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## Why we don't want massive multiplications?



Faster computation is likely to be crucial for further progress and for consumer applications on low-power devices.


A multiplier-free network could pave the way to fast, hardware friendly training of neural networks.

## Various trials in the past decades...

- Quantize weight values (Kwan \& Tang, 1993; Marchesi et al., 1993).
- Quantize states, learning rates, and gradients. (Simard \& Graf, 1994)
- Completely Boolean network at test time (Kim \& Paris, 2015
- Replace all floating-point multiplications by integer shifts. (Machado et al., 2015)
- Bit-stream networks (Burge et al., 1999) substituting weight connections with logical gates.


## Binarization as regularization?

In many cases, neural networks only need very low precision


Stochasticity comes with benefits

- Dropout, Blackout. [4][5]
- Noisy Gradients [3]
stochasticity
- Noisy activation functions [2]

Can we take advantage of the impreciseness of a binarization process so that we can have reduced computation load and extra regularization at the same time?

## Our approach

## Binarize weight values

- BinaryConnect[Courbariaux, et al., 2015] and TernaryConnect
- Binarize weights in the forward/backward propagations, but store a full-precision version of them in the backend.


## Quantize backprop

- Exponential quantization
- Employ quantization of the representations while computing down-flowing error signals in the backward pass.
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## Stochastic

- $P\left(W_{i j}=1\right)=\frac{w_{i j}+1}{2}$
- $P\left(W_{i j}=-1\right)=1-P\left(W_{i j}=1\right)$

BinaryConnect
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## Stochastic

- If $w_{i j}>0$ :
- $P\left(W_{i j}=1\right)=w_{i j}$
- $P\left(W_{i j}=0\right)=1-w_{i j}$
- Else:
- $P\left(W_{i j}=-1\right)=-w_{i j}$
- $P\left(W_{i j}=0\right)=1+w_{i j}$



## Deterministic

$$
\text { - } W_{i j}=\left\{\begin{array}{lr}
1 & w_{i j}>0.5 \\
0 & -0.5<w_{i j} \leq 0.5 \\
-1 & w_{i j} \leq-0.5
\end{array}\right.
$$

## Our approach

```
Binarize weight values
- BinaryConnect[Courbariaux, et al., 2015] and
    TernaryConnect
- Binarize weights in the forward/backward
    propagations, but store a full-precision version of
    them in the backend.
```


## Quantize backprop

- Exponential quantization
- Employ quantization of the representations while computing down-flowing error signals in the backward pass.
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## Quantized Backprop



- Consider the update you need to take in the backward pass of a given layer, with $N$ input units and $M$ outputs:

$$
\begin{gather*}
\Delta W=\left[\eta \delta_{l} \circ h^{\prime}(W x+b) \odot c^{T}\right. \\
\Delta b=\eta \delta_{l} \circ h^{\prime}(W x+b)  \tag{2}\\
\delta_{l-1}=\left[W^{T} \cdot \delta_{l}\right] \circ h^{\prime}(W x+b) \tag{3}
\end{gather*}
$$

- It is hard to bound the values of $h^{\prime}$, thus make it hard to decide how many bits it will need.
- We choose to quantize $x$.


## Quantized Backprop



## How many multiplications saved?



|  | Full precision | Ternary connect + <br> Quantized backprop | ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| without BN | $1.7480 \times 10^{9}$ | $1.8492 \times 10^{6}$ | 0.001058 |
| with BN | $1.7535 \times 10^{9}$ | $7.4245 \times 10^{6}$ | 0.004234 |

- MLP with ReLU, 4 layers (784-1024-1024-1024-10)
- Assume that standard SGD are used as the optimization algorithm.
- BN stands for Batch Normalization


## Range of Hidden Representations



- Histogram of hidden states at each layer. The figure represents a snap-shot in the middle of training.
- The horizontal axes stand for the exponent of the layers' representations, i.e., $\log _{2} x$.


## The Effect of Limiting the Range of Exponent

- Constraining the maximum allowed amount of bit shifts in quantized backprop.



## General Performance

|  | Full precision | Binary connect | Binary connect + Quantized backprop | Ternary connect + Quantized backprop |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MNIST | 1.33\% | 1.23\% | 1.29\% | 1.15\% |
| CIFAR10 | 15.64\% | 12.04\% | 12.08\% | 12.01\% |
| SVHN | 2.85\% | 2.47\% | 2.48\% | 2.42\% |
|  |  |  |  | - Full Resolution <br> - Binary Connect <br> - Binary Connect + Quantized BP <br> - Ternary Connect <br> + Quantized BP |
|  | $0.10 \quad 50$ |  |  |  |

## Related Works \& Recent Advances

- Binarize both weights and activations [Courbariaux, et al., 2016]
- Exponential quantization over the forward pass.
- Larger, more serious datasets.
- Actual dedicated hardware realization.


## MILA

Any questions?


