### Dynamic formation of self-organizing maps

Jérémy Fix Jeremy.Fix@supelec.fr IMS - MaLIS group

July 2nd 2014



### Introduction and motivations

## Kohonen Self Organizing maps

Given a sample  $\zeta \sim \mathcal{I}$ , a distance function  $d_{\mathcal{I}}$  :



The SOM algorithm :

- is synchronized to the input distribution
- relies on a global supervisor for the competition
- computes a neighborhood unaware winner

### Dynamic neural fields

The dynamic neural field equation introduced by Amari (1977) is :

$$\tau \frac{\partial v}{\partial t}(x,t) = -v(x,t) + \int_{y} w(x,y) f(v(y,t)) + I(x,t)$$

Transfer function f(x)



Weights w(x, y)



## Typical behaviors

Depending on the parameters, dynamic neural fields can have different behaviors, e.g. :

#### Competition

(local excitation), global inhibition for competing



#### Working memory

<u>local excitation</u> for holding <u>local inhibition</u> for bounding



### The Amari equation is not sufficient for SOMs

Given a sample  $\zeta \sim \mathcal{I}$ , and a collection of prototypes  $w_i$ , the matching  $g(d_{\mathcal{I}}(\epsilon, w_i))^1$  has different shapes as the map learns :



1. with g a gaussian,  $d_{\mathcal{I}}$  the distance in the input space

# The Amari equation is not sufficient for SOMs

Experimentally, the Amari equation is **not an adequate competition mechanism** in the context of self-organizing maps; the field is whether **not responsive enough** or **blind to input changes**.



 learn the lat. weights with homeostatic plasticity rules [Moldakarimov(2006)]

#### A new equation

We introduce an intermediate layer between the input I(x, t) and the decision layer V(x, t):

$$\tau \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(x,t) = -u(x,t) + \beta(\overbrace{\int_{y} g(x,y)I(y,t)}^{\text{local input}} - \overbrace{\int_{y} f(v(y,t))I(y,t)}^{\text{input below the decision}})$$
  
$$\tau \frac{\partial v}{\partial t}(x,t) = -v(x,t) + \int_{y} w(x,y)f(v(y,t)) + f(u(x,t))$$

with :

- ▶ g a gaussian, w a mexican hat,
- ▶ 7 parameters  $(\tau, \beta, \sigma_g, A_+, \sigma_+, A_-, \sigma_-)$
- evaluation in O(N log(N)), with the FFT

The lateral connections are not plastic  $\rightarrow$  we keep the same plasticity all the time

## Qualitative behavior of the new equation

Local raise of activity in regions where the input is locally higher compared to the input supporting the current decision.



# Experiments

### Discrete self-organizing dynamic neural field

Given a sample  $\epsilon(t)$ , initial prototypes p(.,0), activities u(.,0), v(.,0):

$$\Delta u(x,t) = \frac{\Delta t}{\tau} (-u(x,t) + \beta (\sum_{y} g(x,y)I(y,t) - \sum_{y} f(v(y,t))I(y,t)))$$
  

$$\Delta v(x,t) = \frac{\Delta t}{\tau} (-v(x,t) + \sum_{y} w(x,y)f(v(y,t)) + f(u(x,t)))$$
  

$$I(x,t) = \exp(-\frac{|p(x,t) - \epsilon(t)|}{2\sigma_{\rho}^{2}})$$
  

$$\Delta p(x,t) = \frac{\Delta t}{\tau_{\rho}} f(v(x,t))(\epsilon(t) - p(x,t))$$

Parameters :

Ν	$\Delta t$	$\tau_p$	$\sigma_p$	au	$\beta$	$\sigma_{g}$	$A_+$	$\sigma_+$	A_
50	0.01	10	0.2	0.05	2.6	4.7	1.2	4.6	1.08

# Ring experiment - 1D Neural Field

#### 2D Distribution

 $\begin{array}{l} \mbox{Samples are drawn in a ring} \\ \mbox{Domain } \mathcal{D} \subset [-1,1]^2 \\ \mbox{Prototypes : random in } [-1,1]^2 \end{array}$ 



#### Simulation



## Rotating bar experiment - 1D Neural Field

#### $100\times100D$ Distribution

A bar is rotating at  $\omega = 10 \text{ deg.} s^{-1}$ Prototypes : mean of 50 stimuli + noise



#### Simulation



Without topology : dynamical online K-means

$$\tau \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(x,t) = -u(x,t) + I(y,t) - \sum_{y} f(v(y,t))I(y,t)$$
  

$$\tau \frac{\partial v}{\partial t}(x,t) = -v(x,t) + w_{e}f(v(x,t)) - w_{i}\sum_{y \neq x} f(v(y,t)) + f(u(x,t)))$$
  

$$I(x,t) = \exp(-\frac{|p(x,t) - \epsilon(t)|}{2\sigma_{p}^{2}}) + b(x,t)$$
  

$$\tau_{p}\frac{\partial p}{\partial t}(x,t) = f(v(x,t))(\epsilon(t) - p(x,t))$$
  

$$\tau_{b}\frac{\partial b}{\partial t}(x,t) = b^{*} - \overline{f(v)}(x,t)$$
  

$$\frac{\partial \overline{f(v)}}{\partial t}(x,t) = -\overline{f(v)}(x,t) + f(v(x,t))$$

We remove all the dependencies on distance in the field; We add an adaptive baseline to avoid *dead units*,  $b^* = 1/N$ 

 $\tau_b$ 

## Without topology : dynamical online K-means

#### 2D Distribution

Samples are drawn in a ring or a square. Domain  $\mathcal{D} \subset [-1,1]^2$ Prototypes : **outside** from  $\mathcal{D}$ 



#### Simulation



# Summary and perspectives

### Summary

In the context of self-organizing maps :

- a static Amari equation is not sufficient
- ▶ an intermediate layer can be added to destabilize the output decision

Experiments conducted :

- $\blacktriangleright$  with 1D populations, ring topology, with 2D or 100<sup>2</sup> prototypes
- without topology

Introducing an adaptive baseline avoids dead units.

### Perspectives

Improving the performances of the self-organizing neural field :

- when the prototypes are too far from the samples
- without cyclic boundary conditions, the units on the border have less chance to win

Making use of dynamical systems for self-organizing maps may open the road toward :

- an easier analytic treatment of self-organizing maps, the WTM is a result of the interactions of the units,
- the study of exotic self-organizing structures with multiple winning locations by bounding the extent of lateral inhibition,
- suitable for recurrent self-organizing maps, where multiple interconnected maps require a relaxation