
PROBABILITY-DEPENDENT GRADIENT DECAY IN LARGE MARGIN SOFTMAX

Siyuan Zhang

School of Internet of Things Engineering
Jiangnan University
Wuxi, China
6191905048@stu.jiangnan.edu.cn

Linbo Xie

School of Internet of Things Engineering
Jiangnan University
Wuxi, China
xie_linbo@jiangnan.edu.cn

Ying Chen

Key Laboratory of Advanced Process Control for Light Industry (Ministry of Education)
Jiangnan University
Wuxi, China
chenying@jiangnan.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

In the past few years, Softmax has become a common component in neural network frameworks. In this paper, a gradient decay hyperparameter is introduced in Softmax to control the probability-dependent gradient decay rate during training. By following the theoretical analysis and empirical results of a variety of model architectures trained on MNIST, CIFAR-10/100 and SVHN, we find that the generalization performance depends significantly on the gradient decay rate as the confidence probability rises, i.e., the gradient decreases convexly or concavely as the sample probability increases. Moreover, optimization with the small gradient decay shows a similar curriculum learning sequence where hard samples are in the spotlight only after easy samples are convinced sufficiently, and well-separated samples gain a higher gradient to reduce intra-class distance. Based on the analysis results, we can provide evidence that the large margin Softmax will affect the local Lipschitz constraint of the loss function by regulating the probability-dependent gradient decay rate. This paper provides a new perspective and understanding of the relationship among concepts of large margin Softmax, local Lipschitz constraint and curriculum learning by analyzing the gradient decay rate. Besides, we propose a warm-up strategy to dynamically adjust Softmax loss in training, where the gradient decay rate increases from over-small to speed up the convergence rate.

Keywords Gradient decay · Large margin Softmax · Local Lipschitz constraint · Curriculum learning · Warm-up strategy

1 Introduction

Deep learning has become the hot point of data analysis and has been applied in several fields, such as face verification, natural language processing, etc. Softmax function combined with a cross-entropy loss (CE) as the logically reasonable loss function in experience risk minimization of classification, has been recognized as the state-of-the-art base objective function in practical neural network optimization.

Compared to the base regression criterion MSE (Mean Square Error), it is demonstrated in [1] that CE has a faster convergence rate since MSE takes into account more complex optimization scenarios. Softmax function converts the whole output space $[-\infty, +\infty]$ into an approximate probability distribution as a measure of the distance between the predicted distribution and the label where each category output is within $[0, 1]$ and the sum of all label output is 1. It makes the optimization of output more flexible throughout the real number space. Besides, another characteristic of CE is also worthy of attention. Continuous learning with tiny training errors can still improve the implicit regularization of




Figure 1: **The distribution of the features in the decision space with different gradient decay factors (a. 1 b. 0.2 c. 0.1 d. 0.01).** Default Softmax cannot learn distinctive features, as shown in Fig. 1a, while small β can shrink intra-class distance and expand the inter-class distance. However, overly small gradient decay seeks a smaller intra-class distance of well-separated samples at the expense of the inter-class distance of some hard negative samples.

the network in classification with CE [2]. Similarly, all samples become support vectors when the model with CE keeps long-standing training in the over-parameter model [3].

The Softmax function is usually defined by a single hyperparameter, the temperature τ , which is scaled to adjust calibration so that the model tends toward over-confidence or under-confidence for hard negative samples. The temperature τ is often discussed in contractive learning [4], knowledge distilling [5], natural language processing [6] and so on. Typically, the default Softmax is unable to learn discriminative features sufficiently. A small preset temperature τ can produce a hefty penalty on hard negative samples to force more significant inter-class discrepancy. Moreover, the penalty distribution tends to be more uniform as the temperature increases [7]. It seems reasonable that static model calibration plays the pivotal role [8]. Nevertheless, the literature [9] demonstrates that the dependence of the generalization on temperature is due to a dynamical phenomenon rather than model confidence.

Similarly, the hard mining strategy explicitly emphasizes more challenging samples by discarding easy samples or enlarging the weights of false negative samples that will benefit training [10, 11]. Based on the loss values, mining-based Softmax concentrates on the informative samples, so can learn more discriminative features [12, 13]. Selecting the value sample and removing noisy data are the technical foundation of the hard mining strategy. On the other hand, a soft mining strategy, like focal loss, smooths the mining strategy by introducing a modifiable hyperparameter so that the hard sample can be given more importance [14]. Due to its broad applicability, it has become a prevailing loss [15].

Another branch of Softmax research is the large margin Softmax, which increases the feature margin from the perspective of the ground truth class. Lin et al. introduced Large-margin Softmax (L-Softmax) [16] and Angular Softmax (A-Softmax) [17] to impose discriminative constraints on a hypersphere manifold to encourage intra-class compactness and inter-class separability between learned features. Wang et al. proposed a more interpretable way to import the angular margin into Additive Margin Softmax (AM-Softmax) [18]. In [19], the Additive Angular Margin Loss (ArcFace) showed a clear geometric interpretation due to its exact correspondence to geodesic distance on a hypersphere. Unlike the hard mining strategy, large margin Softmax not only swells the inter-class distance by adjusting the temperature but also remains focused on the intra-class distance. However, to the best of our knowledge, there is a lack of corresponding explanatory work from dynamic training performance.

This paper introduces a hyperparameter β in Softmax, which controls the probability-dependent gradient decay as the sample confidence probability rises. From the theoretical analysis, we can conclude that the smaller the hyperparameter β is, the smoother the local L -constraint of the Softmax is. It means that the model with a smaller β can obtain a rapid convergence rate in the initial phase. Besides, minor gradient decay produces a higher gradient to the well-separated sample to shrink the intra-class distance at the expense of “discarding” some hard negative samples due to the limited network capacity, as shown in Fig. 1. The training with a slight gradient decay shows a similar curriculum learning idea [20, 21, 22] that the hard samples will be optimized only after the easy samples have been convinced sufficiently. This paper analyzes the dynamic training phenomenon with different β and provides a new understanding of large margin Softmax by considering the effect of the hyperparameters β on gradient decay rate. Besides, we propose a warm-up training strategy to set an over-small initial hyperparameter β to speed up the convergence rate. Then, β is enlarged to an adequate value to prevent over-confidence.

2 Preliminaries

In classification, the class label can be predicted using the one-versus-all technique as

$$cls(z(x)) = \max\{z_i(x)\}, i = 1, \dots, m \quad (1)$$

where $z_i, i = 1, \dots, m$ represent the outputs of m labels. c represents the truth class in m classes. Logically, we hope the output z_c can be larger than other class outputs $z_i, i = 1, \dots, m, i \neq c$.

$$\arg \min z_i - z_c, i = 1, \dots, m, i \neq c \quad (2)$$

To smooth the above $m - 1$ optimization problems in 2, we can obtain a logically equivalent objective for the above problem. That is, minimizing the output of the category most adversarial to z_c .

$$\arg \min \max\{z_i - z_c\}, i = 1, \dots, m, i \neq c \quad (3)$$

Then, two hyperparameters are introduced into (3), temperature τ and margin $\log \beta$, where $\beta > 0$.

$$\arg \min \max\{\log \beta, z_i - z_c/\tau\}, i = 1, \dots, m, i \neq c \quad (4)$$

Although the max function is convex, it is discrete and (4) is hard to optimize by gradient descent. So, (4) needs to be smoothed by sum-exp-up (also called Softmax), as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max\{\log \beta, z_i - z_c/\tau\}, i = 1, \dots, m, i \neq c \\ & \approx \log \sum_{i \neq c} e^{z_i - z_c/\tau} + \beta \\ & = -\log \frac{e^{z_c/\tau}}{\sum_{i \neq c} e^{z_i/\tau} + \beta e^{z_c/\tau}} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The symmetric formulation, Large-margin Softmax loss (L-Softmax) [16], is given as follows:

$$J_{LMS} = -\log \frac{e^{\|w_c\| \|h\| \psi(\theta_c)}}{\sum_{i \neq c} e^{\|w_i\| \|h\| \cos(\theta_i)} + e^{\|w_c\| \|h\| \psi(\theta_c)}} \quad (6)$$

in which

$$\psi(\theta) = \begin{cases} \cos(k\theta), & 0 \leq \theta \leq \frac{\pi}{k} \\ D(\theta), & \frac{\pi}{k} < \theta \leq \pi \end{cases}$$

where k is an integer that is closely related to the classification. $D(\theta)$ is required to be a monotonically decreasing function and $D(\frac{\pi}{k})$ should equal $\cos(\frac{\pi}{k})$. h is the input of the last layer and w_i is the i -th column of the last fully connected layer to the output z_i . β can be regarded as the hyperparameter decoupled from L-Softmax loss [18].

The temperature τ in (5) has been widely researched in the literature [4] and the reference therein.

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} -\log \frac{e^{z_c/\tau}}{\sum e^{z_i/\tau}} = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \max\{z_i - z_c/\tau\}, i = 1, \dots, m \quad (7)$$

When τ approaches 0, the cross entropy is approximated as a max function of the difference between the truth class output and other class outputs. The model will pay more attention to the hard negative sample near the decision boundary so that the inter-class can be scattered. Larger τ means that the model will handle all class outputs of the sample more smoothly. Some papers attribute the improvement of the temperature scaling solely to the calibration of the model confidence [4]. A challenge was raised in [9] that the dependence of the generalization on temperature is due to a dynamical phenomenon rather than model confidence.

In (4), the hyperparameter β represents the margin of hinge loss in decision space. So the cross-entropy itself can be interpreted as a margin-based loss [14], as shown in (5-6). However, the above large margin is defined in the features of the output space. Owing to the distance distortion between input and representation spaces, the large margin in the input space of models is not maximized simultaneously by the above large margin Softmax loss. The margin of the input space is more relevant to the model generalization and robustness than that of the output space. That is reflected in experimental results that a more considerable margin k in (6) does not mean better generalization. Besides, the margins defined based on different criteria realize different performances, i.e., angular margin or cosine margin. So the interpretation of the effect of large boundaries on inter- and intra-class distances is slightly ambiguous.

On the other hand, the training of the neural network is associated with $J_j, j = 1, \dots, n$, which n represents sample number, and n optimization problems are equally combined as a multi-objective optimization $\sum_{j=1}^n J_j$. In addition to the implication of the single loss function, the coupling effect among the samples should be considered in the dynamic optimization process.

In the next section, we will focus on the effect of the hyperparameter β on inter- and intra-class distances and local Lipschitz constraint in terms of the gradient decay rate.




Figure 2: **The gradient magnitude as the sample probability rises with different values of β .** $\beta > 1$ results in a concave decrease of the gradient magnitude while $1 > \beta > 0$ results in a convex decrease of the gradient magnitude as sample probability rises.

3 GRADIENT DECAY

3.1 Gradient decay hyperparameter

We consider the Softmax with the sole hyperparameter β . The temperature τ is set to 1.

$$J = -\log \frac{e^{z_c}}{\sum_{i \neq c} e^{z_i} + \beta e^{z_c}} \quad (8)$$

Let us first consider the gradient of the Softmax.

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial z_c} = -\frac{\sum e^{z_i} - e^{z_c}}{\sum e^{z_i} + (\beta - 1)e^{z_c}} \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial z_i} = \frac{e^{z_i}}{\sum e^{z_i} + (\beta - 1)e^{z_c}} \quad (10)$$

We introduce probabilistic output $p_i = \frac{e^{z_i}}{e^{z_1} + \dots + e^{z_m}}$ as an intermediate variable. Then we obtain:

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial z_i} = \begin{cases} -\frac{1 - p_c}{1 + (\beta - 1)p_c}, & i = c \\ \frac{p_i}{1 + (\beta - 1)p_c}, & i \neq c \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Since $\left| \frac{\partial J}{\partial z_c} \right| + \sum_{i \neq c} \left| \frac{\partial J}{\partial z_i} \right| = 2 \left| \frac{\partial J}{\partial z_c} \right|$, $\left| \frac{\partial J}{\partial z_c} \right|$ can represent the gradient magnitude of this sample. Moreover, p_c can represent the confidence of the model for this sample. In (11), we can conclude that β determines the gradient magnitude related to sample probability confidence. We define the gradient magnitude $G = -\frac{\partial J}{\partial z_c}$. Then, we can get first-order and second-order derivatives of G with respect to p_c .

$$\frac{\partial G}{\partial p_c} = \frac{-\beta}{(1 + (\beta - 1)p_c)^2} \quad (12)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial p_c^2} = \frac{2\beta(\beta - 1)}{(1 + (\beta - 1)p_c)^3} \quad (13)$$

When $\beta > 1$, $\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial p_c^2} > 0$, gradient magnitude decreases concave monotonically as the sample probability rises; When $1 > \beta > 0$, $\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial p_c^2} < 0$, gradient magnitude shows convex monotonically decreasing as the sample probability rises. As shown in Fig. 2, β controls the gradient decay rate as the sample probability rises. The smaller hyperparameter β shows a lower gradient decay rate in the initial phase. Furthermore, the gradient magnitude decays rapidly after the probability exceeds a certain value, which can be interpreted as a soft probability margin.




Figure 3: The gradient magnitude as the sample output increases with different hyperparameter values under the assumption: 1) Initialization $z_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, m$ and $m = 10$ 2) Other class outputs are equal, i.e., $\frac{\partial J}{\partial z_i} = -\frac{1}{m-1} \frac{\partial J}{\partial z_c}, i = 1, \dots, m, i \neq c$.

However, derivatives of G to p_c seem to be abstract. So, we need to obtain the second-order and the third-order derivatives of J to the truth class output z_c . Significantly, we also introduce the intermediate variable p_c .

$$\frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial z_c^2} = \frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial z_c \partial p_c} \frac{\partial p_c}{\partial z_c} \quad (14)$$

Because $\frac{\partial p_c}{\partial z_c} = p_c(1 - p_c)$. So we get

$$\frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial z_c^2} = \frac{\beta p_c(1 - p_c)}{(1 + (\beta - 1)p_c)^2} \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{\partial^3 J}{\partial z_c^3} = \frac{\beta p_c(1 - p_c)}{(1 + (\beta - 1)p_c)^3} (1 - (1 + \beta)p_c) \quad (16)$$

$\frac{\beta p_c(1 - p_c)}{(1 + (\beta - 1)p_c)^3} > 0$ is constant since $\beta > 0$ and $1 > p_c > 0$. So $\frac{\partial^3 J}{\partial z_c^3} < 0$ when $p_c > \frac{1}{1 + \beta}$; $\frac{\partial^3 J}{\partial z_c^3} > 0$ when $p_c < \frac{1}{1 + \beta}$. We concentrate on the change of the gradient magnitude G . Thus, the magnitude shows convex monotonically decreasing as z_c increases when $p_c < \frac{1}{1 + \beta}$, and concave monotonically decreasing when $p_c > \frac{1}{1 + \beta}$. $p_c = \frac{1}{1 + \beta}$ is the inflection point of gradient as the z_c increases. β determines the inflection point, as shown in Fig. 3.

The magnitude of the gradient always decays from 1 to 0. As shown in Fig. 2, smaller β produces a smoother decay in the initial phase, which results in a larger magnitude in the whole training. As shown in Fig. 3, the inflection gradually moves away from the initial point $z_c = 0$ so that a smooth gradient and large magnitude can dominate training. So, a small hyperparameter β induces a low gradient decay rate and large gradient magnitude.

Let us consider two extreme cases: $\beta \rightarrow 0^+$ and $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$.

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0^+} G = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1 - p_c}{1 + (\beta - 1)p_c} = 1 \quad (17)$$

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow +\infty} G = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1 - p_c}{1 + (\beta - 1)p_c} = 0 \quad (18)$$

Obviously, $\beta \rightarrow 0^+$ will keep the sum of the gradient amplitudes $\left| \frac{\partial J}{\partial z_c} \right| + \sum_{i \neq c} \left| \frac{\partial J}{\partial z_i} \right|$ unchanged. In Fig. 2, the curve will be approximated as a step function where $G = 1, p_c < 1$ and $G = 0, p_c = 1$. On the other hand, $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$ forces the gradient down rapidly to 0. It is reflected in the changes of the convexity of the curves in Fig. 2 and the panning of the inflection point in Fig. 3.

3.2 How does the gradient decay rate affect the model performance?

Fast gradient decay produces a slight gradient in the early phase of optimization. So the training may be prone to trap into local minima before sufficient learning in the early training phase. From the perspective of dynamic multi-objective




Figure 4: **Confidence of some samples of MNIST during training with different gradient decay hyperparameters (a. 2, b. 1, c. 0.5, d. 0.2, e. 0.1, f. 0.01).** Significant gradient decay focuses on the whole optimization, while the small gradient decay keeps optimization on the easy samples to further shrink the intra-class distance. The focus of optimization with minor gradient decay will change slowly. Complex samples are optimized after the easy samples have been convinced sufficiently, or even discarded due to the small decay and limited network capacity like the sample of the grey curve in d-e.

Table 1: Confidence distribution of the samples with different gradient decay factors on MNIST. # indicates the number of samples that belong to the confidence interval.

β	1	0.5	0.1	0.01	0.001
$\#p_c \leq 0.2$	903	828	1105	1325	2375
$\#0.2 < p_c \leq 0.4$	454	206	119	91	142
$\#0.4 < p_c \leq 0.6$	528	245	132	92	116
$\#0.6 < p_c \leq 0.8$	1291	484	191	100	193
$\#0.8 < p_c \leq 1$	56824	58237	58453	58392	57174

optimization $\sum_{j=1}^n J_j$, hard objectives can always chase the easy objectives and stay consistent with the easy objectives in optimization due to the large probability-dependent gradient decay, as shown in Fig. 4. The gradient of well-separated sample is forced to decrease rapidly. There exists a greater constraint on the synchronization of the optimization process. As a result, the distinction between samples is lacking, and the model is under-confident for the easy sample.

Slow gradient decay can always keep the high gradient to the well-separated sample. In training, the dominance of easy samples continues until the preset margin, where gradients begin to fall. Thus, well-separated samples can be learned sufficiently and output feature can be gathered more compactly, as shown in Fig. 1. Then the intra-class variance can be shrunk and discriminative features can be learned by the higher gradient [23].

Furthermore, the low gradient decay training strategy is similar to curriculum learning. That is, the samples should be learned strictly sequentially from easy to hard. In traditional curriculum learning, the samples usually are labeled as “easy” or “hard” by complicated offline or online strategies [24]. A smooth gradient implicitly ensures the strict training sequence and softly divides the sample optimization by posterior probability. As shown in Fig. 4, the optimization of the prevailing Softmax with $\beta = 1$ keeps relatively consistent, while the smaller β shows distinguishability over different samples. Fig. 5 shows the mean confidence of the different sample groups with different gradient decay rates. The classes “1-5” represent the five sample classes from “hard” to “easy”. The default Softmax with $\beta = 1$ is relatively conservative for the sample training, while the Softmax with smaller gradient decay is more inclined to mine more information in easy samples under a soft curriculum idea. It can be inferred that the smaller gradient decay can realize




Figure 5: **Mean confidence of five groups of samples during training with different gradient decay hyperparameters (a. 1. b. 0.1 c. 0.001).** The samples are divided into 5 classes “1-5” according to the posterior probability of the model, where “5” represents the simplest sample with the highest posterior probability and the “1” represents the hardest sample.

the stricter curriculum sequence. Moreover, small gradient decay usually performs better convergence rate, but too low gradient decay does not imply better results.

Appropriate reduction of gradient decay facilitates sufficient learning of discriminative features. From the comparison between Fig. 5a and Fig. 5b, the probability can be enlarged for almost all samples. In the practical application, the slight boost is very important to improve generalization and robustness, although the error is very small [2]. However, the network capacity is limited and there is no free lunch [25]. If we make excessive demands on the margin, some post-training samples cannot get any chance and will be “sacrificed” according to the soft curriculum learning strategy, as shown in Fig. 4. The result in Tab. 1 shows that the number of the samples with low confidence $\#p_c \leq 0.2$ increases as β is set to an over-small value. The over-large margin in [18] will discard some hard negative samples under limited model capacity, since the model gives more priority to easy samples. The intra-class distance of the partial positive easy samples will be reduced at the expense of the inter-class distance of some hard negative samples near the decision boundary. So there is a clear difference between the large margin Softmax and hard mining strategies: the former focuses on the overall confidence or even more on the mining of easy positive samples while the latter focuses more on hard negative samples.

Confidence calibration between τ and β : The Softmax with small τ disperses the inter-class distance by adjusting the probability output to focus more on hard negative samples. Nevertheless, large τ can only smooth the output of all categories and cannot mine more information from simple positive samples. On the contrary, small β makes the gradient decay slowly so that easy positive samples can be sufficiently learned up to high confidence as shown in Figs. 4-5. An appropriate β can mining more discriminative features on the whole. Similarly, large β only keeps the consistency of the overall sample training and cannot extract more meaningful features from challenging samples.

In terms of the training process, τ changes the probability distribution of the class outputs and β determines the gradient magnitude assigned by the probability of belonging to the truth class. They improved the mining capability of Softmax in two different dimensions. So it is convinced that the general Softmax loss should be defined with these two hyperparameters τ and β .

3.3 Local Lipschitz constraint

Assume that the gradient of the function $J(z)$ satisfies Lipschitz constraint (L -constraint) that is

$$\|\nabla_z J(z + \Delta z) - \nabla_z J(z)\|_2 \leq L \|\Delta z\|_2 \quad (19)$$

For a second-order differentiable objective function, the above condition is equivalent to $\|\nabla_z^2 J(z)\|_2 \leq L$, where L represents the degree of fluctuation of the gradient. Then we have the following inequality [26]

$$J(z + \Delta z) \leq J(z) + \langle \nabla_z J(z), \Delta z \rangle + \frac{1}{2} L \|\Delta z\|_2^2 \quad (20)$$

The gradient descent is applied to optimization.

$$\Delta z = -\eta \nabla_z J(z) \quad (21)$$

where $\eta > 0$ is the learning rate. Substituting (21) into (20), we obtain

$$J(z + \Delta z) \leq J(z) + \left(\frac{1}{2}L\eta^2 - \eta \right) \|\nabla_z J(z)\|_2^2 \quad (22)$$

So, $\frac{1}{2}L\eta^2 - \eta < 0$ is the sufficient condition for loss decline at each iteration. And $\frac{1}{2}L\eta^2 - \eta$ is the minimum value when $\eta^* = \frac{1}{L}$. The larger the magnitude of the gradient $\|\nabla_z J(z)\|_2^2$ is, the smaller the L -constraint is. Furthermore, the smaller L -constraint results in the rapider convergence [26]. The learning rate η can be adaptively designed to maximize the convergence speed [27]. Unfortunately, L -constraint is an intrinsic property of the loss function.

Since $\left| \frac{\partial J}{\partial z_c} \right| = \sum_{i \neq c} \left| \frac{\partial J}{\partial z_i} \right|$, we consider the only variable z_c in Softmax. For function $J(z_c)$ as shown in (15-16), we obtain that the max $\|\nabla_{z_c}^2 J(z_c)\|_2$ is $\frac{1}{4}$ when $p_c = \frac{1}{1+\beta}$. So β cannot change the global L -constrain since it is a constant. However, the local L -constrain can be adjusted by overall panning, as shown in Fig. 3. Thus, we can narrow β and change the inflection point of the gradient $p_c = \frac{1}{1+\beta}$ so that the constant maximum is far from the initial point, allowing a larger range of the smooth gradient to occupy the optimization process. For example, we consider the local range $p_c \in [0, 0.5]$ and can obtain a local L -constrain of $\|\nabla_{z_c}^2 J(z_c)\|_2$ as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \|\nabla_{z_c}^2 J(z_c)\|_2 \leq \frac{\beta}{(\beta+1)^2}, \beta < 1 \\ \|\nabla_{z_c}^2 J(z_c)\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{4}, \beta \geq 1 \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

So it can be demonstrated that the β smaller is, the gradient smoother is. When β is set to a small value, the learning rate η of gradient descent in (23) can be amplified to accelerate the optimization. On the other hand, the gradient magnitude $\|\nabla_{z_c} J(z_c)\|_2^2$ of smaller β is always greater than that of larger β . Besides, it is meaningful that we can change β to control the local L -constraint of the Softmax loss in optimization. Some literature [28] have shown that the Lipschitz constraint of the gradient has been strongly related to model generalization and robustness. The regularization of the gradient L -constraint has been applied to obtain the large margin decision boundary or guarantee the stable optimization in Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN) [29].

3.4 Warm-up strategy

Based on the above analysis, we can conclude that the smaller β produces a larger gradient magnitude with less gradient decay in the initial phase and can realize faster convergence. However, some hard negative samples may be discarded by over-small β . Thus, we propose a warm-up training strategy, where over-small β in the initial phase provides fast convergence with the smooth local L -constraint and increases gradually until an adequate set in the training. The easy sample can be learned sufficiently in early training. In this paper, we use a simple linear warm-up strategy as follows:

$$\beta = \frac{\beta_{end} - \beta_{initial}}{t_{end}} t + \beta_{initial} \quad (24)$$

where $\beta_{initial}$ and β_{end} are preset initial and final values. t_{end} and t represent the end iteration of warm-up strategy and current iteration, respectively. $\beta_{initial}$ gradually increases to preset β_{end} in the training.

4 Numerical results

In this section, we give some other experimental results of a variety of model architectures, such as FCNN, Resnet18 [30], Resnet35 [30], VGG16[31] and MobilenetV1 [32], trained on MNIST, CIFAR-10/100 and SVHN. Based on empirical analysis, we briefly show how different β dynamical affect the performance of the models on different datasets.

4.1 Implementation details

The shallow three-layer architecture of FCNN with 50, 20 and 10 nodes is implemented on MNSIT. The learning rate is 10^{-3} and weight decay is 10^{-4} . The momentum is set to 0.9. The batch is set to 100 within a total of 100 epochs. $\beta_{initial}$ and β_{end} in the warm-up strategy are set to 0.001 and 0.01, respectively, where over-small $\beta = 0.001$ provides faster convergence in early phase.

The deep models are used for training and predicting in CIFAR-10/100 and SVHN. The learning rate is 10^{-2} and weight decay is 10^{-4} . The momentum is set to 0.9. The batch is set to 100. CIFAR-10/100 is traversed over 200 epochs, while SVHN is traversed over 100 epochs. At 50% and 75% epochs, the learning rate decreases to 10 percent. β is set to $\{5, 2, 1, 0.1, 0.01\}$. In real-world training, we find that over-small β may cause the overflow of the Softmax function. So e^z is replaced by e^{z-u} in (25) and u is set to 70 to prevent exp function from being too large in experiments. At the same time, we set gradient clip with $norm = 3$.

$$J = -\log \frac{e^{z_c - u}}{\sum_{i \neq c} e^{z_i - u} + \beta e^{z_c - u}} \quad (25)$$

4.2 Experimental results

4.2.1 MNIST

It is shown in Fig. 6 that the performance of different gradient decays shows different phenomena. The Softmax with less gradient decay displays faster convergence and better generalization with discriminate feature learning. $\beta = 0.01$ realizes the better accuracy than traditional CE with $\beta = 1$ and the large gradient decay $\beta = 5$ has worse performance.




Figure 6: The performance of Softmax with different gradient decay hyperparameters $\{5, 2, 1, 0.1, 0.01\}$ and warm-up strategy.




Figure 7: CE with different gradient decay hyperparameters $\{5, 2, 1, 0.1, 0.01\}$.

The warm-up strategy sets a small initial gradient decay hyperparameter β to speed up the convergence rate and guarantees final stable performance by increasing β to prevent over-confidence for easy sample. Warm-up strategy achieves even better results. Furthermore, decline curves of cross-entropy loss with different β are shown in Fig. 7 to empirically show the high convergence rate of small gradient decay. It can be inferred that minor gradient decay shows the rapid convergence rate, although the gap decreases due to the deviation between the general cross-entropy loss

and objective functions with different β . Significantly, the result of this experiment is enough to empirically show that minor gradient decay with small L -constraint can achieve a faster convergence rate.

Table 2: Top-1 accuracy on CIFAR-10 with different gradient decay hyperparameters $\{5, 2, 1, 0.1, 0.01\}$ and warm-up strategy.

β	5	2	1	0.1	0.01	warm-up
Resnet18	82.1	83.8	83.9	84.4	84.4	84.8
Resnet35	83.4	84.3	84.3	84.7	85.2	85.6
VGG16	83.8	85.3	85.6	85.7	85.9	86.1
MobilenetV1	78.4	79.6	81.7	82.9	83.0	83.3

4.2.2 CIFAR-10 and SVHN

The top-1 accuracy of several deep models such as Resnet18, Resnet35, VGG16 and MobilenetV1 on CIFAR-10 and SVHN are given in Tabs. 2-3. It can be concluded that these models all benefit from the more minor gradient decay compared with the general Softmax with $\beta = 1$. It means that the original Softmax cannot learn the feature sufficiently. It can be improved by setting smaller gradient decay or larger “margin” [18]. However, over-small gradient decay pursuits the smaller intra-class distance under the limited capacity of the network. Some challenging samples cannot get enough training and may be discarded. So as shown in Tab. 3, the large β cannot always indicate a better performance.

On the other hand, large β induces large gradient decay and large L -constraint of Softmax, which means that gradient change is sharp and the training of easy samples and challenging samples is relatively consistent, as discussed in Figs. 4-5. As a result, the consistency of overall samples training may damage the final performance, as the shown in Tabs. 2-3. We can observe that there is a noticeable accuracy oscillation in Fig. 8. In experiments, we find that it is a common phenomenon when β is large but this kind of large consolidation does not happen when momentum is small.

Table 3: Top-1 accuracy on SVHN with different gradient decay hyperparameters $\{5, 2, 1, 0.1, 0.01\}$ and warm-up strategy.

β	5	2	1	0.1	0.01	warm-up
Resnet18	94.5	94.8	94.9	95.8	95.6	95.9
Resnet35	95.0	95.2	95.5	96.1	96.0	96.2
VGG16	95.1	95.3	95.4	96.1	95.8	96.0
MobilenetV1	94.1	94.5	95.0	95.2	95.5	95.9




Figure 8: Top-1 accuracy curve on CIFAR-10 with different gradient decay hyperparameters $\{5, 2, 1, 0.1, 0.01\}$ and warm-up strategy.

4.2.3 CIFAR-100

Confidence is not always a good thing. Curriculum design that divides samples is crucial to curriculum learning idea. Apart from the manual design, most division can only be done by the posterior probability of the model. When the model does not have enough capacity to solve a challenging task, confidence toward easy or negative hard samples would damage the performance. Besides, based the previous analysis in section 3.2, large margin may impair the

performance since some hard negative samples containing important information are discarded under the limited model capacity. In this experiments, $\beta_{initial}$ and β_{end} in the warm-up strategy are set to 1 and 5, respectively, where $\beta_{initial} = 1$ prevents too rapid gradient decay in early training.

Table 4: Top-1 accuracy on CIFAR-100 with different gradient decay hyperparameters {5, 2, 1, 0.1, 0.01} and warm-up strategy.

β	5	2	1	0.1	0.01	warm-up
Resnet18	52.8	53.8	52.9	52.8	52.7	54.3
Resnet35	54.2	54.1	53.4	53.0	53.0	54.6
VGG16	53.0	52.8	52.8	52.5	52.4	53.0
MobilenetV1	45.0	44.1	43.8	43.5	43.5	45.4

Table 5: Top-5 accuracy on CIFAR-100 with different gradient decay hyperparameters {5, 2, 1, 0.1, 0.01} and warm-up strategy.

β	5	2	1	0.1	0.01	warm-up
Resnet18	79.6	80.4	78.8	77.9	78.1	80.7
Resnet35	80.3	79.9	80.9	78.2	77.2	80.4
VGG16	77.0	77.9	77.4	77.2	76.4	77.8
MobilenetV1	75.2	73.4	71.9	71.8	71.9	75.4

As shown in Tabs. 4-5, these models on CIFAR-100 all prefer the large hyperparameter β while the default Softmax with $\beta = 1$ is relative small in this tasks. The difficulty of CIFAR-100 is reflected in more categories than MNIST, CIFAR-10 and SVHN, which leads to a lower probability of true category. Since the smaller β keeps lower gradient decay in the low probability output as shown in Figs. 2-3, this experiment is more sensitive for small β . From another perspective, the mentioned model has no high probability confidence and the training material is not good enough. Learning every sample more equally is a better choice since the model cannot confidently determine which the simple sample is or which a more informative sample is by posterior probability. Obviously, the large margin in Softmax loss [16, 17, 18] is a relative concept in different tasks and has the constraint condition for model capacity in mining more discriminating features.

5 Conclusion

This paper introduces the gradient decay hyperparameter β to analyze the effect of the large margin defined in decision space on inter-class and intra-class distances from a dynamical training process. The large margin of Softmax induces the small gradient decay as the sample probability rises. The easy positive samples can be learned sufficiently up to high probability and the model tends to be more confident toward these samples. Training displays distinguishability over different samples in training, i.e., the samples are optimized under the stricter curriculum sequence. Under the limited network capacity and over-large margin, reducing the intra-class distance of the partial easy positive samples will sacrifice the inter-class distance of hard negative samples. Besides, the Softmax with smaller gradient decay has a smoother local L -constraint, so the large margin Softmax can obtain a faster convergence rate. Thus, we propose a warm-up training strategy to improve the convergence rate by setting an over-small gradient decay and smoother L -constraint in early training.

We hope this paper can provide a new understanding of how large margin Softmax affects model performance by adjusting the gradient decay during dynamic training and the change of inter-class and intra-class distances with a large margin.

References

- [1] Pavel Golik, Patrick Doetsch, and Hermann Ney. Cross-entropy vs. squared error training: a theoretical and experimental comparison. In *INTERSPEECH*, 2013.
- [2] Daniel Soudry, Elad Hoffer, Mor Shpigel Nacson, Suriya Gunasekar, and Nathan Srebro. The implicit bias of gradient descent on separable data. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(70):1–57, 2018.
- [3] Roei Sarussi, Alon Brutzkus, and Amir Globerson. Towards understanding learning in neural networks with linear teachers. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 9313–9322. PMLR, 2021.

- [4] Feng Wang and Huaping Liu. Understanding the behaviour of contrastive loss. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2495–2504, June 2021.
- [5] Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, et al. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2(7), 2015.
- [6] Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.13586*, 2021.
- [7] Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 1321–1330. PMLR, 2017.
- [8] Xu Zhang, Felix Xinnan Yu, Svebor Karaman, Wei Zhang, and Shih-Fu Chang. Heated-up softmax embedding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.
- [9] Atish Agarwala, Jeffrey Pennington, Yann Dauphin, and S. Schoenholz. Temperature check: theory and practice for training models with softmax-cross-entropy losses. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2020.
- [10] Xiaobo Wang, Shifeng Zhang, Shuo Wang, Tianyu Fu, Hailin Shi, and Tao Mei. Mis-classified vector guided softmax loss for face recognition. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, pages 12241–12248, 2020.
- [11] Yazhou Ren, Peng Zhao, Yongpan Sheng, Dezhong Yao, and Zenglin Xu. Robust softmax regression for multi-class classification with self-paced learning. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 2641–2647, 2017.
- [12] Abhinav Shrivastava, Abhinav Gupta, and Ross Girshick. Training region-based object detectors with online hard example mining. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 761–769, 2016.
- [13] Yuge Huang, Yuhan Wang, Ying Tai, Xiaoming Liu, Pengcheng Shen, Shaoxin Li, Jilin Li, and Feiyue Huang. Curricularface: adaptive curriculum learning loss for deep face recognition. In *proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5901–5910, 2020.
- [14] W Zheng, J Lu, and J Zhou. Hardness-aware deep metric learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 43(9):3214–3228, 2021.
- [15] Tsung-Yi Lin, Priya Goyal, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Dollar. Focal loss for dense object detection. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 42(2):318–327, 2020.
- [16] Weiyang Liu, Yandong Wen, Zhiding Yu, and Meng Yang. Large-margin softmax loss for convolutional neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2016.
- [17] Weiyang Liu, Yandong Wen, Zhiding Yu, Ming Li, Bhiksha Raj, and Le Song. Sphreface: Deep hypersphere embedding for face recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 212–220, 2017.
- [18] Feng Wang, Jian Cheng, Weiyang Liu, and Haijun Liu. Additive margin softmax for face verification. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 25(7):926–930, 2018.
- [19] Jiankang Deng, Jia Guo, Niannan Xue, and Stefanos Zafeiriou. Arcface: Additive angular margin loss for deep face recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 4690–4699, 2019.
- [20] Yoshua Bengio, Jérôme Louradour, Ronan Collobert, and Jason Weston. Curriculum learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 41–48, 2009.
- [21] Lu Jiang, Zhengyuan Zhou, Thomas Leung, Li-Jia Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Mentornet: Learning data-driven curriculum for very deep neural networks on corrupted labels. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 2304–2313. PMLR, 2018.
- [22] Tianyi Zhou and Jeff Bilmes. Minimax curriculum learning: Machine teaching with desirable difficulties and scheduled diversity. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.
- [23] Rajeev Ranjan, Carlos D Castillo, and Rama Chellappa. L2-constrained softmax loss for discriminative face verification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.09507*, 2017.
- [24] Ying-Peng Tang and Sheng-Jun Huang. Self-paced active learning: Query the right thing at the right time. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, pages 5117–5124, 2019.

- [25] Yu-Chi Ho and David L Pepyne. Simple explanation of the no-free-lunch theorem and its implications. *Journal of optimization theory and applications*, 115(3):549–570, 2002.
- [26] Jingzhao Zhang, Tianxing He, Suvrit Sra, and Ali Jadbabaie. Why gradient clipping accelerates training: A theoretical justification for adaptivity. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2019.
- [27] Yair Carmon, John C Duchi, Oliver Hinder, and Aaron Sidford. Accelerated methods for nonconvex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(2):1751–1772, 2018.
- [28] Gamaleldin Elsayed, Dilip Krishnan, Hossein Mobahi, Kevin Regan, and Samy Bengio. Large margin deep networks for classification. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2018.
- [29] Alexia Jolicoeur-Martineau and Ioannis Mitliagkas. Gradient penalty from a maximum margin perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.06922*, 2019.
- [30] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [31] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [32] Andrew G Howard, Menglong Zhu, Bo Chen, Dmitry Kalenichenko, Weijun Wang, Tobias Weyand, Marco Andreetto, and Hartwig Adam. Mobilenets: Efficient convolutional neural networks for mobile vision applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04861*, 2017.