

# Recurrent Rational Networks

Quentin Delfosse<sup>1</sup> Patrick Schramowski<sup>1</sup> Alejandro Molina<sup>1</sup> Kristian Kersting<sup>1,2</sup>

## Abstract

Latest insights from biology show that intelligence does not only emerge from the connections between the neurons, but that individual neurons shoulder more computational responsibility. Current Neural Network architecture design and search are biased on fixed activation functions. Using more advanced learnable activation functions provide Neural Networks with higher learning capacity. However, general guidance for building such networks is still missing. In this work, we first explain why rationals offer an optimal choice for activation functions. We then show that they are closed under residual connections, and inspired by recurrence for residual networks we derive a self-regularized version of Rationals: Recurrent Rationals. We demonstrate that (Recurrent) Rational Networks lead to high performance improvements on Image Classification and Deep Reinforcement Learning.

## 1. Introduction

Neural Networks' efficiency in approximating any function has made them the most used approximation function for many machine learning tasks. They consist of successive layers, that topologically reshape the input space, transform and extract new features, that are then separately activated. Neuro-Scientists first explained that the brainpower resides in the combinations happening through trillions of connections. However, research has progressively shown that individual neurons are actually more capable than first thought, and latest results have shown that dendritic compartments can compute complex functions, (*e.g.* XOR), previously categorized as unsolvable by single-neuron systems (Gidon et al., 2020).

In current neural network design, most of the research is focusing on well-performing architectural patterns (Liu

<sup>1</sup>AI and Machine Learning Group, CS Department, TU Darmstadt, Germany <sup>2</sup>Centre for Cognitive Science, TU Darmstadt, Germany. Correspondence to: Quentin Delfosse <quentin.delfosse@cs.tu-darmstadt.de>.




Figure 1. Recurrent Rational Network in its folded and unfolded forms. The input passed along the layers and recurrently in the rational function of the network.

et al., 2018; Xie et al., 2019), while keeping a fixed, pre-determined activation function. Nevertheless, many different functions have been adopted across different domains (*e.g.* Leaky ReLU in YOLO (Redmon et al., 2016), GELU in GTP-3 (Brown et al., 2020), Tanh in PPO (Schulman et al., 2017)). This indicates that the performance of neural networks jointly depends on the task, the architecture, hyper-parameters, the dataset (or environment), as well as the activation functions.

To reduce the bias introduced by a fixed activation function and achieve higher expressive power, one can use learnable activation functions. While Neural Architecture Search uses Reinforcement Learning or evolutionary algorithms on a pre-set family of activation functions to find performing patterns (Zoph & Le, 2017; Liu et al., 2018), one can directly make use of gradient descent to optimize parametric activation functions. In this way, one can learn a linear combination of an arbitrary family of activation functions (Manessi & Rozza, 2018), or use polynomial activation functions, where the polynomials' coefficients are considered as weights to be optimized (Goyal et al., 2019).

A finer approach consists in learning a rational function (*i.e.* a ratio of polynomials, see Eq 1). Rational functions and

polynomials can converge to any continuous function, but rational functions are better approximants than polynomials in terms of convergence (Telgarsky, 2017). Rational activation functions were first introduced as Padé Activation Units (Molina et al., 2020).

$$R(x) = \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^m a_j x^j}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^n b_k x^k} \quad (1)$$

Molina et al. (2020) have shown that Rational Units outperform other activation functions on several supervised learning tasks. However, neural networks embedding rationals tend to overfit and ways to regularize the rationals are required.

In this paper, we uncover important properties of rationals that explain their performance. We show that they can learn various features, carried by different handcrafted activation functions (Clevert et al., 2016; Elfwing et al., 2018; Ramachandran et al., 2017; Misra, 2020; Georgescu et al., 2020). In addition, we demonstrate that, if properly constructed, they can express similar behavior to residual blocks, as they are closed under residual connection. Therefore, we use rational functions to replace residual blocks in a residual neural network and show that the performance is maintained or even increased, while the number of parameters decreases. Furthermore, inspired by weight sharing for Residual Networks, we introduce Recurrent Rational Networks, whose recurrence acts as a natural regularizer. We evaluate Rational and Recurrent Rational both on supervised learning tasks and Reinforcement Learning. Our empirical evidence<sup>1</sup> demonstrates that (recurrent) rational functions dominate domain. We used five different seeds for networks and (potentially environment) initialization. For all the details and hyper parameters of our experiments, refer to the appendix.

Our source code<sup>2</sup> to reproduce our experimental evaluation and our Rational Network library<sup>3</sup> are publicly available.

**Contributions.** We make the following contributions:

- We investigate the performance gains and analyze important properties of Rational Units, e.g. the natural embedding of residual connections.
- Moreover, we introduce Recurrent Rational Networks and showcase their advantages over Rational Networks on supervised image classification tasks.
- We demonstrate that Rational Networks bring massive improvements in Reinforcement Learning and even

<sup>1</sup>20.000 GPU hours, carried on DGX-2 Machine with Nvidia Tesla V100 with 32GB.

<sup>2</sup>[github.com/ml-research/rational\\_rl](https://github.com/ml-research/rational_rl) and [github.com/ml-research/rational\\_sl](https://github.com/ml-research/rational_sl)

<sup>3</sup>[github.com/ml-research/rational\\_activations](https://github.com/ml-research/rational_activations)

further increase the performances with our introduced Recurrent Rational Networks.

- We provide a Rational Activation Functions library to create (Recurrent) Rational Networks compatible with most popular machine learning frameworks PyTorch, Keras, Tensorflow and MXNet.

We proceed as follows. We start by describing the role of activation in Neural Networks. Then, we analyze the properties of rational activation functions, notably showing that they can incorporate residual blocks. Inspired by recurrence for residual networks, we introduce Recurrent Rational Networks. We demonstrate that these self-regularized networks improve generalization performances on supervised learning classification. We then evaluate on Reinforcement Learning tasks, and show Rational Networks outperforms every non-learnable baselines and our Recurrent version dominate. Before concluding, we discuss best practices and outlooks for these emerging Rational Network types.

## 2. On the Role of Activation Functions

Let us start by investigating the role of activation functions in (deep) neural networks.

**Activation Functions Perform Internal Space Transformations.** Contrary to the rest of the layer, activation functions separately act on every dimension of the input, i.e. they perform elementwise operations. They can be compared to the brains' dendrites that perform scalar transformations on the signal they propagate, further merged into the neuron body (Li et al., 2020). The transformation operated by the activation function cannot extract new feature spaces by recombining the inputs, as convolutions do, but only stretch, compress and cut the space. We refer to these transformations as internal transformations, and to the ones performed by layers (without their activation functions) as external ones. Different types of internal transformations exist: Naitzat et al. (2020) showed that ReLU and its variants not only help to tackle the vanishing gradient problem but allow non-homeomorphic topological transformations. In contrast, Sigmoid or Tanh can only perform homeomorphic ones. In other terms, ReLU can fold its input space, sending the whole negative to one point, whereas Sigmoid and Tanh continuously squish it.

**Diversity Inside the Network.** Dendrites do not share identical behavior inside the biological brain (Tavosanis, 2012). However, most common neural network architectures use a fixed function across the network during learning. Some architectures use a cell that contains different activation functions, as LSTMs (Greff et al., 2015), or in Networks discovered by Neural Architecture Search (Liu et al., 2018). Providing each layer with the ability to refine the activation




Figure 2. Rational Units (Rat.) discover biologically relevant operations automatically. Rational Unit from trained DQN Agents on Time Pilot compared to ADA (Georgescu et al., 2020), which like biological neurons can perform XOR, and Recurrent one on Tuthankham to dSiLU, with bounded negative domains and non-monotonic shape.

function for its specific need leads to higher modeling capacity. In Rational Networks, we thus place different rational functions at each layer, as done in (Molina et al., 2020).

**Rationals Embed Desired Properties.** Researchers have often searched for a golden activation function. A combination of exhaustive and reinforcement learning-based search led to SiLU/Swish (Ramachandran et al., 2017), later refined with Mish by Misra et al. (2020), who showed common properties of well-performing functions such as bounded negative domains and non-monotonic shapes. These properties are learned by some of our trained Rationals (*cf.* Fig. 2 right). Inspired by the biological results described above, ADA, particularly suited for performing XOR operation, was recently introduced (Georgescu et al., 2020). This complex operation is feasible because of the spike (high non-monotonicity) of ADA. We, here again, observe this property learned by a trained Rational Unit. (*cf.* Fig. 2 left).

### 3. Rationals to Replace Residual Blocks

Veit et al. (2016) have exhibited Residual Networks (ResNet) ability to tackle the Vanishing Gradient Problem. However, they were first introduced following the idea that, for very deep networks, it is easier to start learning from an identity layer and deviate from it, rather than trying to converge to it if necessary (He et al., 2016). ResNets propagate an input  $\mathbf{x}$  through two paths: a transforming block of layers that preserve dimensionality ( $F$ ) and a residual connection (identity). The output  $\mathbf{y}$  of such a block satisfies Eq 2.

$$\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}) = F(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{x} \quad (2)$$

Rational functions can also follow this precept. They can be initialized as the identity function, by having  $a_j = \mathbb{1}_{j=1}$  and  $b_k = 0$  for all  $j, k$  in Eq 1.

**Rationals are Closed Under Residual Connections.** Moreover, adding a residual connection to a Rational Unit

$R(x)$  gives:

$$\begin{aligned} R(x) + x &= \frac{\sum_{j=0}^m a_j x^j}{\sum_{k=0}^n b_k x^k} + x \\ &= \frac{\sum_{j=0}^m a_j x^j + \sum_{k=0}^n b_k x^{k+1}}{\sum_{k=0}^n b_k x^k} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{j=0}^M c_j x^j}{\sum_{k=0}^n b_k x^k} = R'(x), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \max(m, n + 1), \\ \forall j \in \{0, \dots, M\}, c_j &= a_j + b_{j-1}, \\ \forall j \notin \{0, \dots, m\}, a_j &= 0, \quad \text{and} \\ \forall k \notin \{0, \dots, n\}, b_k &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that rationals (with  $m > n$ ) embed residual connections, and as rationals are also closed under compositions, successive (residual) rationals can be embedded into a single rational function. Hence, in order to provide Rational Units with residual connections, one should select a numerator with a higher order than the denominator.

**ResNets Need Internal Space Transformations.** However, ResNet blocks differ from rationals as they act on multi-dimensional input space. Whereas the rational acts on every dimension separately, they perform internal transformations.

For very deep ResNet, Greff et al. (2017) showed that Residual blocks are unrolled iterative estimation that refines upon their input representation. They show that feature recombination does not occur inside the blocks, which thus perform only internal transformations. These transitions to new levels of representations (external transformations) occur during dimensionality change. This view explains why lesioning and shuffling do not affect ResNet performances significantly, and is also compatible with the findings obtained by Molina et al. (2020), in pruned ResNets. We hypothesize that the Residual Networks mentioned in these papers could benefit more from internal transformations than from the external ones that these blocks can provide.

To test this hypothesis, we conduct lesioning experiments on a pretrained ResNet101, on which we either remove the residual block (as in (Veit et al., 2016)), or we replace it with a Rational units. We finetune the surrounding blocks and in our case the identity-initialized rational. Using Rational Units lead to performance improvements, even above the original model (*cf.* Tab. 1). We are here mainly interested in the train loss, as it shows how effectively the model can learn. Nevertheless, the test accuracy is also provided.

These findings empirically show that Residual Networks (ResNets) with rational activation functions are less affected

Eval	Lesion	L2.B3	L3.B13	L3.B19	L4.B2
train	Std. (Veit <i>et al.</i> )	100.9	120.2	90.5	58.9
	Rat. (our)	<b>101.1</b>	<b>120.3</b>	<b>104.0</b>	<b>91.1</b>
test	Std. (Veit <i>et al.</i> )	<b>93.1</b>	102.0	97.1	81.7
	Rat. (our)	90.5	<b>102.6</b>	<b>97.6</b>	<b>85.3</b>
% dropped params		0.63	2.51	2.51	10.0

*Table 1.* Rational functions improve lesioning. Recovery percentage for retrained networks after lesioning (Veit *et al.*, 2016) of a ResNet layer’s (L) block (B). Residual blocks were lesioned, *i.e.* replaced, with a Identity (Std.) or a Rational (Rat.) from a pretrained ResNet101 (44M parameters). Then, the surrounding blocks (and implanted Rational Activation) are retrained for 15 epochs. The best results are highlighted **bold**.

Network		LReLU	RN	RRN
VGG8	Train	98.7 ± .0	<b>99.5 ± .0</b> •	99.2 ± .0•
	Test	61.7 ± .0	61.3 ± .3	<b>64.0 ± .1</b> •
VGG11	Train	99.7 ± .0	<b>99.8 ± .0</b> •	<b>99.8 ± .0</b> •
	Test	56.6 ± .4	57.7 ± .3•	<b>60.0 ± .2</b> •

*Table 2.* Recurrence helps the network to regularize and thus improves the performances on the test set. Train and test accuracies (with std. dev.) for different architectures trained with Leaky ReLU (baseline), Rational and Recurrent Rational Networks. The best results are highlighted **bold** and results outperforming the LReLU baseline with • markers.

when compressing the neural network, *i.e.* that internal transformations performed by rationals compensate for the dropped neural connections.

Nonetheless, retraining with rationals on pretrained network, whose architecture and weights have been optimized along with identity blocks might have led the architecture to a local optimum. Using rationals from the beginning might lead to a different optimum, and would require more investigations.

Additionally, Lu *et al.* (2018) have bridged the gap between Numerical Differential Equations and Residual Networks. Binding together Rational Units with the latter thus implicitly connect rational functions to Linear Sytems.

## 4. Recurrent Rational Networks

In the previous section, we bridged the gap between rationals and Residual Networks. Continuing along these lines, Greff *et al.* (2017) further indicate that sharing the weights in blocks can improve learning performances, as shown for Highway (Lu & Renals, 2016) and Residual (Liao & Poggio, 2016) Networks.

**Recurrent Rational Networks.** Liao *et al.* (2016) link Residual Learning, Recurrent Neural Networks and Visual Cortex. They first show that very deep ResNets approximate

	Location	All	Early	Middle	Late
10	Train	74.3±.4	<b>76.6±.6</b>	75.1±.5	75.9±.1
	Test	74.9±.6	<b>76.7±.5</b>	74.9±.4	75.7±.0
100	Train	40.7±1.	43.5±.8	43.7±1.	<b>44.4±.0</b>
	Test	40.4±.3	<b>42.5±.4</b>	42.3±.0	42.1±.9


*Table 3.* Recurrence in early stages leads to the best performances. Mean accuracies with std. dev. are provided. The evaluation is conducted on a simple Convolutional Neural Network on CIFAR10 (10) and CIFAR100 (100) for Recurrent Rational Networks and networks where recurrence is shared for two successive layers. For local recurrent networks, best train accuracy (for 10) and test accuracies are obtained when weights are shared at the first two layers, best train accuracy (for 100) for recurrence in the last layers. The best results are highlighted **bold**.

shallow Recurrent Neural Networks with weight sharing among the layer. Inspired by this findings, we introduce Recurrent Rational Networks (RRN), a novel type a Recurrent Network where weights are shared between rationals. In this type of Networks, the input is propagated through different layers, but always passed in the same rational activation function.

Moreover, Molina *et al.* (2020) showed that rational tend to overfit and suggested to further investigate regularization for Rationals. We advocate that recurrence can act as a natural regularizer for rationals. We test this hypothesis by comparing Rational Networks and Recurrent Rational Networks to a baseline in Tab. 2 and later on Reinforcement Learning Tasks (*cf.* Section 5). Our empirical results also indicate that recurrence helps regularize on CIFAR100.

**Localized Recurrence.** Liao *et al.* (2016) also investigate where weight sharing could be the most beneficial for the network. They show that for visual tasks, recurrent computations are more beneficial in early visual areas than at middle and later stages, and as explained in their conclusion, these findings later found psychophysics support (Eberhardt *et al.*, 2016). We thus evaluate networks different recurrence localizations, and report the results in Tab. 3 (and Tab. ?? in the appendix). Our findings partially confirm these hypotheses, as the best performing networks are the one sharing weights in the two early and the two last layers. Localized recurrence is thus a good balance between modeling power of the network and regularization.

For bigger networks, testing every possible localized recurrence combination is resource intensive, as the number of network architectures to test grows exponentially ( $2^{n-1}$  different networks for  $n$  activation functions). Therefore, having a way to automatically detect which layer need weight sharing would considerably reduce computations. In Fig. 3, we plot the shapes of the learned activation functions and note that the first two functions have similar profiles as well



**Figure 3.** Learned rational functions confirm biological intuition that weight sharing in early layers is beneficial. Shown are the profiles of rational functions learned at each layer (increasing layers from left to right) of a simple convolutional network on CIFAR10. As one can see, similar profiles are learned in the early resp. late layers. The input distributions, as well as the *neural distance* between each function are reported on the graph, and confirms the intuition.

as the last two functions. However, we here want to quantify objectively the similarity, or the distance, between profiles of functions.

**Neurally equivalent activation functions.** We first concentrate on equivalence between neural networks, to derive properties of a suited metric. Research on neural network equivalence is usually interested in changing the shape of the neural network, especially reducing its amount of parameters (Al-Rawi & Al-Rawi, 2010; Kumar et al., 2019). Two networks are defined to be equivalent if they produce the same output for any given input. In this work, we focus on equivalence between neural networks that differ only in their activation functions. The neural networks we consider are equipped with linear layers such as convolutional or fully connected ones. To provide some intuition, we first point out that such neural networks, at any given layer, dividing the activation function by a constant and multiplying the weights of the next layer by this constant produces an equivalent neural network. Any learned activation function is thus scale independent (for vertical scaling). Such transformations can be applied to the bias with addition on the activation function. Formally, we consider  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  two functions such that:


$$\forall x, f_1(x) = a.f_2(c.x + d) + b,$$

we derive:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_i f_1(\mathbf{W}_{i-1}x + \mathbf{B}_{i-1}) + \mathbf{B}_i \\ = a.\mathbf{W}_i f_2(c.\mathbf{W}_{i-1}x + (c.\mathbf{B}_{i-1} + \mathbf{d})) + (\mathbf{B}_i + \mathbf{b}) \\ = \mathbf{W}'_i f_1(\mathbf{W}'_{i-1}x + \mathbf{B}'_{i-1}) + \mathbf{B}'_i, \end{aligned}$$

Thus, replacing  $f_1$  by  $f_2$  at a given layer of a neural network and changing the weights and bias of this layer or the next one produces an equivalent neural network.

**Equivalence between activation is scale and shift independent.** Considering this, we introduce a new metric between two functions  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  in Equation 4, that is shift



**Figure 4.** Rational and Recurrent Rational Networks lead to superhuman performance. DQN agents equipped with the Leaky ReLU baseline (LReLU), Rational Networks (RN) and Recurrent Rational Networks (RRN). The asterisk (\*) is highlighting games for which RN/RRN performs better than human baseline, whereas baseline does not (67%).

and scale —both vertical and horizontal— independent.

$$ND(f_1, f_2) = \min_{a,b,c,d} \int |f_1(x) - (af_2(cx+d) + b)| dx \quad (4)$$

With this definition, ND is actually a quasi-pseudo-metric, as it does not respect the symmetry and the positive definiteness. We can easily turn it into a pseudo-metric by taking the minimum between  $ND(f_1, f_2)$  and  $ND(f_2, f_1)$  as the new metric, thus solving the symmetry. However, the positive definite property (i.e.  $ND(f_1, f_2) = 0 \Rightarrow f_1 = f_2$ ) is not verified on purpose, as this is used as neural equivalence property. We provide the distance measured between the rational functions learned at each layer in the Fig. 3. The two smallest distances correspond to the pairs of functions with similar profiles, and confirm that merging those functions is an optimal choice, as it is a good balance between regularization and modeling capacity.

## 5. Boosting DQN using Recurrent RNs

As mentioned in the introduction, different activation functions are often used for different tasks. Earlier work has shown that Rationals are suited for supervised learning classification (Molina et al., 2020) and image generation (Boulle et al., 2020). In this section, we would like to extend the use of Rational Networks to Deep Reinforcement Learning.

Deep Reinforcement Learning requires additional constraints on the network, as the policy influences the input and output distributions, and it has often been shown that unstable policies could lead to a drop in performance (Schulman et al., 2015; 2017). Therefore, plugging rational networks in a Reinforcement Learning agent might lead to instabilities. In this section, we demonstrate that rational networks indeed enhance the performance of the original DQN agent. We also evaluate the self-regularized Recurrent Rational version, that helps to prevent potential instabilities introduced by the higher modeling capacity of Rational Networks. Here the scores are normalized according to Eq 5.

$$\text{score}_{\text{normalized}} = 100 \times \frac{\text{score}_{\text{agent}} - \text{score}_{\text{random}}}{\text{score}_{\text{baseline}} - \text{score}_{\text{random}}}^4. \quad (5)$$

**Rational Networks in DQN.** We evaluate Rational Networks and Recurrent Rational Networks on Deep Reinforcement Learning regression tasks, using the original DQN architecture (Mnih et al., 2015) on 15 different games of the Atari 2600 domain. Our first experiments show that DQN agents equipped with Rational Networks always outperform their baseline. Importantly, Recurrent Rational Networks further outperform Rational Networks on most (9 out of 15) games. Moreover, on 67% of the games where the DQN baseline does not, DQN agents equipped with RN and RRN surpasses human experts (*cf.* Fig. 4).

**Comparison to Swish/SiLU.** The SiLU activation function ( $\text{SiLU}(x) = x \cdot \text{sigmoid}(x)$ ) and its derivative dSiLU were introduced by Elfwing et al. (2018). The authors showed that using SiLU or a combination of SiLU (on convolutional layers) and its derivative dSiLU (on fully connected layers) in DQN agents perform better on several games than ReLU networks. Swish, a refined version of SiLU was later discovered via Reinforcement Learning based automatic search in (Ramachandran et al., 2018) (as  $\text{swish}(x) = x \cdot \text{sigmoid}(\beta x)$ , with  $\beta$  constant or as trainable parameter).

SiLU is —to our knowledge—the only activation function specifically designed for Reinforcement Learning task. We train DQN agents equipped with SiLU and with the combination (d+SiLU) proposed by Elfwing et al. on the same set of games. Results are summarized in Tab. 4. Agents

Game	Learnable		Fixed	
	RRN	RN	SiLU	d+SiLU
Asterix	9059•	<b>13018</b>	27.9	116
Battlezone	<b>679</b>	615•	200	99
Breakout	<b>217</b>	203•	16.8	2.1
Enduro	791•	<b>862</b>	22	2.3
Jamesbond	<b>3622</b>	3572•	70.5	61.2
Kangaroo	<b>1636</b>	911	1085•	118
Pong	<b>106•</b>	<b>106•</b>	95.1	103
Qbert	210•	<b>216</b>	25.7	5
Seaquest	<b>3239</b>	2865•	646	32.4
Skiing	151•	<b>152</b>	82	106
SpaceInv.	<b>280</b>	125•	97.6	95.3
Tennis	<b>2967</b>	2960•	300	900
Timepilot	1699•	<b>2290</b>	129	122.4
Tutankham	<b>452050</b>	439525•	195950	9750
VideoPinball	206•	<b>368</b>	12.7	-0.9
# > LReLU	<b>15/15</b>	<b>15/15</b>	6/15	7/15

Table 4. Rational Networks leading to dramatic performance improvement. Normalized mean scores (*cf.* Eq 5 in percentage with LReLU as baseline), averaged over 5 reruns, of DQN agents equipped with Recurrent Rational and Rational Networks, and with SiLU and SiLU + dSiLU. The best results are highlighted **bold** and runner-up with • markers. The last row summarizes the number of improvements over the Leaky ReLU baseline.

with SiLU were only able to outperform Rational Networks on one game out of 15 (Kangaroo), whereas Recurrent Rational Networks achieve better performance than every non-learnable activation function for every game, doubling the score of the runner up, which is the Rational Network, on Space Invaders.

**Rational Flexibility to Solve Overestimation.** A known problem of the DQN algorithm is overestimation. Overestimation is due to the combination Bootstrapping, Off-policy learning and a function approximator (Neural Network) operated by DQN. To solve this problem, Van et al. (2016) introduced DDQN, that uses an addition network to separate action selection and action evaluation.

Q-learning overestimation was initially investigated in (Thrun & Schwartz, 1993) and notably attributed to insufficiently flexibility in the function approximation, that lacks accuracy. Learnable rational functions provide additional flexibility and accuracy while adding a minimal number of parameters to the network, that might help tackle the overestimation problem. To verify this hypothesis, we compare the performance of our DQN agent equipped with (Recurrent) Rational Networks to a standard DDQN agent in Tab. 5.

<sup>4</sup>If every score is negative, the inverse is used for consistency.

Game	DQN		DDQN	
	LReLU	RRN	RN	LReLU
Asterix	206	12621•	<b>18109</b>	3723
Battlezone	4464	<b>25749</b>	23403•	22775
Breakout	155	<b>336</b>	316•	79
Enduro	121	957•	<b>1043</b>	353
Jamesbond	38	<b>1137</b>	1122•	45
Kangaroo	335	<b>5266</b>	2941•	484
Pong	16	<b>18.13</b>	18.04•	12
Qbert	6715	14080•	<b>14436</b>	8954
Seaquest	250	<b>7460</b>	6603•	898
Skiing	-27365	-23582•	<b>-23487</b>	-26892
SpaceInv.	531	<b>1395</b>	650•	490
Tennis	-22.4	<b>20.6</b>	20.5•	-18.4
Timepilot	1428	13261•	<b>17632</b>	1016
Tutankham	3.6	<b>184</b>	179•	36.4
VideoPinball	45683	86942•	<b>149712</b>	62151
# Wins	0/15	<b>9/15</b>	6/15•	0/15

Table 5. DQN equipped with Recurrent Rational and Rational Networks always outperform the more complex DDQN algorithm, equipped with the baseline. Mean raw scores (averaged over 5 re-runs) are provided. DDQN agents are equipped with Leaky ReLU (LReLU). The DQN baseline is also provided. The best results are highlighted **bold** and runner-up with • markers. The last row summarizes the total wins.

Our result show that for every tested game, indeed both Rational and Recurrent Rational DQN agents outperform the DDQNs equipped with the baseline activation.

**DDQN only delays performance drops.** As our (Recurrent) Rational DQN agents continue learning for longer than 200 epochs on several games (*cf.* Asterix on Fig. 5, we let our agent train for 500 epochs. This shows that for several games (Breakout, JamesBond, Kangaroo, Seaquest, TimePilot), DDQNs do not solve performance drops, but only delay them, sometimes lowering its performance below DQNs. A complete graph, with the performance evolution of every tested agent on every game is provided in the appendix.

## 6. Rationals: Beyond Existing Activations

Across our rational journey, we found several best practices that we discuss in this section.

**Importance of Tracking the Input.** Properties of different new activation functions (Georgescu et al., 2020; Misra, 2020) were reported as crucial for neural networks performances. To verify this hypothesis, the input distribution of the function should be taken into consideration, as the




Figure 5. DDQN delays performance drop instead of solving it. Evolution of the scores of DQN agents with Rational Networks (RN) and Recurrent RN (RRN) and DQN and DDQN with LReLU. The line corresponds to the mean score of every agent and the shaded area to the std. dev. of five executed runs. A figure including the evolution on every game is provided in the appendix.


network can make use of the different parts of the activation function’s domain. This is particularly relevant for highly learnable functions such as rational functions. Therefore, in every activation function graph provided in this work, we also provided the input distribution. An efficient and direct way of tracking the distribution is provided in our rational framework.

**Refining the Neural Equivalence Metric.** Continuing along these lines, we present in Equation 6 a refined version of our neural distance that takes into account the input distribution  $\rho$ .

$$rND(f_1, f_2) = \min_{a,b,c,d} \int \rho(x) |f_1(x) - af_2(cx+d) + b| dx. \quad (6)$$

This new neural distance gives more importance to parts that are more used. One could also use explainability techniques (Wang et al., 2019; Shao et al., 2021) to track the importance across the input of the rational function.

**Embedding Different Function.** In Fig. 6 we provide the learned Rational and Recurrent Rational functions for trained networks on several games. We observe that several learned profiles are similar to the dSiLU one (notably Recurrent Rationals), and that every activation function is non-monotonic (as the one of supervised learning experiments, *cf.* Fig. 3), experimentally confirming that non-monotonicity helps the learning process (Misra, 2020).



**Figure 6.** Learned rational activation functions of Reinforcement Learning Agents automatically reduced their co-domains. Several input distribution has converged to multimodal Gaussians (e.g. Asterix, Space Invaders and Tutankham). (Left) activation functions at the successive layers in Rational Networks. As for supervised learning, several desired properties (as nonmonotonicity and bounded negative domains) are also learned by these parametric functions. (Right) Common activation function of every layer in a Recurrent Rational Network. A Figure with parametric functions for every games is provided in the appendix.

Furthermore, if we look at the inputs of those functions, we see that they follow Gaussian distributions. For some of them (Asterix, Kangaroo, Space Invaders, Tutankham), multimodality appears in the distribution along learning. This lead us to think that the input distribution is split during training, and that the rational learns several functions, one next to the other for these different input groups. If these modes are produced by different neurons of the layer, this means that several neuron groups need different activation functions, and that the network could benefit from having several rational activation functions across one layer. Detecting this need by tracking the input distribution during learning could lead to performance improvements.

**The need for a new batch normalization.** Consequently, using batch normalization prevents this behavior, as at every layer, the input distribution is normalized. Future work might benefit from a batch normalization that would not prevent input distribution split.

**Rationals’ Automatic Scaling.** Another interesting property of both recurrent rationals and rationals on Reinforcement Learning is that for all of them, the size of the co-domain is lower than one, besides their long domain range. While the supervised learning experiments consist in classifying, DQN requires a precise regression for the Q-value estimation. This enforces the network to accurately estimate the expected return of the current policy. We hypothesize that this automatic vertical scaling mainly observed for reinforcement learning (*cf.* Fig. 6 vs Fig. 3) helps the network to accurately predict the Q-Value.

## 7. Conclusion

In this paper, we provided several explanations on the role of activation functions and shed some light on the reasons why rational functions are so efficient notably with their implicit residual connection embedding. Importantly, we introduced Recurrent Rational Networks, whose nature self-regularizing behavior allow to improve generalization performances, solving the biggest flaw of Rational Networks. For the first time, the evaluation of learnable rational activations was brought to Deep Reinforcement Learning, exhibiting drastic performance improvements. Importantly, we show that Recurrent Rational Networks further increase the performance of DQN agents. Alongside releasing an efficient library for building Rational and Recurrent Rational Networks, we discussed several best practices for their use, such as tracking the input distribution and similarity of the functions across a Rational Network for automatic merging.

Our work provides several interesting avenues for future work. To implement Rational Networks, rational functions have so far been inserted in existing neural networks architectures. To investigate this further, one should incorporate Rational Networks into other architectures, *e.g.* Transformers (Vaswani et al., 2017), and evaluate them on different tasks. Most interesting is the incorporation of Rational Networks into Neural Architecture Search (Liu et al., 2018) to discover new efficient Rational Network Architectures. Finally, rich insight could be gained from the Linear System field (Lu et al., 2018), linked with rationals through residual connections in this work.

## References

- Al-Rawi, M. S. and Al-Rawi, K. R. On the equivalence between ordinary neural networks and higher order neural networks. In *Artificial Higher Order Neural Networks for Computer Science and Engineering: Trends for Emerging Applications*, pp. 138–158. IGI Global, 2010.
- Boullé, N., Nakatsukasa, Y., and Townsend, A. Rational neural networks. In Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M., and Lin, H. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D. M., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., and Amodei, D. Language models are few-shot learners. In Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M., and Lin, H. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- Clevert, D., Unterthiner, T., and Hochreiter, S. Fast and accurate deep network learning by exponential linear units (elus). In Bengio, Y. and LeCun, Y. (eds.), *4th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2016.
- Eberhardt, S., Cader, J. G., and Serre, T. How deep is the feature analysis underlying rapid visual categorization? In Lee, D. D., Sugiyama, M., von Luxburg, U., Guyon, I., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pp. 1100–1108, 2016.
- Elfwing, S., Uchibe, E., and Doya, K. Sigmoid-weighted linear units for neural network function approximation in reinforcement learning. *Neural Networks*, 107:3–11, 2018.
- Georgescu, M.-I., Ionescu, R. T., Ristea, N.-C., and Sebe, N. Non-linear neurons with human-like apical dendrite activations. 2020.
- Gidon, A., Zolnik, T. A., Fidzinski, P., Bolduan, F., Papoutsis, A., Poirazi, P., Holtkamp, M., Vida, I., and Larkum, M. E. Dendritic action potentials and computation in human layer 2/3 cortical neurons. *Science*, 367(6473):83–87, 2020.
- Goyal, M., Goyal, R., and Lall, B. Learning activation functions: A new paradigm of understanding neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/1906.09529, 2019.
- Greff, K., Srivastava, R. K., Koutník, J., Steunebrink, B. R., and Schmidhuber, J. LSTM: A search space odyssey. *CoRR*, abs/1503.04069, 2015.
- Greff, K., Srivastava, R. K., and Schmidhuber, J. Highway and residual networks learn unrolled iterative estimation. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. OpenReview.net, 2017.
- He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 770–778. IEEE Computer Society, 2016.
- Kumar, A., Serra, T., and Ramalingam, S. Equivalent and approximate transformations of deep neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/1905.11428, 2019.
- Li, X., Tang, J., Zhang, Q., Gao, B., Yang, J. J., Song, S., Wu, W., Zhang, W., Yao, P., Deng, N., et al. Power-efficient neural network with artificial dendrites. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 15(9):776–782, 2020.
- Liao, Q. and Poggio, T. A. Bridging the gaps between residual learning, recurrent neural networks and visual cortex. *CoRR*, abs/1604.03640, 2016.
- Liu, C., Zoph, B., Neumann, M., Shlens, J., Hua, W., Li, L., Fei-Fei, L., Yuille, A. L., Huang, J., and Murphy, K. Progressive neural architecture search. In Ferrari, V., Hebert, M., Sminchisescu, C., and Weiss, Y. (eds.), *Computer Vision - ECCV 2018 - 15th European Conference*, volume 11205 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 19–35. Springer, 2018.
- Lu, L. and Renals, S. Small-footprint deep neural networks with highway connections for speech recognition. In Morgan, N. (ed.), *17th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association (INTERSPEECH)*, pp. 12–16. ISCA, 2016.
- Lu, Y., Zhong, A., Li, Q., and Dong, B. Beyond finite layer neural networks: Bridging deep architectures and numerical differential equations. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, (ICML)*, pp. 3282–3291, 2018.
- Manessi, F. and Rozza, A. Learning combinations of activation functions. In *2018 24th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, pp. 61–66. IEEE, 2018.
- Misra, D. Mish: A self regularized non-monotonic activation function. In *31st British Machine Vision Conference 2020 (BMVC)*. BMVA Press, 2020.

- Mnih, V., Kavukcuoglu, K., Silver, D., Rusu, A. A., Veness, J., Bellemare, M. G., Graves, A., Riedmiller, M. A., Fidjeland, A., Ostrovski, G., Petersen, S., Beattie, C., Sadik, A., Antonoglou, I., King, H., Kumaran, D., Wierstra, D., Legg, S., and Hassabis, D. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 518(7540):529–533, 2015.
- Molina, A., Schramowski, P., and Kersting, K. Padé activation units: End-to-end learning of flexible activation functions in deep networks. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. OpenReview.net, 2020.
- Naitzat, G., Zhitnikov, A., and Lim, L. Topology of deep neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/2004.06093, 2020.
- Ramachandran, P., Zoph, B., and Le, Q. V. Searching for activation functions. *CoRR*, abs/1710.05941, 2017.
- Ramachandran, P., Zoph, B., and Le, Q. V. Searching for activation functions. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. OpenReview.net, 2018.
- Redmon, J., Divvala, S. K., Girshick, R. B., and Farhadi, A. You only look once: Unified, real-time object detection. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 779–788. IEEE Computer Society, 2016.
- Schulman, J., Levine, S., Abbeel, P., Jordan, M. I., and Moritz, P. Trust region policy optimization. In Bach, F. R. and Blei, D. M. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 37 of *JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, pp. 1889–1897. JMLR, 2015.
- Schulman, J., Wolski, F., Dhariwal, P., Radford, A., and Klimov, O. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *CoRR*, abs/1707.06347, 2017.
- Shao, X., Skryagin, A., Schramowski, P., Stammer, W., and Kersting, K. Right for better reasons: Training differentiable models by constraining their influence function. In *Proceedings of Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, 2021.
- Tavosanis, G. Dendritic structural plasticity. *Developmental neurobiology*, 72(1):73–86, 2012.
- Telgarsky, M. Neural networks and rational functions. In Precup, D. and Teh, Y. W. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 3387–3393. PMLR, 2017.
- Thrun, S. and Schwartz, A. Issues in using function approximation for reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 1993 Connectionist Models Summer School Hillsdale, NJ. Lawrence Erlbaum*, 1993.
- van Hasselt, H., Guez, A., and Silver, D. Deep reinforcement learning with double q-learning. In Schuurmans, D. and Wellman, M. P. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, pp. 2094–2100. AAAI Press, 2016.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., and Polosukhin, I. Attention is all you need. In Guyon, I., von Luxburg, U., Bengio, S., Wallach, H. M., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S. V. N., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pp. 5998–6008, 2017.
- Veit, A., Wilber, M. J., and Belongie, S. J. Residual networks behave like ensembles of relatively shallow networks. In Lee, D. D., Sugiyama, M., von Luxburg, U., Guyon, I., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pp. 550–558, 2016.
- Wang, H., Du, M., Yang, F., and Zhang, Z. Score-cam: Improved visual explanations via score-weighted class activation mapping. *CoRR*, abs/1910.01279, 2019.
- Xie, S., Zheng, H., Liu, C., and Lin, L. SNAS: stochastic neural architecture search. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. OpenReview.net, 2019.
- Zoph, B. and Le, Q. V. Neural architecture search with reinforcement learning. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. OpenReview.net, 2017.

# Technical Appendix

## A. Additional resources

### A.1 Neural Network visualisation

Here are presented two different neural networks used in our RL experiments, with their parameters. The graphs are generated using a modified version of pytorchviz<sup>1</sup>. Rational activations are available on github.<sup>2</sup>




Figure 7: left: Rational Network with Rational Activation Functions (Rat.). Any other network with classical activation functions (as Leaky Relu or SiLU) would be similar, with the corresponding activation function instead of the Rational one. right: Recurrent Rational Network. In the Recurrent Rational Network, the same activation is used at different layers. The parameters of the rational activation function are shared. Operations are in grey and parameters in blue.

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/szagoruyko/pytorchviz>

<sup>2</sup>[https://github.com/ml-research/rational\\_activations](https://github.com/ml-research/rational_activations)

## A.2 Complete raw scores table for Deep Reinforcement Learning


Here are given all the mean final scores obtained by the Rational and Recurrent Rational DQN Agent and original DQN ones (with Leaky ReLU, SiLU, d+SiLU), a DDQN (Leaky ReLU) agent, and the Random agents we used in our experiments with their standard deviations.

game	LReLU	RRN	RN	SiLU	d+SiLU	Random	DDQN
Asterix	206 ± 90	12621 ± 2436	<b>18109 ± 1755</b>	107 ± 45	228 ± 108	67.9 ± 2.2	3723 ± 1324
Battlezone	4464 ± 2291	<b>25749 ± 2837</b>	23403 ± 701	7612 ± 4877	4429 ± 2183	788 ± 38	22775 ± 11265
Breakout	155 ± 46	<b>336 ± 10</b>	315 ± 36	26.2 ± 16	3.4 ± 3.89	0.14 ± 01	79.4 ± 33.8
Enduro	121 ± 158	957 ± 109	<b>1043 ± 111</b>	274 ± 131	2.77 ± 3.41	0 ± 0	353 ± 134
Jamesbond	37.6 ± 23.6	<b>1137 ± 216</b>	1122 ± 176	28.4 ± 13.8	25.5 ± 16.2	6.39 ± 0.41	45.2 ± 40.7
Kangaroo	335 ± 342	<b>5266 ± 2365</b>	2940 ± 1175	3500 ± 2607	393 ± 504	14.2 ± 0.9	484 ± 395
Pong	15.9 ± 2	<b>18.1 ± 1</b>	18 ± 0.9	14.1 ± 4.3	16.9 ± 1.2	-20.2 ± 0	12.4 ± 11
Qbert	6715 ± 2058	14080 ± 593	<b>14436 ± 336</b>	1754 ± 2048	371 ± 28	40.6 ± 2.8	8954 ± 2616
Seaquest	250 ± 162	<b>7461 ± 1321</b>	6603 ± 200	1504 ± 1677	94.6 ± 87.2	20.1 ± 0.4	898 ± 353
Skiing	-27365 ± 4794	-23582 ± 7058	<b>-23487 ± 7624</b>	-29890 ± 4	-26725 ± 5485	-16104 ± 92	-26892 ± 5881
SpaceInvaders	531 ± 62	<b>1395 ± 251</b>	650 ± 45	520 ± 169	509 ± 176	51.6 ± 1.1	490 ± 15
Tennis	-22.4 ± 3.0	<b>20.6 ± 0.9</b>	20.5 ± 0.5	-19.4 ± 9.2	-10.4 ± 11.1	-23.9 ± 0.0	-18.4 ± 8.9
TimePilot	1428 ± 739	13261 ± 576	<b>17632 ± 5242</b>	1644 ± 1566	1594 ± 1918	688 ± 30	1016 ± 401
Tutankham	3.55 ± 4.3	<b>184 ± 40</b>	179 ± 15	81.9 ± 66	7.41 ± 5.96	3.51 ± 0.54	36.4 ± 0
VideoPinball	45683 ± 11383	86942 ± 48143	<b>149712 ± 91219</b>	11730 ± 5941	6439 ± 3336	6795 ± 461	62151 ± 21791

Table 6: Raw mean scores (with std. dev.) of every tested agent on Atari 2600 games, averaged over 5 seeds.

## A.3 Learnt activation functions

This section first provides the learned parametric rational functions from rational agents (left) and the Recurrent Rational Agents (right) after convergence for every different tested game of the gym Atari 2600 environment. Histograms of the input distributions (in grey) display the parts used in each function.






Figure 8: Profiles of Rational (left) and Recurrent Rational (right) on different games. Every function from the recurrent agents seems to converge to pretty similar functions. The codomain of most of these functions has been reduced.

Additionally, hereafter are the profiles of the functions learned by Rational and Recurrent Rational Networks after convergence on MNIST and Fashion MNIST with VGG-8 Network, as well as scores for VGG-8 and Lenet networks.




Figure 9: Profiles of Rational and Recurrent Rational VGG-8 MNIST and Fashion MNIST after convergence. The learned functions in layers 3 and 4 for MNIST and Fashion MNIST are very close, suggesting that parameters could be shared.

Network	VGG			LeNet		
	LReLU	RN	RRN	LReLU	RN	RRN
mnist	$99.23 \pm 0.05$	$99.38 \pm 0.04$	$99.47 \pm 0.02$	$99.05 \pm 0.06$	$99.09 \pm 0.06$	$99.15 \pm 0.04$
fmnist	$89.22 \pm 0.39$	$91.53 \pm 0.21$	$92.29 \pm 0.1$	$87.76 \pm 0.2$	$89.52 \pm 0.62$	$89.32 \pm 0.2$

Table 7: Means accuracies and std. dev. of Rational (RN), Recurrent Rational (RRN) VGG-8 and LeNet Networks, as well as their baseline (LReLU).

#### A.4 Evolution of the scores on every game

Here we present the evolution of the scores of different agents. Rational and Recurrent Rational DQN agents are always the best-performing ones. Experiments on several games (e.g. Jamesbond, Seaquest) show that using DDQN does not prevent the agent's performance drop but only delays this.




Figure 10: Evolution of the scores on every tested game for Rational and Recurrent Rational DQN agents, and original DQN agents with Leaky ReLU, SiLU+dSiLU, and SiLU as well as for a DDQN agent with Leaky ReLU.

## A.5 Additional Mixed Network

In this section, we provide a VGG-8 network with mixed Rational and Recurrent Rational trained on CIFAR10 and CIFAR100.

Network		RN	RRN	r2rrr	rr2rr	rrr2r	rrrr2	r2r2r	rr2r2
<i>10</i>	train	<b>99.5±.0</b>	99.0±.1	99.4±.0	<b>99.5±.0</b>	<b>99.5±.0</b>	<b>99.5±.0</b>	<b>99.5±.0</b>	<b>99.5±.0</b>
	test	<b>89.4±.2</b>	88.9±.3	89.2±.3	89.1±.3	<b>89.4±.1</b>	89.0±.2	89.1±.1	89.0±.3
<i>100</i>	train	99.5±.0	99.2±.0	99.5±.0	99.5±.0	99.5±.0	<b>99.6±.0</b>	99.5±.0	<b>99.6±.0</b>
	test	61.4±.3	63.9±.2	61.4±.4	60.9±.4	61.3±.4	62.2±.4	61.2±.3	61.7±.3
Network		r2rr2	r3rr	rr3r	rrr3	r3r2	r2r3	r4r	rr4
<i>10</i>	train	<b>99.5±.0</b>	98.2±3.0	<b>99.5±.0</b>	<b>99.5±.0</b>	<b>99.5±.0</b>	<b>99.5±.0</b>	99.4±.0	99.4±.1
	test	89.0±.2	88.3±.9	89.1±.2	89.0±.2	88.6±.3	88.9±.2	89.1±.4	89.2±.2
<i>100</i>	train	99.5±.0	96.8±5.0	99.5±.0	99.5±.0	99.5±.0	99.5±.0	99.5±.0	99.5±.0
	test	62.1±.3	60.0±1.0	61.3±.3	63.4±.4	61.2±.2	63.3±.3	60.9±.3	<b>64.5±.5</b>

Table 8: Training and testing accuracies of every different combination of Rational and Recurrent Rational function inside a VGG-8 Network on CIFAR10 (*10*) and CIFAR100 (*100*). Comparison between a rational network (RN), with no recurrence, recurrent rational network (RRN), and every combination. For the other networks, r*X* represent recurrent rationals shared for *X* successive layer. For example, r3r2 represents a rational network where the first three layers share one recurrent rational activation function, and the last two layers share another one.

## B. Experiments details

Every conducted experiment can be reproduced with the default parameters of the different repositories provided<sup>3,4</sup>. Every random experiment was (re-)launched with (at least) 5 seeds (from 0 to 4). For every experiment conducted in this paper, we use Rationals and Recurrent Rationals with polynomials of degrees  $m = 5$  and  $n = 4$  ( $m > n$ ). Leaky ReLU (LReLU) is the closest classical activation function to the identity function, and preliminary experiments CIFAR10 and breakout have shown that DQN agents with Leaky ReLU networks outperform ReLU ones. Therefore, we initialized our (Recurrent) Rational functions to be approximating the Leaky ReLU function.

### 1. Supervised Learning

**Lesioning on Residual Networks:** For lesioning, we take a ResNet101<sup>5</sup> and replace a specific block with an identity function (for lesioning) or with a Rational Activation Function and retrain the previous and successive block (and potentially the Rational function) for 15 epochs with batches of size 128. We use *SGD* optimizer with *learning rate* of 0.001, *momentum* of 0.9.

**F/MNIST:** We train on MNIST and FMNIST for 100 epochs, using a SGD optimizer with a *learning rate* of 0.01 and *momentum* of 0.5. The batch size is 64. Weights are initialized using *Xavier normal* method.

**CIFAR10/100:** Networks are trained on CIFAR10/100 for 60 epochs. We use *SGD*, with a *learning rate* of 0.02, *momentum* of 0.9, and *weight decay* of  $5e^{-4}$ . Weights are initialized using *Xavier normal* method.

### 2. Reinforcement Learning

The convolutional network used in the RL experiments is exactly the one proposed in the Original DQN paper and reused in the DDQN paper (*cf.* A.1 Neural Network visualisation). Instead of RMSprop, we use Adam optimizer as it corresponds to a more efficient version of the optimization algorithm with a learning rate of 0.00025, and we use a *smooth l1* loss. We use 32 as *batch size*.

For every game, we used the same hyperparameters across the agents. In details, we use an *evaluation frequency* of 250000, a *target update frequency* of 10000, an *initial replay size* 50000, a *max replay size* of 500000 and a *test samples* of 125000. We use the *Deterministic-v4* version of every tested game. For training, epsilon linearly goes from 1.0 to 0.1 in 1000000 steps and for testing, the epsilon value is set to 0.05. We let every agent run for 100 epochs on Pong, 200 on VideoPinball and Skiing, and 500 on all the other games.

<sup>3</sup>[https://github.com/ml-research/rational\\_sl](https://github.com/ml-research/rational_sl)

<sup>4</sup>[https://github.com/ml-research/rational\\_rl](https://github.com/ml-research/rational_rl)

<sup>5</sup>[pytorch.org/vision/0.8/\\_modules/torchvision/models/resnet.html#resnet101](https://pytorch.org/vision/0.8/_modules/torchvision/models/resnet.html#resnet101)