

Generalization and Memorization in Sparse Neural Network

Chaoqi Wang Zi University of Chicago

Ziyu Ye

Zixin Ding Yuxin Chen



Motivation: Future is Sparse Training from Scratch

[Backgrounds] True Efficiency by Sparse Training from Scratch



[Challenges] Performance Gap: A Tale of Two Regimes

Performance gap (i.e., generalization discrepancy) exists between sparse scratch and sparse finetuning.



[Research Questions] Closing the Gap Requires Understanding

What is the <u>root cause</u> for the performance gap (between sparse scratch and sparse finetuning)?
How may we <u>close</u> the performance gap?

[Preliminaries] Hessian, Jacobian, Fisher Info and Memorization

Hessian and the Loss Curvature	$\mathbf{H}(oldsymbol{ heta}) = abla_{oldsymbol{ heta}}^2 \mathcal{L}(oldsymbol{ heta}).$
Jacobian and Network Sensitivity	$\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}) = abla_{\mathbf{x}^{\mathrm{T}}} f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{ heta}).$
Fisher Information	$\mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{D}, \hat{y} \sim p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(y \mid \mathbf{x})} \left[\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\hat{y} \mid \mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\hat{y} \mid \mathbf{x})^T \right].$
Long-Tail Hypothesis of Memorization	Memorization of data labels is necessary to achieve good generalization on long-tailed data distribution (Feldman, 2020).



Table 1: Summary of the underlying mechanisms for sparse training from scratch.

[Generalization Regime] Curse of Information

The Curse of Information for Sparse Training:
Sparse scratch requires <i>more information</i> in learning, hurting its generalization.

	Sparsity Ratio	Tr(F)	Tr(H)	Jacobian Norm
Sol-D	0.00	53.81	66.32	35.60
	0.90	543.27	720.49	43.27
Sol-F	0.94	2573.51	4198.26	52.25
	0.96	4376.32	9618.40	67.92
	0.90	2701.68 ↑	10452.93 ↑	63.74 ↑
Sol-S	0.94	9840.60	12905.88 ↑	66.36
	0.96	15818.65	20715.41	70.10

[Optimization Regime] The Memorization Hypothesis





Sparse training from scratch is more robust to label noise. This experiment is conducted on CIFAR-10 with ResNet32. The training set contains 30% perturbed data whose labels are uniformly randomly flipped. The sparsity ratio is 0.95 for sparse training The learning rate is 0.02 and decay by 0.1 at the 40th and 80th epoch. The left two columns show the performance on the training set (noisy) and test set (clean), and the right two columns show the performance on the clean and noisy data in the training set; the notation correct means predicted label equals to true label, while memorized means predicted label,



Regularized Sparse Training from Scratch

A naïve approach is to adaptively apply Fisher information regularization.

Data-Efficient Sparse Training from Scratch

Scheduling data (e.g., iteratively constructing training data subsets) may be effective.





- Sparse scratch is weaker at memorization and requires more information in learning.
- Next steps: closing the gap for sparse scratch by regularization or data scheduling.