Calorimeters meet *MLPs*

Jan Kieseler

Recap: DNNs and their parameters

- All nodes of consecutive layers are connected with each other
- Typically an ANN is called "deep" if it has >4 hidden layers
- Referred to as Multi-Layer Perceptron, Feed-Forward NN

Activation functions: adding non-linearities

• One layer:
$$
h^{(k+1)}(h^{(k)}) = \theta(\omega(h^{(k)}) + b_k)
$$

• Without non-linear activation: $y(x) = h^{(4)}(h^{(3)}(h^{(2)}(h^{(1)}(x)))) = \tilde{\omega}x + \tilde{b}$

Back-of-the envelope exercise

- There is a whole zoo: theoretically, the choice does not matter for hidden layers
	- For the output it **does** matter as it restricts / shapes the output distribution
- In practice: not vanishing/exploding output (and gradients)
	- Suggestion: (s/r)elu

<https://machinelearninggeek.com/activation-functions/>

DNNs as universal function approximators

• Very simple NN: one hidden layer, one input, one output, tanh activation

"Out-of-distribution"

- DNNs are universal function approximators, already with very few parameters
	- But beware of extrapolation / out-of-distribution effects

Loss (cost) function

- The loss function quantifies how well a model performs
- Here we compare sample-by-sample the NN output with a truth label
- E.g. text book linear regression: we know the 'truth'
	- Model: $\Phi(\omega, x) = \omega_a x + \omega_b$
	- Least-square method:

$$
\min_{i} 1/N \sum_{i}^{N} \left((\Phi(\omega, x_{i}) - y_{i})^{2} \right) = \min_{\text{MSE}(\Phi(\omega, x), y)} \frac{y_{i}^{2}}{\omega_{i}^{2}} + \text{Mean squared error loss}
$$

- The mean squared error loss is a standard loss for regression tasks
- It assumes a Gaussian distribution of the NN estimates (log(L))
- We want to map to the whole output range: linear output activation

What does that mean for calorimeters??

How do we train: gradient descent

• Well established, robust numerical minimisation procedure:

$$
\omega^{(k+1)} = \omega^{(k)} - \eta \nabla_{\omega^{(k)}} L(\Phi(\omega, x), y)
$$
Learning rate

• Update ω until $L\left(\Phi(\omega^{(k)}, x), y\right) - L\left(\Phi(\omega^{(k+1)}, x), y\right) < \epsilon$

https://ml-cheatsheet.readthedocs.io/en/latest/gradient_descent.html

Stochastic gradient descent and momentum

- Stochastic gradient descent is gradient descent on (mini) batches instead of the full data set $\omega^{(k+1)} = \omega^{(k)} - \eta \nabla_{\omega^{(k)}} L(\Phi(\omega, x), y) \rightarrow \omega^{(k+1)} = \omega^{(k)} - \eta \nabla_{\omega^{(k)}} L(\Phi(\omega, (x_k), y_k))$ GD SGD
- Reduces computational burden: makes training feasible
- Introduces extra noise that can actually **help**

Goodfellow et al. (2016)

• Add a momentum/velocity that averages the general directions in parameter space

$$
v^{(k)} = \alpha v^{(k-1)} - \eta \nabla_{\omega^{(k)}} L
$$

$$
\omega^{(k+1)} = \omega^{(k)} + v^{(k)}
$$

For our exercises, use "Adam"

→ The basis for most common optimisers that are in use

Momentum in action

The above and many more details (great page) [https://towardsdatascience.com/a-visual-explanation-of-gradient-descent-methods](https://towardsdatascience.com/a-visual-explanation-of-gradient-descent-methods-momentum-adagrad-rmsprop-adam-f898b102325c)[momentum-adagrad-rmsprop-adam-f898b102325c](https://towardsdatascience.com/a-visual-explanation-of-gradient-descent-methods-momentum-adagrad-rmsprop-adam-f898b102325c)

- There is no universally best learning rate always needs to be adjusted
- Rule of thumb:
	- More parameters ↔ lower learning rate
	- Smaller batches \leftrightarrow lower learning rate

Overfitting / overtraining

- More data **per weight**:
	- Simpler network
	- More data
- Lower learning rate
- Regularisation (weight regularisation, Dropout) *

<https://medium.com/analytics-vidhya/the-perfect-fit-for-a-dnn-596954c9ea39>

Summary

- Interactive
- MLPs and activations: non-linearities
- Loss functions: how to chose them?

- Gradient descent and momentum
- How to chose learning rates