
SIMPLE LINEAR NEURON BOOSTING

PREPRINT

Daniel Munoz
Independent Researcher
lnb@dmunoz.org

ABSTRACT

Given a differentiable network architecture and loss function, we revisit optimizing the network’s neurons in function space using Boosted Backpropagation (Grubb & Bagnell, 2010), in contrast to optimizing in parameter space. From this perspective, we reduce descent in the space of linear functions that optimizes the network’s backpropagated-errors to a preconditioned gradient descent algorithm. We show that this preconditioned update rule is equivalent to reparameterizing the network to whiten each neuron’s features, with the benefit that the normalization occurs outside of inference. In practice, we use this equivalence to construct an online estimator for approximating the preconditioner and we propose an online, matrix-free learning algorithm with adaptive step sizes. The algorithm is applicable whenever autodifferentiation is available, including convolutional networks and transformers, and it is simple to implement for both the local and distributed training settings. We demonstrate fast convergence both in terms of epochs and wall clock time on a variety of tasks and networks.

1 Introduction

First-order optimization techniques for training deep networks on large datasets continue to yield impressive results on a variety of tasks. Typically, these networks are a composition of linear functions with nonlinear activations and require multiple epochs over a dataset that is as large as possible. We refer to these linear functions (*without* the nonlinear activations) as **neurons**. However, due to the deeply compositional structure of the network, achieving fast convergence in practice can sometimes be difficult due to the relative scaling of values between layers, *e.g.*, vanishing and exploding gradients. Due to these practical challenges there is wide research into techniques such as adaptive gradient updates (Kingma & Ba, 2014; Salimans & Kingma, 2016; Tieleman & Hinton, 2012; ?), and improved optimizers (Amari, 1998; Schraudolph, 2002; Martens, 2020).

One way to avoid the optimization issues related to feature scaling (*e.g.*, arbitrarily scaling a feature dimension by a large value typically induces a large gradient vector) is to use non-parametric methods and forgo optimizing in parameter space, such as with Gaussian Processes and kernel methods Schölkopf & Smola (2018). Another alternative is to optimize in the space of functions, where the corresponding inner product definition is independent of the parameterization (Mason et al., 2000; Friedman, 2001). In the context of training compositional networks, this idea has been investigated in Grubb & Bagnell (2010) where they derive how gradient descent in function space can be used to backpropagate errors to the respective nested functions; this is referred to as *boosted backpropagation*. As will be reviewed in §2.4, this approach no longer explicitly parameterizes each function, but instead operates in the boosting regime and learns a set of strong-learners, each of which is additive in a series of weak-learners.

In general, the weak-learners can be any function that is differentiable w.r.t. its inputs, including a multilayer perception (MLP), for example. This leads to a design question of whether to construct (a) a shallow network composed of highly nonlinear strong-learners, *e.g.*, each strong-learner is a sum of wide MLP weak-learners, or (b) a deep sequence of linear strong-learners composed with nonlinear activations. For the known state-of-the-art performance they can achieve, we study case (b) of learning the linear neurons of nonlinear deep networks.

After reviewing the requisite definitions and notations in the next section, in §3 we reduce boosted backpropagation for linear neurons to a covariant gradient descent algorithm with a metric (inner product space) that corresponds to the column space of the features that are input to each respective neuron. We discuss how this reduction is equivalent to performing feature whitening in the network, but the boosting perspective motivates a practical training algorithm and informs regularization and adaptive step sizes. Our primary contribution is an easy to implement algorithm to perform

linear boosted backpropagation that is applicable to any network architecture compatible with autodifferentiation and does not require specialized compute kernels. A secondary contribution is making the equivalence of this interpretation with prior work such as Natural Neural Networks (Desjardins et al., 2015), FOOF (Benzing, 2022), and LocoProp Amid et al. (2021). In addition to ease of implementation, we demonstrate in §5 that the algorithm is also efficient with popular architectures in practical settings.

2 Notation and Background

We denote the derivative of a function $f : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ at $v = f(u)$ as the linear map $\frac{\partial f(u)}{\partial u} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$, or equivalently as $\frac{\partial v}{\partial u}$. In general, u can represent a high dimensional tensor, such as a feature map or the filter parameters in a convolutional neural network (CNN). Similarly, we denote the transpose of the derivative as $\frac{\partial v}{\partial u}^T : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$. Throughout this work we'll operate in vector spaces; when f is a scalar function, we interchangeably denote the gradient vector at u , $\nabla f(u) \in \mathcal{U}$, as the transpose of its derivative, $\frac{\partial v}{\partial u}^T \in \mathcal{U}$.

2.1 Preconditioned Gradient Descent

We denote $\ell_{(x,y)} : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as the pointwise loss function for a labeled sample, where x and y are the inputs and labels, respectively, and the samples are drawn from a data distribution, \mathcal{D} . Minimizing the expected loss, $\bar{\ell}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\ell_{(x,y)}(\theta)]$, via gradient descent leads to the update rule $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \alpha^{(t)} \nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta)$, where $\alpha^{(t)}$ is the desired step size at iteration t . Depending on the form of ℓ , convergence can be improved by preconditioning the gradient vector by a matrix P , e.g., using the inverse of the Hessian of $\ell(\theta)$ when performing Newton's method. In general, when the preconditioner can be factored as $P = WW^T$, the update rule of following the preconditioned gradient vector, $WW^T \nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta)$, is equivalent to performing gradient descent on $\bar{\ell}(\hat{\theta})$ with the reparameterized model, $\hat{\theta} = W\theta$.

2.2 Natural Gradient Descent

One way to view natural gradient descent Amari (1998) is as a trust-region optimization problem to find a small step, w.r.t. some norm, that is aligned in the direction of $\nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \min_{\delta\theta} \bar{\ell}(\theta) + \nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta) \cdot \delta\theta \\ \text{s.t. } \frac{1}{2} \langle \delta\theta, \delta\theta \rangle_{M_\theta} = \epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\langle u, v \rangle_{M_\theta} > 0$ is the inner product defined by the (Riemannian) metric M_θ in the local tangent space at θ . Solving for the stationary point of its Lagrange function results in an update step $\delta\theta \propto M_\theta^{-1} \nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta)$. When defining M_θ as the Fisher Information Matrix (FIM), the resulting vector is referred to as the natural gradient vector; see Kunstner et al. (2019) for an informative review and discussion. However, in general, we are free to choose any positive-definite metric, $M_\theta \succ 0$, and we denote the resulting vector under the metric as $\nabla_M \bar{\ell}(\theta) = M_\theta^{-1} \nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta)$. Note that taking a step solely proportional $\nabla_M \bar{\ell}(\theta)$ ignores the trust region constraint of Equation 1; solving for it obtains the appropriate step size, α_θ , in the original parameter space that induces an ϵ -sized step under the chosen metric: $\alpha_\theta = \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{z_\theta}}$, where

$$z_\theta = \langle \nabla_M \bar{\ell}(\theta), \nabla_M \bar{\ell}(\theta) \rangle_{M_\theta} = \nabla_M \bar{\ell}(\theta) \cdot \nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta). \quad (2)$$

2.3 Functional Gradient Descent

In contrast to optimizing a function in the space of parameters, an alternative is to optimize in the space of functions, \mathcal{F} , which can also be viewed as boosting (Mason et al., 2000; Friedman, 2001). The following summarizes §2 of Grubb (2014) to introduce notation on this topic. We denote $\bar{\mathcal{L}}[f] = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[l_y(f(x))]$ to be the loss functional that computes the expected loss for a given function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$, where $l_y : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is loss function (using label y) in the image (output space) of f , and \mathcal{V} is an application-specific vector space¹. Letting $v_x = f(x)$, the functional gradient “vector” of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ at f is defined as the *function*,

$$\nabla_F \bar{\mathcal{L}}[f] = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\nabla_F l_y(v_x)] = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[\lambda_{(x,y)} \mathbb{1}_x],$$

¹In general, each element in \mathcal{V} need not be a 1-D vector and each could be a multi-dimensional tensor. For example, in k -class logistic regression, the image of f is the predicted logits vector ($\mathcal{V} = \mathbb{R}^k$) and l is pointwise log-loss. Whereas for k -class semantic image segmentation, each the image of f is a tensor ($\mathcal{V} = \mathbb{R}^{h \times w \times k}$) whose outer component is the per-pixel logits and l is the per-pixel log-loss summed over the inner spatial components.

where each $\lambda_{(x,y)} = \frac{\partial l_y(v_x)}{\partial v_x}^T \in \mathcal{V}$ is a gradient vector, and $\mathbb{1}_x : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is the Dirac delta function centered at x . For brevity, let $\Delta_f = \nabla_F \tilde{\mathcal{L}}[f]$.

Instead of the defining the strong-learner, f , additively in $\Delta_f \in \mathcal{F}$, each Δ_f is projected onto a smaller hypothesis space, $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, such as small decision trees or MLPs, in order to generalize. The projection of Δ_f onto a hypothesis $h \in \mathcal{H}$ is analogous to vector projection in Euclidean space: $\frac{\langle \Delta_f, h \rangle_F}{\|h\|_F} \frac{h}{\|h\|_F}$, where $\langle f, g \rangle_F = \mathbb{E}_x[f(x) \cdot g(x)]$ is the inner product in function space with norm $\|h\|_F = \sqrt{\langle h, h \rangle_F}$.

When \mathcal{H} are regressors, the hypothesis, \hat{h} , that maximizes the scalar projection term is equivalent (Friedman, 2001) to minimizing a least squares problem,

$$\hat{h} = \arg \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{\langle \Delta_f, h \rangle_F}{\|h\|_F} = \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \mathbb{E}_x[\|h(x) - \Delta_f(x)\|^2]. \quad (3)$$

In practice, this translates to training a (vector-output) regressor over the dataset $\{(x, \lambda_{(x,y)})\}$. Finally, this leads to the update rule $f \leftarrow f - \epsilon^{(t)} \frac{\hat{h}}{\|\hat{h}\|_F}$, and we refer to each \hat{h} as weak-learners.

2.3.1 Regularization

In addition to minimizing the incurred loss of f , we may also want to include a regularization term in the objective $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}[f] + \frac{\rho}{2} \|f\|_F^2$, where $\rho \geq 0$. The update rule with the regularized objective is

$$f \leftarrow (1 - \epsilon^{(t)} \rho) f - \epsilon^{(t)} \frac{\hat{h}}{\|\hat{h}\|_F}. \quad (4)$$

In practice, this is implemented by shrinking the existing weak-learner coefficients $\{\epsilon^{(j)} | j < t\}$ by the factor $0 \leq (1 - \epsilon^{(t)} \rho) \leq 1$.

2.4 Boosted Backpropagation

For simplicity in explanation, we begin with the problem of training a feed-forward network (FFN), as done in Grubb & Bagnell (2010), and note that general architectures will be discussed in the next section. We represent a FFN as a composition of m differentiable functions $F = \{f_i : \mathcal{X}_{i-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i | 1 \leq i \leq m\}$, where a subset $F_B \subseteq F$ are neurons with parameters θ_i that we want to train, e.g., $f_i(\cdot; \theta_i) \in F_B$ could be convolutional layer with filters θ_i . We denote θ_B as all the trainable parameters in the network. The complement set of functions, $F \setminus F_B$, are fixed, e.g., activation functions, resizing layers, etc. We denote the loss incurred for sample (x, y) for the given network parameters as $\ell_{(x,y)}(\theta_B) = (l_y \circ f_m \circ \dots \circ f_1)(x)$, where $l_y : \mathcal{X}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ computes the loss of the last layer's prediction vector with label y . Backpropagation can be used to compute the gradient vector of the expected loss, $\nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta_B)$, and we denote g_i to be the component of $\nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta_B)$ that corresponds to θ_i , i.e., $g_i = \frac{\partial \bar{\ell}(\theta_B)}{\partial \theta_i}^T$.

Forgoing parameterizing the FFN neurons with weights, Grubb & Bagnell (2010) optimize the loss w.r.t. each neuron's *function* by using the adjoint state method for the equivalent constrained minimization problem,

$$\begin{aligned} & \arg \min_{F_B} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [l_y(x_m)] \\ & \text{s.t. } x_0 = x, x_i = f_i(x_{i-1}), i \in [1, \dots, m]. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Using the necessary conditions for a stationary point of its Lagrangian, they describe an algorithm to recursively compute the functional gradient vector for each neuron. For $f_i \in F_B$ in a FFN, its functional gradient vector is $\lambda_i \mathbb{1}_{x_{i-1}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{m+1} &= \frac{\partial l_y(x_m)}{\partial x_m}^T, \\ \lambda_i &= \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial x_{i-1}}^T \lambda_{i+1}, i \in [1, \dots, m], \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

are the errors backpropagated from the loss layer via vector-Jacobian products (VJPs). That is, each training step is analogous to performing normal backpropagation with the key difference of training a weak-learner using the dataset

$\{(x_{i-1}, \lambda_i)\}$ for each $f_i \in F_B$, instead of pulling-back the targets, λ_i , through respective neuron's local derivative. That is, f_i 's component of $\nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta_B)$ is $g_i = \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \theta_i}^T \lambda_i$.

As presented, the time complexity for computing the unprojected functional gradient vectors is the same backpropagation; however, the storage complexity increases linearly with the dataset and dimensionality due to aggregating the regression targets. The projection operation then adds significant compute as it requires solving a large vector regression problem for each neuron². Lastly, the presented algorithm is specific to a FFN and it is left as an exercise to construct the corresponding recurrence relation of Equation 6 for different network architectures, which can be error prone. In the next section we address these concerns and provide a simple and efficient boosting algorithm for any network architecture compatible with autodifferentiation.

3 Boosting over Linear Neurons

3.1 Reduction

For training general architectures we can forgo computing the regression targets, λ_i . Instead, we use its definition that it is the gradient vector of the loss w.r.t. the *output* of f_i ,

$$\lambda_i^T = \frac{\partial l_y(x_m)}{\partial f_i(x_{i-1})} = \frac{\partial l_y(x_m)}{\partial x_i}, \quad (7)$$

where $x_{i-1} \in \mathcal{X}_{i-1}$ are the forward-propagated *input* features to the neuron f_i . Note that x_{i-1} and λ_i both depend on the sample (x, y) and current network definition, F_B .

When projecting the functional gradient vector for f_i over a linear hypothesis space, the weak-learners have the same function definition as the neuron but differ in the parameters. The scalar projection step (Equation 3) then corresponds to solving the ordinary least squares (OLS) problem

$$\hat{\theta}_i = \arg \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \|f_i(x_{i-1}; \theta) - \lambda_i\|^2. \quad (8)$$

Because this is an OLS problem, we know its solution is the projection of the targets, $\{\lambda_i\}$, onto the column space of the forward-propagated input features to f_i ; we denote this set of input features as $X_i = \{x_{i-1}\}$.

Using Equation 7 and the definition $x_i = f_i(x_{i-1}; \theta) = \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \theta_i} \theta$ (because f_i is linear), we can rewrite Equation 8 as

$$\hat{\theta}_i = \arg \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left\| \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \theta_i} \theta - \frac{\partial l_y(x_m)}{\partial x_i} \right\|^2, \quad (9)$$

which has the corresponding Normal Equation

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_{i-1} \sim X_i} \left[\frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \theta_i}^T \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \theta_i} \right] \hat{\theta}_i = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[\left(\frac{\partial l_y(x_m)}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \theta_i} \right)^T \right]. \quad (10)$$

The right-hand side is the component of $\nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta_B)$ corresponding to θ_i , so the solution is $\hat{\theta}_i = M_i^{-1} g_i$, where $M_i = \mathbb{E}_{x_{i-1} \sim X_i} \left[\frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \theta_i}^T \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \theta_i} \right]$. We can confirm that the norm in function space is equivalent to the inner product under M_i of Equation 2:

$$\|f_i(\cdot; \hat{\theta}_i)\|_F^2 = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \theta_i} \hat{\theta}_i \cdot \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \theta_i} \hat{\theta}_i \right] = \hat{\theta}_i \cdot M_i \hat{\theta}_i = \hat{\theta}_i \cdot g_i.$$

Because the OLS problems are solved independently per neuron, the final solution is equivalent to as if we constructed a block-diagonal metric, M , containing each M_i along the diagonal and then computing the preconditioned gradient vector from §2.2. We denote this vector as $\hat{\theta}_B = \nabla_M \bar{\ell}(\theta_B)$, which is composed of each neuron's $\hat{\theta}_i$ solution. Note that the structure of the network is only needed to compute $\nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta_B)$ (via autodifferentiation) and we can then solve Equation 10 for each neuron independently.

²e.g., for a convolutional layer, each λ_i represents a $\mathbb{R}^{h \times w \times d}$ feature map and there are $|\mathcal{D}|$ of them.

Algorithm 1 Linear Neuron Boosting

input Network F , linear neurons $F_B \subseteq F$ with parameters θ_B , loss function $\bar{\ell}$, step size schedule $\{\epsilon^{(t)}\}_{t=1}^T$, weight decay ρ

- 1: Randomly initialize θ_B
- 2: **for** $\epsilon \in [\epsilon^{(1)}, \dots, \epsilon^{(T)}]$ **do**
- 3: Compute $\nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta_B)$ via backpropagation and save the inputs to each neuron, $X_B = \{X_i | f_i \in F_B\}$
- 4: **for** $(f_i, g_i, X_i) \in (F_B, \nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta_B), X_B)$ **do**
- 5: Define the Equation 11 MVP function, $M_i(\cdot)$, using the VJP and JVP of \mathbf{f}_{X_i}
- 6: $\hat{\theta}_i \leftarrow \text{linear_solver}(A = M_i, b = g_i)$
- 7: **end for**
- 8: $\theta_B \leftarrow (1 - \sqrt{\epsilon\rho})\theta_B$ ▷ Weight decay
- 9: $z = \hat{\theta}_B \cdot \nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta_B)$ ▷ Norm
- 10: $\theta_B \leftarrow \theta_B - \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{z}}\hat{\theta}_B$ ▷ Adaptive step size
- 11: **end for**

output θ_B

3.2 Optimization

To solve for $\hat{\theta}_i$ in Equation 10, we can leverage any linear system solver that internally uses matrix-vector-products (MVP) instead of instantiating each metric, M_i . First, we need to save the set of forward-propagated input features, X_i , to the neuron; we note that these features are already computed and saved in memory during backpropagation. In practice, the MVP $M_i\theta$ can then be computed via a VJP composed with a Jacobian-vector-product (JVP) of the vectorized function $\mathbf{f}_{X_i}(\theta_i) = \text{vec}(\{f_i(x_{i-1}; \theta_i)\}_{x_{i-1} \in X_i})$, which maps $f_i(\cdot; \theta_i)$ over every element (tensor) in dataset X_i , and then

$$M_i(\theta) = \frac{1}{n_i} \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_{X_i}}{\partial \theta_i}^T \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_{X_i}}{\partial \theta_i} \theta, \quad (11)$$

where n_i is the number of samples that contribute to the gradient³. Note that since \mathbf{f}_{X_i} is linear it need only be linearized once (at any point) by the linear system solver.

After solving Equation 10 for each neuron, we can construct $\hat{\theta}_B$ and compute the ϵ -sized step under the full metric M via Equation 2. Lastly, we may wish to regularize our strong-learner in function space as discussed in §2.3.1. Because the learner is linear, this corresponds to a “weight decay” of factor $1 - \sqrt{\epsilon\rho}$; note that if a neuron contains bias terms, these should also decay. Algorithm 1 summarizes the entire optimization algorithm, which we refer to as Linear Neuron Boosting (LNB).

3.3 Update Properties

We now analyze the properties of the LNB update rule. For simplicity in explanation, we use a neuron with scalar output, $f_i : \mathcal{X}_{i-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and note that this is sufficient because the OLS solution of Equation 8 for a vector output is the same as independently solving for each component.

When $f_i(x; \theta) = \theta^T x$ without a bias term, the resulting metric is the *uncentered* second moment matrix, $M_i = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim X_i}[xx^T]$. Denoting the number of parameters as d_i , when the features are linearly independent and $n_i > d_i$, then $M_i \succ 0$ and the OLS solution is scale equivariant w.r.t. the features. Of course, satisfying both of these conditions can be rare in practice and we discuss mitigations in §3.4.

When $f_i(x; \theta) = \theta^T \hat{x}$, where $\hat{x}^T = [x^T, 1]$ the resulting metric has the block form

$$M_i = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_i + \mu_i \mu_i^T & \mu_i \\ \mu_i^T & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

where $\mu_i = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim X_i}[x]$ and Σ_i are the mean and covariance matrix of X_i , respectively. We can analytically invert M_i via the factorization $M_i = L_i^T L_i$, where $L_i = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_i^{\frac{1}{2}} & 0 \\ \mu_i^T & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Then, $M_i^{-1} = W_i W_i^T$, where $W_i = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_i^{-\frac{1}{2}} & 0 \\ -\mu_i^T \Sigma_i^{-\frac{1}{2}} & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

³In general this value can be computed using the shape of \mathcal{X}_i , e.g., if $f_i(x; \theta) = \theta^T x$, then n_i is the batch size; if f_i is a strided convolution, then n_i is the number of output pixels in the batch.

From §2.1, preconditioning $W_i W_i^T g_i$ is the same as reparameterizing the model:

$$f_i(x; W_i \theta) = (W_i \theta)^T \hat{x} = \theta^T W_i^T \hat{x} = \theta^T (\Sigma_i^{-\frac{1}{2}} (x - \mu_i)).$$

To summarize, when running LNB with neurons that have bias parameters, it is equivalent to optimizing a model where we added a whitening transformation step in the network to each f_i 's input features using the respective statistics from X_i , *before* applying the parameters. We further discuss this relationship to Batch Normalization (Ioffe & Szegedy, 2015) and other methods in §4.

When the neuron is a convolution layer, $f_i(x; \theta) = x * \theta$, the output is still linear in the parameters (filters) and the interpretation reduces to either of the previous two cases, with the only difference that the first and second moments are computed using the filter's spatial support features (and are translationally equivariant). By representing the metric using Jacobians, we can use autodifferentiation to compute the metric without requiring a specialized implementation for this case, *e.g.*, `unfold`.

Other common forms of f_i will likely result in an identity M_i . For example, in a vision transformer (Dosovitskiy et al., 2021) the corresponding metric for both the embedding function, $f(x; \theta) = x + \theta$, and the class-token function, $f(x; \theta) = \text{concat}(\theta, x)$, is the identity. In these cases, the linear solver can be skipped since $\hat{\theta}_i = g_i$ and there are no other changes to the LNB algorithm.

3.4 Positive Semi-definite Metrics

Since M_i is an inner product of a Jacobian with itself, $M_i \succeq 0$, in general. To ensure $M_i \succ 0$ in practice, a common regularizer is to add a small constant, γ , along the diagonal of M_i (excluding the bias terms) when solving the linear system. In the boosting perspective this adds a $\gamma \|\theta\|^2$ penalty term to Equation 9 (which is why one would typically exclude the bias terms). Because this regularizes the norm of the parameters, the solution is no longer scale equivariant. When the metric's eigenvalues are small it no longer informs a meaningful step-size ($z_\theta \approx 0$). In this case, we can upperbound the maximum allowed step size to avoid taking a large step. This is essentially equivalent to disabling the preconditioning and following the typical gradient vector direction.

Algorithm 2 Online Linear Neuron Boosting

input Network F , linear neurons $F_B \subseteq F$ with parameters θ_B , mini-batch loss function $\bar{\ell}$, step size schedule $\{\epsilon^{(t)}\}_{t=1}^T$, weight decay ρ , minimum norm z_0

- 1: Randomly initialize θ_B
- 2: **for** $\epsilon \in [\epsilon^{(1)}, \dots, \epsilon^{(T)}]$ **do**
- 3: Compute $\nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta_B)$ via backpropagation and save the inputs to each neuron, $X_B = \{X_i | f_i \in F_B\}$
- 4: $g_B = \text{ema}(g_B, \nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta_B))$
- 5: **for** $(f_i, g_i, X_i) \in (F_B, g_B, X_B)$ **do**
- 6: $\mu_i = \text{ema}(\mu_i, \text{mean}(X_i))$
- 7: $\chi_i = \text{ema}(\chi_i, \text{mean}(X_i \odot X_i))$
- 8: Create P_i from μ_i and χ_i (§3.5)
- 9: Define the Equation 11 MVP function, $M_i(\cdot)$, using the VJP and JVP of f_{X_i}
- 10: $\hat{\theta}_i \leftarrow \text{cg}(A = M_i, b = g_i, P = P_i, x_0 = \hat{\theta}_i)$
- 11: **end for**
- 12: $\theta_B \leftarrow (1 - \sqrt{\epsilon} \rho) \theta_B$ ▷ Weight decay
- 13: $z = \max(z_0, \hat{\theta}_B \cdot g_B)$ ▷ Norm
- 14: $\theta_B \leftarrow \theta_B - \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{z}} \hat{\theta}_B$ ▷ Adaptive step size
- 15: **end for**

output θ_B

3.5 Online Learning

As presented, each step of boosting should be performed using the entire dataset, which is quite impractical. We can easily switch to using an online estimator of the gradient vector, *e.g.*, an exponential moving average (EMA) over minibatches. However, computing an online estimate for M_i in our setting is difficult because we rely on MVPs and do not materialize it nor M_i^{-1} . One alternative, at the expense of increased compute and memory during training, is to estimate M_i using samples from a much larger dataset, which has demonstrated to help under the FIM (Pascanu & Bengio, 2014). Because M_i does not require labels we can compute it via only forward passes. A second option, when

M_i can be materialized in memory, is to use standard techniques for online covariance estimation (Dasgupta & Hsu, 2007). If eigendecomposition can be afforded, a third option is to initialize M_i^{-1} with the identity and perform k-rank updates via the Woodbury matrix identity; this could also be amortized across gradient updates.

Instead of the previous three options, we instead propose to use an online, approximate estimate of the feature moments as a preconditioner for the linear system solver. Specifically, we use the Conjugate Gradient algorithm where we precondition each conjugate step with the approximate solution to facilitate quick convergence. The form of the preconditioner, P_i , is dependent on if the respective f_i has a bias term or not. If f_i does not have a bias term, we approximate M_i^{-1} using its diagonal, $P_i = \mathbb{E}[\text{diag}(xx^T)]^{-1}$. If f_i has a bias term, we approximate $W_i W_i^T$ from §3.3 with the incomplete Cholesky factorization $P_i = \widetilde{W}_i \widetilde{W}_i^T$, where \widetilde{W}_i approximates the respective Σ_i term with its diagonal. Note that this does *not* approximate M_i^{-1} with a diagonal matrix, since it still contains the off-diagonal μ_i terms.

We construct the terms in P_i using an EMA of the moments μ_i and $\chi_i = \mathbb{E}[x \odot x]$ across the minibatches⁴. Then, $\mathbb{E}[\text{diag}(xx^T)] = \chi_i$ and $\text{diag}(\Sigma_i) = \chi_i - \mu_i \odot \mu_i$. When initializing conjugate gradient with the solution from the previous LNB step and using P_i as the preconditioner, we found that we obtain diminishing returns on the solution quality after only two iterations in practice. The online version of LNB is summarized in Algorithm 2. Note that this approach is also amenable to the distributed training setting where the sufficient statistics, μ and χ , can be asynchronously updated and communicated to different nodes (as with the gradient vectors) while each node runs its own conjugate gradient solver.

3.6 Complexity

The space complexity of computing a LNB step is the same as backpropagation since it reuses the feature sets X_B . However, the actual amount of used memory is increased by approximately the size of X_B in order to evaluate the MVP. Additionally, conjugate gradient holds additional copies of the parameters.

For each neuron, the time complexity to solve the linear system is $O(n_i d_i^2 + d_i^3)$, in general. However, in practice, due to the outer-product nature of the metric, one MVP evaluation is $O(n_i d_i)$ and we perform only 2 steps of conjugate gradient.

4 Related Work

4.1 Function Space Optimization and Whitening

The functional gradient descent framework is general and the application to neural networks described in Grubb & Bagnell (2010) has connections to multiple recent works. The LocoProp-S Algorithm 1 in Amid et al. (2021) is mechanically equivalent to solving Equation 9 using gradient descent instead of solving in closed form, whereas this work avoids constructing the targets altogether. As the authors discuss in Appendix C, there is a reduction from LocoProp-S to ProxProp (Frerix et al., 2018).

The FOOF algorithm (Benzing, 2022) is also motivated by performing gradient descent in function space. For simplicity in implementation the authors analyzed functions with no bias terms and Equation 6 in Benzing (2022) is equivalent to solving Equation 10. In that work, an online estimate of the covariance matrix is computed but only infrequently inverted to update the preconditioner. This work provides the following novel perspectives. First, we formulate the metric via inner-product of Jacobians. This approach automatically handles, without specialized implementations, various forms of the neurons, including if it has a bias term, is a convolutional layer, etc. Second, we make the equivalence to feature whitening explicit, which enables us to analytically identify a Cholesky preconditioner for fast convergence via conjugate gradient. Lastly, this feature whitening perspective also explains why FOOF converges in a single step in the example described in Appendix F: it is performing a Newton step on squared loss, which is equivalent to performing one gradient descent step on whitened features (via the reparameterized model).

Standardizing the inputs to neurons is an essential practitioner technique (LeCun et al., 2012), with BatchNorm (Ioffe & Szegedy, 2015) being one of the most prevalent usages with a diagonal approximation. The reparameterized model interpretation discussed in §3.3 is equivalent to placing a BatchNorm layer before applying the *weights*, as opposed to typical practice of placing BatchNorm before the *activation*. The preconditioner connection is also discussed in (Lange et al., 2022) where the preconditioner for CNNs is carefully constructed. Related, PRONG Desjardins et al. (2015) also computes the same first and second moments (again, manually) to reparameterize the network, but misses the analytical interpretation of the preconditioner matrix that enables easy adaption to arbitrary network topologies.

⁴Note that these quantities are also straightforward to compute for convolutions: μ_i is the mean over all pixels in the minibatch.




Figure 1: Matrix factorization via a 2-layer linear network

In summary, all aforementioned work will obtain the same result, and the primary difference is implementation. The primary benefit of the LNB interpretation is that it can be easily implemented for any differentiable network architecture and the trust-region connection informs an adaptive step size.

4.2 (Quasi-) Second-order methods

The M_i metric is very local in that it finds an update vector that induces an ϵ -sized squared norm in the differential of each neuron’s output, $\langle \delta\theta_i, \delta\theta_i \rangle_{M_i} = \delta\theta_i^T \mathbb{E}[\frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \theta_i}^T] \delta\theta_i = \mathbb{E}[\delta x_i^T \delta x_i]$. Intuitively, a better metric would compose the neuron’s output differential with the change in the *network’s* output differential, δx_m , to ensure that the cascaded output perturbations are small when the neuron’s parameters change; this corresponds to the Gauss-Newton (GN) matrix, $\mathbb{E}[\frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial x_m}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial x_m}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial \theta_i}^T] = \mathbb{E}[\frac{\partial x_m}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial x_m}{\partial \theta_i}^T]$. A seemingly better metric would measure how δx_m locally varies in the landscape of the loss function, i.e., the inner product of δx_m along the eigenvectors of the loss’ Hessian at x_m , $\mathbb{E}[\frac{\partial x_m}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial^2 \ell_y(x_m)}{\partial x_m \partial x_m} \frac{\partial x_m}{\partial \theta_i}^T]$; this is the Generalized GN matrix (GGN) (Schraudolph, 2002). As reviewed in Kunstner et al. (2019), in the special case when the network predictions, x_m , are the parameters of an exponential probability distribution and $\ell(x_m)$ is log-loss, then the GGN matrix is equivalent to the FIM used in natural gradient descent.

There are strong theoretical reasons to prefer the FIM in general (Amari, 1998; Martens, 2020); however, computing the metric is typically expensive in practice and there is extensive research for efficiently approximating it (Martens & Grosse, 2015; Ren & Goldfarb, 2021). The functional gradient descent interpretation makes no attempt to approximate the FIM. But, given that LNB uses a much simpler metric, it provides an effective and efficient intermediary between the identity metric of gradient descent and the full network Jacobian used in GGN and natural gradients.

5 Experiments

The prior works of FOOF, LocoProp, PRONG have shown to compare competitively with other sophisticated optimizers such as K-FAC (Martens & Grosse, 2015). Given their discussed equivalence with LNB, we focus on experimentally confirming the contributions of this work: feature whitening via preconditioning the gradient vector, and the applicability and effectiveness on the realistic networks of ViT (Dosovitskiy et al., 2021) and UNet (Ronneberger et al., 2015).

Due to its de facto status, we benchmark convergence with Adam in both iteration and wall time. In all experiments, the default EMA values were used ($\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.999$) by Adam while the learning rate was grid searched around $1e^{-4}$. All timings were recorded from a NVIDIA L4 GPU. Due to the deterministic nature of performing 2 conjugate gradient steps for LNB, the variance in reported times is negligible.




Figure 2: MNIST test accuracy evolution trained on the original data (a) vs. inverted pixels (b). The step-size is parenthesized.

5.1 Matrix factorization

We start with the pathological example from Recht (2017). This is a matrix factorization problem formulated as a two-layer linear network: $\sum_{i=1}^n \|W_1 W_2 x_i - y_i\|^2$, where $y_i = Ax_i$ for a poorly conditioned matrix, $\kappa(A) = 10^5$. Due to the conditioning and the columns being correlated, it is known that gradient descent converges slowly for this problem, whereas GN converges quickly. Because the LNB preconditioner is decorrelating the feature space, we would also expect fast convergence.

We use the same initialization as in the notebook, but in order to magnify the differences, we increase the dimensions by a factor of 10: $n = 10^4$, $W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{60 \times 60}$, $W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{100 \times 60}$. Learning rates were tuned via grid search to find fast and stable convergence for each method. The results are plotted in Figure 1 and reproduce the prior reported slow convergence of Adam and demonstrate fast convergence with LNB.

5.2 MLP

We reproduce the MLP result in Grubb & Bagnell (2010) that compares boosting and gradient descent for a 2-layer MLP on MNIST using 800-node layers, tanh activation, Glorot Normal initialization and a batch size of 1,000.

In Fig 2-a., we plot the test accuracies w.r.t. epoch with the best two learning rates for Adam. We first note that Adam and LNB obtain better than the prior reported accuracy of 98.3%. Second, LNB achieved this performance with a fixed (ridge) regularizer λ , whereas prior work heavily tuned this. One explanation for the difference is that LNB is taking an adaptive step size according to the metric and this was not derived before. Third, there is little observed difference between boosting and gradient descent on this dataset. This can be explained due to that most of the binary pixels in MNIST are zero, so the feature space of the vectorized images is low rank, i.e., decorrelating provides little benefit.

However, whitening does include a centering step. If we were to shift the feature space, we would expect to get same performance. In Fig 2-b, we plot the same models when trained and tested on pixels $1 - x$, where x are the original binary pixel values used in Fig 2-a. We observe that LNB gets very similar performance while Adam (and other methods not invariant to affine reparameterizations) degrade. Although we could (and should) simply normalize the features before training, this example illustrates a case of how feature scaling can greatly affect convergence.

5.3 Vision Transformer

We train a vision transformer Dosovitskiy et al. (2021) using the notebook from Equinox Kidger on CIFAR10. The only modification we make is to not learn the affine terms in the LayerNorm in order to speed up experimentation and we observed no performance benefit with it. The train and test fold performances are show in Figure 3, where we observe faster convergence and better generalization with LNB. Excluding JIT compilation time, the duration per epoch for LNB and Adam is 1.26 min and 0.85 min, respectively.




Figure 3: ViT performances on CIFAR10.




Figure 4: UNet performances on VOC Segmentation.

5.4 UNet

We train a UNet Ronneberger et al. (2015) on the 2012 VOC Segmentation Challenge dataset Everingham et al.. The images are pixelwise normalized into the range $[0, 1]$ using ImageNet mean and variance R,G,B pixel values and then zero-padded to 500×500 size and then down-sized to 384×384 . No data augmentation is performed. We plot the results in Figure 4 and remark that LNB converges very quickly, using the same learning rate as with ViT, and avoids overfitting. While both optimizers converge to comparable performance on the val split, the rapid progress by LNB suggests it would be able to leverage more data effectively. However, excluding JIT compilation time, the duration per epoch for LNB and Adam is 2.92 min and 1.27 min, respectively, and this highlights the trade-off between convergence w.r.t. iterations vs. wall time. While LNB converged marginally faster in wall time and is significantly easier to implement to prior equivalent work, it is future work to better understand in what deep networks does the whitening behavior lead to better generalization as demonstrated in the other three experiments.

References

Amari, S.-i. Natural Gradient Works Efficiently in Learning. *Neural Computation*, 10(2), 1998.

- Amid, E., Anil, R., and Warmuth, M. K. Locoprop: Enhancing backprop via local loss optimization. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2021.
- Benzing, F. Gradient descent on neurons and its link to approximate second-order optimization. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2022.
- Dasgupta, S. and Hsu, D. On-line estimation with the multivariate gaussian distribution. In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual Conference on Learning Theory, COLT'07*, 2007.
- Desjardins, G., Simonyan, K., Pascanu, R., and Kavukcuoglu, K. Natural neural networks. In Cortes, C., Lawrence, N., Lee, D., Sugiyama, M., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28, 2015.
- Dosovitskiy, A., Beyer, L., Kolesnikov, A., Weissenborn, D., Zhai, X., Unterthiner, T., Dehghani, M., Minderer, M., Heigold, G., Gelly, S., Uszkoreit, J., and Houlsby, N. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Everingham, M., Van Gool, L., Williams, C. K. I., Winn, J., and Zisserman, A. The PASCAL Visual Object Classes Challenge 2012 (VOC2012) Results. <http://www.pascal-network.org/challenges/VOC/voc2012/workshop/index.html>. Accessed: 2025-01-30.
- Frerix, T., Mollenhoff, T., Moeller, M., and Cremers, D. Proximal backpropagation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Friedman, J. H. Greedy function approximation: A gradient boosting machine. *The Annals of Statistics*, 29(5), 2001.
- Grubb, A. *Anytime Prediction: Efficient Ensemble Methods for Any Computational Budget*. PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, 2014.
- Grubb, A. and Bagnell, J. A. Boosted backpropagation learning for training deep modular networks. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2010.
- Ioffe, S. and Szegedy, C. Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2015.
- Kidger, P. Equinox tutorial: Vision transformer. https://github.com/patrick-kidger/equinox/blob/v0.11.11/examples/vision_transformer.ipynb. Accessed: 2025-01-30.
- Kingma, D. and Ba, J. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 12 2014.
- Kunstner, F., Balles, L., and Hennig, P. Limitations of the empirical fisher approximation for natural gradient descent. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- Lange, S., Helfrich, K., and Ye, Q. Batch normalization preconditioning for neural network training. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(72):1–41, 2022.
- LeCun, Y. A., Bottou, L., Orr, G. B., and Müller, K.-R. *Efficient BackProp*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012.
- Martens, J. New insights and perspectives on the natural gradient method. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21 (146), 2020.
- Martens, J. and Grosse, R. Optimizing neural networks with kronecker-factored approximate curvature. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2015.
- Mason, L., Baxter, J., Bartlett, P., and Frean, M. Functional gradient techniques for combining hypotheses. *Advances in Large Margin Classifiers*, 01 2000.
- Pascanu, R. and Bengio, Y. Revisiting natural gradient for deep networks. In Bengio, Y. and LeCun, Y. (eds.), *2nd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2014*, 2014.
- Recht, B. Gradient descent doesn't find a local minimum in a two layer linear net. <https://github.com/benjamin-recht/shallow-linear-net/blob/master/TwoLayerLinearNets.ipynb>, 2017. Accessed: 2025-01-30.

- Ren, Y. and Goldfarb, D. Tensor normal training for deep learning models. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- Ronneberger, O., Fischer, P., and Brox, T. U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. *Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, abs/1505.04597, 2015.
- Salimans, T. and Kingma, D. P. Weight normalization: A simple reparameterization to accelerate training of deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS'16, 2016.
- Schraudolph, N. N. Fast curvature matrix-vector products for second-order gradient descent. *Neural Computation*, 14, 2002.
- Schölkopf, B. and Smola, A. J. *Learning with Kernels: Support Vector Machines, Regularization, Optimization, and Beyond*. The MIT Press, 06 2018.
- Sutskever, I., Martens, J., Dahl, G., and Hinton, G. On the importance of initialization and momentum in deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2013.
- Tieleman, T. and Hinton, G. Lecture 6.5-rmsprop: Divide the gradient by a running average of its recent magnitude. In *COURSERA: Neural Networks for Machine Learning*, 2012.