0.1$ in our simulations. Through this procedure, the evolving fraction of frozen weights during the sequential learning can also be computed.

To check whether the solution space is ergodic or not, we investigate the histograms of reduced Hamming distances between solutions found by SWF at fixed α . For three different sizes $N = 101$, 501 and 1001, we collect 100 different solutions respectively. Their overlaps are then calculated and histograms of corresponding reduced Hamming distances




FIG. 4: (Color online) The fraction of frozen weights as a function of the loading α . Three different trajectories with $N = 1001$ are shown. The inset displays the corresponding learning time.

are shown in Fig. 3. It is observed that different solutions are separated by an extensive Hamming distance and we argue that clusters are formed before the critical capacity is reached and these solutions are located at different clusters. The size of the cluster visited by SWF determines the final achieved capacity. As seen from Fig. 3, the histograms depend on the loading, with mean distances $d_H \simeq 0.449$ for $\alpha \simeq 0.15$ and $d_H \simeq 0.431$ for $\alpha \simeq 0.20$, given the same system size $N = 1001$. For the same loading $\alpha \simeq 0.15$, the histogram with size $N = 501$ shows larger standard error compared with the histogram with size $N = 1001$, despite their nearly identical mean distances. For the small system with $N = 101$ but high loading $\alpha \simeq 0.35$, the mean distance turns to be $d_H \simeq 0.366$. For larger system, the standard error becomes smaller and the structure of the solution space gets more involved. On physical grounds, in the small size clusters, strong correlations will be built up among all synaptic weights, which dramatically worsens the local search algorithms. This is explicitly shown in Fig. 4 where the fraction of frozen weights is plotted against the loading. As more and more patterns are presented to the perceptron, the learning becomes harder and harder since the number of solutions in the cluster visited by our local search algorithms decreases and by local search it is impossible to move to another larger cluster in principle. When the cluster visited by the local search algorithms gets smaller and smaller, meaning that more and more weights become frozen and eventually none of weights is flippable, the local search processes will be trapped and have to be terminated in that the configuration could not be moved further any more. The corresponding learning time is also displayed in the inset of Fig. 4. Intrinsically, the Ising perceptron is a densely-connected model where each constraint involves all the degrees of freedom in the system. Even if a finite fraction of weights (not unity) are frozen, they can turn to be free again upon satisfying the next presented pattern because all their stabilities are optimized to a higher value (≥ 3) stable with respect to single weight flip. However, once all weights are frozen, the current pattern with negative stability will be no longer satisfied since random walks are trapped by suboptimal states which can be bypassed by `WalkLearning` to some extent.

V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Motivated by recent insights gained on the further structure of the solution space of combinatory satisfaction problems based on the study of local search algorithms [26–28], we propose a random walking scheme for the learning problem in the Ising perceptron. The overlap distribution of solutions found by use of SWF at given loading α shows that ergodicity of the solution space has been broken before the critical capacity is approached. Even for small α , solutions found by SWF are well-separated, which suggests that they are located at distinct clusters with various sizes and clusters has formed in the highly disconnected weight space. As the loading increases, some clusters would become smaller and smaller, and eventually disappear. As a result, the learning time cutoff is saturated. Moreover, SWF working by single weight flips, is not capable of crossing energy barriers separating clusters. However, taking into the barely learned patterns account, the storage capacity can be boosted by a significant amount. In this situation, a strategy namely relearning is adopted and the weight space is guaranteed to be explored more sufficiently before dramatic changes of the solution space structure. We may speculate that our learning algorithms run in those coexisting exponentially many small clusters although large clusters are also dominant but with much smaller number

compared with that of small clusters [21]. Based on our numerical simulations, some small clusters will turn into a single point then vanish from the weight space, which prohibits the perceptron from learning another new pattern. Actually, not all clusters share the same size, therefore different final capacities would be achieved depending on the size of the cluster visited by the local search algorithms. In the most efficient **WalkLearning**, barely learned patterns are considered, reminiscent of the special rule that synapses have only meta-plastic changes to stabilize their current states when a barely learned pattern is encountered [10]. Differently, we keep all previous learned patterns still satisfied and modify synaptic weights by single weight flips to satisfy the current pattern. In other words, the energy cost (the number of incorrect mappings of the input pattern to the desired output) does not necessary increase or decrease. Hence, in our context, repeated representations of patterns performed in Ref. [10] are not required.

Our study raises the open question of how the structure of solution space may affect the learning dynamics by local search strategies. In fact, much less is understood about this point. The non equilibrium dynamics of stochastic local search algorithms (e.g., WalkSAT), has been thoroughly addressed in Refs. [30, 31]. It was claimed that the dynamical transition of the algorithms (separating the linear resolution time regime from the exponential regime) is not apparently related to the onset of solution clustering. In our current analysis, the well-separated clusters (even point-like clusters) are conjectured to be related to the computational hardness. The relationship between dynamical and static properties of the weight space remains to be elucidated in further research.

Another appealing problem is the generalization where the inputs-output associations are no longer uncorrelated and the desired output is given by a teacher perceptron instead [11, 35–37]. The student perceptron tries to learn the rule provided by the teacher. After an enough amount of examples are presented to the student perceptron, the student’s weights match the teacher’s ones then the network undergoes a first order transition from poor to perfect generalization [35, 36]. In this case, one solution provided by the teacher does exist. It is worthwhile to extend current analysis to accommodate the generalization problem in Ising perceptron. To conclude, **WalkLearning** proposed in our work is easily implementable and efficient for moderate system sizes and moderate values of α , on the other hand, it is of neurobiological significance since it updates synaptic weights by single weight flips and circumvents the learning hardness by excluding the barely learned patterns temporarily and relearning is carried out subsequently. And moreover, it provides insights for understanding the relationship between the dynamics of local search learning algorithms and the static structure of the weight space of the Ising perceptron.

Acknowledgments

The present work was partially supported by the National Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 10774150) and by the National Basic Research Program (973-Program) of China (Grant No. 2007CB935903).

-
- [1] A. Engel and C. V. den Broeck, *Statistical Mechanics of Learning* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2001).
 - [2] W. Krauth and M. Opper, *J. Phys. A* **22**, L519 (1989).
 - [3] B. Derrida, R. B. Griffiths, and A. Prügel-Bennett, *J. Phys. A* **24**, 4907 (1991).
 - [4] I. Kocher and R. Monasson, *J. Phys. A* **25**, 367 (1992).
 - [5] H. M. Köhler, *J. Phys. A* **23**, L1265 (1990).
 - [6] H. Köhler, S. Diederich, W. Kinzel, and M. Opper, *Z. Phys. B* **78**, 333 (1990).
 - [7] L. Reimers, M. Bouten, and B. V. Rompaey, *J. Phys. A* **29**, 6247 (1996).
 - [8] G. Milde and S. Kobe, *J. Phys. A* **30**, 2349 (1997).
 - [9] A. Braunstein and R. Zecchina, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **96**, 030201 (2006).
 - [10] C. Baldassi, A. Braunstein, N. Brunel, and R. Zecchina, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **104**, 11079 (2007).
 - [11] C. Baldassi, *J. Stat. Phys* **136**, 902 (2009).
 - [12] E. Gardner, *J. Phys. A* **21**, 257 (1988).
 - [13] E. Gardner and B. Derrida, *J. Phys. A* **21**, 271 (1988).
 - [14] W. Krauth and M. Mézard, *J. Phys. A* **20**, L745 (1987).
 - [15] J. K. Anlauf and M. Biehl, *Europhys. Lett* **10**, 687 (1989).
 - [16] E. Gardner and B. Derrida, *J. Phys. A* **22**, 1983 (1989).
 - [17] W. Krauth and M. Mézard, *J. Phys. (France)* **50**, 3057 (1989).
 - [18] H. Gutfreund and Y. Stein, *J. Phys. A* **23**, 2613 (1990).
 - [19] H. Horner, *Z. Phys. B* **86**, 291 (1992).
 - [20] J. Ardelius and L. Zdeborová, *Phys. Rev. E* **78**, 040101(R) (2008).
 - [21] T. Obuchi and Y. Kabashima, *J. Stat. Mech.* **P12014** (2009).
 - [22] R. W. Penney and D. Sherrington, *J. Phys. A* **26**, 6173 (1993).

- [23] R. W. Penney and D. Sherrington, *J. Phys. A* **26**, 3995 (1993).
- [24] D. Malzahn, *Phys. Rev. E* **61**, 6261 (2000).
- [25] J. Ardelius, E. Aurell, and S. Krishnamurthy, *J. Stat. Mech.* **P10012** (2007).
- [26] H. Zhou, arXiv:0907.0295 (2009), [*Eur. Phys. J. B* (in press)].
- [27] H. Zhou and H. Ma, *Phys. Rev. E* **80**, 066108 (2009).
- [28] H. Zhou, arXiv:0911.4328 (2009).
- [29] S. Cocco, R. Monasson, A. Montanari, and G. Semerjian, arXiv:cs.CC/0302003 (2003).
- [30] G. Semerjian and R. Monasson, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 066103 (2003).
- [31] W. Barthel, A. K. Hartmann, and M. Weigt, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 066104 (2003).
- [32] F. Altarelli, R. Monasson, G. Semerjian, and F. Zamponi, arXiv:0802.1829 (2008).
- [33] J. Ardelius and E. Aurell, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 037702 (2006).
- [34] M. Alava, J. Ardelius, E. Aurell, P. Kaski, S. Krishnamurthy, P. Orponen, and S. Seitz, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **105**, 15253 (2008).
- [35] G. Györgyi, *Phys. Rev. A* **41**, 7097 (1990).
- [36] H. Sompolinsky, N. Tishby, and H. S. Seung, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **65**, 1683 (1990).
- [37] H. Horner, *Z. Phys. B* **87**, 371 (1992).