

Evaluation of Random Neural Layers in Deep Neural Networks

Corentin Hardy, Erwan Le Merrer, Gerardo Rubino, Bruno Sericola

▶ To cite this version:

Corentin Hardy, Erwan Le Merrer, Gerardo Rubino, Bruno Sericola. Evaluation of Random Neural Layers in Deep Neural Networks. NIPS 2017 - workshop Deep Learning: Bridging Theory and Practice, Dec 2017, Long Beach, United States. pp.1, 2017. hal-01657644

HAL Id: hal-01657644 https://inria.hal.science/hal-01657644v1

Submitted on 7 Dec 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Queuing system as Neural Net

Random Neural Networks (RNN) are pro 1989 by Gelenbe. A RNN is a queuing sy



Fig 1 : A queue as Neuron

- Neurons are seen as queues receiving and negative customers :

- when a *positive customer* (la enters in the queue at time t, it increa queue size N_t by one,

- when a negative customer (la enters in the queue at time t, it dele positive customer in the queue, if any, de the queue size N_t by one,

- The first positive customer of the queu the queue every $1/\mu$ in average.

- When a customer leaves a queue, it decr the queue size by one.

- The activation value of a neuron probability that $N_t > 0$ in steady state (ie., t

Gelenbe shows that it is possible to com activation values of neurons of a introduces weight connections between which are tunable to train the RNN for a a Gradient Descent as in a classica Network.

Evaluation of Random Neural Layers in Deep Neural Networks Corentin Hardy, Erwan Le Merrer, Gerardo Rubino, Bruno Sericola

tworkoposed in
rstem.Inspired by Random Neural Layer
(RNL), we
with other kinds of neural layer
(RNN). The RNL takes
$$X \in R^m$$
. The RNL is composed
- A matrix of parameters $W^+ \in$
- A matrix of parameters $W^- \in$
- A vector of constants $M \in R^n_+$
The activation values of
vector $A \in R^n$ computed such
 $A = N/D$
where
 $N = W^+ X$
 $D = W^- X + M$
N; represents the mean throu
customers of neuron i. D; is the
of negative customers plus
rate μ .Recall on the classical fully-connel
task with
al NeuralRecall on the classical fully-connel
The activation value of a FCL with an i
 $A = F(WX + \beta)$
where $\beta \in R^n$ is the bias vector, W
matrix of weights, and F is the active
Take away mess
DNNs containing
task with

| * | Experiments We experiment RNLs in classical architectures of DNNs (taken from Keras). We run different combinations by mixing classical FCL and RNL. In CNN models, convolutionnal layers are not changed. | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------|------------------|----------|
| vorks, we introduce hich is compatible ers in Deep Neural as input a vector of : | | | | | | | | | | |
| $R^{n \times m}$ | 1^{st} layer | | 2^{nd} layer | | 3^{rd} layer | | Final accuracy | | | |
| $R^{n \times m}_+$ | RN | L | RNL | | RNL | | 96.39% | | | |
| | RNL | | RNL | | FCL | | 97.16% | | | |
| - | RN | L | FCL | | RNI | 9 | | 97.22% | | |
| | RN | L | FCL | | FCL | | 97.31% | | | |
| the RNL is a | FC] | | RNL | I | RNL | | 94.78% | | | |
| has: | [FC] | | RNL | I | FCL | | 98.06% | | | |
| | FC] | | FCL | | RNL | | 98.35 % | | | |
| (element-wise division) | FCL | | FCL | | FCL | | 98.31% | | | |
| ughput of positive e mean throughput | 1^{st} layer | 1^{st} laver 2^{nd} laver 3^{rd} laver 4^{th} laver Final accu | | | | | | | al accuracy | |
| | ${\text{CNN}}$ | CNN | | BNL | | | | 08 12% | | |
| | CNN | CNN | | RNL | | FCL | | 98.68% | | |
| the mean service | CNN | CNN | | FCL | | RNL | | 98.96% | | |
| | CNN | CNN | | FCL | | FCL | | 99.03% | | |
| | Final accuracy of a CNINI on MANICT | | | | | | | | | |
| | | iai a | .ccu | acy | UI d | | | 11 111 | | |
| ected layers (FCL) | | | | | | | | | | |
| nput $X \in R^m$ is : | $\frac{1^{rt}}{1^{rt}}$ layer 2^{nd} | laver | 3^{rd} lave | $r \mid 4^{th}$ | laver | 5^{th} layer | 6^{th} | laver | Final accurac | <u> </u> |
| | CNN CNI | N | CNN | | N | RNL | | NL | 75.57% | |
| | CNN CNI | N | CNN | CN | N | RNL | FC | L | 50.83% | |
| | $\left \begin{array}{c} CNN\\ CNN \end{array}\right \left \begin{array}{c} CNI\\ CNI \end{array}\right $ | N N | CNN CNN | $ CN \\ CN $ | N N | FCL | RN FC | | 83.92% 81.17% | |
| $r \in R^{n 	imes m}$ is the ation function. | Final accuracy of a CNN on CIFAR10 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

sage

g a mix of classical neural layers and RNLs may obtain similar or better results, especially when the RNL is the last layer.

