

# Practical Recommendations for Gradient-Based Training of Deep Architectures

Yoshua Bengio

Version 2, Sept. 16th, 2012

## Abstract

Learning algorithms related to artificial neural networks and in particular for Deep Learning may seem to involve many bells and whistles, called hyper-parameters. This chapter is meant as a practical guide with recommendations for some of the most commonly used hyper-parameters, in particular in the context of learning algorithms based on back-propagated gradient and gradient-based optimization. It also discusses how to deal with the fact that more interesting results can be obtained when allowing one to adjust many hyper-parameters. Overall, it describes elements of the practice used to successfully and efficiently train and debug large-scale and often deep multi-layer neural networks. It closes with open questions about the training difficulties observed with deeper architectures.

## 1 Introduction

Following a decade of lower activity, research in artificial neural networks was revived after a 2006 breakthrough (Hinton *et al.*, 2006; Bengio *et al.*, 2007; Ranzato *et al.*, 2007) in the area of *Deep Learning*, based on greedy layer-wise unsupervised pre-training of each layer of features. See (Bengio, 2009) for a review. Many of the practical recommendations that justified the previous edition of this book are still valid, and new elements were added, while some survived longer by virtue of the practical advantages they provided. The panorama presented in this chapter regards some of these surviving or novel elements

of practice, focusing on learning algorithms aiming at training deep neural networks, but leaving most of the material specific to the Boltzmann machine family to another chapter (Hinton, 2013).

Although such recommendations come out of a living practice that emerged from years of experimentation and to some extent mathematical justification, they should be challenged. They constitute a good starting point for the experimenter and user of learning algorithms but very often have not been formally validated, leaving open many questions that can be answered either by theoretical analysis or by solid comparative experimental work (ideally by both). A good indication of the need for such validation is that different researchers and research groups do not always agree on the practice of training neural networks.

Several of the recommendations presented here can be found implemented in the *Deep Learning Tutorials*<sup>1</sup> and in the related *Pylearn2* library<sup>2</sup>, all based on the *Theano* library (discussed below) written in the *Python* programming language.

The 2006 Deep Learning breakthrough (Hinton *et al.*, 2006; Bengio *et al.*, 2007; Ranzato *et al.*, 2007) centered on the use of *unsupervised representation learning* to help learning *internal representations*<sup>3</sup> by providing a *local train-*

<sup>1</sup> <http://deeplearning.net/tutorial/>

<sup>2</sup> <http://deeplearning.net/software/pylearn2>

<sup>3</sup> A neural network computes a sequence of data transformations, each step encoding the raw input into an intermediate or internal representation, in principle to make the prediction or modeling task of interest easier.

ing signal at each level of a hierarchy of features<sup>4</sup>. Unsupervised representation learning algorithms can be applied several times to learn different layers of a deep model. Several unsupervised representation learning algorithms have been proposed since then. Those covered in this chapter (such as auto-encoder variants) retain many of the properties of artificial multi-layer neural networks, relying on the back-propagation algorithm to estimate stochastic gradients. Deep Learning algorithms such as those based on the Boltzmann machine and those based on auto-encoder or sparse coding variants often include a supervised fine-tuning stage. This supervised fine-tuning as well as the gradient descent performed with auto-encoder variants also involves the back-propagation algorithm, just as like when training deterministic feedforward or recurrent artificial neural networks. Hence this chapter also includes recommendations for training ordinary supervised deterministic neural networks or more generally, most machine learning algorithms relying on iterative gradient-based optimization of a parametrized learner with respect to an explicit training criterion.

This chapter assumes that the reader already understands the standard algorithms for training supervised multi-layer neural networks, with the loss gradient computed thanks to the back-propagation algorithm (Rumelhart *et al.*, 1986). It starts by explaining basic concepts behind Deep Learning and the greedy layer-wise pretraining strategy (Section 1.1), and recent unsupervised pre-training algorithms (denoising and contractive auto-encoders) that are closely related in the way they are trained to standard multi-layer neural networks (Section 1.2). It then reviews in Section 2 basic concepts in iterative gradient-based optimization and in particular the stochastic gradient method, gradient computation with a flow graph, automatic differentia-

tion. The main section of this chapter is Section 3, which explains hyper-parameters in general, their optimization, and specifically covers the main hyper-parameters of neural networks. Section 4 briefly describes simple ideas and methods to debug and visualize neural networks, while Section 5 covers parallelism, sparse high-dimensional inputs, symbolic inputs and embeddings, and multi-relational learning. The chapter closes (Section 6) with open questions on the difficulty of training deep architectures and improving the optimization methods for neural networks.

## 1.1 Deep Learning and Greedy Layer-Wise Pretraining

The notion of *reuse*, which explains the power of distributed representations (Bengio, 2009), is also at the heart of the theoretical advantages behind *Deep Learning*. Complexity theory of circuits, e.g. (Håstad, 1986; Håstad and Goldmann, 1991), (which include neural networks as special cases) has much preceded the recent research on deep learning. The depth of a circuit is the length of the longest path from an input node of the circuit to an output node of the circuit. Formally, one can change the depth of a given circuit by changing the definition of what each node can compute, but only by a constant factor (Bengio, 2009). The typical computations we allow in each node include: weighted sum, product, artificial neuron model (such as a monotone non-linearity on top of an affine transformation), computation of a kernel, or logic gates. Theoretical results (Håstad, 1986; Håstad and Goldmann, 1991; Bengio *et al.*, 2006b; Bengio and LeCun, 2007; Bengio and Delalleau, 2011) clearly identify families of functions where a deep representation can be exponentially more efficient than one that is insufficiently deep. If the same set of functions can be represented from within a family of architectures associated with a smaller VC-dimension (e.g. less hidden units<sup>5</sup>), learning theory would suggest that it can be learned

<sup>4</sup> In standard multi-layer neural networks trained using back-propagated gradients, the only signal that drives parameter updates is provided at the output of the network (and then propagated backwards). Some unsupervised learning algorithms provide a local source of guidance for the parameter update in each layer, based only on the inputs and outputs of that layer.

<sup>5</sup> Note that in our experiments, deep architectures tend to generalize very well even when they have quite large numbers of parameters.

with fewer examples, yielding improvements in both *computational* efficiency and *statistical* efficiency.

Another important motivation for feature learning and Deep Learning is that they can be done with *unlabeled examples*, so long as the factors (unobserved random variables explaining the data) relevant to the questions we will ask later (e.g. classes to be predicted) are somehow salient in the input distribution itself. This is true under the *manifold hypothesis*, which states that natural classes and other high-level concepts in which humans are interested are associated with *low-dimensional* regions in input space (manifolds) near which the distribution concentrates, and that different class manifolds are well-separated by regions of very low density. It means that a small semantic change around a particular example can be captured by changing only a few numbers in a high-level abstract representation space. As a consequence, feature learning and Deep Learning are intimately related to principles of *unsupervised learning*, and they can work in the *semi-supervised setting* (where only a few examples are labeled), as well as in the *transfer learning* and *multi-task* settings (where we aim to generalize to new classes or tasks). The underlying hypothesis is that many of the underlying factors are *shared* across classes or tasks. Since representation learning aims to extract and isolate these factors, representations can be *shared* across classes and tasks.

One of the most commonly used approaches for training deep neural networks is based on *greedy layer-wise pre-training* (Bengio *et al.*, 2007). The idea, first introduced in Hinton *et al.* (2006), is to train one layer of a deep architecture at a time using unsupervised representation learning. Each level takes as input the representation learned at the previous level and learns a new representation. The learned representation(s) can then be used as input to predict variables of interest, for example to classify objects. After unsupervised pre-training, one can also perform supervised fine-tuning of the whole system<sup>6</sup>, i.e., optimize not just the classifier but also the lower levels of the feature hierarchy with respect

to some objective of interest. Combining unsupervised pre-training and supervised fine-tuning usually gives better generalization than pure supervised learning from a purely random initialization. The unsupervised representation learning algorithms for pre-training proposed in 2006 were the Restricted Boltzmann Machine or RBM (Hinton *et al.*, 2006), the auto-encoder (Bengio *et al.*, 2007) and a sparsifying form of auto-encoder similar to sparse coding (Ranzato *et al.*, 2007).

## 1.2 Denoising and Contractive Auto-Encoders

An auto-encoder has two parts: an encoder function  $f$  that maps the input  $x$  to a representation  $h = f(x)$ , and a decoder function  $g$  that maps  $h$  back in the space of  $x$  in order to reconstruct  $x$ . In the regular auto-encoder the reconstruction function  $r(\cdot) = g(f(\cdot))$  is trained to minimize the average value of a reconstruction loss *on the training examples*. Note that reconstruction loss should be high for most other input configurations<sup>7</sup>. The regularization mechanism makes sure that reconstruction cannot be perfect everywhere, while minimizing the reconstruction loss at training examples digs a hole in reconstruction error where the density of training examples is large. Examples of reconstruction loss functions include  $\|x - r(x)\|^2$  (for real-valued inputs) and  $-\sum_i x_i \log r_i(x) + (1 - x_i) \log(1 - r_i(x))$  (when interpreting  $x_i$  as a bit or a probability of a binary event). Auto-encoders capture the input distribution by learning to *better reconstruct more likely input configurations*. The difference between the reconstruction vector and the input vector can be shown to be related to the log-density gradient as estimated by the learner (Vincent, 2011; Bengio *et al.*, 2012) and the Jacobian matrix of the reconstruction with respect to the input gives information about the second derivative of the density, i.e., in which direction the density remains high when you are on a high-density

<sup>6</sup> The whole system composes the computation of the representation with computation of the predictor’s output.

<sup>7</sup> Different regularization mechanisms have been proposed to push reconstruction error up in low density areas: denoising criterion, contractive criterion, and code sparsity. It has been argued that such constraints play a role similar to the partition function for Boltzmann machines (Ranzato *et al.*, 2008a).

manifold (Rifai *et al.*, 2011a; Bengio *et al.*, 2012). In the Denoising Auto-Encoder (DAE) and the Contractive Auto-Encoder (CAE), the training procedure also introduces *robustness* (insensitivity to small variations), respectively in the reconstruction  $r(x)$  or in the representation  $f(x)$ . In the DAE (Vincent *et al.*, 2008, 2010), this is achieved by training with stochastically corrupted inputs, but trying to reconstruct the uncorrupted inputs. In the CAE (Rifai *et al.*, 2011a), this is achieved by adding an explicit regularizing term in the training criterion, proportional to the norm of the Jacobian of the encoder,  $\|\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x}\|^2$ . But the CAE and the DAE are very related (Bengio *et al.*, 2012): when the noise is Gaussian and small, the denoising error minimized by the DAE is equivalent to minimizing the norm of the Jacobian of the reconstruction function  $r(\cdot) = g(f(\cdot))$ , whereas the CAE minimizes the norm of the Jacobian of the encoder  $f(\cdot)$ . Besides Gaussian noise, another interesting form of corruption has been very successful with DAEs: it is called the *masking corruption* and consists in randomly zeroing out a large fraction (like 20% or even 50%) of the inputs, where the zeroed out subset is randomly selected for each example. In addition to the contractive effect, it forces the learned encoder to be able to rely only on an arbitrary subset of the input features.

Another way to prevent the auto-encoder from perfectly reconstructing everywhere is to introduce a sparsity penalty on  $h$ , discussed below (Section 3.1).

### 1.3 Online Learning and Optimization of Generalization Error

The objective of learning is not to minimize training error or even the training criterion. The latter is a surrogate for generalization error, i.e., performance on new (out-of-sample) examples, and there are no hard guarantees that minimizing the training criterion will yield good generalization error: it depends on the appropriateness of the parametrization and training criterion (with the corresponding prior they imply) for the task at hand.

Many learning tasks of interest will require huge quantities of data (most of which will be unlabeled)

and as the number of examples increases, so long as capacity is limited (the number of parameters is small compared to the number of examples), training error and generalization approach each other. In the regime of such large datasets, we can consider that the learner sees an unending stream of examples (e.g., think about a process that harvests text and images from the web and feeds it to a machine learning algorithm). In that context, it is most efficient to simply update the parameters of the model after each example or few examples, as they arrive. This is the ideal *online learning* scenario, and in a simplified setting, we can even consider each new example  $z$  as being sampled i.i.d. from an unknown generating distribution with probability density  $p(z)$ . More realistically, examples in online learning do not arrive i.i.d. but instead from an unknown stochastic process which exhibits serial correlation and other temporal dependencies. Many learning algorithms rely on gradient-based numerical optimization of a training criterion. Let  $L(z, \theta)$  be the loss incurred on example  $z$  when the parameter vector takes value  $\theta$ . The gradient vector for the loss associated with a single example is  $\frac{\partial L(z, \theta)}{\partial \theta}$ .

If we consider the simplified case of i.i.d. data, there is an interesting observation to be made: *the online learner is performing stochastic gradient descent on its generalization error*. Indeed, the generalization error  $C$  of a learner with parameters  $\theta$  and loss function  $L$  is

$$C = E[L(z, \theta)] = \int p(z)L(z, \theta)dz$$

while the stochastic gradient from sample  $z$  is

$$\hat{g} = \frac{\partial L(z, \theta)}{\partial \theta}$$

with  $z$  a random variable sampled from  $p$ . The gradient of generalization error is

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \int p(z)L(z, \theta)dz = \int p(z)\frac{\partial L(z, \theta)}{\partial \theta}dz = E[\hat{g}]$$

showing that the online gradient  $\hat{g}$  is an unbiased estimator of the generalization error gradient  $\frac{\partial C}{\partial \theta}$ . *It means that online learners, when given a stream of*

non-repetitive training data, really optimize (maybe not in the optimal way, i.e., using a first-order gradient technique) what we really care about: generalization error.

## 2 Gradients

### 2.1 Gradient Descent and Learning Rate

The gradient or an estimator of the gradient is used as the core part the computation of parameter updates for gradient-based numerical optimization algorithms. For example, simple online (or stochastic) gradient descent (Robbins and Monro, 1951; Bottou and LeCun, 2004) updates the parameters after each example is seen, according to

$$\theta^{(t)} \leftarrow \theta^{(t-1)} - \epsilon_t \frac{\partial L(z_t, \theta)}{\partial \theta}$$

where  $z_t$  is an example sampled at iteration  $t$  and where  $\epsilon_t$  is a *hyper-parameter* that is called the *learning rate* and whose choice is crucial. If the learning rate is too large<sup>8</sup>, the average loss will increase. The optimal learning rate is usually close to (by a factor of 2) the *largest learning rate that does not cause divergence of the training criterion*, an observation that can guide heuristics for setting the learning rate (Bengio, 2011), e.g., start with a large learning rate and if the training criterion diverges, try again with 3 times smaller learning rate, etc., until no divergence is observed.

See Bottou (2013) for a deeper treatment of stochastic gradient descent, including suggestions to set learning rate schedule and improve the asymptotic convergence through averaging.

In practice, we use *mini-batch* updates based on an *average* of the gradients<sup>9</sup> inside each block of  $B$

examples:

$$\theta^{(t)} \leftarrow \theta^{(t-1)} - \epsilon_t \frac{1}{B} \sum_{t'=Bt+1}^{B(t+1)} \frac{\partial L(z_{t'}, \theta)}{\partial \theta}. \quad (1)$$

With  $B = 1$  we are back to ordinary online gradient descent, while with  $B$  equal to the training set size, this is standard (also called “batch”) gradient descent. With intermediate values of  $B$  there is generally a sweet spot. When  $B$  increases we can get more multiply-add operations per second by taking advantage of parallelism or efficient matrix-matrix multiplications (instead of separate matrix-vector multiplications), often gaining a factor of 2 in practice in overall training time. On the other hand, as  $B$  increases, the number of updates per computation done decreases, which slows down convergence (in terms of error vs number of multiply-add operations performed) because less updates can be done in the same computing time. Combining these two opposing effects yields a typical U-curve with a sweet spot at an intermediate value of  $B$ .

Keep in mind that even the true gradient direction (averaging over the whole training set) is only the steepest descent direction locally but may not point in the right direction when considering larger steps. In particular, because the training criterion is not quadratic in the parameters, as one moves in parameter space the optimal descent direction keeps changing. Because the gradient direction is not quite the right direction of descent, there is no point in spending a lot of computation to estimate it precisely for gradient descent. Instead, doing more updates more frequently helps to explore more and faster, especially with large learning rates. In addition, smaller values of  $B$  may benefit from more exploration in parameter space and a form of regularization both due to the “noise” injected in the gradient estimator, which may explain the better test results sometimes observed with smaller  $B$ .

When the training set is finite, training proceeds by sweeps through the training set called an *epoch*, and full training usually requires many epochs (iterations through the training set). Note that stochastic gradient (either one example at a time or with mini-batches) is different from ordinary *gradient de-*

<sup>8</sup> above a value which is approximately 2 times the largest eigenvalue of the average loss Hessian matrix

<sup>9</sup> Compared to a sum, an average makes a small change in  $B$  have only a small effect on the optimal learning rate, with an increase in  $B$  generally allowing a small increase in the learning rate because of the reduced variance of the gradient.

*scent*, sometimes called “batch gradient descent”, which corresponds to the case where  $B$  equals the training set size, i.e., there is one parameter update per epoch). The great advantage of stochastic gradient descent and other online or minibatch update methods is that their convergence does not depend on the size of the training set, only on the number of updates and the richness of the training distribution. In the limit of a large or infinite training set, a batch method (which updates only after seeing all the examples) is hopeless. In fact, even for ordinary datasets of tens or hundreds of thousands of examples (or more!), stochastic gradient descent converges much faster than ordinary (batch) gradient descent, and beyond some dataset sizes the speed-up is almost linear (i.e., doubling the size almost doubles the gain)<sup>10</sup>. It is really important to use the stochastic version in order to get reasonable clock-time convergence speeds.

As for any stochastic gradient descent method (including the mini-batch case), it is important for efficiency of the estimator that each example or mini-batch be sampled approximately independently. Because random access to memory (or even worse, to disk) is expensive, a good approximation, called incremental gradient (Bertsekas, 2010), is to visit the examples (or mini-batches) in a fixed order corresponding to their order in memory or disk (repeating the examples in the same order on a second epoch, if we are not in the pure online case where each example is visited only once). In this context, it is safer if the examples or mini-batches are first put in a random order (to make sure this is the case, it could be useful to first shuffle the examples). Faster convergence has been observed if the order in which the mini-batches are visited is changed for each epoch, which can be reasonably efficient if the training set holds in computer memory.

<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, batch methods can be parallelized easily, which becomes an important advantage with currently available forms of computing power.

## 2.2 Gradient Computation and Automatic Differentiation

The gradient can be either computed manually or through automatic differentiation. Either way, it helps to structure this computation as a *flow graph*, in order to prevent mathematical mistakes and make sure an implementation is computationally efficient. The computation of the loss  $L(z, \theta)$  as a function of  $\theta$  is laid out in a graph whose nodes correspond to elementary operations such as addition, multiplication, and non-linear operations such as the neural networks activation function (e.g., sigmoid or hyperbolic tangent), possibly at the level of vectors, matrices or tensors. The flow graph is directed and acyclic and has three types of nodes: input nodes, internal nodes, and output nodes. Each of its nodes is associated with a numerical output which is the result of the application of that computation (none in the case of input nodes), taking as input the output of previous nodes in a directed acyclic graph. Example  $z$  and parameter vector  $\theta$  (or their elements) are the input nodes of the graph (i.e., they do not have inputs themselves) and  $L(z, \theta)$  is a scalar output of the graph. Note that here, in the supervised case,  $z$  can include an input part  $x$  (e.g. an image) and a target part  $y$  (e.g. a target class associated with an object in the image). In the unsupervised case  $z = x$ . In a semi-supervised case, there is a mix of labeled and unlabeled examples, and  $z$  includes  $y$  on the labeled examples but not on the unlabeled ones.

In addition to associating a numerical output  $o_a$  to each node  $a$  of the flow graph, we can associate a gradient  $g_a = \frac{\partial L(z, \theta)}{\partial o_a}$ . The gradient will be defined and computed recursively in the graph, in the opposite direction of the computation of the nodes’ outputs, i.e., whereas  $o_a$  is computed using outputs  $o_p$  of *predecessor* nodes  $p$  of  $a$ ,  $g_a$  will be computed using the gradients  $g_s$  of *successor* nodes  $s$  of  $a$ . More precisely, the chain rule dictates

$$g_a = \sum_s g_s \frac{\partial o_s}{\partial o_a}$$

where the sum is over immediate successors of  $a$ . Only output nodes have no successor, and in particular for the output node that computes  $L$ , the



gradient is set to 1 since  $\frac{\partial L}{\partial L} = 1$ , thus initializing the recursion. Manual or automatic differentiation then only requires to define the partial derivative associated with each type of operation performed by any node of the graph. When implementing gradient descent algorithms with manual differentiation the result tends to be verbose, brittle code that lacks modularity – all bad things in terms of software engineering. A better approach is to express the flow graph in terms of objects that modularize how to compute outputs from inputs as well as how to compute the partial derivatives necessary for gradient descent. One can pre-define the operations of these objects (in a “forward propagation” or **fprop** method) and their partial derivatives (in a “backward propagation” or **bprop** method) and encapsulate these computations in an object that knows how to compute its output given its inputs, and how to compute the gradient with respect to its inputs given the gradient with respect to its output. This is the strategy adopted in the **Theano** library<sup>11</sup> with its **Op** objects (Bergstra *et al.*, 2010), as well as in libraries such as **Torch**<sup>12</sup> (Collobert *et al.*, 2011b) and **Lush**<sup>13</sup>.

Compared to **Torch** and **Lush**, **Theano** adds an interesting ingredient which makes it a full-fledged automatic differentiation tool: symbolic computation. The flow graph itself (without the numerical values attached) can be viewed as a symbolic representation (in a data structure) of a numerical computation. In **Theano**, the gradient computation is first performed symbolically, i.e., each **Op** object knows how to create other **Ops** corresponding to the computation of the partial derivatives associated with that **Op**. Hence the *symbolic differentiation* of the output of a flow graph with respect to any or all of its input nodes can be performed easily in most cases, yielding another flow graph which specifies how to compute these gradients, given the input of the original graph. Since the gradient graph typically contains the original graph (mapping parameters to loss) as a sub-graph, in order to make computations efficient it is important to automate (as done in **Theano**) a number of *simplifications* which are graph transformations preserving the

semantics of the output (given the input) but yielding smaller (or more numerically stable or more efficiently computed) graphs (e.g., removing redundant computations). To take advantage of the fact that computing the loss gradient includes as a first step computing the loss itself, it is advantageous to structure the code so that both the loss and its gradient are computed at once, with a single graph having multiple outputs. The advantages of performing gradient computations symbolically are numerous. First of all, one can readily compute gradients over gradients, i.e., second derivatives, which are useful for some learning algorithms. Second, one can define algorithms or training criteria involving gradients themselves, as required for example in the Contractive Auto-Encoder (which uses the norm of a Jacobian matrix in its training criterion, i.e., really requires second derivatives, which here are cheap to compute). Third, it makes it easy to implement other useful graph transformations such as graph simplifications or numerical optimizations and transformations that help making the numerical results more robust and more efficient (such as working in the domain of logarithms of probabilities rather than in the domain of probabilities directly). Other potential beneficial applications of such symbolic manipulations include parallelization and additional differential operators (such as the R-operator, recently implemented in **Theano**, which is very useful to compute the product of a Jacobian matrix  $\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x}$  or Hessian matrix  $\frac{\partial^2 L(x, \theta)}{\partial \theta^2}$  with a vector without ever having to actually compute and store the matrix itself (Pearlmutter, 1994)).

### 3 Hyper-Parameters

A pure learning algorithm can be seen as a function taking training data as input and producing as output a function (e.g. a predictor) or model (i.e. a bunch of functions). However, in practice, many learning algorithms involve hyper-parameters, i.e., annoying knobs to be adjusted. In many algorithms such as Deep Learning algorithms the number of hyper-parameters (ten or more!) can make the idea of having to adjust all of them unappealing. In addition, it has been shown that the use of computer clus-

<sup>11</sup> <http://deeplearning.net/software/theano/>

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.torch.ch>

<sup>13</sup> <http://lush.sourceforge.net>

ters for hyper-parameter selection can have an important effect on results (Pinto *et al.*, 2009). Choosing hyper-parameter values is formally equivalent to the question of *model selection*, i.e., given a family or set of learning algorithms, how to pick the most appropriate one inside the set? *We define a hyper-parameter for a learning algorithm A as a variable to be set prior to the actual application of A to the data, one that is not directly selected by the learning algorithm itself.* It is basically an outside control knob. It can be discrete (as in model selection) or continuous (such as the learning rate discussed above). Of course, one can hide these hyper-parameters by wrapping another learning algorithm, say B, around A, to select A’s hyper-parameters (e.g. to minimize validation set error). We can then call B a hyper-learner, and if B has no hyper-parameters itself then the composition of B over A could be a “pure” learning algorithm, with no hyper-parameter. In the end, to apply a learner to training data, one has to have a pure learning algorithm. The hyper-parameters can be fixed by hand or tuned by an algorithm, but their value has to be selected. The value of some hyper-parameters can be selected based on the performance of A on its training data, but most cannot. For any hyper-parameter that has an impact on the effective capacity of a learner, it makes more sense to select its value based on out-of-sample data (outside the training set), e.g., a validation set performance, online error, or cross-validation error. Note that some learning algorithms (in particular unsupervised learning algorithms such as algorithms for training RBMs by approximate maximum likelihood) are problematic in this respect because we cannot directly measure the quantity that is to be optimized (e.g. the likelihood) because it is intractable. On the other hand, the expected denoising reconstruction error is easy to estimate (by just averaging the denoising error over a validation set).

Once some out-of-sample data has been used for selecting hyper-parameter values, it cannot be used anymore to obtain an unbiased estimator of generalization performance, so one typically uses a test set (or double cross-validation<sup>14</sup>, in the case of small

datasets) to estimate generalization error of the pure learning algorithm (with hyper-parameter selection hidden inside).

### 3.1 Neural Network Hyper-Parameters

Different learning algorithms involve different sets of hyper-parameters, and it is useful to get a sense of the kinds of choices that practitioners have to make in choosing their values. We focus here mostly on those relevant to neural networks and Deep Learning algorithms.

#### 3.1.1 Hyper-Parameters of the Approximate Optimization

First of all, several learning algorithms can be viewed as the combination of two elements: a training criterion and a model (e.g., a family of functions, a parametrization) on the one hand, and on the other hand, a particular procedure for approximately optimizing this criterion. Correspondingly, one should distinguish hyper-parameters associated with the optimizer from hyper-parameters associated with the model itself, i.e., typically the function class, regularizer and loss function. We have already mentioned above some of the hyper-parameters typically associated with gradient-based optimization. Here is a more extensive descriptive list, focusing on those used in stochastic (mini-batch) gradient descent (although number of training iterations is used for all iterative optimization algorithms).

- The **initial learning rate** ( $\epsilon_0$  below, Eq.(2)). This is often the single most important hyper-parameter and one should always make sure that it has been tuned (up to approximately a factor of 2). Typical values for a neural network with standardized inputs (or inputs mapped to the (0,1) interval) are less than 1 and greater than  $10^{-6}$  but these should not be taken as strict

---

cross-validation, using an outer loop cross-validation to evaluate generalization error and then applying an inner loop cross-validation inside each outer loop split’s training subset (i.e., splitting it again into training and validation folds) in order to select hyper-parameters for that split.

<sup>14</sup> Double cross-validation applies recursively the idea of



ranges and greatly depend on the parametrization of the model. A default value of 0.01 typically works for standard multi-layer neural networks but it would be foolish to rely exclusively on this default value. If there is only time to optimize one hyper-parameter and one uses stochastic gradient descent, then this is the hyper-parameter that is worth tuning.

- The choice of strategy for decreasing or adapting the **learning rate schedule** (with hyper-parameters such as the time constant  $\tau$  in Eq. (2) below). The default value of  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$  means that the learning rate is constant over training iterations. In many cases the benefit of choosing other than this default value is small. An example of  $O(1/t)$  learning rate schedule, used in Bergstra and Bengio (2012) is

$$\epsilon_t = \frac{\epsilon_0 \tau}{\max(t, \tau)} \quad (2)$$

which keeps the learning rate constant for the first  $\tau$  steps and then decreases it in  $O(1/t^\alpha)$ , with traditional recommendations (based on asymptotic analysis of the convex case) suggesting  $\alpha = 1$ . See Bach and Moulines (2011) for a recent analysis of the rate of convergence for the general case of  $\alpha \leq 1$ , suggesting that smaller values of  $\alpha$  should be used in the non-convex case, especially when using a gradient averaging or momentum technique (see below). An adaptive and heuristic way of automatically setting  $\tau$  above is to keep  $\epsilon_t$  constant until the training criterion stops decreasing significantly (by more than some relative improvement threshold) from epoch to epoch. That threshold is a less sensitive hyper-parameter than  $\tau$  itself. An alternative to a fixed schedule with a couple of (global) free hyper-parameters like in the above formula is the use of an *adaptive* learning rate heuristic, e.g., the simple procedure proposed in Bottou (2013): at regular intervals during training, using a fixed small subset of the training set (what matters is only the number of examples used, not what fraction of the whole training set it represents), continue training with  $N$  different

choices of learning rate (all in parallel), and keep the value that gave the best results until the next re-estimation of the optimal learning rate. Other examples of adaptive learning rate strategies are discussed below (Sec. 6.2).

- The **mini-batch size** ( $B$  in Eq. (1)) is typically chosen between 1 and a few hundreds, e.g.  $B = 32$  is a good default value, with values above 10 taking advantage of the speed-up of matrix-matrix products over matrix-vector products. The impact of  $B$  is mostly computational, i.e., larger  $B$  yield faster computation (with appropriate implementations) but requires visiting more examples in order to reach the same error, since there are less updates per epoch. In theory, this hyper-parameter should impact *training time* and not so much *test performance*, so it can be optimized separately of the other hyper-parameters, by comparing training curves (training and validation error vs amount of training time), after the other hyper-parameters (except learning rate) have been selected.  $B$  and  $\epsilon_0$  may slightly interact with other hyper-parameters so both should be re-optimized at the end. Once  $B$  is selected, it can generally be fixed while the other hyper-parameters can be further optimized (except for a *momentum* hyper-parameter, if one is used).
- **Number of training iterations**  $T$  (measured in mini-batch updates). This hyper-parameter is particular in that it can be optimized almost for free using the principle of *early stopping*: by keeping track of the out-of-sample error (as for example estimated on a validation set) as training progresses (every  $N$  updates), one can decide how long to train for any given setting of all the other hyper-parameters. Early stopping is an inexpensive way to avoid strong overfitting, i.e., even if the other hyper-parameters would yield to overfitting, early stopping will considerably reduce the overfitting damage that would otherwise ensue. It also means that it hides the overfitting effect of other hyper-parameters, possibly obscuring the analysis that one may want to do when trying to figure out the effect of individual

hyper-parameters, i.e., it tends to even out the performance obtained by many otherwise overfitting configurations of hyper-parameters by compensating a too large capacity with a smaller training time. For this reason, it might be useful to turn early-stopping off when analyzing the effect of individual hyper-parameters. Now let us turn to implementation details. Practically, one needs to continue training beyond the selected number of training iterations  $\hat{T}$  (which should be the point of lowest validation error in the training run) in order to ascertain that validation error is unlikely to go lower than at the selected point. A heuristic introduced in the *Deep Learning Tutorials*<sup>15</sup> is based on the idea of *patience* (set initially to 10000 examples in the MLP tutorial), which is a minimum number of training examples to see after the candidate selected point  $\hat{T}$  before deciding to stop training (i.e. before accepting this candidate as the final answer). As training proceeds and new candidate selected points  $\hat{T}$  (new minima of the validation error) are observed, the patience parameter is increased, either multiplicatively or additively on top of the last  $\hat{T}$  found. Hence, if we find a new minimum<sup>16</sup> at  $t$ , we save the current best model, update  $\hat{T} \leftarrow t$  and we increase our patience up to  $t + \text{constant}$  or  $t \times \text{constant}$ . Note that validation error should not be estimated after each training update (that would be really wasteful) but after every  $N$  examples, where  $N$  is at least as large as the validation set (ideally several times larger so that the early stopping overhead remains small)<sup>17</sup>.

- **Momentum**  $\beta$ . It has long been advocated (Hinton, 1978, 2010) to temporally smooth out the stochastic gradient samples obtained

during the stochastic gradient descent. For example, a moving average of the past gradients can be computed with  $\bar{g} \leftarrow (1 - \beta)\bar{g} + \beta g$ , where  $g$  is the instantaneous gradient  $\frac{\partial L(z_t, \theta)}{\partial \theta}$  or a mini-batch average, and  $\beta$  is a small positive coefficient that controls how fast the old examples get downweighted in the moving average. The simplest momentum trick is to make the updates proportional to this smoothed gradient estimator  $\bar{g}$  instead of the instantaneous gradient  $g$ . The idea is that it removes some of the noise and oscillations that gradient descent has, in particular in the directions of high curvature of the loss function<sup>18</sup>. A default value of  $\beta = 1$  (no momentum) works well in many cases but in some cases momentum seems to make a positive difference. Polyak averaging (Polyak and Juditsky, 1992) is a related form of parameter averaging<sup>19</sup> that has theoretical advantages and has been advocated and shown to bring improvements on some unsupervised learning procedures such as RBMs (Swersky *et al.*, 2010). More recently, several mathematically motivated algorithms (Nesterov, 2009; Le Roux *et al.*, 2012) have been proposed that incorporate some form of momentum and that also ensure much faster convergence (linear rather than sublinear) compared to stochastic gradient descent, at least for convex optimization problems. See also Bottou (2013) for an example of averaged SGD with successful empirical speedups in the convex case. Note however that in the pure online case (stream of examples) and under some assumptions, the sublinear rate of convergence of stochastic gradient descent with  $O(1/t)$  decrease of learning rate is an optimal rate, at least for convex problems (Nemirovski and Yudin, 1983). That would suggest that for really large train-

<sup>15</sup> <http://deeplearning.net/tutorial/>

<sup>16</sup> Ideally, we should use a statistical test of significance and accept a new minimum (over a longer training period) only if the improvement is statistically significant, based on the size and variance estimates one can compute for the validation set.

<sup>17</sup> When an extra processor on the same machine is available, validation error can conveniently be recomputed by a processor different from the one performing the training updates, allowing more frequent computation of validation error.

<sup>18</sup> Think about a ball coming down a valley. Since it has not started from the bottom of the valley it will oscillate between its sides as it settles deeper, forcing the learning rate to be small to avoid large oscillations that would kick it out of the valley. Averaging out the local gradients along the way will cancel the opposing forces from each side of the valley.

<sup>19</sup> Polyak averaging uses for predictions a moving average of the parameters found in the trajectory of stochastic gradient descent.

ing sets it may not be possible to obtain better rates than ordinary stochastic gradient descent, albeit the constants in front (which depend on the condition number of the Hessian) may still be greatly reduced by using second-order information online (Bottou and LeCun, 2004; Bottou and Bousquet, 2008).

- **Layer-specific optimization hyper-parameters:** although rarely done, it is possible to use different values of optimization hyper-parameters (such as the learning rate) on different layers of a multi-layer network. This is especially appropriate (and easier to do) in the context of layer-wise unsupervised pre-training, since each layer is trained separately (while the layers below are kept fixed). This would be particularly useful when the number of units per layer varies a lot from layer to layer. See the paragraph below entitled **Layer-wise optimization of hyper-parameters** (Sec. 3.3.4). Some researchers also advocate the use of different learning rates for the different *types* of parameters one finds in the model, such as biases and weights in the standard multi-layer network, but the issue becomes more important when parameters such as precision or variance are included in the lot (Courville *et al.*, 2011).

Up to now we have only discussed the hyper-parameters in the setup where one trains a neural network by stochastic gradient descent. With other optimization algorithms, some hyper-parameters are typically different. For example, Conjugate Gradient (CG) algorithms typically have a number of line search steps (which is a hyper-parameter) and a tolerance for stopping each line search (another hyper-parameter). An optimization algorithm like L-BFGS (limited-memory Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno) also has a hyper-parameter controlling the memory usage of the algorithm, the rank of the Hessian approximation kept in memory, which also has an influence on the efficiency of each step. Both CG and L-BFGS are iterative (e.g., one line search per iteration), and the number of iterations can be optimized as described above for stochastic gradient descent, with early stopping.

## 3.2 Hyper-Parameters of the Model and Training Criterion

Let us now turn to “model” and “criterion” hyper-parameters typically found in neural networks, especially deep neural networks.

- **Number of hidden units  $n_h$ .** Each layer in a multi-layer neural network typically has a size that we are free to set and that controls capacity. Because of early stopping and possibly other regularizers (e.g., weight decay, discussed below), it is mostly important to choose  $n_h$  large enough. Larger than optimal values typically do not hurt generalization performance much, but of course they require proportionally more computation (in  $O(n_h^2)$  if scaling all the layers at the same time in a fully connected architecture). Like for many other hyper-parameters, there is the option of allowing a different value of  $n_h$  for each hidden layer<sup>20</sup> of a deep architecture. See the paragraph below entitled **Layer-wise optimization of hyper-parameters** (Sec. 3.3.4). In a large comparative study (Larochelle *et al.*, 2009), we found that using the same size for all layers worked generally better or the same as using a decreasing size (pyramid-like) or increasing size (upside down pyramid), but of course this may be data-dependent. For most tasks that we worked on, we find that an *overcomplete*<sup>21</sup> first hidden layer works better than an under-complete one. Another even more often validated empirical observation is that the optimal  $n_h$  is much larger when using unsupervised pre-training in a supervised neural network, e.g., going from hundreds of units to thousands of units. A plausible explanation is that after unsupervised pre-training many of the hidden units are carrying information that is irrelevant to the specific supervised task of interest. In order to make sure that the information relevant to the task is captured, larger hidden layers are therefore necessary when using unsupervised pre-training.

<sup>20</sup> A hidden layer is a group of units that is neither an input layer nor an output layer.

<sup>21</sup> larger than the input vector

- **Weight decay** regularization coefficient  $\lambda$ . A way to reduce overfitting is to add a *regularization term* to the training criterion, which limits the capacity of the learner. The parameters of machine learning models can be regularized by pushing them towards a prior value, which is typically 0. L2 regularization adds a term  $\lambda \sum_i \theta_i^2$  to the training criterion, while L1 regularization adds a term  $\lambda \sum_i |\theta_i|$ . Both types of terms can be included. There is a clean Bayesian justification for such a regularization term: it is the negative log-prior  $-\log P(\theta)$  on the parameters  $\theta$ . The training criterion then corresponds to the negative joint likelihood of data and parameters,  $-\log P(\text{data}, \theta) = -\log P(\text{data}|\theta) - \log P(\theta)$ , with the loss function  $L(z, \theta)$  being interpreted as  $-\log P(z|\theta)$  and  $-\log P(\text{data}|\theta) = -\sum_{t=1}^T L(z_t, \theta)$  if the *data* consists of  $T$  i.i.d. examples  $z_t$ . This detail is important to note because when one is doing stochastic gradient-based learning, it makes sense to use an unbiased estimator of the gradient of the total training criterion (including both the total loss and the regularizer), but one only considers a single mini-batch or example at a time. How should the regularizer be weighted in this sum, which is different from the sum of the regularizer and the total loss on all examples? On each mini-batch update, the gradient of the regularization penalty should be multiplied not just by  $\lambda$  but also by  $\frac{B}{T}$ , i.e., one over the number of updates needed to go once through the training set. When the training set size is not a multiple of  $B$ , the last mini-batch will have size  $B' < B$  and the contribution of the regularizer to the mini-batch gradient should therefore be modified accordingly (i.e. scaled by  $\frac{B'}{B}$  compared to other mini-batches). In the pure online setting (there is no fixed ahead training set size nor iterating again on the examples), it would then make sense to use  $\frac{B}{t}$  at example  $t$ , or one over the number of updates to date. L2 regularization penalizes large values more strongly and corresponds to a Gaussian prior  $\propto \exp(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\|\theta\|^2}{\sigma^2})$  with prior variance  $\sigma^2 = 1/(2\lambda)$ . Note that there is a connection

between early stopping (see above, choosing the number of training iterations) and L2 regularization (Collobert and Bengio, 2004a), with one basically playing the same role as the other (but early stopping allowing a much more efficient selection of the hyper-parameter value, which suggests dropping L2 regularization altogether when early-stopping is used). However, L1 regularization behaves differently and can sometimes be useful, acting as a form of feature selection. L1 regularization makes sure that parameters that are not really very useful are driven to zero (i.e. encouraging sparsity of the parameter values), and corresponds to a Laplace density prior  $\propto e^{-\frac{|\theta|}{s}}$  with scale parameter  $s = \frac{1}{\lambda}$ . L1 regularization often helps to make the input filters<sup>22</sup> cleaner (more spatially localized) and easier to interpret. Stochastic gradient descent will not yield actual zeros but values hovering around zero. If both L1 and L2 regularization are used, a different coefficient (i.e. a different hyper-parameter) should be considered for each, and one may also use a different coefficient for different layers. In particular, the input weights and output weights may be treated differently.

One reason for treating output weights differently (i.e., not relying only on early stopping) is that we know that it is sufficient to regularize only the output weights in order to constrain capacity: in the limit case of the number of hidden units going to infinity, L2 regularization corresponds to Support Vector Machines (SVM) while L1 regularization corresponds to boosting (Bengio *et al.*, 2006a). Another reason for treating inputs and outputs differently from hidden units is because they may be sparse. For example, some input features may be 0 most of the time while others are non-zero frequently. In that case, there are fewer examples that inform the model about that rarely active input feature, and the corresponding parameters (weights outgoing from the corresponding input units) should

<sup>22</sup> The input weights of a 1st layer neuron are often called “filters” because of analogies with signal processing techniques such as convolutions.

be more regularized than the parameters associated with frequently observed inputs. A similar situation may occur with target variables that are sparse (e.g., trying to predict rarely observed events). In both cases, the effective number of meaningful updates seen by these parameters is less than the actual number of updates. This suggests to scale the regularization coefficient of these parameters by one over the effective number of updates seen by the parameter. A related formula turns up in Bayesian probit regression applied to sparse inputs (Graepel *et al.*, 2010). Some practitioners also choose to penalize only the weights  $w$  and not the biases  $b$  associated with the hidden unit activations  $w'z+b$  for a unit taking the vector of values  $z$  as input. This guarantees that even with strong regularization, the predictor would converge to the optimal constant predictor, rather than the one corresponding to 0 activation. For example, with the mean-square loss and the cross-entropy loss, the optimal constant predictor is the output average.

- **Sparsity of activation** regularization coefficient  $\alpha$ . A common practice in the Deep Learning literature (Ranzato *et al.*, 2007, 2008b; Lee *et al.*, 2008, 2009; Bagnell and Bradley, 2009; Glorot *et al.*, 2011a; Coates and Ng, 2011; Goodfellow *et al.*, 2011) consists in adding a penalty term to the training criterion that encourages the hidden units to be sparse, i.e., with values at or near 0. Although the L1 penalty (discussed above in the case of weights) can also be applied to hidden units activations, this is mathematically very different from the L1 regularization term on parameters. Whereas the latter corresponds to a prior on the parameters, the former does not because it involves the training distribution (since we are looking at data-dependent hidden units outputs). Although we will not discuss this much here, the inspiration for a sparse representation in Deep Learning comes from the earlier work on *sparse coding* (Olshausen and Field, 1997). As discussed in Goodfellow *et al.* (2009) sparse representations may be advantageous be-

cause they encourage representations that *disentangle* the underlying factors of representation. A sparsity-inducing penalty is also a way to regularize (in the sense of reducing the number of examples that the learner can learn by heart) (Ranzato *et al.*, 2008b), which means that the sparsity coefficient is likely to interact with the many other hyper-parameters which influence capacity. In general, increased sparsity can be compensated by a larger number of hidden units.

Several approaches have been proposed to induce a sparse representation (or with more hidden units whose activation is closer to 0). One approach (Ranzato *et al.*, 2008b; Le *et al.*, 2011; Zou *et al.*, 2011) is simply to penalize the L1 norm of the representation or another function of the hidden units' activation (such as the student-t log-prior). This typically makes sense for non-linearities such as the sigmoid which have a saturating output around 0, but not for the hyperbolic tangent non-linearity (whose saturation is near the -1 and 1 interval borders rather than near the origin). Another option is to penalize the biases of the hidden units, to make them more negative (Ranzato *et al.*, 2007; Lee *et al.*, 2008; Goodfellow *et al.*, 2009; Larochelle and Bengio, 2008). Note that penalizing the bias runs the danger that the weights could compensate for the bias<sup>23</sup>, which could hurt the numerical optimization of parameters. When directly penalizing the hidden unit outputs, several variants can be found in the literature, but no clear comparative analysis has been published to evaluate which one works better. Although the L1 penalty (i.e., simply  $\alpha$  times the sum of output elements  $h_j$  in the case of sigmoid non-linearity) would seem the most natural (because of its use in sparse coding), it is used in few papers involving sparse auto-encoders. A close cousin of the L1 penalty is the Student-t penalty ( $\log(1 + h_j^2)$ ), originally proposed for sparse coding (Olshausen and Field, 1997). Sev-

<sup>23</sup> because the input to the layer generally has a non-zero average, that when multiplied by the weights acts like a bias



eral researchers penalize the *average* output  $\bar{h}_j$  (e.g. over a mini-batch), and instead of pushing it to 0, encourage it to approach a fixed target  $\rho$ . This can be done through a mean-square error penalty such as  $\sum_j (\rho - \bar{h}_j)^2$ , or maybe more sensibly (because  $\bar{h}_j$  behaves like a probability), a Kullback-Liebler divergence with respect to the binomial distribution with probability  $\rho$ ,  $-\rho \log \bar{h}_j - (1 - \rho) \log(1 - \bar{h}_j) + \text{constant}$ , e.g., with  $\rho = 0.05$ , as in (Hinton, 2010). In addition to the regularization penalty itself, the choice of activation function can have a strong impact on the sparsity obtained. In particular, rectifying non-linearities (such as  $\max(0, x)$ , instead of a sigmoid) have been very successful in several instances (Jarrett *et al.*, 2009; Nair and Hinton, 2010; Glorot *et al.*, 2011a; Mesnil *et al.*, 2011; Glorot *et al.*, 2011b). The rectifier also relates to the hard tanh (Collobert and Bengio, 2004b), whose derivatives are also 0 or 1. In sparse coding and sparse predictive coding (Kavukcuoglu *et al.*, 2009) the activations are directly optimized and actual zeros are the expected result of the optimization. In that case, ordinary stochastic gradient is not guaranteed to find these zeros (it will oscillate around) and other methods such as proximal gradient are more appropriate (Bertsekas, 2010).

- **Neuron non-linearity.** The typical neuron output is  $s(a) = s(w'x + b)$ , where  $x$  is the vector of inputs into the neuron,  $w$  the vector of weights and  $b$  the offset or bias parameter, while  $s$  is a scalar non-linear function. Several non-linearities have been proposed and some choices of non-linearities have been shown to be more successful (Jarrett *et al.*, 2009; Glorot and Bengio, 2010; Glorot *et al.*, 2011a). The most commonly used by the author, for hidden units, are the sigmoid  $1/(1+e^{-a})$ , the hyperbolic tangent  $\frac{e^a - e^{-a}}{e^a + e^{-a}}$ , the rectifier  $\max(0, a)$  and the hard tanh (Collobert and Bengio, 2004b). Note that the sigmoid was shown to yield serious optimization difficulties when used as the top hidden layer of a deep supervised network (Glorot and Bengio, 2010) without unsupervised

pre-training, but works well for auto-encoder variants<sup>24</sup>. For output (or reconstruction) units, hard neuron non-linearities like the rectifier do not make sense because when the unit is saturated (e.g.  $a < 0$  for the rectifier) and associated with a loss, no gradient is propagated inside the network, i.e., there is no chance to correct the error<sup>25</sup>. In the case of hidden layers the gradient manages to go through a subset of the hidden units, even if the others are saturated. For output units a good trick is to obtain the output non-linearity and the loss by considering the associated negative log-likelihood and choosing an appropriate (conditional) output probability model, usually in the exponential family. For example, one can typically take squared error and linear outputs to correspond to a Gaussian output model, cross-entropy and sigmoids to correspond to a binomial output model, and  $-\log \text{output}[\text{target class}]$  with softmax outputs to correspond to multinomial output variables. For reasons yet to be elucidated, having a sigmoidal non-linearity on the output (reconstruction) units (along with target inputs normalized in the (0,1) interval) seems to be helpful when training the contractive auto-encoder.

- **Weights initialization scaling coefficient.**

Biases can generally be initialized to zero but weights need to be initialized carefully to break the symmetry between hidden units of the same layer<sup>26</sup>. Because different output units receive different gradient signals, this symmetry breaking issue does not con-

<sup>24</sup> The author hypothesizes that this discrepancy is due to the fact that the weight matrix  $W$  of an auto-encoder of the form  $r(x) = W^T \text{sigmoid}(Wx)$  is pulled towards being orthonormal since this would make the auto-encoder closer to the identity function, because  $W^T Wx \approx x$  when  $W$  is orthonormal and  $x$  is in the span of the rows of  $W$ .

<sup>25</sup> A hard non-linearity for the output units non-linearity is very different from a hard non-linearity in the loss function, such as the hinge loss. In the latter case the derivative is 0 only when there is no error.

<sup>26</sup> By symmetry, if hidden units of the same layer share the same input and output weights, they will compute the same output and receive the same gradient, hence performing the same update and remaining identical, thus wasting capacity.

cern the output weights (into the output units), which can therefore also be set to zero. Although several tricks (LeCun *et al.*, 1998a; Glorot and Bengio, 2010) for initializing the weights into hidden layers have been proposed (i.e. a hyper-parameter is the discrete choice between them), Bergstra and Bengio (2012) also inserted as an extra hyper-parameter a scaling coefficient for the initialization range. These tricks are based on the idea that units with more inputs (the *fan-in* of the unit) should have smaller weights. Both LeCun *et al.* (1998a) and Glorot and Bengio (2010) recommend scaling by the inverse of the *square root* of the fan-in, although Glorot and Bengio (2010) and the Deep Learning Tutorials use a combination of the fan-in and fan-out, e.g., sample a  $\text{Uniform}(-r, r)$  with  $r = \sqrt{6/(\text{fan-in} + \text{fan-out})}$  for hyperbolic tangent units and  $r = 4\sqrt{6/(\text{fan-in} + \text{fan-out})}$  for sigmoid units. We have found that we could avoid any hyper-parameter related to initialization using these formulas (and the derivation in Glorot and Bengio (2010) can be used to derive the formula for other settings). Note however that in the case of RBMs, a zero-mean Gaussian with a small standard deviation around 0.1 or 0.01 works well (Hinton, 2010) to initialize the weights, while visible biases are typically set to their optimal value if the weights were 0, i.e.,  $\log(\bar{x}/(1 - \bar{x}))$  in the case of a binomial visible unit whose corresponding binary input feature has empirical mean  $\bar{x}$  in the training set.

An important choice is whether one should use *unsupervised pre-training* (and which unsupervised feature learning algorithm to use) in order to initialize parameters. In most settings we have found unsupervised pre-training to help and very rarely to hurt, but of course that implies additional training time and additional hyper-parameters.

- **Random seeds.** There are often several sources of randomness in the training of neural networks and deep learners (such as for random initialization, sampling examples, sampling hidden units in stochastic models such as RBMs,

or sampling corruption noise in denoising auto-encoders). Some random seeds could therefore yield better results than others. Because of the presence of local minima in the training criterion of neural networks (except in the linear case or with fixed lower layers), parameter initialization matters. See Erhan *et al.* (2010b) for an example of histograms of test errors for hundreds of different random seeds. Typically, the choice of random seed only has a slight effect on the result and can mostly be ignored in general or for most of the hyper-parameter search process. If computing power is available, then a final set of jobs with different random seeds (5 to 10) for a small set of best choices of hyper-parameter values can squeeze a bit more performance. Another way to exploit computing power to push performance a bit is model averaging, as in Bagging (Breiman, 1994) and Bayesian methods. After training them, the outputs of different networks (or in general different learning algorithms) can be averaged. For example, the difference between the neural networks being averaged into a committee may come from the different seeds used for parameter initialization, or the use of different subsets of input variables, or different subsets of training examples (the latter being called Bagging).

- **Preprocessing.** Many preprocessing steps have been proposed to massage raw data into appropriate inputs for neural networks and model selection must also choose among them. In addition to element-wise standardization (subtract mean and divide by standard deviation), Principal Components Analysis (PCA) has often been advocated (LeCun *et al.*, 1998a; Bergstra and Bengio, 2012) and also allows dimensionality reduction, at the price of an extra hyper-parameter (the number of principal components retained, or the proportion of variance explained). A convenient non-linear preprocessing is the *uniformization* (Mesnil *et al.*, 2011) of each feature (which estimates its cumulative distribution  $F_i$  and then transforms each feature  $x_i$  by its quantile  $F_i^{-1}(x_i)$ , i.e., returns



an approximate normalized rank or quantile for the value  $x_i$ ). A simpler to compute transform that may help reduce the tails of input features is a non-linearity such as the logarithm or the square root, in an attempt to make them more Gaussian-like.

In addition to the above somewhat generic choices, more choices arise with different architectures and learning algorithms. For example, the denoising auto-encoder has a hyper-parameter scaling the amount of input corruption and the contractive auto-encoder has as hyper-parameter a coefficient scaling the norm of the Jacobian of the encoder, i.e., controlling the importance of the contraction penalty. The latter seems to be a rather sensitive hyper-parameter that must be tuned carefully. The contractive auto-encoder’s success also seems sensitive to the **weight tying** constraint used in many auto-encoder architectures: the decoder’s weight matrix is equal to the transpose of the encoder’s weight matrix. The specific architecture used in the contractive auto-encoder (with tied weights, sigmoid non-linearities on hidden and reconstruction units, along with squared loss or cross-entropy loss) works quite well but other related variants do not always train well, for reasons that remain to be understood.

There are also many architectural choices that are relevant in the case of convolutional architectures (e.g. for modeling images, time-series or sound) (LeCun *et al.*, 1989, 1998b; Le *et al.*, 2010) in which hidden units have local receptive fields. Their discussion is postponed to another chapter (LeCun, 2013).

### 3.3 Manual Search and Grid Search

Many of the hyper-parameters or model choices described above can be ignored by picking a standard trick suggested here or in some other paper. Still, one remains with a substantial number of choices to be made, which may give the impression of neural network training as an art. With modern computing facilities based on large computer clusters, it is however possible to make the optimization of hyper-parameters a more reproducible and automated pro-

cess, using techniques such as grid search or better, random search, or even hyper-parameter optimization, discussed below.

#### 3.3.1 General guidance for the exploration of hyper-parameters

First of all, let us consider recommendations for exploring hyper-parameter settings, whether with manual search, with an automated procedure, or with a combination of both. We call a *numerical hyper-parameter* one that involves choosing a real number or an integer (where order matters), as opposed to making a discrete symbolic choice from an unordered set. Examples of numerical hyper-parameters are regularization coefficients, number of hidden units, number of training iterations, etc. One has to think of hyper-parameter selection as *a difficult form of learning*: there is both an optimization problem (looking for hyper-parameter configurations that yield low validation error) and a generalization problem: there is uncertainty about the expected generalization after optimizing validation performance, and it is possible to overfit the validation error and get optimistically biased estimators of performance when comparing many hyper-parameter configurations. The training criterion for this learning is typically the validation set error, which is a proxy for generalization error. Unfortunately, the relation between hyper-parameters and validation error can be complicated. Although to first approximation we expect a kind of U-shaped curve (when considering only a single hyper-parameter, the others being fixed), this curve can also have noisy variations, in part due to the use of finite data sets.

- **Best value on the border.** When considering the validation error obtained for different values of a numerical hyper-parameter one should pay attention as to whether or not the best value found is near the border of the investigated interval. If it is near the border, then this suggests that better values can be found with values beyond the border: it is recommended in that case to explore further, beyond that border. Because the relation between a hyper-parameter

and validation error can be noisy, it is generally not enough to try very few values. For instance, trying only 3 values for a numerical hyper-parameter is insufficient, even if the best value found is the middle one.

- **Scale of values considered.** Exploring values of a numerical hyper-parameter entails choosing a *starting interval* to be searched, which is therefore a kind of hyper-hyper-parameter. By choosing the interval large enough to start with, but based on previous experience with this hyper-parameter, we ensure that we do not get completely wrong results. Now instead of choosing the intermediate values *linearly* in the chosen interval, it often makes much more sense to consider a linear or uniform sampling in the *log-domain* (in the space of the logarithm of the hyper-parameter). For example, the results obtained with a learning rate of 0.01 are likely to be very similar to the results with 0.011 while results with 0.001 could be quite different from results with 0.002 even though the absolute difference is the same in both cases. The *ratio* between different values is often a better guide of the expected impact of the change. That is why exploring uniformly or regularly-spaced values in the space of the *logarithm* of the numerical hyper-parameter is typically preferred for positive-valued numerical hyper-parameters.
- **Computational considerations.** Validation error is actually not the only measure to consider in selecting hyper-parameters. Often, one has to consider computational cost, either of training or prediction. Computing resources for training and prediction are limited and generally condition the choice of intervals of considered values: for example increasing the number of hidden units or number of training iterations also scales up computation. An interesting idea is to use *computationally cheap estimators* of validation error to select some hyper-parameters. For example, Saxe *et al.* (2011) showed that the architecture hyper-parameters of convolutional networks could be selected using *random weights* in the lower layers of the network (filters of

the convolution). While this yields a noisy and biased (pessimistic) estimator of the validation error which would otherwise be obtained with full training, this cheap estimator appears to be correlated with the expensive validation error. Hence this cheap estimator is enough for selecting some hyper-parameters (or for keeping under consideration for further and more expensive evaluation only the few best choices found). Even without cheap estimators of generalization error, high-throughput computing (e.g., on clusters, GPUs, or clusters of GPUs) can be exploited to run not just hundreds but thousands of training jobs, something not conceivable only a few years ago, with each job taking on the order of hours or days for larger datasets. With computationally cheap surrogates, some researchers have run on the order of ten thousands trials, and we can expect future advances in parallelized computing power to boost these numbers.

### 3.3.2 Coordinate Descent and Multi-Resolution Search

When performing a manual search and with access to only a single computer, a reasonable strategy is *coordinate descent*: change only one hyper-parameter at a time, always making a change from the best configuration of hyper-parameters found up to now. Instead of a standard coordinate descent (which systematically cycles through all the variables to be optimized) one can make sure to regularly fine-tune the most sensitive variables, such as the learning rate.

Another important idea is that there is no point in exploring the effect of fine changes before one or more reasonably good settings have been found. The idea of *multi-resolution search* is to start the search by considering only a few values of the numerical hyper-parameters (over a large range), or considering large changes each time a new value is tried. One can then start from the one or few best configurations found and explore more locally around them with smaller variations around these values.

### 3.3.3 Automated and Semi-automated Grid Search

Once some interval or set of values has been selected for each hyper-parameter (thus defining a search space), a simple strategy that exploits parallel computing is the **grid search**. One first needs to convert the numerical intervals into lists of values (e.g.,  $K$  regularly-spaced values in the log-domain of the hyper-parameter). The grid search is simply an exhaustive search through all the combinations of these values. The cross-product of these lists contains a number of elements that is unfortunately exponential in the number of hyper-parameters (e.g., with 5 hyper-parameters, each allowed to take 6 different values, one gets  $6^5 = 7776$  configurations). In section 3.4 below we consider an approach that works more efficiently than the grid search when the number of hyper-parameters increases beyond 2 or 3.

The advantage of the grid search, compared to many other optimization strategies (such as coordinate descent), is that it is fully parallelizable. If a large computer cluster is available, it is tempting to choose a model selection strategy that can take advantage of parallelization. One practical disadvantage of grid search (especially against random search, Sec. 3.4), with a parallelized set of jobs on a cluster, is that if only one of the jobs fails<sup>27</sup> then one has to launch another volley of jobs to complete the grid (and yet a third one if any of these fails, etc.), thus multiplying the overall computing time.

Typically, a single grid search is not enough and practitioners tend to proceed with a sequence of grid searches, each time adjusting the ranges of values considered based on the previous results obtained. Although this can be done manually, this procedure can also be automated by considering the idea of multi-resolution search to guide this outer loop. Different, more local, grid searches can be launched in the neighborhood of the best solutions found previously. In addition, the idea of coordinate descent can also be thrown in, by making each grid search focus on only a few of the hyper-parameters. For example, it is common practice to start by exploring the

initial learning rate while keeping fixed (and initially constant) the learning rate descent schedule. Once the shape of the schedule has been chosen, it may be possible to further refine the learning rate, but in a smaller interval around the best value found.

Humans can get very good at performing hyper-parameter search, and having a human in the loop also has the advantage that it can help detect bugs or unwanted or unexpected behavior of a learning algorithm. However, for the sake of reproducibility, machine learning researchers should strive to use procedures that do not involve human decisions in the middle, only at the outset (e.g., setting hyper-parameter ranges, which can be specified in a paper describing the experiments).

### 3.3.4 Layer-wise optimization of hyper-parameters

In the case of Deep Learning with unsupervised pre-training there is an opportunity for combining coordinate descent and cheap relative validation set performance evaluation associated with some hyper-parameter choices. The idea, described by Mesnil *et al.* (2011); Bengio (2011), is to perform greedy choices for the hyper-parameters associated with lower layers (near the input) before training the higher layers. One first trains (unsupervised) the first layer with different hyper-parameter values and somehow estimates the relative validation error that would be obtained from these different configurations if the final network only had this single layer as internal representation. In the common case where the ultimate task is supervised, it means training a simple supervised predictor (e.g. a linear classifier) on top of the learned representation. In the case of a linear predictor (e.g. regression or logistic regression) this can even be done on the fly while unsupervised training of the representation progresses (i.e. can be used for early stopping as well), as in (Larochelle *et al.*, 2009). Once a set of apparently good (according to this greedy evaluation) hyper-parameters values has been found (or possibly using only the best one found), these good values can be used as starting point to train (and hyper-optimize) a second layer in the same way, etc. The completely greedy ap-

<sup>27</sup> For all kinds of hardware and software reasons, a job failing is very common.

proach is to keep only the best configuration up to now (for the lower layers), but keeping the  $K$  best configurations overall only multiplies computational costs of hyper-parameter selection by  $K$  for layers beyond the first one, because we would still keep only the best  $K$  configurations from all the 1st layer and 2nd layer hyper-parameters as starting points for exploring 3rd layer hyper-parameters, etc. This procedure is formalized in the Algorithm 1 below. Since greedy layer-wise pre-training does not modify the lower layers when pre-training the upper layers, this is also very efficient computationally. This procedure allows one to set the hyper-parameters associated with the unsupervised pre-training stage, and then there remains hyper-parameters to be selected for the supervised fine-tuning stage, if one is desired. A final supervised fine-tuning stage is strongly suggested, especially when there are many labeled examples (Lamblin and Bengio, 2010).

### 3.4 Random Sampling of Hyper-Parameters

A serious problem with the grid search approach to find good hyper-parameter configurations is that it scales exponentially badly with the number of hyper-parameters considered. In the above sections we have discussed numerous hyper-parameters and if all of them were to be explored at the same time it would be impossible to use only a grid search to do so.

One may think that there are no other options simply because this is an instance of the curse of dimensionality. But like we have found in our work on Deep Learning (Bengio, 2009), if there is some structure in a target function we are trying to discover, then there is a chance to find good solutions without paying an exponential price. It turns out that in many practical cases we have encountered, there is a kind of structure that *random sampling* can exploit (Bergstra and Bengio, 2012). The idea of random sampling is to replace the regular grid by a random (typically uniform) sampling. Each tested hyper-parameter configuration is selected by independently sampling each hyper-parameter from a prior distribution (typically uniform in the log-domain, inside the interval of interest). For a discrete

---

#### Algorithm 1 : Greedy layer-wise hyper-parameter optimization.

---

**input**  $K$ : number of best configurations to keep at each level.  
**input**  $NLEVELS$ : number of levels of the deep architecture  
**input**  $LEVELSETTINGS$ : list of hyper-parameter settings to be considered for unsupervised pre-training of a level  
**input**  $SFTSETTINGS$ : list of hyper-parameter settings to be considered for supervised fine-tuning

Initialize set of best configurations  $S = \emptyset$   
**for**  $L = 1$  **to**  $NLEVELS$  **do**  
  **for**  $C$  **in**  $LEVELSETTINGS$  **do**  
    **for**  $H$  **in**  $(S \text{ or } \{\emptyset\})$  **do**  
      \* Pretrain level  $L$  using hyper-parameter setting  $C$  for level  $L$  and the parameters obtained with setting  $H$  for lower levels.  
      \* Evaluate target task performance  $\mathcal{L}$  using this depth- $L$  pre-trained architecture (e.g. train a linear classifier on top of these layers and estimate validation error).  
      \* Push the pair  $(C \cup H, \mathcal{L})$  into  $S$  if it is among the  $K$  best performing of  $S$ .  
    **end for**  
  **end for**  
  **for**  $C$  **in**  $SFTSETTINGS$  **do**  
    **for**  $H$  **in**  $S$  **do**  
      \* Supervised fine-tuning of the pre-trained architecture associated with  $H$ , using supervised fine-tuning hyper-parameter setting  $C$ .  
      \* Evaluate target task performance  $\mathcal{L}$  of this fine-tuned predictor (e.g. validation error).  
      \* Push the pair  $(C \cup H, \mathcal{L})$  into  $S$  if it is among the  $K$  best performing of  $S$ .  
    **end for**  
  **end for**  
**output**  $S$  the set of  $K$  best-performing models with their settings and validation performance.

---

hyper-parameter, a multinomial distribution can be defined according to our prior beliefs on the likely good values. At worse, i.e., with no prior preference at all, this would be a uniform distribution across the allowed values. In fact, we can use our prior knowledge to make this prior distribution quite sophisticated. For example, we can readily include knowledge that some values of some hyper-parameters only make sense in the context of other particular values of hyper-parameters. This is a practical consideration for example when considering layer-specific hyper-parameters when the number of layers itself is a hyper-parameter.

The experiments performed (Bergstra and Bengio, 2012) show that random sampling can be many times more efficient than grid search as soon as the number of hyper-parameters goes beyond the 2 or 3 typically seen with SVMs and vanilla neural networks. The main reason why faster convergence is observed is because it allows one to explore more values for each hyper-parameter, whereas in grid search, the same value of a hyper-parameter is repeated in exponentially many configurations (of all the other hyper-parameters). In particular, if only a small subset of the hyper-parameters really matters, then this procedure can be shown to be exponentially more efficient. What we found is that for different datasets and architectures, the subset of hyper-parameters that mattered most was different, but it was often the case that a few hyper-parameters made a big difference (and the learning rate is always one of them!). When marginalizing (by averaging or minimizing) the validation performance to visualize the effect of one or two hyper-parameters, we get a more noisy picture using a random search compared to a grid search, because of the random variations of the other hyper-parameters but one with much more resolution, because so many more different values have been considered. Practically, one can plot the curves of best validation error as the number of random trials<sup>28</sup> is increased (with mean and standard deviation, obtained by considering, for each choice of number of trials, all possible same-size subsets of trials), and this curve

tells us that we are approaching a plateau, i.e., it tells us whether it is worth it or not to continue launching jobs, i.e., we can perform a kind of early stopping in the outer optimization over hyper-parameters. Note that one should distinguish the curve of the “best trial in first N trials” with the curve of the mean (and standard deviation) of the “best in a subset of size N”. The latter is a better statistical representative of the improvements we should expect if we increase the number of trials. Even if the former has a plateau, the latter may still be on the increase, pointing for the need to more hyper-parameter configuration samples, i.e., more trials (Bergstra and Bengio, 2012). Comparing these curves with the equivalent obtained from grid search we see faster convergence with random search. On the other hand, note that one advantage of grid search compared to random sampling is that the qualitative analysis of results is easier because one can consider variations of a single hyper-parameter with all the other hyper-parameters being fixed. It may remain a valid option to do a small grid search around the best solutions found by random search, considering only the hyper-parameters that were found to matter or which concern a scientific question of interest<sup>29</sup>.

Random search maintains the advantage of easy parallelization provided by grid search and improves on it. Indeed, a practical advantage of random search compared to grid search is that if one of the jobs fails then there is no need to re-launch that job. It also means that if one has launched 100 random search jobs, and finds that the convergence curve still has an interesting slope, one can launch another 50 or 100 without wasting the first 100. It is not that simple to combine the results of two grid searches because they are not always compatible (i.e., one is not a subset of the other).

Finally, although random search is a useful addition to the toolbox of the practitioner, semi-automatic exploration is still helpful and one will often iterate between launching a new volley of jobs and analysis of the results obtained with

<sup>28</sup> each random trial corresponding to a training job with a particular choice of hyper-parameter values

<sup>29</sup> This is often the case in machine learning research, e.g., does depth of architecture matter? then we need to control accurately for the effect of depth, with all other hyper-parameters optimized for each value of depth.

the previous volley in order to guide model design and research. What we need is more, and more efficient, automation of hyper-parameter optimization. There are some interesting steps in this direction (Hutter, 2009; Bergstra *et al.*, 2011; Hutter *et al.*, 2011; Srinivasan and Ramakrishnan, 2011) but much more needs to be done.

## 4 Debugging and Analysis

### 4.1 Gradient Checking and Controlled Overfitting

A very useful debugging step consists in verifying that the implementation of the gradient  $\frac{\partial L}{\partial \theta}$  is compatible with the computation of  $L$  as a function of  $\theta$ . If the analytically computed gradient does not match the one obtained by a finite difference approximation, this signals that a bug is probably present somewhere. First of all, looking at for which  $i$  one gets important relative change between  $\frac{\partial L}{\partial \theta_i}$  and its finite difference approximation, we can get hints as to where the problem may be. An error in sign is particularly troubling, of course. A good next step is then to verify in the same way intermediate gradients  $\frac{\partial L}{\partial a}$  with  $a$  some quantities that depend on the faulty  $\theta$ , such as intervening neuron activations.

As many researchers know, the gradient can be approximated by a finite difference approximation obtained from the first-order Taylor expansion of a scalar function  $f$  with respect to a scalar argument  $x$ :

$$\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x} = \frac{f(x + \varepsilon) - f(x)}{\varepsilon} + o(\varepsilon)$$

But a less known fact is that a second order approximation can be achieved by considering the following alternative formula:

$$\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x} \approx \frac{f(x + \varepsilon) - f(x - \varepsilon)}{2\varepsilon} + o(\varepsilon^2).$$

The second order terms of the Taylor expansion of  $f(x + \varepsilon)$  and  $f(x - \varepsilon)$  cancel each other because they are even, leaving only 3rd or higher order terms, i.e.,  $o(\varepsilon^2)$  error after dividing the difference by  $\varepsilon$ . Hence this formula is twice more expensive (not a

big deal while debugging) but provides quadratically more precision.

Note that because of finite precision in the computation, there will be a difference between the analytic (even correct) and finite difference gradient. Contrary to naive expectations, the relative difference may *grow* if we choose an  $\varepsilon$  that is too small, i.e., the error should first decrease as  $\varepsilon$  is decreased, and then may worsen when numerical precision kicks in, due to non-linearities. We have often used a value of  $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$  in neural networks, a value that is sufficiently small to detect most bugs.

Once the gradient is known to be well computed, another sanity check is that gradient descent (or any other gradient-based optimization) should be able to overfit on a small training set<sup>30</sup>. In particular, to factor out effects of SGD hyper-parameters, a good sanity check for the code (and the other hyper-parameters) is to verify that one can overfit on a small training set using a powerful second order method such as L-BFGS. For any optimizer, though, as the number of examples is increased, the degradation of training error should be gradual while validation error should improve. And one typically sees the advantages of SGD over batch second-order methods like L-BFGS increase as the training set size increases. The break-even point may depend on the task, parallelization (multi-core or GPU, see Sec.5 below), and architecture (number of computations compared to number of parameters, per example).

Of course, the real goal of learning is to achieve good generalization error, and the latter can be estimated by measuring performance on an independent test set. When test error is considered too high, the first question to ask is whether it is because of a difficulty in optimizing the training criterion or because of overfitting. Comparing training error and test error (and how they change as we change hyper-parameters that influence capacity,

<sup>30</sup> In principle, bad local minima could prevent that, but in the overfitting regime, e.g., with more hidden units than examples, the global minimum of the training error can generally be reached almost surely from random initialization, presumably because the training criterion becomes convex in the parameters that suffice to get the training error to zero (Bengio *et al.*, 2006a), i.e., the output weights of the neural network.

such as the number of training iterations) helps to answer that question. Depending on the answer, of course, the appropriate ways to improve test error are different. Optimization difficulties can be fixed by looking for bugs in the training code, inappropriate values of optimization hyper-parameters, or simply insufficient capacity (e.g. not enough degrees of freedom, hidden units, embedding sizes, etc.). Overfitting difficulties can be addressed by collecting more training data, introducing more or better regularization terms, multi-task training, unsupervised pre-training, unsupervised term in the training criterion, or considering different function families (or neural network architectures). In a multi-layer neural network, both problems can be simultaneously present. For example, as discussed in Bengio *et al.* (2007); Bengio (2009), it is possible to have zero training error with a large top-level hidden layer that allows the output layer to overfit, while the lower layer are not doing a good job of extracting useful features because they were not properly optimized.

Unless using a framework such as Theano which automatically handles the efficient allocation of buffers for intermediate results, it is important to pay attention to such buffers in the design of the code. The first objective is to avoid memory allocation in the middle of the training loop, i.e., all memory buffers should be allocated once and for all. Careless reuse of the same memory buffers for different uses can however lead to bugs, which can be checked, in the debugging phase, by initializing buffers to the NaN (Not-A-Number) value, which propagates into downstream computation (making it easy to detect that uninitialized values were used)<sup>31</sup>.

## 4.2 Visualizations and Statistics

The most basic statistics that should be measured during training are error statistics. The *average loss* on the training set and the validation set and their evolution during training are very useful to monitor progress and differentiate overfitting from poor optimization. To make comparisons easier, it may be

useful to compare neural networks during training in terms of their “age” (number of updates made times mini-batch size  $B$ , i.e., number of examples visited) rather than in terms of number of epochs (which is very sensitive to the training set size).

When using unsupervised training to learn the first few layers of a deep architecture, a very common debugging and analysis tool is the *visualization of filters*, i.e., of the weight vectors associated with individual hidden units. This is simplest in the case of the first layer and where the inputs are images (or image patches), time-series, or spectrograms (all of which are visually interpretable). Several recipes have been proposed to extend this idea to visualize the preferred input of hidden units in layers that follow the first one (Lee *et al.*, 2008; Erhan *et al.*, 2010a). In the case of the first layer, since one often obtains Gabor filters, a parametric fit of these filters to the weight vector can be done so as to visualize the distribution of orientations, positions and scales of the learned filters. An interesting special case of visualizing first-layer weights is the visualization of *word embeddings* (see Section 5.3 below) using a dimensionality reduction technique such as t-SNE (van der Maaten and Hinton, 2008).

An extension of the idea of visualizing filters (which can apply to non-linear or deeper features) is that of visualizing local (around the given test point) leading tangent vectors, i.e., the main directions in input space to which the representation (at a given layer) is most sensitive to (Rifai *et al.*, 2011b).

In the case where the inputs are not images or easily visualizable, or to get a sense of the weight values in different hidden units, Hinton diagrams (Hinton, 1989) are also very useful, using small squares whose color (black or white) indicates a weight’s sign and whose area represents its magnitude.

Another way to visualize what has been learned by an unsupervised (or joint label-input) model is to look at samples from the model. Sampling procedures have been defined at the outset for RBMs, Deep Belief Nets, and Deep Boltzmann Machines, for example based on Gibbs sampling. When weights become larger, mixing between modes can become very slow with Gibbs sampling. An interesting alternative is rates-FPCD (Tieleman and Hinton, 2009;

<sup>31</sup> Personal communication from David Warde-Farley, who learned this trick from Sam Roweis.



Breuleux *et al.*, 2011) which appears to be more robust to this problem and generally mixes faster, but at the cost of losing theoretical guarantees.

In the case of auto-encoder variants, it was not clear until recently whether they were really capturing the underlying density (since they are not optimized with respect to the maximum likelihood principle or an approximation of it). It was therefore even less clear if there existed appropriate sampling algorithms for auto-encoders, but a recent proposal for sampling from contractive auto-encoders appears to be working very well (Rifai *et al.*, 2012), based on arguments about the geometric interpretation of the first derivative of the encoder (Bengio *et al.*, 2012), showing that denoising and contractive auto-encoders capture local moments (first and second) of the training density.

To get a sense of what individual hidden units represent, it has also been proposed to vary only one unit while keeping the others fixed, e.g., to the value obtained by finding the hidden units representation associated with a particular input example.

Another interesting technique is the *visualization of the learning trajectory in function space* (Erhan *et al.*, 2010b). The idea is to associate the function (as opposed to simply the parameters) computed by a neural network with a low-dimensional (2-D or 3-D) representation, e.g., with the t-SNE (van der Maaten and Hinton, 2008) or Isomap (Tenenbaum *et al.*, 2000) algorithms, and then plot the evolution of this function during training, or the population of such trajectories for different initializations. This provides visualization of *effective local minima*<sup>32</sup> and shows that no two different random initializations ended up in the same effective local minimum.

Finally, another useful type of visualization is to display statistics (e.g., histogram, mean and standard deviation) of activations (inputs and outputs of the non-linearities at each layer), activation gradients, parameters and parameter gradients, by groups (e.g. different layers, biases vs weights) and across training iterations. See Glorot and Bengio (2010)

<sup>32</sup> It is difficult to know for sure if it is a true local minima or if it appears like one because the optimization algorithm is stuck.

for a practical example. A particularly interesting quantity to monitor is the discriminative ability of the representations learnt at each layer, as discussed in (Montavon *et al.*, 2012), and ultimately leading to an analysis of the disentangled factors captured by the different layers as we consider deeper architectures.

## 5 Other Recommendations

### 5.1 Multi-core machines, BLAS and GPUs

Matrix operations are the most time-consuming in efficient implementations of many machine learning algorithms and this is particularly true of neural networks and deep architectures. The basic operations are matrix-vector products (forward propagation and back-propagation) and vector times vector outer products (resulting in a matrix of weight gradients). Matrix-matrix multiplications can be done substantially faster than the equivalent sequence of matrix-vector products for two reasons: by smart caching mechanisms such as implemented in the BLAS library (which is called from many higher-level environments such as python’s numpy and Theano, Matlab, Torch or Lush), and thanks to parallelism. Appropriate versions of BLAS can take advantage of multi-core machines to distribute these computations on multi-core machines. The speed-up is however generally a fraction of the total speedup one can hope for (e.g.  $4\times$  on a 4-core machine), because of communication overheads and because not all computation is parallelized. Parallelism becomes more efficient when the sizes of these matrices is increased, which is why mini-batch updates can be computationally advantageous, and more so when more cores are present.

The extreme multi-core machines are the GPUs (Graphics Processing Units), with hundreds of cores. Unfortunately, they also come with constraints and specialized compilers which make it more difficult to fully take advantage of their potential. On 512-core machines, we are routinely able to get speed-ups of  $4\times$  to  $40\times$  for large neural networks. To make the

use of GPUs practical, it really helps to use existing libraries that efficiently implement computations on GPUs. See Bergstra *et al.* (2010) for a comparative study of the Theano library (which compiles numpy-like code for GPUs). One practical issue is that only the GPU-compiled operations will typically be done on the GPU, and that transfers between the GPU and CPU considerably slow things down. It is important to use a profiler to find out what is done on the GPU and how efficient these operations are in order to quickly invest one’s time where needed to make an implementation GPU-efficient and keep most operations on the GPU card.

## 5.2 Sparse High-Dimensional Inputs

Sparse high-dimensional inputs can be efficiently handled by traditional supervised neural networks by using a sparse matrix multiplication. Typically, the input is a sparse vector while the weights are in a dense matrix, and one should use an efficient implementation made for just this case in order to optimally take advantage of sparsity. There is still going to be an overhead on the order of  $2\times$  or more (on the multiply-add operations, not the others) compared to a dense implementation of the matrix-vector product.

For many unsupervised learning algorithms there is unfortunately a difficulty. The computation for these learning algorithms usually involves some kind of reconstruction of the input (like for all auto-encoder variants, but also for RBMs and sparse coding variants), as if the inputs were in the output space of the learner. Two exceptions to this problem are semi-supervised embedding (Weston *et al.*, 2008) and Slow Feature Analysis (Wiskott and Sejnowski, 2002; Berkes and Wiskott, 2002). The former pulls the representation of nearby examples near each other and pushes dissimilar points apart, while also tuning the representation for a supervised learning task. The latter maximizes the learned features’ variance while minimizing their covariance and maximizing their temporal auto-correlation.

For algorithms that do need a form of input reconstruction, an efficient approach based on *sampled reconstruction* (Dauphin *et al.*, 2011) has been proposed, successfully implemented and evaluated

for the case of auto-encoders and denoising auto-encoders. The first idea is that on each example (or mini-batch), one samples a subset of the elements of the reconstruction vector, along with the associated reconstruction loss. One only needs to compute the reconstruction and the loss associated with these sampled elements (or features), as well as the associated back-propagation operations into hidden units and reconstruction weights. That alone would multiplicatively reduce the computational cost by the amount of sparsity but make the gradient much more noisy and possibly biased as well, if the sampling distribution was chosen not uniform. To reduce the variance of that estimator, the idea is to guess for which features the reconstruction loss will be larger and to sample with higher probability these features (and their loss). In particular, the authors always sample the features with a non-zero in the input (or the corrupted input, in the denoising case), and uniformly sample an equal number of those with a zero in the input and corrupted input. To make the estimator unbiased now requires introducing a weight on the reconstruction loss associated with each sampled feature, inversely proportional to the probability of sampling it, i.e., this is an importance sampling scheme. The experiments show that the speed-up increases linearly with the amount of sparsity while the average loss is optimized as well as in the deterministic full-computation case.

## 5.3 Symbolic Variables, Embeddings, Multi-Task Learning and Multi-Relational Learning

Parameter sharing (Lang and Hinton, 1988; LeCun, 1989; Lang and Hinton, 1988; Caruana, 1993; Baxter, 1995, 1997) is an old neural network technique for increasing statistical power: if a parameter is used in  $N$  times more contexts (different tasks, different parts of the input, etc.) then it may be as if we had  $N$  times more training examples for tuning its value. More examples to estimate a parameter reduces its variance (with respect to sampling of training examples), which is directly influencing generalization error: for example the generalization mean squared error can

be decomposed as the sum of a bias term and a variance term (Geman *et al.*, 1992). The **reuse** idea was first exploited by applying the same parameter to different parts of the input, as in convolutional neural networks (Lang and Hinton, 1988; LeCun, 1989). Reuse was also exploited by sharing the lower layers of a network (and the representation of the input that they capture) across multiple tasks associated with different outputs of the network (Caruana, 1993; Baxter, 1995, 1997). This idea is also one of the key motivations behind Deep Learning (Bengio, 2009) because one can think of the intermediate features computed in higher (deeper) layers as different tasks that can share the sub-features computed in lower layers (nearer the input). This very basic notion of reuse is key to improving generalization in many settings, guiding the design of neural network architectures in practical applications as well.

An interesting special case of these ideas is in the context of learning with symbolic data. If some input variables are symbolic, taking value in a finite alphabet, they can be represented as neural network inputs by a one-hot subvector of the input vector (with a 0 everywhere except at the position associated with the particular symbol). Now, sometimes different input variables refer to different instances of the same *type* of symbol. A patent example is with neural language models (Bengio *et al.*, 2003; Bengio, 2008), where the input is a sequence of words. In these models, the same input layer weights are reused for words at different positions in the input sequence (as in convolutional networks). The product of a one-hot sub-vector with this shared weight matrix is a generally dense vector, and this associates each symbol in the alphabet with a point in a vector space<sup>33</sup>, which we call its *embedding*. The idea of vector space representations for words and symbols is older (Deerwester *et al.*, 1990) and is a particular case of the notion of *distributed representation* (Hinton, 1986, 1989) central to the connectionist approaches. Learned embeddings of symbols (or other objects) can be conveniently visualized using a dimensionality reduction algorithm such as t-

SNE (van der Maaten and Hinton, 2008).

In addition to sharing the embedding parameters across positions of words in an input sentence, Collobert *et al.* (2011a) share them across natural language processing tasks such as Part-Of-Speech tagging, chunking and semantic role labeling. Parameter sharing is a key idea behind convolutional nets, recurrent neural networks and dynamic Bayes nets, in which the same parameters are used for different temporal or spatial slices of the data. This idea has been generalized from sequences and 2-D images to arbitrary graphs with recursive neural networks or recursive graphical models (Pollack, 1990; Frasconi *et al.*, 1998; Bottou, 2011; Socher *et al.*, 2011), Markov Logic Networks (Richardson and Domingos, 2006) and relational learning (Getoor and Taskar, 2006). A relational database can be seen as a set of objects (or typed values) and relations between them, of the form (object1, relation-type, object2). The same global set of parameters can be shared to characterize such relations, across relations (which can be seen as tasks) and objects. Object-specific parameters are the parameters specifying the embedding of a particular discrete object. One can think of the elements of each embedding vector as *implicit learned attributes*. Different tasks may demand different attributes, so that objects which share some underlying characteristics and behavior should end up having similar values of some of their attributes. For example, words appearing in semantically and syntactically similar contexts end up getting a very close embedding (Collobert *et al.*, 2011a). If the same attributes can be useful for several tasks, then statistical power is gained through parameter sharing, and transfer of information between tasks can happen, making the data of some task informative for generalizing properly on another task.

The idea proposed in Bordes *et al.* (2011, 2012) is to learn an energy function that is lower for positive (valid) relations present in the training set, and parametrized in two parts: on the one hand the symbol embeddings and on the other hand the rest of the neural network that maps them to a scalar energy. In addition, by considering relation types themselves as particular symbolic objects, the model can reason about relations themselves and have relations

<sup>33</sup> the result of the matrix multiplication, which equals one of the columns of the matrix

between relation types. For example, ‘To be’ can act as a relation type (in subject-attribute relations) but in the statement “‘To be’ is a verb” it appears both as a relation type and as an object of the relation.

Such multi-relational learning opens the door to the application of neural networks outside of their traditional applications, which was based on a single homogeneous source of data, often seen as a matrix with one row per example and one column (or group of columns) per random variable. Instead, one often has multiple heterogeneous sources of data (typically providing examples seen as a tuple of values), each involving different random variables. So long as these different sources *share some variables*, then the above multi-relational multi-task learning approaches can be applied. Each variable can be associated with its embedding function (that maps the value of a variable to a generic representation space that is valid *across tasks and data sources*). This framework can be applied not only to symbolic data but to mixed symbolic/numeric data if the mapping from object to embedding is generalized from a table look-up to a parametrized function (the simplest being a linear mapping) from its raw attributes (e.g., image features) to its embedding. This has been exploited successfully to design image search systems in which images and queries are mapped to the same semantic space (Weston *et al.*, 2011).

## 6 Open Questions

### 6.1 On the Added Difficulty of Training Deeper Architectures

There are experimental results which provide some evidence that, at least in some circumstances, deeper neural networks are more difficult to train than shallow ones, in the sense that there is a greater chance of missing out on better minima when starting from random initialization. This is borne out by all the experiments where we find that some initialization scheme can drastically improve performance. In the Deep Learning literature this has been shown with the use of unsupervised pre-training (supervised or not), both applied to super-

vised tasks — training a neural network for classification (Hinton *et al.*, 2006; Bengio *et al.*, 2007; Ranzato *et al.*, 2007) — and unsupervised tasks — training a Deep Boltzmann Machine to model the data distribution (Salakhutdinov and Hinton, 2009).

The learning trajectories visualizations of Erhan *et al.* (2010b) have shown that even when starting from nearby configurations in function space, different initializations seem to always fall in a different effective local minimum. Furthermore, the same study showed that the minima found when using unsupervised pre-training were far in function space from those found from random initialization, in addition to giving better generalization error. Both of these findings highlight the importance of initialization, hence of local minima effects, in deep networks. Finally, it has been shown that these effects were both increased when considering deeper architectures (Erhan *et al.*, 2010b).

There are also results showing that specific ways of setting the initial distribution and ordering of examples (“curriculum learning”) can yield better solutions (Elman, 1993; Bengio *et al.*, 2009; Krueger and Dayan, 2009). This also suggests that very particular ways of initializing parameters, very different from uniformly sampled, can have a strong impact on the solutions found by gradient descent. The hypothesis proposed in (Bengio *et al.*, 2009) is that curriculum learning can act similarly to a *continuation method*, i.e., starting from an easier optimization task (e.g. convex) and tracking the local minimum as the learning task is gradually made more difficult and closer to the real task of interest.

Why would training deeper networks be more difficult? This is clearly still an open question. A plausible partial answer is that deeper networks are also more non-linear (since each layer composes more non-linearity on top of the previous ones), making gradient-based methods less efficient. It may also be that the number and structure of local minima both change qualitatively as we increase depth. Theoretical arguments support a potentially exponential gain in expressive power of deeper architectures (Bengio, 2009; Bengio and Delalleau, 2011) and it would be plausible that with this added expressive power coming from the combinatorics of composed reuse of sub-

functions could come a corresponding increase in the number (and possibly quality) of local minima. But the best ones could then also be more difficult to find.

On the practical side, several experimental results point to factors that may help training deep architectures:

- **A local training signal.** What many successful procedures for training deep networks have in common is that they involve a local training signal that helps each layer decide what to do without requiring the back-propagation of gradients through many non-linearities. This includes of course the many variants of greedy layer-wise pre-training but also the less well-known semi-supervised embedding algorithm (Weston *et al.*, 2008).
- **Initialization in the right range.** Based on the idea that both activations and gradients should be able to flow well through a deep architecture without significant reduction in variance, Glorot and Bengio (2010) proposed setting up the initial weights to make the Jacobian of each layer have singular values near 1 (or preserve variance in both directions). In their experiments this clearly helped greatly reducing the gap between purely supervised and pre-trained deep networks.
- **Choice of non-linearities.** In the same study (Glorot and Bengio, 2010) and a follow-up (Glorot *et al.*, 2011a) it was shown that the choice of hidden layer non-linearities interacted with depth. In particular, without unsupervised pre-training, a deep neural network with sigmoids in the top hidden layer would get stuck for a long time on a plateau and generally produce inferior results, due to the special role of 0 and of the initial gradients from the output units. Symmetric non-linearities like the hyperbolic tangent did not suffer from that problem, while softer non-linearities (without exponential tails) such as the *softsign* function  $s(a) = \frac{a}{1+|a|}$  worked even better. In Glorot *et al.* (2011a) it was shown that an asymmetric but hard-limiting non-linearity such as the rectifier

( $s(a) = \max(0, a)$ , see also (Nair and Hinton, 2010)) actually worked very well (but should not be used for output units), in spite of the prior belief that the fact that when hidden units are saturated, gradients would not flow well into lower layers. In fact gradients flow very well, but on selected paths, possibly making the credit assignment (which parameters should change to handle the current error) sharper and the Hessian condition number better. A recent heuristic that is related to the difficulty of gradient propagation through neural net non-linearities is the idea of “centering” the non-linear operation such that each hidden unit has zero average output and zero average slope (Schraudolph, 1998; Raiko *et al.*, 2012).

## 6.2 Adaptive Learning Rates and Second-Order Methods

To improve convergence and remove learning rates from the list of hyper-parameters, many authors have advocated exploring adaptive learning rate methods, either for a global learning rate (Cho *et al.*, 2011), a layer-wise learning rate, a neuron-wise learning rate, or a parameter-wise learning rate (Bordes *et al.*, 2009) (which then starts to look like a diagonal Newton method). LeCun (1987); LeCun *et al.* (1998a) advocate the use of a second-order diagonal Newton (always positive) approximation, with one learning rate per parameter (associated with the approximated inverse second derivative of the loss with respect to the parameter). Hinton (2010) proposes scaling learning rates so that the average weight update is on the order of 1/1000th of the weight magnitude. LeCun *et al.* (1998a) also propose a simple power method in order to estimate the largest eigenvalue of the Hessian (which would be the optimal learning rate). An interesting alternative to variants of Newton’s method are variants of the *natural gradient* method (Amari, 1998), but like the basic Newton method it is computationally too expensive, requiring operations on a too large square matrix (number of parameters by number of parameters). Diagonal and low-rank online approximations of natural gradient (Le Roux *et al.*, 2008; Le Roux *et al.*, 2011)

have been proposed and shown to speed-up training in some contexts. Several adaptive learning rate procedures have been proposed recently and merit more attention and evaluations in the neural network context, such as *adagrad* (Duchi *et al.*, 2011) and the adaptive learning rate method from Schaul *et al.* (2012) which claims to remove completely the need for a learning rate hyper-parameter.

Whereas stochastic gradient descent converges very quickly initially it is generally slower than second-order methods for the final convergence, and this may be important in some applications. As a consequence, batch training algorithms (performing only one update after seeing the whole training set) such as the Conjugate Gradient method (a second order method) have dominated stochastic gradient descent for not too large datasets (e.g. less than thousands or tens of thousands of examples). Furthermore, it has recently been proposed and successfully applied to use second-order methods over *large mini-batches* (Le *et al.*, 2011; Martens, 2010). The idea is to do just a few iterations of the second-order methods on each mini-batch and then move on to the next mini-batch, starting from the best previous point found. A useful twist is to start training with one or more epoch of SGD, since SGD remains the fastest optimizer early on in training.

At this point in time however, although the second-order and natural gradient methods are appealing conceptually, have demonstrably helped in the studied cases and may in the end prove to be very important, they have not yet become a standard for neural networks optimization and need to be validated and maybe improved by other researchers, before displacing simple (mini-batch) stochastic gradient descent variants.

### 6.3 Conclusion

In spite of decades of experimental and theoretical work on artificial neural networks, and with all the impressive progress made since the first edition of this book, in particular in the area of Deep Learning, there is still much to be done to better train neural networks and better understand the underlying issues that can make the training task difficult. As stated in

the introduction, the wisdom distilled here should be taken as a guideline, to be tried and challenged, not as a practice set in stone. The practice summarized here, coupled with the increase in available computing power, now allows researchers to train neural networks on a scale that is far beyond what was possible at the time of the first edition of this book, helping to move us closer to artificial intelligence.

### Acknowledgements

The author is grateful for the comments and feedback provided by Nicolas Le Roux, Ian Goodfellow, James Bergstra, Guillaume Desjardins, Razvan Pascanu, David Warde-Farley, Eric Larsen, Frederic Bastien, and Sina Honari, as well as for the financial support of NSERC, FQRNT, CIFAR, and the Canada Research Chairs.

### References

- Amari, S. (1998). Natural gradient works efficiently in learning. *Neural Computation*, **10**(2), 251–276.
- Bach, F. and Moulines, E. (2011). Non-asymptotic analysis of stochastic approximation algorithms. In *NIPS'2011*.
- Bagnell, J. A. and Bradley, D. M. (2009). Differentiable sparse coding. In *NIPS'2009*, pages 113–120.
- Baxter, J. (1995). Learning internal representations. In *COLT'95*, pages 311–320.
- Baxter, J. (1997). A Bayesian/information theoretic model of learning via multiple task sampling. *Machine Learning*, **28**, 7–40.
- Bengio, Y. (2008). Neural net language models. *Scholarpedia*, **3**(1), 3881.
- Bengio, Y. (2009). *Learning deep architectures for AI*. Now Publishers.
- Bengio, Y. (2011). Deep learning of representations for unsupervised and transfer learning. In *JMLR W&CP: Proc. Unsupervised and Transfer Learning*.

- Bengio, Y. and Delalleau, O. (2011). On the expressive power of deep architectures. In *ALT'2011*.
- Bengio, Y. and LeCun, Y. (2007). Scaling learning algorithms towards AI. In *Large Scale Kernel Machines*.
- Bengio, Y., Ducharme, R., Vincent, P., and Jauvin, C. (2003). A neural probabilistic language model. *JMLR*, **3**, 1137–1155.
- Bengio, Y., Le Roux, N., Vincent, P., Delalleau, O., and Marcotte, P. (2006a). Convex neural networks. In *NIPS'2005*, pages 123–130.
- Bengio, Y., Delalleau, O., and Le Roux, N. (2006b). The curse of highly variable functions for local kernel machines. In *NIPS'2005*, pages 107–114.
- Bengio, Y., Lamblin, P., Popovici, D., and Larochelle, H. (2007). Greedy layer-wise training of deep networks. In *NIPS'2006*.
- Bengio, Y., Louradour, J., Collobert, R., and Weston, J. (2009). Curriculum learning. In *ICML'09*.
- Bengio, Y., Alain, G., and Rifai, S. (2012). Implicit density estimation by local moment matching to sample from auto-encoders. Technical report, arXiv:1207.0057.
- Bergstra, J. and Bengio, Y. (2012). Random search for hyper-parameter optimization. *J. Machine Learning Res.*, **13**, 281–305.
- Bergstra, J., Breuleux, O., Bastien, F., Lamblin, P., Pascanu, R., Desjardins, G., Turian, J., Warde-Farley, D., and Bengio, Y. (2010). Theano: a CPU and GPU math expression compiler. In *Proc. Python for Scientific Comp. Conf. (SciPy)*.
- Bergstra, J., Bardenet, R., Bengio, Y., and Kégl, B. (2011). Algorithms for hyper-parameter optimization. In *NIPS'2011*.
- Berkes, P. and Wiskott, L. (2002). Applying slow feature analysis to image sequences yields a rich repertoire of complex cell properties. In *ICANN'02*, pages 81–86.
- Bertsekas, D. P. (2010). Incremental gradient, sub-gradient, and proximal methods for convex optimization: a survey. Technical Report 2848, LIDS.
- Bordes, A., Bottou, L., and Gallinari, P. (2009). Sgdqn: Careful quasi-newton stochastic gradient descent. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **10**, 1737–1754.
- Bordes, A., Weston, J., Collobert, R., and Bengio, Y. (2011). Learning structured embeddings of knowledge bases. In *AAAI 2011*.
- Bordes, A., Glorot, X., Weston, J., and Bengio, Y. (2012). Joint learning of words and meaning representations for open-text semantic parsing. *AISTATS'2012*.
- Bottou, L. (2011). From machine learning to machine reasoning. Technical report, arXiv.1102.1808.
- Bottou, L. (2013). Large-scale learning with stochastic gradient descent. In K.-R. Müller, G. Montavon, and G. B. Orr, editors, *Neural Networks: Tricks of the Trade, Reloaded*. Springer.
- Bottou, L. and Bousquet, O. (2008). The tradeoffs of large scale learning. In *NIPS'2008*.
- Bottou, L. and LeCun, Y. (2004). Large-scale on-line learning. In *NIPS'2003*.
- Breiman, L. (1994). Bagging predictors. *Machine Learning*, **24**(2), 123–140.
- Breuleux, O., Bengio, Y., and Vincent, P. (2011). Quickly generating representative samples from an rbm-derived process. *Neural Computation*, **23**(8), 2053–2073.
- Caruana, R. (1993). Multitask connectionist learning. In *Proceedings of the 1993 Connectionist Models Summer School*, pages 372–379.
- Cho, K., Raiko, T., and Ilin, A. (2011). Enhanced gradient and adaptive learning rate for training restricted boltzmann machines. In *ICML'2011*, pages 105–112.



- Coates, A. and Ng, A. Y. (2011). The importance of encoding versus training with sparse coding and vector quantization. In *ICML'2011*.
- Collobert, R. and Bengio, S. (2004a). Links between perceptrons, MLPs and SVMs. In *ICML'2004*.
- Collobert, R. and Bengio, S. (2004b). Links between perceptrons, MLPs and SVMs. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML*.
- Collobert, R., Weston, J., Bottou, L., Karlen, M., Kavukcuoglu, K., and Kuksa, P. (2011a). Natural language processing (almost) from scratch. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **12**, 2493–2537.
- Collobert, R., Kavukcuoglu, K., and Farabet, C. (2011b). Torch7: A matlab-like environment for machine learning. In *BigLearn, NIPS Workshop*.
- Courville, A., Bergstra, J., and Bengio, Y. (2011). Unsupervised models of images by spike-and-slab RBMs. In *ICML'2011*.
- Dauphin, Y., Glorot, X., and Bengio, Y. (2011). Sampled reconstruction for large-scale learning of embeddings. In *Proc. ICML'2011*.
- Deerwester, S., Dumais, S. T., Furnas, G. W., Landauer, T. K., and Harshman, R. (1990). Indexing by latent semantic analysis. *J. Am. Soc. Information Science*, **41**(6), 391–407.
- Duchi, J., Hazan, E., and Singer, Y. (2011). Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*.
- Elman, J. L. (1993). Learning and development in neural networks: The importance of starting small. *Cognition*, **48**, 781–799.
- Erhan, D., Courville, A., and Bengio, Y. (2010a). Understanding representations learned in deep architectures. Technical Report 1355, Université de Montréal/DIRO.
- Erhan, D., Bengio, Y., Courville, A., Manzagol, P.-A., Vincent, P., and Bengio, S. (2010b). Why does unsupervised pre-training help deep learning? *J. Machine Learning Res.*, **11**, 625–660.
- Frasconi, P., Gori, M., and Sperduti, A. (1998). A general framework for adaptive processing of data structures. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, **9**(5), 768–786.
- Geman, S., Bienenstock, E., and Doursat, R. (1992). Neural networks and the bias/variance dilemma. *Neural Computation*, **4**(1), 1–58.
- Getoor, L. and Taskar, B. (2006). *Introduction to Statistical Relational Learning*. MIT Press.
- Glorot, X. and Bengio, Y. (2010). Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks. In *AISTATS'2010*, pages 249–256.
- Glorot, X., Bordes, A., and Bengio, Y. (2011a). Deep sparse rectifier neural networks. In *AISTATS'2011*.
- Glorot, X., Bordes, A., and Bengio, Y. (2011b). Domain adaptation for large-scale sentiment classification: A deep learning approach. In *ICML'2011*.
- Goodfellow, I., Le, Q., Saxe, A., and Ng, A. (2009). Measuring invariances in deep networks. In *NIPS'2009*, pages 646–654.
- Goodfellow, I., Courville, A., and Bengio, Y. (2011). Spike-and-slab sparse coding for unsupervised feature discovery. In *NIPS Workshop on Challenges in Learning Hierarchical Models*.
- Graepel, T., Candela, J. Q., Borchert, T., and Herbrich, R. (2010). Web-scale Bayesian click-through rate prediction for sponsored search advertising in microsoft’s bing search engine. In *ICML'2010*.
- Håstad, J. (1986). Almost optimal lower bounds for small depth circuits. In *STOC'86*, pages 6–20.
- Håstad, J. and Goldmann, M. (1991). On the power of small-depth threshold circuits. *Computational Complexity*, **1**, 113–129.
- Hinton, G. E. (1978). *Relaxation and its role in vision*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- Hinton, G. E. (1986). Learning distributed representations of concepts. In *Proc. 8th Annual Conf. Cog. Sc. Society*, pages 1–12.

- Hinton, G. E. (1989). Connectionist learning procedures. *Artificial Intelligence*, **40**, 185–234.
- Hinton, G. E. (2010). A practical guide to training restricted Boltzmann machines. Technical Report UTML TR 2010-003, Department of Computer Science, University of Toronto.
- Hinton, G. E. (2013). A practical guide to training restricted Boltzmann machines. In K.-R. Müller, G. Montavon, and G. B. Orr, editors, *Neural Networks: Tricks of the Trade, Reloaded*. Springer.
- Hinton, G. E., Osindero, S., and Teh, Y.-W. (2006). A fast learning algorithm for deep belief nets. *Neural Computation*, **18**, 1527–1554.
- Hutter, F. (2009). *Automated Configuration of Algorithms for Solving Hard Computational Problems*. Ph.D. thesis, University of British Columbia.
- Hutter, F., Hoos, H., and Leyton-Brown, K. (2011). Sequential model-based optimization for general algorithm configuration. In *LION-5*.
- Jarrett, K., Kavukcuoglu, K., Ranzato, M., and LeCun, Y. (2009). What is the best multi-stage architecture for object recognition? In *ICCV’09*.
- Kavukcuoglu, K., Ranzato, M.-A., Fergus, R., and LeCun, Y. (2009). Learning invariant features through topographic filter maps. In *CVPR’2009*.
- Krueger, K. A. and Dayan, P. (2009). Flexible shaping: how learning in small steps helps. *Cognition*, **110**, 380–394.
- Lamblin, P. and Bengio, Y. (2010). Important gains from supervised fine-tuning of deep architectures on large labeled sets. NIPS\*2010 Deep Learning and Unsupervised Feature Learning Workshop.
- Lang, K. J. and Hinton, G. E. (1988). The development of the time-delay neural network architecture for speech recognition. Technical Report CMU-CS-88-152, Carnegie-Mellon University.
- Larochelle, H. and Bengio, Y. (2008). Classification using discriminative restricted Boltzmann machines. In *ICML’2008*.
- Larochelle, H., Bengio, Y., Louradour, J., and Lamblin, P. (2009). Exploring strategies for training deep neural networks. *J. Machine Learning Res.*, **10**, 1–40.
- Le, Q., Ngiam, J., Chen, Z., hao Chia, D. J., Koh, P. W., and Ng, A. (2010). Tiled convolutional neural networks. In *NIPS’2010*.
- Le, Q., Ngiam, J., Coates, A., Lahiri, A., Prochnow, B., and Ng, A. (2011). On optimization methods for deep learning. In *ICML’2011*.
- Le Roux, N., Manzagol, P.-A., and Bengio, Y. (2008). Topmoumoute online natural gradient algorithm. In *NIPS’07*.
- Le Roux, N., Bengio, Y., and Fitzgibbon, A. (2011). Improving first and second-order methods by modeling uncertainty. In *Optimization for Machine Learning*. MIT Press.
- Le Roux, N., Schmidt, M., and Bach, F. (2012). A stochastic gradient method with an exponential convergence rate for strongly-convex optimization with finite training sets. Technical report, arXiv:1202.6258.
- LeCun, Y. (1987). *Modèles connexionistes de l’apprentissage*. Ph.D. thesis, Université de Paris VI.
- LeCun, Y. (1989). Generalization and network design strategies. Technical Report CRG-TR-89-4, University of Toronto.
- LeCun, Y. (2013). to appear. In K.-R. Müller, G. Montavon, and G. B. Orr, editors, *Neural Networks: Tricks of the Trade, Reloaded*. Springer.
- LeCun, Y., Boser, B., Denker, J. S., Henderson, D., Howard, R. E., Hubbard, W., and Jackel, L. D. (1989). Backpropagation applied to handwritten zip code recognition. *Neural Computation*, **1**(4), 541–551.
- LeCun, Y., Bottou, L., Orr, G. B., and Müller, K. (1998a). Efficient backprop. In *Neural Networks, Tricks of the Trade*.

- LeCun, Y., Bottou, L., Bengio, Y., and Haffner, P. (1998b). Gradient based learning applied to document recognition. *IEEE*, **86**(11), 2278–2324.
- Lee, H., Ekanadham, C., and Ng, A. (2008). Sparse deep belief net model for visual area V2. In *NIPS'07*.
- Lee, H., Grosse, R., Ranganath, R., and Ng, A. Y. (2009). Convolutional deep belief networks for scalable unsupervised learning of hierarchical representations. In *ICML'2009*.
- Martens, J. (2010). Deep learning via Hessian-free optimization. In *ICML'2010*, pages 735–742.
- Mesnil, G., Dauphin, Y., Glorot, X., Rifai, S., Bengio, Y., Goodfellow, I., Lavoie, E., Muller, X., Desjardins, G., Warde-Farley, D., Vincent, P., Courville, A., and Bergstra, J. (2011). Unsupervised and transfer learning challenge: a deep learning approach. In *JMLR W&CP: Proc. Unsupervised and Transfer Learning*, volume 7.
- Montavon, G., Braun, M. L., and Muller, K.-R. (2012). Deep boltzmann machines as feed-forward hierarchies. In *AISTATS'2012*.
- Nair, V. and Hinton, G. E. (2010). Rectified linear units improve restricted Boltzmann machines. In *ICML'2010*.
- Nemirovski, A. and Yudin, D. (1983). *Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization*. Wiley.
- Nesterov, Y. (2009). Primal-dual subgradient methods for convex problems. *Mathematical programming*, **120**(1), 221–259.
- Olshausen, B. A. and Field, D. J. (1997). Sparse coding with an overcomplete basis set: a strategy employed by V1? *Vision Research*, **37**, 3311–3325.
- Pearlmutter, B. (1994). Fast exact multiplication by the Hessian. *Neural Computation*, **6**(1), 147–160.
- Pinto, N., Doukhan, D., DiCarlo, J. J., and Cox, D. D. (2009). A high-throughput screening approach to discovering good forms of biologically inspired visual representation. *PLoS Comput Biol*, **5**(11), e1000579.
- Pollack, J. B. (1990). Recursive distributed representations. *Artificial Intelligence*, **46**(1), 77–105.
- Polyak, B. and Juditsky, A. (1992). Acceleration of stochastic approximation by averaging. *SIAM J. Control and Optimization*, **30**(4), 838–855.
- Raiko, T., Valpola, H., and LeCun, Y. (2012). Deep learning made easier by linear transformations in perceptrons. In *AISTATS'2012*.
- Ranzato, M., Poultney, C., Chopra, S., and LeCun, Y. (2007). Efficient learning of sparse representations with an energy-based model. In *NIPS'06*.
- Ranzato, M., Boureau, Y.-L., and LeCun, Y. (2008a). Sparse feature learning for deep belief networks. In J. Platt, D. Koller, Y. Singer, and S. Roweis, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20 (NIPS'07)*, pages 1185–1192, Cambridge, MA. MIT Press.
- Ranzato, M., Boureau, Y., and LeCun, Y. (2008b). Sparse feature learning for deep belief networks. In *NIPS'2007*.
- Richardson, M. and Domingos, P. (2006). Markov logic networks. *Machine Learning*, **62**, 107–136.
- Rifai, S., Vincent, P., Muller, X., Glorot, X., and Bengio, Y. (2011a). Contracting auto-encoders: Explicit invariance during feature extraction. In *ICML'2011*.
- Rifai, S., Dauphin, Y., Vincent, P., Bengio, Y., and Muller, X. (2011b). The manifold tangent classifier. In *NIPS'2011*.
- Rifai, S., Bengio, Y., Dauphin, Y., and Vincent, P. (2012). A generative process for sampling contractive auto-encoders. In *ICML'2012*.
- Robbins, H. and Monro, S. (1951). A stochastic approximation method. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, **22**, 400–407.

- Rumelhart, D. E., Hinton, G. E., and Williams, R. J. (1986). Learning representations by back-propagating errors. *Nature*, **323**, 533–536.
- Salakhutdinov, R. and Hinton, G. (2009). Deep Boltzmann machines. In *AISTATS'2009*.
- Saxe, A. M., Koh, P. W., Chen, Z., Bhand, M., Suresh, B., and Ng, A. (2011). On random weights and unsupervised feature learning. In *ICML'2011*.
- Schaul, T., Zhang, S., and LeCun, Y. (2012). No More Pesky Learning Rates. Technical report.
- Schraudolph, N. N. (1998). Centering neural network gradient factors. In G. B. Orr and K.-R. Muller, editors, *Neural Networks: Tricks of the Trade*, pages 548–548. Springer.
- Socher, R., Manning, C., and Ng, A. Y. (2011). Parsing natural scenes and natural language with recursive neural networks. In *ICML'2011*.
- Srinivasan, A. and Ramakrishnan, G. (2011). Parameter screening and optimisation for ILP using designed experiments. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **12**, 627–662.
- Swersky, K., Chen, B., Marlin, B., and de Freitas, N. (2010). A tutorial on stochastic approximation algorithms for training restricted boltzmann machines and deep belief nets. In *Information Theory and Applications Workshop*.
- Tenenbaum, J., de Silva, V., and Langford, J. C. (2000). A global geometric framework for nonlinear dimensionality reduction. *Science*, **290**(5500), 2319–2323.
- Tieleman, T. and Hinton, G. (2009). Using fast weights to improve persistent contrastive divergence. In *ICML'2009*.
- van der Maaten, L. and Hinton, G. E. (2008). Visualizing data using t-sne. *J. Machine Learning Res.*, **9**.
- Vincent, P. (2011). A connection between score matching and denoising autoencoders. *Neural Computation*, **23**(7).
- Vincent, P., Larochelle, H., Bengio, Y., and Manzagol, P.-A. (2008). Extracting and composing robust features with denoising autoencoders. In *ICML 2008*.
- Vincent, P., Larochelle, H., Lajoie, I., Bengio, Y., and Manzagol, P.-A. (2010). Stacked denoising autoencoders: Learning useful representations in a deep network with a local denoising criterion. *J. Machine Learning Res.*, **11**.
- Weston, J., Ratle, F., and Collobert, R. (2008). Deep learning via semi-supervised embedding. In *ICML 2008*.
- Weston, J., Bengio, S., and Usunier, N. (2011). Ws-abie: Scaling up to large vocabulary image annotation. In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI*.
- Wiskott, L. and Sejnowski, T. J. (2002). Slow feature analysis: Unsupervised learning of invariances. *Neural Computation*, **14**(4), 715–770.
- Zou, W. Y., Ng, A. Y., and Yu, K. (2011). Unsupervised learning of visual invariance with temporal coherence. In *NIPS 2011 Workshop on Deep Learning and Unsupervised Feature Learning*.