

---

---

# Learning Using Dynamic Regime Identification and Synchronization

Nicolas Brodu

Presentation for WCCI06 / IJCNN

# Outline


---

---

Introduction.....The main idea



Building learning rules.....Theory



Application.....Practice



Conclusion.....Retrospection





# Main idea

Main idea: Synchronizing neuron behaviors

- By favoring connections as in Hebbian Learning.
- When the neuron behaviors are similar.

Problems:

- How to define “behavior”? What similarity is relevant?
- What to synchronize? Why?

Act locally, monitor globally:


- Why should this setup even “learn” anything?
- How to avoid convergence to a global stasis?



# Possible Global states


## Totally ordered, convergent system

- Few final modes, well adapted to classification.
- Some initial information is “lost”, mapped  $N \rightarrow 1$ .
- Hard to reverse, the system is not evolvable.




## Totally Random


- Initial information is “lost”, robust property.



## Critical line:

- NM-separation of initial information. [1]
- Much advertised concept of “edge of chaos”.
- Processing power, fading memory, and more. [2]






# How to go critical

## Synchronization

- Helps tighten efficient circuits, faster reaction.
- Tends to produce global order.


## Frustration [3] (Incompatible constraints)

- Helps avoiding over-specialization.
- Tends to produce controlled chaos.



## Of neuron local behaviors

- Time series, statistics, dynamical systems... [4]
- Get a synthetic ID for the neuron state.
- Synchronize and frustrate these IDs.



# Building learning rules

---

Theory  
2 / 4

Choose a dynamical regime identifier


- What aspect of the neuron dynamics?
- What information does it carry?

Choose a significant target

- Related to synchronization.
- Negative & positive learning cases.

Derive a learning rule

- Prevent global order and total randomness.
  - Prevent over-specialization of connections.
  - Maximal processing capabilities on a critical line?
-




# Hebbian Learning

Theory  
3 / 4

Spiking neural network version [5].


Observable:

- Relevant info: contribution to spiking.
- $\Delta t$  difference between afferent and efferent spike times.
- Rationale: Favor the afferent neuron that triggers the efferent neuron spike.



Analysis:

- This is a kind of synchronization: goal is  $0 < \Delta t < \epsilon$ .
- Only one afferent node triggers the spike: frustration for the others (competitive learning).



# Validation method

Theory  
4 / 4

If the main idea is correct:

- The particular Hebbian Learning  $\Delta t$  choice is not the only possible observable.
- Any reasonable regime identifier would work.
- With an adequate learning rule.

Validation proposal:

- Find identifiers sufficiently different from  $\Delta t$ .
  - Another information is used, it cannot be equivalent.
  - Yet it should be local: a node or connectivity property.
- Derive learning rules.
- Observe the similitudes and differences.




# A possible rule

Practice  
1 / 5

Candidate observable: Neuron inter-spike time

- Not concerned by afferent/efferent times.
- Internal to a neuron, unlike Hebbian learning.
- But: Average is the activation frequency inverse, and averaging loses dynamical information.



Refinement to get part of the sequence info.:

- Time/Frequency decomposition?
- Other statistics/time series methods?
- Choice to use Multifractal Analysis (DFA/Wavelet [6]):
  - Efficient [7], different enough from Hebbian Learning
  - Gives a synthetic ID to use for synchronization.



# Application: Setup

Practice  
2 / 5

Liquid State Machine [8] spiking neural network:


- Input layer receives spike trains.
- Randomized recurrent layer processes.
- Output layer receives activity signals.

Basic version:

- Recurrent layer does not learn.
- Output layer is actually a linear classifier.

Idea:

- Apply the previous rules to the recurrent layer.
- Compare performances with the base version.








# Results: Training

Practice  
4 / 5





Two examples of learning error (error vs epochs).

Artificial data. Testing error is 0 in all cases.



# Learning Comparison

Practice  
5 / 5



Graphs: Improvement over the Basic version Mean & Dev.  
Artificial (left) and Real data (right) (train error vs epoch).

Classification errors on real data, mean (dev): Base 6.20%  
(1.71%), Hebbian 5.70% (1.34%), MFA 5.73% (1.58%).

# Conclusion

---

## Retrospection:

- Theoretical method for generating learning rules.
- Application works and is illustrated by one rule.

## Does this validate the theory generally?

- No, more rules and tests would be needed.
- Refining the theory would be interesting:
  - Better understanding of the role of synchronism and frustration in learning.
  - At least we have a practical approach how to do it.
  - Refined rules could lead to better learning.

All the code <sup>[10,11]</sup> is free-libre software: Use it!



# Full References

---

- [1] T. Natschläger, N. Bertschinger, and R. Legenstein, “At the edge of chaos: real-time computations and self-organized criticality in recurrent neural networks”, in Proc. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, Dec. 2004.
- [2] R. Legenstein and W. Maass, “What makes a dynamical system computationally powerful?” New Directions in Statistical Signal Processing: From Systems to Brain, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005.
- [3] H. Bersini, P. Sener, “The connections between the frustrated chaos and the intermittency chaos in small Hopfield networks.”, in Neural Networks 15, 2002, pp1197-1024.
- [4] Cosma Rohilla Shalizi (2006), “Methods and techniques of complex systems science: An overview”. Chapter 1, p. 33-114, Thomas S. Deisboeck and J. Yasha Kresh, Complex Systems Science in Biomedicine, 2006.
- [5] S. Song, K. D. Miller, L. F. Abbott, “Competitive Hebbian learning through spike-timing-dependent synaptic plasticity”, Nature Neuroscience. vol. 3, num. 9, pp 919-926, Sep. 2000.
- [6] P. Manimaran, P. K. Panigrahi, and J. C. Parikh, “Wavelet analysis and scaling properties of time series”, Physical Review E, vol. 72, 046120, Oct. 2005.
- [7] N. Brodu, “Real-time update of multi-fractal analysis on dynamic time series using incremental discrete wavelet transforms”, submitted for publication, Nov. 2005.
- [8] W. Maass, T. Natschläger, and H. Markram “Computational models for generic cortical microcircuits” in Computational Neuroscience: A Comprehensive Approach, J. Feng, Ed. ch. 18, pp 575-605, 2003.
- [10] Amygdala project, <http://amygdala.sourceforge.net/>
- [11] <http://nicolas.brodu.free.fr/en/recherche/publications/index.html>
- The penguin logo is by V. Dagrain, based on original art by L.L. de Mars, license Art Libre.
-