

# ANDHRA Bandersnatch: Training Neural Networks to Predict Parallel Realities

Venkata Satya Sai Ajay Daliparthi  
Blekinge Institute of Technology  
Karlskrona, Sweden

venkatasatyaajay.daliparthi@bth.se

## Abstract

Inspired by Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI), this work introduces a novel neural network architecture that splits the same input signal into parallel branches at each layer, utilizing a Hyper Rectified Activation, referred to as ANDHRA. The branched layers do not merge and form a separate network path, leading to multiple network heads for output prediction. For a network with branching factor 2 at three levels, the total heads are  $2^3 = 8$ . The individual heads are jointly trained by combining their respective loss values. However, the proposed architecture requires additional parameters and memory during training due to the additional branches. During inference, the experimental results on CIFAR-10/100 demonstrate that there exists one individual head that outperforms the baseline accuracy, achieving statistically significant improvement with equal parameters and computational cost.

## 1. Introduction

As the depth of the neural networks (NN) starts increasing, the training complexity increases due to the vanishing gradient problem [10]. As the gradients pass through each layer, they shrink, leading to an ineffective update of weights in the earlier layers (close to input). The existing solutions investigated this problem through different dimensions that include non-linear activations (ReLU [21]), initialization techniques (Xavier [6] and He [7]), batch normalization [14], stochastic optimization (Adam [16]), and network architectures (residual [8], and dense [12] connections). In the network architectures landscape, the prominent ResNets [8] introduced skip-connections between layers to facilitate direct gradient flow in deeper architectures. The DenseNet [12] connects each layer to every other layer thus providing each layer with direct access to gradients from all previous layers. Nevertheless, in many cases NNs are trained using a single loss function attached to the final output layer, this is due to the traditional network architecture style. To mention, some earlier works introduced methods like *Com-*




Figure 1. Comparison of training accuracy progression in baseline and proposed method AB (ANDHRA Bandersnatch), in log-scale graph

*panion objective* [19], and *Auxiliary loss* [18, 23] where an additional loss function is attached to the earlier layers for improvement in gradient flow. However, the place of these auxiliary losses remains arbitrary [19, 25], and the auxiliary prediction is often discarded at the inference stage.

To address the vanishing gradient problem through network architectures, inspired by Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI), this work proposes a novel NN architecture that grows exponentially by forming branches/splits at each layer where different branches independently handle the flow of information, resulting in multiple *parallel heads*(output layers). A loss function is attached to the *individual heads* and the whole network is jointly trained by aggregating the individual head losses. The main contributions of this work are as follows:

- A non-merging splitting/branching network module called *ANDHRA*.
- A network architecture named *ANDHRA Bandersnatch (AB)* that uses the *ANDHRA* module at different levels to create network branches.

“The key idea is that by splitting the network into multiple independent branches at each level, the flow of gradients is no longer confined to a single path. This should allow the network to effectively propagate gradients through the layers, as multiple paths are available to carry the gradient backward during training.”

The figure 1 presents the training accuracy progression of the proposed architecture in comparison with the baseline, where the baseline (*Baseline 1GR3*) network is equivalent to a traditional feed-forward ResNet [8], and the proposed network; ANDHRA Bandersnatch (*AB 2GR3*). The *AB 2GR3* network has a branching factor 2 at 3 levels, the total heads for this network are  $2^3 = 8$  heads. Here, one head in *AB 2GR3* is equivalent to the baseline in terms of parameters and computational cost. Thus, in the figure 1, the *Baseline 1GR3* curve should be compared with *AB 2GR3 one head*, and the *AB 2GR3 combined* is an ensemble prediction that is inherent to the proposed architecture.

The experiential results on CIFAR-10/100 demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed architecture by showing statistically significant accuracy improvements over the baseline networks.

## 2. Method

This section provides a background on the source of inspiration for the proposed method, then introduces the proposed ANDHRA module, Bandersnatch network, and definition of training loss for the proposed method.

*Source of Inspiration:* Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) of quantum mechanics assumes that every quantum measurement leads to multiple branches of reality, with each branch representing a different outcome of a quantum event. It assumes that all possible outcomes of a quantum event actually occur but in different, non-interacting branches of the universe. These parallel realities exist simultaneously, each one corresponding to a different possibility that could have occurred, leading to the idea that parallel universes are created for every quantum decision. According to MWI, a popular quantum paradox, Schrödinger Cat is interpreted as where both outcomes (the cat being dead and the cat being alive) occur, but in separate branches of the universe. There is no collapse of the wave function; the universe simply splits into two branches, one where the cat is dead and one where the cat is alive.

A similar idea of parallel realities arising from decisions (like in human choice or action, rather than purely quantum events) has been explored in various ways, often in the context of multiverse theories or alternate realities in science fiction (Netflix shows *Bandersnatch* and *Dark*).

### 2.1. Ajay N’ Daliparthi Hyper Rectified Activation (ANDHRA)

*Idea:* “The idea is to implement a NN architecture based on MWI where the network splits into multiple “branches” or “heads” (representing different paths) that process the same input signal in parallel, each corresponding to different possible outcomes. Akin to how MWI suggests parallel universes in their treatment of parallelism and branching, the NN architecture involves computational paths that exist




Figure 2. MWI based state changes

*simultaneously, and those outcomes are handled independently (separate branches or worlds).”, as depicted in Figure 2*

The intuition behind the idea is that by designing a network that grows exponentially, the parent layers are shared among the individual branches, thus the shallow/earlier layers (close to input) receive multiple gradient updates from each individual branch. Since these individual branches are identical, the updates from multiple branches shouldn’t deviate much from the ideal one.

*Proposed method:* Based on the idea, this work proposes a network module referred to as ANDHRA that splits the given input signal into  $N$  (branching factor) number of parallel branches. The A N’D stands for Ajay and Daliparthi, and HRA stands for Hyper Rectified Activation.

Since the activation function adds non-linearity to the network, this work interprets the activation function as a decision-making point and makes a design decision to introduce the splitting function at the activation layer, the one before reducing the spatial dimensions and passing it to next-level, meaning one module for one-level.

By introducing the ANDHRA module, the network grows exponentially in terms of the number of outputs, parameters, and computational complexity.

Let’s assume that each layer uses one ANDHRA module,  $N$  is the branching factor, and  $L$  is the level of NN.

The number of heads  $H$  at level  $L$  can be expressed as 1

$$H_L = N^L \quad (1)$$

The total number of layers can be expressed as the sum of the layers at each level of the network, also expressed in 2

$$\text{Layers up to level } L = H_0 + H_1 + H_2 + \dots + H_L \quad (2)$$

By substituting the formula in eq 1 in eq 2

$$\text{Layers up to level } L = 1 + N + N^2 + N^3 + \dots + N^L \quad (3)$$

The equation 3 resembles a classic geometric series, where the first term is 1 and the common ratio is  $N$ . The sum of the first  $L + 1$  terms of a geometric series is given by the formula:

$$S_L = \frac{N^{L+1} - 1}{N - 1} \quad (4)$$

$$\therefore \text{Layers up to level } L = \frac{N^{L+1} - 1}{N - 1} \quad (5)$$

Where:

- $N$  is the branching factor.
- $L$  is the Level number, starting from 0.

## 2.2. ANDHRA Bandersnatch (AB) Network

The Bandersnatch network is a NN implemented using the ANDHRA module with branching factor  $N = 2$ , denoted as ANDHRA Bandersnatch 2G (where G stands for generations also denoting network growth rate/common ratio). It assumes that the network splits into two outcomes at each level. Based on the dataset (input image resolution), the levels will be decided in a network architecture. Figure 3 presents baseline and Bandersnatch-2G network architectures side-by-side in which there are four levels (based on CIFAR input resolution 32x32), and ANDHRA module is placed three times, each at level-1, 2, and 3. The baseline architecture is implemented by replicating ResNet[8], and the Bandersnatch-2G is implemented to match the baseline for a given individual head, this can also be observed from the Figure 3. Using eq 1, the total heads for a 3-leveled network with branching factor 2 is  $2^3 = 8$ . Thus, the Bandersnatch-2G network consists of 8 identical heads, and the baseline is identical to an individual head in terms of parameters and computational complexity.

*In Figure 3, the Conv layer at level-0 (with 3 in filters, and 64 out filters), also the first Conv layer, receives gradient updates from eight heads, the two Conv layers at level-1; each receives gradient updates from four heads, .... (the pattern repeats until the end)*

Network Notation: Each Conv block is followed by a ResBlock (R), the depth of the ResBlock will be decided during experimentation (R-Depth). A network with R0 means zero residual blocks are present in a network. For networks with R value 3, three residual blocks are stacked on top of each other, each residual block consists of two Conv layers and a skip-connection. For any given Res-Block, the number of input filters and output filters are same.

The Conv layers represented in Figure 3 have stride 2, and a point-wise (1x1 Conv) skip connection. Before passing the individual heads into linear layers, there is an average pooling layer with kernel size 4. Since there are 8

heads, during inference, the individual head predictions are majority-voted to get the combined prediction.

*Calculating the number of layers:* using equations 2 3 4, the total number of layers for levels 0, 1, 2, and 3 in a Bandersnatch-2G network can be calculated as:

For each layer:

$$H_0 = 1, \quad H_1 = 2, \quad H_2 = 4, \quad H_3 = 8$$

The total number of Conv layers up to level 3 is:

$$\text{Total layers up to layer 3} = 1 + 2 + 4 + 8 = 15$$

Using the geometric sum formula:

$$\text{Total heads up to layer 3} = \frac{2^{3+1} - 1}{2 - 1} = \frac{16 - 1}{1} = 15$$

Thus, the total number of heads up to layer 3 is 15, this can also be manually verified by counting the number of Conv blocks at each level of the Bandersnatch-2G network in Figure 3.

## 2.3. Training the ANDHRA Bandersnatch network

While training, each head is assigned a loss function and these individual losses are combined by summing and averaging. Let  $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_N$  be the individual losses for the  $n$  heads. Each  $L_i$  corresponds to the loss computed for the  $i$ -th head of the network. The final loss  $L_{\text{total}}$  passed for back-propagation is the average of all individual losses, represented in equation 6

$$L_{\text{total}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^N L_i \quad (6)$$

The reason for summing and averaging the losses is to create a global loss that represents the overall error across all heads. The averaging ensures that the optimization process treats each head equally, which might help avoid overfitting to any one branch of the network, ensuring that each head contributes equally to the final loss.

For Bandersnatch Network with 8 heads, the total loss from eq 6 can be written as:

$$L_{\text{total}} = 0.125 \cdot (L_1 + L_2 + L_3 + L_4 + L_5 + L_6 + L_7 + L_8) \quad (7)$$

## 3. Evaluation

### 3.1. Experiment Setup

Each network is trained five times and the mean and standard deviation values are reported.

These training hyper-parameters are kept the same for both baseline and Bandersnatch Network, and experiments are conducted by replacing just the network (The training and validation function needs adjustments to support the Bandersnatch 2G Network):




Figure 3. From the left side, baseline network, the levels & output shapes chart, and the ANDHRA Bandersnatch 2G network

- Dataset: CIFAR 10/100
- Training data transforms: RandomCrop(32, padding=4), RandomHorizontalFlip(), and Normalize. For validation data, only Normalization.
- Batch Size: 128
- Epochs: 200
- Loss: CrossEntropyLoss
- Optimizer: SGD (momentum=0.9, weight decay=5e-4)
- Learning rate: 0.1
- Learning rate scheduler: Cosine Annealing (T max=200)
- Performance metric: Top-1 accuracy

*Experiment Hypothesis:* Since, the baseline is identical to any individual network branch/(head) in Bandersnatch 2G Network (see Figure 3); if any individual head outperforms the baseline accuracy, during inference, that particular head can be detached and used for inference, it means improving the performance of the network without adding additional computation and parameter overhead.

To check if the experiment hypothesis holds true: a statistical significance test (Paired T-test) is performed between the results of each baseline variant and its corresponding top-performing head in Bandersnatch 2G Network. If the p-value is equal to or less than 0.05, then the prediction distributions (5 runs) are considered to be statistically significant.

### 3.2. Experiment results

In Table 1, and 2; the first column represents the depth of the residual blocks placed at each level (shown in Figure 3) of the network (refer to section 2.2 network notation); the second column represents the performance of the baseline networks; the third column represents the performance of top performing heads out of the eight heads in the Bandersnatch 2G network; the fourth column represents the combined prediction of 8 heads. During the comparison, the

baseline performance (col-2) is matched with the top performing head (col-3) out of 8 heads. Thus, in the fifth and sixth columns, the statistically significant difference and mean squared error is measured between the 5 runs of baseline and top performing head performance, columns (2 and 3).

Table 1 presents results on CIFAR-10 where the top performing head in ANDHRA Bandersnatch (2G) network outperforms the baseline from residual depth (0-3) with statistical significance difference. The *experiment hypothesis* holds true in all cases, at every depth.

Table 2 presents results on CIFAR-100 where the performance of the top performing head in ANDHRA Bandersnatch (2G) outperforms the baseline from residual depth (1-3) with a statistically significant difference. Expect, in case of residual depth (0), the proposed method slightly under-performs the baseline, thus, no statistically significant difference is observed. Hence, the *experiment Hypothesis* holds true, except for row one with residual depth zero.

Furthermore, in between Table 1 and 2, the performance difference is higher in Table 2 (CIFAR-100), specifically, the rows 3 and 4 in Table 2 with residual depths 2 & 3, this is an interesting result, demonstrating the effectiveness of the proposed method. This difference can also be observed through high mean squared error in rows 3, and 4 (in Table 2).

### 4. Ablation study on ensemble prediction methods

Since the proposed architecture consists of multiple network predictions, the combined/ensemble prediction is used for the joint training of individual heads. Thus, an ablation study is conducted to compare different ensemble techniques on ANDHRA Bandersnatch (AB) Networks trained

R-Depth	Baseline (1G)	ANDHRA Bandersnatch (2G)		Significance	Mean Sq. Error
		Top-Head	Combined		
R0	93.546 ± 0.190	<b>94.118 ± 0.099</b>	94.738 ± 0.090	Yes	0.404
R1	95.202 ± 0.097	<b>95.536 ± 0.078</b>	95.890 ± 0.099	Yes	0.138
R2	95.366 ± 0.171	<b>95.900 ± 0.127</b>	96.230 ± 0.108	Yes	0.334
R3	95.474 ± 0.162	<b>96.088 ± 0.065</b>	96.378 ± 0.023	Yes	0.418

Table 1. Experimental results on CIFAR-10, (compare columns 2, and 3)

R-Depth	Baseline (1G)	ANDHRA Bandersnatch (2G)		Significance	Mean Sq. Error
		Top-Head	Combined		
R0	<b>73.982 ± 0.184</b>	73.930 ± 0.233	77.186 ± 0.153	No	0.143
R1	77.952 ± 0.145	<b>78.792 ± 0.173</b>	81.214 ± 0.114	Yes	0.733
R2	78.676 ± 0.324	<b>80.354 ± 0.084</b>	82.422 ± 0.113	Yes	2.910
R3	78.610 ± 0.361	<b>80.830 ± 0.116</b>	82.784 ± 0.128	Yes	5.007

Table 2. Experimental results on CIFAR-100, (compare columns 2, and 3)

R-Depth	Majority Voting	Average Probability	Product of Experts (PoE)	Rank-Based Voting
R0	94.738 ± 0.090	<b>94.892 ± 0.110</b>	94.846 ± 0.139	94.818 ± 0.113
R1	94.890 ± 0.099	96.052 ± 0.119	<b>96.094 ± 0.095</b>	95.918 ± 0.098
R2	96.230 ± 0.108	<b>96.348 ± 0.102</b>	96.344 ± 0.096	96.294 ± 0.108
R3	96.378 ± 0.023	96.504 ± 0.108	<b>96.508 ± 0.101</b>	96.428 ± 0.037

Table 3. Ablation study on ensemble prediction methods of Bandersnatch network on CIFAR-10

R-Depth	Majority Voting	Average Probability	Product of Experts (PoE)	Rank-Based Voting
R0	77.186 ± 0.153	77.662 ± 0.297	<b>78.026 ± 0.238</b>	77.664 ± 0.218
R1	81.214 ± 0.114	81.506 ± 0.180	<b>81.712 ± 0.125</b>	81.516 ± 0.132
R2	82.422 ± 0.113	82.584 ± 0.126	<b>82.612 ± 0.090</b>	82.460 ± 0.119
R3	82.784 ± 0.128	82.932 ± 0.108	<b>82.950 ± 0.079</b>	82.872 ± 0.138

Table 4. Ablation study on ensemble prediction methods of Bandersnatch network on CIFAR-100

on CIFAR-10/100 in Section 3. Note that the default ensemble method used for the experiments in section 3 is a simple majority voting.

#### 4.1. Selected ensemble techniques

Let:

- $N$ : Number of heads
- $y_i$ : Prediction of the  $i$ -th head
- $p_i$ : Softmax probability distribution from the  $i$ -th head
- $\hat{y}$ : Final combined prediction

1. Majority Voting [1] This strategy selects the class based on the most frequent vote among the multiple heads. By stacking all the predictions from the heads into a tensor, the mode across the predictions for each sample is calculated, as shown in Equation 8

$$\hat{y} = \text{mode}([y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N]) \quad (8)$$

2. Average Probability [4]

This strategy averages the probability distributions from each head and chooses the class with the highest average probability. The probabilities from all heads are stacked, the mean is computed, and the class with the highest average probability is chosen, as shown in Equation 9

$$\hat{y} = \arg \max_c \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N p_i[c] \right) \quad (9)$$

3. Product of Experts (PoE) [9]

This strategy assumes that the heads are “experts,” and their probabilities are multiplied (in log space) to combine

their opinions. The probabilities from all heads are stacked, take the log of each, sum them, and then exponentiate to get the combined probability where the class with the highest combined probability is selected, as shown in Equation 10

$$\hat{y} = \arg \max_c \left( \exp \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \log(p_i[c] + \epsilon) \right) \right) \quad (10)$$

#### 4. Rank-Based Voting [2]

This strategy assigns higher weight to the top-ranked classes for each head. For each class, the rank scores are calculated across all heads. The ranking values are added to a tensor, where each class’s rank gets added to its corresponding position, and the class with the highest rank score is chosen. Let  $r_i[c]$  denote the rank of class  $c$  for head  $i$ , the rank-based voting is shown in 11

$$\hat{y} = \arg \max_c \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{r_i[c]} \quad (11)$$

#### 4.2. Ablation study results

From Table 3, the ablation results on CIFAR-10, a similar performance is observed between the techniques; average probability and product of experts, they outperform majority voting and rank-based voting.

In Table 4, the ablation results on CIFAR-100, the product of experts outperforms other techniques. Similar to table 3, the average probability shows adequate performance.

#### 5. Related Work

The Inception [23] module proposed to split the feature map and process them with parallel convolutional layers of different kernel sizes, for capturing features at different scales. The ResNeXt[26] extended the ResNet [8] to increase the width of the network by proposing cardinality, the number of independent splits. A similar concept of using multiple parallel convolutions has been investigated in Wide-ResNet [27], and FractalNet[18], Res2Net [5]. Through model architecture search methods, the RegNet[22], MobilenetV3 [11], and EfficientNet [24] balances between depth, width, and scaling.

Grouped Convolutions [17] is a separate branch of convolutional layers that divide the channels in an input feature map into multiple groups, and each group is processed individually, thus reducing the computational complexity of the convolutional operations. The Shufflenetv2 [20], CondenseNet [13], and MobilenetV3 [11] demonstrated the effectiveness of grouped convs in designing light-weight networks. In Xception[3], each channel is processed independently and a 1x1 convolution is used to combine the channels, this is a special case of grouped convolution where the number of groups is equal to the channels in the input feature map.

*Nevertheless, the existing works merge or concatenate feature maps after parallel processing/splitting. In contrast, this work proposes to maintain an independent branch after splitting that continues until the output layer of the network, leading to multiple network heads for prediction.*

On the other hand, the auxiliary loss [23, 25] concept proposes to introduce additional losses at intermediate layers to improve the training of earlier layers (close to input). During inference, the auxiliary heads are discarded, and the final output is considered for prediction, this can be viewed as a regularizing technique [23].

The concept of applying multiple loss functions is prominent in multitask learning [15] where each loss learns to solve a specific task, these losses are combined with the primary loss for training on multiple tasks simultaneously.

*Instead, this work proposes training a network with multiple identical heads where each head is treated with a loss function and the total losses are summed and scaled before proceeding with gradient updates.*

#### 6. Conclusions

This work proposes a novel NN architecture that splits the network into parallel branches where the multiple network heads are jointly trained. Due to the shared parent branches, the earlier(close to input) layers in the network receive gradient updates from multiple output heads, leading to faster convergence of the individual heads (compared to baseline as shown in Figure 1). The experimental results on CIFAR-10/100 demonstrate a statistically significant difference by adopting the proposed architecture for simple ResNet style baselines. Unlike traditional methods, the ensemble prediction is inherent to the proposed architecture. Moreover, the proposed method is analogous to existing network modules, thus paving a path forward for experimentation.

#### References

- [1] Krizhevsky Alex. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. <https://www.cs.toronto.edu/kriz/learning-features-2009-TR.pdf>, 2009. 5
- [2] Chris Burges, Tal Shaked, Erin Renshaw, Ari Lazier, Matt Deeds, Nicole Hamilton, and Greg Hullender. Learning to rank using gradient descent. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning*, pages 89–96, 2005. 6
- [3] François Chollet. Xception: Deep learning with depthwise separable convolutions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1251–1258, 2017. 6
- [4] Thomas G Dietterich. Ensemble methods in machine learning. In *International workshop on multiple classifier systems*, pages 1–15. Springer, 2000. 5
- [5] Shang-Hua Gao, Ming-Ming Cheng, Kai Zhao, Xin-Yu Zhang, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Philip Torr. Res2net: A new

- multi-scale backbone architecture. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 43(2):652–662, 2019. 6
- [6] Xavier Glorot and Yoshua Bengio. Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 249–256. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2010. 1
- [7] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Delving deep into rectifiers: Surpassing human-level performance on imagenet classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 1026–1034, 2015. 1
- [8] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016. 1, 2, 3, 6
- [9] Geoffrey E Hinton. Training products of experts by minimizing contrastive divergence. *Neural computation*, 14(8): 1771–1800, 2002. 5
- [10] Sepp Hochreiter. Recurrent neural net learning and vanishing gradient. *International Journal Of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*, 6(2):107–116, 1998. 1
- [11] Andrew Howard, Mark Sandler, Grace Chu, Liang-Chieh Chen, Bo Chen, Mingxing Tan, Weijun Wang, Yukun Zhu, Ruoming Pang, Vijay Vasudevan, et al. Searching for mobilenetv3. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 1314–1324, 2019. 6
- [12] Gao Huang, Zhuang Liu, Laurens Van Der Maaten, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Densely connected convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4700–4708, 2017. 1
- [13] Gao Huang, Shichen Liu, Laurens Van der Maaten, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Condensenet: An efficient densenet using learned group convolutions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2752–2761, 2018. 6
- [14] Sergey Ioffe. Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.03167*, 2015. 1
- [15] Alex Kendall, Yarin Gal, and Roberto Cipolla. Multi-task learning using uncertainty to weigh losses for scene geometry and semantics. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7482–7491, 2018. 6
- [16] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2015. 1
- [17] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 25, 2012. 6
- [18] Gustav Larsson, Michael Maire, and Gregory Shakhnarovich. Fractalnet: Ultra-deep neural networks without residuals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.07648*, 2016. 1, 6
- [19] Chen-Yu Lee, Saining Xie, Patrick Gallagher, Zhengyou Zhang, and Zhuowen Tu. Deeply-supervised nets. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 562–570. Pmlr, 2015. 1
- [20] Ningning Ma, Xiangyu Zhang, Hai-Tao Zheng, and Jian Sun. Shufflenet v2: Practical guidelines for efficient cnn architecture design. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 116–131, 2018. 6
- [21] Vinod Nair and Geoffrey E Hinton. Rectified linear units improve restricted boltzmann machines. In *Proceedings of the 27th international conference on machine learning (ICML-10)*, pages 807–814, 2010. 1
- [22] Ilija Radosavovic, Raj Prateek Kosaraju, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Dollár. Designing network design spaces. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10428–10436, 2020. 6
- [23] Christian Szegedy, Wei Liu, Yangqing Jia, Pierre Sermanet, Scott Reed, Dragomir Anguelov, Dumitru Erhan, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Andrew Rabinovich. Going deeper with convolutions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1–9, 2015. 1, 6
- [24] Mingxing Tan and Quoc Le. Efficientnetv2: Smaller models and faster training. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 10096–10106. PMLR, 2021. 6
- [25] Surat Teerapittayanon, Bradley McDanel, and Hsiang-Tsung Kung. Branchynet: Fast inference via early exiting from deep neural networks. In *2016 23rd international conference on pattern recognition (ICPR)*, pages 2464–2469. IEEE, 2016. 1, 6
- [26] Saining Xie, Ross Girshick, Piotr Dollár, Zhuowen Tu, and Kaiming He. Aggregated residual transformations for deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1492–1500, 2017. 6
- [27] Erwan Zerhouni, Dávid Lányi, Matheus Viana, and Maria Gabriani. Wide residual networks for mitosis detection. In *2017 IEEE 14th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI 2017)*, pages 924–928. IEEE, 2017. 6

# ANDHRA Bandersnatch: Training Neural Networks to Predict Parallel Realities

## Supplementary Material

From the main paper results in Table 1, and Table 2, the network with residual depth three (R3) is selected for conducting additional experiments in the supplementary material. This selection is motivated by the accuracy of the networks with residual depth three. Just as in the main paper, each network is trained five times and the mean and standard deviation values are reported.

### 7. Parametric Activation

In Figure 3 (main paper), the ANDHRA module is implemented with two identical ReLU layers. However, using parametric activation functions such as PReLU, the definition of two independent layers becomes more coherent due to separate parameters for each branch. As shown in Figure 4 where the two independent PReLU layers are defined with the number of input channels as a parameter.

A parametric version of the baseline and the Bandersnatch -2GR3 networks are implemented by replacing the ReLU layer with PReLU (Params=input channels), and the results are presented in Table 5. The results demonstrate that the top performing head in Bandersnatch -2G outperforms the baseline networks in the parametric activation scenario, aligning with main paper results from Table 1, and Table 2.

### 8. ANDHRA module at different levels

In the main paper, for the network Bandersnatch 2G (refer Figure 3, one ANDHRA module is placed at each network level starting from level 1-3. Thus, the network in Figure 3 consists of three ANDHRA modules, leading to 8 output heads. In this section, an ablation study is performed with:

1. One ANDHRA module = 2 network heads
2. Two ANDHRA modules = 4 network heads

#### 8.1. One ANDHRA module and 2 output heads

Since there are three possibilities of placing the ANDHRA module at levels (1, 2, and 3), *three networks (AB2GR3-2H1, AB2GR3-2H2, and AB2GR3-2H3)* are implemented as shown in the Figure 5.

Note: the network code presented in Figure 8 belongs to this family of networks with one ANDHRA module placed at level 1. (AB2GR1-2H1)

#### 8.2. Two ANDHRA modules and 4 output heads

Since there are two possibilities of placing 2 ANDHRA modules at levels (1-2, and 2-3), *two networks (AB2GR3-4H1 and AB2GR3-4H2)* are implemented as shown in the Figure 6.

### 8.3. Results

The total 5 five networks (3 two heads - 2H) + 2 four heads - 4H) are trained on CIFAR-10/100, and the results are presented in Table 6, and Table 7 along with the baseline network (from main paper, baseline with ReLU). The statistical significance test is performed between the baseline and top-performing head in the Bandersnatch network.

In Table 6 and Table 7, all the Bandersnatch 2G variants (2H, 4H) outperformed the baseline network in terms of top-1 accuracy with statistically significant difference. Further, the network AB2GR3-4H1 outperforms out of the five Bandersnatch network variants trained in this ablation study.

### 9. Implementation

This section presents the implementation of the Bandersnatch-2G Network through a minimal network with the ANDHRA module placed only at level 1, meaning splitting is performed only once, thus leading to 2 output heads. In this network, the residual module depth is limited to one (R1). The PyTorch code for implementing this minimal network is presented in three parts (in figures 7, 8, and 9):

1. *Network Modules (7)*: consists of three building blocks of the network that include the ANDHRA module, a residual module with depth-1, and a residual module for pooling and feature space expansion.
2. *Bandersnatch 2G network with 2 heads (8)*: consists of network definition and forward-pass where the ANDHRA module is only placed at level-1, and the network returns two outputs.
3. *Training function (9)* consists of combined loss and majority voting prediction out of two output heads.



CIFAR	Baseline (1G-PReLU)	ANDHRA Bandersnatch (2G-PReLU)		Significance	Mean Sq. Error
		Top-Head	Combined		
10	95.352 ± 0.175	<b>96.146 ± 0.042</b>	96.394 ± 0.069	Yes	0.665
100	78.658 ± 0.504	<b>80.674 ± 0.144</b>	82.584 ± 0.137	Yes	4.378

Table 5. Parametric activation results on CIFAR10/100,

Parametric ANDHRA module

```

1 class ANDHRA(nn.Module):
2     def __init__(self, in_planes):
3         super(ANDHRA, self).__init__()
4         self.Relu1 = nn.PReLU(num_parameters=in_planes)
5         self.Relu2 = nn.PReLU(num_parameters=in_planes)
6
7     def forward(self, x):
8         x1 = self.Relu1(x)
9         x2 = self.Relu2(x)
10
11        return x1, x2

```

Figure 4. ANDHRA module with PReLU

Network	Top-1 Accuracy		Significance	Mean Sq. Error
	Top-Head	Combined		
Baseline (1GR3)	95.474 ± 0.162	-	-	-
AB2GR3-2H1	95.844 ± 0.117	95.670 ± 0.067	Yes	0.142
AB2GR3-2H2	95.922 ± 0.150	95.972 ± 0.104	Yes	0.214
AB2GR3-2H3	95.668 ± 0.154	95.670 ± 0.163	Yes	0.084
AB2GR3-4H1	<b>95.976 ± 0.151</b>	<b>96.322 ± 0.047</b>	Yes	<b>0.313</b>
AB2GR3-4H2	95.906 ± 0.160	95.882 ± 0.170	Yes	0.249

Table 6. Ablation study results on CIFAR-10 for ANDHRA module at different levels

Network	Top-1 Accuracy		Significance	Mean Sq. Error
	Top-Head	Combined		
Baseline (1GR3)	78.610 ± 0.361	-	-	-
AB2GR3-2H1	79.660 ± 0.260	79.674 ± 0.182	Yes	1.130
AB2GR3-2H2	80.100 ± 0.200	80.140 ± 0.036	Yes	2.301
AB2GR3-2H3	79.444 ± 0.143	79.380 ± 0.116	Yes	0.747
AB2GR3-4H1	<b>80.484 ± 0.141</b>	<b>82.188 ± 0.260</b>	Yes	<b>3.621</b>
AB2GR3-4H2	80.294 ± 0.087	81.324 ± 0.299	Yes	2.991

Table 7. Ablation study results on CIFAR-100 for ANDHRA module at different levels




Figure 5. From the left side: levels chart, AB2GR3-2H1, AB2GR3-2H2, and AB2GR3-2H3 networks




Figure 6. From the left side: levels chart, AB2GR3-4H1, and AB2GR3-4H2 networks

## Network Modules

```
1 class ANDHRA(nn.Module): # Proposed splitting module
2     def __init__(self):
3         super(ANDHRA, self).__init__()
4         self.Relu1 = nn.ReLU(inplace=False)
5         self.Relu2 = nn.ReLU(inplace=False)
6
7     def forward(self, x):
8         x1 = self.Relu1(x)
9         x2 = self.Relu2(x)
10
11        return x1, x2
12
13 class ResBlock(nn.Module): # Residual block with equal in/out filters
14     def __init__(self, in_planes):
15         super(ResBlock3, self).__init__()
16
17         #residual function
18         self.conv = nn.Sequential(
19             nn.Conv2d(in_planes, in_planes, kernel_size=3, stride =1, padding=1, bias=False),
20             nn.BatchNorm2d(in_planes),
21             nn.ReLU(inplace=False),
22             nn.Conv2d(in_planes, in_planes, kernel_size=3, stride =1, padding=1, bias=False),
23             nn.BatchNorm2d(in_planes))
24
25         #shortcut
26         self.shortcut = nn.Sequential()
27
28     def forward(self, x):
29         out = self.conv(x)
30         out += self.shortcut(x)
31         return out
32
33
34 class ResBlockP(nn.Module): # Residual block with inherent pooling that also doubles in filters
35     def __init__(self, in_channels, out_channels, stride):
36         super(ResBlockP, self).__init__()
37
38         #residual function
39         self.residual_function = nn.Sequential(
40             nn.Conv2d(in_channels, out_channels, kernel_size=3, stride= stride, padding=1, bias=False),
41             nn.BatchNorm2d(out_channels),
42             nn.ReLU(inplace=False),
43             nn.Conv2d(out_channels, out_channels, kernel_size=3, padding=1, bias=False),
44             nn.BatchNorm2d(out_channels)
45         )
46
47         #shortcut
48         self.shortcut = nn.Sequential(
49             nn.Conv2d(in_channels, out_channels, kernel_size=1, stride=stride, bias=False),
50             nn.BatchNorm2d(out_channels)
51         )
52
53     def forward(self, x):
54         return nn.ReLU(inplace=False)(self.residual_function(x) + self.shortcut(x))
```

Figure 7. Modules of the network

## Bandersnatch 2G network with 2 heads

```
1 class AB_2GR1_2H1(nn.Module):
2     def __init__(self, num_classes):
3         super(AB_2GR1_2H1, self).__init__()
4         self.Conv1 = nn.Sequential(
5             nn.Conv2d(3, 64, kernel_size=3, stride =1, padding=1, bias=False),
6             nn.BatchNorm2d(64),
7             nn.ReLU(inplace=False))
8         self.Res1 = ResBlock(in_planes = 64)
9
10        self.Act1 = ANDHRA() # Proposed splitting module
11
12
13        self.Conv21 = ResBlockP(in_channels=64, out_channels=128, stride=2) # Branch 1
14        self.Res21 = ResBlock(in_planes = 128)
15
16        self.Conv22 = ResBlockP(in_channels=64, out_channels=128, stride=2) # Branch 2
17        self.Res22 = ResBlock(in_planes = 128)
18
19        self.Act21 = nn.ReLU(inplace=False)
20        self.Act22 = nn.ReLU(inplace=False)
21
22
23        self.Conv31 = ResBlockP(in_channels=128, out_channels=256, stride=2)
24        self.Res31 = ResBlock(in_planes = 256)
25
26        self.Conv32 = ResBlockP(in_channels=128, out_channels=256, stride=2)
27        self.Res32 = ResBlock(in_planes = 256)
28
29        self.Act31 = nn.ReLU(inplace=False)
30        self.Act32 = nn.ReLU(inplace=False)
31
32
33        self.Conv41 = ResBlockP(in_channels=256, out_channels=512, stride=2)
34        self.Res41 = ResBlock(in_planes = 512)
35
36        self.Conv42 = ResBlockP(in_channels=256, out_channels=512, stride=2)
37        self.Res42 = ResBlock(in_planes = 512)
38
39
40        self.Relu = nn.ReLU(inplace=False)
41        self.pool4 = nn.AvgPool2d(kernel_size=4)
42
43        self.Linear1 = nn.Linear(512, num_classes)
44        self.Linear2 = nn.Linear(512, num_classes)
45
46
47    def forward(self, x):
48
49        out = self.Res1(self.Conv1(x))
50
51        out1, out2 = self.Act1(out) # Splitting at level 1
52
53        out1 = self.Res21(self.Conv21(out1)) # Branch 1
54        out2 = self.Res22(self.Conv22(out2)) # Branch 2
55
56        out1 = self.Act21(out1)
57        out2 = self.Act22(out2)
58
59
60        out1 = self.Res31(self.Conv31(out1))
61        out2 = self.Res32(self.Conv32(out2))
62
63        out1 = self.Act31(out1)
64        out2 = self.Act32(out2)
65
66        out1 = self.Linear1(self.pool4(self.Relu(self.Res41(self.Conv41(out1)))).view(out.size(0), -1))
67        out2 = self.Linear2(self.pool4(self.Relu(self.Res42(self.Conv42(out2)))).view(out.size(0), -1))
68
69        return out1, out2
```

Figure 8. Network initialization and forward-pass, ANDHRA module is only placed at level 1

## Training function with Combined Loss and Majority Voting

```
1 def train(epoch): # Training function
2     print('\nEpoch: %d' % epoch)
3     net.train()
4     train_loss = 0
5     correct = 0
6     total = 0
7
8     # Initialize counters for individual model accuracies
9     correct_individual = [0] * 2
10    total_individual = 0
11
12    for batch_idx, (inputs, targets) in enumerate(trainloader):
13        inputs, targets = inputs.to(device), targets.to(device)
14        optimizer.zero_grad()
15        out1, out2 = net(inputs)
16
17        # Calculate losses for each output
18        loss1 = criterion(out1, targets)
19        loss2 = criterion(out2, targets)
20
21        # Combine losses and backpropagate
22        loss = 0.5 * (loss1 + loss2)
23        loss.backward()
24        optimizer.step()
25
26        train_loss += loss.item()
27
28        # Predictions and majority voting
29        outputs = [out1, out2]
30        individual_predictions = [output.max(1)[1] for output in outputs]
31
32        # Majority vote prediction
33        p = torch.stack(individual_predictions, dim=0).cpu().detach().numpy()
34        m = stats.mode(p)
35        predicted_majority = torch.from_numpy(m[0]).squeeze().cuda()
36
37        # Update majority correct count
38        total += targets.size(0)
39        correct += predicted_majority.eq(targets).sum().item()
40
41        # Update individual model correct counts
42        for i, pred in enumerate(individual_predictions):
43            correct_individual[i] += pred.eq(targets).sum().item()
44        total_individual += targets.size(0)
```

Figure 9. Training function with Combined Loss and Majority Voting