

Stochastic batch size for adaptive regularization in deep network optimization

Kensuke Nakamura · Stefano Soatto · Byung-Woo Hong*

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract We propose a first-order stochastic optimization algorithm incorporating adaptive regularization applicable to machine learning problems in deep learning framework. The adaptive regularization is imposed by stochastic process in determining batch size for each model parameter at each optimization iteration. The stochastic batch size is determined by the update probability of each parameter following a distribution of gradient norms in consideration of their local and global properties in the neural network architecture where the range of gradient norms may vary within and across layers. We empirically demonstrate the effectiveness of our algorithm using an image classification task based on conventional network models applied to commonly used benchmark datasets. The quantitative evaluation indicates that our algorithm outperforms the state-of-the-art optimization algorithms in generalization while providing less sensitivity to the selection of batch size which often plays a critical role in optimization, thus achieving more robustness to the selection of regularity.

Keywords Deep network optimization · Adaptive regularization · Stochastic gradient descent · Adaptive mini-batch size

K. Nakamura
Computer Science Department, Chung-Ang University,
Seoul, Korea
E-mail: kensuke@image.cau.ac.kr

S. Soatto
Computer Science Department, University of California Los
Angeles, CA, U.S.A.
E-mail: soatto@cs.ucla.edu

B.-W. Hong (*corresponding author)
Computer Science Department, Chung-Ang University,
Seoul, Korea
E-mail: hong@cau.ac.kr

1 Introduction

In deep learning, the inference process is made through a deep network architecture that generally consists of a nested composition of linear and nonlinear functions leading to a large-scale optimization problem where both the number of model parameters and the number of data are in the millions [11,12,32,33,35,76,83]. The considered optimization problems generally aim to minimize non-convex objective functions defined over a large number of training data, which is often computationally challenging. In dealing with such problems, the most popular algorithm is stochastic gradient descent (SGD) [11,12,68,71,89] that randomly selects a subset of training data in evaluating the loss function and its gradient at each iteration while ordinary gradient descent [68,70] uses the entire data. The estimates of gradients using small batch sizes are generally unreliable, but the computation of full-batch gradients is often intractable, yielding a trade-off between stability and efficiency.

In this work, we propose a stochastic algorithm in the selection of batch size for estimating gradients in the course of optimization in which the batch size is adaptively determined for each parameter at each iteration. The intrinsic motivation stems from a need to impose different degree of regularization on each parameter at each optimization stage in such a way that the generalization is improved by implicitly guiding the trajectory of gradients to preferred minima. Our stochastic scheme is designed to determine the batch size of each parameter following a distribution that is proportional to the gradient norm; its gradient with varying batch size is efficiently computed by the cumulative moving average of usual stochastic gradients due to the additive form of the objective function. The

selection of batch size in stochastic optimization is related to regularization in addition to the computational efficiency [7, 52] in that the variance of gradients is reduced with larger batch size, allowing one to use a larger learning rate. However, it is not necessarily beneficial for complex non-convex problems in order to avoid undesirable local minima [43]. Conventional SGD uses deterministic selection strategies for the batch size that is mostly static, although dynamic scheduling methods exist [54, 77] without taking into account the relative importance of individual parameter.

In the computation of gradients, SGD uses the same batch to compute gradients of all the parameters while coordinate descent (CD) [13, 58, 61] and its block based variants [21, 57, 67, 90] update a subset of parameters at each iteration using the same size of batch for all the parameters. However, the partial update scheme at each batch iteration is inefficient due to the common parallel implementation that can provide gradients of all the parameters at once, resulting in discarding the gradients of non-updated parameters.

We relate our method to prior work in Section 2 and present classical SGD, CD and their integrated algorithms in Section 3 followed by our proposed algorithm in Section 4. The effectiveness of our algorithm is demonstrated by numerical results in Section 5 and the conclusion follows in Section 6.

2 Related work

Deep neural networks have made a significant progress in a variety of applications for understanding visual scenes [14, 39, 55], sound information [3, 51, 59, 65], physical motions [17, 25, 28, 74], and other decision processes [1, 18, 66, 85]. Their optimization algorithms related to our work are reviewed in the following.

Learning rate: In the application of gradient based optimization algorithms, it is generally necessary to determine the step size at updating unknowns. In addition to the fixed learning rate, there have been a number of learning rate scheduling schemes used for the SGD in order to achieve better generalization and convergence. One of the simple, yet popular schemes is staircase [77] and exponential decay [29] also has been applied to reduce stochastic noises and achieve stable convergence. The parameter-wise adaptive learning rate scheduling has also been developed such as AdaGrad [26], AdaDelta [73, 88], RMSprop [84], and Adam [45]. In our experiment we carefully choose the learning rate annealing such that the baseline SGD achieves the best validation accuracy in order to concentrate on the regularization effect due to the batch size.

Variance reduction: The variance of stochastic gradients is detrimental to SGD, motivating variance reduction techniques [15, 40, 69, 75, 91–93] that aim to reduce the variance incurred due to their stochastic process of estimation, and improve the convergence rate mainly for convex optimization while some are extended to non-convex problems [2, 37, 53]. One of the most practical algorithms for better convergence rates includes momentum [82], modified momentum for accelerated gradient [60], and stochastic estimation of accelerated gradient (Accelerated-SGD) [44]. These algorithms are more focused on the efficiency in convergence than the generalization of model for accuracy.

Energy landscape: Understanding of energy surface geometry is significant in deep optimization of highly complex non-convex problems. It is preferred to drive a solution toward plateau in order to yield better generalization [16, 24, 34]. Entropy-SGD [16] is an optimization algorithm biased toward such a wide flat local minimum. In our approach, we do not attempt to explicitly measure geometric property of loss landscape with extra computational cost, but instead implicitly consider the variance by varying batch size.

Importance sampling aims to limit the estimation of gradients to informative samples for efficiency and variance reduction by considering manual selection [8], temporal history of gradient [56, 72], maximizing the diversity of losses [27, 87], or largest changes in parameters [10, 20, 41, 42, 47, 81]. Albeit the benefit of non-uniform sampling, it is computationally expensive to estimate distribution for importance of huge number of parameters.

Dropout is an effective regularization technique in particular with shallower networks by ignoring randomly selected units following a certain probability during the training phase [80]. The dropping rate is generally set to be constant, typically 0.5, but its variants have been proposed with adaptive rates depending on parameter value [4], estimated gradient variance [46], biased gradient estimator [79], layer depth [36], or marginal likelihood over noises [63].

Coordinate descent and its variants: In contrast to SGD that selects a random subset of data for updating all the parameters at each iteration, coordinate descent (CD) updates a random subset of parameters using all the data [9, 86]. It has been proposed to integrate SGD and CD resulting in stochastic random block coordinate descent [67, 90] that selects a random subset of data to update a random subset of parameters. In selection of parameters to update, greedy coordinate descent [23, 49, 78] and its stochastic approach [63, 64, 67] are designed to follow a distribution of gradient norms. Our

algorithm is developed in the framework of stochastic greedy block coordinate descent incorporating stochastic selection of batch size.

Batch size selection: There is a trade-off between the computational efficiency and the stability of gradient estimation leading to the selection of their compromise with generally a constant while learning rate is scheduled to decrease for convergence. The generalization effect of stochastic gradient methods has been analyzed with constant batch size [30, 31]. On the other hand, increasing batch size per iteration with a fixed learning rate has been proposed in [77] where the equivalence of increasing batch size to learning rate decay is demonstrated. A variety of varying batch size algorithms have been proposed by variance of gradients [6, 22, 50, 54] where the additional computational cost for the gradient variance is expensive and the same batch size is used at each estimation of gradients for all the parameters.

3 Preliminaries

We consider a minimization problem of an objective function $F: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in a supervised learning framework:

$$w^* = \arg \min_w F(w), \quad (1)$$

where F is associated with $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_m)$ in the finite-sum form:

$$F(w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n l(h_w(x_i), y_i) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(w), \quad (2)$$

where $h_w: X \rightarrow Y$ is a prediction function defined with the associated model parameters w from a data space X to a label space Y , and $f_i(w) := l(h_w(x_i), y_i)$ is a differentiable loss function defined by the discrepancy between the prediction $h_w(x_i)$ and the true label y_i . The objective is to find optimal parameters w^* by minimizing the empirical loss incurred on a given set of training data $\{(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \dots, (x_n, y_n)\}$.

3.1 Stochastic gradient descent

The optimization of supervised learning applications that often require a large number of training data mainly uses stochastic gradient descent that updates solution w^t at each iteration t based on the gradient:

$$w^{t+1} = w^t - \eta^t (\nabla F(w^t) + \xi^t), \quad (3)$$

where $\eta^t \in \mathbb{R}$ is a learning rate and ξ^t is an independent noise process with zero mean. The computation

of gradient for the entire training data is computationally expensive and often intractable so that stochastic gradient is computed using batch β^t at each iteration t :

$$w^{t+1} = w^t - \eta^t \left(\frac{1}{|\beta^t|} \sum_{i \in \beta^t} \nabla f_i(w^t) \right), \quad (4)$$

where β^t is a subset of the index set $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ for the training data. The selection of batch size $|\beta^t|$ that is inversely proportional to the variance of ξ^t is often critical.

3.2 Alternating minimization

A class of alternating minimization is considered as an effective optimization algorithm to deal with a large number of parameters. The alternating minimization method with a cyclic constraint randomly partitions the unknown parameters w into two mutually disjoint subsets u and v , and the optimization alternatively proceeds over one block and the other at each iteration t :

$$u^{t+1} = u^t - \eta^t \nabla_u F(u^t, v^t), \quad (5)$$

$$v^{t+1} = v^t - \eta^t \nabla_v F(u^{t+1}, v^t), \quad (6)$$

where $\nabla_u F$ and $\nabla_v F$ denote the gradient of F with respect to u and v using the entire training data. The above alternating minimization algorithm is equivalent to randomized cyclic block coordinate descent with two blocks.

3.3 Stochastic alternating minimization

The optimization of large scale learning problems is often required to deal with a large number of both model parameters and training data, which naturally leads to consideration of combining the use of stochastic gradients based on batches and alternating minimization over parameter blocks. The combination of stochastic gradient descent and alternating minimization leads to stochastic randomized cyclic block coordinate descent with two blocks where a random subset of parameters are updated based on their stochastic gradients. The stochastic alternating minimization method finds a solution based on the gradient with respect to each parameter block using batches selected from the training data uniformly at random. The algorithm updates

blocks u^t and v^t of parameters w^t in an alternative way:

$$u^{t+1} = u^t - \frac{\eta^t}{|\beta^t|} \sum_{i \in \beta^t} \nabla_u f_i(u^t, v^t), \quad (7)$$

$$v^{t+1} = v^t - \frac{\eta^t}{|\beta^{t+1}|} \sum_{i \in \beta^{t+1}} \nabla_v f_i(u^{t+1}, v^t), \quad (8)$$

where parameter blocks u and v are updated based on the gradients computed using β^t and β^{t+1} , respectively.

4 Proposed algorithm

We propose a first-order optimization algorithm that updates each model parameter based on its stochastic gradient computed with stochastic batch size. The batch size for each parameter is determined by its update probability following a distribution of the norm of stochastic gradients in consideration of local and global properties of gradient norms in the network architecture.

4.1 Alternating minimization with stochastic batch size

The update probability p_j associated with parameter w_j is represented by a Bernoulli random variable χ_j :

$$\Pr(\chi_j = 1) = p_j, \quad (9)$$

where $0 < p_j < 1$ is the probability that $\chi_j = 1$. The proposed algorithm is designed to update each parameter w_j according to the probability p_j at iteration t :

$$w_j^{t+1} = w_j^t - \chi_j^t (\eta_j^t g_j^t), \quad (10)$$

where η_j^t is a learning rate to update w_j^t , χ_j^t is an indicator variable associated with the update probability p_j^t for w_j^t , and g_j^t is stochastic gradient with respect to w_j^t :

$$g_j^t = \frac{1}{|\beta_j^t|} \sum_{i \in \beta_j^t} \nabla_{w_j} f_i(w^t), \quad (11)$$

where $\nabla_{w_j} f = e_j^T \nabla f$ denotes the gradient of f with respect to w_j , e_j is a unit vector, and β_j^t denotes a batch. The essence of the proposed algorithm is to determine the size of batch β_j^t for each parameter w_j at iteration t depending on the update probability p_j^t . Let $\{\beta^t\}$ be a set of usual batches, called universal batches, that are the same as the ones used by standard SGD. The

stochastic batch β_j^t is determined in a recursive manner depending on the update probability p_j^t :

$$\beta_j^t = \begin{cases} \beta_j^{t-1} \cup \beta^t, & \text{if } \chi_j^t = 0 \\ \emptyset, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where β_j^t is obtained by the accumulation of the previous batch β_j^{t-1} with the current universal batch β^t when parameter w_j is not updated. On the other hand, β_j^t is set to be an empty set after parameter w_j is updated. The proposed algorithm with constant update probability $p_j^t = 1$ for all j and t results in standard SGD, and $p_j^t = 1/2$ results in an algorithm similar to Dropout except its forward-propagation that assigns zero to the output of ignored node while the proposed algorithm preserves the previous value. The pseudocode of the algorithm is described in Algorithm 1 where the indicator variable χ_j^t is determined by the update probability p_j^t that will be presented in Section 4.3.

Algorithm 1 Alternating Minimization with Stochastic Batch Size

for all epoch **do**

$\{\beta^t\}$: universal batches given by random shuffling

$\beta_j^0 = \emptyset$: initialize stochastic batch for all j

for all t : index for universal batch **do**

for all j : index for parameter **do**

$\beta_j^t = \beta_j^{t-1} \cup \beta^t$

if $\chi_j^t = 1$ **then**

$g_j^t = \frac{1}{|\beta_j^t|} \sum_{i \in \beta_j^t} \nabla_{w_j} f_i(w^t)$

$w_j^{t+1} = w_j^t - \chi_j^t (\eta_j^t g_j^t)$

$\beta_j^t = \emptyset$

end if

end for

end for

end for

4.2 Efficient algorithm of stochastic batch size via cumulative moving average

The computation of gradient using stochastic batch with varying size is inefficient due to the parallel implementation of back-propagation applied to the mixture of updating and non-updating parameters. Thus, we propose an alternative efficient algorithm that manipulates the gradients computed using universal batches instead of directly computing gradients using stochastic batches due to the additive form of the objective function. The modified algorithm computes gradients of all the parameters using universal batch at each iteration and

then takes weighted average of the non-updated previous gradients of each parameter to estimate its gradient with accumulated batches when updating, which leads to a Gauss-Seidel type iterative method.

Let us denote by $\beta^{[k]} = \beta^1 \cup \beta^2 \cup \dots \cup \beta^k$ a union of universal batches where we assume that $|\beta^1| = |\beta^2| = \dots = |\beta^k|$ for ease of presentation. The update of parameter w_j using stochastic batch $\beta^{[k]}$ at iteration t reads:

$$w_j^{t+1} = w_j^t - \tilde{\eta}_j^t \left(\frac{1}{|\beta^{[k]}|} \sum_{i \in \beta^{[k]}} \nabla_j f_i(w^t) \right), \quad (13)$$

where $\tilde{\eta}_j^t$ denotes a learning rate associated with a stochastic batch $\beta^{[k]}$. We can consider $\tilde{\eta}_j^t := k \eta_j^t$ where η_j^t denotes the learning rate for a single universal batch, e.g. β^1 , due to the linear relation between the learning rate and the batch size, and $|\beta^{[k]}| = k|\beta^1|$. The update in Eq.(13) requires separate back-propagations for different parameters when they have different stochastic batches. Therefore we estimate gradient $\tilde{g}_j$ of w_j for a set of universal batches $\beta^{[k]}$ by taking the cumulative moving average of the gradients computed using a series of universal batches leading to the following recursive steps with the initial condition $\tilde{g}_j^t = 0$:

$$\begin{cases} g_j^{t+\frac{s}{k}} &= \frac{1}{|\beta^s|} \sum_{i \in \beta^s} \nabla_j f_i(w^{t+\frac{s-1}{k}}), \\ \tilde{g}_j^{t+\frac{s}{k}} &= \tilde{g}_j^{t+\frac{s-1}{k}} + \frac{1}{s} \left(g_j^{t+\frac{s}{k}} - \tilde{g}_j^{t+\frac{s-1}{k}} \right), \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where s iterates from 1 to k , and the update of parameter w_j is obtained by:

$$w_j^{t+1} = w_j^t - \tilde{\eta}_j^t \tilde{g}_j^{t+1}, \quad (15)$$

where $\tilde{g}_j^{t+1}$ is considered as gradient of w_j with stochastic batch $\beta^{[k]}$, and $\tilde{\eta}_j^t$ denotes its learning rate. This Gauss-Seidel type of recursive update enables the parallelization in computing the gradients with stochastic batches. In addition, the use of intermediate update of other parameters in computing stochastic gradient is beneficial in convergence.

The pseudocode of the modified algorithm is described in Algorithm 2 where the computation of gradients with respect to all the parameters is parallelized at each universal batch iteration, and their cumulative moving averages are used to estimate the gradients with stochastic batches. Note that the back-propagation cost of the modified algorithm is the same as the conventional SGD using the universal batch.

Algorithm 2 Alternating minimization with stochastic batch size via cumulative moving average

for all epoch do

$\{\beta^t\}$: universal batches given by random shuffling

$\tilde{g}_j^0 = 0$: initialize gradients for all j

$k_j = 1$: initialize the count of batches for all j

for all t : index for universal batch do

$g^t = \frac{1}{|\beta^t|} \sum_{i \in \beta^t} \nabla f_i(w^t)$

for all j : index for parameter do

$\tilde{g}_j^t = \tilde{g}_j^{t-1} + \frac{1}{k_j} (g_j^t - \tilde{g}_j^{t-1})$

$w_j^{t+1} = w_j^t - \chi_j^t (\eta_j^t \tilde{g}_j^t)$

$\tilde{g}_j^t = (1 - \chi_j^t) \tilde{g}_j^t$

$k_j = (1 - \chi_j^t)(k_j + 1) + \chi_j^t$

end for

end for

end for

4.3 Adaptive update probability

The update of parameters w_j at iteration t is determined by the associated probability p_j^t based on the sigmoid function:

$$s(x; \alpha, \gamma) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\alpha x - \gamma)}, \quad (16)$$

where $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ are parameters for the slope and the horizontal position of the curve, respectively. The update probability is designed to be proportional to the norm of the gradient following the sigmoid function where α and γ are related to the randomness and the expectation of the probability, respectively. We present local and global adaptive schemes in the determination of the update probability and we will use their combination. In consideration of local and global adaptive probability in a neural network architecture, we denote by θ_l a set of parameter indexes and $\{w_j \mid j \in \theta_l\}$ a set of parameters at layer l where $l = 1, 2, \dots, L$.

Local adaptive probability: The local scheme is designed to consider the relative magnitude of the gradient norms in determining the update probability of the parameters within each layer. Let μ_l^t and σ_l^t be the mean and the standard deviation (std) of each set of gradient norms $\{|g_j^t|\}_{j \in \theta_l}$ of parameters $\{w_j\}_{j \in \theta_l}$ at iteration t . Note that we compute the weighted average considering the number of parameters at different layers. We also consider the parameter types such as convolution, fully connected, bias, batch normalization in constructing distribution of gradient norms since different types of parameters tend to have different ranges of gradient norms. We initially normalize the gradient norms

of parameters at each layer with mean 0 and std 1:

$$v_j^t = \frac{|g_j^t| - \mu_l^t}{\sigma_l^t}, \quad \forall j \in \theta_l, \quad l = 1, 2, \dots, L. \quad (17)$$

Then, the update probability p_j^t is determined by:

$$p_j^t = s(v_j^t; \alpha, \gamma), \quad \gamma = 0, \quad (18)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is a control parameter for the randomness of update, and $\alpha = 0, \gamma = 0$ yields a random update with probability $1/2$. Setting $\gamma = 0$ leads to $\mathbb{E}_t[p_j^t | j \in \theta_l] = 1/2$ for all l , thus we equally consider all the layers in updating their parameters.

Global adaptive probability: The global scheme is designed to consider the relative magnitude of the average gradient norms from all the layers, and assign the same probability to all the parameters within the same layer. Let μ^t and σ^t be the mean and the std of μ_l^t over all the layers $l = 1, 2, \dots, L$ at iteration t . We normalize the mean μ_l^t over layers l with mean 0 and std 1:

$$\tilde{\mu}_l^t = \frac{\mu_l^t - \mu^t}{\sigma^t}, \quad l = 1, 2, \dots, L. \quad (19)$$

Then, the update probability p_j^t for all the parameters $\{w_j\}_{j \in \theta_l}$ at layer l is determined by:

$$p_j^t = s(v_j^t; \alpha, \gamma), \quad \alpha = 0, \quad \gamma = \lambda \tilde{\mu}_l^t, \quad \forall j \in \theta_l \quad (20)$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is a control parameter for the randomness of update across layers and the gradient norm of individual parameters is ignored by setting $\alpha = 0$ leading to $\mathbb{E}_t[p_j^t | j \in \theta_l] = 1/2$. The same update probability is applied to all the parameters at each layer, but the probability is adaptively determined across layers depending on the mean of the gradient norms at each layer. The global scheme effectively considers different ranges of gradient norms at different layers.

Combined adaptive probability: Our final choice of the update probability uses both local and global adaptive schemes considering relative magnitude of gradient norms of parameters both within- and cross-layers. The gradient norm of each parameter is normalized at each layer and the weighted means of the gradient norms with the number of parameters are normalized across layers. The combined update probability p_j^t is determined by:

$$p_j^t = s(v_j^t; \alpha, \gamma), \quad \gamma = \lambda \tilde{\mu}_l^t, \quad \forall j \in \theta_l \quad (21)$$

where $\alpha, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ are constants related to the std of the update probabilities within- and cross-layers, respectively.

5 Experimental results

We provide quantitative evaluation of our algorithm in comparison to the state-of-the-art optimization algorithms. For the experiments, we use datasets including CIFAR10 [48] that consists of 50K training and 10K test object images with 10 categories, SVHN [62] that consists of 70K training and 25K test street scenes for digit recognition, and STL10 [19] that consists of 500 training and 800 test object images with 10 categories. Regarding the neural network architecture, we consider VGG11 [76], ResNet18 [32, 33], and ResNet50 [5] in combination with the batch normalization [38].

In our comparative analysis, we consider the following optimization algorithms: SGD, Dropout (Drop) [80], Adaptive Dropout (aDrop) [36], Entropy-SGD (eSGD) [16], Accelerated-SGD (aSGD) [44], and our proposed algorithm (Ours). We use SGD as a baseline for comparing the performance of the above algorithms of which the common hyperparameters such as learning rate, batch size, and momentum are chosen with respect to the best validation accuracy of the baseline. Regarding the additional parameters specific to Dropout and Entropy-SGD, we use the recommended values; the dropout rate is 0.5 and the number of inner loop is 5, respectively. In the quantitative evaluation, we perform 10 independent trials and their average learning curves indicating the validation accuracy are considered. In particular, we consider both the maximum across all the epochs and the average over the last 10% epochs for the validation accuracy. We present the numerical results that determine the hyperparameters used across all the experiments in the following section.

5.1 Selection of optimal hyperparameters

The learning rate, batch size, and momentum are selected by the best validation accuracy averaged over the last 10% of epochs and 10 trials by the baseline SGD using the models VGG11 and ResNet18 based on the dataset CIFAR10.

Learning rate: In order to focus on the batch size, we carefully choose the learning rate as follow. We have performed a comparative analysis using constant learning rates, staircase decay [77], exponential decay [29], sigmoid scheduling, RMSProp [84] and Adam [45] based on the networks VGG11 and ResNet18 using CIFAR10 dataset. We used grid search, and set 0.1 and 0.05 as the initial value and exponential power, respectively for Exponential decay, 0.95 as the weighting factor for RMSProp, 0.9 and 0.999 as the weighting factors of gradients and their moments, respectively for Adam. We

Table 1 Validation accuracy (%) of SGD using VGG11 (left) and ResNet18 (right) with different learning rate annealing schemes: constants (0.1, 0.01, 0.001), Exponential decay [29], RMSProp [84], Adam [45], Staircase [77], and our Sigmoid based on CIFAR10 with batch size $|\beta| = 16$ and momentum = 0. The average accuracy (upper) over the last 10% of epochs and the maximum (lower) are computed over 10 trials.

	VGG11								ResNet18							
	0.1	0.01	0.001	Exp	RMS	Adam	Stair	Sigm	0.1	0.01	0.001	Exp	RMS	Adam	Stair	Sigm
mean	83.44	88.43	87.36	91.23	88.55	88.58	91.88	92.03	87.76	91.45	90.23	93.78	91.11	91.35	94.69	94.89
max	86.31	89.56	88.04	91.98	89.42	89.30	92.37	92.48	90.33	92.66	91.01	94.59	91.88	92.26	95.10	95.16




Fig. 1 Learning rate annealing curves (top) given by the constants (0.1, 0.01, 0.01), Exponential decay [29], RMSProp [84], Adam [45], Staircase [77], and the Sigmoid scheme from left to right. The learning curves including the training loss (blue), validation loss (red), and validation accuracy (green) for VGG11 (middle) and ResNet18 (bottom) based on CIFAR10, are computed using each learning rate annealing with batch size $|\beta| = 16$ and momentum = 0.

Table 2 Validation accuracy (%) of SGD using VGG11 (top) and ResNet18 (bottom) based on CIFAR10 with different batch size ($|\beta|$) and momentum (m). The average accuracy (upper) over the last 10% of epochs and the maximum (lower) are computed over 10 trials.

$ \beta $	16	16	16	16	32	32	32	32	64	64	64	64	128	128	128	128
m	0	0.3	0.6	0.9	0	0.3	0.6	0.9	0	0.3	0.6	0.9	0	0.3	0.6	0.9
mean	92.03	92.05	91.82	86.07	92.01	92.08	92.09	90.24	91.46	91.60	91.97	91.60	90.96	91.11	91.55	91.97
max	92.48	92.33	92.45	87.43	92.43	92.56	92.48	90.99	91.93	91.92	92.39	92.01	91.30	91.47	91.81	92.34
mean	94.89	94.89	94.50	90.77	94.72	94.90	94.85	92.64	94.14	94.36	94.71	94.14	93.33	93.75	94.20	94.49
max	95.16	95.20	94.82	91.61	95.13	95.18	95.22	93.14	94.40	94.73	95.05	94.42	93.80	94.14	94.44	94.77

used 0.1 and 0.001 as the initial and final values with the steepness parameter for the sigmoid annealing.

The quantitative evaluation in validation accuracy for each learning rate scheme is presented in Table 1 where the average over the last 10% of epochs (upper) and the maximum (lower) are obtained by 10 trials. The learning rates by selected schemes are presented in Figure 1 (top) and the learning curves including the training loss (blue), validation loss (red), and validation accuracy (green) are presented in Figure 1 using VGG11 (middle) and ResNet18 (bottom). The sigmoid scheduling has been shown to achieve the best validation accuracy while yielding smooth validation curves, thus we apply the sigmoid learning rate to all the optimization algorithms throughout the following experiments.

Batch size and momentum: The selection of batch size is related to the momentum coefficient and we search for their optimal combination in terms of the validation accuracy by SGD using VGG11 and ResNet18 based on CIFAR10. We use 16, 32, 64, 128 for batch size and 0, 0.3, 0.6, 0.9 for momentum, respectively. The validation accuracy in average and maximum is obtained for VGG11 (upper) and ResNet18 (lower) with each combination of the parameters in Table 2 indicating that better results are obtained by the combination of larger both batch size and momentum, or smaller both batch size and momentum leading to our choice of momentum 0, 0.3, 0.6, 0.9 for batch size 16, 32, 64, 128, respectively throughout the experiments.

Table 3 Validation accuracy (%) of our algorithm is computed with varying parameters for (1) the local (α) and (2) the global (λ) adaptive probabilities using VGG11 (left) and ResNet18 (right) based on CIFAR10 with batch size 16. The average accuracy (upper) over the last 10% epochs and the maximum (lower) over 10 trials are shown.

(1) Effect of the local parameter (α) with $\lambda = 0$									(2) Effect of the global parameter (λ) with $\alpha = 0.1$								
α	VGG11				ResNet18				λ	VGG11				ResNet18			
	-0.1	0	0.1	1	-0.1	0	0.1	1		0	-2	-4	-8	0	-2	-4	-8
mean	92.09	92.17	92.18	91.78	94.85	94.86	94.95	94.79	mean	92.18	92.35	92.38	92.46	94.95	95.06	95.05	95.15
max	92.44	92.48	92.52	92.28	95.13	95.11	95.27	95.08	max	92.52	92.85	92.88	92.74	95.27	95.40	95.60	95.46

Table 4 Validation accuracy (%) is computed with the algorithms: Stochastic gradient descent (SGD) and our algorithm (Ours) with the models: VGG11 (top) and ResNet18 (bottom) based on the datasets: CIFAR10 using its partial training data: 1/2, 1/4, 1/8 and the batch sizes $|\beta|$: 16, 32, 64, 128. The average validation accuracy over the last 10% of epochs is computed over 10 trials. The accuracy gain by our algorithm with respect to SGD is also presented for ease of interpretation.

(1) Validation accuracy (%) and improvement (%-point) for VGG11									
	SGD			Ours			improvement		
training ratio	1/2	1/4	1/8	1/2	1/4	1/8	1/2	1/4	1/8
$ \beta =16$	89.16	84.78	79.25	89.58	85.50	80.18	0.43	0.71	0.93
$ \beta =32$	88.87	84.61	79.27	89.23	85.22	79.64	0.36	0.61	0.37
$ \beta =64$	88.79	84.43	78.44	89.08	84.81	79.50	0.29	0.37	1.05
$ \beta =128$	88.70	84.07	77.47	89.02	84.73	78.98	0.33	0.67	1.51

(2) Validation accuracy (%) and improvement (%-point) for ResNet18									
	SGD			Ours			improvement		
training ratio	1/2	1/4	1/8	1/2	1/4	1/8	1/2	1/4	1/8
$ \beta =16$	92.32	88.34	82.77	92.53	88.63	83.68	0.22	0.29	0.92
$ \beta =32$	92.01	87.88	81.92	92.31	88.37	82.53	0.29	0.49	0.60
$ \beta =64$	91.81	87.42	81.50	92.23	87.73	82.02	0.43	0.30	0.52
$ \beta =128$	91.84	87.43	81.02	92.09	87.96	81.64	0.25	0.53	0.62

5.2 Effect of local and global adaptive probability

We empirically demonstrate the effect of parameter α for the local adaptive probability in Eq. (18) and parameter λ for the global one in Eq. (20) in our algorithm with varying one parameter while the other is fixed. We present the average and maximum validation accuracy in Table 3 where (1) the parameter α in local adaptive probability is set as $-0.1, 0, 0.1, 1$ with fixed $\lambda = 0$, and (2) the parameter λ in global adaptive probability is set as $0, -2, -4, -8$ with fixed $\alpha = 0.1$, respectively using VGG11 (left) and ResNet18 (right) based on CIFAR10 with the batch size being 16. It is shown that $\alpha = 0.1$ and $\lambda = -4$ yields the best results for VGG11 and ResNet18, and thus we use the pair of $\alpha = 0.1$ and $\lambda = -4$ for our combined adaptive scheme throughout the experiments.

5.3 Effect of stochastic batch size in generalization

We empirically demonstrate that the proposed algorithm with the combined adaptive scheme achieves bet-

ter generalization than the baseline SGD in terms of the validation accuracy obtained with partial training data. In Table 4, we present the average validation accuracy with VGG11 (top) and ResNet18 (bottom) using CIFAR10 from which 1/2, 1/4, 1/8 portions of the 50K training data are randomly selected for each individual trial and used its training process. We use 16, 32, 64, 128 as universal batch sizes for each partial set of data. It is clearly shown that our algorithm yields better accuracy than SGD irrespective of the batch size. Moreover the performance gain by our algorithm increases as less number of training data are used due to our effective generalization imposed by adaptive regularization with the local and global update probabilities.

5.4 Comparison to the state-of-the-art

We now compare our algorithm with the combined adaptive probability to SGD, Dropout (Drop) [80], Adaptive Dropout (aDrop) [36], Entropy-SGD (eSGD) [16], and Accelerated-SGD (aSGD) [44]. We present the average (upper) and maximum (lower) validation accuracy with




Fig. 2 Validation accuracy curve for the datasets: CIFAR10 (top), SVHN (middle), STL10 (bottom) by the models: VGG11 (left), ResNet18 (middle), ResNet50 (right) optimized using SGD (black), Dropout (yellow), Adaptive Dropout (blue), Entropy-SGD (magenta), Accelerated-SGD (green), and Ours (red). The x-axis represents epoch and the y-axis represents accuracy (%).

the models VGG11 (left), ResNet18 (middle), ResNet50 (right) based on the datasets (1) CIFAR10, (2) SVHN, and (3) STL10 in Table 5 where 16, 32, 64, 128 are used for the universal batch size $|\beta|$. It is shown that our algorithm outperforms the others consistently regardless of model, dataset and batch size. Figure 2 also visualizes validation accuracy curves with batch size of 16, indicating that ours (red) achieves better accuracy than SGD (black), Dropout (yellow), Adaptive Dropout (blue), Entropy-SGD (magenta), and Accelerated-SGD (green) across all the models VGG11 (left), ResNet18 (middle), ResNet50 (right) and all the datasets CIFAR10 (top), SVHN (middle), and STL10 (bottom).

6 Conclusion and discussion

We have proposed a first-order optimization algorithm with stochastic batch size for large scale problems in deep learning. Our algorithm determines batch size for each parameter at each iteration in a stochastic way fol-

lowing a probability proportional to its gradient norm in such a way that adaptive regularization is imposed on each parameter, leading to better generalization of the network model. The efficient computation of the gradient with varying batch size is achieved by the cumulative moving average scheme based on the usual stochastic gradients. The effectiveness of the proposed algorithm has been demonstrated by the experimental results in which our algorithm outperforms a number of other methods for the classification task with conventional network architectures using a number of benchmark datasets indicating that our algorithm achieves better generalization in particular with less number of training data without additional computational cost.

Acknowledgements This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea: NRF-2017R1A2B4006023 and NRF-2018R1A4A1059731.

Table 5 Validation accuracy (%) is computed with the algorithms: Stochastic gradient descent (SGD), Dropout (Drop) [80], Adaptive Dropout (aDrop) [36], Entropy-SGD (eSGD) [16], Accelerated-SGD (aSGD) [44], and our algorithm (Ours) with the models: VGG11 (left), ResNet18 (middle), ResNet50 (right) based on the datasets: CIFAR10 (top block), SVHN (middle), and STL10 (bottom) using the batch sizes $|\beta|$: 16, 32, 64, 128. The average validation accuracy over the last 10% of epochs is shown at the upper part of each block and the maximum validation accuracy over all the epochs is shown at the lower part. The accuracy is computed over 10 trials.

(1) Validation accuracy for CIFAR10 with the average over the last 10% epochs (upper part) and the maximum (lower part)

mean	VGG11						ResNet18						ResNet50					
	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours
$ \beta =16$	92.03	91.17	92.10	89.47	90.86	92.38	94.89	94.11	94.84	92.26	93.49	95.05	95.22	94.76	95.11	92.18	93.21	95.24
$ \beta =32$	92.08	90.94	92.00	89.38	90.83	92.36	94.90	94.04	94.79	91.97	93.42	94.99	95.20	94.62	95.01	91.74	93.03	95.29
$ \beta =64$	91.97	90.73	91.88	89.12	90.72	92.24	94.71	93.76	94.63	91.00	93.11	94.92	94.93	94.39	94.91	90.47	92.84	95.19
$ \beta =128$	91.97	90.48	91.88	88.83	90.64	92.34	94.49	93.85	94.58	91.48	92.98	94.92	94.48	94.37	94.54	90.43	92.71	94.81
max	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours
$ \beta =16$	92.48	91.50	92.34	89.81	91.27	92.88	95.16	94.42	95.12	92.49	93.86	95.60	95.53	95.08	95.41	92.56	93.82	95.58
$ \beta =32$	92.56	91.38	92.37	89.77	91.38	92.62	95.18	94.36	95.13	92.29	93.88	95.32	95.54	94.94	95.27	92.42	93.45	95.67
$ \beta =64$	92.39	91.23	92.31	89.59	91.24	92.70	95.05	94.05	95.05	92.08	93.62	95.33	95.41	94.84	95.28	90.90	93.51	95.45
$ \beta =128$	92.34	91.20	92.25	89.20	91.08	92.84	94.77	94.07	94.78	91.69	93.34	95.15	94.98	94.66	94.91	91.28	93.30	95.14

(2) Validation accuracy for SVHN with the average over the last 10% epochs (upper part) and the maximum (lower part)

mean	VGG11						ResNet18						ResNet50					
	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours
$ \beta =16$	95.39	95.11	95.32	95.43	94.75	95.76	96.22	96.06	96.19	96.27	95.44	96.36	96.45	96.34	96.37	96.57	95.32	96.68
$ \beta =32$	95.42	95.07	95.35	95.38	94.77	95.72	96.17	95.98	96.19	96.13	95.57	96.30	96.41	96.23	96.29	96.33	95.38	96.59
$ \beta =64$	95.37	95.08	95.33	95.36	94.78	95.72	96.08	95.90	96.12	95.74	95.49	96.28	96.31	96.17	96.26	96.16	95.36	96.57
$ \beta =128$	95.47	95.13	95.35	95.20	94.62	95.74	96.16	95.94	96.10	95.85	95.35	96.33	96.41	96.29	96.31	95.90	94.86	96.63
max	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours
$ \beta =16$	95.63	95.24	95.44	95.60	95.01	95.92	96.38	96.22	96.35	96.42	95.67	96.48	96.61	96.54	96.51	96.75	95.66	96.88
$ \beta =32$	95.59	95.24	95.59	95.57	95.03	95.87	96.42	96.16	96.34	96.24	95.74	96.50	96.56	96.39	96.49	96.64	95.72	96.82
$ \beta =64$	95.58	95.31	95.51	95.63	95.00	95.91	96.25	96.04	96.28	96.10	95.77	96.47	96.54	96.37	96.42	96.45	95.64	96.86
$ \beta =128$	95.59	95.34	95.57	95.41	94.91	95.91	96.26	96.10	96.29	95.98	95.55	96.49	96.75	96.55	96.56	96.13	95.42	96.85

(3) Validation accuracy for STL10 with the average over the last 10% epochs (upper part) and the maximum (lower part)

mean	VGG11						ResNet18						ResNet50					
	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours
$ \beta =16$	69.31	69.11	71.53	69.03	67.62	74.21	62.14	62.84	65.09	61.38	61.41	67.42	62.47	62.33	65.30	61.31	60.96	67.88
$ \beta =32$	69.62	69.43	71.76	67.89	67.01	74.34	63.12	62.34	64.97	61.52	62.51	66.16	63.16	61.86	64.17	61.55	62.94	66.60
$ \beta =64$	68.29	68.02	71.24	66.86	66.57	73.05	62.65	61.28	62.91	55.39	62.43	64.74	62.31	61.56	63.70	54.03	61.89	65.06
$ \beta =28$	67.23	66.23	67.58	65.04	65.43	70.00	61.28	61.11	62.93	48.53	60.15	63.38	60.61	62.00	61.40	48.84	61.27	64.56
max	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours	SGD	Drop	aDrop	eSGD	aSGD	Ours
$ \beta =16$	71.18	73.21	73.34	70.75	69.54	75.79	66.15	66.49	69.23	65.91	64.93	70.35	65.58	66.09	68.28	63.29	65.54	71.01
$ \beta =32$	72.26	71.43	73.63	71.33	69.43	76.26	65.89	65.15	68.44	64.80	67.08	68.94	66.50	65.74	67.38	65.00	67.94	69.29
$ \beta =64$	70.79	70.91	73.38	69.04	68.95	74.63	65.88	65.80	67.48	60.35	66.06	67.84	65.69	65.26	65.98	62.01	64.35	66.93
$ \beta =128$	69.68	68.44	69.98	66.69	68.74	71.86	65.30	64.69	66.71	55.26	65.21	66.99	66.01	65.95	64.93	55.55	64.21	67.54

References

1. Ahmad, K., Conci, N.: How deep features have improved event recognition in multimedia: a survey. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing Communications and Applications* (2019)
2. Allen-Zhu, Z., Hazan, E.: Variance reduction for faster non-convex optimization. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 699–707 (2016)
3. Aytar, Y., Vondrick, C., Torralba, A.: Soundnet: Learning sound representations from unlabeled video. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 892–900 (2016)
4. Ba, J., Frey, B.: Adaptive dropout for training deep neural networks. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 3084–3092 (2013)
5. Balduzzi, D., Frean, M., Leary, L., Lewis, J.P., Ma, K.W.D., McWilliams, B.: The shattered gradients problem: If resnets are the answer, then what is the question? In: *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 70, pp. 342–350. PMLR (2017)
6. Balles, L., Romero, J., Hennig, P.: Coupling adaptive batch sizes with learning rates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.05086* (2016)
7. Bengio, Y.: Practical recommendations for gradient-based training of deep architectures. In: *Neural networks: Tricks of the trade*, pp. 437–478. Springer (2012)
8. Bengio, Y., Louradour, J., Collobert, R., Weston, J.: Curriculum learning. In: *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, pp. 41–48. ACM (2009)
9. Bertsekas, D.P., Tsitsiklis, J.N.: *Parallel and distributed computation: numerical methods*, vol. 23. Prentice hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ (1989)
10. Borsos, Z., Krause, A., Levy, K.Y.: Online variance reduction for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.04715* (2018)
11. Bottou, L.: Large-scale machine learning with stochastic gradient descent. In: *Proceedings of COMPSTAT'2010*, pp. 177–186. Springer (2010)
12. Bottou, L., Curtis, F.E., Nocedal, J.: Optimization methods for large-scale machine learning. *Siam Review* **60**(2), 223–311 (2018)
13. Breheny, P., Huang, J.: Coordinate descent algorithms for nonconvex penalized regression, with applications to biological feature selection. *The annals of applied statistics* **5**(1), 232 (2011)
14. Cai, J., Gu, S., Zhang, L.: Learning a deep single image contrast enhancer from multi-exposure images. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* **27**(4), 2049–2062 (2018)
15. Chatterji, N.S., Flammarion, N., Ma, Y.A., Bartlett, P.L., Jordan, M.I.: On the theory of variance reduction for stochastic gradient monte carlo. In: *ICML* (2018)
16. Chaudhari, P., Choromanska, A., Soatto, S., LeCun, Y., Baldassi, C., Borgs, C., Chayes, J., Sagun, L., Zecchina, R.: Entropy-sgd: Biasing gradient descent into wide valleys. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (2017)
17. Chen, C., Seff, A., Kornhauser, A., Xiao, J.: Deepdriving: Learning affordance for direct perception in autonomous driving. In: *The IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)* (2015)
18. Cheng, H.T., Koc, L., Harmsen, J., Shaked, T., Chandra, T., Aradhye, H., Anderson, G., Corrado, G., Chai, W., Ispir, M., et al.: Wide & deep learning for recommender systems. In: *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Deep Learning for Recommender Systems*, pp. 7–10. ACM (2016)
19. Coates, A., Ng, A., Lee, H.: An analysis of single-layer networks in unsupervised feature learning. In: *Proceedings of the fourteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pp. 215–223 (2011)
20. Csiba, D., Qu, Z., Richtárik, P.: Stochastic dual coordinate ascent with adaptive probabilities. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 674–683 (2015)
21. Dang, C.D., Lan, G.: Stochastic block mirror descent methods for nonsmooth and stochastic optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **25**(2), 856–881 (2015)
22. De, S., Yadav, A., Jacobs, D., Goldstein, T.: Automated inference with adaptive batches. In: *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1504–1513 (2017)
23. Diakonikolas, J., Orecchia, L.: Alternating randomized block coordinate descent. In: *ICML* (2018)
24. Dinh, L., Pascanu, R., Bengio, S., Bengio, Y.: Sharp minima can generalize for deep nets. In: *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70*, pp. 1019–1028. JMLR. org (2017)
25. Dosovitskiy, A., Fischer, P., Ilg, E., Hausser, P., Hazirbas, C., Golkov, V., van der Smagt, P., Cremers, D., Brox, T.: Flownet: Learning optical flow with convolutional networks. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 2758–2766 (2015)
26. Duchi, J., Hazan, E., Singer, Y.: Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **12**(Jul), 2121–2159 (2011)
27. Fan, Y., Tian, F., Qin, T., Bian, J., Liu, T.Y.: Learning what data to learn. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08635* (2017)
28. Finn, C., Levine, S.: Deep visual foresight for planning robot motion. In: *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 2786–2793. IEEE (2017)
29. George, A.P., Powell, W.B.: Adaptive stepsizes for recursive estimation with applications in approximate dynamic programming. *Machine learning* **65**(1), 167–198 (2006)
30. Hardt, M., Recht, B., Singer, Y.: Train faster, generalize better: Stability of stochastic gradient descent. In: M.F. Balcan, K.Q. Weinberger (eds.) *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 48, pp. 1225–1234. PMLR, New York, New York, USA (2016). URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v48/hardt16.html>
31. He, F., Liu, T., Tao, D.: Control batch size and learning rate to generalize well: Theoretical and empirical evidence. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 1141–1150 (2019)
32. He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., Sun, J.: Deep residual learning for image recognition. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 770–778 (2016)
33. He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., Sun, J.: Identity mappings in deep residual networks. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 630–645. Springer (2016)
34. Hochreiter, S., Schmidhuber, J.: Flat minima. *Neural Computation* **9**(1), 1–42 (1997)
35. Huang, G., Liu, Z., van der Maaten, L., Weinberger, K.Q.: Densely connected convolutional networks. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* (2017)

36. Huang, G., Sun, Y., Liu, Z., Sedra, D., Weinberger, K.Q.: Deep networks with stochastic depth. In: European Conference on Computer Vision, pp. 646–661. Springer (2016)
37. Huo, Z., Huang, H.: Asynchronous mini-batch gradient descent with variance reduction for non-convex optimization. In: Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (2017)
38. Ioffe, S., Szegedy, C.: Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. In: International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 448–456 (2015)
39. Jin, K.H., McCann, M.T., Froustey, E., Unser, M.: Deep convolutional neural network for inverse problems in imaging. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* **26**(9), 4509–4522 (2017). DOI 10.1109/TIP.2017.2713099
40. Johnson, R., Zhang, T.: Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction. In: Advances in neural information processing systems, pp. 315–323 (2013)
41. Johnson, T.B., Guestrin, C.: Training deep models faster with robust, approximate importance sampling. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, pp. 7276–7286 (2018)
42. Katharopoulos, A., Fleuret, F.: Not all samples are created equal: Deep learning with importance sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.00942* (2018)
43. Keskar, N.S., Mudigere, D., Nocedal, J., Smelyanskiy, M., Tang, P.T.P.: On large-batch training for deep learning: Generalization gap and sharp minima. In: International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) (2017)
44. Kidambi, R., Netrapalli, P., Jain, P., Kakade, S.: On the insufficiency of existing momentum schemes for stochastic optimization. In: 2018 Information Theory and Applications Workshop (ITA), pp. 1–9 (2018). DOI 10.1109/ITA.2018.8503173
45. Kingma, D.P., Ba, J.: Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014)
46. Kingma, D.P., Salimans, T., Welling, M.: Variational dropout and the local reparameterization trick. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, pp. 2575–2583 (2015)
47. Konečný, J., Qu, Z., Richtárik, P.: Semi-stochastic coordinate descent. *Optimization Methods and Software* **32**(5), 993–1005 (2017)
48. Krizhevsky, A., Hinton, G.: Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images (2009)
49. Lei, Q., Zhong, K., Dhillon, I.S.: Coordinate-wise power method. In: Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’16, pp. 2064–2072. Curran Associates Inc., USA (2016). URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=3157096.3157327>
50. Levy, K.: Online to offline conversions, universality and adaptive minibatch sizes. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, pp. 1613–1622 (2017)
51. Li, J., Dai, W.P., Metze, F., Qu, S., Das, S.: A comparison of deep learning methods for environmental sound detection. 2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP) pp. 126–130 (2017)
52. Li, M., Zhang, T., Chen, Y., Smola, A.J.: Efficient mini-batch training for stochastic optimization. In: Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining, pp. 661–670. ACM (2014)
53. Liu, S., Kailkhura, B., Chen, P.Y., Ting, P., Chang, S., Amini, L.: Zeroth-order stochastic variance reduction for nonconvex optimization. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, pp. 3731–3741 (2018)
54. Liu, X., Hsieh, C.J.: Fast variance reduction method with stochastic batch size. In: ICML (2018)
55. Long, J., Shelhamer, E., Darrell, T.: Fully convolutional networks for semantic segmentation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pp. 3431–3440 (2015)
56. Loshchilov, I., Hutter, F.: Online batch selection for faster training of neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06343* (2015)
57. Lu, Z., Xiao, L.: On the complexity analysis of randomized block-coordinate descent methods. *Mathematical Programming* **152**(1-2), 615–642 (2015)
58. Mazumder, R., Friedman, J.H., Hastie, T.: Sparsenet: Coordinate descent with nonconvex penalties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **106**(495), 1125–1138 (2011)
59. Mesaros, A., Heittola, T., Benetos, E., Foster, P., Lagrange, M., Virtanen, T., Plumbley, M.D.: Detection and classification of acoustic scenes and events: Outcome of the dcse 2016 challenge. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech and Language Processing (TASLP)* **26**(2), 379–393 (2018)
60. Nesterov, Y.: A method for unconstrained convex minimization problem with the rate of convergence $O(1/k^2)$. In: *Doklady AN USSR*, vol. 269, pp. 543–547 (1983)
61. Nesterov, Y.: Efficiency of coordinate descent methods on huge-scale optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **22**(2), 341–362 (2012)
62. Netzer, Y., Wang, T., Coates, A., Bissacco, A., Wu, B., Ng, A.Y.: Reading digits in natural images with unsupervised feature learning (2011)
63. Noh, H., You, T., Mun, J., Han, B.: Regularizing deep neural networks by noise: Its interpretation and optimization. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, pp. 5109–5118 (2017)
64. Nutini, J., Laradji, I., Schmidt, M.: Let’s make block coordinate descent go fast: Faster greedy rules, message-passing, active-set complexity, and superlinear convergence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.08859* (2017)
65. Van den Oord, A., Dieleman, S., Schrauwen, B.: Deep content-based music recommendation. In: Advances in neural information processing systems, pp. 2643–2651 (2013)
66. Owens, A., Efros, A.A.: Audio-visual scene analysis with self-supervised multisensory features. In: Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV), pp. 631–648 (2018)
67. Richtárik, P., Takáč, M.: Iteration complexity of randomized block-coordinate descent methods for minimizing a composite function. *Mathematical Programming* **144**(1-2), 1–38 (2014)
68. Robbins, H., Monro, S.: A stochastic approximation method. *The annals of mathematical statistics* pp. 400–407 (1951)
69. Roux, N.L., Schmidt, M., Bach, F.: A stochastic gradient method with an exponential convergence rate for finite training sets. In: Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 2, NIPS’12, pp. 2663–2671 (2012)
70. Ruder, S.: An overview of gradient descent optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.04747* (2016)
71. Rumelhart, D.E., Hinton, G.E., Williams, R.J., et al.: Learning representations by back-propagating errors. *Cognitive modeling* **5**(3), 1 (1988)

72. Schaul, T., Quan, J., Antonoglou, I., Silver, D.: Prioritized experience replay. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.05952* (2015)
73. Schaul, T., Zhang, S., LeCun, Y.: No more pesky learning rates. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 343–351 (2013)
74. Shahroudy, A., Ng, T.T., Gong, Y., Wang, G.: Deep multimodal feature analysis for action recognition in rgb+ d videos. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* **40**(5), 1045–1058 (2018)
75. Shen, Z., Qian, H., Zhou, T., Mu, T.: Adaptive variance reducing for stochastic gradient descent. In: *IJCAI*, pp. 1990–1996 (2016)
76. Simonyan, K., Zisserman, A.: Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556* (2014)
77. Smith, S.L., Kindermans, P.J., Ying, C., Le, Q.V.: Don’t decay the learning rate, increase the batch size. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (2018)
78. Song, C., Cui, S., Jiang, Y., Xia, S.T.: Accelerated stochastic greedy coordinate descent by soft thresholding projection onto simplex. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 4838–4847 (2017)
79. Srinivas, S., Babu, R.V.: Generalized dropout. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.06791* (2016)
80. Srivastava, N., Hinton, G.E., Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I., Salakhutdinov, R.: Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *Journal of machine learning research* **15**(1), 1929–1958 (2014)
81. Stich, S.U., Raj, A., Jaggi, M.: Approximate steepest coordinate descent. In: D. Precup, Y.W. Teh (eds.) *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 70, pp. 3251–3259. PMLR, International Convention Centre, Sydney, Australia (2017)
82. Sutton, R.: Two problems with back propagation and other steepest descent learning procedures for networks. In: *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, 1986, pp. 823–832 (1986)
83. Szegedy, C., Liu, W., Jia, Y., Sermanet, P., Reed, S., Anguelov, D., Erhan, D., Vanhoucke, V., Rabinovich, A.: Going deeper with convolutions. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 1–9 (2015)
84. Tieleman, T., Hinton, G.: Lecture 6.5-rmsprop: Divide the gradient by a running average of its recent magnitude. *COURSERA: Neural networks for machine learning* **4**(2), 26–31 (2012)
85. Wang, H., Wang, N., Yeung, D.Y.: Collaborative deep learning for recommender systems. In: *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pp. 1235–1244. ACM (2015)
86. Warga, J.: Minimizing certain convex functions. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics* **11**(3), 588–593 (1963)
87. Wu, C.Y., Manmatha, R., Smola, A.J., Krahenbuhl, P.: Sampling matters in deep embedding learning. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 2840–2848 (2017)
88. Zeiler, M.D.: Adadelta: an adaptive learning rate method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.5701* (2012)
89. Zhang, T.: Solving large scale linear prediction problems using stochastic gradient descent algorithms. In: *Proceedings of the twenty-first international conference on Machine learning*, p. 116. ACM (2004)
90. Zhao, T., Yu, M., Wang, Y., Arora, R., Liu, H.: Accelerated mini-batch randomized block coordinate descent method. In: *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 2, NIPS’14*, pp. 3329–3337 (2014)
91. Zhong, W., Kwok, J.: Fast stochastic alternating direction method of multipliers. In: *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-14)*, pp. 46–54 (2014)
92. Zhou, K., Shang, F., Cheng, J.: A simple stochastic variance reduced algorithm with fast convergence rates. In: J. Dy, A. Krause (eds.) *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 80, pp. 5980–5989. PMLR (2018)
93. Zou, D., Xu, P., Gu, Q.: Stochastic variance-reduced Hamilton Monte Carlo methods. In: J. Dy, A. Krause (eds.) *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 80, pp. 6028–6037. PMLR, Stockholmsmssan, Stockholm Sweden (2018)