Information Processing & the Brain 2019/2020

University of BRISTOL

Brainbow (Litchman Lab)

Lecture 17
Neural circuits and learning:

Microcircuits and RNNs

Brain vs Machine

Previously on *IPB*…

Dayan and Abbott book (2001)

But, recurrent neural networks may benefit from additional structure…

How can you solve the delayed addition task with a RNN?

But, recurrent neural networks may benefit from additional structure…

Delayed addition task:

You would need an **integrator**:

and **mask/gating** neuron:

Outline

1. **Excitatory and inhibitory cell types, and their dynamics**
2. **Cortical excitatory and inhibitory microcircuits**
3. **Gated RNNs:** long short-term memory networks
4. **A biological plausible version:** Subtractive gated-RNNs
5. Brain vs machine

The excitatory and inhibitory dance

The brain contains two main types of neurons: **excitatory** (i.e. make synapses onto other neurons with positive synaptic weights) and **inhibitory** (i.e. make synapses onto other neurons with negative weights).

Inhibitory neurons act as gates:

Hennequin et al. review (2017)

The excitatory and inhibitory dance

In vivo excitation-inhibition (detailed) balance:
(i.e. excitation and inhibition have similar weights)

Okun and Lampl Nat. Neurosci. (2008)

Hennequin et al. review (2017)

Learning to balance excitation and inhibition

Inhibitory learning rule:

$$\Delta w_{\text{inh}} = \eta x(y - r_0)$$

target rate

Vogels et al. Science (2011)

Learning to balance excitation and inhibition

Inhibitory learning rule:

$$\Delta w_{\text{inh}} = \eta x(y - r_0)$$

$$0 = \eta x(y - r_0)$$

$$y = r_0$$

postsynaptic neuron, *y* = target rate (*r_0*)

Vogels et al. Science (2011)

Learning to balance excitation and inhibition

Vogels et al. Science (2011)

Inhibitory plasticity balances receptive fields

Inhibitory balance in a recurrent neural network

Recurrent network: 200 000 exc. neurons + ~40 000 inh. neurons

Features: keeps activity under control (homeostasis) and memories hidden

Vogels et al. Science (2011)

But cortical circuits are way more complicated..

The six neocortical layers

Introduction to Psychology 2015; lib.umn.edu

vanat.cvm.umn.edu/brain18

Why so much (apparent) complexity?

Ramon y Cajal

Structure of cortical microcircuits: canonical view

Douglas et al. Neural Computation 1989

Structure of cortical microcircuits:
inhibitory cells (gates)

Harris and Mrsic-Flogel. Nature Review 2013

Structure of cortical microcircuits:
inhibitory cells (gates)

Basket cells (~50% of INs)

Harris and Mrsic-Flogel. Nature Review 2013

Vogels and Abbott NatNeurosci. 2009

Machine learning recurrent neural networks: long short-term memory (LSTM)

- **LSTMs are state-of-the-art** (or close to) **in:**
  - Language modelling (Melis et al. 2017)
  - Caption generation (Lu et al. 2016)
  - Speech recognition (Chan et al. 2016)
  - Machine Translation (Luong et al,. 2015)
  - With new impressive applications every week

Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, Neural Computation,(1997)

Machine learning recurrent neural networks: long short-term memory (LSTM)

- **LSTMs are state-of-the-art** (or close to) **in:**
  - Language modelling (Melis et al. 2017)
  - Caption generation (Lu et al. 2016)
  - Speech recognition (Chan et al. 2016)
  - Machine Translation (Luong et al,. 2015)
  - With new impressive applications every week
- **At the core of industry applications:**
  - Siri (Apple)
  - Translate (Google)
  - Alexa (Amazon)

Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, Neural Computation,(1997)

Long short-term memory (LSTM)

Captures long and short-term dependencies!

memory cell, c_t

⊙ denotes element-wise multiplication

Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, Neural Computation,(1997)

Cortical circuits vs LSTMs

Cortical circuits vs LSTMs

subtractive LSTMs

$$[\mathbf{f}_t, \mathbf{o}_t, \mathbf{i}_t]^T = \sigma(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}),$$

LSTM

Costa et al. NIPS 2017

subtractive LSTMs

LSTM

$$[\mathbf{f}_t, \mathbf{o}_t, \mathbf{i}_t]^T = \sigma(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}),$$

$$\mathbf{z}_t = \tanh(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}),$$

Costa et al. NIPS 2017

subtractive LSTMs

LSTM

$$
\begin{aligned}
[\mathbf{f}_t, \mathbf{o}_t, \mathbf{i}_t]^T &= \sigma(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}), \\
\mathbf{z}_t &= \tanh(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}), \\
\mathbf{c}_t &= \mathbf{c}_{t-1} \odot \mathbf{f}_t + \mathbf{z}_t \odot \mathbf{i}_t,
\end{aligned}
$$

Costa et al. NIPS 2017

subtractive LSTMs

LSTM

$$
\begin{aligned}
[\mathbf{f}_t, \mathbf{o}_t, \mathbf{i}_t]^T &= \sigma(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}), \\
\mathbf{z}_t &= \tanh(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}), \\
\mathbf{c}_t &= \mathbf{c}_{t-1} \odot \mathbf{f}_t + \mathbf{z}_t \odot \mathbf{i}_t, \\
\mathbf{h}_t &= \tanh(\mathbf{c}_t) \odot \mathbf{o}_t.
\end{aligned}
$$

Costa et al. NIPS 2017

subtractive LSTMs

subLSTM

$$
\begin{aligned}
[\mathbf{f}_t, \mathbf{o}_t, \mathbf{i}_t]^T &= \sigma(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}), \\
\mathbf{z}_t &= \sigma(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}), \\
\mathbf{c}_t &= \mathbf{c}_{t-1} \odot \mathbf{f}_t + \mathbf{z}_t - \mathbf{i}_t, \\
\mathbf{h}_t &= \sigma(\mathbf{c}_t) - \mathbf{o}_t.
\end{aligned}
$$

sub-LSTM

Costa et al. NIPS 2017

subtractive LSTMs vs LSTMs

	subLSTM	LSTM
$[\mathbf{f}_t, \mathbf{o}_t, \mathbf{i}_t]^T =$	$\sigma(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}),$	$\sigma(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}),$
$\mathbf{z}_t =$	$\sigma(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}),$	$\tanh(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}),$
$\mathbf{c}_t =$	$\mathbf{c}_{t-1} \odot \mathbf{f}_t + \mathbf{z}_t - \mathbf{i}_t,$	$\mathbf{c}_{t-1} \odot \mathbf{f}_t + \mathbf{z}_t \odot \mathbf{i}_t,$
$\mathbf{h}_t =$	$\sigma(\mathbf{c}_t) - \mathbf{o}_t.$	$\tanh(\mathbf{c}_t) \odot \mathbf{o}_t.$

Costa et al. NIPS 2017

subtractive LSTMs vs LSTMs

	subLSTM	LSTM
$[\mathbf{f}_t, \mathbf{o}_t, \mathbf{i}_t]^T =$	$\sigma(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}),$	$\sigma(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}),$
$\mathbf{z}_t =$	$\sigma(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}),$	$\tanh(W\mathbf{x}_t + R\mathbf{h}_{t-1} + \mathbf{b}),$
$\mathbf{c}_t =$	$\mathbf{c}_{t-1} \odot \mathbf{f}_t + \boxed{\mathbf{z}_t - \mathbf{i}_t},$	$\mathbf{c}_{t-1} \odot \mathbf{f}_t + \boxed{\mathbf{z}_t \odot \mathbf{i}_t},$
$\mathbf{h}_t =$	$\boxed{\sigma(\mathbf{c}_t) - \mathbf{o}_t}.$	$\boxed{\tanh(\mathbf{c}_t) \odot \mathbf{o}_t}.$

Costa et al. NIPS 2017

Gated RNNs are usually trained using BackPropagation Through Time (BPTT)

Similar to backprop, but now we unfold the network across time and backprop the gradients 'back in time' (each timestep is a layer).

Task 1: Pixel-by-pixel sequential MNIST (dataset of handwritten digits)

Costa et al. NIPS 2017

Task 2: Language modelling (word-based)
Penn Treebank dataset

Penn Treebank dataset:
Training: 929k; Validation: 73k; Test: 82k; Vocabulary: 10k

"...since then life has changed a lot for X"

Costa et al. NIPS 2017

Task 2: Language modelling (word-based)
Penn Treebank dataset

Penn Treebank dataset:
Training: 929k; Validation: 73k; Test: 82k; Vocabulary: 10k

"...since then life has changed a lot for X"

Costa et al. NIPS 2017

Task 3: Language modelling (word-based)
Wikitext-2

Wikitext-2 dataset:

Training: 2000k; Validation: 217k; Test: 245k; Vocabulary: 33k

Costa et al. NIPS 2017

Gated recurrent units

There are other popular recurrent neural networks, such as the **gated recurrent units** (GRUs):

GRUs are simpler (less parameters) than LSTMs, and obtain competitive results in some tasks.

Chung et al. arXiv 2014

Summary

1. **Multiple excitatory and inhibitory cell types in the brain**

2. **Intricate microcircuits across multiple layers**

3. **Machine learning LSTMs are a form of gated-RNN good for capturing long-term dependencies** (e.g. language modelling)

4. **Cortical microcircuits have similar features to gated-RNNs but** (may) **operate with subtractive gating (subLSTMs)**

References

Text books:

Neuronal Dynamics: Gerstner et al. (2014)

Deep Learning by Courville, Goodfellow and Bengio (2015)

Relevant papers:

- Hennequin et al. Inhibitory Plasticity: Balance, Control, and Codependence. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, (2017) [review on balanced neural networks]
- Greff et al. LSTM: A Search Space Odyssey, arXiv (2015)
- Costa et al. Cortical Microcircuits as Gated Recurrent Neural Networks. Neural Information Processing (2017) [paper that first introduced the mapping between gated-RNNs and cortical networks]
- Harris and Mrsic-Flogel. Nature Review (2013) [More general review on cortical microcircuits]

Brain vs **maquina**:

Super human performance in Atari games

Mnih et al. Nature 2015

Brain vs maquina:

Sub-human performance in Atari games

Mnih et al. Nature 2015

Group discussion
groups of 2-3 (5min)

Where do machines still fail fundamentally
that we are very good at?

Brain vs maquina:

Machines fail to plan ahead

Mnih et al. Nature 2015

Brain vs maquina:
Learning to learn and think

BEHAVIORAL AND BRAIN SCIENCES (2017), Page 1 of 72
doi:10.1017/S0140525X16001837, e253

Building machines that learn and think like people

Brenden M. Lake
Department of Psychology and Center for Data Science, New York University, New York, NY 10011
brenden@nyu.edu
http://cims.nyu.edu/~brenden/

Tomer D. Ullman
Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences and The Center for Brains, Minds and Machines, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139
tomeru@mit.edu
http://www.mit.edu/~tomeru/

Joshua B. Tenenbaum
Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences and The Center for Brains, Minds and Machines, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139
jbt@mit.edu
http://web.mit.edu/cocosci/josh.html

Samuel J. Gershman
Department of Psychology and Center for Brain Science, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, and The Center for Brains, Minds and Machines, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139
gershman@fas.harvard.edu
http://gershmanlab.webfactional.com/index.html

Lake et al. BBS 2017

Lake et al. argue that:

Machines fail at building causal models of the world

Machines fail: build causal models of the world that support explanation and understanding, rather than merely solving pattern recognition problems;

Given a single example of a alphabet:

i)

Humans quickly generate new examples:

ii)

Lake et al. BBS 2017

Lake et al. argue that:

Machines fail at compositionality

Identify the parts:

iii)

Map it to different objects to generate a new object:

iv)

Lake et al. BBS 2017

Lake et al. argue that:

Learning to learn/adapt rapidly

Machines fail in: learning-to-learn to rapidly acquire and generalize knowledge to new tasks and situations. And ground learning in intuitive theories of physics and psychology to support and enrich the knowledge that is learned

Also, current DQNs can only solve one task at a time (i.e. they fail in continual learning).

Brain vs maquina:

DNNs fail to generalize

Image classification

Geirhos et al. NeurIPS 2018

Brain vs maquina:

But, is this a fair comparison?

- **Humans have decades of experience** (with vast amounts of data)
- **Humans have built-in inductive biases** (e.g. built-in neural circuits)
- **Unlikely humans, ML methods are typically trained to solve one particular task**
- **The data+cost function+architecture is fundamental**

Self-supervised learning

Innate in animals?

What if you train DNNs based on curiosity alone?
For example, trying to predict the next state:

$$L = [f(x_t, a_t) - \phi(x_{t+1})]^2$$

Burda et al. ICML 2018

Self-supervised learning

Innate in animals?

What if you train DNNs based on curiosity alone? For example, trying to predict the next state (**no reward!**):

$$L = [f(x_t, a_t) - \phi(x_{t+1})]^2$$

youtube.com/watch?v=11FqtAHfJLI

Burda et al. ICML 2018

Upcoming lectures:
How to relate all these models to experimental data?

- **L18-19: Neural data science** (by Cian O'Donnell)