

Learning by the F-adjoint

AHMED BOUGHAMMOURA*

HIGHER INSTITUTE OF INFORMATICS AND MATHEMATICS OF MONASTIR,
UNIVERSITY OF MONASTIR, 5000 MONASTIR, TUNISIA.

July 17, 2024

Abstract

A recent paper by Boughammoura (2023) describes the back-propagation algorithm in terms of an alternative formulation called the F-adjoint method. In particular, by the F-adjoint algorithm the computation of the loss gradient, with respect to each weight within the network, is straightforward and can simply be done. In this work, we develop and investigate this theoretical framework to improve some supervised learning algorithm for feed-forward neural network. Our main result is that by introducing some neural dynamical model combined by the gradient descent algorithm, we derived an equilibrium F-adjoint process which yields to some local learning rule for deep feed-forward networks setting. Experimental results on MNIST and Fashion-MNIST datasets, demonstrate that the proposed approach provide a significant improvements on the standard back-propagation training procedure ¹.

1 Introduction

It is well known that Artificial neural networks (ANNs) are inspired by biological systems in brains and have been utilized in many applications, among others classification, pattern recognition, and multivariate data analysis (Basheer and Hajmeer 2000 [4]). In practice, Back-propagation algorithm is the main component for gradient type learning rules for (ANNs). In 1986, D. Rumelhart and J. McClelland [14] have presented the neural networks using the back-propagation algorithm to achieve some classification problems. Since this work many other were developed to improve both theory and practice in association with the concept of back-propagation, see for example [16, 9] and references therein.

Nevertheless, back-propagation which is generally used in (ANNs) to provide the modification/update of their synaptic connections, or weights, during learning phase is revealed to be biologically unrealistic/non plausible. In particular, in (ANNs) each synaptic weight update depends on the activity and computations of all downstream neurons, but biological

*Correspondence to ahmed.boughammoura@gmail.com

¹The code to reproduce the experimental results is available at <https://github.com/ahmadbougham/F-adjoint-Learning>

neurons change their connection strength based solely on local signals (see [11]). This could be mathematically expressed by the deficiency of local formulation in the back-propagation method, as mentioned in [11]. The main question that motivate this paper is how one could reveal, capture and specify a local behavior behind the back-propagation procedure.

In the past few years, several models [2, 15, 16, 17] have been proposed that characterize locally the back-propagation. These models are considered to be biologically plausible and more closely approximate, in many applications, the back-propagation algorithm. In this spirit of investigation, we have introduced the notion of F-adjoint propagation [5, 6] to provide an alternative formulation of the back-propagation in order to highlight some mathematical properties within this method.

In the present work, we shall continue this exploration further by proposing a family of learning rules based on this F-adjoint method. In particular, by using a neural dynamical model, we provide an "asymptotic" version of the F-adjoint by which we introduce some local learning rule to update the synaptic weights of each layer in an (ANN).

Inspired by a recent gradient-based learning method for feed-forward neural networks [15], we present learning rules that are (i) gradient-descent based algorithm, (ii) local in space, (iii) local in time, and in particular do not require storing intermediate states. To meet all these criteria at once, we start from gradient-descent optimization of the loss function, and we reformulate learning process within the F-adjoint formulation. In particular, we provide the equivalence of the backpropagation and some methods based on the so-called equilibrium propagation [15] which is essentially a combination of a neural dynamics with a learning rule based on synaptic plasticity models, which provides the change in the synaptic weights.

To end this section, let us emphasize that the primary goal of this work is the development of a significant mathematical framework in which we introduce some precise definitions that cover the concepts commonly needed in supervised learning algorithm for feedforward neural network, such as sequential models, forward/F-propagation and backward/F-adjoint propagation and local learning rule, etc. Specifically, we could be able, within this F-adjoint formulation, to provide and prove simply, many properties about the backpropagation method in both fundamental and application viewpoints.

2 Notation and mathematical background

The purpose of this section is to provide a brief overview of the mathematical framework used in the F-adjoint theory which is introduced in [6] We consider the simple case of a fully-connected deep multi-layer perceptron (MLP) composed of L layers trained in a supervised setting. Following [3] (see (2.18) in page 24), we will denote such an architecture by

$$A[N_0, \dots, N_\ell, \dots, N_L] \tag{1}$$

where N_0 is the size of the input layer, N_ℓ is the size of hidden layer ℓ , and N_L is the size of the output layer; L is defined as the depth of the ANN, then the neural network is called as Deep Neural Network (DNN).

Notation describing a multi-layered FF network (MLP) is summarized in table 1. To simplify notation, we assume bias is stored in an extra column on each weight matrix W^ℓ and

Term	Description
W^ℓ	Weight matrix of the layer ℓ with bias, $W^\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\ell \times (N_{\ell-1}+1)}$
$W_\#^\ell$	Weight matrix of the layer ℓ without bias, $W^\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\ell \times N_{\ell-1}}$
Y^ℓ	Pre-activation vector at layer ℓ , $Y^\ell = W^\ell X^{\ell-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\ell}$
X^ℓ	Activation vector at the layer ℓ , $X^\ell = (\sigma^\ell(Y^\ell), 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\ell} \times \{1\}$
σ^ℓ	Point-wise activation function of the layer ℓ with bias, $\sigma^\ell : \mathbb{R}^{N_\ell} \ni Y^\ell \mapsto \sigma^\ell(Y^\ell) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\ell}$

Table 1: Notations describing a (DNN).

we assume a 1 is concatenated to the end of the activity vector X^ℓ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\sigma^\ell = \sigma$ for all $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$. Consider an L -layer feedforward network with input $X^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0}$. The standard training approach is to minimize a loss, $J(y, \hat{y})$, with respect to the weights, where y is the desired output and $\hat{y} = X^L$ is the prediction of the network.

3 The F-propagation and F-adjoint

Modern feedforward deep networks are built on the key concept of layers. In the forward passes, each network consists of a family of some L pre-activation and activation vectors, where L is the depth of the network. To update these networks, the backward passes rely on backpropagating through the same L layers via some rule, which generally necessitates that we store the intermediate values of these layers. Thus, sequence mathematical models are commonly used for many applications of deep networks. Moreover, sequence modeling has shown continuous advances in model architectures. Specifically, a feedforward sequence model can be written as the following.

Definition 3.1 (Sequence model).

Suppose that we are given an input vector $X^0 = (X_1^0, \dots, X_m^0)$, and try to predict some output vector $y^0 = (y_1^0, \dots, y_m^0)$. To predict the output y_i^0 for some i , we are constrained to only use X_1^0, \dots, X_i^0 . Mathematically, a sequence model is a function $f : \mathcal{X}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^m$ that produces the mapping

$$\hat{y}^0 = f(X^0) \tag{2}$$

if it satisfies the causal constraint that \hat{y}_i^0 depends only on X_1^0, \dots, X_i^0 and not on any X_{i+1}^0, \dots, X_m^0 . In addition, when X_i^0 , for some i , is computed via two-step, we shall refer to this model as a two-step sequence model.

Let us noted that, the main goal of learning in the sequence model setting is to find a function f that minimizes some expected loss between the actual outputs and the predictions, $L(y^0, f(X^0))$. Within this formalism and based on the idea of the two-scale rule for back-propagation [5], the first author have introduced the F-adjoint concept in [6].

For the sake of coherency of presentation we shall recall and revise the definition of the this notion and provide some straightforward properties and improvements of this adjoint-like representation.

Definition 3.2 (An F-propagation).

Let $X^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0}$ be a given data, σ be a coordinate-wise map from \mathbb{R}^{N_ℓ} into $\mathbb{R}^{N_{\ell+1}}$ and $W^\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\ell \times N_{\ell-1}}$ for all $1 \leq \ell \leq L$. We say that we have a two-step recursive F-propagation F through the DNN $A[N_0, \dots, N_L]$ if one has the following family of vectors

$$F(X^0) := \{Y^1, X^1, \dots, X^{L-1}, Y^L, X^L\} \quad (3)$$

with

$$Y^\ell = W^\ell X^{\ell-1}, \quad X^\ell = \sigma(Y^\ell), \quad X^\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\ell}, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, L. \quad (4)$$

Before going further, let us point that in the above definition the prefix "F" stands for "Feed-forward".

Definition 3.3 (The F-adjoint of an F-propagation).

Let $(X^0, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_L}$ be a given feature-target pair and let $X_*^L \in \mathbb{R}^{N_L}$ be a given vector. We define the F-adjoint F_* , through the DNN $A[N_0, \dots, N_L]$, associated to the F-propagation $F(X^0)$ as follows

$$F_*(X^0, y) := \{X_*^L, Y_*^L, X_*^{L-1}, \dots, X_*^1, Y_*^1\} \quad (5)$$

with

$$Y_*^\ell = X_*^\ell \odot \sigma'(Y^\ell), \quad X_*^{\ell-1} = (W_{\#}^\ell)^\top Y_*^\ell, \quad h = L, \dots, 1. \quad (6)$$

Firstly, let us precise that we shall introduce the following schematic diagram to illustrate how to recover/find easily the formulas (6) (see Figure1).




Figure 1: A schematic diagram showing the F and F_* processes.

To refine and develop further the Fadjoint transformation we shall introduce the F-adjoint through a single ℓ^{th} hidden layer

Secondly, we shall mention that one gets the following immediate properties gives some straightforward relations between the vectors Y_*^ℓ , $X_*^{\ell-1}$, Y^ℓ and $X^{\ell-1}$.

Hereafter we us the following notations

$$F(X^0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(Y^\ell, X^\ell)\}_{\ell=1}^L \quad \text{et} \quad F_*(X^0, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(X_*^\ell, Y_*^\ell)\}_{\ell=L}^1$$

the set of steps taken during forward propagation and back-propagation associated with the input X^0 through the DNN $A[N_0, \dots, N_L]$.

3.1 Properties of the F-adjoint

Lemma 3.1.

For a fixed data point $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_L}$, with feature vector x and label y and a fixed loss function J . If $X_*^L = \frac{\partial J}{\partial X^L}$ then for any $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$, we have

$$Y_*^\ell (X^{\ell-1})^\top = \frac{\partial J}{\partial W^\ell}. \quad (7)$$

The formulas given by (7) have two factors: the F-adjoint vector Y_*^ℓ through the layer ℓ and the transpose of the activation vector $(X^{\ell-1})^\top$ through the precedent layer. Both terms are available in $F_*(X^0, y)$ and $F(X^0)$ respectively. Thus, to update the weight W^ℓ of layer ℓ we need the couple of vectors $(Y_*^\ell, X^{\ell-1}) \in F_*(X^0, y) \times F(X^0)$ for any $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$. As consequence, to evaluate the loss gradient we simply need to determine only the sets $F(X^0)$ and $F_*(X^0, y)$.

Proof.

Firstly, let us recall that if one has

$$W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}, \quad X \in \mathbb{R}^{(q-1)} \times \{1\}, \quad Y = WX, \quad f = f(Y) \quad (8)$$

then

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial W} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial W_{i,j}} \right)_{i,j} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial Y} X^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q} \quad (9)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial X} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial X_i} \right)_i = W_\#^\top \frac{\partial f}{\partial Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times 1} \quad (10)$$

since $X_q = 1$. Furthermore, for any differentiable function with respect to Y

$$F : \mathbb{R}^n \ni Y \mapsto X := \sigma(Y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto F(X) \in \mathbb{R}$$

we have

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial Y} = \frac{\partial F}{\partial X} \odot \sigma'(Y). \quad (11)$$

Now, by using the chain rule for the loss function J with respect to Y^ℓ , $X^{\ell-1}$ and W^ℓ respectively, we have

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial Y^\ell} = \frac{\partial J}{\partial X^\ell} \frac{\partial X^\ell}{\partial Y^\ell} = X_*^\ell \odot \sigma'(Y^\ell) = Y_*^\ell,$$

and

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial X^{\ell-1}} = (W_\#^\ell)^\top \frac{\partial J}{\partial Y^\ell} = (W_\#^\ell)^\top Y_*^\ell = X_*^{\ell-1}$$

As consequence

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial W^\ell} = \frac{\partial J}{\partial Y^\ell} (X^{\ell-1})^\top = Y_*^\ell (X^{\ell-1})^\top.$$

□

3.2 Learning by F-adjoint

The mathematical learning rule to change a weight of a network can be local or non-local. According to a 'neuro-physiological postulate' which is referred to as Hebb's rule, the second possibility must be excluded in case the weight is associated with a synapse. More precisely, in [10], Hebb conjectured that "When an axon of cell A is near enough to excite a cell B and repeatedly or persistently takes part in firing it, some growth process or metabolic change takes place in one or both cells so that A 's efficiency, as one of the cells firing B , is increased". Thus, a change of the weights may depend only on local, in space and time, variables. In this context, we shall introduce the following mathematical definition of a local learning rule written with the F-adjoint formulation.

Definition 3.4 (Local F-learning rule).

For a given F - F_ sets*

$$F(X^0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(Y^\ell, X^\ell)\}_{\ell=1}^L \quad \text{et} \quad F_*(X^0, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(X_*^\ell, Y_*^\ell)\}_{\ell=L}^1$$

We shall say that the associated deep feedforward network is trained by a local F-learning rule if every Y_^ℓ , $\ell = L, \dots, 1$ depend only on the initial data X_*^L and the F-propagation set $F(X^0)$.*

3.3 Non-local learning rule

Consider a dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}\}$, for any data point $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0} \times \mathbb{R}^{N_L}$, with feature vector x and label y and a fixed loss function J . If $X_*^L = \frac{\partial J}{\partial X^L}$ then for any $\ell \in \{1, \dots, L\}$, we have the following learning update rule given by (7), namely

$$Y_*^\ell (X^{\ell-1})^\top = \frac{\partial J}{\partial W^\ell}.$$

At iteration t_0 , an explicit SGD iteration subtracts the gradient of the loss function J from the parameters:

$$W^\ell(t_0 + 1) = W^\ell(t_0) - \eta \frac{\partial J}{\partial W^\ell(t_0)} = W^\ell(t_0) - \eta Y_*^\ell(t_0) (X^{\ell-1}(t_0))^\top,$$

with step size η . The back-propagation [14] is a common algorithm for implementing SGD in deep networks. Here, a pseudo-code of the SGD rewritten in the F-adjoint formulation.

Algorithm 1: Nonlocal F-adjoint algorithm

```
Data: Dataset  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}\}$ , parameters  $W = \{W^1, \dots, W^L\}$ , learning rate  $\eta$ .  
/* Iterate over dataset */  
for  $(x, y \in \mathcal{D})$  do  
    /* F-propagation */  
     $X^0 = x$   
    for  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$  do  
         $Y^\ell = W^\ell X^{\ell-1}$   
         $X^\ell = \sigma(Y^\ell)$   
    end  
    /* F-adjoint propagation */  
     $X_*^0 = \frac{\partial J}{\partial X^L}(\cdot, y)$   
    for  $\ell = L, \dots, 1$  do  
         $Y_*^\ell = X_*^\ell \odot \sigma'(Y^\ell)$   
         $X_*^{\ell-1} = (W_\#^\ell)^\top Y_*^\ell$   
    end  
    /* Update weights */  
    for  $\ell = L, \dots, 1$  do  
         $W^\ell = W^\ell - \eta Y_*^\ell (X^{\ell-1})^\top$   
    end  
end
```

3.4 Local learning rule

We now present an explanation of the main idea behind the local learning rule by using the F-adjoint terms Y_*^ℓ, X_*^ℓ . As it is clear from the above non-local learning rule (see Algorithm 1), the major disadvantage inherent in the use of this method lies in the difficulty of computing the factor

$$Y_*^\ell \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X_*^\ell \odot \sigma'(Y^\ell). \quad (12)$$

In fact, the computation of this term is achieved by applying, recursively from the output loss through the layer $l + 1$, the following relation

$$X_*^\ell = (W_\#^{\ell+1})^\top Y_*^{\ell+1} = (W_\#^{\ell+1})^\top X_*^{\ell+1} \odot \sigma'(Y^{\ell+1}). \quad (13)$$

Since the update at each ℓ -layer depends on the F-adjoint terms of all superordinate layers in the hierarchy, thus this procedure is not local.

Main idea of this approach The procedure does not compute the true gradient of the objective function, but rather approximates it at a precision which is proven to be directly related to the degree of symmetry of the feedforward and feedback weights.

Here, we shall propose a method for computing the F-adjoint term X_*^ℓ using a dynamical systems approach. Recall that $X_*^\ell = \frac{\partial J}{\partial X^\ell}$ (The loss derivative with respect to the ℓ -layer activation). Particularly, we define a dynamical system on a space state similar to the F-set $F(X^0)$ denoted $\{(X_\sim^\ell(t), Y_\sim^\ell(t))\}_{\ell=L}^1$, where of each ℓ -layer the pair $(X_\sim^\ell(t), Y_\sim^\ell(t))$ corresponds to the state, at time t , of the dynamical system driven by the input $X_*^\ell(t_0)$ (

t_0 is a fixed iteration step) and starting from $X^\ell(t_0)$. The simplest dynamical system to achieve this is a leaky-integrator driven by top-down feedback, defined on the state space of F-propagation type, by the following autonomous leaky integrate-and-fire neuron form, introduced in [7] (Chapter 4).

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dX_\sim^\ell}{dt}(t) &= -X_\sim^\ell(t) + X_*^\ell(t_0) \\ X_\sim^\ell(0) &= X^\ell(t_0) \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where the F-F_{*} pair $(X^\ell(t_0), X_*^\ell(t_0))$ is given at a fixed iteration $t_0 > 0$ for the ℓ -hidden layer. the above dynamical system that is defined by an F-pass vector X_\sim^ℓ will be called an F-dynamical system.

Then (14) converges to the minimum of some state $X_\sim^\ell(\infty)$ which is given by $\frac{dX_\sim^\ell}{dt}(t) = 0$, thus

$$X_\sim^\ell(\infty) = X_*^\ell(t_0) \quad (15)$$

The equality (15) shows clearly that the steady-state equilibrium of (14) is exactly equal to necessary term needed to update the weights.

On the other hand, by (13) and (15) one has

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dX_\sim^\ell}{dt}(t) &= -X_\sim^\ell(t) + (W_\#^{\ell+1}(t_0))^\top X_*^{\ell+1}(t_0) \odot \sigma'(Y^{\ell+1}(t_0)) \\ &= -X_\sim^\ell(t) + (W_\#^{\ell+1}(t_0))^\top (X_\sim^{\ell+1}(\infty)) \odot \sigma'(Y^{\ell+1}(t_0)) \\ X_\sim^\ell(0) &= X^\ell(t_0) \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Let us denote for any $\ell = 1, \dots, L$

$$Y_\sim^\ell(\infty) = (X_\sim^\ell(\infty)) \odot \sigma'(Y^\ell(t_0)) \quad (17)$$

and as consequence, we shall define the equilibrium F-propagation $F_\sim(X^0, y)$, associated to the pair of feature and target (X^0, y) as follows :

$$F_\sim(X^0, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(X_\sim^\ell(\infty), Y_\sim^\ell(\infty))\}_{\ell=L}^1$$

Then (16) is rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dX_\sim^\ell}{dt}(t) &= -X_\sim^\ell(t) + (W_\#^{\ell+1}(t_0))^\top (Y_\sim^{\ell+1}(\infty)) \\ X_\sim^\ell(0) &= X^\ell(t_0) \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Let us emphasize that the systems (18) and (14) are equivalent, thus they converges to the same optimum, namely $X_*^\ell(t_0)$.

The equivalent F-dynamical system (18) forms the backbone of the local F-adjoint learning rule. The algorithm 2 proceeds as follows. First, an F-pass computes the L couples constituting the set $F(X^0)$ then starting from the top-layer equilibrium F-propagation pair $(X_\sim^L(\infty) = X_*^L, Y_\sim^L(\infty) = X_\sim^L(\infty) \odot \sigma'(Y^L))$ the equilibrium state $X_\sim^{L-1}(\infty)$ of the penultimate layer is computed, then the associated $Y_\sim^{L-1}(\infty) = X_\sim^{L-1}(\infty) \odot \sigma'(Y^{L-1})$, the network

enters into an F-dynamical phase where the system (18) is iterated for all layers until convergence for each layer. Upon convergence, the equilibrium state of each layer multiplied by $\sigma'(Y^\ell)$ is precisely equal to Y_*^ℓ , and are used to update the weights.

Algorithm 2: Local F-adjoint algorithm

Data: Dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}\}$, parameters $W = \{W^1, \dots, W^L\}$, inference learning rate τ , weight learning rate η .

```

/* Iterate over dataset */
for  $(x, y \in \mathcal{D})$  do
  /* F-propagation */
   $X^0 = x$ 
  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$  do
     $Y^\ell = W^\ell X^{\ell-1}$ 
     $X^\ell = \sigma(Y^\ell)$ 
  end
  /* Equilibrium F-adjoint */
   $X_\sim^L(\infty) = X_*^L := \frac{\partial J}{\partial X^L}(\cdot, y)$ 
   $Y_\sim^L(\infty) = X_\sim^L(\infty) \odot \sigma'(Y^L)$ 
  for  $\ell = L, \dots, 1$  do
    /* Equilibrium state  $X_\sim^{\ell-1}(\infty)$  */
     $X_\sim^{\ell-1} = X^{\ell-1}$ 
    while not converged do
       $dX_\sim^{\ell-1}(t) = -X_\sim^{\ell-1}(t) + (W_\#^\ell)^\top Y_\sim^\ell(\infty)$ 
       $X_\sim^{\ell-1}(t+1) = X_\sim^{\ell-1}(t) + \tau dX_\sim^{\ell-1}(t)$ 
    end
     $Y_\sim^{\ell-1}(\infty) = (X_\sim^{\ell-1}(\infty)) \odot \sigma'(Y^{\ell-1})$ 
  end
  /* Update weights */
  for  $\ell = L, \dots, 1$  do
     $W^\ell = W^\ell - \eta Y_\sim^\ell(\infty) (X^{\ell-1})^\top$ 
  end
end

```

Let us emphasize that the learning update rule in the above algorithm is given by $\eta Y_\sim^\ell(\infty) (X^{\ell-1})^\top$, thus the associated learning rule is

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial W^\ell} = Y_\sim^\ell(\infty) (X^{\ell-1})^\top \quad (19)$$

where for each $\ell \in \{L, \dots, 1\}$ one has

$$Y_\sim^\ell(\infty) = (X_\sim^\ell(\infty)) \odot \sigma'(Y^\ell), \quad X_\sim^L(\infty) = X_*^L$$

which confirm that the present learning rule depend only on the initial data X_*^L and the F-propagation set $F(X^0)$, thus it is a local one relatively to the Definition 3.4.

4 Experiments

Firstly, let us recall that the MNIST (Modified National Institute of Standards and Technology) is a standard benchmark dataset of handwritten digit images made in 1998 (Lecun et al., [8]). Firstly, we shall flattened the 28*28 images to have the following model architecture.

Secondly, we shall compare performance of the proposed learning algorithms on two image classification datasets (MNIST and Fashion-MNIST) by using a simple shallow Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) with the architecture $A[784, 128, 10]$, sigmoid activation function through each hidden layer, Xavier weight initialization, Cross-entropy loss function and learning rate 0.001. Let us mention, that we have deliberately fixed this (MLP) architecture for all conducted experiments.

Thirdly, for the optimizer, here we choose to use the standard SGD algorithm written with the F-adjoint and equilibrium F-adjoint steps respectively. We train the model by batch with the following appropriate parameters : number of epochs = 1000, learning rate = 0.001 and batch size = 128. A summary of parameter choices are given in the following table.

Finally, in order to determine the performance of the neural network and predictions and report the results produced by our neural network, we choose to calculate the training accuracy and testing accuracy.

4.1 Results for MNIST dataset

F-adjoint model	Training accuracy	Testing accuracy
Non-local learning rule	99.233 %	97.879 %
Local learning rule	97.094 %	96.629 %

Table 2: Accuracy results for the MNIST dataset.

4.2 Results for Fashion-MNIST dataset

F-adjoint model	Training accuracy	Testing accuracy
Non-local learning rule	95.025 %	89.770 %
Local learning rule	89.893 %	88.58 %

Table 3: Accuracy results for the Fashion-MNIST dataset.

It can be seen that training accuracy tends to increase as the epoch increases. Meanwhile, testing accuracy rate didn't increase significantly.

In this section, we test and compare F-adjoint based algorithms to by training these models on supervised classification tasks. Results




Figure 2: Accuracy for MNIST with nonlocal learning rule.




Figure 3: Accuracy for Fashion-MNIST with nonlocal learning rule.




Figure 4: Accuracy for MNIST with local learning rule.




Figure 5: Accuracy for Fashion-MNIST with local learning rule.

5 Conclusion

In this work, by using the F-adjoint formulation combined with a leak-integrator dynamical system, we propose a local F-learning rule to train feed-forward deep neural networks. The proposed model consists only of two steps, namely F-propagation and an equilibrium F-propagation phase. Experiment results revealed that the proposed approach can achieve results similar to the one based only on the F-adjoint version, which is equivalent to the standard back-propagation method. We believe that F-adjoint techniques provide some mathematical setting within we can describe straightforward some important training processes.

Our work suggests an immediate direction of future research, including:

- Replace the W^T weight transpose by a random matrix B with the same dimensions

as W^T for each layer in the F-dynamical system (18). This procedure yields to some new variation of the so-called feedback alignment algorithm [13];

- For the equilibrium F-adjoint, we propose some scaling on the initialization of the procedure by choosing $\mu X_{\sim}^L(\infty)$ for some $\mu > 0$ instead of $X_{\sim}^L(\infty)$;
- Investigate the regularization process in the local learning rule.

However, some open questions also remain on the side of mathematical generalization. F-adjoint framework only describes propagation processes in feed-forward artificial neural networks, and it may be different in different contexts. A particularly interesting type of result to consider in the future regards the relationship between F-adjoint concept and some recurrent-type artificial neural networks, for example.

To end this section, we may conjecture that by *local* learning rule (19), the classification accuracies tends to be approximately similar for the training and the testing datasets.

References

- [1] Shaojie Bai, J Zico Kolter, and Vladlen Koltun. An empirical evaluation of generic convolutional and recurrent networks for sequence modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.01271*, 2018.
- [2] Shaojie Bai, J Zico Kolter, and Vladlen Koltun. Deep equilibrium models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [3] Pierre Baldi. *Deep learning in science*. Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- [4] Imad A Basheer and Maha Hajmeer. Artificial neural networks: fundamentals, computing, design, and application. *Journal of microbiological methods*, 43(1):3–31, 2000.
- [5] Ahmed Boughammoura. A two-step rule for backpropagation. *International Journal of Informatics and Applied Mathematics*, 6(1):57–69, 2023.
- [6] Ahmed Boughammoura. Backpropagation and F-adjoint. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.13820*, 2023.
- [7] Gerstner, Wulfram and Kistler, Werner M. *Spiking neuron models: Single neurons, populations, plasticity*. Cambridge university press, 2002.
- [8] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.
- [9] Timothy P Lillicrap, Adam Santoro, Luke Marris, Colin J Akerman, and Geoffrey Hinton. Backpropagation and the brain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 21(6):335–346, 2020.
- [10] Hebb, Donald O. Organization of behavior. newblock *New York: Wiley. J. Clin. Psychol*, 6(3): 335-307, (1949).

- [11] Mazzoni, Pietro, Richard A. Andersen, and Michael I. Jordan. A more biologically plausible learning rule for neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 88(10):4433-4437, 1991.
- [12] Beren Millidge, Alexander Tschantz, Anil K Seth, and Christopher L Buckley. Activation relaxation: A local dynamical approximation to backpropagation in the brain. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.05359*, 2020.
- [13] Nøkland, Arild. Direct feedback alignment provides learning in deep neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).
- [14] David E Rumelhart, Geoffrey E Hinton, and Ronald J Williams. Learning representations by back-propagating errors. *nature*, 323(6088):533-536, 1986.
- [15] Scellier, Benjamin, and Yoshua Bengio. Equivalence of equilibrium propagation and recurrent backpropagation. *newblock Neural computation*, 31(2), 312-329, 2019.
- [16] James CR Whittington and Rafal Bogacz. Theories of error back-propagation in the brain. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 23(3):235-250, 2019.
- [17] Xie, Xiaohui and Seung, H Sebastian. Equivalence of backpropagation and contrastive Hebbian learning in a layered network. *Neural computation*, 15(2):441-454, 2003.