

Storing messages with multipartite neural cliques

???

Abstract

???

Index terms— associative memory, error correcting code

probability for i and j to be active in their respective clusters for one message : $\frac{a}{l}$

probability of the edge not being added in the network for one message : $1 - \left(\frac{a}{l}\right)^2$

$$d = 1 - \left(1 - \left(\frac{a}{l}\right)^2\right)^m$$

I Introduction

II Networks of neural cliques

1 Learning messages

2 Retrieving messages

a The "winner takes all" rule

b The " a winners take all" rule

less biologically plausible rule

same algorithmic complexity

gap with density in simulations : under 1 percent

probability for a vertex v to achieve the maximum score, that is to mean $a(c - c_e)$: $d^{a(c-c_e)}$

probability for a vertex v not to achieve the maximum : $1 - d^{a(c-c_e)}$

probability for none of the vertices of one erased cluster, excepting the correct ones, to achieve the maximum : $\left(1 - d^{a(c-c_e)}\right)^{l-a}$

probability for none of the vertices in any erased cluster, excepting the correct ones, to achieve the maximum in their respective cluster : $\left(1 - d^{a(c-c_e)}\right)^{c_e(l-a)}$

Whence error rate is :

$$P_{err} = 1 - \left(1 - d^{a(c-c_e)}\right)^{c_e(l-a)}$$

III Retrieval performance

1 Analytical results

number of neurons per cluster l

number of clusters c

number of erased clusters c_e

number of messages : m

number of activities per cluster : a

density : d

edge : (i, j)

2 Simulations

Improves the retrieval rate for multiple iterations and/or corrupted messages.

The simulations agree with the analytical results for density and error rate.

For one iteration (for erasures, not for errors), winner takes all is the same as a -winners take all.




Figure 1: Theoretical and empirical densities

For multiple iterations a -winners take all is a significant improvement.

" a -winners take all" better than "winner takes all" with errors instead of erasures, even for one iteration.

For errors : only better than only 1 activity per cluster if multiple iterations of the a -winners take all rule. For one iteration, it is less efficient.




Figure 2: 2 activities per cluster, 4 clusters, 512 neurons per cluster, two erasures, each point is the mean of 5 networks with 1000 sampled messages, analytical result in continuous black

Spéculations en Français :

Peut-être un intérêt pour cluster based associative memories build from unreliable storage : si une arête porte moins d'info, on peut peut-être en supprimer plus (mais rajout ?!)

Marche mieux pour des bruits importants

$$P(n_{v_c} = n_0) = \binom{ac_k}{n_0} (1 - \psi)^{n_0} \psi^{ac_k - n_0}$$

$$P_+ = \psi(1 - d) + (1 - \psi)d$$

$$P(n_v = x) = \binom{ac_k}{x} P_+^x (1 - P_+)^{ac_k - x}$$

Sans tenir compte du choix au hasard si plus sont activés.

IV Conclusion

References

- [LPGRG14] François Leduc-Primeau, Vincent Gripon, Michael Rabbat, and Warren Gross. Cluster-based associative memories built from unreliable storage. In *ICASSP*, May 2014. To appear.