Understanding Gradient Regularization in Deep Learning: Efficient Finite-Difference Computation and Implicit Bias

Ryo Karakida*, Tomoumi Takase*, Tomohiro Hayase⁺ & Kazuki Osawa[◆] *AIST (Japan), ⁺Cluster (Japan), [◆] ETH Zurich (Switzerland)

ICML 2023

Gradient Regularization (GR)

[Barrett+, Smith+, ICLR '21], [Zhao+ ICML '22]

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\theta) = \mathcal{L}(\theta) + \frac{\gamma}{2}R(\theta), \quad R(\theta) = \|\nabla_{\theta}\mathcal{L}(\theta)\|^2$$

- Explicitly decreasing GR enhances a convergence to flat minima and generalization performance: Explicit GR $\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t - \eta \nabla_{\theta} \tilde{\mathcal{L}} \left(\theta_t \right)$
- Discrete update of (S)GD implicitly decreases GR: Implicit GR

Backward error analysis (Approx. by continuous time)

$$\begin{pmatrix} \theta_{t+1} = \theta_t - \eta \nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t) \\ \dot{\theta} = -\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\theta) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^2) \quad (\gamma = \eta/4) \end{cases}$$

Algorithms for explicit GR

Requires computation of "gradient of gradient"

- **Double Backpropagation (DB)** $\nabla \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t)\|^2$ Auto-grad. ×2 [Drucker & LeCun 1992]
- Finite Difference ($\varepsilon > 0$) $\Delta R_F(\varepsilon) = \frac{\nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t + \varepsilon \nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t)) - \nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t)}{\nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t)}$
 - Forward GR (F-GR)
 - $\Delta R_B(\varepsilon) = \frac{\nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t) \nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t \varepsilon \nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t))}{\varepsilon \nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t)}$ - Backward GR (B-GR)

Note: Centered or high-order finite differences are not used here because they require more gradient computation (backpropagation)

Result 1: Efficiency of GR algorithms

• Computational cost (measured by # of matrix multiplication)

For *L*-layered MLP,
$$6L$$
 (Finite difference) < 9*L* (DB)



Computational graph of DB: Each node with an incoming arrow requires one matrix multiplication for the forward pass.

ResNet - L

Result 2: Dependence on GR Algorithms



Generalization performance highly depends on the choice of algorithms. F-GR achieves better performance than B-GR and DB. A relatively large ascent step ($\epsilon \sim 0.1$) is the best.

Implicit Bias in Diagonal Linear Network (DLN)

[Woodworth, ... & Srebro, COLT '20]

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{D} (w_{+,i}^2 - w_{-,i}^2) x_i =: \beta_i$$

Settings:MSE Loss $L(w) = \sum_{\mu=1}^{N} \|y^{\mu} - f(x^{\mu})\|_{2}^{2}$ Gradient dynamics $dw/dt = -\nabla \mathcal{L}$ Initialization scale $\alpha = w_{\pm,i}(t=0)$

Evaluate interpolation solutions: $X\beta = y$

Implicit Bias in Diagonal Linear Network (DLN)

[Woodworth, ... & Srebro, COLT '20]

If gradient dynamics converges to the interpolation solution β^{∞} , it depends on α and satisfies $\beta^{\infty}(\alpha) = \underset{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{D} \text{ s.t. } X\beta = y}{\arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{D} \text{ s.t. } X\beta = y}} \phi_{\alpha}(\beta)$ $\phi_{\alpha}(\beta) = \sum_{i=1}^{D} \alpha^{2}q \left(\beta_{i}/\alpha^{2}\right), \quad q(z) = 2 - \sqrt{4 + z^{2}} + z \operatorname{arcsinh}(z/2)$

• Initialization scale (α) changes the minima

 $\pmb{lpha} \gg \pmb{1}$: Lazy regime $\phi_{lpha}(eta) \sim \|eta\|_2^2$

L2 norm regularization

$\alpha \ll 1$: Rich regime

 $\phi_{lpha}(eta) \sim \|eta\|_1$

 β^{2}

Shape of ϕ

Result 3: Analysis of GR in DLN

$$\frac{dw}{dt} = -\nabla \mathcal{L}(w) - \gamma \Delta R(\varepsilon) \qquad \Delta R(\varepsilon) = \frac{\nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t + \varepsilon \nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t)) - \nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t)}{\varepsilon}$$

Remind: F-GR ($\varepsilon > 0$), B-GR ($\varepsilon < 0$), DB ($\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$)

If the gradient dynamics with GR converges to the interpolation solution, $\beta^{\infty}(\alpha_{GR}) = \underset{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{D} \text{ s.t. } X\beta = y}{\operatorname{arg min}} \phi_{\alpha_{GR}}(\beta), \quad \alpha_{GR} = \alpha \circ \exp\left(-\gamma\left(c_{0} + \varepsilon c_{1} + \varepsilon^{2}c_{2}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\gamma^{2}\right)\right)$

$$c_0 = \int_0^\infty (X^\top (X\beta(s) - y))^2 ds/n^2, \quad c_1 = (X^\top (X\beta(t = 0) - y))^2/2n^2$$

- For F-GR, $\alpha_{GR,i} \lesssim \alpha_i \exp(-\gamma \epsilon c_{1,i}/2)$ As ϵ increases, biased towards L1 (Rich regime)
- For B-GR, $\alpha_{GR,i} \gtrsim \alpha_i D^{\gamma} \exp(\gamma |\varepsilon| c_{1,i})$ As $|\varepsilon|$ increases, biased towards L2 (Lazy regime)

Experiments: DLN

Artificial data: input $x \in \mathbb{R}^D$ given by i.i.d Gaussian, $y \sim \mathcal{N}(\langle \beta^*, x \rangle, 0.01)$ (D=100, sample size $N = 50, \beta^*$: 5 non-zero entries)



• Non-monotonicity of F-GR comes from c_2 (which is empirically negative) $\alpha_{GR} = \alpha_0 \circ \exp(-\gamma(c_0 + \varepsilon c_1 + \varepsilon^2 c_2) + \mathcal{O}(\gamma^2))$

Experiments: Grid Search on (ε, γ)

• DLN on artificial data

• ResNet-18 on CIFAR-10



Both cases are consistent in

- F-GR achieves the highest accuracy on large ascent steps
- B-GR is worse in the accuracy and is likely to explode

Result 4: Relation to other methods

Sharpness-aware minimalization (SAM) [Foret+ ICLR '21]

$$\nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta) + \frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon} \left(\nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta') - \nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta) \right) = \nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta') \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \theta' = \theta_t + \rho \nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t)$$

Flooding [Ishida+ ICML '21]

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\theta) = |\mathcal{L}(\theta) - b| + b \quad (b > 0), \ \theta_{t+1} = \theta_t - \eta \operatorname{Sgn}(\mathcal{L} - b)\nabla\mathcal{L}$$

• Floating up from "water surface" at time t, (*i.e.*, $\mathcal{L}(\theta_t) < b$, $\mathcal{L}(\theta_{t+1}) > b$), $\theta_{t+2} = \theta_t - \eta^2 \frac{\nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t + \eta \nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t)) - \nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_t)}{\eta}$ Equivalent to F-GR w/ $\eta = \gamma = \varepsilon$

