





### Pathological overfitting in SAEs

### 200 models, random hyperparams





# Enabling hyperparameter optimization in sequential autoencoders for spiking neural data Mohammad Reza Keshtkaran, Chethan Pandarinath

Georgia Tech and Emory University Email: mkeshtk@emory.edu

# Two solutions to address pathological overfitting in SAEs

## **1- Coordinated dropout (CD)**

CD forces the network to only model shared structure underlying the observations. CD first passes in a subset of samples at the input (by applying dropout). Next, to update network weights, CD only uses gradients calculated for reconstruction of the complementary subset of samples.



## Simulation example, linear over-complete autoencoder:

CD is equivalent to preventing diagonal weights to be trained.

$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{p}}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{Q}$	low-c high-d observ latent va	l data: /ation: riable:	$\begin{array}{l} Q \in \mathbb{R}^{mxn} \\ X \in \mathbb{R}^{oxn} \\ Z \in \mathbb{R}^{hxn} \end{array}$
X = Y + N whe	ere N ~ $N(0, \sigma)$		m < o ≤ h
<u>encoder</u>	<u>decoder</u>	<u>auto</u>	<u>-encoder</u>
$Z = W_1^T X$ latent variable	$\mathbf{X'} = \mathbf{W}_{2}\mathbf{Z}$ Reconstruction	X' =	$\underbrace{W_2 W_1^T X}_W$
Train loss: IIX-X	True	loss:	<b> Y-X'  </b> <sup>2</sup>

**2- Sample validation** 

never seen during training or evaluation.



## **Denoising autoencoders do not address overfitting in SAEs**

Salt and Pepper 0 20% Φ O 2000 1600 2400 1200 Validation loss





# Evaluate the network by how well it can predict the rates for the samples it has





# **Experimental setup - decoding arm velocity**



# HP optimization trains accurate models with 5-10x less data

HP optimization performed using Population based training (PBT)<sup>3</sup> **Dataset 1: Curved reaching task** 





## Conclusions

- using standard validation loss.
- Lack of a reliable validation metric prevented HP optimization in SAEs.
- We developed two solutions "Coordinated dropout" and "Sample validation" to address pathological overfitting in SAEs and enable HP optimization.
- HP optimization led to accurate models while using 5-10-fold less training data.

### References

arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.09846 (2017). program.



# • SAEs are prone to a particular type of overfitting that cannot be detected through

Acknowledgements: This work was supported NSF NCS 1835364, and DARPA Intelligent Neural Interfaces

<sup>[1]</sup> Pandarinath, Chethan, Daniel J. O'Shea, Jasmine Collins, et al. "Inferring Single-Trial Neural Population Dynamics Using Sequential Auto-Encoders." Nature Methods, 2018.

<sup>[2]</sup> Sussillo, David, Rafal Jozefowicz, L. F. Abbott, and Chethan Pandarinath. "Lfads-latent factor analysis via dynamical systems." arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.06315 (2016).

<sup>[3]</sup> Jaderberg, Max, Valentin Dalibard, Simon Osindero, et al. "Population based training of neural networks."