

Exploring Variance Reduction in Importance Sampling for Efficient DNN Training

Takuro Kutsuna*

*Toyota Central R&D Labs., Inc.

Abstract

Importance sampling is widely used to improve the efficiency of deep neural network (DNN) training by reducing the variance of gradient estimators. However, efficiently assessing the variance reduction relative to uniform sampling remains challenging due to computational overhead. This paper proposes a method for estimating variance reduction during DNN training using only minibatches sampled under importance sampling. By leveraging the proposed method, the paper also proposes an *effective minibatch size* to enable automatic learning rate adjustment. An absolute metric to quantify the efficiency of importance sampling is also introduced as well as an algorithm for real-time estimation of importance scores based on moving gradient statistics. Theoretical analysis and experiments on benchmark datasets demonstrated that the proposed algorithm consistently reduces variance, improves training efficiency, and enhances model accuracy compared with current importance-sampling approaches while maintaining minimal computational overhead.

1 Introduction

Importance sampling is widely used in various research areas for two primary purposes. First, it is used to estimate the expectation of a function $f(x)$ of a random variable x under the target distribution $p(x)$, where direct sampling from $p(x)$ is challenging. Instead, an alternative distribution $q(x)$, from which sampling is feasible, is used. Applications include Bayesian posterior estimation [22] and particle filters [20]. Second, it aims to reduce the variance of the expectation estimator of $f(x)$ by carefully selecting the alternative distribution $q(x)$. Examples include rare event estimation [12] and reliability analysis [2].

Importance sampling has also been applied to improve the efficiency of deep neural network (DNN) training [1, 14, 11, 13, 4], which falls under the second purpose of variance reduction. In standard stochastic gradient descent (SGD) training, data samples are uniformly drawn from the training dataset to form minibatches. In contrast, importance sampling-based approaches for DNN training estimate the importance score of each training sample using specific criteria during training, define an alternative sampling distribution proportional to these importance scores, and construct minibatches by sampling in accordance with this distribution. To ensure unbiased estimation of the expected training loss, importance weights are applied to each sample. Accurately estimating the importance score of each sample enables importance sampling to reduce the variance of the estimator for the expected loss (or its gradient) compared with uniform sampling in SGD.

The effectiveness of variance reduction achieved through importance sampling depends on the choice of the alternative distribution, i.e., the estimated importance score of each training sample in DNN-training applications; however, quantifying this effectiveness is challenging. While the variance-reduction rate can be evaluated by concurrently sampling from both the uniform distribution and alternative distribution to compute the variance of the loss for each case, this approach introduces significant computational overhead, making it impractical in most scenarios. Although metrics, such as the effective sample size (ESS) [15, 19] and its variants [21], have been proposed as proxies for the effectiveness of importance sampling, they are insufficient for assessing variance-reduction efficiency in DNN training for the following reasons. While the

primary objective of importance sampling in DNN training is to reduce the variance of the loss estimation compared with uniform sampling, it is implicitly assumed with ESS that importance sampling cannot achieve a variance smaller than that of uniform sampling [21]. However, this assumption does not necessarily hold in the context of DNN training with importance sampling.

To address this issue, this paper proposes a method for estimating the variance reduction achieved by importance sampling relative to uniform sampling during DNN training. It also estimates the lower bound of variance reduction achievable with the theoretically optimal alternative distribution. A key advantage of this method is that all estimations are executed using only minibatches sampled from the alternative distribution. Thus, the computational overhead remains minimal.

On the basis of the proposed method, this paper also proposes an effective minibatch size (EMS) for automatic learning-rate adjustment. We derive the EMS N_{ems} for importance sampling with a minibatch size of N such that uniform sampling with a minibatch size of N_{ems} achieves the same variance as that obtained with importance sampling. By leveraging the relationship between minibatch size and optimal learning rate [25, 26, 18], we derived an automatic learning-rate adjustment based on the EMS. We also introduce an absolute metric to evaluate the efficiency of importance sampling and designed an importance-score-estimation algorithm: The metric assigns a value of 0 to indicate the theoretically optimal case and 1 to represent equivalence with uniform sampling. With this metric, the algorithm estimates the importance score of each data point during training by using the moving statistics of per-sample loss gradients. Specifically, the hyperparameter for the moving statistics, which determines the weight assigned to past observations, is designed on the basis of this metric.

In summary, the contributions of this study are as follows:

- We propose a method for estimating the variance reduction of the loss-gradient estimator in DNN training with importance sampling compared with uniform sampling, while maintaining minimal computational overhead (section 4).
- We propose an EMS on the basis of the proposed method and apply it for automatic learning-rate adjustment (section 5).
- We introduce a metric to evaluate the efficiency of importance sampling and designed an algorithm to estimate importance scores using moving statistics (section 6).
- Experimental results on benchmark datasets indicate the superiority of the proposed method over current importance-sampling methods for DNN training (section 7).

2 Related work

Importance sampling for DNN training Several studies investigated the use of importance sampling to improve the efficiency of DNN training. Alain et al. [1] proposed a method for distributed training with importance sampling. With this method, the gradient norm of each training sample is computed across multiple computation nodes, aggregated on a master node, and used to carry out training with importance sampling. Although they discussed the variance reduction achieved through importance sampling, they did not explore efficient estimation methods or applications such as learning-rate adjustment, as proposed in this paper. Johnson and Guestrin [11] investigated accelerating SGD training by analyzing the convergence speed of SGD to the optimal solution, leading to the development of importance sampling based on per-sample gradient norms. They proposed a robust regression model to estimate the importance score of each training sample. They also introduced a method for automatically adjusting the learning rate based on the estimated "expected squared norm of the gradient." This method differs from the EMS-based learning-rate adjustment we derived. Similarly, Katharopoulos and Fleuret [14] proposed an importance-sampling method for accelerating the convergence speed of SGD to the optimal solution. They introduced a two-step approach for constructing minibatches with importance sampling. Importance scores are first calculated for a large initial minibatch (larger than the final minibatch size), then, a subsampling step is carried out on the basis of the computed importance scores to generate the final minibatch. Katharopoulos and Fleuret [13] proposed

using per-sample loss values as importance scores. To speed up the estimation of these loss values, they suggested training a smaller auxiliary model for loss estimation alongside the primary model. Chang et al. [4] proposed a method for maintaining a history of model predictions during training and estimating per-sample importance scores using either the average or variance of these predictions.

Several studies explored the effectiveness of importance sampling in convex optimization problems [32, 23, 28]. However, since DNN training involves non-convex problems, these methods are challenging to apply directly.

Other training approaches with non-uniform sampling Curriculum learning [3, 27] is another approach that uses non-uniform sampling of training data. The core idea is to reorder the training dataset on the basis of data difficulty, prioritizing easier samples during the early stages of training and gradually introducing harder samples as training progresses. This strategy aims to enhance the generalization performance of the final model. In contrast, importance sampling executes training that is theoretically equivalent to uniform sampling but with reduced variance, as the estimated expected loss or gradient remains unbiased.

Efficiency measure in importance sampling ESS [15, 19] was proposed as a metric to evaluate the efficiency of importance sampling and is widely used in applications such as detecting degeneracy in particle filters and sequential Monte Carlo methods [20]. It is estimated on the basis of the ratio of the variance of an estimator $\hat{\mu}$ under the target distribution π , $\text{Var}_\pi[\hat{\mu}]$, to the variance of an estimator $\tilde{\mu}$ under the proposal distribution q , $\text{Var}_q[\tilde{\mu}]$.¹ This concept is closely related to the EMS we propose. However, due to assumptions and approximations in its derivation, the property $\text{Var}_\pi[\hat{\mu}] \leq \text{Var}_q[\tilde{\mu}]$ is implicitly assumed with ESS [21]. The same limitation applies to its extension, generalized-ESS [21]. While this property does not pose significant issues for applications such as detecting degeneracy, it becomes a critical constraint when applying importance sampling to DNN training. This is because the primary objective of importance sampling in DNN training is to achieve lower variance of the estimator compared with uniform sampling, which serves as the target distribution. In contrast, our EMS does not impose such constraints, making it suitable for applications of importance sampling in DNN training.

3 Preliminary

In this section, we summarize key aspects of importance sampling for DNN training that are relevant to our research.

3.1 Notations

Let the training dataset, consisting of M pairs of input x and ground truth label y , be represented as $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}} = \{(x^{(i)}, y^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^M$. Each pair $(x^{(i)}, y^{(i)})$ is assumed to be i.i.d. in accordance with the distribution $p(x, y)$. Let f_θ denote a DNN model to be trained, where θ represents the model parameters. The training loss function for the i -th data point $(x^{(i)}, y^{(i)})$ is defined as $\mathcal{L}(\theta; i) := \ell(f_\theta(x^{(i)}), y^{(i)})$, where ℓ can be a function such as the cross-entropy function. The gradient of the loss function with respect to θ is denoted as $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)$. Since θ represents a vector, $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)$ is also a vector. Specifically, the gradient with respect to the k -th parameter θ_k is represented as $\nabla_{\theta_k} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)$, which is a scalar. Additionally, for a natural number a , let $\llbracket a \rrbracket := \{1, \dots, a\}$. The expectation and variance (or covariance matrix) of a random variable z following the distribution $p(z)$ are denoted as $\mathbb{E}_{z \sim p(z)}[\cdot]$ and $\mathbb{V}_{z \sim p(z)}[\cdot]$, respectively. Note that these become a vector and a matrix, respectively, when z is a vector. Let $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^M$ denote the M -dimensional space in which all elements are strictly positive.

¹The notations follow those in a previous study [21].

3.2 DNN training based on uniform sampling

In DNN training based on uniform sampling, the following expectation of the loss gradient is computed:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{unif}} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)] := \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{unif}}(i)} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)], \quad (1)$$

where $p_{\text{unif}}(i)$ denotes a uniform distribution defined over $\llbracket M \rrbracket$, the index set of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, indicating $p_{\text{unif}}(i) = 1/M$ ($\forall i \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$). Since $\mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{unif}}(i)} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)] \approx \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim p(x,y)} [\nabla_{\theta} \ell(f_{\theta}(x), y)]$, the expectation computed using uniform sampling from $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ approximately corresponds to the expectation under $p(x, y)$. In standard SGD training, $\mathbb{E}_{\text{unif}} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)]$ is estimated using a minibatch sampled in accordance with $p_{\text{unif}}(i)$.²

3.3 Training with importance sampling

Let $W \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^M$ denote the importance score, where the i -th element w_i represents the importance of $(x^{(i)}, y^{(i)}) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$. In DNN training using importance sampling with W , the following expectation is computed:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\text{is}(W)} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)] &:= \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} [r(i; W) \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)], \\ r(i; W) &:= \frac{p_{\text{unif}}(i)}{p_{\text{is}}(i; W)}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $p_{\text{is}}(i; W)$ is a distribution defined over $\llbracket M \rrbracket$ and given by $p_{\text{is}}(i; W) \propto w_i$, which indicates $p_{\text{is}}(i; W) = w_i / \sum_{i' \in \llbracket M \rrbracket} w_{i'}$. The term $r(i; W)$ is referred to as the importance-sampling weight, or simply the weight, of data point i .

3.4 Expectation equivalence

The following relationship holds for any $W \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^M$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{unif}} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)] = \mathbb{E}_{\text{is}(W)} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)], \quad (3)$$

which indicates that the expectation of the loss gradient remains identical under both uniform sampling and importance sampling, regardless of W (see Appendix A.1 for a detailed derivation of (3)).

3.5 Comparison of variance

The covariance matrices of the loss gradient for uniform sampling and importance sampling are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_{\text{unif}} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)] &:= \mathbb{V}_{i \sim p_{\text{unif}}(i)} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)], \\ \mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W)} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)] &:= \mathbb{V}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} [r(i; W) \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)]. \end{aligned}$$

Although the expectations of the loss gradient for uniform sampling and importance sampling are identical regardless of W , their variances may vary depending on W .

Following Alain et al. [1], we consider the trace of the covariance matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{unif}} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)]) &= \sum_{\theta_k \in \theta} \mathbb{V}_{\text{unif}} [\nabla_{\theta_k} \mathcal{L}(\theta)], \\ \text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W)} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)]) &= \sum_{\theta_k \in \theta} \mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W)} [\nabla_{\theta_k} \mathcal{L}(\theta)]. \end{aligned}$$

²In SGD, sampling is often carried out without replacement (no resampling) within each epoch. However, for ease of comparison with importance sampling, we assume uniform sampling with replacement. For example, Chang et al. [4] refers to the former as SGD-Scan and the latter as SGD-Uni. Both methods were compared in our experiments.

This corresponds to summing the variances of the gradients for each θ_k , while ignoring the covariances between parameters. It has been shown [1] that $\text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W)}[\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta)])$ is minimized when W is set to the following optimal value W^* :

$$W^* := \{w_i \mid w_i = p_{\text{unif}}(i) \|\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta; i)\|, i \in \llbracket M \rrbracket\}, \quad (4)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the L2 norm of a vector. Considering that $p_{\text{unif}}(i)$ is $1/M$ and independent of i , minimizing the trace of the covariance matrix of the loss gradient can be achieved by carrying out importance sampling with weights proportional to the L2 norm of the loss gradient $\|\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta; i)\|$ for each data point. If the L2 norm of the loss gradient serves as a measure of the degree to which a data point i affects the training, prioritizing the sampling of data points with larger effects reduces the variance of the loss gradient. Alain et al. [1] also showed that the trace at W^* is given as

$$\text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W^*)}[\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta)]) = (\mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{unif}}(i)}[\|\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta; i)\|])^2 - \|\mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{unif}}(i)}[\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta; i)]\|^2. \quad (5)$$

4 Variance estimation of loss gradient

In this section, we derive the formula for estimating the traces of the covariance matrices of the loss gradient under three settings: importance sampling with W , uniform sampling, and importance sampling with the optimal W^* . All these estimations can be efficiently carried out using only a sample drawn under importance sampling with W .

We extended the results by Alain et al. [1] to derive the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1 (Variance estimation for importance sampling). *The traces of the covariance matrices of the loss gradient under importance sampling with W , uniform sampling, and importance sampling with W^* are given as*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W)}[\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta)]) &= \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} \left[\|r(i; W) \nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta; i)\|^2 \right] - \|\mu\|^2, \\ \text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{unif}}[\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta)]) &= \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} \left[r(i; W) \|\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta; i)\|^2 \right] - \|\mu\|^2, \\ \text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W^*)}[\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta)]) &= (\mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} [r(i; W) \|\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta; i)\|])^2 - \|\mu\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where μ is given by

$$\mu = \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} [r(i; W) \nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta; i)].$$

Proof. See Appendix A.2. □

The key point of Proposition 4.1 is that the expectations in the variance-estimation formulas are all taken with respect to $p_{\text{is}}(i; W)$. This enables the traces of the covariance matrices to be computed using only samples drawn from $p_{\text{is}}(i; W)$. In other words, during training with minibatches under importance sampling, all relevant variances can be estimated solely from the data points within the minibatch.

4.1 Pseudo code

In Appendix B, we present the pseudocode for variance estimation based on Proposition 4.1. As shown in the pseudocode, the traces of the covariance matrices described in Proposition 4.1 can be efficiently estimated with only a few lines of code, given $r(i; W)$ and the loss gradients for each data point in a minibatch generated in accordance with $p_{\text{is}}(i; W)$.

4.2 On computing loss gradient for each data point

The formula in Proposition 4.1 requires the computation of the loss gradient $\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta; i)$ for each data point. However, calculating the loss gradient with respect to θ introduces significant computational overhead. To address this issue, methods have been proposed to use the gradient with respect to the output of the final layer of the DNN (referred to as the logits) instead of the gradient with respect to θ [11, 14]. Compared with computing the gradient for θ , the gradient with respect to the logits can be obtained at a significantly lower computational cost. The L2 norm of the gradient with respect to the logits is then used as an approximation, up to a constant factor, of the L2 norm of the gradient with respect to θ . Experimental results indicated that these values exhibit a high correlation [11]. In our experiments, we also adopted the gradient with respect to the logits to enable efficient computation.

5 Effective-minibatch-size estimation and learning-rate adjustment

We derived an EMS that achieves the same variance reduction under uniform sampling as that achieved by importance sampling with a minibatch of size N and W . We then propose its application to automatic learning-rate adjustment.

5.1 Effective minibatch size

Our EMS is defined as follows.

Definition 5.1 (Effective minibatch size). *For DNN training with a minibatch size of N under importance sampling with W , the N_{ems} is defined as*

$$N_{\text{ems}} := \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{unif}}[\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta)])}{\text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W)}[\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta)])}N. \quad (6)$$

Note that the traces of the covariance matrices in (6) can be efficiently estimated during DNN training by using Proposition 4.1. The following proposition holds for the EMS:

Proposition 5.2. *The following two settings are equivalent in terms of the expectation and trace of the covariance matrix for the loss-gradient estimation:*

- *Training with a minibatch of size N under importance sampling with W .*
- *Training with a minibatch of size N_{ems} under uniform sampling.*

Proof. See Appendix A.3. □

In contrast to ESS [15, 19], denoted as N_{ess} , which is implicitly restricted to $N_{\text{ess}} \leq N$ [21], the proposed EMS can satisfy $N_{\text{ems}} > N$ depending on W . Therefore, Proposition 5.2 suggests that, with an appropriate W , training under importance sampling with a minibatch of size N is equivalent to training under uniform sampling with a minibatch of size N_{ems} , where $N_{\text{ems}} > N$. This suggests that importance sampling with an appropriate W effectively increases the number of training epochs for a fixed number of training iterations, as training with a larger minibatch size corresponds to an increase in the number of effective epochs.

5.2 Application to automatic learning rate adjustment

It has been demonstrated that, in DNN training using SGD, increasing the minibatch size by a factor of α and scaling the learning rate by α^{-1} have equivalent effects on controlling the magnitude of noise during training [25, 26, 18]. Therefore, under importance sampling with W , the learning rate is implicitly scaled by a factor of N/N_{ems} , as the minibatch size is implicitly scaled by N_{ems}/N according to Proposition 5.2. This suggests that the effective learning rate in importance-sampling-based training may differ from the specified

learning rate ϵ . To address this issue, we propose adjusting ϵ as follows to mitigate the impact of changes in the EMS caused by importance sampling:

$$\epsilon_{\text{ems}} := \frac{N_{\text{ems}}}{N} \epsilon = \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{unif}}[\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta)])}{\text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W)}[\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta)])} \epsilon. \quad (7)$$

6 Designing importance-score-estimation algorithm using variance estimators

As discussed in subsection 3.5, setting W proportional to the per-sample gradient norm is optimal for variance reduction. However, since the gradients evolve during training, directly computing their exact values at every step is computationally expensive and impractical. We designed an algorithm to efficiently estimate the per-sample gradient norms using their moving statistics during training. We first introduce an absolute metric to evaluate W called $\mathcal{S}(W)$ that is based on Proposition 4.1, enabling real-time monitoring of the effectiveness of importance sampling. It is particularly useful for designing and assessing algorithms to estimate W . As an example, we use $\mathcal{S}(W)$ to determine the hyperparameters for the moving statistics.

6.1 Absolute metric for effectiveness of importance sampling

To evaluate the quality of W , we introduce $\mathcal{S}(W)$:

$$\mathcal{S}(W) := \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W)}[\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta)]) - \text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W^*)}[\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta)])}{\text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{unif}}[\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta)]) - \text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W^*)}[\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta)])}.$$

The quantities required to compute $\mathcal{S}(W)$ can be efficiently evaluated using Proposition 4.1. The $\mathcal{S}(W)$ takes values greater than or equal to zero and can be interpreted as follows.

- When $\mathcal{S}(W)$ is close to 0, the W perform nearly as well as W^* .
- When $\mathcal{S}(W) = 1$, importance sampling with W is equivalent to uniform sampling in terms of the variance of the loss-gradient estimation.
- When $\mathcal{S}(W) > 1$, importance sampling with W results in a larger variance of the loss-gradient estimation compared with uniform sampling.

Therefore, if $0 \leq \mathcal{S}(W) < 1$, importance sampling effectively reduces the variance, with smaller $\mathcal{S}(W)$ indicating greater variance reduction. Conversely, if $\mathcal{S}(W) \geq 1$, importance sampling fails to reduce the variance compared with uniform sampling.

6.2 Gradient-norm estimation using moving statistics

At training iteration t , the gradient norm for data sample i is defined as g_i^t :

$$g_i^t := \|\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta; i)|_{\theta=\theta^t}\|, \quad (8)$$

where θ^t represents the model parameters at t . Note that θ^t is updated throughout the training process.

Our Algorithm 1 estimates W using moving statistics of g_i^t during training. In Algorithm 1, the moving average of g_i^t is maintained as the internal state $\hat{\mu}_i$ ($i \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$). At t , when g_i^t is computed for i , the moving average is updated via UPDATESTATS. We assume that g_i^t is computed only for data samples included in the minibatch at t , and UPDATESTATS is applied accordingly. Notably, when importance sampling is used, the intervals between iterations at which an i appears in the minibatch become non-uniform. To address this, UPDATESTATS extends the exponential moving average (EMA) to account for non-uniform time intervals [6]. Furthermore, Algorithm 1 estimates the moving variance $\hat{\sigma}_i^2$ [7] alongside the moving average $\hat{\mu}_i$. The W is then computed by summing these statistics in COMPUTEIMPORTANCE. The inclusion of $\hat{\sigma}_i^2$ serves to prevent numerical instabilities, as discussed in [1, 11].

Algorithm 1 W estimation with unevenly spaced moving statistics

[Hyper parameter] $\tau > 0$

[Inputs] t : current iteration of training, g_i^t : gradient norm of the loss for data sample i at t

[State variables] $\hat{\mu}_i$: moving average for data sample i , $\hat{\sigma}_i^2$: moving variance for i , t_i^{prev} : iteration where i was last evaluated

```
1: function UPDATESTATS( $t, g_i^t$ )
2:    $\alpha \leftarrow \exp(-(t - t_i^{\text{prev}})/\tau)$ 
3:    $\delta \leftarrow g_i^t - \hat{\mu}_i$ 
4:    $\hat{\mu}_i \leftarrow \hat{\mu}_i + (1 - \alpha)\delta$ 
5:    $\hat{\sigma}_i^2 \leftarrow \alpha(\hat{\sigma}_i^2 + (1 - \alpha)\delta^2)$ 
6:    $t_i^{\text{prev}} \leftarrow t$ 
7: function COMPUTEIMPORTANCE( )
8:   return  $W = \{w_i \mid w_i = \hat{\mu}_i + \sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_i^2}, \forall i \in \llbracket M \rrbracket\}$ 
```

Initialization of internal variables The internal state variables in Algorithm 1 are initialized as follows: We first conduct two epochs of training using uniform sampling without replacement, prior to applying importance sampling. The gradient norms g_i^t obtained during this uniform sampling phase are used to estimate the initial $\hat{\mu}_i$ and $\hat{\sigma}_i^2$.

Hyperparameter Hyperparameter τ in Algorithm 1 determines the extent to which past observations affect the moving statistics. For example, when τ is small, α computed in line 2 becomes small (closer to 0). Consequently, in line 4, the moving average $\hat{\mu}_i$ is updated to place greater emphasis on the current observation g_i^t rather than past values. Conversely, when τ is large, α approaches 1, causing the update to prioritize past values over the current observation. In the next section, we examine the effect of τ on W estimation using $\mathcal{S}(W)$ and discuss strategies for determining an appropriate τ .

6.3 Hyperparameter investigation using the proposed metric

A straightforward approach to determining τ is to vary it, conduct training, and selecting the τ that achieves the highest prediction accuracy on a validation dataset. However, metrics, such as prediction accuracy, can be affected by factors other than τ , making it difficult to directly evaluate the quality of τ or the resulting W . To address this, we investigated the impact of τ on the effectiveness of importance sampling using $\mathcal{S}(W)$.

6.3.1 Preliminary experiments using benchmark datasets

We conducted importance-sampling-based training using W , estimated with Algorithm 1, on the CINIC-10 [5] and Fashion-MNIST (FMNIST) [31] datasets. Details of the training setup are provided in subsection 7.3. The total number of training iterations was set to 70000 for CINIC-10 and 25000 for FMNIST. For each setting, we conducted training five times with different random seeds and evaluated the mean and standard deviation of $\mathcal{S}(W)$ throughout the training process.

For the CINIC-10 dataset, we fixed τ in Algorithm 1 to 5000, 10000, 30000, or 70000 and conducted training for each setting. The estimated $\mathcal{S}(W)$ during training is shown in Figure 1a (labeled as "Fixed" in the legend). The horizontal axis represents the training iterations, and the vertical axis represents $\mathcal{S}(W)$. For FMNIST, we fixed τ to 1000, 5000, 10000, or 25000 and conducted training for each setting. The results are shown in Figure 1b. As described in subsection 6.1, $\mathcal{S}(W) = 0$ represents W^* , while $\mathcal{S}(W) = 1$ indicates variance reduction equivalent to uniform sampling. Both are depicted in the figures as gray lines: a dashed line labeled "Optimal IS" and dash-dotted line labeled "Uniform," respectively.

As shown in Figure 1a, when τ is set relatively small (e.g., $\tau = 5000$) for CINIC-10, $\mathcal{S}(W)$ remains small during the early to middle stages of training but becomes larger and unstable in the later stages. In contrast, as τ increases, $\mathcal{S}(W)$ exhibits more stable behavior throughout training. However, when τ is excessively




Figure 1: Transitions of $\mathcal{S}(W)$ during training for CINIC-10 and FMNIST.

large, $\mathcal{S}(W)$ decreases more slowly. As shown in Figure 1b, for FMNIST, similar to CINIC-10, smaller fixed values of τ result in smaller $\mathcal{S}(W)$ during the early stages of training. However, unlike CINIC-10, even for the smallest value $\tau = 1000$, $\mathcal{S}(W)$ remains stable throughout the middle stages of training and continues to stay small until the final stages. These results suggest that the appropriate τ can vary significantly depending on the dataset and model.

6.3.2 Dynamic τ

On the basis of the above results, we propose varying τ during training instead of using a fixed value. Specifically, we set τ to the current t by inserting $\tau \leftarrow t$ just before line 2 in Algorithm 1. Hereafter, we refer to this method as *Linear- τ* , which notably eliminates the need for hyperparameter tuning in Algorithm 1.

The training results for CINIC-10 using *Linear- τ* are shown in Figure 1a (labeled as "Linear" in the legend). *Linear- τ* consistently achieved small $\mathcal{S}(W)$ throughout the training process. These results suggest that in the early stages of training, importance sampling is more efficient when w_i adapts to the most recent g_i^t . However, as training progresses, estimating w_i on the basis of a longer-term history of g_i^t leads to more stable importance sampling. The training results for FMNIST using *Linear- τ* are shown in Figure 1b. While $\mathcal{S}(W)$ was slightly larger compared with when τ was fixed at 1000, it still maintained relatively small $\mathcal{S}(W)$ throughout the training process. Due to $\mathcal{S}(W)$, which efficiently assesses the effectiveness of importance sampling across the training process, a more refined and effective design of τ was achieved.

We also conducted training using *Linear- τ* while varying the total number of training iterations and evaluated the corresponding $\mathcal{S}(W)$. The results in Appendix C.1 show that *Linear- τ* achieves consistently small and stable $\mathcal{S}(W)$ across different total numbers of training iterations.

7 Experiments

In this section, we present the results of experiments comparing the proposed method with other methods on benchmark datasets.

7.1 Datasets

The following three datasets were used in the evaluation: *FMNIST* [31] consists of 28×28 grayscale images of clothing items labeled into ten classes. It contains 60000 images for training and 10000 images for testing. *CINIC-10* [5] is a dataset of 32×32 RGB images featuring objects such as animals and vehicles, labeled into ten classes. It contains 90000 images for training and 90000 images for testing. The *ChestX-ray14* dataset [30] contains anonymized 1024×1024 grayscale chest X-ray images. Labels for 14 types of diseases (e.g., pneumonia) are assigned to each image by processing radiologist reports using natural language processing methods. Since a single X-ray image may be associated with multiple diseases described in the corresponding

report, the dataset uses multi-label annotations. Specifically, each image is assigned 14 binary labels, where a value of 1 indicates the presence of a particular disease and 0 indicates its absence. Images with all 14 labels set to 0 correspond to "No Finding" (absence of any conditions). It contains 86524 images for training and 25596 images for testing.

7.2 Compared methods

We used the following methods as comparisons, in which we refer to the proposed method as EMAIS (exponential moving average-based importance sampling):

- *SGD-Scan, SGD-Uni*: SGD-Scan generates training minibatches via uniform sampling without replacement, whereas SGD-Uni applies uniform sampling with replacement.
- *RAIS* [11]: In RAIS, W is estimated using a robust regression model based on the per-sample gradient norm, and training is conducted using importance sampling with this W . The learning rate is also adjusted in accordance with the expected squared norm of the gradient. RAIS also introduces the "effective iteration number," a virtual iteration count used to adjust the learning rate scheduling accordingly.
- *Presampling-IS* [14]: This method generates training minibatches by first calculating per-sample gradient norms for a large initial minibatch of size N_{large} . A subsampling step is then executed using these scores to construct the final minibatch.
- *Confidence* [4]: With this method, the prediction probability $p_{y_{\text{true}}}^i$ for the correct class of training data point i is recorded during training. The average prediction probability, denoted as $\bar{p}_{y_{\text{true}}}^i$, is then used to compute each element of W as $w_i = 1 - \bar{p}_{y_{\text{true}}}^i$. Following this study [4], instead of directly using w_i , we compute the average of w_i across all data points and add this value as an offset to each w_i . A simple average is used to estimate the loss gradient instead of using (2).
- *Confidence Variance (ConfVar)* [4]: ConfVar is a method proposed by Chang et al. [4] that determines w_i based on the variance of $p_{y_{\text{true}}}^i$ recorded during training. Specifically, ConfVar prioritizes sampling data points the prediction probabilities for the correct class of which exhibit significant fluctuation. As with the Confidence method, ConfVar incorporates an offset by adding the average of w_i to each w_i , and uses a simple average to estimate the loss gradient.
- *Self-paced learning* [16]: Self-paced learning, a variant of curriculum learning [3], automatically estimates the difficulty of each data point and selects training data accordingly. This method introduces a hyperparameter K such that, at each training iteration, only data points with loss values below $1/K$ are used for training. As training progresses and more data points achieve smaller loss values, the proportion of data used for training increases. We use the method proposed by [16] to adjust K . It is important to note that self-paced learning was originally designed for batch learning and cannot be directly applied to minibatch-based DNN training. To address this, we use a straightforward approach: within each minibatch, only data points with loss values below $1/K$ are used for training.
- *EMAIS (proposed)*: EMAIS uses Algorithm 1 to estimate W with Linear- τ . The learning rate is adjusted during training in accordance with (7).

Details for implementation and settings of each method For RAIS, the robust regression model was reused from the authors' implementation [10]. All other methods were implemented from scratch. The hyperparameters for RAIS, such as the variables used in regression, were directly adopted from the authors' implementation. For Presampling-IS, the large initial minibatch size was set to $N_{\text{large}} = 1024$. With Self-paced learning, the initial value of K was set such that 60% of the training data were used at the beginning, and $\mu = 1.2$ was used to increase K during training. Note that the application of the Confidence and ConfVar methods to ChestX-ray14 is not straightforward, as it contains multi-labeled data. Therefore, these methods were excluded from evaluation on ChestX-ray14 in the experiments.

7.3 DNN model, training, and evaluation settings

The DNN models and training configurations for each dataset are summarized in Table 1. For each dataset, multiple experiments were conducted by varying the total number of training iterations (“Total-iters” in the table). For CINIC-10, two different weight-decay settings were evaluated. The minibatch size was fixed at 128 as a common setting across all datasets. The learning rate was initialized with the values specified in Table 1 and decayed using cosine scheduling, ensuring the learning rate reaches zero at the specified total number of training iterations.

Table 1: DNN model and training setup for each dataset

| Dataset | Model | Loss | Total-iters | LR | WD | DA | SD |
|--------------|--------------|------|--------------------------|------|-----------|-----------|-----|
| FMNIST | Lenet5 [17] | CE | 6250/12500/25000 | 0.01 | 1e-3 | – | – |
| CINIC-10 | ResNet18 [8] | CE | 17500/35000/70000/140000 | 0.1 | 1e-4/5e-4 | Crop,Flip | – |
| ChestX-ray14 | ResNet50 [8] | BCE | 17500/35000/70000 | 0.1 | 1e-4 | Crop,Flip | 0.5 |

LR: learning rate, WD: weight decay, DA: data augmentation, SD: stochastic depth [9],
 CE: cross entropy, BCE: binary cross entropy

For each configuration in Table 1, training was conducted five times with different random seeds, and the average and standard deviation of the test accuracy were measured. For FMNIST and CINIC-10, prediction error (lower is better) was used as the evaluation metric. For the multi-label ChestX-ray14 dataset, prediction performance was assessed using mean average precision (mAP), where higher values indicate better performance.

7.4 Evaluation results

7.4.1 Comparison of EMAIS and SGD-Uni with dynamic minibatch size

To investigate the relationship between EMS, defined in section 5, and learning with importance sampling, we conducted the following experiment. We first trained a model on FMNIST using EMAIS with a minibatch of size $N = 128$ for a total of 25000 iterations, recorded the value of N_{ems} at each iteration (note that N_{ems} is computed online during EMAIS training). We then trained SGD-Uni by dynamically adjusting the minibatch size at each iteration on the basis of the recorded N_{ems} while adjusting the learning rate accordingly using the method described in subsection 5.2.

Figure 2 presents the results, including the training loss and test error for each model, as well as the transitions of N_{ems} recorded during EMAIS training. For comparison, we also show the training loss and test error of SGD-Uni with a fixed minibatch size of $N = 128$. The figure shows that both the training loss and test error follow nearly the same trend for EMAIS with a fixed minibatch size of $N = 128$ and SGD-Uni with a dynamic minibatch size of $N = N_{\text{ems}}$. This suggests that training with importance sampling, given an appropriate W , effectively mimics the effect of increasing the minibatch size. Moreover, N_{ems} serves as an effective estimator of the extent to which the minibatch size is adjusted by importance sampling. The figure also illustrates the superior performance of EMAIS compared with SGD-Uni under the condition that the minibatch size is fixed at $N = 128$. As described in subsection 6.2, the reason N_{ems} remains flat in the early stages of training is that EMAIS estimates the initial values of the moving statistics during this period, without applying importance sampling.

7.4.2 Comparison of prediction accuracy

The evaluation results of prediction accuracy for FMNIST, CINIC-10, and ChestX-ray14 are summarized in Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4, respectively. Each table shows the mean values of the evaluation metrics, with the numbers in parentheses indicating the standard deviations. In each table, the best results for each




Figure 2: Training loss values (top), test error (middle), and EMS transitions (bottom) for FMNIST. Upper two plots compare three methods: SGD-Uni with fixed minibatch size of $N = 128$, EMAIS with a minibatch size of $N = 128$, and SGD-Uni with dynamic minibatch size $N = N_{\text{ems}}$, where N_{ems} is reused from the values obtained during EMAIS training with $N = 128$ (shown in lower plot).

setting are highlighted in bold. The results with mean values that fall within the standard deviation of the best result are also highlighted in bold.

From the tables, it is clear that EMAIS consistently achieved top performance across all datasets and settings, demonstrating its effectiveness. RAIS achieved the second-best accuracy and outperformed the standard SGD-Scan method with stable and high accuracy. These results suggest that importance sampling based on gradient norms is effective for DNN training. In contrast, Presampling-IS exhibited instability in certain settings, particularly on CINIC-10. Confidence, ConfVar, and Self-paced Learning did not consistently yield better results than SGD-Scan. While the performance difference between SGD-Scan and SGD-Uni was not significant, SGD-Scan achieved slightly higher accuracy, especially on CINIC-10.

Table 2: Prediction error on FMNIST test set (\downarrow)

| Total-iters | SGD-Scan | SGD-Uni | RAIS | Presampling-IS | Confidence | ConfVar | Self-paced | EMAIS |
|-------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| 6250 | 12.02(± 0.45) | 12.05(± 0.07) | 10.90(± 0.26) | 11.50(± 0.13) | 10.78(± 0.31) | 12.30(± 0.20) | 22.54(± 3.34) | 10.52 (± 0.10) |
| 12500 | 10.32(± 0.11) | 10.30(± 0.19) | 9.59(± 0.26) | 10.22(± 0.23) | 9.35(± 0.33) | 10.28(± 0.16) | 13.24(± 0.92) | 9.05 (± 0.22) |
| 25000 | 9.21(± 0.23) | 9.37(± 0.25) | 8.84 (± 0.18) | 9.04 (± 0.18) | 9.11(± 0.25) | 9.09(± 0.25) | 9.72(± 0.26) | 8.83 (± 0.22) |

Table 3: Prediction error on CINIC-10 test set (\downarrow)

| WD | Total-iters | SGD-Scan | SGD-Uni | RAIS | Presampling-IS | Confidence | ConfVar | Self-paced | EMAIS |
|------|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1e-4 | 17500 | 16.69(± 0.09) | 16.89(± 0.05) | 16.66(± 0.13) | 16.76(± 0.13) | 17.08(± 0.19) | 16.92(± 0.21) | 17.86(± 0.21) | 16.42 (± 0.15) |
| | 35000 | 15.25(± 0.15) | 15.52(± 0.13) | 14.98 (± 0.20) | 16.00(± 1.75) | 15.39(± 0.09) | 15.57(± 0.09) | 15.77(± 0.10) | 14.88 (± 0.11) |
| | 70000 | 14.14(± 0.08) | 14.32(± 0.15) | 14.02(± 0.09) | 14.76(± 0.50) | 14.44(± 0.07) | 14.32(± 0.16) | 14.56(± 0.13) | 13.86 (± 0.09) |
| | 140000 | 13.49(± 0.08) | 13.55(± 0.11) | 13.31(± 0.09) | 13.80(± 0.10) | 13.79(± 0.13) | 13.52(± 0.11) | 13.66(± 0.09) | 13.13 (± 0.03) |
| 1e-5 | 17500 | 15.27 (± 0.06) | 15.52(± 0.13) | 15.23 (± 0.03) | 15.26 (± 0.11) | 15.61(± 0.11) | 15.51(± 0.07) | 16.18(± 0.25) | 15.19 (± 0.15) |
| | 35000 | 13.99(± 0.11) | 14.21(± 0.08) | 13.83 (± 0.08) | 14.64(± 1.07) | 14.18(± 0.13) | 14.05(± 0.08) | 14.55(± 0.16) | 13.82 (± 0.14) |
| | 70000 | 13.15(± 0.05) | 13.33(± 0.07) | 13.06(± 0.10) | 16.28(± 2.85) | 13.26(± 0.06) | 13.36(± 0.05) | 13.40(± 0.05) | 12.99 (± 0.06) |
| | 140000 | 12.67 (± 0.09) | 12.86(± 0.04) | 12.75 (± 0.07) | 16.82(± 3.19) | 13.03(± 0.06) | 12.89(± 0.08) | 12.84(± 0.07) | 12.70 (± 0.07) |

Table 4: mAP on ChestX-ray14 test set (\uparrow)

| Total-iters | SGD-Scan | SGD-Uni | RAIS | Presampling-IS | Self-paced | EMAIS |
|-------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| 17500 | 18.66(± 0.16) | 18.71(± 0.03) | 20.30(± 0.10) | 19.69(± 0.14) | 17.08(± 0.71) | 20.76 (± 0.10) |
| 35000 | 22.07(± 0.10) | 21.92(± 0.07) | 23.52(± 0.17) | 23.43(± 0.05) | 21.35(± 0.23) | 23.72 (± 0.16) |
| 70000 | 24.69(± 0.12) | 24.72(± 0.14) | 25.39(± 0.33) | 25.35(± 0.04) | 24.35(± 0.23) | 25.74 (± 0.07) |

7.4.3 Comparison of training time

The training times for DNN models on FMNIST, CINIC-10, and ChestX-ray14 are summarized in Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7, respectively.³ Each table reports the mean training time in seconds, with the numbers in parentheses representing the standard deviations. The time required for DNN training can vary due to factors beyond the computational complexity of the learning algorithm, such as implementation details or the impact of other computational tasks when using shared computing resources. Therefore, while the current results are not suitable for a detailed comparison of computational complexity, they do provide an approximate understanding of the overall trends in training time.

Table 5: Training time (s) for FMNIST

| Total-iters | SGD-scan | SGD-unif | RAIS | Presampling-IS | Confidence | ConfVar | Self-paced | EMAIS |
|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 6250 | 53.1(± 0.2) | 53.5(± 0.3) | 68.6(± 0.7) | 321.8(± 1.6) | 40.4(± 0.9) | 58.1(± 1.5) | 53.4(± 0.4) | 48.0(± 1.2) |
| 12500 | 108.0(± 0.8) | 107.8(± 0.9) | 135.3(± 6.4) | 656.0(± 1.5) | 76.6(± 1.2) | 114.3(± 3.8) | 108.2(± 0.4) | 90.1(± 2.3) |
| 25000 | 216.2(± 2.4) | 216.9(± 2.2) | 262.3(± 14.5) | 1316.2(± 12.2) | 151.2(± 2.4) | 223.7(± 4.2) | 219.3(± 1.1) | 176.9(± 3.6) |

As shown in Tables 5 to 7, there were no significant differences in training time among the methods, except for Presampling-IS. For Presampling-IS, the computational overhead was notably large because it requires performing calculations on large minibatches beforehand, which resulted in the observed differences in training time. Taking into account the results from the previous section and these findings, EMAIS can train more accurate models with approximately the same computational time as the widely used SGD-Scan.

8 Conclusion

We proposed a method for estimating the variance reduction of loss gradient estimators in DNN training using importance sampling, compared to uniform sampling. Since the proposed method requires only minibatches generated through importance sampling, it enables the online estimation of the variance reduction rate during DNN training. By leveraging the proposed method, we also proposed an EMS to enable automatic learning rate adjustment. We developed an absolute metric to evaluate the efficiency of importance sampling and designed an algorithm to estimate importance score using moving statistics. Through numerical experiments, we demonstrated that the proposed method consistently achieved higher accuracy than uniform sampling, while maintaining comparable computational time. We also showed that the proposed method outperformed related importance-sampling methods, highlighting its effectiveness and efficiency.

³The experiments were conducted on a machine equipped with an Intel[®] Xeon[®] Gold 6134 CPU and NVIDIA[®] Tesla[®] V100 GPU.

Table 6: Training time (s) for CINIC-10

| WD | Total-iters | SGD-scan | SGD-unif | RAIS | Presampling-IS | Confidence | ConfVar | Self-paced | EMAIS |
|------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1e-4 | 17500 | 1169.3(±76.4) | 1111.3(±13.7) | 1188.2(±65.4) | 3496.6(±139.2) | 1116.2(±30.7) | 1167.5(±29.6) | 1137.5(±33.2) | 1153.6(±47.7) |
| | 35000 | 2329.3(±167.3) | 2322.7(±151.5) | 2327.2(±50.1) | 7140.6(±397.3) | 2250.7(±68.3) | 2342.5(±66.6) | 2272.0(±39.9) | 2280.6(±87.5) |
| | 70000 | 4693.2(±168.4) | 4498.9(±27.3) | 4552.2(±38.5) | 13596.8(±287.9) | 4416.5(±115.1) | 4591.8(±49.6) | 4601.4(±91.5) | 4546.3(±88.0) |
| | 140000 | 9202.0(±303.0) | 9068.9(±165.7) | 9071.8(±94.4) | 28065.0(±802.4) | 8838.7(±275.4) | 9318.1(±156.0) | 9123.9(±228.8) | 9065.2(±205.7) |
| 1e-5 | 17500 | 1164.0(±54.2) | 1174.8(±63.4) | 1183.8(±61.2) | 3443.2(±120.3) | 1114.6(±39.3) | 1185.3(±27.3) | 1112.9(±21.3) | 1237.2(±29.2) |
| | 35000 | 2250.6(±50.7) | 2415.6(±163.2) | 2307.8(±43.3) | 6885.3(±211.3) | 2219.1(±63.6) | 2364.7(±58.1) | 2254.2(±36.4) | 2473.4(±37.8) |
| | 70000 | 4697.9(±170.7) | 4605.3(±304.8) | 4631.1(±79.8) | 13595.9(±285.0) | 4405.0(±121.9) | 4724.7(±151.7) | 4617.2(±52.1) | 4620.0(±223.4) |
| | 140000 | 9124.9(±361.5) | 9739.0(±712.0) | 9328.6(±195.0) | 27772.9(±306.7) | 8867.0(±338.4) | 9433.2(±268.2) | 9087.3(±211.2) | 9195.6(±357.6) |

Table 7: Training time (s) for ChestX-ray14

| Total-iters | SGD-scan | SGD-unif | RAIS | Presampling-IS | Self-paced | EMAIS |
|-------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 17500 | 7768.5(±14.2) | 7758.2(±2.0) | 7866.1(±43.1) | 23824.4(±25.7) | 7759.7(±3.1) | 7773.8(±3.1) |
| 35000 | 15580.2(±5.1) | 15587.5(±2.4) | 15724.8(±62.4) | 47792.9(±42.5) | 15583.7(±6.7) | 15608.3(±7.2) |
| 70000 | 31223.1(±7.7) | 31223.7(±13.7) | 31487.9(±115.0) | 95637.2(±92.0) | 31222.2(±13.2) | 31268.2(±10.2) |

A Proofs and formula derivations

A.1 Proof for expectation equivalence

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\text{unif}} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)] &= \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{unif}}(i)} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^M p_{\text{unif}}(i) \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^M p_{\text{is}}(i; W) \frac{p_{\text{unif}}(i)}{p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^M p_{\text{is}}(i; W) r(i; W) \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} [r(i; W) \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\text{is}(W)} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)].
\end{aligned}$$

A.2 Proof of Proposition 4.1

From Appendix A.1, it holds that

$$\mu = \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} [r(i; W) \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)] = \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{unif}}(i)} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)].$$

We denote the expected value of the loss gradient with respect to the k -th parameter θ_k by μ_k as

$$\mu_k = \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} [r(i; W) \nabla_{\theta_k} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)] = \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{unif}}(i)} [\nabla_{\theta_k} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)]$$

Then $\text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W)} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)])$ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W)} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)]) \\
&= \sum_{\theta_k \in \theta} \mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W)} [\nabla_{\theta_k} \mathcal{L}(\theta)] \\
&= \sum_{\theta_k \in \theta} \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} \left[(r(i; W) \nabla_{\theta_k} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i) - \mu_k)^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} \left[\sum_{\theta_k \in \theta} (r(i; W) \nabla_{\theta_k} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i) - \mu_k)^2 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} \left[\|r(i; W) \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i) - \mu\|^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} \left[\|r(i; W) \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)\|^2 \right] - 2\mu^{\top} \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} [r(i; W) \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)] + \|\mu\|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} \left[\|r(i; W) \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)\|^2 \right] - \|\mu\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that this result, although derived through a different procedure, is consistent with the result of Alain et al. [1]. Moreover, $\text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{unif}}[\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)])$ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{unif}}[\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)]) &= \sum_{\theta_k \in \theta} \mathbb{V}_{\text{unif}}[\nabla_{\theta_k} \mathcal{L}(\theta)] \\
&= \sum_{\theta_k \in \theta} \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{unif}}(i)} \left[(\nabla_{\theta_k} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i) - \mu_k)^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{unif}}(i)} \left[\|\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i) - \mu\|^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{unif}}(i)} \left[\|\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)\|^2 \right] - \|\mu\|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} \left[r(i; W) \|\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)\|^2 \right] - \|\mu\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

On the basis of (5), $\text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W^*)}[\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)])$ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{tr}(\mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W^*)}[\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)]) &= (\mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{unif}}(i)} [\|\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)\|])^2 - \|\mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{unif}}(i)} [\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)]\|^2 \\
&= (\mathbb{E}_{i \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W)} [r(i; W) \|\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i)\|])^2 - \|\mu\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

A.3 Proof of Proposition 5.2

In training with a minibatch of size N' under uniform sampling, the following statistic is computed for the loss gradient estimation:

$$\nabla_{\theta} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{unif}}^{N'}(\theta) := \frac{1}{N'} \sum_{k=1}^{N'} \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i'_k) \text{ with } i'_k \sim p_{\text{unif}}(i).$$

Assuming that i'_k are i.i.d., the mean and covariance matrix of $\nabla_{\theta} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{unif}}^{N'}(\theta)$ are given, respectively, by⁴

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{unif}}^{N'}(\theta) \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\text{unif}}[\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)], \\
\mathbb{V} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{unif}}^{N'}(\theta) \right] &= \frac{1}{N'} \mathbb{V}_{\text{unif}}[\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the expectation and variance on the left sides of the above equations are taken over the minibatch distribution.

Similarly, in training with a minibatch of size N under importance sampling with W , the following statistic is computed for the loss gradient estimation:

$$\nabla_{\theta} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{is}(W)}^N(\theta) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N r(i_k; W) \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta; i_k) \text{ with } i_k \sim p_{\text{is}}(i; W).$$

Under the i.i.d. assumption of i_k , the mean and covariance matrix of $\nabla_{\theta} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{is}(W)}^N(\theta)$ are given, respectively, by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{is}(W)}^N(\theta) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\text{is}(W)}[\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)],$$

⁴See Appendix A.4 for the detailed derivation.

$$\mathbb{V} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{is}(W)}^N(\theta) \right] = \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W)} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta) \right].$$

Then, from (3), it follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{unif}}^{N'}(\theta) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{is}(W)}^N(\theta) \right].$$

Moreover, if N' is assumed to be equal to N_{ems} in (6), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr} \left(\mathbb{V} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{unif}}^{N'}(\theta) \right] \right) &= \text{tr} \left(\mathbb{V} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{unif}}^{N_{\text{ems}}}(\theta) \right] \right) \\ &= \text{tr} \left(\frac{\text{tr} \left(\mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W)} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta) \right] \right)}{\text{tr} \left(\mathbb{V}_{\text{unif}} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta) \right] \right) N} \mathbb{V}_{\text{unif}} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta) \right] \right) \\ &= \text{tr} \left(\frac{1}{N} \mathbb{V}_{\text{is}(W)} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta) \right] \right) = \text{tr} \left(\mathbb{V} \left[\nabla_{\theta} \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{is}(W)}^N(\theta) \right] \right). \end{aligned}$$

A.4 Mean and variance of sample mean

Consider a random variable $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ following a distribution p_x , with mean μ and covariance matrix Σ . Given L i.i.d. samples of x , the sample mean of x is defined as

$$\bar{x} := \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L x_i \quad \text{with} \quad x_i \sim p_x.$$

The mean and covariance matrix of the sample mean \bar{x} are then given as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\bar{x}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L x_i \right] = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{E}[x_i] = \frac{1}{L} L \mu = \mu, \\ \mathbb{V}[\bar{x}] &= \mathbb{V} \left[\frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L x_i \right] = \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{i=1}^L \mathbb{V}[x_i] + \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^L \text{Cov}[x_i, x_j] = \frac{1}{L^2} L \Sigma = \frac{1}{L} \Sigma, \end{aligned}$$

where Cov denotes the covariance, and the assumption of i.i.d. samples indicates $\text{Cov}[x_i, x_j] = 0$ for $i \neq j$.

B Pseudo codes for variance estimation

Assuming the use of Python [29] and PyTorch [24], we present the pseudocode for variance estimation based on Proposition 4.1 in Figure 3. As shown in the pseudocode, by providing $r(i; W)$ and the loss gradients for each data point in a minibatch generated in accordance with $p_{\text{is}}(i; W)$, the traces of the covariance matrices described in Proposition 4.1 can be efficiently estimated with only a few lines of code.

C Additional experimental results

C.1 Analysis of Linear- τ with varying total iterations

We conducted training for CINIC-10 using Linear- τ while varying the total number of training iterations as 35000, 70000, 105000, or 140000. The evaluated $\mathcal{S}(W)$ during training is presented in Figure 4.


```

1 def compute_tr_vars(r, per_sample_grad):
2     """ Estimate the trace of variance-covariance matrices.
3     Mini-batch is assumed to be generated following p_is.
4
5     Args:
6         r ([batch_size]): p_uniform / p_is
7         per_sample_grad ([batch_size, n_params]): gradients for each sample
8     """
9     # Compute mu
10    mu = (r[:, None] * per_sample_grad).mean(dim=0)
11
12    # Variance of grad with current importance sampling
13    tr_var_is = (r[:, None] * per_sample_grad).norm(p=2, dim=1).pow(2).mean()
14    tr_var_is -= mu.norm(p=2).pow(2)
15
16    # Variance of grad with uniform sampling
17    tr_var_uniform = (r * per_sample_grad).norm(p=2, dim=1).pow(2).mean()
18    tr_var_uniform -= mu.norm(p=2).pow(2)
19
20    # Variance of grad with optimal importance sampling (lower-bound)
21    sample_grad_norm = per_sample_grad.norm(p=2, dim=1)
22    tr_var_optimal_is = (r * sample_grad_norm).mean().pow(2)
23    tr_var_optimal_is -= mu.norm(p=2).pow(2)
24
25    return tr_var_is, tr_var_uniform, tr_var_optimal_is
26

```

Figure 3: Pseudo code for variance estimation in Proposition 4.1




Figure 4: Transition of $S(W)$ during training with importance sampling under Linear- τ strategy for varying total training iterations on CINIC-10.

References

- [1] Guillaume Alain, Alex Lamb, Chinnadhurai Sankar, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Variance reduction in SGD by distributed importance sampling. In *ICLR 2016 Workshop Track*, 2016.
- [2] S.K. Au and J.L. Beck. A new adaptive importance sampling scheme for reliability calculations. *Structural Safety*, 21(2):135–158, 1999. ISSN 0167-4730. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-4730\(99\)00014-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-4730(99)00014-4). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167473099000144>.
- [3] Yoshua Bengio, Jérôme Louradour, Ronan Collobert, and Jason Weston. Curriculum learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2009.
- [4] Haw-Shiuan Chang, Erik Learned-Miller, and Andrew McCallum. Active bias: Training more accurate neural networks by emphasizing high variance samples. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- [5] Luke N Darlow, Elliot J Crowley, Antreas Antoniou, and Amos J Storkey. CINIC-10: CINIC-10 is not ImageNet or CIFAR-10, 2018. URL <https://datashare.ed.ac.uk/handle/10283/3192>.
- [6] Andreas Eckner. Algorithms for unevenly spaced time series: Moving averages and other rolling operators, 2019. URL <http://eckner.com/papers/Algorithms%20for%20Unevenly%20Spaced%20Time%20Series.pdf>.
- [7] Tony Finch. Incremental calculation of weighted mean and variance, 2009. URL <https://fanf2.user.srcf.net/hermes/doc/antiforgery/stats.pdf>.
- [8] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [9] Gao Huang, Yu Sun, Zhuang Liu, Daniel Sedra, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Deep networks with stochastic depth. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 646–661, 2016.
- [10] Tyler B Johnson. Training deep models faster with robust, approximate importance sampling, 2018. URL <https://www.tbjohns.com/code/rais.tar.gz>.
- [11] Tyler B Johnson and Carlos Guestrin. Training deep models faster with robust, approximate importance sampling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- [12] S. Juneja and P. Shahabuddin. Chapter 11 rare-event simulation techniques: An introduction and recent advances. In Shane G. Henderson and Barry L. Nelson, editors, *Simulation*, volume 13 of *Handbooks in Operations Research and Management Science*, pages 291–350. Elsevier, 2006. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-0507\(06\)13011-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-0507(06)13011-X). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S092705070613011X>.
- [13] Angelos Katharopoulos and François Fleuret. Biased importance sampling for deep neural network training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.00043*, 2017.
- [14] Angelos Katharopoulos and François Fleuret. Not all samples are created equal: Deep learning with importance sampling. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018.
- [15] Augustine Kong. A note on importance sampling using standardized weights. Technical Report 348, University of Chicago, 1992.
- [16] M Kumar, Benjamin Packer, and Daphne Koller. Self-paced learning for latent variable models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 23, 2010.

- [17] Yann LeCun, Bernhard Boser, John S Denker, Donnie Henderson, Richard E Howard, Wayne Hubbard, and Lawrence D Jackel. Backpropagation applied to handwritten zip code recognition. *Neural computation*, 1(4):541–551, 1989.
- [18] Shuaipeng Li, Penghao Zhao, Hailin Zhang, Samm Sun, Hao Wu, Dian Jiao, Weiyang Wang, Chengjun Liu, Zheng Fang, Jinbao Xue, Yangyu Tao, Bin CUI, and Di Wang. Surge phenomenon in optimal learning rate and batch size scaling. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=hD9TUV4xdz>.
- [19] Jun S Liu. Metropolized independent sampling with comparisons to rejection sampling and importance sampling. *Statistics and computing*, 6:113–119, 1996.
- [20] Jun S. Liu, Rong Chen, and Tanya Logvinenko. *A Theoretical Framework for Sequential Importance Sampling with Resampling*, pages 225–246. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2001. ISBN 978-1-4757-3437-9. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4757-3437-9_11. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-3437-9_11.
- [21] Luca Martino, Víctor Elvira, and Francisco Louzada. Effective sample size for importance sampling based on discrepancy measures. *Signal Processing*, 131:386–401, 2017. ISSN 0165-1684. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sigpro.2016.08.025>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0165168416302110>.
- [22] Radford M Neal. Annealed importance sampling. *Statistics and computing*, 11:125–139, 2001.
- [23] Deanna Needell, Rachel Ward, and Nati Srebro. Stochastic gradient descent, weighted sampling, and the randomized kaczmarz algorithm. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2014.
- [24] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. PyTorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- [25] Samuel L Smith and Quoc V Le. A bayesian perspective on generalization and stochastic gradient descent. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [26] Samuel L Smith, Pieter-Jan Kindermans, Chris Ying, and Quoc V Le. Don’t decay the learning rate, increase the batch size. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [27] Petru Soviany, Radu Tudor Ionescu, Paolo Rota, and Nicu Sebe. Curriculum learning: A survey. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 130(6):1526–1565, 2022.
- [28] Sebastian U Stich, Anant Raj, and Martin Jaggi. Safe adaptive importance sampling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- [29] Guido Van Rossum and Fred L. Drake. *Python 3 Reference Manual*. CreateSpace, Scotts Valley, CA, 2009. ISBN 1441412697.
- [30] Xiaosong Wang, Yifan Peng, Le Lu, Zhiyong Lu, Mohammadhadi Bagheri, and Ronald M Summers. Chestx-ray8: Hospital-scale chest x-ray database and benchmarks on weakly-supervised classification and localization of common thorax diseases. In *IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2097–2106, 2017.
- [31] Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. Fashion-MNIST: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms, 2017. URL <https://github.com/zalandoresearch/fashion-mnist>.
- [32] Peilin Zhao and Tong Zhang. Stochastic optimization with importance sampling for regularized loss minimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2015.