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Abstract. Using information theoretic concepts to understand and explore the inner organization of deep neural networks (DNNs) remains a big challenge. Recently, the concept of an information plane (coupled with the famed information bottleneck principle) began to shed light on the analysis of multilayer perceptrons (MLPs). We provided an in-depth insight into stacked autoencoders (SAEs) using a novel matrix-based Rényi’s $\alpha$-entropy functional, enabling for the first time the analysis of the dynamics of learning using information flow in real-world scenario involving complex network architecture and large data. Despite the great potential of these past works, there are several open questions when it comes to applying information theoretic concepts to understand convolutional neural networks (CNNs). These include for instance the accurate estimation of information quantities among multiple variables, and the many different training methodologies. By extending the novel matrix-based Rényi’s $\alpha$-entropy functional to a multivariate scenario and introducing the partial information decomposition (PID) framework, this paper presents a systematic method to analyze CNNs training using information theory. Our results validate two fundamental data processing inequalities in CNNs, and also reveals some fundamental issues embedded in the training phase of CNNs.
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1 Introduction

Despite their great success in practical applications, the theoretical and systematic understanding of deep neural networks (DNNs) remains limited and unsatisfactory. Consequently, deep models themselves are typically regarded as “black boxes”\textsuperscript{2}. Current work on understanding DNNs can be classified into two categories. The first category intends to interpret the mechanism of DNNs by building a strong connection with the widely acknowledged concepts or theorems from other disciplines (e.g.,\textsuperscript{14,16,29}, etc.), whereas approaches in the second category concentrate more on the analysis of deep feature representations.
from a geometric perspective (e.g., [4], etc.). However, all these works are either built upon limited validations on simulated or toy data, or suffer from no solid examples. Apart from these two approaches, there are some other works concentrating on hidden codes visualization (e.g., [34,15]), aiming at giving insights on the function of hidden layers. However, these methods are typically only applicable for convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and fail to unveil the intrinsic properties of CNNs in the training phase.

There has been a growing interest in understanding DNN mappings and training using information theory [29,22]. According to the authors, a DNN should be analyzed by measuring the information quantities that each layer’s representation $T$ preserves about the input signal $X$ with respect to the desired signal $Y$ (i.e., $I(X;T)$ with respect to $I(T;Y)$, where $I$ denotes mutual information), which has been called the Information Plane (IP). Moreover, they also empirically show that the common stochastic gradient descent (SGD) optimization undergoes two separate phases in the IP: an early “fitting” phase, in which both $I(X;T)$ and $I(T;Y)$ increase rapidly along with the iterations, and a later “compression” phase, in which there is a reversal such that $I(X;T)$ and $I(T;Y)$ continually become smaller. Furthermore, they conjectured that $T$ follows the Information Bottleneck (IB) principle [28] with respect to $X$ and $Y$. However, the results so far have not been extended to large datasets or complex DNN architectures, which were later questioned by some counter-examples in [20]. To address these issues, a recent paper [1] suggests measuring the information in the network weights, rather than activations or layer outputs, to understand network representations and optimization. A duality bound concerning the weights and the learned representations is also presented.

In our most recent work [33], we use a novel matrix-based Rényi’s $\alpha$-entropy [8] to analyze the information flow in stacked autoencoders (SAEs). This novel entropy functional does not require any probability density function (PDF) estimation, thus providing a promising and reliable avenue in analyzing large data with high dimensionality. According to our observations, the existence of “compression” phase associated with $I(X;T)$ and $I(T;Y)$ in IP, as observed in [22] using simple multilayer perceptrons (MLPs) on toy data, is predicated to the proper dimension of the bottleneck layer size $K$ of SAEs: if $K$ is larger than the intrinsic dimensionality $d$ [7] of training data, the mutual information values start to increase up to a point and then go back approaching the bisector of IP; if $K$ is smaller than $d$, the mutual information values increase consistently up to a point, and never go back. Moreover, we also validate two data processing inequalities (DPIs) in feedforward DNNs based on the Markov property that always serve as foundations or (unproven) theorems for theoretically analysis of DNNs (e.g., [12,22]), i.e., $I(X,T_1) \geq I(X,T_2) \geq \cdots \geq I(X,T_K)$ and $I(\delta_L,\delta_K) \geq I(\delta_L,\delta_{K-1}) \geq \cdots \geq I(\delta_L,\delta_1)$, where $T_1, T_2, \cdots, T_K$ are successive hidden layer representations from the 1-st hidden layer to the $K$-th hidden layer, and $\delta_K, \delta_{K-1}, \cdots, \delta_1$ denote the errors (in the backpropagation chain) from the $K$-th hidden layer to the 1-st hidden layer. See Fig. [1] for more details.
Fig. 1. The data processing inequalities (DPIs) in feedforward deep neural networks (DNNs). In the input forward propagation procedure, the input signal $X$ (red vector) goes through different hidden layers (blue vectors), thus forming successive representations $T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_K$. The DNN then evaluates the loss by comparing output $\hat{y}$ with the desired signal $y$, the error signal $\delta_L$ then goes through all hidden layers in a reverse direction as marked with the green dashed arrow, thus generating a series of error signals $\delta_K, \delta_{K-1}, \ldots, \delta_1$. We expect two Markov chains in any feedforward DNNs: an input signal forward propagation chain $X \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow T_K$, and an error backward propagation chain: $\delta_L \rightarrow \delta_K \rightarrow \delta_{K-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \delta_1$.

Despite the great potential of aforementioned early work, there are several open questions when it comes to the applications of information theoretic concepts on CNNs. These include but are not limited to:

1) The accurate and tractable estimation of information quantities in CNNs. Despite the obvious benefits and great simplicity, the first generation of matrix-based Rényi’s $\alpha$-entropy [8] cannot be directly applied to CNNs. This is because the input signal $X$ is represented by multiple feature maps in the convolutional layers, as opposed to a single vector in the fully connected layers. Therefore, it is necessary to extend the current theory of matrix-based Rényi’s $\alpha$-entropy functional to multivariate scenario, such that it can measure the multivariate mutual information between a single variable (e.g., $X$) and a group of variables (e.g., different feature maps).

2) The intrinsic properties of CNNs in the training phase. Although the existence of two DPIs is a fundamental property for any feedforward DNNs (will be validated in Section 3), it would be much more interesting to identify more observations and explore their practical usage, such as the implications to the design and the efficient training of CNNs.

In this paper, we answer these questions and make the following contributions:

1) By generalizing the matrix-based Rényi’s $\alpha$-entropy to multivariate scenario thus enabling the estimation of mutual information between a single variable and a group of variables, we are among the first to systematically analyze the information flow in CNNs.

2) By introducing the partial information decomposition (PID) framework [30], we identified the synergy and redundancy tradeoff amongst different feature
maps in convolutional layers. We also observed how such tradeoff values change along with the width (i.e., the number of filters) of convolutional layer. These results have direct impacts on the design of CNNs.

2 Information Quantity Estimation in CNNs

The entropy of hidden layer representation and the mutual information between any pairwise layer representations are the key to analyze the information flow and hidden properties in any feedforward DNNs in the training phase. In this section, we introduce for completeness the recently proposed matrix-based Rényi’s \( \alpha \)-entropy functional and then generalize it to multivariate scenario, such that such that majority of the relevant information quantities in any feedforward DNNs can be estimated directly from data without any PDF estimation. One should note that, the reliable estimation of the multivariate mutual information that quantifies the amount of information obtained by one variable through a group of other variables, are widely acknowledged as an intractable or infeasible task in machine learning and information theory communities, especially when each variable is in a high-dimensional space. In this perspective, the usage and the effectiveness of our novel definitions are not limited to analyzing the information flow in DNNs, it has great potential in various other real-world applications, such as feature selection [32].

2.1 Matrix-based Rényi’s \( \alpha \)-entropy functional

The Rényi’s \( \alpha \)-order entropy [18] was defined in 1960 as a one-parameter generalization of the celebrated Shannon’s entropy. For a random variable \( X \) with probability density function (PDF) \( f(x) \) in a finite set \( X \), the \( \alpha \)-entropy \( H_\alpha(X) \) is defined as:

\[
H_\alpha(f) = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \log \int_X f^\alpha(x) dx
\]  

The limiting case of (1) for \( \alpha \to 1 \) reduces to Shannon’s entropy. It also turns out that for any real \( \alpha \), the above quantity can be expressed, under some restrictions, as function of inner products between PDFs [17]. In particular, the quadratic entropy and cross-entropy along with Parzen window density estimation lay the foundation for information theoretic learning (ITL) [17] in the last decade.

However, as mentioned earlier, (1) is not feasible on DNNs because \( f(x) \) for high-dimensional variables is hard to estimate. To this end, we suggest using the recently proposed matrix-based Rényi’s \( \alpha \)-entropy functional by Sánchez Giraldo, et al. [8], which is defined in terms of the normalized eigenspectrum of the Hermitian matrix of the projected data in a Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space (RKHS). For brevity, we only provide definitions of entropy and joint entropy as follows.
Definition 1. Let $\kappa : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a real valued positive definite kernel that is also infinitely divisible \cite{6}. Given $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$ and the Gram matrix $G$ obtained from evaluating a positive definite kernel $\kappa$ on all pairs of exemplars, that is $(G)_{ij} = \kappa(x_i, x_j)$, a matrix-based analogue to Rényi’s $\alpha$-entropy for a normalized positive definite (NPD) matrix $A$ of size $n \times n$, such that $\operatorname{tr}(A) = 1$, can be given by the following functional:

$$S_\alpha(A) = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \log_2 (\operatorname{tr}(A^\alpha)) = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \log_2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i(A)^\alpha \right]$$

(2)

where $A_{ij} = \frac{1}{n} \frac{G_{ij}}{\sqrt{G_{ii}G_{jj}}}$, $\operatorname{tr}(\cdot)$ denotes the trace, and $\lambda_i(A)$ denotes the $i$-th eigenvalue of $A$.

Definition 2. Given $n$ pairs of samples $\{z_i = (x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n}$, each sample contains two different types of measurements $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ obtained from the same realization, and the positive definite kernels $\kappa_1 : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $\kappa_2 : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, a matrix-based analogue to Rényi’s $\alpha$-order joint-entropy can be defined as:

$$S_\alpha(A, B) = S_\alpha\left( \frac{A \circ B \operatorname{tr}(A \circ B)}{\operatorname{tr}(A \circ B)} \right)$$

(3)

where $A_{ij} = \kappa_1(x_i, x_j)$, $B_{ij} = \kappa_2(y_i, y_j)$ and $A \circ B$ denotes the Hadamard product between the matrices $A$ and $B$.

The following proposition proved in \cite{8} makes the definition of the above joint entropy compatible with the individual entropies of its components.

**Proposition 1.** Let $A$ and $B$ be two $n \times n$ positive definite matrices with trace 1 with nonnegative entries, and $A_{ii} = B_{ii} = \frac{1}{n}$, for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$. Then the following two inequalities hold:

$$S_\alpha\left( \frac{A \circ B \operatorname{tr}(A \circ B)}{\operatorname{tr}(A \circ B)} \right) \leq S_\alpha(A) + S_\alpha(B),$$

(4)

$$S_\alpha\left( \frac{A \circ B \operatorname{tr}(A \circ B)}{\operatorname{tr}(A \circ B)} \right) \geq \max [S_\alpha(A), S_\alpha(B)].$$

(5)

By Proposition 1, the matrix notion of Rényi’s mutual information in analogy to Shannon’s definition can be expressed as:

$$I_\alpha(A; B) = S_\alpha(A) + S_\alpha(B) - S_\alpha(A, B)$$

(6)

2.2 Extension of matrix-based Rényi’s $\alpha$-entropy functional to multivariate scenario

Despite the elegant expressions and the great simplicity, the matrix-based Rényi’s $\alpha$-entropy (i.e., Eq. (2)) and mutual information (i.e., Eq. (6)) are insufficient to quantify the information flow in CNNs. This is because given $C$ filters in
one convolutional layer, the input image is represented by different feature maps, each characterizing a specific property of the input. This suggests that the amount of information that the convolutional layer gained from input $X$ is preserved in different information sources $T^1, T^2, \cdots, T^C$ (see Fig. 2 for a better understanding). Therefore, the information quantity that we really need to estimate is the multivariate mutual information $I(X; \{T^1, T^2, \cdots, T^C\})$:

$$I(X; \{T^1, T^2, \cdots, T^C\}) = H(X) + H(T^1, T^2, \cdots, T^C) - H(X, T^1, T^2, \cdots, T^C)$$

(7)

where $H$ denotes entropy for a single variable or joint entropy for a group of variables. As can be seen, the key to estimate $I(X; \{T^1, T^2, \cdots, T^C\})$ lies in the reliable estimation of joint entropy among multiple variables. To this end, we give the following definition that generalizes the joint entropy between two variables (i.e., Eq. (3)) to the multivariate scenario.

**Definition 3.** Given a collection of $n$ samples $\{s_i = (x_{i1}^1, x_{i2}^2, \cdots, x_{iC}^C)\}_{i=1}^n$, where the superscript $i$ denotes the sample index, each sample contains $C$ ($C \geq 2$) measurements $x_1 \in X_1, x_2 \in X_2, \cdots, x_C \in X_C$ obtained from the same realization,
where the positive definite kernels \( \kappa_1: \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_1 \mapsto \mathbb{R} \), \( \kappa_2: \mathcal{X}_2 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \mapsto \mathbb{R} \), \ldots, \( \kappa_C: \mathcal{X}_C \times \mathcal{X}_C \mapsto \mathbb{R} \), a matrix-based analogue to Rényi’s \( \alpha \)-order joint-entropy among \( C \) variables can be defined as:

\[
S_\alpha(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_C) = S_\alpha \left( \frac{A_1 \circ A_2 \circ \cdots \circ A_C}{\text{tr}(A_1 \circ A_2 \circ \cdots \circ A_C)} \right)
\]

where \((A_1)_{ij} = \kappa_1(x_i^1, x_j^1)\), \((A_2)_{ij} = \kappa_2(x_i^2, x_j^2)\), \ldots, \((A_C)_{ij} = \kappa_C(x_i^C, x_j^C)\), and \(\circ\) denotes the Hadamard product.

The following two corollaries (proved in \(\text{[32]}\)) serves as a foundation for our Definition 3.

**Corollary 1.** Let \([C]\) be the index set \(\{1, 2, \ldots, C\}\). We partition \([C]\) into two complementary subsets \(s\) and \(\bar{s}\). For any \(s \subset [C]\), denote all indices in \(s\) with \(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_{|s|}\), where \(|.|\) stands for cardinality. Similarly, denote all indices in \(\bar{s}\) with \(\bar{s}_1, \bar{s}_2, \ldots, \bar{s}_{|\bar{s}|}\). Also let \(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_C\) be \(C \times n \times n\) positive definite matrices with trace 1 and nonnegative entries, and \((A_1)_{ii} = (A_2)_{ii} = \cdots = (A_C)_{ii} = \frac{1}{n}\), for \(i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\). Then the following two inequalities hold:

\[
S_\alpha \left( \frac{A_1 \circ A_2 \circ \cdots \circ A_C}{\text{tr}(A_1 \circ A_2 \circ \cdots \circ A_C)} \right) \leq \left[ S_\alpha \left( \frac{A_{s_1} \circ A_{s_2} \circ \cdots \circ A_{s_{|s|}}}{\text{tr}(A_{s_1} \circ A_{s_2} \circ \cdots \circ A_{s_{|s|}})} \right) \right. + \left. S_\alpha \left( \frac{A_{\bar{s}_1} \circ A_{\bar{s}_2} \circ \cdots \circ A_{\bar{s}_{|\bar{s}|}}}{\text{tr}(A_{\bar{s}_1} \circ A_{\bar{s}_2} \circ \cdots \circ A_{\bar{s}_{|\bar{s}|}})} \right) \right],
\]

\[
\text{max} \left[ S_\alpha \left( \frac{A_{s_1} \circ A_{s_2} \circ \cdots \circ A_{s_{|s|}}}{\text{tr}(A_{s_1} \circ A_{s_2} \circ \cdots \circ A_{s_{|s|}})} \right) \right. + \left. S_\alpha \left( \frac{A_{\bar{s}_1} \circ A_{\bar{s}_2} \circ \cdots \circ A_{\bar{s}_{|\bar{s}|}}}{\text{tr}(A_{\bar{s}_1} \circ A_{\bar{s}_2} \circ \cdots \circ A_{\bar{s}_{|\bar{s}|}})} \right) \right].
\]

**Corollary 2.** Let \(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_C\) be \(C \times n \times n\) positive definite matrices with trace 1 and nonnegative entries, and \((A_1)_{ii} = (A_2)_{ii} = \cdots = (A_C)_{ii} = \frac{1}{n}\), for \(i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\). Then the following two inequalities hold:

\[
S_\alpha \left( \frac{A_1 \circ A_2 \circ \cdots \circ A_C}{\text{tr}(A_1 \circ A_2 \circ \cdots \circ A_C)} \right) \leq S_\alpha(A_1) + S_\alpha(A_2) + \cdots + S_\alpha(A_C),
\]

\[
S_\alpha \left( \frac{A_1 \circ A_2 \circ \cdots \circ A_C}{\text{tr}(A_1 \circ A_2 \circ \cdots \circ A_C)} \right) \geq \max \left[ S_\alpha(A_1), S_\alpha(A_2), \ldots, S_\alpha(A_C) \right].
\]

Given Definition 3, suppose we are going to estimate \(H(T^1, T^2, \ldots, T^C)\) (i.e., the joint entropy of \(C\) feature maps in the convolutional layer) in a mini-batch, then \(n\) becomes the mini-batch size and \(x_p^i\) refers to the feature map generated from the \(i\)-th input sample using the \(p\)-th \((1 \leq p \leq C)\) filter. By this, instead of estimating the joint PDF of \(\{T^1, T^2, \ldots, T^C\}\) which is typically unattainable, one just needs to compute \(C\) Gram matrices using a real valued positive definite kernel that is also infinitely divisible.
3 Understanding CNN Training with Multivariate Matrix-based Rényi’s $\alpha$-entropy Functional

This section presents two sets of experiments to corroborate the two DPIs in both forward and backward chains, and the novel nonparametric information theoretic estimators put forth in this work. Specifically, Section 3.1 validates the existence of two DPIs in CNNs, whereas Section 3.2 illustrate, via the application of the PID framework, some interesting observations associated with different CNN topologies in the training phase. Following this, we present two implications to the design and training of CNNs motivated by these results. We finally point out, in Section 3.3 an advanced interpretation to the information plane (IP) that deserve more (theoretical) investigations. All the experiments reported in this work were conducted in MATLAB 2016b under a Windows 10 64bit operating system. Two benchmark datasets, namely MNIST [13] and Fashion-MNIST [31], are selected for evaluation.

The baseline CNN architecture to be considered in this work is a LeNet-5 [13] like network with two convolutional layers, two pooling layers, and two fully connected layers (thus constituting 6 hidden layers). Each convolutional layer consists of $5 \times 5$ filters. We train the CNN using the basic SGD with momentum 0.95 and mini-batch size 128. In both datasets, we select learning rate 0.1 and 10 training epochs. Both “sigmoid” and “ReLU” activation functions are tested. For the estimation of all information quantities in this work, we fix $\alpha = 1.01$ to approximate Shannon’s definition, and use the radial basis function (RBF) kernel $\kappa(x_i, x_j) = \exp(-\frac{\|x_i - x_j\|^2}{2\sigma^2})$ to obtain the Gram matrices. The kernel size $\sigma$ is determined based on the Silverman’s rule of thumb $\sigma = h \times n^{-1/(1+d)}$, where $n$ is the number of samples in the mini-batch (128 in this work), $d$ is the sample dimensionality and $h$ is an empirical value selected experimentally by taking into consideration the data’s average marginal variance. In this paper, we select $h = 5$ for the input signal forward propagation chain and $h = 0.1$ for the error backpropagation chain.

3.1 Validation of Data Processing Inequality

Fig. 3 shows the DPIs in MNIST (the first and second rows) and Fashion-MNIST (the bottom two rows) at the initial training stage, after 1 epoch’s training, after 3 epochs' training and at the final training stage, respectively. We train CNNs on MNIST use “sigmoid” activation function, whereas on Fashion-MNIST we select “ReLU” activation function for higher classification accuracy. As can be seen, $I(X, T_1) \geq I(X, T_2) \geq \cdots \geq I(X, T_K)$ and $I(\delta_L, \delta_K) \geq I(\delta_L, \delta_{K-1}) \geq \cdots \geq I(\delta_L, \delta_1)$ in most of the cases, where $K$ denotes hidden layer index. Note that, there are a few disruptions in the error backpropagation chain. One possible reason is that when the training converges, the error becomes very small such that we cannot select a proper scale parameter $\sigma$ to obtain a reliable estimation of Gram matrix $G$. 
Fig. 3. The DPIs in CNNs. (a)-(d) show the validation results, using a CNN with 2 filters in the first convolutional layer and 2 filters in the second convolutional layer, on MNIST dataset; (e)-(h) show the validation results, using a CNN with 6 filters in the first convolutional layer and 12 filters in the second convolutional layer, on MNIST dataset. Similarly, (i)-(l) show the validation results, using a CNN with 2 filters in the first convolutional layer and 2 filters in the second convolutional layer, on Fashion-MNIST dataset; (m)-(p) show the validation results, using a CNN with 6 filters in the first convolutional layer and 32 filters in the second convolutional layer, on Fashion-MNIST dataset. In each subfigure, the blue curves show the mutual information values $I(X;T)$ in different hidden layers, whereas the green curves show the mutual information values $I(\delta_L;\delta_K)$ in different hidden layers.
3.2 The Redundancy and Synergy in Convolutional Layer Representations

In this section, we explore some hidden properties, with the help of the PID framework, associated with different information theoretic quantities of convolutional layer representations in the training phase of CNNs. Particularly, we are interested in figuring out the redundancy-synergy tradeoff amongst different feature maps and how this tradeoff evolves with training for different CNN topologies. Moreover, we are also interested in identifying some upper or lower limits (if they exist) for these quantities.

Given input signal \( X \) and two feature maps \( T^1 \) and \( T^2 \), the PID framework indicates that the multivariate mutual information \( I(X;\{T^1,T^2\}) \) can be decomposed into four non-negative components: the synergy \( \text{Syn}(X;\{T^1,T^2\}) \) that measures the information about \( X \) provided by the coalition or combination of \( T^1 \) and \( T^2 \) (i.e., the information that cannot be captured by either \( T^1 \) or \( T^2 \) alone); the redundancy \( \text{Rdn}(X;\{T^1,T^2\}) \) that measures the shared information about \( X \) that can be provided by either \( T^1 \) or \( T^2 \); the unique information \( \text{Unq}(X;T^1) \) (or \( \text{Unq}(X;T^2) \)) that measures the information about \( X \) that can only be provided by \( T^1 \) (or \( T^2 \)). Moreover, the unique information, the synergy and the redundancy satisfy (see Fig. 4 for better understanding):

\[
I(X;\{T^1,T^2\}) = \text{Syn}(X;\{T^1,T^2\}) + \text{Rdn}(X;\{T^1,T^2\}) + \text{Unq}(X;T^1) + \text{Unq}(X;T^2);
\]

\[
I(X;T^1) = \text{Rdn}(X;\{T^1,T^2\}) + \text{Unq}(X;T^1);
\]

\[
I(X;T^2) = \text{Rdn}(X;\{T^1,T^2\}) + \text{Unq}(X;T^2).
\]

The intuitive framework for \( I(X;\{T^1,T^2\}) \) can be straightforwardly extended for more than three variables, thus decomposing \( I(X;\{T^1,T^2,\ldots,T^K\}) \) into much more components. For example, if \( K = 4 \), there will be 166 individual non-negative items. Admittedly, the PID framework coupled with its Lattice decomposition structure give us an intuitive manner to understand the interactions between input and different feature maps, the reliable estimation to each PID term still remains a big challenge. In fact, there is even no universal agreement on the definition of synergy and redundancy among one-dimensional 3-way interactions, let alone the estimation of each synergy or redundancy item among numerous variables in high-dimensional space [59].

In light of the above descriptions, this work suggests monitoring three simple yet effective quantities (marked in red for emphasis) that characterize different intrinsic properties of CNN representations (in the training phase):

1) \( I(X;\{T^1,T^2,\ldots,T^K\}) \), which is referred to multivariate mutual information. This quantity measures the total amount of information about \( X \) that is captured by all feature maps (in one convolutional layer).

2) \( \frac{2}{K(K-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{K} \sum_{j=i+1}^{K} I(X;T^i) + I(X;T^j) - I(X;\{T^i,T^j\}) \), which is referred to redundancy-synergy tradeoff or co-information [3] in other literature (e.g., [27]). This quantity measures the (average) redundancy-synergy tradeoff amongst different feature maps. This is because \( I(X;T^i) + I(X;T^j) - I(X;\{T^i,T^j\}) = \text{Rdn}(X;\{T^i,T^j\}) - \text{Syn}(X;\{T^i,T^j\}) \) (by Eqs. (13)-(15)). Intuitively, a positive
(a) Input interacts with 2 feature maps

(b) Partial information decomposition to $I(X;\{T^1, T^2\})$

Fig. 4. Synergy and redundancy amongst feature maps in one convolutional layer.
(a) shows the interactions between input signal and two feature maps. The shadow area indicates the multivariate mutual information $I(X;\{T^1, T^2\})$. (b) shows the partial information decomposition (PID) framework to $I(X;\{T^1, T^2\})$: $\text{Syn}(X;\{T^1, T^2\})$, $\text{Rdn}(X;\{T^1, T^2\})$, $\text{Unq}(X;T^1)$ and $\text{Unq}(X;T^2)$ denote the synergy, the redundancy, the unique information of feature map $T^1$, and the unique information of feature map $T^2$, respectively.

value of this tradeoff implies redundancy, whereas a negative value signifies

As mentioned earlier, it is intractable to compute the real redundancy and

We compute these three quantities in the training phase, and compare their

3) $\frac{2}{K(K-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{K} \sum_{j=i+1}^{K} 2 \times I(X;\{T^i, T^j\}) - I(X; T^i) - I(X; T^j)$, which is referred to weighted non-redundant information. This quantity measures the (average) amount of non-redundant information about $X$ that is captured by pairs of feature maps, as $2 \times I(X;\{T^i, T^j\}) - I(X; T^i) - I(X; T^j) = \text{Unq}(X;T^i) + \text{Unq}(X;T^j) + 2 \times \text{Syn}(X;\{T^i, T^j\})$ (by Eqs.(13)-(15)). Despite the simplicity of this quantity, one should note that we overemphasized the role of synergy.

3 The actual amount of non-redundant information is $\text{Unq}(X;T^i) + \text{Unq}(X;T^j) + \text{Syn}(X;\{T^i, T^j\})$, rather than $\text{Unq}(X;T^i) + \text{Unq}(X;T^j) + 2 \times \text{Syn}(X;\{T^i, T^j\})$. 

The multivariate mutual information, the redundancy-synergy tradeoff, and the weighted non-redundant information in CNNs trained on MNIST dataset. (a)-(d) show the multivariate mutual information for the first and second convolutional layer representations $C_1$ and $C_2$, respectively. The dashed black line indicates the average mini-batch input entropy (also the upper bound of the multivariate mutual information). We also report the average classification accuracy (%) on testing set (over 10 Monte-Carlo simulations) in the subtitle. (e) and (f) demonstrate the percentages of redundancy-synergy tradeoff and the weighted non-redundant information, with respect to the multivariate mutual information in each pair of feature maps, for CNNs with different number of filters in $C_1$, but 12 filters in $C_2$. (g) and (h) demonstrate the percentages of redundancy-synergy tradeoff and the weighted non-redundant information, with respect to the multivariate mutual information in each pair of feature maps, for CNNs with 6 filters in $C_1$, but different number of filters in $C_2$. 

Fig. 5. The multivariate mutual information, the redundancy-synergy tradeoff, and the weighted non-redundant information in CNNs trained on MNIST dataset. (a)-(d) show the multivariate mutual information for the first and second convolutional layer representations $C_1$ and $C_2$, respectively. The dashed black line indicates the average mini-batch input entropy (also the upper bound of the multivariate mutual information). We also report the average classification accuracy (%) on testing set (over 10 Monte-Carlo simulations) in the subtitle. (e) and (f) demonstrate the percentages of redundancy-synergy tradeoff and the weighted non-redundant information, with respect to the multivariate mutual information in each pair of feature maps, for CNNs with different number of filters in $C_1$, but 12 filters in $C_2$. (g) and (h) demonstrate the percentages of redundancy-synergy tradeoff and the weighted non-redundant information, with respect to the multivariate mutual information in each pair of feature maps, for CNNs with 6 filters in $C_1$, but different number of filters in $C_2$. 

(a) 2 filters in $C_1$, (b) 6 filters in $C_1$, (c) 128 filters in $C_1$, (d) 6 filters in $C_1$. 2 filters in $C_2$; av-32 filters in $C_2$; av-32 filters in $C_2$; av-128 filters in $C_2$. 

Monte-Carlo simulations) in the subtitle. (e) and (f) demonstrate the percentages of redundancy-synergy tradeoff and the weighted non-redundant information, with respect to the multivariate mutual information in each pair of feature maps, for CNNs with different number of filters in $C_1$, but 12 filters in $C_2$. (g) and (h) demonstrate the percentages of redundancy-synergy tradeoff and the weighted non-redundant information, with respect to the multivariate mutual information in each pair of feature maps, for CNNs with 6 filters in $C_1$, but different number of filters in $C_2$.
Fig. 6. The multivariate mutual information, the redundancy-synergy tradeoff, and the weighted non-redundant information in CNNs trained on Fashion-MNIST dataset. (a)-(d) show the multivariate mutual information for the first and second convolutional layer representations $C_1$ and $C_2$, respectively. The dashed black line indicates the average mini-batch input entropy (also the upper bound of the multivariate mutual information). We also report the average classification accuracy (%) on testing set (over 10 Monte-Carlo simulations) in the subtitle. (e) and (f) demonstrate the percentages of redundancy-synergy tradeoff accounts for the multivariate mutual information in each pair of feature maps. The network differs in the number of filters in $C_1$. (g) and (h) demonstrate the percentages of redundancy-synergy tradeoff accounts for the multivariate mutual information in each pair of feature maps. The network differs in the number of filters in $C_2$. (a) 2 filters in $C_1$, (b) 6 filters in $C_1$, (c) 128 filters in $C_1$, (d) 6 filters in $C_1$. 2 filters in $C_2$; av-32 filters in $C_2$; av-32 filters in $C_2$; av-128 filters in $C_2$; average classification accuracy: 68.25 accuracy: 87.71 accuracy: 87.05 accuracy: 88.38.
with the increase of the number of filters, the total amount of information that each convolutional layer captured also increases correspondingly. Moreover, it is very interesting to find that only using 6 filters in the first convolutional layer and 32 filters in the second convolutional layer, the multivariate mutual information values can approach to their theoretical maximum (i.e., the ensemble average entropy of mini-batch input). More filters (in a reasonable range) can improve the classification performance. However, if we blindly increase the number of filters in two convolutional layers, the classification accuracy cannot increase anymore or even becomes worse.

We argue that this phenomenon can be explained with the percentage that the redundancy-synergy tradeoff or the weighted non-redundant information accounts for the multivariate mutual information in each pair of feature maps, i.e.,

\[
\frac{2}{K(K-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{K} \sum_{j=i+1}^{K} \left( \frac{I(X;T^i) + I(X;T^j) - I(X;\{T^i,T^j\})}{I(X;\{T^i,T^j\})} \right) \\
\frac{2}{K(K-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{K} \sum_{j=i+1}^{K} \left( 2xI(X;\{T^i,T^j\}) - I(X;T^i) - I(X;T^j) \right) \frac{I(X;\{T^i,T^j\})}{I(X;\{T^i,T^j\})}
\]

In fact, by referring to Fig. 5(e)-Fig. 5(h) and Fig. 6(e)-Fig. 6(h), it is obvious that more filters can push the network towards an improved redundancy-synergy tradeoff, i.e., the synergy gradually dominates in each pair of feature maps with the increase of number of filters. That is perhaps one of the main reasons why the increased number of filters can lead to better classification performance, even though the total multivariate mutual information keeps the same. However, if we look deeper, it seems that the redundancy is always larger than the synergy such that their tradeoff can never cross the x-axis. This is unfortunate, because it may suggest a (virtual) lower bound on the redundancy-synergy tradeoff. On the other hand, one should note that the amount of non-redundant information is always less than (or upper bounded by) the multivariate mutual information no matter the number of filters, therefore it is impossible to improve the classification performance by blindly increasing the number of filters.

Having illustrated the DPIs and the redundancy-synergy tradeoffs, it is easy to summarize some implications concerning the design and training of CNNs. First, as a possible application of DPI in the error backpropagation chain, one has to realize that the DPI provides an indicator on where to perform the “bypass” in the recently proposed Relay backpropagation [21]. Second, the DPIs and the redundancy-synergy tradeoff may give some guidelines on the depth and width of CNNs. Indeed, we need multiple layers to denoise the input and to extract representations from different abstract levels. However, more layers will lead to severe information loss. The same interpretation goes for the number of filters in convolutional layers, we need sufficient number of filters to ensure the layer representations can extract and transfer input information as much as possible and to learn a good redundancy-synergy tradeoff. However, too many filters do not always lead to the increased amount of the non-redundant information, as the minimum probability of classification error is upper bounded by the mutual information expressed in different forms (e.g., [11,19]).

\[The only exception comes from Figs. 6(e) and 6(f), in which the CNN (with 16 filters in C1 and 128 filters in C2) has more synergy at the initial training stage.\]
3.3 Revisiting the Information Plane (IP)

IP refers to the plane of information that each hidden layer representation \( T \) preserves about the input signal \( X \) with respect to desired signal \( Y \). Schwartz-Ziv and Tishby [22] implemented IP on a simple MLP with the classical Shannon's discrete entropy and mutual information. They argue that the curves in IP have two separate phases in the common SGD optimization procedure: both \( I(X; T) \) and \( I(T; Y) \) increase rapidly in the early “fitting” phase, but gradually decrease in the second “compression” phase. This argument was later questioned in [20] using the same network topology but different activation functions. According to [20], double-sided saturating nonlinearities (e.g., “sigmoid”) yield a compression phase when the units become saturated, but linear activation functions and single-sided saturating nonlinearities (e.g., “ReLU”) in fact do not show such feature.

In [33], we implement IP on SAEs with the matrix-based Rényi’s \( \alpha \)-entropy functional. Unlike [20,22], we find that the existence of the second “compression” phase depends on the value of bottleneck layer size \( K \) of SAEs. This is intuitive, because if \( K < d \) (the intrinsic dimensionality of given data), the bottleneck layer projection space does not have sufficient degree of freedom to reconstruct input signal without any information loss, thus the bottleneck layer representation consistently attempts to fill up the projection space to ensure minimum reconstruction distortion (see [33] for more details).

The IPs for different CNN topologies on MNIST and Fashion-MNIST datasets are shown in Fig. 7 and Fig. 8 respectively. At first glance, both \( I(X; T) \) and \( I(T; Y) \) increase rapidly up to a certain point with the SGD iterations, independently of the adopted activation functions or the number of filters in the convolutional layers (see the first row in each figure). This result suggests that the behaviour of CNNs in the IP not being the same as that of the MLPs in [20,22] and our intrinsic dimensionality hypothesis in [33] is specific to SAEs. However, if we remove the redundancy in \( I(X; T) \) and \( I(T; Y) \), and only preserve the unique information and the synergy (i.e., substituting \( I(X; T) \) and \( I(T; Y) \) with their corresponding (average) weighted non-redundant information defined in Section 3.2), it is easy to observe the “compression” phase in the modified IP. Same as [20], it seems that the “sigmoid” activation function is more likely to result in the “compression”, compared with the “ReLU” activation function. However, using “sigmoid” activation function is not the necessary condition of “compression”, and vice versa.

4 Conclusion and Future Work

This paper presents a systematic method to analyze convolutional neural networks (CNNs) mappings and training using information theoretic concepts. By generalizing the matrix-based Rényi’s \( \alpha \)-entropy functional to multivariate scenario, we validated two data processing inequalities (DPIs) in CNNs associated with respectively the input signal forward propagation chain and the error backward propagation chain. The introduction of partial information decomposition
(PID) framework enables us to pinpoint beneficial information in layer representations and to figure out the redundancy-synergy tradeoff amongst different feature maps. Our results and methodology have direct impacts on the design and training of CNNs, thus opening the door to analyze CNNs using information theoretic concepts. For future work, we are interested in two extensions:

1) All the information quantities mentioned in this paper are estimated based on a vector rastering of samples, i.e., each layer input (e.g., an input image, a feature map) is first converted to a single vector before entropy or mutual information estimation. Albeit its simplicity, we distort spatial relationships amongst neighboring pixels, i.e., we are investigating hidden properties in CNNs using vector flow, rather than tensor flow. Therefore, a question remains on the reliable information theoretic estimation that is feasible to a tensor structure.

2) We look forward to testing and validating the observations shown in this work on more complex CNN architecture, such as the VGGNet [24], the ResNet [10], or even the Inception v3 [25]. Some initial work has been done.
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Fig. 7. The Information Plane (IP) and modified Information Plane (M-IP) of different CNN topologies trained on MNIST dataset. (a), (d) and (g) demonstrate the IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), the M-IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), and the M-IP (trained with “ReLU” activation function) respectively of a baseline CNN with 6 filters in C1 and 6 filters in C2. (b), (e) and (h) demonstrate the IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), the M-IP (trained with “ReLU” activation function) and the M-IP (trained with “ReLU” activation function) respectively of a baseline CNN with 16 filters in C1 and 32 filters in C2. (c), (f) and (i) demonstrate the IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), the M-IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), and the M-IP (trained with “ReLU” activation function) respectively of a baseline CNN with 16 filters in C1 and 32 filters in C2. In all IPs defined in [22], the curves increase rapidly up to a point without the co-called “compression” phase. By contrast, in M-IPs, it is easy to observe the “compression” on the weighted non-redundant information. Moreover, compared with the “ReLU” activation function, the “sigmoid” activation function is more likely to result in the “compression”.
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Fig. 8. The Information Plane (IP) and modified Information Plane (M-IP) of different CNN topologies trained on Fashion-MNIST dataset. (a), (d) and (g) demonstrate the IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), the M-IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), and the M-IP (trained with “ReLU” activation function) respectively of a baseline CNN with 6 filters in $C_1$, 6 filters in $C_2$. (b), (e) and (h) demonstrate the IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), the M-IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), and the M-IP (trained with “ReLU” activation function) respectively of a baseline CNN with 6 filters in $C_1$ and 32 filters in $C_2$. (c), (f) and (i) demonstrate the IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), the M-IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), and the M-IP (trained with “ReLU” activation function) respectively of a baseline CNN with 16 filters in $C_1$, 6 filters in $C_2$. (c), (f) and (i) demonstrate the IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), the M-IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), and the M-IP (trained with “ReLU” activation function) respectively of a baseline CNN with 16 filters in $C_1$ and 32 filters in $C_2$. In all IPs defined in [22], the curves increase rapidly up to a point without the co-called “compression” phase. By contrast, in M-IPs, it is easy to observe the “compression” on the weighted non-redundant information. Moreover, compared with the “ReLU” activation function, the “sigmoid” activation function is more likely to result in the “compression”.

The Information Plane (IP) and modified Information Plane (M-IP) of different CNN topologies trained on Fashion-MNIST dataset. (a), (d) and (g) demonstrate the IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), the M-IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), and the M-IP (trained with “ReLU” activation function) respectively of a baseline CNN with 6 filters in $C_1$, 6 filters in $C_2$. (b), (e) and (h) demonstrate the IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), the M-IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), and the M-IP (trained with “ReLU” activation function) respectively of a baseline CNN with 6 filters in $C_1$ and 32 filters in $C_2$. (c), (f) and (i) demonstrate the IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), the M-IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), and the M-IP (trained with “ReLU” activation function) respectively of a baseline CNN with 16 filters in $C_1$, 6 filters in $C_2$. (c), (f) and (i) demonstrate the IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), the M-IP (trained with “sigmoid” activation function), and the M-IP (trained with “ReLU” activation function) respectively of a baseline CNN with 16 filters in $C_1$ and 32 filters in $C_2$. In all IPs defined in [22], the curves increase rapidly up to a point without the co-called “compression” phase. By contrast, in M-IPs, it is easy to observe the “compression” on the weighted non-redundant information. Moreover, compared with the “ReLU” activation function, the “sigmoid” activation function is more likely to result in the “compression”.