

# Periodic Spectral Ergodicity: A Complexity Measure for Deep Neural Networks and Neural Architecture Search

**Mehmet Süzen**

Member ACM and IoP

E-mail: [suzen@acm.org](mailto:suzen@acm.org); [mehmet.suzen@physics.org](mailto:mehmet.suzen@physics.org)

**J. J. Cerdà**

Department of Physics, University of the Balearic Islands, Crta. de Valldemossa, km 7.5, 07122 Palma (Illes Balears), Spain

E-mail: [jj.cerda@uib.cat](mailto:jj.cerda@uib.cat)

**Cornelius Weber**

Department of Informatics, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, University of Hamburg, Germany

E-mail: [weber@informatik.uni-hamburg.de](mailto:weber@informatik.uni-hamburg.de)

January 2020

**Abstract.** Establishing associations between the structure and the generalisation ability of deep neural networks (DNNs) is a challenging task in modern machine learning. Producing solutions to this challenge will bring progress both in the theoretical understanding of DNNs and in building new architectures efficiently. In this work, we address this challenge by developing a new complexity measure based on the concept of Periodic Spectral Ergodicity (PSE) originating from quantum statistical mechanics. Based on this measure a technique is devised to quantify the complexity of deep neural networks from the learned weights and traversing the network connectivity in a sequential manner, hence the term cascading PSE (cPSE), as an empirical complexity measure. This measure will capture both topological and internal neural processing complexity simultaneously. Because of this cascading approach, i.e., a symmetric divergence of PSE on the consecutive layers, it is possible to use this measure for Neural Architecture Search (NAS). We demonstrate the usefulness of this measure in practice on two sets of vision models, ResNet and VGG, and sketch the computation of cPSE for more complex network structures.

*Keywords:* Complexity, Spectral Ergodicity, Deep Neural Networks

## 1. Introduction

Complexity measures appear in multiple fields from physics to medicine in the design of artificial systems, the understanding of natural phenomena and the detection of signals [1–4]. One of the prominent example systems requiring robust complexity measures appear to be machine learning systems. Their recent success in producing learning systems exceeding human ability in some tasks is attributed to deep learning [5–7], i.e. Deep Neural Networks (DNNs). However, understanding complexity of DNNs both in structure and from learning theory perspective lagged behind their practical engineering success. LeCun [8] has made an analogy that this situation resembles lack of theory of thermodynamics and the success of thermal machines in early industrial revolution.


Sophisticated neural network architectures used in deep learning are still built by human experts who are usually highly mathematically minded. Understanding the guiding principles in such design process will help experts to increase their efficiency in producing superior architectures. Neural Architecture Search (NAS) methods have already been proposed [9] in this direction. NAS methods usually operate on the search space, with a search strategy and a guiding performance estimation strategy. Embedding complexity measures in both search strategy and performance estimation strategy could accelerate the NAS frameworks. Complexity measures for supervised classification were suggested [10], however these measures do not specifically address deep learning architectures. Recently a complexity measure for characterising deep learning structural complexity is proposed based on topological data analysis [11, 12], which can be used in NAS. It requires embedding the computation of the measure into the learning algorithm.

In this work, we extend a definition of spectral ergodicity for an ensemble of matrices [13] to handle different sized matrices within the same ensemble. This is possible by defining a periodicity on the eigenvalue vectors via a method, so called *Periodic Spectral Ergodicity (PSE)* on the learned weights. Our main mathematical object is defined as a complexity measure for the neural network based on PSE. This measure reflects structure of the network with a cascading computation of PSEs on the consecutive layers. This leads to a complexity of DNNs measure called cascading PSE (cPSE). A reason why deep neural networks generalise better with over-parametrisation is a challenge for generic setting [14], cPSE addresses this as well.

The usage of spectral properties of neural networks, i.e., learned weight matrices or Hessian matrix, has appeared recently in novel works in an attempt to build a strong theoretical foundation for DNNs [15–20] and extracting feature interaction [21]. Current work follows a similar ethos.

## 2. Periodic spectral ergodicity

Spectral ergodicity originates from quantum statistical mechanics [22]. In a recent inception it is attributed as a reason why deep neural networks perform in high accuracy, demonstrated on random matrix ensembles as surrogate to weight matrix ensembles [13]. In that work, only fixed size complex matrix ensembles were used to measure the ensemble’s approach to spectral ergodicity. Changing matrix dimensions in ensembles corresponds to increasing the size of a single layer, as an interpretation. Circular ensembles were used in that study as surrogate matrices having close to unit



**Figure 1.** A sample arbitrary architecture *a fork*. In the fork each edge represents an arbitrary DNN layer. This architecture is a special case of fully connected feedforward architecture, certain connections are removed.

spectral radius. In trained neural network's weight matrices, it is known that unit spectral radius prevents gradient instabilities. However informative, this approach was short of direct usage in real practical networks even though it has given empirical evidence of usefulness of spectral ergodicity. One shortcoming was how to handle different size weight matrices and the second one was how to transform complex layer structures like multi-dimensional convolutional units to a weight matrix.

Having multi-dimensional connections between two consecutive layers leads to a tensor representation of the deep neural network. For this reason, we defined a *Layer Matrix Ensemble*  $\mathcal{L}^m$ , that is coming from  $m$  layer connections via mapping from multi-dimensional connections, i.e., trained weights, to two-dimensional square matrices  $X_l$  of size  $N_l \times N_l$  where  $N_l \geq 2$ , see Definition 1. In the case of linear connections, this mapping acts as a unit transformation. This would enable us to generate a layer matrix ensemble or simply weight matrices of any trained deep neural network architecture.

**Definition 1.** *Layer Matrix Ensemble  $\mathcal{L}^m$*


The weights  $W_l \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2 \times \dots \times p_n}$  are obtained from a trained deep neural network architecture's layer  $l$  as an  $n$ -dimensional Tensor. A Layer Matrix Ensemble  $\mathcal{L}^m$  is formed by transforming  $m$  set of weights  $W_l$  to square matrices  $X_l \in \mathbb{R}^{N_l \times N_l}$ , that  $X_l = A_l \cdot A_l^T$  and  $A_l \in \mathbb{R}^{N_l \times M_l}$  is merely a stacked up version of  $W_l$  where  $n > 1$ ,  $N_l = p_1$ ,  $M_l = \prod_{j=2}^n p_j$  and  $p_j, n, m, N_l, M_l, j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . Consequently  $\mathcal{L}^m$  will have  $m$  potentially different  $N_l$  size square matrices  $X_l$  of at least size  $2 \times 2$ .

The original definition of spectral ergodicity for DNNs [13] relies on the same size squared matrices in the matrix ensemble. We proceed with applying periodic or cyclic conditions to all eigenvalue vectors, obtaining periodic eigenvalue vectors  $\mathcal{E}^m$ , see Definition 2. This preprocessing step produces a suitable dataset extracted from trained neural network weights, preserving layer order, that can be used in computing approach to spectral ergodicity.

**Definition 2.** *Periodic eigenvalue vectors  $\mathcal{E}^m$*

Given layer matrix ensemble  $\mathcal{L}^m$ , the set of eigenvalue vectors of length  $N_l$  is computed, eigenvalues of  $X_l$  as  $e_l$ . Naturally, not all vectors will be same length. In order to align the different size vectors, first we identify the maximum length eigenvalue vector,  $l_{max} = \max |e_l|$ . Then, we align all other eigenvalue vectors by applying cyclic boundary condition, meaning that replicating them up to length  $l_{max}$ , simply  $N$  hereafter.

Given layer  $L$  and  $N$  eigenvalues, a spectral density  $\rho_j$  is computed for all  $j$  layers from first to the layer  $L$  using periodic eigenvectors  $\mathcal{E}^m$ . Here a layer corresponds to



**Figure 2.**  $D_{pse}$ , and for VGG architecture variants (left) and with batch normalisation (right).

the weight matrices in the layer matrix ensemble. Spectral ergodicity at layer  $L$  is defined as a distribution extracted from spectral densities,

$$\Omega^L = \Omega^L(b_k) = \frac{1}{L \cdot N} \sum_{j=1}^L \left[ \rho_j(b_k) - \overline{\rho^L(b_k)} \right]^2, \quad (1)$$

where  $b_k$  are histogram bin centres, and  $j$  represents layer  $l \leq L$ . The mean spectral density up to layer  $L$  is given by

$$\overline{\rho^L(b_k)} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{j=1}^L \rho_j(b_k).$$

Since  $\Omega^L$  alone is a distribution, in order to get an approach to spectral ergodicity over increasing depth we define a symmetric distance metric between two consecutive layers,  $D_{pse}$ , as follows,

$$D_{pse} = D_{pse}(N_l, N_{l+1}) = D_{KL}(\Omega^l | \Omega^{l+1}) + D_{KL}(\Omega^{l+1} | \Omega^l). \quad (2)$$

The terms on the right are Kullback-Leibler divergence between consecutive layers, one backwards, and they are defined as follows, sums run over spectral density bins,

$$D_{KL}(\Omega^l | \Omega^{l+1}) = \sum_k \Omega^l \log_2 \frac{\Omega^l}{\Omega^{l+1}},$$

$$D_{KL}(\Omega^{l+1} | \Omega^l) = \sum_k \Omega^{l+1} \log_2 \frac{\Omega^{l+1}}{\Omega^l}.$$

It is shown on circular complex matrix ensembles that increasing layer sizes decreases the value of  $D_{pse}$ .  $D_{pse}$  is defined to be a distance metric for *approach to spectral ergodicity* for DNNs.

### 2.1. Cascading PSE for feed forward networks

Complexity of an entire feed forward neural networks, possibly having many complicated connections as in convolution units, can be identified with the *approach to spectral ergodicity* for a given  $L$  layered network,

$$\mathcal{C}^L = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} \log_{10} D_{pse}(N_l, N_{l+1}), \quad (3)$$

which is identified as cascading PSE (cPSE).

**Theorem 1.** *Decreasing cPSE for feedforward networks*

*Given  $L$  layered DNN and corresponding complexity cPSE  $\mathcal{C}^L$ , adding one more layer to the DNN almost certainly will not increase the complexity measure cPSE,  $\mathcal{C}^L \geq \mathcal{C}^{L+1}$ . Hence, lower cPSE implies higher complexity.*

*Proof.* The approach to ergodicity requires decreasing values in distance metric  $\log_{10} D_{pse}$  for well behaved spectra. Given

$$Dl_{l,l+1} = \log_{10} D_{pse}(N_l, N_{l+1})$$

then it follows

$$Dl_{1,2} > Dl_{2,3} > Dl_{3,4} > \dots > Dl_{l-1,l} > Dl_{l,l+1}, \dots$$

because of the fact that increasing ensemble size  $\Omega_L$  should approach to zero monotonically, leading to decreasing symmetric distance on consecutive layers. This implies  $Dl_{1,2} > \dots > Dl_{L-1,L}$ .

Now, let's say  $\mathcal{C}^{L+1} > \mathcal{C}^L$  contradicting the theorem, this yields to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} Dl_{l,l+1} &< \frac{1}{L+1} \sum_{l=1}^L Dl_{l,l+1} \\ \frac{L}{L^2 + L} \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} Dl_{l,l+1} &< Dl_{L,L+1} \\ \lambda &< Dl_{L,L+1} \end{aligned}$$

is a contradiction as  $L$  is very large both  $Dl_{L,L+1}$  and  $\lambda$  approaches to zero. So  $Dl_{L,L+1}$  can not be greater than  $\lambda$  for large  $L$ . Hence, the value of cPSE by adding one layer should not increase,  $\mathcal{C}^{L+1} \leq \mathcal{C}^L$ . □

The assertion that increasing number of layers will decrease the complexity measure  $\mathcal{C}^L$  given in Theorem 1. Interpretation of this assertion follows a reverse effect. This means an increasingly complex deep network will have a smaller  $\mathcal{C}^L$  value. This agrees with the notion that removing a connection decreases complexity [23]. However, this assertion is closely related to the learning performance too. Decreasing value of  $\mathcal{C}^L$  follows performance improvement, i.e., complexity measure is directly correlated to learning performance. Once a network reached *periodic spectral ergodicity*, very small  $D_{pse}$  values, the designed network's performance will not increase. This is a consequence of Theorem 1.




Figure 3.  $D_{pse}$  for ResNet architecture variants.

**Proposition 1.** *Performance and cPSE*

Given an  $L$  layered DNN, corresponding complexity cPSE  $\mathcal{C}^L$  and generalisation performance measure  $\mathcal{P}^L$ . Given a set of ordered series  $\mathcal{S}^C = (L, \mathcal{C}^L)$  and  $\mathcal{S}^P = (L, \mathcal{P}^L)$ . For a large enough set of values of  $L$ ,  $\mathcal{S}^C$  and  $\mathcal{S}^P$  are almost perfectly correlated.

It is observed that adding many more layers to a DNNs degrade the performance after certain depth [24]. We asserted that this discrepancy is a characteristics of training and numerical difficulty, rather than a generalised theoretical property of correspondance between learning and the architectures. Performance should not degrade just to due to depth, if everything else fixed, as a logical inference from Theorem 1.

## 2.2. Cascading PSE for forward architectures

The extension of feedforward complexity  $\mathcal{C}^L$  to any type of connectionist architecture lies in how to treat branching connections, i.e., a layer connecting to multiple layers. A basic rule to treat branches, compute complexity up to a branching point and also up to end of the branch, the difference of the value would give the branch complexity. By this rule one could compute cPSE for entire arbitrary architectures.

We demonstrate the computation of cPSE for arbitrary architecture with a dummy example. The fork shaped architecture is identified with 15 layers, braching out at layer 3 to 3 different branches, see Figure 1. Using layer ranges as subscripts to indicate cPSE computation in between those layers, total cPSE for the fork architecture reads,

$$\mathcal{C}^L = \mathcal{C}_{1-7}^L + \mathcal{C}_{1-11}^L + \mathcal{C}_{1-15}^L - 2 \cdot \mathcal{C}_{1-3}^L.$$

Automation of this branching rule might require efficient graph algorithms for more complex architectures in detecting branches. For recurrent networks, a transformed version of the architecture to non-recurrent topology is needed to compute cPSE. Note that the fork architecture is a special case of fully connected feedforward architecture, certain connections are removed. Fork architecture demonstrates multiple parallel streams. Hence, layer types, convolutional, or residual connections can be handled by cPSE.

| Architecture | Top-1 error | Top-5 error | cPSE  |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------|
| vgg11        | 30.98       | 11.37       | 0.04  |
| vgg13        | 30.07       | 10.75       | 0.41  |
| vgg16        | 28.41       | 9.63        | 0.14  |
| vgg19        | 27.62       | 9.12        | -0.10 |
| vgg11bn      | 29.62       | 10.19       | 0.38  |
| vgg13bn      | 28.45       | 9.63        | 0.36  |
| vgg16bn      | 26.63       | 8.50        | 0.18  |
| vgg19bn      | 25.76       | 8.15        | -0.07 |
| resnet18     | 30.24       | 10.92       | -0.19 |
| resnet34     | 26.70       | 8.58        | -0.74 |
| resnet50     | 23.85       | 7.13        | -1.03 |
| resnet101    | 22.63       | 6.44        | -1.77 |
| resnet152    | 21.69       | 5.94        | -2.29 |

**Table 1.** Classification performance and cPSE of investigated architectures. The correlation between both classification performances and cPSE for ResNet ( $\rho = 0.94$ ), and for VGG ( $\rho = 0.44$  and  $\rho_{bn} = 0.93$  with batch normalisation).

### 3. Experiments

We tested our assertions and framework on real-life feed forward architectures designed for vision tasks: ResNet and VGG variants. Pre-trained weights on ImageNet classification task [24] are used to build *Layer Matrix Ensembles* to compute  $D_{pse}$  over increasing layer depth within the architecture variant. Overall network complexity  $\mathcal{C}^L$  is computed via mean  $\log_N D_{pse}$  values and shows to be decreasing with depth.

#### 3.1. VGG architectures

The convolutional network depth investigated for visual image classification [25], so called VGG architectures. We have used pre-trained VGG in computing  $D_{pse}$ , approach to PSE over layers and single *cPSE* measure per variant. Results are summarized in Figure 2. We observe the decreasing  $D_{pse}$  values increasing depth. The VGG variants and their corresponding batched normalised versions: *vgg11*, *vgg13*, *vgg16* and *vgg19*. We observed that *vgg11*'s cPSE did not obey the monotonicity of cPSE. However batched normalised *vgg11* did obey. VGG11 does not obey monotonicity because it might be too shallow for cPSE to capture the variation of spectral density.

#### 3.2. ResNet architectures

A residual neural network (ResNet) brings state-of-the-art results in visual object classification tasks by introducing layer skip procedures in training [26]. We have used pre-trained variants of ResNet: *resnet18*, *resnet34*, *resnet50*, *resnet101* and *resnet152* in computing  $D_{pse}$ , approach to PSE over layers and single *cPSE* measure per variant.

### 4. Empirical evidence for correlation to performance

We have compared cPSE values for each architecture from our ResNet and VGG variants against their misclassification test errors. We found very strong correlation

between classification performance on a test dataset and cPSE for the ResNet and VGG. Correlations remain the same for both top-1 and top-5 errors. We attribute the drop in correlation for VGG poorer training approach and the effect of batch normalisation. The summary is given in Table 1, classification performance and cPSE of investigated architectures. The correlation between both classification performances and cPSE for ResNet  $\rho = 0.94$  for VGG  $\rho = 0.44$  and  $\rho_{bn} = 0.93$  with batch normalisation. Results show empirical evidence supporting Proposition 1. The higher the depth the smaller the cPSE complexity measure.

## 5. Conclusion

We developed a complexity measure for arbitrary neural network architectures based on *spectral ergodicity* defined on learned weights among layers so called cPSE measure. This measure has given consistent numerical results on the ResNet and VGG architectures. We also sketch how to compute cPSE with branched networks, i.e. arbitrary architectures. cPSE provided a quantitative relation between architecture and learning performance in our test. Moreover, we provided mathematical properties of cPSE, such as monotonicity.

In this work, we explain the success of deeper neural networks via theoretically founded structural complexity measure. Going beyond theoretical understanding, proposed complexity measure for DNNs is simple to implement and it can be directly used in practice with a minimal effort. Usage of our complexity measure can also be embedded into NAS methods. For this reason, we sketch how to compute cPSE for arbitrarily branched networks. Search strategies can use cPSE in deciding how to grow a network or in genetic algorithms settings how to mutate to a new structure leveraging the cPSE.

We also assert that cPSE can provide hints to explain why deep neural networks generalize better with over-parametrization.

## Acknowledgements and Notes

We would like to express our gratitude to Charles Martin for pointing us out the usage of pre-trained weights from *pytorchvision* and thank the PyTorch core team [24] for bundling these datasets neatly. We did not practice so called HARK-ing in this work: HARK issues in machine learning research [27]. Propositions are asserted first before generating the data. The supplementary software code *cpse\_manuscript\_results\_initial\_dev.ipynb* is provided for reproducing the results. The cPSE measure is also available in Bristol python package [28] and an example usage is also provided in *cpse\_bristol\_package\_usage.ipynb* found in the code supplement.

Authors do not have any competing or other kind of conflict of interests.

- [1] Steven M Pincus. Approximate entropy as a measure of system complexity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 88(6):2297–2301, 1991.
- [2] John S Shiner, Matt Davison, and Peter T Landsberg. Simple measure for complexity. *Physical Review E*, 59(2):1459, 1999.
- [3] Christoph Bandt and Bernd Pompe. Permutation entropy: a natural complexity measure for time series. *Physical Review Letters*, 88(17):174102, 2002.
- [4] Wojciech H Zurek. *Complexity, entropy and the physics of information*. CRC Press, 2018.



- [5] Jürgen Schmidhuber. Deep learning in neural networks: An overview. *Neural networks*, 61:85–117, 2015.
- [6] Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. Deep learning. *Nature*, 521(7553):436–444, 2015.
- [7] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, et al. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 518(7540):529, 2015.
- [8] Yann LeCun. My take on Ali Rahimi’s Test of Time award talk at NIPS. *unpublished*.
- [9] Thomas Elsken, Jan Hendrik Metzen, and Frank Hutter. Neural architecture search: A survey. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20:1–21, 2019.
- [10] Tin Kam Ho and Mitra Basu. Complexity measures of supervised classification problems. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis & Machine Intelligence*, (3):289–300, 2002.
- [11] M. Bianchini and F. Scarselli. On the complexity of neural network classifiers: A comparison between shallow and deep architectures. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 25(8):1553–1565, 2014.
- [12] Bastian Rieck, Matteo Togninalli, Christian Bock, Michael Moor, Max Horn, Thomas Gumbsch, and Karsten Borgwardt. Neural persistence: A complexity measure for deep neural networks using algebraic topology. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2019.
- [13] Mehmet Süzen, Cornelius Weber, and Joan J. Cerdà. Spectral Ergodicity in Deep Learning Architectures via Surrogate Random Matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.08303*, Apr 2017.
- [14] Behnam Neyshabur, Zhiyuan Li, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Yann LeCun, and Nathan Srebro. The role of over-parametrization in generalization of neural networks. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*, 2019.
- [15] Jeffrey Pennington, Samuel Schoenholz, and Surya Ganguli. Resurrecting the sigmoid in deep learning through dynamical isometry: theory and practice. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4785–4795, 2017.
- [16] Levent Sagun, Utku Evci, V Ugur Guney, Yann Dauphin, and Leon Bottou. Empirical analysis of the Hessian of over-parametrized neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.04454*, 2017.
- [17] Jeffrey Pennington, Samuel S Schoenholz, and Surya Ganguli. The emergence of spectral universality in deep networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.09979*, 2018.
- [18] Charles H Martin and Michael W Mahoney. Implicit self-regularization in deep neural networks: Evidence from random matrix theory and implications for learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.01075*, 2018.
- [19] Charles H Martin and Michael W Mahoney. Traditional and heavy-tailed self regularization in neural network models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08276*, 2019.
- [20] Charles H Martin and Michael W Mahoney. Heavy-tailed universality predicts trends in test accuracies for very large pre-trained deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08278*, 2019.
- [21] Michael Tsang, Dehua Cheng, and Yan Liu. Detecting statistical interactions from neural network weights. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.04977*, 2017.
- [22] AD Jackson, C Mejia-Monasterio, T Rupp, M Saltzer, and T Wilke. Spectral ergodicity and normal modes in ensembles of sparse matrices. *Nuclear Physics A*, 687(3-4):405–434, 2001.
- [23] Stephen I. Gallant. Connectionist expert systems. *Commun. ACM*, 31(2):152169, February 1988.
- [24] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. pages 8024–8035, 2019.
- [25] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [26] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 770–778, 2015.
- [27] Oguzhan Gencoglu, Mark van Gils, Esin Guldogan, Chamin Morikawa, Mehmet Süzen, Mathias Gruber, Jussi Leinonen, and Heikki Huttunen. Hark side of deep learning - from grad student descent to automated machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.0763*, 2019.
- [28] M. Süzen. Bristol python package: Random matrix tools. <https://pypi.python.org/pypi/bristol>.