

Freeness in cognitive science

Ewa Gudowska-Nowak* and Maciej A. Nowak†

*Institute of Theoretical Physics and Mark Kac Center for Complex Systems Research,
Jagiellonian University, 30-348 Kraków, Poland*

In this mini-review, dedicated to the Jubilee of Professor Tadeusz Marek, we highlight in a popular way the power of so-called free random variables (hereafter FRV) calculus, viewed as a potential probability calculus for the XXI century, in applications to the broad area of cognitive sciences. We provide three examples: (i) inference of noisy signals from multivariate correlation data from the brain; (ii) distinguished role of non-normality in real neuronal models; (iii) applications to the field of deep learning in artificial neural networks.

I. INTRODUCTION

Cognitive science is a broad domain of interdisciplinary research, dedicated to the ultimate understanding of mind and intelligence. Within the last hundred years, it has passed a dramatic change from mostly humanistic (and even philosophical) area to the domain of hard science. This transition was caused, among others, by several technological breakthroughs in deciphering *in vivo* the neuronal signals [1]. Techniques alike dense array encephalography (dEEG) (including more invasive version alike electrocorticography), functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), (including diffusive tensor analysis), magnetoencephalography (MEG), transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS), and finally, optogenetics, provided gargantuan amount of data at wide spectrum of temporal and/or spatial resolutions. That flood of data has opened the door for the methodologies of empirical sciences, especially in the area of complex systems. Standard mathematical tools in this area, due to the noisy character of the data, include probability calculus and stochastic differential equations. However, the new challenge with respect to modern neurological data comes from their high dimensionality - e.g. number of voxels in fMRI single snapshot reaches tens of thousands and time series length for dEEG recordings can be easily order of magnitude larger, since one can probe up to thousand signals per second. This multivariate character of time series brings immediately the connotation to random matrix theory. Already, more then 90 years ago John Wishart [2] has asked the following question: It is well known, that the sum of squares of the independent Gaussian variables x_t , where t labels e.g. times of the measurement ($t = 1, \dots, T$), is given by χ^2 distribution. What is the generalisation of χ^2 distribution, if we look at similar process, but with multivariate Gaussian variable x_{it} , where indices i count the number of different measured objects? For example, in our setup, i may correspond to distinct electrodes on the scalp ($i = 1, \dots, N$).

* ewa.gudowska-nowak@uj.edu.pl

† maciej.a.nowak@uj.edu.pl

The resulting distribution is today known as Wishart distribution, corresponding to the distribution of *correlation matrix* $C_{ij} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it}x_{jt} = \frac{1}{T} \text{tr}XX^\tau$, where in the last equality we have exploited the matricial notation - here x_{it} is the element of $N \times T$ matrix X and τ denotes the transposition of such matrix. One can simply say, that random matrix theory is just the sort of probability theory, where random variable is matrix-valued. In the 50-ties of the previous century, random matrix theory started making the impact on almost all branches of physics, and later, on other domains of hard science. The reason was that people like Wigner, Porter, Dyson, Gaudin and Mehta started looking at the statistics of eigenvalues of random matrices instead of the statistics of the elements of matrices [3]. It turned out, that at the microscopic level (spacing between eigenvalues scaling like $1/N$, where N is the dimension of the matrix), the spectral properties are universal and, in general, independent on the probability distribution of the matricial elements. On the other side, at the macroscopic level, the resulting spectral laws started to tend to simple expressions in the limit when the size of the matrix was very large. In 90-ties of the previous century, this observation was formalised in mathematical language by Voiculescu [4], leading to the emergence of free random calculus, perhaps the most fundamental and versatile generalisation of probability theory for non-commuting random operators. Since Voiculescu theory agrees with RMT in the limit of infinite dimension of random matrices, it represents an asymptotic limit. But, first, the convergence to the asymptotic results is very fast, even for moderately large matrices of dimensions of order 10 (this is sometimes anecdotally expressed as $8 \approx \infty$), second, analysed matrices have dimensions easily reaching 10^3 , so deviations from asymptotic results are usually very small, therefore the method of FRV is operational and practical. This is why, from the probabilistic point of view, we do not hesitate to call FRV calculus as the probability calculus for the XXI century.

II. FREE RANDOM VARIABLES IN A NUT-SHELL

Free random variable calculus can be viewed as a generalisation of classical probability calculus, for the case of non-commuting operators (viewed here as infinite, noncommuting matrices), hence it is natural to explain the cornerstones of FRV using the intuition from classical probability calculus. Let us consider the problem of "adding" two, *independent* random variables x_1 and x_2 , from corresponding distributions $p_1(x_1)$ and $p_2(x_2)$, i.e. the problem of finding distribution

$$p(s) = \int dx_1 dx_2 p_1(x_1) p_2(x_2) \delta(s - (x_1 + x_2)) = \int dx p_1(x) p_2(s - x) \quad (1)$$

The last equation represents the convolution, so it is natural to take Fourier transform of the probability distribution $p(s)$. Then $\hat{p}(k) = \int p(s) e^{iks} ds = \hat{p}_1(k) \cdot \hat{p}_2(k)$. Expanding the exponent we see, that Fourier transform generates moments of the distributions -

$\hat{p}(k) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(ik)^n}{n!} m_n$ with $m_n = \int dx x^n p(x)$. Further simplification happens when we take the logarithm of Fourier transform, $r(k) = \ln \hat{p}(k)$. Then we have an addition law

$$r_{1+2}(k) = r_1(k) + r_2(k) \quad (2)$$

Since $r(k)$ can be also viewed as another generating function $r(k) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(ik)^n}{n!} \kappa_n$, where coefficients κ_i are called cumulants, we just have found the way of linearizing convolution of independent distributions: first, we calculate the cumulants of individual components, then we add them algebraically. Resulting series yields the cumulants of the convolution. Particularly simple example is provided by the Gaussian $p(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2} \equiv N(0, \sigma^2 = 1)$. Fourier transform is also a Gaussian, $\hat{p}(k) = e^{-k^2/2}$, and the $r(k) = -k^2/2$. We see that all cumulants vanish except of the second one, $\kappa_2 = 1$. The convolution of two standard Gaussians is therefore also a Gaussian, but with a dispersion $\sigma^2 = 1 + 1$.

Now we will parallel the above reasoning in the case of infinitely large random matrices. We start from the symmetric random matrices, since their spectrum is real. We define first the analogue of independence, which is called freeness. Consider two large diagonal matrices of size N by N , named X and Y . They are not free. However, if at least one of them we rotate by Haar measure, $Y \rightarrow OYO^T$, where O is random orthogonal transformation, then matrices X and OYO^T are mutually free in the limit of infinite size of matrices. Intuitively, freeness is equivalent to maximal decorrelation of corresponding sets of eigenvectors. As a next cornerstone we introduce the moment generating function (Green's function), defined as

$$G_X(z) = \int \frac{\rho_x(\lambda)}{z - \lambda} \quad (3)$$

where $\rho_x(\lambda) \equiv \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \langle \sum_i \delta(\lambda - \lambda_i) \rangle$ is the average spectral density of the matrix X with respect to the probabilistic measure $\langle \dots \rangle = \int DX \dots e^{-N \text{tr} V(X)}$ therefore an analog of the probability density function $p(x)$ in classical probability. For example, Gaussian measure corresponds to $V(X) = \frac{1}{2} X^2$. Note, that for large complex values z , $G_X(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} z^{-k-1} m_k$, where spectral moments read $m_k = \int \lambda^k \rho_x(\lambda) d\lambda = \frac{1}{N} \langle \text{tr} X^k \rangle$. Finally, we define the function generating the free cumulants. In FRV calculus this function is called R-transform and is defined as $R(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \kappa_k z^{k+1}$. Its relation to G is involved - basically, modulo the shift $1/z$, it is the functional inverse (for any z) of the Green's function - $G[R(z) + \frac{1}{z}] = z$ (or equivalently $R[G(w)] + \frac{1}{G(w)} = w$). The algorithm of "addition" of the spectra is now as follows.

- (i) Knowing $\rho_X(\lambda)$ and $\rho_Y(\lambda)$, we construct the corresponding Green's functions $G_X(z)$ and $G_Y(z)$
- (ii) We invert functionally both Green's functions, finding $R_X(z)$ and $R_Y(z)$
- (iii) We perform the addition law $R_{X+Y}(z) = R_X(z) + R_Y(z)$, and we functionally invert the result, getting $G_{X+Y}(z)$.

(iv) Finally, we reconstruct $\rho_{X+Y}(\lambda)$, using the analytical properties of $G_{X+Y}(z)$

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} G_{X+Y}(z)|_{z=\lambda+i\epsilon} &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int \rho_{X+Y}(\mu) \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\epsilon}{(\mu - \lambda)^2 + \epsilon^2} d\mu \\ &= \int \rho_{X+Y}(\mu) \delta(\mu - \lambda) d\mu = \rho_{X+Y}(\lambda) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We conclude this part by providing a pedagogical ensemble. Let us consider "the Gaussian" in the FRV calculus. By analogy to classical case, we consider the case, when only one cumulant is non-vanishing, i.e. κ_2 , which for simplicity we put to 1. Then $R(z) = z$, and inverting the R-transform reduces to the solution of quadratic equation $G + 1/G = z$. The solution with proper asymptotic behaviour for large z reads $G(z) = \frac{1}{2}(z - \sqrt{z^2 - 4})$, and rerun of the argument (iv) from above list yields $\rho(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{4 - \lambda^2}$, i.e. the famous Wigner semicircle. "Addition" of mutually free semicircles parallels the "addition" of independent Gaussians in classical probability.

We conclude this introduction with few comments on multiplication of random variables. In classical probability, at least formally, multiplication is not very much different from addition, due to the relation $e^x \cdot e^y = e^{x+y}$. If x, y would be replaced by large matrices X, Y , above relation does not hold, since matrices, in general do not commute. Even worst, the product of two symmetric matrices is usually not symmetric, which means, that first, the spectrum is becoming complex-valued, second, the eigenvectors do not decouple from the spectrum and are crucial for analysing e.g. the stability problems. Luckily, there exist few cases, where the application of the whole machinery for non-normal random matrices is not necessary. First, consider the case, when we multiply two matrices, where at least one of them is positive. One can then define so-called S-transform, which is multiplicative (i.e. $S_{X \cdot Y}(z) = S_X(z) \cdot S_Y(z)$) and S-transform is related to R-transform by $S_X(z)R_X(zS_X(z)) = 1$, which allows to extend the addition program for multiplication. Second exception corresponds to the case, when random matrix X can be decomposed as $X = PO$ where P is positive, O is a Haar measure and both P, O are mutually free. In such case, the spectrum has azimuthal symmetry, and only radial distribution is non-trivial $\rho(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi r} dF(r)/dr$, (where $r = |\lambda|$ and $F(r)$ is the cumulative radial distribution), so this case corresponds to a quasi-one dimensional case. In this case, powerful Haagerup-Larsen (or single ring) theorem holds [5] for the spectra,

$$\begin{aligned} S_X(F(r) - 1) &= \frac{1}{r^2} \\ O_X(r) &\equiv \frac{1}{N^2} \left\langle \sum_i \delta^{(2)}(z - \lambda_i) \langle L_i | L_i \rangle \langle R_i | R_i \rangle \right\rangle = \frac{1}{\pi r^2} F(r)(1 - F(r)) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

whereas second line addresses the eigenvectors [6], i.e. $\langle L_i | X = \langle L_i | \lambda_i$ and $X | R_i \rangle = \lambda_i | R_i \rangle$ are left and right, distinct eigenvectors corresponding to same complex-valued eigenvalue λ_i . Last but not least, if the problem of finding eigenvalues and eigenvectors

of non-normal operator X is very hard, one may look at the singular value decomposition (SVD), i.e. consider the real spectrum of the operator XX^τ . In below, we will exploit all three above mentioned special cases corresponding to multiplication laws for large random matrices.

III. SPECTRAL ANALYSIS OF CORRELATION MATRICES

We explain the main idea of spectral analysis of correlation matrices on the basis of anecdotal example. Let us consider the measurement of dense array electroencephalogram performed on one of the authors of this review, in so-called resting state *dolce far niente* (Figure 1). We specify the number of electrodes N and the elapsed time of the measurement. Since the measurement is done at fixed intervals (e.g. with frequency 100Hz), as a result we obtain the multivariate time series M_{it} of measurements of $i = 1, \dots, N$ electrodes at T time steps $t = 1, \dots, T$, with T much larger than N . Let us now look at the fluctuations between the consecutive measurements ($X_{it} = M_{it} - M_{i,t-1}$), and let us standartize these fluctuations, i.e. for each electrode we calculate the mean and the variance of the time series X_{it} , and for each number of electrodes we calculate $x_{it} = (X_{it} - \langle X_i \rangle) / \sqrt{\langle X_i^2 \rangle}$. Finally, we construct the Pearson estimator for the correlation matrix

$$C_{ij} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it} x_{jt} \quad (6)$$

In matricial form, above equation reads $C = \frac{1}{T} XX^\tau$. In Figure 2 we plot the histogram of all eigenvalues of this estimator (in orange). The power of FRV calculus stems from the fact, that we can easily construct analytical benchmarks, which allow the comparison of the measured data with some assumptions on the nature of true correlations, and then, perform the inference of the true correlation from the data. Let us start from the simplest assumption, that all x_{it} come from independent central, standard, Gaussian distributions $N(0, 1)$. The correlation estimator in this case is just the Wishart matrix C_W . In the case when $N = T \gg 1$, the simple inspection shows that all spectral cumulants κ_i are identical and equal to 1. We can therefore consider the resulting spectral distribution as an analogue of Poisson distribution in classical probability. The resulting R transform is therefore $R(z) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \kappa_i z^i = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} z^i = \frac{1}{1-z}$. When $T > N \gg 1$, the cumulants are simply rescaled by the "rectangularity" $r = N/T$, leading to $\kappa_i = r^i$, so the R-transform for Wishart reads

$$R_W(z) = \frac{1}{1-rz} \quad (7)$$

Since, by definition $R(G(z)) + 1/G(z) = z$, formula (7) leads to a quadratic algebraic equation for the Green's function, with obvious solution for $G_W(z)$. Taking the imaginary



FIG. 1: dAEEG experiment, done at J. Ochab's lab.




FIG. 2: Spectral histograms of the pdf of Pearson estimator.

part of the solution leads to spectral density for the Wishart ensemble

$$\rho_{MP}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi r \lambda} \sqrt{(\lambda_+ - \lambda)(\lambda - \lambda_-)} \quad (8)$$

where $\lambda_{\pm} = (1 \pm \sqrt{r})^2$. This is the celebrated Marcenko-Pastur distribution. This famous formula is a benchmark of lack of any correlations in the measured multivariate time series. Why then this spectrum does not correspond to the spectrum of true covariance matrix for multivariate Gaussian (which is unit diagonal), or, in other words, to the spectral measure $\rho_{true} = \delta(\lambda - 1)$? The reason is the finite number of measurements, which always introduces the noise. Note, that only in the limit $T \rightarrow \infty$ with N fixed, the Marcenko-Pastur distribution tends to single eigenvalue 1, since the support of the spectrum, $[\lambda_-, \lambda_+]$ shrinks in the limit $r \rightarrow 0$ to this value from both sides of the support. Still, the disagreement between orange histogram and analytical result (blue line) from Marcenko-Pastur distribution shows that even in the resting state the electric activity of the brain of the author is more involved comparing to Gaussian noise, which is reassuring! Finally, left us make the next "measurement". Let us now destroy all the temporal (causal) correlations in the measured EEG data of the author, by multiple reshuffling of all the columns in matrix X . Then, we construct again the covariance matrix and calculate the spectrum. As expected, the data now (blue histogram on Figure 2) are in perfect agreement with pure noise data, i.e. with the Marcenko-Pastur distribution, since all causal correlations have been destroyed.

Of course, inferring the information that the signals in the head of one of the authors are not pure noise is not very far reaching. In general, we expect that the covariance matrix is much more sophisticated, e.g. $\langle x_{it}x_{js} \rangle = A_{ij}B_{ts}$, where matrices A reflect the true correlations between the clusters of electrodes and matrices B reflect temporal (auto)correlations for the same electrode. Assuming still the Gaussian character of the fluctuations, we are facing the problem of calculating spectral moments (cumulants) of the type $\langle \text{tr}[XX^T]^k \rangle_{cW}$, where index cW means correlated Wishart, i.e. the true measure is proportional to $\exp -\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(A^{-1}XB^{-1}X^T)$. Now we can see the power of FRV calculus. Let us change the variables $\sqrt{A^{-1}X}\sqrt{B^{-1}} \equiv Y$. Note that this change of variables converts

the measure into pure Gaussian one, $\exp -\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}YY^\tau$, but at the expense of complicating the moments, which read now $\langle \text{tr}[\sqrt{A}YBY^\tau\sqrt{A}]^k \rangle_W = \langle \text{tr}[AYBY^\tau]^k \rangle_W$, where we used the cyclic property of the trace. Such mixed moments can be easily disentangled using the powerful S-transform technique. First, one can "factorise" the spectrum of A from the moments $\langle \text{tr}[YBY^\tau]^k \rangle_W \sim \langle \text{tr}[BY^\tau Y]^k \rangle_W$, where again we used the cyclic properties of the trace. Second, one can "factorise" further the spectrum of B from anti-Wishart moments $\langle \text{tr}[Y^\tau Y]^k \rangle_W$, which are equal, modulo trivial normalisation to moments of Wishart $\langle \text{tr}[YY^\tau]^k \rangle_W$. In such way we have spectrally disentangled the correlated moments in terms of elementary spectral constituents. The resulting explicit formulae are complicated (so we do not list them), but there are exact, and allow to infer the true moments from the measured estimators. Assuming the a priori unknown structure of correlations A and/or B and minimising the error allows the explicit optimisation of the predictions for the true correlation matrices. For explicit ensembles, we refer to [7]. The additional advantage of the FRV spectral methods stems from the fact, that they can be easily generalised for other cases of randomness (Lévy, Student-Fisher etc) and can be applied also in the case of non-linear estimators, alike nonlinear shrinkage estimators.

IV. RAJAN-ABBOTT MODEL FOR REAL NEURONAL NETWORK

In the majority of models of synaptic interactions, strength of interactions between all the pairs of N neurons is provided by random adjacency matrix. The neuroscience imposes however stronger constraints comparing to random matrix theory, in particular, allows at least two types of neurons to be active, excitatory and inhibitory ones, with two different values of means of variances from e.g. the simplest Gaussian ensembles. The synaptic matrix can be therefore mimicked as $X = M + W$, where $W = G\Lambda$, with G purely random (Gaussian Ginibre ensemble type), and Λ the diagonal with first elements corresponding to excitatory neurons equal to variance σ_E and remaining inhibitory neurons with variance σ_I . One rank matrix M includes the information on the means μ of two kinds of neurons. Since empirical studies show that the amount of inhibition and excitation of a neuron is the same even at the scale of few milliseconds, global constraint is applied, $f_E\mu_E + f_I\mu_I = 0$, where corresponding f_i are the fractions of pertinent neurons. Even in this case, the non-normal character of the spectrum causes the eigenvalues of X to be dramatically different from simple assumption of Gaussianity of W . In their important contribution Rajan and Abbott [8] suggested an additional local condition, demanding that the sums of strengths coupled independently for each neuron vanish. In recent paper [9], we have reanalysed that analysis using the powerful tools of FRV calculus, exploiting the Haagerup-Larsen theorem and the fact, that if G is R-diagonal, the product of $G\Lambda$ is as well. First, we have provided back-on-envelope re-derivation of the original model, using the advantage of FRV variables. Second, we have addressed the issue of the statistics of

eigenvectors, which was not amenable in original formulation. Main message was, that left-right eigenvector correlation O_X (eq. 5) is dramatically sensitive to the local balance condition. Since FRV calculus allows also the calculations where moments do not exist, we considered this case, showing that in the case of heavy-tailed spectra the above effect is magnified by orders of magnitude. This means, that the full description of dynamical processes of realistic adjacency neuronal networks requires the entangled dynamics of both eigenvalues and eigenvectors, contrary to the evolution of normal (symmetric matrices), where eigenvectors decouple. For balanced networks, the sensitivity of eigenvalues to any additive perturbation is dramatic, which calls for some specific, powerful mechanism for the stabilisation of the spectra of adjacency matrices. We have envisioned, that the generic mechanism of such type can be provided by the transient behaviour [11]. We notice, that such mechanism is consistent with the model of del Molino et al. [10] et al.

V. FREENESS IN DEEP LEARNING

Free random variables applications to deep neural networks was pioneered by Google AI team [12], where the particular, generic fit to tailor the initialisation in feed forward networks was obtained (so-called isometry). In this section, we briefly advertise the extension of above construction to the case of residual networks [15]. In residual network, the information propagates according to the prescription

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}^l &= \phi(\mathbf{h}^l) + a\mathbf{h}^{l-1} \\ \mathbf{h}^l &= \mathbf{W}^l\mathbf{x}^{l-1} + \mathbf{b}^l\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

where l runs the depth of the network ($l = 1, \dots, L$), and N -dimensional (here N - number of neurons in each layer) vectors \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{x} are pre- and post- activations for each layer. Here, for fixed layer, \mathbf{W} is the synaptic matrix, ϕ is a generic, non-linear, activation function and \mathbf{b} are real valued bias vectors. Parameter a tracks the influence of skip connections in the networks. In the process of adjusting the weights during training, the crucial role is played by the Jacobian of transition from one layer to the next one, i.e.

$$\frac{\partial x_k^l}{\partial x_t^{l-1}} = \left[\mathbf{D}^l \mathbf{W}^l + a\mathbf{1} \right]_{kt}\tag{10}$$

where \mathbf{D}^l is a diagonal matrix $D_{ij}^l = \phi'(h_i^l)\delta_{ij}$. Note that too large or too small gradients in the Jacobian matrix will harm the learning process, leading either to chaos or to un-effective learning, respectively. The total input-output Jacobian is the product of Jacobians for each L layers of the network, and has the form of the matrix

$$\mathbf{J} = \prod_{l=1}^L (\mathbf{D}^l \mathbf{W}^l + a\mathbf{1})\tag{11}$$

Understanding the spectral properties of such object is of paramount importance. Luckily, one can address this problem using FRV, since the initialisation of the weight matrix \mathbf{W} is usually Gaussian. The general structure resembles the non-hermitian multiplicative diffusion [13]. Since in this case the spectrum is complex, it is technically easier to consider SVD, i.e. to study the real spectrum of $\mathbf{J}\mathbf{J}^\tau$. Let us start from the simplest example, when we put $a = 0$ and $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{1}$. This is a linear problem of understanding the spectral properties of the SVD of the product $\mathbf{W}_i \dots \mathbf{W}_L$ of random matrices. Luckily, we can use the power of FRV calculus, noticing that the spectral properties of the product of such matrices is equivalent to the spectral properties of the L -power of the single random matrix \mathbf{W} [14]. Then, the simple application of Haagerup-Larsen theorem shows, that one can just change the variables

$$S_{\mathbf{J}^\tau \mathbf{J}}(F_{\mathbf{J}}(r) - 1) = \frac{1}{r^{2/L}} \quad (12)$$

and the crucial parameter $\xi = \frac{1}{N} \langle \text{tr} \mathbf{W}^\tau \mathbf{W} \rangle$ is just the outer rim of the famous single ring theorem. In the case of non-linear case, the similar reasoning holds, following our argument from the previous section, that the product of R-diagonal \mathbf{W} and any other matrix \mathbf{D} is still R-diagonal. So, we can use again Haagerup-Larsen theorem and simple change of variables. This is the mathematical essence of Google AI team observation. The crucial object is, as before, the outer rim of the single rim theorem, which reads now

$$\chi = \frac{1}{N} \langle \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{W})^\tau \mathbf{D}\mathbf{W} \rangle \quad (13)$$

The main observation of the Google AI team was, that even at the outer rim of single rings theorem, the value of the maximal SVD eigenvalue still grows with the depth of the neural networks L . Therefore for e.g. both ReLU and hard-tanh networks, there is no way that any choice of Gaussian initialisation can prevent the failure of dynamical learning procedure. However, in the case when initialisation was based on Gaussian *orthogonal* random matrices, similar rerun of arguments has shown, that e.g. for hard-tanh networks such fine tuning was possible, even for very large L . This spectacular agreement of numerical simulations compared to theoretical predictions based on FRV calculus was the first demonstration of the power of FRV techniques in Machine Learning.

The generalisation for ResNet networks ($a \neq 0$) is non-trivial, since the shift in multiplication process destroys the azimuthal symmetry of the spectrum, and invalidates the assumptions of the Haagerup-Larsen theorem. Nevertheless, more sophisticated tools of FRV calculus still can be used [15], leading to the isometry also in the case of ResNets. In particular, for several different activations functions (e.g. ReLU, tanh, hard tanh, sigmoid, SeLU, leaky ReLU), proper rescaling of initialisation conditions lead to isometry (scaling). Analytical results based on FRV calculus were confronted with numerics based on CIFAR10 datasets, confirming the power of FRV when applied to Deep Learning.

VI. SUMMARY

In this mini-review, we have highlighted three different aspects of cognitive data analysis using the modern tools of FRV calculus. Our motivation was two-fold. First, we wanted to stress, how broad is the spectrum of FRV tools when applied to different neuroscience datasets. The second motivation is however deeper. Nowadays, the areas of statistical analysis of human (or mammalian, to be more general) Big Data brain networks, simulations of real, often low-level neuronal systems alike considered here Rajan-Abbott model and an exploding area of artificial neural networks (deep learning in ML) have little in common, despite obvious general motivations to better understanding how to emulate (outperform?) the human mind. On top of semantic differences, all three areas are using different tools and different mathematical formalisms, sometimes at very different level of mathematical rigidity. In our opinion, FRV calculus provides a rare opportunity for *scientifically more rigid* comparison of these three so different aspects of understanding the broad empirical spectrum of cognitive sciences, at the level when verification of hypotheses and prospects of assessing new algorithms based on bio-inspiration can be verified at the quantitative level.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research was supported by the TEAMNET POIR.04.04.00- 00-14DE/18-00 grant "Bio-inspired Artificial Neural Networks" of the Foundation for Polish Science and by the Priority Research Area Digiworld under the program Excellence Initiative – Research University at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków.

-
- [1] M. Fąfrowicz, T. Marek, W. Karwowski, D. Schmorow (Editors), *Neuroadaptive Systems: Theory and Applications*, CRC Press (2012).
 - [2] J. Wishart, *Biometrika*, 20A (12) (1928) 32.
 - [3] For a review on random matrices, see e.g. T. Tao, *Topics in random matrix theory* (Vol. 132). American Mathematical Soc.(2012).
 - [4] D.V. Voiculescu, K.J. Dykema and A. Nica, *Free random variables*, Providence, RI: AMS (1992).
 - [5] U. Haagerup and F. Larsen, *Journal of Functional Analysis* 176 (2), 331 (2000).
 - [6] S. Belinschi, M.A. Nowak, R. Speicher and W. Tarnowski, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 50 (10) 105204.
 - [7] Z. Burda, A. Jarosz, M.A. Nowak, J. Jurkiewicz, G. Papp and I. Zahed, *Quantitative Finance* 11, 1103 (2011).

- [8] K. Rajan and L. Abbott, *Physical Review Letters* 97 (18), 188104 (2006).
- [9] E. Gudowska-Nowak, M.A. Nowak, D.R. Chialvo, J.K. Ochoa and W. Tarnowski, *Neural Computation* 32, 395 (2020).
- [10] L.C.G. del Molino, K. Pakdaman, J. Touboul and G. Wainrib, *Physical Review E* 88(4) 042824 (2013).
- [11] For review of transient behaviour in complex systems, see J. Grela, *Physical Review E* 96(2), 022316 (2017).
- [12] J. Pennington, S. Schoenholz and S. Ganguli, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 4785 (2017).
- [13] E. Gudowska-Nowak, R.A. Janik, J. Jurkiewicz and M.A. Nowak, *Nuclear Physics B* 670(3) 479 (2003).
- [14] Z. Burda, M.A. Nowak and A. Świąch, *Phys. Rev. E* 86, 061137 (2012).
- [15] W. Tarnowski, P. Warchoń, S. Jastrzębski, J. Tabor and M.A. Nowak, in *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS 2019)*, PMLR:Volume 89.