
BACKPROPAGATION AT THE INFINITESIMAL INFERENCE LIMIT OF ENERGY-BASED MODELS: UNIFYING PREDICTIVE CODING, EQUILIBRIUM PROPAGATION, AND CONTRASTIVE HEBBIAN LEARNING

Beren Millidge

MRC Brain Networks Dynamics Unit
University of Oxford, UK
beren@millidge.name

Yuhang Song*

Department of Computer Science
University of Oxford, UK
yuhang.song@some.ox.ac.uk

Tommaso Salvatori

Department of Computer Science
University of Oxford, UK
tommaso.salvatori@cs.ox.ac.uk

Thomas Lukasiewicz

Department of Computer Science
University of Oxford, UK
thomas.lukasiewicz@cs.ox.ac.uk

Rafal Bogacz

MRC Brain Networks Dynamics Unit
University of Oxford, UK
rafal.bogacz@ndcn.ox.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

How the brain performs credit assignment is a fundamental unsolved problem in neuroscience. Many ‘biologically plausible’ algorithms have been proposed, which compute gradients that approximate those computed by backpropagation (BP), and which operate in ways that more closely satisfy the constraints imposed by neural circuitry. Many such algorithms utilize the framework of energy-based models (EBMs), in which all free variables in the model are optimized to minimize a global energy function. However, in the literature, these algorithms exist in isolation and no unified theory exists linking them together. Here, we provide a comprehensive theory of the conditions under which EBMs can approximate BP, which lets us unify many of the BP approximation results in the literature (namely, predictive coding, equilibrium propagation, and contrastive Hebbian learning) and demonstrate that their approximation to BP arises from a simple and general mathematical property

*Corresponding author.

of EBMs at free-phase equilibrium. This property can then be exploited in different ways with different energy functions, and these specific choices yield a family of BP-approximating algorithms, which both includes the known results in the literature and can be used to derive new ones.

1 Introduction

The backpropagation of error algorithm (BP) (Rumelhart, Hinton & Williams, 1986) has become the fundamental workhorse algorithm underlying the significant recent successes of deep learning (Krizhevsky, Sutskever & Hinton, 2012; Silver et al., 2016; Vaswani et al., 2017). From a neuroscience perspective, however, BP has often been criticised as not being biologically plausible (Crick et al., 1989; Stork, 1989). A fundamental question then is, given that the brain faces a credit assignment problem at least as challenging as deep neural networks, whether the brain uses BP to perform credit assignment. The answer to this question fundamentally depends on whether there are biologically plausible algorithms that approximate BP and that can be implemented in neural circuitry (Lillicrap, Santoro, Marris, Akerman & Hinton, 2020; Whittington & Bogacz, 2019). A large number of potential algorithms have been proposed in the literature (Bengio & Fischer, 2015; Lee, Zhang, Fischer & Bengio, 2015; Lillicrap, Cownden, Tweed & Akerman, 2016; Millidge, Tschantz & Buckley, 2020; Millidge, Tschantz, Seth & Buckley, 2020a; Nøkland, 2016; Ororbia & Mali, 2019; Song, Lukasiewicz, Xu & Bogacz, 2020; Whittington & Bogacz, 2017; Xie & Seung, 2003), however, insight into the linkages and relationships between them is scarce, and so far the field largely presents itself as a set of disparate algorithms and ideas without any unifying or fundamental principles.

In this paper, we provide a theoretical framework that unifies four disparate schemes for approximating BP, namely, predictive coding with weak feedback (Whittington & Bogacz, 2017) and on the first step after initialization (Salvatori, Song, Xu, Lukasiewicz & Bogacz, 2022; Song et al., 2020), the equilibrium propagation (EP) framework (Scellier & Bengio, 2017), and contrastive Hebbian learning (CHL) (Xie & Seung, 2003). We show that these algorithms all emerge as special cases of a general mathematical property of the energy-based model (EBM) framework that underlies them and, as such, can be generalized to novel energy functions and to derive novel algorithms that have not yet been described in the literature.

The key insight is that for the EBMs underlying these algorithms, the total energy can be decomposed into a component corresponding to the supervised loss function that depends on the output of the network, and a second component that relates to the ‘internal energy’ of the network. Crucially, at the minimum of the internal energy, the dynamics of the neurons point exactly in the direction of the gradient of the supervised loss. Thus, at this point, the network dynamics implicitly provides an exact gradient signal. This fact can be exploited in two ways. Firstly, this instantaneous direction can be directly extracted and used to perform weight updates. This ‘first step’ approach is taken in Song et al. (2020) and results in exact BP using only the intrinsic dynamics of the EBM, but typically requires a complex set of control signals to specify when updates should occur. Alternatively, a second equilibrium can be found close to the initial one. If it is close enough (a condition that we call the *infinitesimal inference limit*), then the vector from the initial to the second equilibrium approximates the direction of the initial dynamics, and thus the difference in equilibria approximates the BP loss gradient. This fact is then utilized either implicitly (Whittington & Bogacz, 2017) or explicitly (Scellier & Bengio, 2017; Xie & Seung, 2003) to derive algorithms that approximate BP. Once at this

equilibrium, all weights can be updated in parallel rather than sequentially, and no control signals are needed, resulting in fully parallel and autonomous algorithms.

Our main contributions are i.) we distill the fundamental mathematical condition for when EBMs can approximate backprop ii.) using this condition, we provide a unified understanding many existing methods in the literature iii.) we use our theory to derive a novel BP-approximating algorithm and demonstrate its properties are closely predicted by our theory. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. First, we provided concise introductions to predictive coding networks (PCNs), contrastive Hebbian learning (CHL), and equilibrium propagation (EP). Then, we derive our fundamental results on EBMs, show how this results in a unified framework for understanding existing algorithms, and showcase how to generalize our framework to derive novel BP-approximating algorithms. Finally, we summarize and give an outlook on future research on understanding understanding the mathematical underpinnings of energy based approximations to BP.

2 Preliminaries

We assume that we perform credit assignment on a hierarchical stack of feedforward layers x_0, \dots, x_L with layer indices $0, \dots, L$ in a supervised learning task. The input layer x_0 is fixed to some data element d . The layer states x_l are vectors of real values and represent a rate-coded average firing rate for each neuron. We assume a supervised learning paradigm in which a target vector T is provided to the output layer of the network, and the network as a whole minimizes a supervised loss $\mathcal{L}(x_L, T)$. T is usually assumed to be a one-hot vector in classification tasks, but this is not necessary. Synaptic weight matrices W_l at each layer affect the dynamics of the layer above. The network states x_l are assumed to be free parameters that can vary during inference. We use $x = \{x_l\}$ and $W = \{W_l\}$ to refer to the sets across all layers when specific layer indices are not important.

The models that we describe are EBMs, which possess an energy function $E(x_0 \dots x_L, W_0 \dots W_L, T)$. Neural activities are then updated to minimize the energy² with dynamics

$$\text{Inference: } \frac{dx_l}{dt} = -\frac{\partial E}{\partial x_l} \quad (1)$$

which are simply a gradient descent on the energy. For notational simplicity, we ignore learning rates η and implicitly set $\eta = 1$ throughout. In such models, we generally run ‘inference’ to optimize the activities first using Equation 1 until convergence. Then, after the inference phase is complete, the weights can be updated in one of several ways (typically either gradient descent or a contrastive update), which we call the learning phase.

2.1 Predictive Coding

Predictive coding (PC) emerged as a theory of neural processing in the retina (Srinivasan, Laughlin & Dubs, 1982) and was extended to a general theory of cortical function (Friston, 2005; Mumford, 1992; Rao & Ballard, 1999). The fundamental idea is that the brain performs inference and learning by learning to predict its sensory stimuli and minimizing the resulting *prediction errors*. Such an approach provides a natural unsupervised learning objective for the brain (Rao & Ballard, 1999), while also minimizing redundancy and maximizing information transmission by

²Technically, the energy is also time-dependent where “time” is the number of inference steps that have occurred, but we drop this dependence for notational simplicity.

transmitting only unpredicted information (Barlow, 1961; Sterling & Laughlin, 2015). The learning rules used by PC networks (PCNs) require only local and Hebbian updates (Millidge, Tschantz, Seth & Buckley, 2020b) and a variety of neural microcircuits have been proposed that can implement the computations required by PC (Bastos et al., 2012; Keller & Mrcic-Flogel, 2018). Moreover, recent works have begun exploring the use of large-scale PCNs in machine learning tasks, to some success (Kinghorn, Millidge & Buckley, 2021; Lotter, Kreiman & Cox, 2016; Millidge, 2019; Millidge, Salvatori, Song, Bogacz & Lukasiewicz, 2022; Ofner & Stober, 2021; Salvatori, Pinchetti et al., 2022; Salvatori et al., 2021). Unlike the other algorithms presented here, PC has a mathematical interpretation as in terms of variational Bayesian inference (Bogacz, 2017; Buckley, Kim, McGregor & Seth, 2017; Friston, 2003, 2005; Millidge, Seth & Buckley, 2021), and the variables in the model can be mapped to explicit probabilistic elements of a generative model. The energy function minimized by a PCN is,

$$E_{\text{PC}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^L (\Pi_l (x_l - f(W_l x_{l-1})))^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^L \epsilon_l^2 \quad (2)$$

where the ϵ_l terms are prediction errors, since they denote the difference between the activity x_l of a layer and the ‘prediction’ of that activity from the layer below $f(W_l x_{l-1})$. The prediction error terms are weighted by their inverse covariance Π_l , and this provides the network with a degree of knowledge about its own uncertainty. The ratio of these precisions Π_l/Π_{l-1} effectively controls the weighting of bottom-up vs. top-down information flow through a PCN. Given this energy function, the dynamics of the PCN can be derived from the general EBM dynamics above:

$$\frac{dx_l}{dt} = -\frac{\partial E_{\text{PC}}}{\partial x_l} = \Pi_l \epsilon_l - \Pi_{l+1} \epsilon_{l+1} \frac{\partial f(W_l x_l)}{\partial x_l} \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{dW_l}{dt} = -\frac{\partial E_{\text{PC}}}{\partial W_l} = \Pi_l \epsilon_{l+1} \frac{\partial f(W_l x_l)}{\partial W_l}. \quad (4)$$

To simplify notation, for most derivations, we assume identity precision matrices $\Pi_l = \Pi_{l+1} = I$. Several limits in which PC approximates BP have been observed in the literature (Millidge, Tschantz & Buckley, 2020; Song et al., 2020; Whittington & Bogacz, 2017). We show that the results of Whittington and Bogacz (2017) and Song et al. (2020) can be explained through our general framework, since both rely on properties of the infinitesimal inference limit. Specifically, Whittington and Bogacz (2017) demonstrate convergence to BP as the precision ratio is heavily weighted towards bottom-up information. Secondly, Song et al. (2020) takes advantage of the dynamics of the EBM at equilibrium to devise a PCN that implements exact BP.

2.2 Contrastive Hebbian Learning

Contrastive Hebbian learning (CHL) originated as a way to train continuous Hopfield networks (Hopfield, 1984) without the pathologies that arise with pure Hebbian learning (Hebb, 1949). Because pure Hebbian learning simply strengthens synapses that fire together, it induces a positive feedback loop that eventually drives many weights to infinity. CHL approaches handle this by splitting learning into two phases (Galland & Hinton, 1991; Movellan, 1991). In the first phase (free phase), the network output is left to vary freely, while the input is fixed, and the network state converges to an equilibrium known as the free phase equilibrium \bar{x} . At the free phase equilibrium, an anti-Hebbian weight update is performed $\Delta W \propto -\bar{x}\bar{x}^T$. Then, in the second phase, the network output is clamped to the desired targets T , and the network converges to a new equilibrium: the clamped phase equilibrium \tilde{x} . The weights are then updated with a standard Hebbian update rule $\Delta W \propto \tilde{x}\tilde{x}^T$. Instead of updating weights individually at each phase,




Figure 1: **Left:** The difference between an ANN optimizing a supervised loss function with BP and an EBM. For the ANN, the supervised loss is only affected by the output, and gradients are sequentially propagated backwards through the network. For the EBM, the energy is a global function of all variables, and all variables update themselves to minimize the energy. **Right:** Hierarchy of methods approximating BP. Exactly at the free phase, the dynamics point in the direction of the supervised loss gradient. First-step algorithms use this fact. If the network is run to a clamped-phase equilibrium, the gradients only converge to BP, as the clamped phase converges to the free-phase equilibrium, which we call the infinitesimal inference limit. This can be assured either by ensuring that top-down information propagation through the network is weak (the weak feedback limit) or else ensuring that the supervised loss has only a small effect on the total energy (weak supervision limit).

one can instead write a single weight update rule that occurs at the end of the clamped phase:

$$\Delta W_{\text{CHL}} = \tilde{x}\tilde{x}^T - \bar{x}\bar{x}^T. \quad (5)$$

The intuition behind this rule is that neurons that are co-active at the clamped phase are strengthened, while those that are co-active in the free phase are weakened, thus strengthening connections that are in some sense involved in correctly responding to the target, while weakening those that are not. CHL can be interpreted as performing gradient descent on a contrastive loss function,

$$C(W) = E^{\tilde{x}}(\tilde{x}, W) - E^{\bar{x}}(\bar{x}, W), \quad (6)$$

where the individual energies $E^{\tilde{x}}$ and $E^{\bar{x}}$ refer to the standard Hopfield energy (Hopfield, 1982) at either the free-phase or clamped-phase equilibria. The Hopfield energy is defined as

$$E_{\text{CHL}}(x, W) = -(x^T W x + x^T b), \quad (7)$$

where b is a bias vector. In one of the first results demonstrating an approximation to BP, Xie and Seung (2003) showed that in the limit of geometrically decreasing feedback from higher to lower layers, the updates of CHL approximate BP to first order.

2.3 Equilibrium Propagation

Equilibrium propagation (EP) (Scellier & Bengio, 2017) can be considered a contrastive Hebbian method based on an infinitesimal perturbation of the loss function. In essence, instead of clamping the output of the network to the target,

the outputs are clamped to a ‘nudged’ version of the activity in the output layer where the targets only possess a small influence on the output. This influence is parametrized by a scalar parameter λ . Like in CHL, the network operates in two phases: a free phase and a ‘nudged’ phase. In the free phase, the network minimizes an energy function $E_{\text{EP}}^{\lambda=0}$, which is usually the Hopfield energy. In the ‘nudged phase’, the network instead optimizes a nudged energy function $E_{\text{EP}}^{\lambda} = E_{\text{EP}} + \lambda\mathcal{L}$, where L is the supervised loss function at the output layer, and $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ is a scalar parameter, which is assumed to be small. The activities at the free phase equilibrium, as in CHL, are denoted by \bar{x} , and the clamped phase equilibrium as \tilde{x} . EP then updates the weights with the following rule:

$$\Delta W = \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \left[\frac{\partial E_{\text{EP}}^{\lambda}}{\partial W}(\tilde{x}, W) - \frac{\partial E_{\text{EP}}^{\lambda=0}}{\partial W}(\bar{x}, W) \right], \quad (8)$$

which is the difference between the weight gradients at the nudged-phase equilibrium and the free-phase equilibrium. It was proven in Scellier and Bengio (2017) that in the limit as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, the EP update rule converges to BP. Beyond this, it was shown in Scellier and Bengio (2019) that in an RNN with static input, the dynamics of the weight updates in EP are identical to that of recurrent BP (Almeida, 1990; Pineda, 1987). Recently, there has been significant work scaling up EP to train large-scale neural networks with significant success (Ernout, Grollier, Querlioz, Bengio & Scellier, 2020; Laborieux et al., 2021) as well as implementations using analog hardware (Kendall, Pantone, Manickavasagam, Bengio & Scellier, 2020), which utilizes the ability to implement the inference dynamics directly through physics to achieve significant computational speedups.

3 Theoretical Results

3.1 General Energy-Based Model

Here, we demonstrate how these disparate algorithms and their relationship with BP can all be derived from a basic mathematical property of EBMs. A key fact about the EBMs utilized in these algorithms is that the total energy E can be decomposed into a sum of two components. An energy function at the output layer, which corresponds to the supervised loss \mathcal{L} , and an ‘internal energy’ function \mathcal{I} , which corresponds to the energy of all the layers in the network except the output layer. Typically, the internal energy can be further subdivided into layerwise local energies for each layer $\mathcal{I} = \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} E_l$. If we add a scaling coefficient $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ to scale the relative contributions of the internal and supervised losses, we can write the total energy as

$$E = \mathcal{I} + \lambda\mathcal{L}. \quad (9)$$

The EBM is then run in two phases. In the free phase, the output is left to vary freely, so that the targets have no impact on the dynamics. This is equivalent to ignoring the supervised loss, and hence setting $\lambda = 0$. In the clamped (or ‘nudged’) phase, the output layer is either clamped or nudged towards the targets. This means that the targets do have an impact on the dynamics, and hence $\lambda > 0$. We now consider the dynamics of the network at the equilibrium at the free phase. Since the dynamics of the activities of the network are simply a gradient descent on the energy (Equation 1), we have that

$$\left. \frac{dx}{dt} \right|_{\text{free phase}} = 0 \implies \frac{\partial \mathcal{I}}{\partial x} = 0, \quad (10)$$

since during the free phase $\lambda = 0$, and so $E = \mathcal{I}$. If we then begin the clamped phase, but start out at the free-phase equilibrium of the activities, it is straightforward to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{dx}{dt} \right|_{\text{clamped phase}} &= -\frac{\partial E}{\partial x} = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{I}}{\partial x} - \lambda \cdot \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{I}}{\partial x} = 0 &\implies \frac{dx}{dt} = -\lambda \cdot \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

and thus that, when initialized at the free-phase equilibrium, the activity dynamics in the clamped phase follows the negative gradient of the BP loss. As a mathematical consequence of the decomposition of the energy function, at the free-phase equilibrium, information about the supervised loss is implicitly backpropagated to all layers of the network to determine their dynamics.

An intuitive way to view this, which is presented in Figure 2, is that during inference, we can interpret the activity dynamics during the clamped phase as balancing between two forces — one pushing to minimize the internal energy and one pushing to minimize the supervised loss. At the minimum of the internal energy (which is the equilibrium of the free phase), the ‘force’ of the internal energy is 0, and so the only remaining force is that corresponding to the gradient of the supervised loss. Moreover, as long as the activities remain ‘close enough’ to the free phase equilibrium, the dynamics should still be dominated by the supervised loss, and thus the activity dynamics closely approximate the BP loss gradients. We call the limit where the clamped-phase equilibrium converges to the free-phase equilibrium the *infinitesimal inference limit*, since it is effectively stating that the ‘inference phase’ of the network is only achieving an infinitesimal change to the initial (free phase) ‘beliefs’. This is the general condition that unifies the disparate BP-approximating algorithms from the literature, which differ primarily in how they attain the infinitesimal inference limit.

It is important to note that in layerwise architectures initialized at the free-phase equilibrium, information has to propagate back in a layerwise fashion from the clamped output. This means that only the penultimate layer is affected first, and then one layer down is perturbed at each timestep. What this means is that the ‘first’ motion of the activities in a layer in the clamped phase are guaranteed to minimize the BP loss — not that all these motions occur simultaneously. This is the property that is exploited in the single-step algorithms below. If, instead, it is required to update all weights simultaneously, instead of in a layerwise fashion, it is necessary to wait for information to propagate through the entire network and ultimately converge to the clamped-phase fixed point. It is this requirement that leads to the fixed-point algorithms in CHL, EP, and PC which, since more than one steps taken away from the free-phase fixed point, results in approximate BP instead.

3.2 First-Step Algorithms

A simple approach to exploit the dynamics at the free-phase equilibrium is just to directly use the direction of the activity dynamics at the first step to update the weights. This approach can compute the exact BP gradients, since the gradients of the loss with respect to the weights can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W_l} &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x_{l+1}} \frac{\partial x_{l+1}}{\partial W_l} = \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \left. \frac{\partial E}{\partial x_{l+1}} \right|_{x_{l+1}^*} \frac{\partial x_{l+1}}{\partial W_l} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \left. \frac{dx_{l+1}}{dt} \right|_{\bar{x}_{l+1}} \frac{\partial x_{l+1}}{\partial W_l}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$




Figure 2: **Top:** A schematic visualization of the infinitesimal inference limit. At the free-phase equilibrium, the contribution from the internal energy is 0, so the dynamics follows exactly the gradient of the supervised loss. Away from the equilibrium, the dynamics is determined by contributions from both the internal energy and the supervised loss. At the clamped-phase equilibrium, the contributions of the internal and supervised losses perfectly cancel each other out. **Bottom Left:** The evolution of the energies during an inference phase starting at the free phase. The supervised loss rapidly decreases while the internal energy increases (from 0). The total energy declines as the increase in internal energy is counteracted by a larger decrease of the supervised loss. **Right:** Relationships between distance between the clamped- and free-phase equilibria and the distance between the estimated gradients and the true BP gradients for multiple initializations of a small MLP (experimental details in the supplementary). As predicted by the Taylor expansion, for most initializations, the approximation error grows linearly with distance between equilibria, although some curves appear to bend slightly, especially for larger distances, indicating a breakdown of the local linearity assumption.

A specific case of this relation in PCNs was derived by Song et al. (2020). To understand what this looks like concretely, we specialize the derivation to the dynamics of PCNs as in (Song et al., 2020). The free-phase equilibrium of PCNs is equivalent to the feedforward pass in the equivalent ANN $\bar{x}_l = f(W_{l-1}\bar{x}_{l-1})$, where f is an activation function applied elementwise. A key property of PC is that the internal energy is 0 at the free-phase equilibrium. Thus, all prediction errors throughout the network are zero: $\epsilon_l = 0$. In the clamped phase, the output layer is clamped to the target, and a prediction error ϵ_L is generated at the output layer. The dynamics of the activities follow Eq. 3, but $\epsilon_l = 0$. This implies that after the first step, away from the free-phase equilibrium, the activities are

$$\frac{dx_l}{dt} = \epsilon_{l+1} \frac{\partial f(W_l x_l)}{\partial x_l} \implies x_l^{t+1} = \bar{x}_l + \epsilon_{l+1}^t \frac{\partial f(W_l x_l^t)}{\partial x_l^t}, \quad (13)$$

and thus that at the first step $t + 1$ after the free phase equilibrium, the prediction error ϵ_l is

$$\epsilon_l^{t+1} = x_l^{t+1} - \bar{x}_l = \bar{x}_l + \epsilon_{l+1}^t \frac{\partial f(W_l x_l)}{\partial x_l} - \bar{x}_l = \epsilon_{l+1}^t \frac{\partial f(W_l x_l^t)}{\partial x_l^t} \quad (14)$$

However, this is simply a scaled version of the BP recursion, where ϵ_{l+1} takes the role of the backwards gradient. Thus, on the first step away from the free-phase equilibrium, PCNs implement exact BP. Importantly though, this

correspondence is not unique to PCNs, but emerges as a consequence of the mathematical structure of the energy function, and thus can occur in any EBM with such a structure and where the free-phase equilibrium is equal to the forward pass of the network.

3.3 The Infinitesimal Inference Limit

Instead of utilizing the instantaneous dynamics at the free-phase equilibrium, we can also use the property that the dynamics direction is approximately the same as the gradient direction, as long as the activities remain ‘close’ to the free-phase equilibrium to derive an algorithm that approximates BP and converges to it in the limit of the free and clamped equilibria coinciding. We consider algorithms that converge to a second ‘clamped’ fixed point \tilde{x} based on the dynamics of the total energy function with a contribution from the supervised loss, i.e., with $\lambda > 0$. Given both the clamped and free fixed points, we show that we can approximate the supervised loss gradient as the difference between the gradients at the clamped and free fixed points. We can derive this approximation directly by considering a first order Taylor expansion of the clamped fixed point around the free fixed point \bar{x} :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial E^\lambda}{\partial W} \Big|_{x=x^*} &\approx \frac{\partial E^\lambda}{\partial W} \Big|_{x=\bar{x}} + \frac{\partial^2 E^\lambda}{\partial x \partial W} \Big|_{x=\bar{x}} (x^* - \bar{x}) + \mathcal{O}(\delta_x)^2 \\ &\approx \frac{\partial I^\lambda}{\partial W} \Big|_{x=\bar{x}} + \lambda \cdot \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^\lambda}{\partial W} \Big|_{x=\bar{x}} + J_{(\bar{x}, W)} \delta_x + \mathcal{O}(\delta_x)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where in the second line we have used the decomposition of the energy (Eq. 9) and we have defined $\delta_x = (x^* - \bar{x})$ and $J_{(\bar{x}, W)} = \frac{\partial^2 E^\lambda}{\partial x \partial W} \Big|_{x=\bar{x}}$. Using Eq. 9 and the fact that the internal energy does not depend on λ , and thus the gradient of the internal energy at the activity values of the free-phase equilibrium is the same as the gradient of the total energy at the free phase equilibrium (i.e., $\frac{\partial I^\lambda}{\partial W} = \frac{\partial E^{\lambda=0}}{\partial W}$), we can rearrange this to obtain

$$\lambda \cdot \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W} \Big|_{x=\bar{x}} \approx \frac{\partial E^\lambda}{\partial W} \Big|_{x=x^*} - \frac{\partial E^{\lambda=0}}{\partial W} \Big|_{x=\bar{x}} - J_{(\bar{x}, W)} \delta_x - \mathcal{O}(\delta_x)^2 \quad (16)$$

which is the CHL update rule (Movellan, 1991) as an approximation to the gradient of the supervised loss at the free-phase equilibrium. This provides a mathematical characterisation of the conditions for when this approximation is accurate, and hence the CHL algorithm well approximates the BP gradient.

By observing the explicit error term, we see that it depends on two quantities. First, the crossderivative of the clamped-phase energy at the free-phase equilibrium $J_{(\bar{x}, W)}$ with respect to both activities and weights, and second the distance between activities at the free- and clamped-phase equilibrium δ_x . Intuitively, the crossderivative term measures how much the weight gradient changes as the activity equilibrium moves. When this term is large, the energy is in a highly sensitive region, so that the gradients computed a small distance away from the free-phase equilibrium might rapidly become inaccurate. The crossderivative term depends heavily on the definition of the energy function, as well as the location of the free-phase equilibrium in the parameter space, and thus this means of reducing the approximation error has largely been ignored by existing algorithms, which instead focus primarily on reducing δ_x . Our analysis does, however, suggest the possibility of ‘correcting’ the CHL update by subtracting out the first-order Taylor expansion term $J_{(\bar{x}, W)} \delta_x$. For many energy functions, this derivative may be obtained analytically or else by automatic differentiation software (Griewank et al., 1989), and δ_x is straightforward to compute. This would then make the corrected CHL update approximate BP to second order instead of the first-order approximation that is currently widely used.

Reducing δ_x means ensuring that the clamped-phase equilibrium is as close as possible to the free phase. This can be accomplished in two ways. The first, which is implemented in CHL, is to still clamp the output units of the network, but

to ensure that feedback connections are weak so that even with output units clamped, the equilibrium does not diverge far from the free phase. This approach is taken in [Xie and Seung \(2003\)](#), which requires a geometrically decaying feedback strength across layers (parameterized by a scalar parameter $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$) to obtain a close approximation to BP. This is why we call this condition the ‘weak feedback limit’. A similar approach is taken in [Whittington and Bogacz \(2017\)](#), which requires a lower precision on the output layer to obtain a close approximation to BP in PCNs. Alternatively, we can instead maintain the feedback strength but reduce the importance of the supervised loss on the network dynamics, i.e., turn a clamped output to a ‘nudged’ output, which we call the ‘weak supervision limit’. This alternate approach is taken in the EP algorithm, where an almost identical algorithm is derived by instead taking an infinitesimal perturbation of the λ parameter.

In fact, in the case of layerwise energy functions $\mathcal{I} = \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} E_l(x_l, x_{l-1}, W_l)$, it is straightforward to show that the strength of feedback γ and the scaling of the loss function λ work equivalently. To see this, consider the dynamics of a layer x_l :

$$\frac{dx_l}{dt} = -\frac{\partial E_l}{\partial x_l} - \gamma \cdot \frac{\partial E_{l+1}}{\partial x_l}, \quad (17)$$

where we have weighted the ‘top down’ connection strength by the γ parameter. Now, consider the dynamics of the penultimate layer without any feedback strength modulation but with a λ parameter:

$$\frac{dx_{L-1}}{dt} = -\frac{\partial E_{L-1}}{\partial x_{L-1}} - \lambda \cdot \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x_{L-1}}. \quad (18)$$

Thus, the λ and γ parameters serve the same role in the network dynamics and equivalently function by weighing the relative influence of the top-down vs. the bottom-up signals.

3.3.1 Predictive Coding as Contrastive Hebbian Learning

Using our new framework, it is straightforward to derive PC as a CHL algorithm which simply uses the variational free energy instead of the Hopfield energy. PCNs have a unique property that the free phase equilibrium is simply the feedforward pass of the network and that all prediction errors ϵ_l in the network are zero, which implies the free phase weight gradient is also zero, since

$$\frac{\partial E^{\lambda=0}}{\partial W} = \epsilon_{l+1} \frac{\partial f(W_l x_l)}{\partial W_l} \bar{x}_l^T = 0, \quad (19)$$

which results in the CHL update in PC simply equalling the gradient at the clamped equilibrium:

$$\Delta W_{CHL}^{PC} = \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \left[\frac{\partial E^\lambda}{\partial W} - \frac{\partial E^{\lambda=0}}{\partial W} \right] = \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{\partial E^\lambda}{\partial W}, \quad (20)$$

since the free phase Hebbian weight update in PCNs is 0. This means that only a single clamped phase is required to train PCNs instead of two for the Hopfield energy ([Scellier & Bengio, 2017](#); [Whittington & Bogacz, 2019](#)). This results in significant computational savings as well as increased biological plausibility since the gradients of the free phase do not need to be stored in the circuit during convergence to the clamped phase equilibrium.

3.4 EP as Infinitesimal Perturbation

While CHL algorithms typically clamp the output of the network to the targets and hence utilize a large output λ , necessitating that feedback through the network be weak, EP takes the opposite approach and explicitly utilizes a small λ directly. EP can be derived by essentially taking an infinitesimal perturbation of λ and comparing the difference




Figure 3: **A:** A linear relationship between the λ weighting coefficient and the approximation of the PC-Nudge algorithm to BP was robustly observed at initialization. **B:** The PC-Nudge network trained with almost identical accuracy across batches as the corresponding ANN. **C:** Cosine similarity during training between BP gradients and those estimated by PC-Nudge. Although similarity appears to decline somewhat, it never goes below 0.999 and has no observable impact on training.

between the two phases, the free phase, and an infinitesimally ‘nudged’ phase where $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. To derive EP, if we take the derivative of the decomposition of the energy in Eq. 9 with respect to λ , we can write the supervised loss \mathcal{L} as

$$E = \mathcal{I} + \lambda \mathcal{L} \implies \mathcal{L} = \frac{dE}{d\lambda}. \quad (21)$$

We wish to compute the gradient of the supervised loss with respect to the parameters W ,

$$\frac{d\mathcal{L}}{dW} = \frac{\partial}{\partial W} \left[\frac{\partial E}{\partial \lambda} + \frac{\partial E}{\partial x} \frac{\partial x}{\partial \lambda} \right] = \frac{\partial}{\partial W} \frac{\partial E}{\partial \lambda} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \frac{\partial E}{\partial W}, \quad (22)$$

where firstly we have utilized the fact that in the free-phase equilibrium $\frac{\partial E}{\partial x} = 0$, and we have substituted in Eq. 9. In the final step, we have utilized the fact that partial derivatives commute. We have thus expressed the gradient of the loss in terms of a derivative with respect to the supervised loss scale term λ . One way to compute this derivative is by finite differences, thus for a small λ ,

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W} = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \left[\frac{\partial E^\lambda}{\partial W} - \frac{\partial E^{\lambda=0}}{\partial W} \right], \quad (23)$$

where the first gradient is taken at the nudged-phase equilibrium and the second at the free-phase equilibrium where $\lambda = 0$. By the standard properties of finite difference approximations, this update rule becomes exact as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. This recovers the EP weight update rule. Importantly, we do not make any assumptions about the form of the energy function. This means that this method is general for any energy function and not just the Hopfield energy used in Scellier and Bengio (2017). For instance, instead the PC squared energy function could be used, which would derive an additional algorithm that approximates BP in the limit that has not yet been proposed in the literature, although it would be closely related to existing results (Whittington & Bogacz, 2017). We implement and investigate this algorithm below and demonstrate that its convergence to BP properties match precisely those predicted by our theory.

4 Experiments

Here, we use our theoretical framework to derive a novel BP-approximating variation, which we call ‘PC-Nudge’, that approximates BP through the use of weak supervision instead of the CHL-like weak-feedback limit previously

reported in [Whittington and Bogacz \(2017\)](#). Instead of adjusting the precision ratio, PC-Nudge varies the weighting of the supervised loss with an EP-like coefficient λ . PC-Nudge can be defined as a gradient descent on the following free-energy functional:

$$E_{\text{PC-Nudge}} = \frac{\lambda}{2} \cdot \epsilon_L^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} \epsilon_l^2, \quad (24)$$

which results in a standard PCN except with a downweighted final layer, since λ is defined to be small. As a demonstration experiment, we compared PC-Nudge to BP on training a simple MLP on the MNIST dataset. The actual scale of the experiment is largely irrelevant, since as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, the gradients computed by PC-Nudge converge towards the exact BP gradient, and so we expect the training performance to be the same for any architecture and scale. In practice, for our network, we found a $\lambda = 0.01$ to achieve extremely close convergence to BP and correspondingly identical training performance. We also found that the distance between the PC-Nudge and BP gradients at initialization was a linear function of λ over a wide range of sensible λ values. During training, we found that the cosine similarity between the PC-Nudge and BP gradients appeared to decline slightly but always remained extremely high at at least 0.999. We conjecture that this occurs, as the norm of the BP gradients decreases during training, necessitating a smaller λ to maintain an equivalent scale. Detailed information regarding our implementation and experiments are given in [Appendix A.1](#).

5 Related Work

The main contribution of this paper is in tying together many previous threads in the literature and presenting a unified view of algorithms approximating BP. As such, many ideas here are present, albeit in isolation, in previous literature. A similar relationship between the gradients of the supervised loss and the dynamics of neural activity at the free-phase equilibrium has been observed before in [Bengio and Fischer \(2015\)](#). The single-step update is derived in [Song et al. \(2020\)](#), although the derivation is specific to PC and was not conceptualized as a general property of EBMs. The derivation of EP as a finite difference approximation of the gradient of the λ parameter follows that in [Scellier and Bengio \(2017\)](#). A relationship between the PC approximation result of [Whittington and Bogacz \(2017\)](#) and EP was hinted at in [Whittington and Bogacz \(2019\)](#) but not explicitly worked out, and we argue that CHL is actually a better fit for PC, since the output is fully clamped and not ‘nudged’ as in EP. The CHL derivation as a gradient descent on a contrastive loss function is an explicit part of the CHL literature ([Movellan, 1991](#); [Xie & Seung, 2003](#)), although, to our knowledge, our derivation of this loss function as a consequence of a general EBM is novel. Similarly, our derivation in [Section 3.3](#) of the infinitesimal inference limit in its full generality is novel, as is explicitly working out the approximation terms.

6 Discussion

In this paper, we have proposed a novel and elegant theoretical framework that unifies almost all the disparate results in the literature concerning the conditions under which various ‘biologically plausible’ algorithms approximate the BP of error algorithm. We have demonstrated that these convergence results arise from a shared and fundamental mathematical property of EBMs in the infinitesimal inference limit. This limit is essentially when the clamped-phase equilibrium of the EBM converges towards its initial free-phase equilibrium. We have shown that the approximation

error scales linearly with the distance between the free and clamped equilibria. This limit can be achieved in one of two ways, either by enforcing a weak feedback through the network, leading to the CHL algorithm of [Xie and Seung \(2003\)](#) and the PC result of [Whittington and Bogacz \(2017\)](#), or else by scaling down the contribution of the supervised loss to the energy function, by which one obtains EP ([Scellier & Bengio, 2017](#)) and our novel PC-Nudge algorithm.

While the analysis in this paper covers almost all the known results concerning approximation or convergence to BP, there exist several other families of biologically plausible learning algorithms, which do not converge to BP, but which nevertheless can successfully train deep networks. These include target propagation ([Lee et al., 2015](#); [Meulemans, Carzaniga, Suykens, Sacramento & Grewe, 2020](#)), the prospective configuration algorithm in PCNs networks ([Song, Millidge, Salvatori, Bogacz & Lukasiewicz, 2022](#)), and the feedback alignment algorithm and its variants ([Launay, Poli, Boniface & Krzakala, 2020](#); [Lillicrap et al., 2016](#); [Nøkland, 2016](#)). Whether these algorithms fit into an even broader family or can be derived as exploiting other mathematical properties of a shared EBM structure remains to be elucidated.

Acknowledgements

Beren Millidge and Rafal Bogacz were supported by the the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council grant BB/S006338/1 and Medical Research Council grant MC_UU_00003/1. Yuhang Song was supported by the China Scholarship Council under the State Scholarship Fund and J.P. Morgan AI Research Awards. Thomas Lukasiewicz and Tommaso Salvatori were supported by the Alan Turing Institute under the EPSRC grant EP/N510129/1 and by the AXA Research Fund.

References

- Almeida, L. B. (1990). A learning rule for asynchronous perceptrons with feedback in a combinatorial environment. In *Artificial neural networks: Concept learning* (pp. 102–111).
- Barlow, H. B. (1961). The coding of sensory messages. *Current Problems in Animal Behavior*.
- Bastos, A. M., Usrey, W. M., Adams, R. A., Mangun, G. R., Fries, P. & Friston, K. J. (2012). Canonical microcircuits for predictive coding. *Neuron*, 76(4), 695–711.
- Bengio, Y. & Fischer, A. (2015). Early inference in energy-based models approximates back-propagation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.02777*.
- Bogacz, R. (2017). A tutorial on the free-energy framework for modelling perception and learning. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 76, 198–211.
- Buckley, C. L., Kim, C. S., McGregor, S. & Seth, A. K. (2017). The free energy principle for action and perception: A mathematical review. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 81, 55–79.
- Crick, F. et al. (1989). The recent excitement about neural networks. *Nature*, 337(6203), 129–132.
- Ernault, M., Grollier, J., Querlioz, D., Bengio, Y. & Scellier, B. (2020). Equilibrium propagation with continual weight updates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.04168*.
- Friston, K. (2003). Learning and inference in the brain. *Neural Networks*, 16(9), 1325–1352.
- Friston, K. (2005). A theory of cortical responses. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 360(1456), 815–836.

- Galland, C. C. & Hinton, G. E. (1991). Deterministic Boltzmann learning in networks with asymmetric connectivity. In *Connectionist models* (pp. 3–9). Elsevier.
- Griewank, A. et al. (1989). On automatic differentiation. *Mathematical Programming: Recent developments and applications*, 6(6), 83–107.
- Hebb, D. O. (1949). The first stage of perception: Growth of the assembly. *The Organization of Behavior*, 4, 60–78.
- Hopfield, J. J. (1982). Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 79(8), 2554–2558.
- Hopfield, J. J. (1984). Neurons with graded response have collective computational properties like those of two-state neurons. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 81(10), 3088–3092.
- Keller, G. B. & Mscis-Flogel, T. D. (2018). Predictive processing: A canonical cortical computation. *Neuron*, 100(2), 424–435.
- Kendall, J., Pantone, R., Manickavasagam, K., Bengio, Y. & Scellier, B. (2020). Training end-to-end analog neural networks with equilibrium propagation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.01981*.
- Kinghorn, P. F., Millidge, B. & Buckley, C. L. (2021). Habitual and reflective control in hierarchical predictive coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00866*.
- Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I. & Hinton, G. E. (2012). ImageNet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 25.
- Laborieux, A., Ernout, M., Scellier, B., Bengio, Y., Grollier, J. & Querlioz, D. (2021). Scaling equilibrium propagation to deep ConvNets by drastically reducing its gradient estimator bias. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 15, 129.
- Launay, J., Poli, I., Boniface, F. & Krzakala, F. (2020). Direct feedback alignment scales to modern deep learning tasks and architectures. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 9346–9360.
- Lee, D.-H., Zhang, S., Fischer, A. & Bengio, Y. (2015). Difference target propagation. In *Joint european conference on machine learning and knowledge discovery in databases* (pp. 498–515).
- Lillicrap, T. P., Cownden, D., Tweed, D. B. & Akerman, C. J. (2016). Random synaptic feedback weights support error backpropagation for deep learning. *Nature Communications*, 7(1), 1–10.
- Lillicrap, T. P., Santoro, A., Marris, L., Akerman, C. J. & Hinton, G. (2020). Backpropagation and the brain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 21(6), 335–346.
- Lotter, W., Kreiman, G. & Cox, D. (2016). Deep predictive coding networks for video prediction and unsupervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.08104*.
- Meulemans, A., Carzaniga, F., Suykens, J., Sacramento, J. & Grewe, B. F. (2020). A theoretical framework for target propagation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 20024–20036.
- Millidge, B. (2019). Implementing predictive processing and active inference: Preliminary steps and results. *PsyArXiv*.
- Millidge, B., Salvatori, T., Song, Y., Bogacz, R. & Lukasiewicz, T. (2022). Predictive coding: Towards a future of deep learning beyond backpropagation? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.09467*.
- Millidge, B., Seth, A. & Buckley, C. L. (2021). Predictive coding: A theoretical and experimental review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.12979*.
- Millidge, B., Tschantz, A. & Buckley, C. L. (2020). Predictive coding approximates backprop along arbitrary computation graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04182*.

- Millidge, B., Tschantz, A., Seth, A. & Buckley, C. L. (2020b). Relaxing the constraints on predictive coding models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.01047*.
- Millidge, B., Tschantz, A., Seth, A. K. & Buckley, C. L. (2020a). Activation relaxation: A local dynamical approximation to backpropagation in the brain. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.05359*.
- Movellan, J. R. (1991). Contrastive Hebbian learning in the continuous Hopfield model. In *Connectionist models* (pp. 10–17). Elsevier.
- Mumford, D. (1992). On the computational architecture of the neocortex. *Biological Cybernetics*, 66(3), 241–251.
- Nøkland, A. (2016). Direct feedback alignment provides learning in deep neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29.
- Ofner, A. & Stober, S. (2021). PredProp: Bidirectional stochastic optimization with precision weighted predictive coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.08792*.
- Ororbia, A. G. & Mali, A. (2019). Biologically motivated algorithms for propagating local target representations. In *Proceedings of the aaai conference on artificial intelligence* (Vol. 33, pp. 4651–4658).
- Pineda, F. J. (1987). Generalization of back-propagation to recurrent neural networks. *Physical Review Letters*, 59(19), 2229.
- Rao, R. P. & Ballard, D. H. (1999). Predictive coding in the visual cortex: A functional interpretation of some extra-classical receptive-field effects. *Nature Neuroscience*, 2(1), 79–87.
- Rumelhart, D. E., Hinton, G. E. & Williams, R. J. (1986). Learning representations by back-propagating errors. *Nature*, 323(6088), 533–536.
- Salvatori, T., Pinchetti, L., Millidge, B., Song, Y., Bogacz, R. & Lukasiewicz, T. (2022). Learning on arbitrary graph topologies via predictive coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.13180*.
- Salvatori, T., Song, Y., Hong, Y., Sha, L., Frieder, S., Xu, Z., ... Lukasiewicz, T. (2021). Associative memories via predictive coding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34.
- Salvatori, T., Song, Y., Xu, Z., Lukasiewicz, T. & Bogacz, R. (2022). Reverse differentiation via predictive coding. In *Proceedings of the 36th aaai conference on artificial intelligence, aaai 2022*. AAAI Press.
- Scellier, B. & Bengio, Y. (2017). Equilibrium propagation: Bridging the gap between energy-based models and backpropagation. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, 11, 24.
- Scellier, B. & Bengio, Y. (2019). Equivalence of equilibrium propagation and recurrent backpropagation. *Neural computation*, 31(2), 312–329.
- Silver, D., Huang, A., Maddison, C. J., Guez, A., Sifre, L., Van Den Driessche, G., ... others (2016). Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature*, 529(7587), 484–489.
- Song, Y., Lukasiewicz, T., Xu, Z. & Bogacz, R. (2020). Can the brain do backpropagation?—Exact implementation of backpropagation in predictive coding networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 22566–22579.
- Song, Y., Millidge, B., Salvatori, T., Bogacz, R. & Lukasiewicz, T. (2022). Inferring neural activity before plasticity: A foundation for learning beyond backpropagation. *bioRxiv preprint*.
- Srinivasan, M. V., Laughlin, S. B. & Dubs, A. (1982). Predictive coding: A fresh view of inhibition in the retina. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B. Biological Sciences*, 216(1205), 427–459.
- Sterling, P. & Laughlin, S. (2015). *Principles of neural design*. MIT press.

- Stork, D. G. (1989). Is backpropagation biologically plausible. In *International joint conference on neural networks* (Vol. 2, pp. 241–246).
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., . . . Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30.
- Whittington, J. C. & Bogacz, R. (2017). An approximation of the error backpropagation algorithm in a predictive coding network with local Hebbian synaptic plasticity. *Neural Computation*, 29(5), 1229–1262.
- Whittington, J. C. & Bogacz, R. (2019). Theories of error back-propagation in the brain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 23(3), 235–250.
- Xie, X. & Seung, H. S. (2003). Equivalence of backpropagation and contrastive Hebbian learning in a layered network. *Neural Computation*, 15(2), 441–454.

A Appendix

A.1 Experimental Details

All experiments used the MNIST dataset. A standard training-test split of 50,000 train images and 10,000 test images was used. All MNIST images were normalized so that their pixel values lay in the range $[0,1]$.

All experiments were undertaken on a 3-layer MLP architecture. The MLP consisted of three layers of size 784,128,64,10 with a one-hot output vector of the correct class. A relu activation function was used with a softmax activation at the output along with the cross-entropy loss function. The network was initialized with using Pytorch’s default (Xavier) initialization for linear layers.

The inference phase of the PCN was accomplished by explicitly integrating Equation 4 for 50 iterations. An inference learning rate of 0.1 was used for the inference phase. All precision parameters Π_l were implicitly set to the identity matrix.

All code required to reproduce all experiments and figures in this paper is publicly available at https://github.com/BerenMillidge/infinitesimal_inference_limit. The computational demands of the PCNs were not large and all experiments were run on Google Colab GPU.

A.1.1 Figure 2 implementation details

In Figure 2 left panel, the energy was computed as the PC energy of the sum of squared prediction errors at each timestep of inference. The internal energy was defined as the sum of the squared prediction errors for the first two layers and the supervised backprop loss was the prediction error of the final layer. This lets us interpret the network as effectively redistributing prediction errors from the output layer into the internals of the network, but doing so in a way that allows the total norm of the prediction errors to decrease.

In Figure 2 right panel, we investigated the relationship between the approximation error to the true backprop gradients and that computed by the EBM (in our case a 3-layer MLP PCN). Estimated gradients were computed by our PC-Nudge algorithm where distances between the free and clamped phase were varied in practice by testing different λ parameters. The total euclidean distance $d(x, y) = \sqrt{\sum_i (x_i - y_i)^2}$ between both free phase (forward pass) and clamped phase activations as well as between the BP and PC-Nudge estimated gradients were used. The equilibrium distances were summed across all layers while the gradient distances were summed across all parameters (weights and biases) in the network. Since the exact value of the distances is largely irrelevant we simply summed and did not normalize either the gradients or equilibrium distances so in practice the exact values of these distances scale with layer-width and depth of the network. For this figure we chose 10 representative examples of the same input image (a randomly selected mnist image and label) across initializations of the network.

A.1.2 Figure 3 implementation details

The learning results were obtained with the SGD with momentum optimizer with a learning rate of 0.001 for both BP and PC-nudge with learning rate of $\frac{0.001}{\lambda}$. To counteract the downscaling of the supervised loss, all learning rates in the PCN are rescaled by λ with a new learning rate $\tilde{\eta} = \frac{\eta}{\lambda}$ resulting in the same training rate as BP The momentum parameter was set to 0.9. A minibatch size of 64 was used throughout. λ was set to 0.001.

Panel A was produced by computing the Euclidean distance between the BP and PC-Nudge gradients after 50 inference steps for various values of λ . The shaded area represents the standard deviation over 10 seeds. Panel B shows the batch-by-batch training accuracies of the BP and PC-Nudge network superimposed. The gradients computed by the two approaches were so similar that the weight and gradient updates ended up being almost identical. Panel C shows the cosine similarity (or normalized dot product) between the PC-Nudge estimated gradients and the true BP gradients. We computed the similarity as,

$$\text{similarity}(x, y) = \frac{x \cdot y}{\|x\|^2 \|y\|^2} \quad (25)$$

A similarity score of 1 is the highest possible score and -1 is the lowest.