As one of the most important paradigms of recurrent neural networks, the echo state network (ESN) has been applied to a wide range of fields, from robotics to medicine, finance, and language processing. A key feature of the ESN paradigm is its reservoir — a directed and weighted network of neurons that projects the input time series into a high dimensional space where linear regression or classification can be applied. Despite extensive studies, the impact of the reservoir network on the ESN performance remains unclear. Combining tools from physics, dynamical systems and network science, we attempt to open the black box of ESN and offer insights to understand the behavior of general artificial neural networks. Through spectral analysis of the reservoir network we reveal a key factor that largely determines the ESN memory capacity and hence affects its performance. Moreover, we find that adding short loops to the reservoir network can tailor ESN for specific tasks and optimize learning. We validate our findings by applying ESN to forecast both synthetic and real benchmark time series. Our results provide a new way to design task-specific ESN. More importantly, it demonstrates the power of combining tools from physics, dynamical systems and network science to offer new insights in understanding the mechanisms of general artificial neural networks.
I. INTRODUCTION

Echo state network (ESN) is a promising paradigm of recurrent neural networks that can be used to model and predict the temporal behavior of nonlinear dynamic systems [1]. As a special form of recurrent neural networks, ESN has feedback loops in the randomly assigned and fixed synaptic connections and trains only a linear combination of the neurons’ states. This fundamentally differs from the traditional feed-forward neural networks, which have multiple layers but no cycles [2] and simplifies other recurrent neural network architectures that suffer from the difficulty in training synaptic connections [3]. Owing to its simplicity, flexibility and empirical success, ESN and its variants have attracted intense interest during the last decade [4,5], and have been applied to many different tasks such as electric load forecasting [6], robotic control [7], epilepsy forecasting [8], stock price prediction [9], grammar processing [10], and many others [11,14].

An ESN can be viewed as a dynamic system from which the information of input signals is extracted [15]. It has been shown that the information processing capacity of a dynamic system, in theory, depends only on the number of linearly independent variables or, in our case, neurons [15,17]. Yet, the theoretical capacity does not imply that all implementations are practical [18,19], nor does it mean that any reservoir is equally desirable for a given task. A clear example is the effect of the reservoir’s spectral radius (i.e., the largest eigenvalue in modulus): an ESN with a larger spectral radius has longer-lasting memory, indicating that it can better process information from past inputs [5].

Over the last decade, a plethora of studies have focused on finding good reservoir networks. Those studies fall broadly into two categories. First, for specific tasks, systematical parameter searches provide some improvement over classical Monte Carlo reservoir selection [20–24], but remain costly and do not offer a significant performance improvement or better understanding. Second, some authors have explored networks with some particular characteristics that make them desirable, typically with long memory [25,27] or “rich” dynamics [28,29], although the desirability of those traits typically are task-specific. Here we focus on a “mechanistic” understanding of reservoir dynamics, but instead of trying to find reservoirs with predefined features, we design reservoirs whose dynamics are tailored to specific problems.

We start by showing how the correlations between neurons define the memory of ESN, and demonstrate that those correlations are determined by the eigenvalues of the reservoir’s adjacency matrix. This result allows us to easily assess the memory capacity of a particular reservoir network, unifying previous results [25,27,30]. Then we go beyond the current ESN practice and reveal previously unexplored optimization strategies. In particular, we show that adding short loops to the reservoir network can create resonant frequencies and enhance ESN performance by adapting the reservoir to specific tasks. Our results provide insights into the memory capacity of dynamic systems, offering potential improvements to other types of artificial neural networks.

II. THE ESN FRAMEWORK

The basic ESN architecture is depicted in Fig. 1. With different coefficients (weights), the input signal and the predicted output from the previous time step are sent to all neurons in the reservoir. The output is calculated as a linear combination of the neuron states and the input. At each time step, each neuron updates its state according to the current input it receives, the output from the previous time step are sent to all neurons in the reservoir. The output is calculated as a linear combination of the neurons’ states. This result allows us to easily assess the memory capacity of a dynamic system. The vector \( \mathbf{x}(t) = f(\mathbf{Wx}(t-1) + \mathbf{w}_i u(t) + \mathbf{w}_{\text{out}} y(t-1)) \),

\[
\mathbf{y}(t) = \mathbf{w}_{\text{out}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}(t) \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( \mathbf{x}(t) = [x_1(t), x_2(t), \ldots, x_N(t)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^N \) denotes the state of the \( N \) neurons at time \( t \), \( u(t) \in \mathbb{R} \) is the input signal, the vector \( \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}(t) \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} \) represents the concatenation of \( \mathbf{x}(t) \) and \( u(t) \), and \( \mathbf{y}(t) \in \mathbb{R} \) is the output at time \( t \). There are various possibilities for the nonlinear function \( f \), the most common ones being the logistic sigmoid and the hyperbolic tangent [2]. Without loss of generality we choose the latter in this work. The matrix \( \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \) is the weighted adjacency matrix of the reservoir network describing the fixed wiring diagram of \( N \) neurons in the reservoir. There is a rich literature on the conditions that the matrix \( \mathbf{W} \) must fulfill [31,34]. Here we adopt a conservative and simple condition that the reservoir must be a stable dynamic system. The vector \( \mathbf{w}_i \in \mathbb{R}^N \) captures the fixed weights of the input connections, which we draw from a uniform distribution in the interval \([−1, 1]\). The vector \( \mathbf{w}_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{R}^N \) denotes the fixed weights of the feedback connections from the output to the \( N \) neurons, which can induce instabilities if chosen carelessly and may be zero in some tasks [5]. Finally, the row vector \( \mathbf{w}_{\text{out}} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times (N+1)} \) represents the trainable weights of the readout connections from the \( N \) neurons and the input to the output.

A key feature of ESN is that \( \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{w}_i \) and \( \mathbf{w}_{\text{out}} \) are all predetermined before the training process, and only the weights of the
readout connections $w_{out}$ are modified to $w_{out}^*$ during the training process:

$$w_{out}^* = \arg \min_{w_{out}} \sum_{t=t_0}^{t_0+T} (y(t) - \hat{y}(t))^2,$$

(3)

where $t_0$ is the starting time, $T$ is the interval of the training, and $\hat{y}(t)$ is the target output obtained from the training data. In other words, $w_{out}^*$ is the linear regression weights of the desired output $\hat{y}(t)$ on the extended state vector $(x(t), u(t))$, which can be easily solved (see SI Sec. 1. for details). Hence, $w_{out}^*$ captures the underlying mechanism of the dynamic system that produces the training data. Indeed, the right choice of $w_{out}^*$ can be used to forecast, reconstruct or filter nonlinear time series.

Note that there is a rich literature on methods to improve the ESN performance such as using regularization in the computation of $w_{out}^*$ [5], controlling the input weights [27] or changing the dynamics of the neurons [35]. Those results, while relevant and important for applications, are tangential to our study. Therefore in this work we will use the simplest version of the ESN as presented above.
FIG. 2: Relationship between memory capacity, neuron correlation and the network spectrum. (a) Memory capacity $M$ vs neuron state correlation $S$. (b) Neuron state correlation $S$ vs average eigenvalue modulus $\langle|\lambda|\rangle$. The ESNs were created using reservoirs of 400 neurons with spectral radius of 1 and sequences of 4000 random inputs uniformly distributed in the interval $[-1, 1]$. The ER curve is given by classical reservoirs having networks given by Erdős-Rényi random graphs with weights drawn from a Gaussian distribution and varying spectral radii. The SF curve (blue) corresponds to scale-free networks where the degree heterogeneity is given by the degree exponent $\gamma \in [2, 6]$, with more heterogeneous networks rendering lower $M$, higher $S$ and lower $\langle|\lambda|\rangle$. The PL curve (green) is calculated from Erdős-Rényi random graphs with weights drawn from a power-law (PL) distribution with varying exponent $\beta \in [2, 5]$, with lower $\beta$ rendering lower $M$, higher $S$ and lower $\langle|\lambda|\rangle$. A more detailed numerical exploration of the dependency between the various network parameters and $M$, and between the network parameters and $\langle|\lambda|\rangle$ is presented in Appendix B. The network generation algorithms are presented in SI Sec. II. All networks have a spectral radius $\alpha = 1$, except the ER random graphs where each point corresponds to a spectral radius increasing from 0.2 to 1. The ER random graphs are plotted with various spectral radius to show the impact of spectral radius.

III. RESULTS

A. The driving factor determining ESN memory capacity

The success of ESN in tasks such as forecasting time-series comes from the ability of its reservoir in retaining memory of previous inputs\textsuperscript{36}. In ESN literature, this is quantified by the memory capacity defined as follows\textsuperscript{30}:

$$M = \sum_{\tau=1}^{\tau_{\text{max}}} M_\tau,$$

with $M_\tau = \max_{w_{\text{out}}} \text{cov}^2(r(t - \tau), y_\tau(t)) / \text{var}(r(t - \tau)) \text{var}(y_\tau(t))$. Here $r(t)$ is a random variable drawn from a standard normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, serving as a random input, ‘cov’ represents the covariance, $y_\tau(t)$ is the output as described in Eq. 2. $w_{\text{out}}^\tau$ is obtained as a minimizer of the difference between $y_\tau(t)$ and $r(t - \tau)$ for any delay $\tau \in [1, ..., \tau_{\text{max}}]$, with $\tau_{\text{max}}$ chosen so that $M_{\tau_{\text{max}}} \approx 0$. To quantify the relationship between the reservoir dynamics and the memory capacity, we note that the extraction of information from the reservoir is made through a linear combination of the neurons’ states. Hence it is reasonable to assume that more linearly independent neurons would offer more variable states, and thus longer memory\textsuperscript{35, 37}. In plain words, we hypothesize that the memory capacity $M$ strongly depends on the correlations among neuron states, which can be quantified as follows:

$$S = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} P_{ij}^2}{N(N-1)/2}.$$
FIG. 3: Time series analyzed in this work and the ESN performance explained by $\langle |\lambda| \rangle$. The plot shows samples of the three datasets used (a-c) and their associated ESN performance as a function of the average eigenvalue modulus $\langle |\lambda| \rangle$ (d-f). (a) the Mackey-Glass time series with 500 points. (b) the Laser Intensity time series with 300 points. (c) the average value of the first mel-frequency cepstral coefficient (MFCC) Channel of the first Spoken Arabic Digit, the error bars represent standard deviations over the training dataset. (d) the ESN forecasting performance for the Mackey-Glass time series, (e) the forecasting performance for Laser Intensity time series, and (f) the failure classification rate for Spoken Arabic Digits. For each task, we use scale-free networks (SF), Erdős-Rényi random graphs with homogeneous link weights (ER), and Erdős-Rényi random graphs whose link weights follow a power-law distribution (PL) as reservoirs (see SI Sec. II for the network generation algorithms). The SF and PL reservoirs have various spectral radii $\alpha$, chosen to be around the optimal value of $\alpha$ for the Erdős-Rényi case. For each parameter set of each network type we created 200 ESN realizations, and then all the points obtained were grouped in 10 bins containing the same number of points. We plotted their median $\langle |\lambda| \rangle$ against their median performance: $\sigma$ from Eq(A1) for (d) and (e); and the failure rate for (f). Here the upper and lower quartile respectively. Each ESN realization corresponds to a reservoir with $N = 1000$ neurons and average degree $\langle k \rangle = 50$ for (d); and $N = 100$, $\langle k \rangle = 10$ for (e) and (f). The three panels show that, regardless of topology or spectral radius, all networks have their optimal performance when the average eigenvalue modulus, $\langle |\lambda| \rangle$, is within the intervals $[0.55, 0.6] (d)$, $[0.3, 0.4] (e)$, or $[0.6, 0.7]$ (f), which are highlighted in pink. See the Appendix A for an expanded description of the three datasets and the performance measurement.

Here $P_{ij} = \frac{\text{cov}(x_i(t), x_j(t))}{\text{std}(x_i(t))\text{std}(x_j(t))}$ is the Pearson’s correlation coefficient between the states of neurons $i$ and $j$, and $\text{std}(x_i)$ represents the standard deviation. Note that $S$ is simply the average of those squared correlation coefficients, representing a global indicator of the correlations among neurons in the reservoir. Fig. 2 corroborates our hypothesis, showing that for various network topologies there is a strong correlation between $S$ and $M$, which can also be justified analytically (see Appendix C). Thus, hereafter we only need to understand how the network structure affects the neuron correlation.

We consider the neuron correlation as a measure of coordination. If the neuron states are highly interdependent, then $S$ will be very high. By contrast, a system with independent neurons will have very low $S$. For linear dynamical systems, the correlations between neurons depend on all the eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix $A$, with larger mean eigenvalue meaning lower correlations (see Appendix D). Our system (4) is non-linear, but given the specific type of nonlinearity in the hyperbolic tangent function $f(z) = (e^z - e^{-z})/(e^z + e^{-z})$, we can relate the correlations with the linearization of $f(z)$ around $z = 0$, which is nothing but the identity function $f(z) = z$. Hence we can use the eigenvalues of matrix $W$ to approximately quantify
how fast the input decays in the reservoir, and hence how poorly the ESN remembers.

To quantify the aggregated effect of the eigenvalue distribution in the complex plane, we define the average eigenvalue moduli:

$$\langle |\lambda| \rangle = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} |\lambda_i|}{N},$$

(6)

where $\lambda_i$’s are the eigenvalues of the matrix $W$. As expected from our previous discussion, we find that $\langle |\lambda| \rangle$ strongly correlates with $S$ (Fig. 2b). The correlation of $\langle |\lambda| \rangle$ with $S$ and therefore with $M$ indicate that $\langle |\lambda| \rangle$ indeed reflects the memory capacity of the reservoir. As opposed to $M$ and $S$, $\langle |\lambda| \rangle$ is much easier to compute and is solely determined by the reservoir network. This offers a simple measure to quantify the ESN memory capacity that does only depend on the network structure. $\langle |\lambda| \rangle$ is consistent with the effects of scaling the adjacency matrix to tune the spectral radius [39] and it extends to network topologies with a fixed spectral radius (see Fig. 6, Fig. 7). This also explains two recent studies in which it was found that ring networks and orthogonalized networks have high memory capacities [26, 40], as both networks have large eigenvalues with respect to their spectral radii.

As ESN is fundamentally a machine learning tool, any results should be supported by studying its performance at different tasks. Here we chose the following three tasks: (1) forecasting the chaotic Mackey-Glass time series [41], which is a classical task in ESN [1, 42], (2) forecasting the Laser Intensity Time series [43] downloaded from the Santa Fe Institute; and (3) classifying Spoken Arabic Digits [44] downloaded from the Machine Learning Repository of the UCI [45] (see Figure 3a–c). To demonstrate the validity of $\langle |\lambda| \rangle$ as a proxy measure for memory, we tested ESN performance for the three tasks with a wide range of network topologies and parameters. As each task requires a memory capacity that is independent of the type of network, we find that the optimal parameters for all networks are within a consistent value of $\langle |\lambda| \rangle$ (see Figure 3d–f).

B. Adapting ESN to a specific frequency band

Besides the memory capacity, there are other features that are relevant for time series forecasting. A key factor in time-series processing and dynamic systems modeling is the frequency spectrum [46–48]. Any signal or time series can be expressed in terms of its spectrum, which reflects the decomposition of signals into sinusoids with different frequencies [49]. This type of characterization usually offers valuable insights into the nature or underlying dynamics of the system, and has been exploited for various applications [50].

Here we leverage it to improve ESN performance. To achieve that, we use a geometric interpretation of the linear regression: the target time series is a point in a space of dimension $T$, where every coordinate is the value of the target time series; the neurons are also points in that same space, and the linear regression simply finds the point in the hyperplane spanned by all the neuron time series that is closest to the target point. Naturally, by having the neurons closer to the target, the distance between the hyperplane and the target – the training error – decreases. The problem here is that getting the neurons closer to the target is typically difficult, as the time series of the neurons are intertwined. Our insight is that the distances in the time domain are the same as the distances in the Fourier domain, thanks to Parseval’s Theorem, thus we can reduce the training error by making the reservoir resonate at specific frequencies. This argument, which is mathematically formalized in Appendix F, implies that the ESN performance for a given forecasting task is bounded by the dissimilarity between the power spectral density (PSD) of the reservoir and that of the target variable.

Knowing that altering the reservoir’s PSD may increase the ESN’s performance, we can deliberately generate reservoirs with specific frequency bands. To achieve that, we add feedback loops with delay $L$ in our neurons, encoded as cycles of length $L$ in the network (note that this can be considered as a simple extension of classical Infinite Impulse Response filters from Signal Processing [50]). We account for the number and strength of those cycles by using the following measure:

$$\rho_L = \frac{E_{L,s} - E_{L,-s}}{E},$$

(7)

where $E_{L,s}$ is the number of edges embedded in cycles of length $L$ and sign $s$, drawn from random matrix theory [51]. Note that in the classical ESN, any cycle has equal probability of providing positive or negative feedback, meaning that $\rho_L$ tends to 0 as $N$ becomes large for any $L > 0$. We prove that $\rho_L$ can be used to tune the average PSD of the reservoir with random inputs (see Appendix G). Specifically, by adding cycles of a desired length into the reservoir and hence increasing $\rho_L$ (see Appendix H), we can tune the response of the reservoir’s average neuron state to specific frequencies, as shown in the colored lines in Fig. 4.

We show in Fig. 5 that the performance of ESN depends heavily on the fraction of cycles $\rho_L$. A simple example is given by the Mackey-Glass time series: Fig. 5 shows that for $\rho_L > 0$, the reservoir’s average PSD response is enhanced for the frequencies close to 0, which is exactly the regime where the spectrum of the Mackey-Glass Time Series is concentrated. Consistent with our hypothesis, positive $\rho_L$ improves the ESN performance on forecasting the Mackey-Glass Time Series (Fig. 5a, d, g), while negative $\rho_L$ decreases it. Similarly, the Spoken Arabic Digits are also dominated by frequencies close to 0, and thus the performance of ESN improves when $\rho_L > 0$ (Fig. 5a, f, i). As for the Laser Intensity Time Series, its dominating frequencies
are around 0.13, 0.27 and 0.38, thus ESN is improved when the response of the reservoir enhances those frequencies. As shown in Fig. 3e,h, this happens when $\rho_L < 0$ for $L = 2, 3$. Indeed, as shown in Fig. 3e,h, negative $\rho_L$ (for $L = 2, 3$) improves the ESN performance. For the case of $L = 1$, we observed in Fig. 4b that the three peaks cannot be all enhanced simultaneously by setting $\rho_1$ to be either positive or negative. Instead, setting $\rho_1 = 0$ would yield the optimal performance. This is what we observed in Fig. 3b.

Those results strongly suggest that the reservoir should be designed to enhance the frequencies present in the target signal. A simple way of achieving this is to obtain the frequency responses of the reservoir for an unstructured signal (white Gaussian noise), and then select the parameters of the reservoir for which the frequencies match the target signal better. Based on those considerations we designed a simple heuristic algorithm to find the optimal values of $\rho_L$’s (see Appendix I). As shown in Fig. 5 (dashed lines), combining cycles of different lengths does indeed further improve the ESN performance.

Intuitively, a reservoir is a set of coupled filters that extract features from the input signal, and our result simply states that the filters should be sampled to efficiently extract the features that are present in the signal. This result is in stark contrast to previous works in which the reservoir network was selected to cover uniformly all the frequency spectrum [28], creating reservoirs that generalize well across multiple tasks, but failing to specialize in a particular one. Note that adding cycles of length one is similar to the Leaky reservoirs used previously [52], but here we show that instead of just increasing the memory by changing $\langle|\lambda|\rangle$, they...
FIG. 5: Improving ESN through frequency adaptation. ESN performance $\sigma$ vs $\rho_L$, for the tasks of Mackey-Glass Forecasting (a, d, g), Laser Intensity Forecasting (b, e, h), and Spoken Arabic Digit Recognition (c, f, i). The length of cycles added into the reservoir is 1 in (a-c), 2 in (d-f) and 3 in (g-i). Every point corresponds to the median performance –measured by $\sigma$ from Eq. [1] in the (a, b, d, e, g, h) and by the failure rate in (c, f, i)— over 200 ESN realizations with the error bars corresponding to upper and lower quartiles. The dashed lines correspond to the performances obtained for each task by creating reservoirs combining cycles of various lengths. Each ESN realization corresponds to a reservoir with $N = 1000$ neurons and average degree $\langle k \rangle = 50$ for (a) and $N = 100$, $\langle k \rangle = 10$ for (b) and (c). Following our observation in Fig. 4, the performance of ESN increases when the reservoir enhances the frequencies that are dominant in the signal. Thus, since the Mackey-Glass and Spoken Arabic Digit signals have low frequencies, the performance of ESN for those signals increases when $\rho > 0$. In contrast, the Laser Intensity time series is dominated by frequencies that are on the center of the spectrum, thus ESN has a better performance when $\rho_1 \approx 0$, $\rho_2 < 0$ and $\rho_3 < 0$, as those parameters adapt the reservoir’s response to the time-series frequencies. In all cases we see that combining cycles of different lengths can bring substantial improvements to ESN performance.

also adapt the reservoir to the frequency of the stimulus, thus explaining why their performance is better than that of classical reservoirs with adapted spectral radius.

Having cycles in the adjacency matrix will naturally change the distribution of eigenvalues, specifically creating some extreme values that are larger than in the original, non-adapted adjacency matrix. This obviously affects the spectral radius, but not $\langle |\lambda| \rangle$. Since we expect that the memory capacity requirement for a forecasting task is not affected by adapting the PSD, it is reasonable to use $\langle |\lambda| \rangle$ as the normalization variable for the weights of reservoir matrix, instead of the spectral radius. We can thus use the optimal value of $\langle |\lambda| \rangle$ found in classical ESN with $\rho_L = 0$ before adapting the PSD.

IV. DISCUSSION

In this paper we explore how simple ideas from classical signal processing and network science can be applied to dissect a classical type of recurrent neural network, i.e., the ESN. Moreover, dissecting ESN helps us design simple strategies to further improve its performance by adapting the dynamics of its reservoir. We find that the memory capacity depends on eigenvalue the distribution of the connectivity matrix $W$, a result that goes beyond the current ESN practice and theory, where the main memory parameter is the spectral radius. Moreover, we demonstrate that the PSD of the time series is very important, and we provide simple tools to adapt the reservoir to a specific frequency band.
It is important to note that we are not advocating for hand-tuning reservoir topologies for specific tasks, but rather to raise the point that notions from classical signal processing can help us understand and improve recurrent neural networks, either through selection of appropriate initial topologies in a pre-training stage, or by designing learning algorithms that account for the principles outlined here. Given that most current learning strategies such as backpropagation focus on adapting single weights, we are convinced that many new learning algorithms can be created by focusing on network-level features. However, our approach goes beyond improving current techniques. By studying which properties of a recurrent neural network make it well-suited for a particular problem, we are also addressing the converse question of how should a neural network be after it has been adapted to a specific task. Thus, we provide valuable insights into the training process of general recurrent neural networks, as our theory highlights structural features that the training process would enhance or inhibit.

To conclude, our results presented here clearly indicate that notions from physics, dynamical systems, control theory and network science can and should be used to understand the mechanism and then improve the performance of artificial neural networks. Furthermore, the insights presented here are very general and thus might also help us understand how complex biological systems learn and process information.

Author Contributions. Y.-Y.L. conceived and designed the project. P.V.A. performed all the analytical calculations and empirical data analysis. P.V.A. and G.Y. performed extensive numerical simulations. All authors analyzed the results. P.V.A. and Y.-Y.L. wrote the manuscript. G.Y. edited the manuscript.

Competing Interests. The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests.

Correspondence. Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Y.-Y.L. (yyl@channing.harvard.edu).

Code availability. The code used in this work is available for download through github under the following link: https://github.com/pvili/EchoStateNetworks_NetworkAdaptation/tree/master

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Professor Herbert Jäger and Benjamin Liebald for valuable discussions. This work was partially supported by the “Fundaci Bancaria la Caixa”.


[40] Farkaš I., Bosák R., Gergel P., Neural Networks 83, 109 (2016).


[55] I. Jolliffe, Principal component analysis (Wiley Online Library, 2002).


Appendix A: Performance Measurement

In the literature of ESN it is common to forecast time series [1]. To be consistent with the previous literature we use the normalized root mean squared error (NRMSE), as a metric of forecasting error

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{t=t_0}^{t_0+T} (y(t) - \hat{y}(t))^2}{T \cdot \text{var}(u(t))}}.$$  

(A1)

This metric is a normalization of the classical root mean squared error (RMSE). The normalization is necessary in this case to avoid having different values if the signal is multiplied by a scalar. This is particularly important for ESN because one of the parameters that is usually tuned [5] is the scaling of the input vector \(w_{in}\) or the input signal \(u(t)\). The parameter \(t_0\) is used to describe when we start to count the performance, since it is also common to ignore the inputs during the initialization phase [5], which is taken here as the full initialization steps given for each task (see details in the subsequent sections). The parameter \(T\) is simply the number of time-steps considered, which we take here as the full count of all points except the initialization phase in each testing time series.

The NRMSE is obviously not a good metric for classification tasks where the target variable is discrete. In order to have a comparable metric for ESN performance, we use the failure rate in classification tasks such as the Spoken Arabic Digit Recognition. Note that having 10 digits implies that the failure rate with random guesses is 0.9, therefore a failure rate of 0.3 is well below it.

1. Forecasting Mackey-Glass time series

Forecasting Mackey-Glass time series is a benchmark task to test the performance of ESN [1]. The Mackey-Glass time series follows the ordinary differential equation [11]:

$$\frac{ds(t)}{dt} = \beta \frac{s(t-\tau)}{1 + s(t-\tau)^n} - \gamma s(t),$$

where \(\beta, \gamma, \tau, n\) are real positive numbers. We used the parameters \(\beta = 0.2, \gamma = 0.1, \tau = 17, n = 10\) in our simulations. The discrete version of the equation uses a time step of length \(h = 0.1\). For each time step we generated \(\tau = 170\) uniformly distributed random values between 1.1 and 1.3 and then followed the equations. The first 1000 points were considered as initialization steps, which did not fully capture the time series dynamics and were thus discarded. For training and testing we used time series of 10,000 points, but in both cases the first 1000 states of the reservoir were considered as initialization steps and were thus ignored for training and testing. For an ESN with 1000 neurons and an optimized memory, the forecasting performance for this setting is close to its maximum value, thus the addition of short cycles will have a small effect. In order to show the interest of our contribution, we normalized the signal to have mean zero and variance of one and we added Gaussian white noise with \(\sigma = 0.05\), and the forecasting was done using reservoirs of 100 neurons, average degree \(\langle k \rangle = 10\) and spectral radius of \(\alpha = 0.85\), and the output was feed back to the reservoir through the vector \(w_{out}\), where every entry is independently drawn from a uniform distribution on the interval \([-1, 1]\). The ESN was trained to forecast one time-step, and then we used this readout to forecast 84 time-steps in the future by recursively feeding the one-step prediction of \(s(t + 1)\) into the ESN as the new input.

2. Forecasting Laser Intensity time series

The Laser Intensity time series [43, 53] was obtained from the Santa Fe Institute time series Forecasting Competition Data. It consists of 10,093 points, which we normalized to have an average of zero and an standard deviation of one, and were filtered with a Gaussian filter of length three and standard deviation of one. The forecasting was done using reservoirs of 100 neurons, average degree \(\langle k \rangle = 10\) and spectral radius of \(\alpha = 0.9\), without feedback so \(w_{out} = 0\). Here we forecasted one time-step. We used 1,000 points of the time series for initialization, 4,547 for training and 4,546 for testing.

3. Spoken Arabic Digit Recognition

The Spoken Arabic Digits [44] dataset was downloaded from the [44] from the UCI Machine Learning Repository [45]. This dataset consists of 660 recordings (330 from men and 330 from women) for each of the ten digits and 110 recordings for testing. Each recording is a time series of varying length encoded with MCCF [54] with 13 channels. While using the first
FIG. 6: The ability of the reservoir to retrieve previous inputs decays as with $\tau$, the delay with which we try to retrieve them. Each network has 400 neurons and average degree $\langle k \rangle = 20$. Each curve shows the average result over 100 trials and the error bars are the standard deviation. The spectral radius $\alpha = 1$, except in ER networks where it varies as marked in the legend.

three channels gave a better performance, here we use only the first channel, which is akin to a very lossy compression. We normalized this time series to have average of zero and a standard deviation of one, and a length of 40. Since in most cases we had less than 40 points, we computed the missing values by interpolation. The classification procedure was done using the forecasting framework. We collected the reservoir states from all the training examples of each digit and computed $w$ out as did in the previous forecasting tasks. In the testing we collected the states and computed the forecasting performance $\sigma$ for each of the 20 cases. We classified the time series as the digit that yielded the lowest forecasting error. Then we calculate the failure rate as the number of misclassified recordings divided by the total number of recordings in the training set. We used reservoirs of 100 neurons, average degree $\langle k \rangle = 10$ and spectral radius of $\alpha = 1$, without feedback ($w_{\text{out}} = 0$). Note that in our simulations we find that for this particular task the ESN performance is not drastically affected by the output feedback.

Appendix B: Numerical study of eigenvalue density and memory capacity

One of the motivations of our study on Memory Capacity is that the spectral radius is not enough to capture how $M$ changes, particularly for different network structures. In Fig.6, we show that for some families of networks the memory is also affected by other parameters.

Specifically, we study the following architectures:

- Erdös-Rény (ER) random graphs with weights drawn from a Gaussian distribution and varying spectral radii.

- Erdös-Rény random graphs with weights drawn from a power law distribution (PL) with $\beta \in [2, 5]$ but normalized to have a spectral radius $\alpha = 1$.

- Scale-Free (SF) networks where the degree heterogeneity is given by the degree exponent $\gamma \in [2, 6]$, and the weights are drawn from a Gaussian distribution, also normalized to have a spectral radius $\alpha = 1$.

- Random Regular (RR) graphs with varying degrees and a spectral radius $\alpha = 1$.

The results from Fig.6 can be contrasted with the eigenvalue densities of the aforementioned network families presented in Fig.7. We observe that the networks where the eigenvalues are concentrated in the center, either through the spectral radius $\alpha$, the power law exponent $\beta$ or the degree heterogeneity $\gamma$, have lower memory, while those with eigenvalues uniformly spread have more memory.
Appendix C: Bound on the Memory Capacity by the Correlations Between Neurons

Here we show that the Memory Capacity as defined in Eq. 4 is closely related by the correlations between neurons. For simplicity in this section we will ignore the output feedback and we will denote $x'(t)$ vector which includes the input. This does not change our derivations but makes the notation cleaner.

Before we start, we will normalize every neuron by their standard deviation, obtaining the normalized reservoir state $z(t) = [u(t), z_1(t), ..., z_N(t)]$. This does not affect the calculation of the memory capacity, because any full-rank linear transformation $A$ applied to $x(t)$ can be compensated by the readout by simply having

$$y(t) = w_{out}x(t) = w_{out}A^{-1}Ax(t)$$

which gives a different readout, but still minimizes the sum of squared errors from $y(t)$ to the target variable.

Now, the memory capacity for a certain delay $\tau$ is given by

$$M_\tau = \frac{\text{cov}^2(r(t-\tau), y_\tau(t))}{\text{var}(r(t-\tau))\text{var}(y_\tau(t))}.$$  

which is the coefficient of determination usually denoted as $R^2$, a measure of how good the readout can approximate the delayed input $r(t-\tau)$ by linear regression. Another alternative formulation very common on statistics textbooks is

$$M_\tau = 1 - \frac{\text{var}(e_\tau(t))}{\text{var}(z^*_\tau(t))},$$

where

$$e_\tau(t) = y_\tau(t) - r(t-\tau).$$
has the portion of variance of $r(t)$ that cannot be explained by the reservoir state $z(t)$ through linear regression and $\text{var}(z_i^r(t))$ is the variance in the reservoir in the direction of $w_{\text{out}}^r$.

The use of a linear regression tacitly implies that we are making a few assumptions

- $r(t - \tau)$ and $z(t)$ are linearly related
- The residuals $e_k(t)$ have mean zero
- Homoscedasticity of residuals or equal variance
- No autocorrelation of residuals.

Note that those are not assumptions about the reservoir, but about the readout: because we are using a linear regression that we are implicitly assuming

$$z(t) = Bu(t) + \varepsilon(t)$$ \tag{C5}$$

where $B$ is an $N \times N$ matrix, $u(t) = [u(t), u(t - 1), ..., u(t - N)]$, and $\varepsilon(t)$ is an error term. This error term emerges from the interactions of the reservoir with previous inputs and the non-linear nature of the reservoir dynamics. It is thus very hard, if not impossible to characterize. However, as we are using a linear readout which implies some assumptions on the error, we can make the following ansatz:

*The noise $\varepsilon(t)$ is $\|\varepsilon(t)\|v_r(t)$, where $\text{cov}[\|\varepsilon(t)\|, (v_r(t))_i] = 0$ for every $i \in [1, 2, ..., N]$.\*

Which simply means that the noise distribution is invariant under rotations. The justification here is that we can indeed treat $z(t)$ as a linear combination of inputs by using a Taylor expansion, whose high-order terms are complex and stochastic, so we lump them together into a variable that, as it can affect all neurons equally, behaves similarly in every dimension. Naturally, the simplest case is to assume that the noise is Gaussian with mean zero and equal variance along any dimension.

Our ansatz simplifies the memory estimation problem by giving the var($e_\tau(t)$) = $\eta$. Thus, we can use Eq. \text{C3} to obtain $M_\tau$.

We can thus compute the total memory by

$$M = \sum_{\tau=1}^N M_\tau = \sum_{\tau=1}^N 1 - \frac{\eta}{\text{var}(z_i^r(t))} = N - \eta \sum_{\tau=1}^N \frac{1}{\text{var}(z_i^r(t))}.$$ \tag{C6}

Obtaining the values of $z_i^r(t)$ directly is impossible as they depend on the specific reservoir, so what we will do instead is to constrain them and then use those constraints to put an upper bound on $M$.

Our constraints on the variances will come from the knowledge of $z(t)$. To make this connection, we note that $\text{cov}[r(t - \tau_1), r(t - \tau_2)] = 0$ for all $\tau_1 \neq \tau_2$, which in geometric terms implies that $r(t - \tau_1)$ is orthogonal to $r(t - \tau_2)$. Since $y_r(t)$ are the best approximations to $r(t - \tau)$ that the reservoir can have, $\text{cov}[y_{\tau_1}(t), y_{\tau_2}(t)] = 0$. If those two are not correlated, then the lines in which they move, defined by $w_{\text{out}}^{\tau_1}$, $w_{\text{out}}^{\tau_2}$ are orthogonal.

The orthogonality of the $w_{\text{out}}^\tau$ vectors is quite an important property, as it implies that the variance allocated to recover each $r(t - \tau)$ is independent of the others, so we can bound their sum by the total independent variance in $z(t)$.

To follow this train of thought is better to change our coordinate system to one where the variables are uncorrelated and the i-th coordinate corresponds to the i-th direction of highest variance. This is the textbook definition of the principal components (see Supplementary Information Sec.2), which defines a basis $PC = \{pc_1, pc_2, ..., pc_N\}$ such that

- The basis is orthonormal, meaning that $\langle pc_i, pc_j \rangle = 0 \forall i \neq j$, $\langle pc_i, pc_j \rangle = 1 \iff i = j$.
- Each $pc_i$ is chosen to be the direction of maximal variance of $x(t)$ under the constraint that it must be orthonormal to $pc_j$ $\forall j < i$, meaning.
- Each $pc_i$ is the i-th eigenvector of the correlation matrix $P = (P_{ij})$, where $P_{ij}$ is the Pearson’s correlation index as presented in Eq. \text{5}.
- The variance of $\langle pc_i, z(t) \rangle$ is the i-th eigenvalue of $P$.
- The total variance of $z(t)$ is the sum of eigenvalues of $P$, $P$ being a correlation matrix, it is $N$.

We will denote the projection of $z(t)$ onto each of the new directions time series $z_i^{pc}(t) = \langle pc_i, z(t) \rangle$.

This already gives us our first constraint, which is

$$\sum_{\tau=1}^N \text{var}[z_i^r(t)] = \sum_{n=1}^N \lambda_n(P) = N.$$ \tag{C7}
Adding this constraint to Eq. [C6] we can obtain by the method of Lagrange multipliers that $M$ has a unique maximum at
\[
\text{var} [z_i^r(t)] = \text{var} [z_j^r(t)] \quad \forall i, j. \tag{C8}
\]
In other words, the higher memory is achieved when the variance across all orthogonal directions given by the readouts is equal. This particular arrangement of variances is, however, not possible in the readouts that we study here, although it would be in other, non-random readouts [56, 57].

The subsequent step is then to show that the variances of $z_i^r(t)$ cannot be equal. This is a trivial consequence of the stability of the reservoir. As the system is contracting, the variance that is induced by $u(t - \tau_1)$ is higher than the variance induced by $u(t - \tau_2)$ for all $\tau_1 < \tau_2$. This simply implies that for any delay $\tau$, there are at least $\tau$ variables that have more variance – the at least being due to possible variance induced by the nonlinearity–, thus
\[
\text{var} [z_i^r(t)] \leq \sum_{k=\tau}^N \text{var} [z_k^p(t)]. \tag{C9}
\]
We know that the more uniform the distribution of variances $\text{var} [z_k^p(t)]$, the higher the memory can be. Thus, we can improve our previous bound from Eq. [C8] by stating that upper bound on the memory is given by having the variances as similar as possible within the constraint from Eq. [C9] which gives us
\[
\text{var} [z_i^r(t)] = \text{var} [z_k^p(t)] = \lambda_i^p. \tag{C10}
\]
where $\lambda_i^p$ is the $i$th eigenvalue of matrix $P$. So what we need to measure is how uniform the distribution of eigenvalues of $P$ is. The simplest measure of uniformity in a distribution of positive values with a fixed first moment – here $N - \text{is the second moment. The highest the second moment, the more the distribution has extreme values, and thus the less uniform it is. In our case, the sum of squared eigenvalues of $P$ is conveniently given by the Frobenius norm}\ Frobenius norm (see Supplementary Information Sec.2),
\[
\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i^p = \|P\|_F = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N P^2_{ij}, \tag{C11}
\]
which after proper rescaling gives us $S$.

**Appendix D: Correlations and eigenvalues in dynamical systems**

We will show that the larger the eigenvalues of $W$, the lower the correlations. To do so we will first linearize the system presented in Eq. [1] which gives us
\[
x(t) = Wx(t - 1) + w_{in}u(t). \tag{D1}
\]
This linearization might seem unjustified, as a key requirement of a reservoir is that it must be non-linear [5] to provide the necessary diversity of computations that a practical ESN requires. However, here we are interested in the memory capacity, which is maximized for linear reservoirs [5, 56]. That is, by studying a linear system we are implicitly deriving an upper bound on the memory, similarly to the approach taken in the control-theoretical study of the effect of the spectral radius [30]. Finally, note that this linearization is within the parameters of the ESN from Eq. [1] as it would suffice to set $\|w_{in}\| < 1$.

Given that our system is linear, we can formulate the state of a single neuron $x_i(t)$ as
\[
x_i(t) = \sum_{k=0}^\infty (W^k w_{in})_i u(t - k) = \sum_{k=0}^\infty a_{i,k} u(t - k) = \langle a_i, u_t \rangle \tag{D2}
\]
where the vector $a_i = [a_{i,0}, a_{i,1}, ...]$ represents the coefficients that the previous inputs $u_t = [u(t), u(t - 1), ...]$ have on $x_i(t)$.

We can then plug this into the covariance between two neurons,
\[
\text{cov} (x_i, x_j) = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{q=-T}^{+T} \langle a_{i,t}, u_{j,q} \rangle = \langle a_i, a_j \rangle \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{q_i=0}^{T} \sum_{q_j=0}^{T} \langle u_{q_i}, u_{q_j} \rangle, \tag{D3}
\]
and given that $u(t)$ is a random time series with zero autocorrelation and variance of one,
\[
\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{q_i=0}^{T} \sum_{q_j=0}^{T} \langle u_{q_i}, u_{q_j} \rangle = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{q=0}^{T} \langle u_q, u_q \rangle = \mathbb{E} [u^2(t)] = 1. \tag{D4}
\]
where

\[
\text{Pr} [v_n = \{a_k\} ] = \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{(a_k)^2}{2}}
\]

and similarly, we can compute the variance of \(x_i\),

\[
\text{var} (x_i) = \text{cov} (x_i, x_i) = \langle a_i, a_i \rangle = \|a_i\|^2.
\]

We can plug the previous two formulas into the Pearson’s correlation coefficient between two nodes \(i, j\) as:

\[
P_{ij} = \frac{\langle a_i, a_j \rangle}{\|a_i\|\|a_j\|} = \cos(\angle(a_i, a_j))
\]

which is the same as the cosine distance between vectors \(a_i\) and \(a_j\).

The next step is thus to write \(a_i\) as a function of the eigenvalues of \(W\). To do so, we note that the state of a neuron can be written as

\[
x(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} W^k w_{in} u(t - k) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (V \Lambda^k V^{-1}) w_{in} u(t - k)
\]

where \(V\) is the matrix eigenvectors of \(W\) and \(\Lambda\) the diagonal matrix containing the eigenvalues of \(W\). When we obtain

\[
x_i(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \lambda_n^k \langle v_n^{-1}, w_{in}\rangle (v_n)_i u(t - k),
\]

where \(v_n\) and \(v_n^{-1}\) are, respectively, the left and right eigenvectors of \(W\). Notice that as long as the network given by \(W\) is drawn from an edge-symmetric probability distribution – meaning that \(\text{Pr} [W_{ij} = a] = \text{Pr} [W_{ji} = a] \forall a \in \mathbb{R}\) – and is self-averaging then \(v_n\) and \(v_n^{-1}\) are vectors drawn from the same distribution.

The \(\lambda_n^k\) terms present in the previous equation can be used as a new vector basis,

\[
x_i(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \langle v_n^{-1}, w_{in}\rangle (v_n)_i (\lambda_n, u_i) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \lambda_n^k \lambda_n b_{i,n} u(t - k),
\]

where \(\lambda_n = [1, \lambda_n, \lambda_n^2, \ldots]\) and \(b_{i,n} = \langle v_n^{-1}, w_{in}\rangle (v_n)_i\). By simple identification from Eq. \ref{D2} we find that

\[
\langle a_i \rangle_k = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \lambda_n^k b_{i,n}.
\]

Thus every coefficient of \(a_i\) is a sum of many terms. Specifically, every term is a multiplication of \(b_{i,n}\), which are all independent as they refer to the projections of \(v_n^{-1}\) into \(w_{in}\) and the values of \(\lambda_n\), whose phase – which we assume to be uniformly distributed on \([0, 2\pi)\) – ensures that \(\langle a_i \rangle_k\) is uncorrelated with \(\langle a_{i+k} \rangle_k\).

We will now proceed to cast the distribution of \(a_i\) as a uniform distribution of points defining an ellipsoid. By the central limit theorem, the values of \(a_i\) are independent random variables drawn from a normal distribution with zero mean and whose variance decreases with the index \(k\). Therefore the distribution of \(a_i\) is given by

\[
\prod_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{(a_i)^2}{2s_k^2}}
\]

where \(s_k\) is a decreasing function of \(k\). Thus all the points with probability \(e^{-r^2}\) are given by the surface

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_i^2}{s_k^2} - r^2 = 0
\]

which are ellipsoids of infinite dimension and axis \(\frac{s_k^2}{s_k} \). Furthermore, as we saw on Eq. \ref{D5} we are only interested in the angular coordinates of the points in the ellipsoid, not on their distance to the origin. Thus we can project every one of those surfaces into an ellipsoid with axis

\[
s = \left[ \frac{s_2}{s_1}, \frac{s_3}{s_1}, \ldots \right].
\]
Note that, even though the ellipsoid has infinite dimensions, the length of the axes decreases exponentially due to the factor $\lambda_k$. Therefore, it has finite surface and it can be approximated by an ellipsoid with finite dimensions.

Now we have that the vectors $a_i$ are, ignoring their length, uniformly distributed on an ellipsoid with axis $\sigma$. Then

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} S = \frac{1}{2} \int_{E_s} \int_{E_s} \cos^2(\angle(p, q)) dp dq$$  \hspace{1cm} (D15)

where the integrals are taken over $E_s$, the ellipsoid with axes $s$, and the half factor comes from counting every pair only once.

If we now change to spherical coordinates we will find that the two vectors can be expressed as

$$p = [r_p, \phi_p^1, \phi_p^2, ...]$$
$$q = [r_q, \phi_q^1, \phi_q^2, ...],$$

where $\phi_p$ is the angle of $p$ on the plane given by the first and second axis, $\phi_q$ the plane by the first and third axis and so on. The cosine between the two vector is then

$$\cos(\angle(p, q)) = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \cos(\phi_p^k - \phi_q^k).$$  \hspace{1cm} (D16)

Thus we can write the integral from Eq. (D15) as

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} S = \frac{1}{2} \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^{2\pi} \cos^2(\phi_k^p - \phi_k^q) \mu_{\phi_k}(\phi_k^p) \mu_{\phi_k}(\phi_k^q) d\phi_k^p d\phi_k^q$$  \hspace{1cm} (D17)

where $\mu_{\phi_k}(\phi)$ is the probability density function of the difference angle $\phi_k^p - \phi_k^q$.

We will show that this integral decreases when the values $s_k$ increase. To do so, it is helpful to consider the extreme cases to get an intuition: when the semi-minor axis is zero, then we have a line, and all the points in the line have an angle between them either of zero or $\pi$, and thus a squared cosine of one. Conversely, when the semi-minor axis is maximal it equals the semi-major one and we have a circle, and the average squared cosine becomes $1/2$. Those are the two extreme values and thus the squared cosine decreases as the ellipse becomes more similar to a circle.

To make this argument more precise, we start by finding the density $\mu_{\phi_k}(\phi_k^p)$. This density is found by taking a segment of differential length $dl_S$ on the sphere of radius one and then compare it with the length covered in the ellipse $dl_E$. This gives us

$$\mu_{\phi_k}(\phi) \propto \frac{dl_E}{dl_S} = \frac{\| \cos(\phi - d\phi) - \cos(\phi), s_k^2(sin(\phi - d\phi) - sin(\phi)) \|}{\phi + d\phi - \phi} = \frac{\sqrt{\sin^2(\phi) + s_k^2 \cos^2(\phi)}}{\sqrt{1 - (1 - s_k^2) \cos^2(\phi)}}.$$  

To fully evaluate the previous integral we would need to normalize $\mu_{\phi_k}$ and then evaluate the integral as a function of $s_k$. However, we would take a simpler approach and note that $s_k$ controls the homogeneity of $\mu_{\phi_k}$: the larger $s_k$ is (within the interval $[0, 1]$), the more the mass of probability is concentrated on the area around $\phi \sim 0$ and $\phi \sim \pi$.

Furthermore, we note that the squared cosine has the following periodicities

$$\cos^2(\theta) = \cos^2(\pi + \theta) = \cos^2(\pi - \theta) = \cos^2(2\pi - \theta),$$

thus, when we integrate over the angle $\phi$ we can take advantage of the four-fold symmetry and integrate only on the interval $[0, \pi/2]$. Thus we only need to study the integral

$$\int_0^{\pi/2} \cos^2(\phi_k^p - \phi_k^q) \mu_{\phi_k}(\phi_k^p) \mu_{\phi_k}(\phi_k^q) d\phi_k^p d\phi_k^q,$$  \hspace{1cm} (D18)

and by using $\sin^2(\theta) + \cos^2(\theta) = 1$, we can recast the previous integral as

$$1 - \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^2(\phi_k^p - \phi_k^q) \mu_{\phi_k}(\phi_k^p) \mu_{\phi_k}(\phi_k^q) d\phi_k^p d\phi_k^q.$$  \hspace{1cm} (D19)

In the interval $\phi \in [0, \pi/2]$ the squared sine can be seen a metric between two angles. Therefore the term

$$\int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^2(\phi_k^p - \phi_k^q) \mu_{\phi_k}(\phi_k^p) \mu_{\phi_k}(\phi_k^q) d\phi_k^p d\phi_k^q$$  \hspace{1cm} (D20)
is nothing else than an average distance between the points which have a density given by $\mu_{\phi_k}$. Thus, the more the density is homogeneous, the larger the distance and vice-versa. Putting it all together, $s_k$ controls the homogeneity of $\mu_{\phi_k}$, and the homogeneity of $\mu_{\phi_k}$ controls the terms on Eq. (D17). Specifically, increasing $s_k$ decreases $S$.

The last thing to mention is that the values of $|\lambda_n|$ control $s_k$, as they give the variance to $(a_i)_k$ in Eq. (D11). Thus, the larger $|\lambda_n|$ the higher $s_k$ and the lower $S$. By the negative correlation between $M$ and $S$, increasing the values of $|\lambda_n|$ should increase the memory.

Appendix E: Reservoir Design in the Fourier Domain

The intuition that we will use here is that every neuron can be seen as a filter that extracts some features from the input time series. If the reservoir extract the right features, the ESN performance would improve.

1. A geometric bound to ESN training

Our argument starts by noting that the ESN training from Eq. (3) is the minimization of an euclidean distance. More specifically, the squared training error

$$
\|e\|^2 = \sum_{t=t_0}^{t+T_0} e^2(t) = \sum_{t=t_0}^{t+T_0} (y(t) - w_{\text{out}}x(t))^2 = \|y - \sum_{i=1}^{N} (w_{\text{out}})_i x_i\|^2 \tag{E1}
$$

is a squared distance, where $\| \cdot \|$ is the euclidean norm and $e$ is the vector of errors, which inhabits in the space of training time series. In this space, $y$ is the target point, where every value of $y(t)$ corresponds to the coordinate of $y$ at dimension $t$. The time series of the neurons $x_i$ are also points in that space with $x_i(t)$ being their corresponding coordinates. Then, $\hat{y}$ is the linear combination of neuron points that is closest to $y$. This gives us the following lemmas

**Lemma 1.** Applying the same rotation to the reservoir state points $\{x_i\}$ and the target point $y$ does not affect the ESN performance.

**Proof.** The euclidean distance between points is invariant to coordinate rotations. \hfill \Box

Having this geometrical interpretation of the ESN training we can already get an intuitive understanding of how the reservoir network should be selected: we should sample $x_i$ to be as close as possible to the target $y$, then the error – the minimum distance between the hyperplane spanned by $x_i$ and the target – should also be reduced.

To make this argument more precise, we will rotate the coordinate frame so that the first dimension of our space is in the exact direction of $y$, which by Lemma 1 does not affect $\|e\|$. We will note the points in this coordinate by the superindex $P$, so that $x_i^P$ are the new points and $y^P = \|y\|$, 0, 0, ..., 0).

In this new basis, we can rewrite the error as

$$
\|e\|^2 = \|y^P(0) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} (w_{\text{out}})_i x_i^P(0)\|^2 + \|\sum_{i=1}^{N} (w_{\text{out}})_i x_i^P(j)\|^2. \tag{E2}
$$

To obtain a bound we impose the constraint that the first term must be equal to zero, so

$$
w_{\text{out}}^* = \arg \min_{w_{\text{out}}} \|\sum_{i=1}^{N} (w_{\text{out}})_i x_i^P(j)\|^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad y^P(0) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} (w_{\text{out}})_i x_i^P(0) = 0, \tag{E3}
$$

where $w_{\text{out}}^*$ is the new readout. Note that we are not proposing a new training goal, as this constraint is just a mathematical trick to bound the training error.

Naturally, this extra constraint can only make the minimization problem harder, so

$$
\|e\|^2 \leq \|e^*\|^2 = \sum_{j=2}^{T-1} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} (w_{\text{out}}^*)_i x_i^P(j) \right]^2. \tag{E4}
$$

Furthermore, we can also use the constraint to bound $w_{\text{out}}$ through the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$
(y^P(0))^2 = \|y\|^2 = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} (w_{\text{out}}^*)_i x_i^P(0) \right)^2 \leq \|w_{\text{out}}^*\|^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} (x_i^P(0))^2. \tag{E5}
$$
which gives us the inequality
\[
\|w_{out}^*\|^2 \geq \frac{\|y\|^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{N}(x_i^P(0))^2}.
\] (E6)

Now we can plug this into Eq. E4
\[
\|e\|^2 \leq \sum_{j=2}^{T-1} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N}(w_{out}^*)i x_i^P(j) \right]^2 \leq \|y\|^2 \sum_{j=2}^{T-1} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i^P(j) \right]^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N}(x_i^P(0))^2.
\] (E7)

This equation gives us an upper bound for our training error. This bound simply states that if the points are very large in coordinate 0 of the new reference frame, and very small in all the other coordinates, then the training error will improve. This is not surprising, as the coordinate 0 is aligned with the target; our bound simply states that if the time series of the neurons are very similar to the target, then calculating the target from the neurons is easy.

Furthermore, since the rotation preserves the symmetry, the signs of \( x_i^P(0) \) are uncorrelated with the signs of \( x_i^P(j) \),
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i^P(j) \leq \mathcal{N}(0, Ns_{x^P \perp y}^2)
\] (E8)
where \( s_{x^P \perp y}^2 \) is the variance of \( x_i^P(j) \) for \( j > 1 \), and the zero mean comes from the symmetry of the distribution. As the neurons are independently drawn and thus have all the same variance, then
\[
\sum_{j=2}^{T-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i^P(j)^2 = Ns_{x^P \perp y}^2 \sum_{j=2}^{T-1} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)^2
\] (E9)
where \( \sum_{j=2}^{T-1} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)^2 \) is the chi-squared distribution with \( T-1 \) degrees of freedom. When \( T \) is large, we can use the central limit theorem, and thus
\[
\|e\|^2 \leq \|y\|^2 \frac{TNs_{x^P \perp y}^2}{Ns_{x^P || y}^2} = \|y\|^2 \frac{s_{x^P \perp y}^2}{s_{x^P || y}^2}
\] (E10)
where \( s_{x^P || y}^2 \) is the variance of \( x_i^P(0) \).

Note that the factor \( T \) appears because we did not normalize \( \|e\|^2 \) by the number of entries in the time series. Imagine that we concatenate the same time series twice, both the training and target points. Naturally, \( w_{out} \) would be the same, but the squared distance to between \( y \) and \( \hat{y} \) would have doubled.

This formulation emphasizes the stochastic nature of picking a reservoir, which is the starting point for Appendix F.

The bound in Eq. E10 is simple to understand but it is hardly helpful: designing a reservoir so that the neuron time series would approach those of the target is a high-dimensional problem with many coupled variables, so we would not expect this to be an easy task; indeed, training recurrent neural networks it is a known hard problem\[^3\]. Our main insight here is that this design is much simpler in the Fourier domain.

By Parseval’s theorem\[^58\]
\[
\|e\|^2 = \sum_{t=t_0}^{t_0+T} (y(t) - w_{out}x(t))^2 = \sum_{f=0}^{T} |\mathcal{F}[y(t) - w_{out}x(t)](f)|^2,
\] (E11)
where \( \mathcal{F} \) is the Fourier transform. Furthermore, the Fourier transform preserves linear operations, so
\[
\|e\|^2 = \sum_{f=0}^{T} \left( |\mathcal{F}[y](f) - \sum_{i=1}^{N}(w_{out}i, \mathcal{F}[x_i](f))| \right)^2,
\] (E12)
Then we can plug this in Eq. E10 specifically on the quotient
\[
\frac{s_{x^P \perp y}^2}{s_{x^P || y}^2}
\] (E13)
which is fairly easy to interpret in terms of signal processing: $s^2_{x \in \mathcal{P}}$ is the projection of the power spectral density of the distribution of $x_i$ on target time series, and $s^2_{x \perp \mathcal{P}}$ is the orthogonal power spectral density. In other words, ESN performance improves if the power spectral density (PSD) of the variables $x_i$ approaches that of the target time series $y$. This is quite a natural result, since the power spectral density is often used as a measure of how distant time series are [48], thus we are simply saying that the time series of the variables $x_i$ are similar to the target, then the readout will work better.

Appendix F: Adapting the Power Spectral Density of a Reservoir

We argued that having sampling networks with cycles of specific lengths can adapt the PSD of the reservoir. To illustrate this, we study how a single neuron changes its power spectral density if it is embedded in a cycle. Consider a neuron with adjacent connections whose state is defined by the equation

$$x_i(t) = \tanh \left( (w_m)_i u(t) + \sum_{j \in S_i} w_{ji} x_j(t - 1) \right),$$

where $S_i$ are the presynaptic neighbors of $i$. For simplicity, we set $u(t)$ to be a random normal variable independently sampled at every time.

Random large graphs are locally tree-like[59,60], meaning that typically all the values of $x_j(t-1)$ are only remotely connected to $x_i$ and among themselves. This implies that we can effectively treat the input to the neuron

$$r_i(t) = (w_m)_i u(t) + \sum_{j \in S_i} w_{ji} x_j(t - 1)$$

as a random variable, which in our case has mean zero and bounded variance.

Now we embed the neuron into a positive cycle of finite length $L$, meaning that there is a sequence of $L - 1$ weights $w_{ij_1}, w_{ij_2}, w_{ij_3}, \ldots, w_{ij_{L-1}}$ such that

$$w_c = w_{ij_1} \cdot w_{ij_2} \cdot \ldots \cdot w_{ij_{L-1}} > 0,$$

and proceed to use the mean value theorem to $x_i(t + \tau)$,

$$x_i(t + \tau) = \tanh' \left( \xi_i(t + \tau) \right) r_i(t + \tau),$$

$$r_i(t + \tau) = w_{ij_{L-1}} x_{ij_{L-1}}(t + \tau) + (w_m)_i u(t + \tau) + \sum_{k \in S_i - \{j_{L-1}\}} w_{ki} x_k(t + \tau - 1)$$

where $\text{sign} [\xi_i(t + \tau)] = \text{sign} [x_i(t + \tau)]$ and $\tanh'$ is the derivative of $\tanh$. To simplify our notation, we will write

$$s_i(t) = (w_m)_i u(t + \tau) + \sum_{k \in S_i - \{j_{L-1}\}} w_{ki} x_k(t + \tau - 1),$$

which are randomly sampled from a symmetric probability distribution, so their expectation over all samples of $W$, even including $w_c$, is zero. The same expansion can be applied to any node in our cycle, so for $l < L$,

$$x_{ji}(t + \tau - l) = \tanh' \left( \xi_{ji}(t + \tau - l) \right) r_{ji}(t + \tau - l)$$

$$r_{ji}(t + \tau - l) = w_{ji} x_{ji}(t + \tau - l - 1) + s_{ji}(t + \tau - l).$$

Then by recursively expanding $x_{ji}(t - l)$,

$$x_i(t + \tau) = \prod_{l=0}^{L-1} w_{li(l+1)} \tanh' \left( \xi_{ji}(t + \tau - l) \right) x_i(t) + \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \sum_{k=0}^{l} \prod_{k=0}^{l} \tanh' \left( \xi_{ji}(t + \tau - l) \right)$$

where we used the convention $i = j_0 = j_L$. We can already see that the value of $x_i(t + \tau)$ is now coupled to the value of $x_i(t)$.

We can now compute this new correlation

$$E_{w_c} [c_i(\tau)] = E_{w_c} \left[ \prod_{l=0}^{L-1} w_{li(l+1)} \tanh' \left( \xi_{ji}(t + \tau - l) \right) x_i^2(t) \right] + E_{w_c} \left[ x_i(t) \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \sum_{k=0}^{l} \prod_{k=0}^{l} \tanh' \left( \xi_{ji}(t + \tau - l) \right) \right].$$

(F8)
By the symmetry of the parameters of the network, the sign of $s_{jl}$ is uncorrelated with $x_j$ if we average over all the possible values of $W$, so if we set $\tau = L$ we are left with

$$E_{|w_c} [c_i(L)] = E_{|w_c} \left[ \prod_{t=0}^{L-1} w_{i,t+1} \tanh' (\xi_j (t + L - l)) x_i^2(t) \right] = w_c E_{|w_c} [\tanh' (\xi_j (t + L - l)) x_i^2(t)].$$  \hspace{1cm} (F9)

Note that $\tanh'(x) = (1 - \tanh^2 (x)) > 0$, therefore

$$E_{|w_c} [c_i(L)] > 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (F10)

This implies that by having cycles, the neurons will have, on average, a positive autocorrelation with time-delay $L$.

Finally, the autocorrelation function gives the PSD by the Wiener-Khinchin Theorem [61, 62],

$$s_i(f) = \sum_{k=\infty} c_i(k) e^{-2\pi i f k},$$  \hspace{1cm} (F11)

thus if we select $f = n/L$,

$$E_{|w_c} \left[ s_i \left( \frac{n}{L} \right) \right] > 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (F12)

for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Note that since neurons are filters randomly sampled from a probability distribution that is not biased towards positive or negative feedback, the average autocorrelation is zero.

Naturally, the same calculations can be repeated by adding more cycles or increasing their weights $w_c$. It is worth noticing that for $w_c$, the enhanced frequencies are $(2n+1)/L$

### Appendix G: Generate adapted reservoirs

**Generating Networks with desired $\rho_L$**

In order to generate networks with desired $\rho_L$, we designed the following algorithm, which takes as parameters the number of neurons $N$; the connectivity $c$; $|\rho_L| \in [0, 1]$, which is the portion of edges that are dedicated to cycles –the other ones being random--; and $s \in \{-1, 1\}$, which corresponds to the feedback sign.

If $L = 1$:: Create a random sparse matrix $W_r$--the subscript $r$ standing for random-- with $cN(N-1)$ non-zero entries. Normalize the spectral radius to 1 and then $W \leftarrow (1 - |\rho_1|) W_r + sr I$, where $I$ is the identity matrix.

Else: :

**Step-1::** Create $\frac{|\rho_L| cN^2}{2L}$ permutations of $L$ numbers randomly picked from 1 to $N$ without replacement. Each permutation corresponds to $L$ nodes that will be connected form a cycle.

**Step-2::** For each cycle, draw a random number from a normal distribution with zero mean and variance one and assign it to all the edges. Thus all the edges share the same weight.

**Step-3::** For each cycle, if the sign of the product of the edge weights is not the same as $s$, multiply the last edge by $-1$. This process generates an adjacency matrix $W_c$.

**Step-4::** Create a random sparse matrix $W_r$ with $\frac{(1-|\rho_L| cN^2}{2}$ entries and weights drawn from a normal distribution with zero mean and variance one. Normalize the spectral radius to 1 and then $W = (W_r + W_c)$.

**Step-5::** Normalize to the desired average eigenvalue moduli $\langle |\lambda| \rangle$ by $W \leftarrow \frac{W}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |\lambda_i(W)|}$, where $\lambda_i(W)$ are the eigenvalues of $W$

The special treatment of the case $L = 1$ is due to the fact that with length of 1 if all edges are self loops the network is completely disconnected and the number of edges is at most $N$, meaning that for some values of $\rho_1$ the number of edges would be lower than the number required by the connectivity parameter.
Appendix H: Heuristic for adapting the reservoir network to a specific task

In the tasks described in the main text, different tasks require different reservoir parameters. Specifically, for a given maximum cycle length value $L$ there is one combination of $\rho_l$, $\forall l \leq L$, which optimizes the ESN performance. In this section we present the heuristic that we use to find those parameters.

For a given $L$ we use the following algorithm to find the optimal combination of cycles with size no greater than $L$.

**Step-1:** Obtain the frequency response of the reservoir $\hat{R}(\rho_l, L)$ for various values of $\rho_l$ for all the $l \leq L$ considered. Compute it by generating Gaussian noise with the same variance and mean as the original signal and use it as an input for the reservoir. Then apply the Fast Fourier Transform to the neurons’ states and average over all neurons. As the reservoirs are generated randomly, it is necessary to average those responses over multiple reservoir instances.

**Step-2:** Compute the Fourier transform of the input signal and keep the vector of absolute values $\hat{s} = [\hat{s}(0), \hat{s}(2), ..., \hat{s}(f_S)]$, where $f_S$ is half the sampling frequency.

**Step-3:** Compute the scalar product $\langle \hat{s}, \hat{R}(\rho_l, l) \rangle$ for all $\rho_l, l$, and select the $\rho_l$ that maximizes it for each $l$.

**Step-4:** Test the performance of an ESN with the values of $\rho_l$ found in the previous step. If the performance is lower than in the default case of $\rho_l = 0$, do not optimize with regard to that length.

**Step-5:** For all values of $\rho_l$ where the cycle length is allowed and which fill the condition $\|\rho\|_1 \leq 1$, select the one that maximizes $\sum_l \langle \hat{s}, \hat{R}(\rho_l, l) \rangle$. 