

GAINING THE SPARSE REWARDS BY EXPLORING BINARY LOTTERY TICKETS IN SPIKING NEURAL NETWORKS

Hao Cheng¹, Jiahang Cao¹, Erjia Xiao¹, Pu Zhao², Mengshu Sun³,
Jiaxu Wang¹, Jize Zhang⁴, Xue Lin², Bhavya Kailkhura⁵, Kaidi Xu⁶, Renjing Xu¹

¹ The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou)

² Northeastern University, ³ Beijing University of Technology

⁴ The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

⁵ Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, ⁶ Drexel University

ABSTRACT

Spiking Neural Network (SNN) as a brain-inspired strategy receives lots of attention because of the high-sparsity and low-power properties derived from its inherent spiking information state. To further improve the efficiency of SNN, some works declare that the Lottery Tickets (LTs) Hypothesis, which indicates that the Artificial Neural Network (ANN) contains a subnetwork without sacrificing the performance of the original network, also exists in SNN. However, the spiking information handled by SNN has a natural similarity and affinity with binarization in sparsification. Therefore, to further explore SNN efficiency, this paper focuses on (1) *the presence or absence of LTs in the binary SNN*, and (2) *whether the spiking mechanism is a superior strategy in terms of handling binary information compared to simple model binarization*. To certify these assumptions, a sparse training method is proposed to find Binary Weights Spiking Lottery Tickets (BinW-SLT) under different network structures. Through comprehensive evaluations, we show that BinW-SLT could attain up to +5.86% and +3.17% improvement on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 compared with binary LTs, as well as achieve 1.86x and 8.92x energy saving compared with full-precision SNN and ANN.

Index Terms— Spiking Neural Networks, Lottery Tickets Hypothesis, Binary Neural Network

1. INTRODUCTION

Although many deep learning algorithms have performed well on different tasks in the current AI research field, some practical problems still need to be resolved. Significantly, the redundancy of model structure and computational burden greatly prevents the democratization of AI. Model compression has been widely combined with various existing AI algorithms as a very effective method. Model pruning [1] and quantization [2] as two representative compressing methods could make the original network pursue more lightweight structures and facilitate their implementations on resource-constrained application

systems, such as smartphone or Field Programmable Gate Arrays (FPGA).

About model pruning, initially, all of them need to go through 1) original model training, 2) model pruning, and 3) post-fine-tuning to find a sub-model according to various pruning rules, which could be categorized as irregular pruning [1] and regular pruning [3; 4; 5]. And the regular pruning could be further classified as filter pruning [3], column pruning [4], and block-based pruning [5]. Recently, ANNs are been proven to have specific sparser but not sacrificing original performance subnetworks named LTs Hypothesis [6]. This finding makes sparse training [7; 8; 9] possible, which makes it more convenient and efficient to find sub-networks without the need for complex pretraining, pruning, and retraining collocation techniques. Model quantization [10] could quantize the original 32-bit model toward the 16-bit to 2-bit state. Among them, converting 32-bit toward 2-bit is the extreme situation of quantization that could be termed as the Binary Neural Network (BNN) [10]. While adopting quantization or binarization to obtain a sparse model, the corresponding processing objects can be weights and activations. However, weights quantizing or binarizing can achieve a smaller performance loss than handling both. Furthermore, about combining LTs with binarization, the Multi-prize Lottery Tickets Hypothesis (MPTs) [9] certifies that the lottery tickets or subnetworks remain in BNN.

SNN, as the most promising third-generation neural network, has received lots of attention due to its distinctive properties of high biological plausibility, temporal information processing capability, inherent binary (spiking) information processing superiority, and energy saving. For training SNN, there are three main approaches, including (1) ANN to SNN conversions [11], (2) direct training [12], and (3) local training [13]. Although it is more computationally and energy efficient than traditional ANN, further improving its sparsity and efficiency is important to be more scalable in resource-limited hardware scenarios. There has already been some work on SNN pruning [14] and binarization [15; 16]. Additionally, Kim et al. [17] claimed that the LTs also exists in SNN.

However, the existence or non-existence of LTs in the binary case of SNN is the pending issue of the most interest to this paper. Furthermore, because of the inherent advantage of SNN in processing spiking information that could be assumed as a special binary form, the specific performance of binarized spiking LTs is also a point of great curiosity for this paper.

Therefore, two important issues to be investigated are how to discover Binary Weights Lottery Ticket (BinW-SLT) more expeditiously and how to analyze the properties of BinW-SLT comprehensively. We propose a new sparse training method that could efficiently find BinW-SLT without model training to solve these two issues. With this training method, we can prove that the LTs exists in the binary SNN case. Furthermore, compared to ANN with simultaneous binary weights and activations, BinW-SLT shows their advantage in processing binary information and attains up to +5.86% and +3.17% improvement in CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 compared with traditional submodel of BNN with binary weights and activations (BNN-BinAct) [6; 10]. BinW-SLT also maintains a better computational energy advantage of over 1.86x and 8.92x compared to full-precision SNN and ANN.

2. METHODS AND EXPERIMENTS

2.1. Binary Weights Spiking Lottery Tickets (BinW-SLT)

SNN Fundamentals: Different from ANN, SNN specializes in the processing of spiking information. In this paper, we adopt the widely used Leaky Integrate-and-Fire (LIF) model [18], which is suitable to characterize the dynamic process of spike generation and can be defined as:

$$\tau \frac{dV(t)}{dt} = -(V(t) - V_{reset}) + I(t) \quad (1)$$

where $I(t)$ represents the input synaptic current at time t to charge up to produce a membrane potential $V(t)$, τ is the time constant. When the membrane potential exceeds the threshold V_{th} , the neuron will trigger a spike and reset its membrane potential to a value V_{reset} ($V_{reset} < V_{th}$). The LIF neuron achieves a balance between computing cost and biological plausibility. In practice, the dynamics must be discretized to facilitate reasoning and training. The discretized version of the LIF model can be described as:

$$U[n] = e^{\frac{1}{\tau}} V[n-1] + (1 - e^{\frac{1}{\tau}}) I[n] \quad (2)$$

$$S[n] = \Theta(U[n] - V_{th}) \quad (3)$$

$$V[n] = U[n](1 - S[n]) + V_{reset} S[n] \quad (4)$$

Where n is the discrete timestep, $U[n]$ is the membrane potential before reset, $S[n]$ denotes the output spike, which equals 1 when there is a spike and 0 otherwise, $\Theta(x)$ is the Heaviside step function, $V[n]$ represents the membrane potential after triggering a spike.

Finding Methods: To explore BinW-SLT, we refer to effective MPTs [9] method that could find binary Spiking LTs

without suffering any weight training. The main work we must do is transfer MPTs to the binary state. This transferring process contains two issues that need special attention: (1) SNN do not need binarize activation since the LIF as the method of processing spiking information is already a special case of binarization; 2) Compared with ANN, SNN has more parameters, such as timestep T , and decay rate λ , that will affect final performance and need to be considered. Therefore, to make the original MPTs satisfy these two issues, the optimizing formula could be rewritten as:

$$\min_{\alpha} \|g(LIF(x; \alpha(M \odot \text{sign}(w)))) - f(x; W^*)\| \quad (5)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is the Gain term necessary to perform binary subnetworks well. $f(x; W^*)$ is the target original network with optimized weights W^* that we wish to approximate.

The specific BinW-SLT finding measure is present in Algorithm 1. The optimizing objects still score s and mask M . However, compared with MPTs, some updates that adapt to SNN are applied. In the input, Step-1 to Step-5 are the initialization of different parameters. The best spiking LTs choose from Step-6 to Step-13, including updating and sorting pruning scores s and mask M updating processes. Finally, the sparse BinW-SLT $g(LIF(x; \alpha(M \odot \text{sign}(w))))$ with best performance is screened out.

Algorithm 1 Finding BinW-SLT

- 1: **Input:** SNN $g(LIF(x;))$ with 2-bit spiking activation; Loss function L ; Training data $\{(x^{(i)}, y^{(i)})\}_{j=1}^N$; Dataset size N ; SNN parameters N_{snn} .
 - 2: *Initialize SNN:* Pruning rate r_p ; Timestep t ; Decay rate λ .
 - 3: *Initialize spiking LTs Parameters:* SNN weights w ; Pruning scores s ; Layerwise masks $M \in \{0, 1\}$.
 - 4: *Initialize spiking LTs Weights:* $\text{sign}(w)$
 - 5: *Initialize Gain Term:* $\alpha \leftarrow \|M \odot w\| / \|M\|$
 - 6: **for** $k = 1$ to N_{epochs} **do**
 - 7: **for** r_p, t and λ **do**
 - 8: $s \leftarrow s - \eta \nabla_s \ell(L(\alpha \cdot M \odot \text{sign}(w)))$
 - 9: $Proj_{[0,1]} \leftarrow$ Sorting s according to $r_p N_{snn}$
 - 10: $M \leftarrow M \odot Proj_{[0,1]}, \alpha \leftarrow \|M \odot w\|_1 / \|M\|_1$
 - 11: **end for**
 - 12: **end for**
 - 13: **Output:** Return $g(LIF(x; \alpha(M \odot \text{sign}(w))))$
-

2.2. Experiments

Experimental Setting: This paper uses various SNN structures as our basic models under two popular datasets, CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100. In Cifar-10, Conv-4 with 4 convolutional layers, VGG-9, VGG-11, and ResNet-19 based SNN are utilized here. In CIFAR-100, we choose VGG-11 and ResNet-19 SNNs to explore our BinW-SLT. About training SNN, Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.1 and surrogate gradient [12] are adopted. In finding the BinW-SLT process, we adopt commonly used LIF neurons with

Architecture	Method	CIFAR-10 Acc(%)
CONV-4 (2.43M)	ANN/SNN	84.60/83.41
	BNN-BinAct	79.21
	BinW-SLT	83.65 (+5.61)
VGG-9 (2.26M)	ANN/SNN	86.70/85.30
	BNN-BinAct	80.68
	BinW-SLT	85.35 (+5.79)
VGG-11 (5.27M)	ANN/SNN	88.10/87.20
	BNN-BinAct	83.84
	BinW-SLT	87.76 (+4.68)
ResNet-19 (12.63M)	ANN/SNN	92.05/91.78
	BNN-BinAct	86.74
	BinW-SLT	91.82 (+5.86)

Table 1. Evaluation results on CIFAR-10. BinW-SLT is mainly compared with BNN-BinAct.

Architecture	Method	OPs (G)	Power (mJ)	CIFAR-100 Acc(%)
VGG-11 (5.27M)	ANN	0.209	0.966	68.64
	SNN	0.140	0.131	62.94
	BNN-BinAct	0.209	0.966	58.57
	BinW-SLT	0.132	0.127	61.74 (+3.17)
ResNet-19 (12.63M)	ANN	2.223	10.225	86.74
	SNN	1.778	1.609	64.27
	BNN-BinAct	2.223	10.225	60.60
	BinW-SLT	1.689	1.528	63.73 (+3.31)

Table 2. Evaluation results on CIFAR-100. BinW-SLT is mainly compared with BNN-BinAct. OPs (G) and Power (mJ) are corresponding to computing and power consumption.

timestep $T = 4$ and decay rate $\lambda = 0.99$. Additionally, to explore the relationship between different SNN parameters and the performance of BinW-SLT, $T = 1, 2, 6, 8$ and $\lambda = 0.8, 0.7, 0.6, 0.5, 0.4, 0.3, 0.2$ are further adopted here. All conducting experiments are implemented based on Pytorch and SpikingJelly [19].

General Performance of BinW-SLT: According to the sub-figure (a) in Fig. 2, in CIFAR-10, among most pruning rate regions, BinW-SLT could attain better accuracy compared with BNN with Binary Activation (BNN-BinAct). With respect to the pruning rate= 40% in Table 1, compared to BNN-BinAct, in CIFAR-10, BinW-SLT could achieve at most +5.61%, +5.79%, +4.68% and +5.86% improvement on CONV-4, VGG-9, VGG-11 and ResNet-19. About CIFAR-100 in Table 2, BinW-SLT could attain +3.17% and +3.31% enhancement on VGG-11 and ResNet-19. We also adopt the full-precision original ANN and original SNN as our baselines. For the performance of CIFAR-10 in Fig. 2, from low to high pruning rate, BinW-SLT could even exceed full-precision SNN in most cases and approaches full-precision ANN to the greatest extent. Specifically, compared with full-precision SNN/ANN, for the CONV-4, VGG-9, VGG-11 and ResNet-19 in CIFAR-10, BinW-SLT with $T=4$ could generate +0.24%, -0.95%, +0.05%, -1.35%, +0.56%, -0.34% and +0.04%, -0.23% modification when the pruning rate is 40%.

For CIFAR-100 in Table 2, compared with SNN, BinW-SLT also maintains a relatively low-performance decrease, and the gaps in VGG-11 and ResNet-19 are only -1.2% and -0.54%. Additionally, to have a comprehensive analysis, we also apply the same corresponding model with Timestep $T = 1$, BinW-SLT ($T=1$), as a fairer comparing object in the sub-figure (a) of Fig. 2. In this case, consistent with the performance scenarios analyzed above, the BinW-SLT in each structure still exceeds the BNN-BinAct and approaches the full-precision SNN and ANN.

According to the results in Fig. 2, Table 1 and Table 2, we could get a straightforward concept: *In the case of extreme sparsity that involves both pruning and binarization, a spiking mechanism, like LIF, can better preserve the original information of activations than 0-1 processing of activation values.* This can be proved by the better performance of BinW-SLT compared with BNN-BinAct under different pruning rates, from $r_p = 20\%$ to $r_p = 90\%$, and timesteps, $t = 4$ or 1. To give a more intuitive analysis, we draw Fig. 1 to illustrate the activation map of full-precision ANN, BNN-BinAct, and BinW-SLT from left to right. The BinW-SLT could obtain a higher-level summary from the ANN activation map (Left). Compared with BNN-BinAct, which performs the naive binary operation on the ANN, the activation map of BinW-SLT is sparser and more representative of the original information.




Fig. 1. Activation map of the 128 last layer neuron representation of (a) ANN, (b) BNN-BinAct (c) BinW-SLT.

The Effect of Timestep and Decay Rate: In Fig.2 (b) and (c), we explore the effect of SNN parameters timestep t and decay rate λ on the performance of BinW-SLT. The experiments adopt CONV-4, VGG-9, VGG-11, and ResNet-19 with $r_p = 40\%, 50\%, 60\%$ as our basic structures, and $t = 4$ and $\lambda = 0.99$ as the main parameters. During exploration, while respectively keeping other parameters constant, we select $T = 1, 2, 4, 6, 8$ and $\lambda = 0.99, 0.8, 0.7, 0.6, 0.5, 0.4, 0.3, 0.2$ as our main research objects.

According to Fig. 2 (b), on the basis that the performance of BinW-SLT is better than BNN-BinAct, the change of timestep t could lead up to +3.3% (CONV-4), +1.22% (VGG-9), +3.48% (VGG-11) and +5.86% (ResNet-19) increase compared to the full-precision SNN. This increase also confirms the theoretical mechanism of t in SNN that could be assumed as a multiple processing method of the same input representation.

And in Fig. 2 (c), following the changes in decay rate from 0.99 to 0.2, BinW-SLT still consistently outperforms BNN-BinAct and also maintains a performance advantage over full-precision SNN under certain value combinations of r_p and λ . Concretely, BinW-SLT could attain at most




Fig. 2. The comparison of CIFAR-10 performance under the modification of (a) Pruning Rate; (b) Timestep; (c) Decay Rate.

+2.69% (CONV-4), +1.23% (VGG-9), +1.91% (VGG-11) and +4.33% (ResNet-19) performance fluctuation. Additionally, regardless of the various p_r , the effect of λ on the performance of BinW-SLT is related to the particular model size. In a word, a smaller model could also tolerate a smaller decay rate λ . Initially, CONV-4, VGG-9, VGG-11, and ResNet-19 experience some degree of accuracy rise or stabilization. However, by decreasing r_p , the accuracy would also translate to the decrease under different λ . When the model size is small to large, the corresponding λ are also the increasing values 0.3, 0.4, 0.6, and 0.7.

The Effect of Fine Tuning: Since the finding of BinW-SLT does not adopt weight training, BinW-SLT could also be assumed as a unique initialization strategy for the pre-discovery of sparse SLTs, and its performance could be further improved according to further fine-tuning. In the right sub-figure of Fig. 3, fine-tuned BinW-SLT at different p_r could produce a tangible improvement under the original trend.




Fig. 3. Left: Comparison of normalized compute energy computed using (a) ANN, (b) SNN without any pruning, and (c) SNN with Spiking Lottery Ticket; Right: BinW-SLTs and their Fine-Tuning (FT) performance under different pruning rates.

Theoretical Power Consumption: To better understand the effects of the BinW-SLT on energy using, we estimate the theoretical power consumption on neuromorphic chips based on previous studies [20]. We use OPs as a metric to judge computational consumption. For ANNs, OPs correspond to floating point operations (FLOPs), while SNNs perform

synaptic operations (SOPs), which is defined as [21]:

$$SOPs(l) = fr \times T \times FLOPs(l) \quad (6)$$

where l is a block/layer, fr is the firing rate of l and T is the timestep. After assuming BinW-SLT is implemented on a 45nm hardware [21] with each FLOP and SOP are $4.6pJ$ and $0.9pJ$, respectively, then we can get the theoretical energy consumption calculated by:

$$E_{SNN} = E_{flop} \times FLOP_{SConv}^1 + E_{sop} \times \left(\sum_{n=2}^N SOP_{SConv}^n + \sum_{m=1}^M SOP_{SFC}^m \right) \quad (7)$$

where N and M denotes the number of spike convolutional ($SConv$) and fully connected (SFC) layers. We first sum up the SOPs of all $SConv$ layers (except the first layer), and SFC layers and multiply by E_{flop} . For the first convolutional layer of SNN, we calculate the energy consumption utilizing FLOPs due to the spike encoding operation performed here. We illustrate the results of our BinW-SLT, BNN-BinAct, full-precision ANN, and SNN in Table 2. Also, as exemplified in Fig. 3, BinW-SLT benefits from the energy advantage of up to 1.86x and 8.92x compared to standard SNN and ANN.

3. CONCLUSION

The main focus of this paper is the Binary Weights Spiking Lottery Ticket, abbreviated as BinW-SLT. The analysis of BinW-SLT certifies that (1) the presence of LTs under binary weights SNN; (2) the spiking mechanism could generate a higher-level binary summary and produce binary information that is superior to simple 0-1 processing of activation; (3) As a special kind of initialization, the performance of BinW-SLT has the potential to be further enhanced by fine-tuning. Additionally, we introduce theoretical energy consumption, and the results indicate that our BinW-SLT model can achieve energy savings of up to 1.86x and 8.92x compared to full-precision SNN and ANN, respectively.

Acknowledgement

BK's work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract No. DE-AC52-07NA27344 and was supported by the LLNL-LDRD Program under Project No. 22-DR-009.

References

- [1] Wei Wen, Chunpeng Wu, Yandan Wang, Yiran Chen, and Hai Li, "Learning structured sparsity in deep neural networks," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2016, pp. 2074–2082.
- [2] Wei Fang, Zhaofei Yu, Yanqi Chen, Tiejun Huang, Timothée Masquelier, and Yonghong Tian, "Deep residual learning in spiking neural networks," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 21056–21069, 2021.
- [3] Yang He, Ping Liu, Ziwei Wang, Zhilan Hu, and Yi Yang, "Filter pruning via geometric median for deep convolutional neural networks acceleration," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2019, pp. 4340–4349.
- [4] Peiyan Dong, Siyue Wang, Wei Niu, Chengming Zhang, Sheng Lin, Zhengang Li, Yifan Gong, Bin Ren, Xue Lin, and Dingwen Tao, "Rtmobile: Beyond real-time mobile acceleration of rnns for speech recognition," in *2020 57th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [5] Xiaolong Ma, Geng Yuan, Zhengang Li, Yifan Gong, Tianyun Zhang, Wei Niu, Zheng Zhan, Pu Zhao, Ning Liu, Jian Tang, et al., "Blcr: Towards real-time dnn execution with block-based reweighted pruning," in *2022 23rd International Symposium on Quality Electronic Design (ISQED)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–8.
- [6] Jonathan Frankle and Michael Carbin, "The lottery ticket hypothesis: Finding sparse, trainable neural networks," *ICLR*, 2019.
- [7] Shiwei Liu, Tianlong Chen, Xiaohan Chen, Zahra Atashgahi, Lu Yin, Huanyu Kou, Li Shen, Mykola Pechenizkiy, Zhangyang Wang, and Decebal Constantin Mocanu, "Sparse training via boosting pruning plasticity with neuroregeneration," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 9908–9922, 2021.
- [8] Md Aamir Raihan and Tor Aamodt, "Sparse weight activation training," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 15625–15638, 2020.
- [9] James Diffenderfer and Bhavya Kailkhura, "Multi-prize lottery ticket hypothesis: Finding accurate binary neural networks by pruning a randomly weighted network," in *ICML*, 2021.
- [10] Haojin Yang, Martin Fritzsche, Christian Bartz, and Christoph Meinel, "Bmxnet: An open-source binary neural network implementation based on mxnet," in *Proceedings of the 25th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, 2017, pp. 1209–1212.
- [11] Jianhao Ding, Zhaofei Yu, Yonghong Tian, and Tiejun Huang, "Optimal ann-snn conversion for fast and accurate inference in deep spiking neural networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.11654*, 2021.
- [12] Emre O Neftci, Hesham Mostafa, and Friedemann Zenke, "Surrogate gradient learning in spiking neural networks: Bringing the power of gradient-based optimization to spiking neural networks," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 51–63, 2019.
- [13] Yu Qi, Jiangrong Shen, Yueming Wang, Huajin Tang, Hang Yu, Zhaohui Wu, Gang Pan, et al., "Jointly learning network connections and link weights in spiking neural networks," in *IJCAI*, 2018, pp. 1597–1603.
- [14] Wenzhe Guo, Mohammed E Fouda, Hasan Erdem Yantir, Ahmed M Eltawil, and Khaled Nabil Salama, "Unsupervised adaptive weight pruning for energy-efficient neuromorphic systems," *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, vol. 14, pp. 598876, 2020.
- [15] Rachmad Vidya Wicaksana Putra and Muhammad Shafique, "Q-spinn: A framework for quantizing spiking neural networks," in *2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–8.
- [16] Yixuan Wang, Yang Xu, Rui Yan, and Huajin Tang, "Deep spiking neural networks with binary weights for object recognition," *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive and Developmental Systems*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 514–523, 2020.
- [17] Youngeun Kim, Yuhang Li, Hyoungseob Park, Yeshwanth Venkatesha, Ruokai Yin, and Priyadarshini Panda, "Exploring lottery ticket hypothesis in spiking neural networks," in *ECCV*. Springer, 2022, pp. 102–120.
- [18] Kaushik Roy, Akhilesh Jaiswal, and Priyadarshini Panda, "Towards spike-based machine intelligence with neuromorphic computing," *Nature*, vol. 575, no. 7784, pp. 607–617, 2019.
- [19] Wei Fang, Yanqi Chen, Jianhao Ding, Ding Chen, Zhaofei Yu, Huihui Zhou, Timothée Masquelier, Yonghong Tian, and other contributors, "Spiking-jelly," <https://github.com/fangwei123456/spikingjelly>, 2020.

- [20] Yifan Hu, Yujie Wu, Lei Deng, and Guoqi Li, “Advancing residual learning towards powerful deep spiking neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.08954*, 2021.
- [21] Zhaokun Zhou, Yuesheng Zhu, Chao He, Yaowei Wang, Shuicheng Yan, Yonghong Tian, and Li Yuan, “Spikformer: When spiking neural network meets transformer,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.15425*, 2022.