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Abstract—We propose a new learning algorithm for propagating a learning signal and updating neural network parameters via a forward pass, as an alternative to backpropagation. In forward signal propagation learning (sigprop), there is only the forward path for learning and inference, so there are no additional structural or computational constraints on learning, such as feedback connectivity, weight transport, or a backward pass, which exist under backpropagation. Sigprop enables global supervised learning with only a forward path. This is ideal for parallel training of layers or modules. In biology, this explains how neurons without feedback connections can still receive a global learning signal. In hardware, this provides an approach for global supervised learning without backward connectivity. Sigprop by design has better compatibility with models of learning in the brain and in hardware than backpropagation and alternative approaches to relaxing learning constraints. We also demonstrate that sigprop is more efficient in time and memory than they are. To further explain the behavior of sigprop, we provide evidence that sigprop provides useful learning signals in context to backpropagation. To further support relevance to biological and hardware learning, we use sigprop to train continuous time neural networks with Hebbian updates and train spiking neural networks without surrogate functions.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The success of deep learning is attributed to the backpropagation of errors algorithm [1] for training artificial neural networks. However, the constraints necessary for backpropagation to take place are incompatible with learning in the brain and in hardware, are computationally inefficient for memory and time, and bottleneck parallel learning. These learning constraints under backpropagation come from calculating the contribution of each neuron to the network’s output error. This calculation during training occurs in two phases. First, the input is fed completely through the network storing the activations of neurons for the next phase and producing an output; this phase is known as the forward pass. Second, the error between the input’s target and network’s output is fed in reverse order of the forward pass through the network to produce parameter updates using the stored neuron activations; this phase is known as the backward pass.

These two phases of learning have the following learning constraints. The forward pass stores the activation of every neuron for the backward pass, increasing memory overhead. The forward and backward passes need to complete before receiving the next inputs, pausing resources. Network learning parameters can only be updated after and in reverse order of the forward pass, which is sequential and synchronous.

The backward pass requires its own feedback connectivity to every neuron, increasing structural complexity. The feedback connectivity need to have weight symmetry with forward connectivity, known as the weight transport problem. The backward pass uses a different type of computation than the forward pass, adding computational complexity. In total, these constraints prohibit parallelization of computations during learning, increase memory usage, run time, and the number of computations, and bound the network structure.

These learning constraints under backpropagation are difficult to reconcile with learning in the brain [2], [3]. Particularly, the backward pass is considered to be problematic [2]–[6] as (1) the brain does not have the comprehensive feedback connectivity necessary for every neuron (2) neither is neural feedback known to be a distinct type of computation, separate from feedforward activity and (3) the feedback and feedforward connectivity would need to have weight symmetry.

These learning constraints also hinder efficient implementations of backpropagation and error based learning algorithms on hardware [7], [8]. (1) weight symmetry is incompatible with elementary computing units which are not bidirectional, (2) the transportation of non-local weight and error information requires special communication channels in hardware, and (3) spiking equations are non-derivable, non-continuous. Hardware implementations of learning algorithms may provide insight into learning in the brain. An efficient, empirically competitive algorithm to backpropagation on hardware will likely parallel learning in the brain.

These constraints can be categorized as follows. (a) Backwardpass unlocking would allow for all parameters to be updated in parallel after the forward pass has completed. (b) Forwardpass unlocking would allow for individual parameters to be asynchronously updated once the forward pass has reached them, without waiting for the forward pass to complete. These categories directly reference parallel computation, but also have implications on network structure, memory, and run-time. For example, backwardpass locking implies top-down feedback connectivity. Similar terminology was used in [9], where (a) is backward locking and (b) is update locking. Alternative approaches to relax learning constraints have been proposed, refer to Section II and Figure 1 but do not solve all of these constraints.

We propose forward signal propagation learning (FSP or sigprop), a new learning algorithm for propagating a learning signal and updating neural network parameters via a forward pass. FSP addresses all of the above learning constraints and is completely forwardpass unlocked. At its core, FSP generates targets from learning signals and then re-uses the forward path to propagate those targets to hidden layers and update parameters. FSP has the following desirable features. First, inputs and learning signals use the same forward path, so there
are no additional structural or computational requirements for learning, such as feedback connectivity, weight transport, or a backward pass. Second, without a backward pass, the network parameters are updated as soon as they are reached by a forward pass containing the learning signal. FSP does not block the next input or store activations. So, FSP is ideal for parallel training of layers or modules. Third, since the same forwardpass used for inputs is used for updating parameters, there is only one type of computation. Compared with alternative approaches to relax learning constraints, only signal propagation learning addresses all of the above constraints, and does so with a global learning signal.

Our work suggests that learning signals can be fed through the forward path to train neurons. Feedback connectivity is not necessary for learning. In biology, this means that neurons who do not have feedback connections can still receive a global learning signal. In hardware, this means that global learning (e.g. supervised or reinforcement) is possible even though there is no backward connectivity.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we detail the improvements on relaxing learning constraints of FSP over alternative approaches. In Section III, we introduce the signal propagation learning algorithm. In Section IV, we describe experiments evaluating the accuracy, run time, and memory usage of signal propagation learning. We also demonstrate that FSP can be trained with a sparse learning signal. In Section V, we demonstrate that signal propagation learning provides a useful learning signal that becomes increasingly similar to backpropagation as training progresses. We also demonstrate that FSP can train continuous time neural networks, and with a Hebbian plasticity mechanism to update parameters in hidden layers, as further support of its relevance to biological learning. In Section VI, we demonstrate that signal propagation learning directly trains Spiking Neural Networks, with or without surrogate functions, as further support of its relevance to hardware learning.

II. RELAXING CONSTRAINTS ON LEARNING

Forward signal propagation learning improves on relaxing learning constraints over alternative approaches. Refer to Figure 1 for a visual comparison.

Feedback Alignment (FA) [10] uses fixed random weights to transport error gradient information back to hidden layers, instead of using symmetric weights, Figure 1d. It was shown that the sign concordance between the forward and feedback weights is enough to deliver effective error signals [7], [11], [12]. During learning, the forward weights move to align with the random feedback weights and have approximate symmetry, forming an angle below 90°. FA addresses the weight transport problem, but remains forwardpass and backwardpass locked. Direct Feedback Alignment (DFA) [13] propagates the error directly to each hidden layer and is additionally backwardpass unlocked, Figure 1f. Sigprop improves on DFA and is forwardpass unlocked. DFA performs similarly to backpropagation on CIFAR-10 for small fully-connected networks with dropout, but performs more poorly for convolutional neural networks. Sigprop performs better than DFA and FA for convolutional neural networks.

FA based algorithms also rely on systematic feedback connections to layers and neurons. Though it is possible [6], [10], [12], there is no evidence in the neocortex of the comprehensive level of connectivity necessary for every neuron to receive feedback (reciprocal connectivity). With sigprop, we introduce an algorithm capable of explaining how neurons without feedback connections learn. That is, neurons without feedback connectivity receive feedback through their feedforward connectivity.

An alternative approach that minimizes feedback connectivity is local learning algorithms, Figure 1. In local learning algorithms [14]–[16], layers are trained independently by calculating a separate loss for each layer using an auxiliary classifier per layer. Local learning algorithms have achieved performance close to backpropagation on CIFAR-10 and is making progress on ImageNet. It trains each layer and auxiliary classifier with backpropagation. At the layer level, it has the weight transport problem and is forwardpass and backwardpass locked. In [14], FA is used to backwardpass unlock the layers. It does not use a global learning signal, but learns greedily. In another approach, synthetic gradients are used to train layers independently [9], [17]. Synthetic gradient algorithm train an auxiliary networks to predict the gradient of the backward pass from the input, the synthetic gradient, Figure 1b. Similar to local learning, synthetic gradient methods trains the auxiliary networks using backpropagation. Until the auxiliary networks are trained, it has the weight transport problem and is forwardpass and backwardpass locked at the network level. In contrast, our signal propagation learning algorithm is completely forwardpass unlocked, combines a global learning signal with local learning, and is compatible with learning in hardware where there is no backward connectivity.

Forwardpass unlocked algorithms do not necessarily address the limitations in biological and hardware learning models with having different types of computations for inference and learning. In signal propagation learning, the approach to having a single type of computation for inference and learning is similar to target propagation. Target propagation [18], [19] generates a target activation for each layer instead of gradients by propagating backward through the network, Figure 1b. It requires reciprocal connectivity and is forwardpass and backwardpass locked. In contrast, signal propagation learning generates a target activation at each layer by going forward through the network. An alternative approach, equilibrium propagation (EP) is an energy based model using a local contrastive Hebbian learning which uses the same computation in the inference and learning phases [6], [20], [21]. The model is a continuous recurrent neural network that minimizes the difference between two fixed points: when receiving an input only and when receiving the target for error correction. Symmetric and random feedback weights work in these models [22]. These models still require comprehensive connectivity for each layer and are forwardpass locked. We demonstrate that sigprop works in the Equilibrium Propagation model, a continuous recurrent neural model that is more closely models neural networks in the brain.

Another approach that reuses the forward connectivity for learning, as is we do in sigprop, is error forward propagation...
Error forward propagation is for closed loop control systems or autoencoders. In either case, the output of the network is in the same space as the input of the network. These works calculate an error between the output and input of the network and then propagate the error forward through the network, instead of backward, as in error backpropagation. Error forward propagation is backwardpass locked and forwardpass locked. It also requires different types of computation for learning and inference. In contrast, signal propagation learning uses only a single type of computation and is backwardpass unlocked and forwardpass unlocked.

III. FORWARD SIGNAL PROPAGATION LEARNING

The premise of signal propagation (sigprop) learning algorithm is to reuse the forward path to map an initial learning signal into targets at each layer for updating parameters. The network is shown in Fig. 2. The initial learning signal is some context, usually the label in supervised learning, that is processed by a target generator to output an initial target which is then fed forward through the network on the same path as the input. The target generator is loosely a transpose of the classification layer, but has an output size to match the first hidden layer, whereas the classification layer has an input size to match the last hidden layer. Each layer processes its input and initial target to create an output and output-target. The layer compares its output with its output-target to update its parameters. In this way, the layer locally computes its update from a global learning signal. The layer then sends its output and output-target to the next layer which will compute its own update. This processes continues until the last layer has computed its update and produces the network’s output (prediction). From this procedure collectively, the network learns to process the input to produce an output, and at the same time, learns to make an initial learning signal into a useful training target at each hidden layer and output layer.

A. Training

The forward pass starts with the input \( x \), a learning signal \( c \), and the target generator. The target generator is conditioned on some context \( c \), usually the classes \( k \) in supervised learning. Let \( (x, y') \) be a mini-batch of inputs and labels where the labels are out of \( m \) classes. Assume the network has two hidden layers, as shown in Figures [2], where \( W_i \) and \( b_i \) are weight and bias for layer \( i \). Let \( S_1 \) and \( d_{1i} \) be the weight and
bias for the target generator. The activation function \( f() \) is a non-linearity. We create a one-hot vector of each class \( c_m \) and feed it to the target generator:
\[
h_i, t_1 = f(W_1 x + b_1), f(S_t c_m + d_1) \tag{1}
\]
\[
[h_2, t_2] = f(W_2[h_1, t_1] + b_2) \tag{2}
\]
\[
[h_3, t_3] = f(W_3[h_2, t_2] + b_2) \tag{3}
\]
The outputted \( t_1 \) is a target for the output of the first hidden layer \( h_1 \). This target is used to compute the loss \( L_1(h_1, t_1) \) for training the first hidden layer and the target generator. Then, the target and the output are fed to the next hidden layer. The forward pass continues this way until the output layer. The output layer and each hidden layer have their own losses:
\[
J = L(h_1, t_1) + L(h_2, t_2) + L(h_3, t_3) \tag{4}
\]
where \( J \) is the total loss for the network. For hidden layers, the loss \( L \) can be a supervised loss, such as \( L_{pred} \) Eq. [9] which is used in Section [IV]. It can also be a Hebbian update rule, such as Eq. [14] which is used in Section [V]. For the output layer, the loss \( L \) is a supervised loss, such as \( L_{pred} \) Eq. [9].

After the first hidden layer, the target does not use a separate hidden layer; the target and the output use the same forward path. The network itself, which is the forward path, takes on the role of the feedback connectivity in producing a learning signal for each layer. This makes sigprop compatible with models of learning where backward connectivity is limited, such as in the brain and learning in hardware (e.g. neuromorphic chips).

\section*{B. Prediction}

In sigprop, the prediction \( y \) is formed by comparing the last layer’s output \( h_3 \) with its target \( t_3 \) - Fig. [2]. Sigprop does not need a classification layer. However, a classification layer may be used with no effect on performance. We describe both version of sigprop below.

**Output Target:** The network’s prediction \( y \) at the output layer is formed by comparing the output \( h_3 \) and outputted target \( t_3 \):
\[
y = y_3 = O(h_3, t_3) \tag{5}
\]
where \( O \) is a comparison function. Two such comparison functions are the dot product and L2 distance:
\[
O_{dot}(h_i, t_i) = h_i \cdot t_i^T \tag{6}
\]
\[
O_{l2}(h_i, t_i) = \sum_k |[t_i[i, 1, k] - h_i[1, j, k]]|^2 \tag{7}
\]
We use the less complex \( O_{dot} \), but both versions give similar performance using the losses in Section [III-C]. Each hidden layer can also output a prediction, these are known as early exits:
\[
y = y_i = O(h_i, t_i) \tag{8}
\]

**Classification Layer:** In sigprop, the learning signal \( c \) (e.g. labels in supervised learning) is at the input of the network. A classification layer requires projecting the learning signal \( c \) to the last layer of the network, as shown in Fig. [2b], but simplifies predictions during inference. In this case, the target \( t_3 \) is no longer used during inference to form \( y \), so neither is the context generator.

\section*{C. Loss}

In sigprop, losses losses compare neurons with themselves over different inputs and with each other. The \( L_{pred} \) is the basic loss we use.

**Prediction Loss:** The prediction loss is a cross entropy loss using a local prediction, eq. [8]. The local prediction is from a dot product between the layer’s local targets \( t_i \) and the layer’s output \( h_i \). The layer’s output is from the network’s input \( x \). The local targets are from the target generator. The target generator is conditioned on the class labels \( c_m \) (i.e. the learning signal) to compute one initial target per label. The local targets for each layer are computed from these initial targets through the forward pass. Samples with the same class label will have the same local target. Given a vector of classes \( k = (k_1, \ldots, k_m) \), a hidden layer’s local targets \( t_i = (t_{i1}, \ldots, t_{im}) \), and a size \( n \) mini-batch of outputs \( h_i = (h_{i1}, \ldots, h_{in}) \) of the same hidden layer:
\[
L_{pred}(h_i, t_i) = CE(y_i^*, -O_{dot}(h_i, t_i)) \tag{9}
\]
where \( h_i \) and \( t_i \) have the same size output dimension. The cross entropy loss (CE) uses \( y_i^* \), which is a reconstruction of the labels \( y_i^* \) at each layer \( i \) from the positional encoding of the inputs \( x \) and context \( c \), starting from the activations \( h_1 \) and targets \( t_1 \) formed at the first hidden layer. In particular, we form a new batch \( [h_1, t_1] \) by interleaving \( h_1 \) and \( t_1 \) such that each sample’s activations in \( h_1 \) is concatenated after its corresponding target \( t_1 \). Then, at each layer \( i \), we assign a label for each sample \( h_{ij} \) depending on which target \( t_{ih} \) the sample came after, where \( 0 \leq k < j \). Many different encodings are available. An alternative is to use the approach in Section [IV] which merges the context \( c \), and therefore generated targets \( t_1 \), with the inputs \( x \) to form a single combined input \( xt \), an input-target, and then either compares them with each other or uses an update rule over multiple iterations. The second option is natural for continuous networks where multiple iterations (e.g time steps) can support robust update rules.

\section*{D. Target Generators}

The target generator takes in some context to condition learning on and then produces the initial learning signal fed forward through the network. There are many possible formulations of the target generator. We describe three formulations below to address different learning scenarios.

**Target-Only:** This is the version described in Eq. [1] and conditions only on the class label. This version of the target generator can interfere with batch normalization statistics as \( h_1 \) and \( t_1 \) do not necessarily have similar enough distribution. Batch normalization statics may be disabled or be put in inference mode when processing the targets, therefore only collecting statistics on the input.

**Target-Input:** Another context we condition on is the class label and input. We feed a one-hot vector of the labels \( y_{im}^* \) through the target generator to produce a scale and shift for
the input. We take the scaled and shifted output as the target for the first hidden layer.

\[ t_1 = h_1 f(S_1 c_m + d_1) + f(S_2 c_m + d_2) \]  

(10)

The target \( t_1 \) is now more closely tied to the distribution of the input. We found that this formulation of the target works better with batch normalization. Even though this version has similar performance to Eq. [1] it increases memory usage as each input will have its own version of the targets.

**Target-Loop:** The last option is to incorporate a form of feedback. The immediate choice is to condition on the activations of the predictions \( y_3 \) and labels \( y^*_m \),

\[ t_1 = f(S_1 y_3 + S_1 y^*_m + d_1) \]  

(11)

or using the output of the last layer and the error to correct it

\[ t_1 = f(S_1 (h_3 - \eta e_3) + d_1) \]  

(12)

\[ \frac{dL}{dh_3} + d_1 \]

where \( \eta \) controls how much error to integrate. The Target-Loop generator is shown in Figure 2. We use it Section V for continuous networks.

### E. Sparse Learning

Sigprop can be a form of sparse learning. We reformulate the target generator to produce a sparse target, which is a sparse learning signal. We make the targets \( t_i \) as sparse as possible such that at minimum, they can still be taken with each layer’s weights \( W_i \), via a convolution or dot-product, and then feed-forward through the network. To make the target sparse, we reduce the output size of \( S_i \) in the target generator. We use sparse learning throughout this paper, except when otherwise written.

For a convolutional layers, the output size of \( S_i \) is made to be the same size as the weights. For example, let there be an input of 32x28x28 and a convolutional hidden layer of 32x16x3x3, where 32 is the in-channels, 28x28 is the width and height of the input, 16 is the out-channels, and 3x3 is the kernel. The dense target’s shape is 32x28x28. In contrast, the sparse target’s shape is reduced to 10x32x3x3. As a result, even though convolutional layers have weight sharing, there is no weight sharing when convolving with a sparse target.

For fully connected layers, the output size of \( S_i \) is made to be smaller than input size of the weights. For example, let there be an input of 1024 and a fully connected hidden layer of 1024x512 features. The dense target’s shape would be 1024. In contrast, the sparse target’s shape is < 1024. Then, we resize the target to match the layer input size of 1024 by filling it with zeros. With the sparse target, the layer is no longer fully connected.

### IV. Experiments

We compare sigprop with backpropagation, local learning, and Feedback Alignment. The models are shown in Figure 1. Feedback Alignment (FA) uses fixed random weights to transport error gradient information back to hidden layers, instead of using symmetric weights. For local learning, we compare with two model versions. The first uses backpropagation at the layer level (LL-BP), and the second uses FA in the auxiliary networks to have a backpropagation free model (LL-FA). This second model performs better than using FA or DFA alone. We compare FSP to LL with predsim losses on the VGG8b architecture [14]. We trained several network on the CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and SVHN datasets. We used a VGG architecture. The experiments were run using the Pytorch Framework. All training was done on a single GeForce GTX 1080. For each layer to have a separate loss, the computational graph was detached before each hidden layer to prevent the gradient from propagating backward past the current layer. The target generator is conditioned on the classes, producing a single target for each class.

**Comparison to BP, LL-BP, and LL-FA** A batch size of 128 was used. The training time was 100 epochs for SVHN, and 400 epochs for CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100. ADAM was used for optimization [29]. The learning rate was set to 5e−4. The learning rate was decayed by a factor of .25 at 50%, 75%, 89%, and 94% of the total epochs. The leaky ReLU activation with a negative slope of 0.01 was used [30]. Batch normalization was applied before each activation function [31] and dropout after. The dropout rate was 0.1 for all datasets. The standard data augmentation was composed of random cropping for all datasets and horizontal flipping for CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100. The results over a single trial for VGG models.

The CIFAR-10 dataset [32] consists of 50000 32x32 RGB images of vehicles and animals with 10 classes. The CIFAR-100 dataset [32] consists of 50000 32x32 RGB images of vehicles and animals with 100 classes. The SVHN dataset [33] consists of 32x32 images of house numbers. We use both the training of 73257 images and the additional training of 531131 images.
Table I. Training time and maximum memory usage per batch over all layers for VGG8b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>BP</th>
<th>LL-BP</th>
<th>LL-FA</th>
<th>FSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR-10</td>
<td>12.29 ± 0.02</td>
<td>8.11 ± 14.40</td>
<td>8.50 ± 29.86</td>
<td>5.91 ± 7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR-100</td>
<td>15.34 ± 1.45</td>
<td>10.20 ± 28.98</td>
<td>9.44 ± 28.63</td>
<td>6.25 ± 7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVHN</td>
<td>148.70 ± 2.23</td>
<td>95.51 ± 3617.90</td>
<td>89.32 ± 1767.26</td>
<td>69.74 ± 1048.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mem (MiB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR-10</td>
<td>22.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>8.85 ± 8.06</td>
<td>13.03 ± 10.61</td>
<td>6.19 ± 1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR-100</td>
<td>27.16 ± 0.38</td>
<td>11.45 ± 106.02</td>
<td>5.51 ± 23.17</td>
<td>5.19 ± 16.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVHN</td>
<td>28.04 ± 2.68</td>
<td>11.41 ± 106.03</td>
<td>5.43 ± 23.04</td>
<td>4.91 ± 16.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Epoch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR-10</td>
<td>319(198)</td>
<td>266(164)</td>
<td>309(201)</td>
<td>313(207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR-100</td>
<td>350(306)</td>
<td>380(209)</td>
<td>339(264)</td>
<td>329(219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVHN</td>
<td>98(11)</td>
<td>41(7)</td>
<td>93(23)</td>
<td>88(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Error (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR-10</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFAR-100</td>
<td>26.20</td>
<td>29.31</td>
<td>38.41</td>
<td>34.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVHN</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Efficiency

We measure training time and maximum memory usage on CIFAR-10 for BP, LL-BP, LL-FA, and FSP. The version of FSP used is \( L_{pred} \) with the loss. The results are summarized in Table I. LL and FSP training time are measured per layer as they are forward pass unlocked and layers can be updated in parallel. However, BP is not forward pass unlocked, so layers are updated sequentially and is necessarily measured at the network level. Measurements are across all seven layers, which is the source of the high variance for LL and FSP, and over four hundred epochs of training. To ensure training times are comparable, we compare the epochs at which FSP, LL, and BP converge toward their lowest test error. We also include the first epochs that have performance within 0.5% of the best reported performance. All learning algorithms converge within significance of their best performance around the same epoch. Given efficiency per iteration, FSP is faster than the other learning algorithms and has lower memory usage.

The largest bottleneck for speed of LL and FSP is successive calls to the loss function in each layer. Backpropagation only needs to call the loss function once for the whole network; it optimizes the forward and backward computations for all layers and the batch. FSP and LL would benefit from using a larger batch size than backpropagation. The batch size could be increased in proportion to the number of layers in the network. This is only pragmatic in cases where memory can be sacrificed for more speed (e.g. not edge devices). We also provide per layer measurements in Tables II. At the layer level, FSP remains faster and more memory efficient than LL and backpropagation. It is interesting to note that LL and FSP tend to be slower and faster in different layers even though both are using the same architecture. For memory, FSP uses less memory than LL and BP regardless of the layer. However, there is a general trend for LL and FSP: the layers closer to the input have more parameters, so are slower and take up more memory then layers closer to the output.

Table II. Training time per sample and maximum memory usage per batch on CIFAR-10 for VGG8b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>LL-BP</th>
<th>LL-FA</th>
<th>FSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.16 ± 0.04</td>
<td>6.21 ± 0.03</td>
<td>4.48 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.80 ± 0.07</td>
<td>15.15 ± 0.09</td>
<td>8.95 ± 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.27 ± 0.04</td>
<td>7.09 ± 0.02</td>
<td>10.13 ± 0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.25 ± 0.30</td>
<td>18.40 ± 0.06</td>
<td>7.27 ± 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.93 ± 0.01</td>
<td>5.66 ± 0.04</td>
<td>4.71 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.46 ± 0.01</td>
<td>3.93 ± 0.02</td>
<td>3.44 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.90 ± 0.00</td>
<td>3.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td>2.36 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mem (MiB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,6,7,4,5</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Sparse Local Targets

We demonstrate that FSP can train a network with a sparse learning signal. We use the larger VGG8b(2x) architecture to leave more room for possible improvement when using this sparse target. The version of FSP used is \( L_{pred} \) with the loss. We use the CIFAR-10 dataset with the same configuration as in Section IV. We see that the network’s training speed increased and memory usage decreased Fig. IIIIV with negligible change in accuracy.

V. In Continuous Time

We demonstrate that sigprop can train a neural model in the continuous setting using a Hebbian update mechanism, in addition to the discrete setting. Biological neural networks work in continuous time and have no indication of different dynamics in prediction and learning. In the model presented in this section, the target generator is conditioned on the activations...
With this feedback loop, we demonstrate in section V-A that where $s_j$ neurons, and $I$ output neurons, magnitude and direction of the feedback, $O$ increasing function of it’s firing rate, a neuron model based on the continuous Hopfield model [36]:

$$\text{sigprop}$$ allows for training in hardware, such as neuromorphic avoiding the need for different hardware for each. In addition, learning and have the same dynamics in inference and learning, and feedback loop weights into alignment. In Section V-B, we sigprop provides useful learning signals by bringing forward of the output layer to produce a feedback loop - Fig. 2c. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Time s (Mem MiB)</th>
<th>Dense</th>
<th>Sparse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.85 ± 5.66</td>
<td>(12.99)</td>
<td>7.42 ± 0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.51 ± 9.31</td>
<td>(20.23)</td>
<td>19.70 ± 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.81 ± 5.50</td>
<td>(13.02)</td>
<td>9.30 ± 0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.30 ± 12.97</td>
<td>(13.02)</td>
<td>14.19 ± 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.69 ± 1.86</td>
<td>(13.02)</td>
<td>8.84 ± 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.11 ± 3.16</td>
<td>(13.02)</td>
<td>5.24 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.06 ± 1.61</td>
<td>(12.99)</td>
<td>2.25 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III: Efficiency of Targets Over All Layers on CIFAR-10 for VGG8b(2x). Training Time Per Sample, Maximum Memory Usage Per Batch

The input receiving neurons $s_j \in I$. All weights and biases are trained. The weights in the feedback loop connections may be fixed or trained. The output neurons receive the $L_2$ error as an additional input which nudges the firing rate towards the target firing rate $d_j$. The target firing rate $d_j$ is the one-hot vector of the target value; all tasks in this section are classification tasks.

The EP learning algorithm can be broken into the free phase, the clamped phase, and the update rule. In the free phase, the input neurons are fixed to a given value and the network is relaxed to an energy minimum to produce a prediction. In the clamped phase, the input neurons remain fixed and the rate of output neurons $s_j \in O$ are perturbed toward the target value $d_j$, given the prediction $s_j$, which propagates to connected hidden layers. The update rule is a simple contrastive Hebbian (CHL) plasticity mechanism that subtracts $s_j^0 s_j^0$ at the energy minimum (fixed point) in the free phase from $s_j^0 s_j^0$ after the perturbation of the output, when $\beta > 0$:

$$\Delta W_{ij} \propto \rho(s_i) \frac{d}{d\beta} \rho(s_j) \approx \frac{1}{\beta} \rho(s_i^0) \rho(s_j^0) - \rho(s_i^0)$$

(14)

The clamping factor $\beta$ allows the network to be sensitive to internal perturbations. As $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$, the fully clamped state in general CHL algorithms is reached where perturbations from the objective function tend to overrun the dynamics and continue backwards through the network.

### B. Forward Signal Propagation Learning Provides Useful Learning Signals

We look at the behavior of our model during training and how the feedback loop drives weight changes. Precise symmetric connectivity was thought to be crucial for effective error delivery [1]. Feedback Alignment, however, showed that approximate symmetry with reciprocal connectivity is sufficient for learning [10]–[12]. Direct Feedback Alignment showed that approximate symmetry with direct reciprocal connectivity is sufficient. In the previous sections, we showed that no feedback connectivity is necessary for learning. Here, we conduct an experiment to show that the same approximate symmetry is found in signal propagation learning.

We provide evidence that signal propagation learning brings weights into alignment within 90°, known as approximate symmetry. In comparison, backpropagation has complete alignment between weights, known as symmetric connectivity. In this experiment, the signal propagation learning network architecture forms a loop, so all the weights serve as both feedback and feedforward weights. For a given weight matrix, the feedback weights are all the weights on the path from the downstream error to the presynaptic neuron. In general, this is all the other weights in the network loop. The weight matrices in the loop evolve to align with each other as seen in Fig. 8.

More precisely, each weight matrix roughly aligns with the product of all the other weights in the network loop. In Fig. 8 the weight alignment for a network with two hidden layers $W_3$ and $W_2$ and one loop back layer $W_3$ is shown. Information about $W_3$ and $W_1$ flows into $W_2$ as roughly $W_3 W_1$, which nudges $W_2$ into alignment with
the rest of the weights in the loop. From equation [14] $W_2 \propto \rho(s_2^3)(\rho(s_3^2) - \rho(s_3^2))$, where $s_2^3 \leftarrow \rho(s_1^3)W_1$, which means information about $W_1$ accumulates in $W_2$. Similarly, $W_1 \propto \rho(s_1^3)(\rho(s_2^3) - \rho(s_2^3))$, except since the network architecture is a feedforward loop, $s_1^3 \leftarrow \rho(s_2^3)W_3$, which means information about $W_3$ accumulates in $W_1$. The result is shown in column c of the bottom row of Fig. 3 where a weight matrix is fixed and the rest of the network’s weights come into alignment with the fixed weight. Notice that $W_3W_1$ has the same shape as $W_2^T$ and serves as its ‘feedback’ weight.

### C. Classification Results

We provide evidence that our model has comparable performance to EP, and report the performance results of the experiment in the previous section. A two and another three layer architecture of 1500 neurons per layer were trained. The two layer architecture was run for sixty epochs and the three layer for one hundred and fifty epochs. The best model during the entire run was kept. On the MNIST dataset [34], the generalization error is 1.85 – 1.90% for both the two layer and three layer architectures, an improvement over EP’s 2 – 3%. The best validation error is 1.76 – 1.80% and the training error decreases to 0.00%. To demonstrate that FSP provides useful learning signals in the previous section, we trained the network on the more difficult Fashion-MNIST dataset [35]. The generalization error is 11.00%. The best validation error is 10.95% and the training error decreases to 2%.

### VI. SPIKING NEURAL NETWORKS

We demonstrate that sigprop can train a spiking neural model. Spiking is the form of neuronal communication in biological and hardware neural networks. Spiking neural networks (SNN) are known to be efficient by parallelizing computation and memory, overcoming the memory bottleneck of Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) [37]–[39]. However, SNNs are difficult to train. A key reason is that spiking equations are non-derivable, non-continuous and spikes do not necessarily represent the internal parameters, such as membrane voltage of the neuron before and after spiking [8]. Spiking also has multiple possible encodings for communication when considering time which are non-trivial, whereas artificial neural networks (ANN) have a single rate value for communication [8]. One approach to training SNNs is to convert an ANN into a spiking neural network after training [40]–[42]. Another approach is to have an SNN in the forward path, but have a backpropagation friendly surrogate model in the backward path, usually approximately making the spiking differentiable in the backward path to update the parameters [8], [43], [44].

We propose to train SNNs with sigprop. With sigprop, the target is forwarded through the network with the input, so learning is done before the non-derivable, non-continuous spiking equation. That is, we do not need to differentiate a non-derivable, non-continuous spiking equation. Also, the SNN has the same dynamics in inference and learning and has no reciprocal feedback connectivity. This makes sigprop ideal for on-chip, as well as off-chip training of spiking neural networks. We measure the performance of this model on the Fashion-MNIST dataset.

#### A. Spiking Neural Network

We train a convolutional spiking neural network with Integrate-and-Fire (IF) nodes, which are treated as activation functions. The IF neuron can be viewed as an ideal integrator where the voltage does not decay. The subthreshold neural dynamics are:

$$v_i^t = v_i^{t-1} + h_i^t$$ (15)

where $v_i^t$ is the voltage at time $t$ for neurons of layer $i$ and $h_i^t$ is the layer’s activations. The surrogate spiking function for the IF neuron is the arc tangent

$$g(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan(\pi x) + \frac{1}{2}$$ (16)

where the gradient is defined by

$$g'(x) = \frac{1}{1 + (\pi x)^2}$$ (17)
The neuron spikes when the subthreshold dynamics reach 0.5 for FSP, and 1.0 for BP and Shallow models. All models are simulated for 4 time-steps, directly using the subthreshold dynamics. The SNN has 4 layers. The first two are convolutional layers, each followed by batch normalization, an If node, and a 2x2 maxpooling. The last two layers are fully connected, with one being the classification layer. The output of the classification layer is averaged across all four time steps and used as the network output. ADAM was used for optimization [29]. The learning rate was set to 5e-4. Cosine Annealing [45] was used as the learning rate schedule with the maximum number of iterations $T_{\text{max}}$ set to 64. The models are trained on the MNIST and Fashion-MNIST datasets for 64 epochs using a batchsize of 128. We use automatic mixed precision for 16-bit floating operations, instead of the only the full 32-bit. The reduced precision is better representative of hardware limitations for learning. We use the classification layer version of FSP Fig. [2].

Table V The Test Error for a Spiking Convolutional Neural Network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BP</th>
<th>Shallow</th>
<th>FSP Surrogate</th>
<th>FSP Voltage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fashion-MNIST</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>10.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNIST</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Results

We compare four spiking models on the MNIST and Fashion-MNIST datasets - Table V. The BP model propagates backward through the spiking equations at each layer using a differentiable surrogate. The Shallow model only trains the classification layer. The FSP Surrogate model uses the same differentiable surrogate as BP does, but FSP propagates forward through the network and does not need to go through the spiking equation to deliver a learning signal. That is, the parameter update and surrogate are before or perpendicular to spiking, possibly as separate compartment. Finally, the FSP voltage model uses the neuron’s voltage to calculate the loss and update the parameters, no surrogate is used. FSP is able to train the spiking network, but a differentiable nonlinear function estimating the spiking behavior (i.e. surrogate) is necessary to come close to BP performance. Even without a surrogate, the FSP Voltage model is able to train the network significantly better than the Shallow model. To the best of our knowledge, FSP is the only learning algorithm with a global supervised (unsupervised, reinforcement) learning signal that satisfies requirements for hardware (on-chip) learning [8], [46].

VII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We demonstrated forward signal propagation, a new learning algorithm for updating neural network parameters via a forward pass. Our work demonstrates that learning signals can be fed through the forward path to train neurons. Feedback connectivity is not necessary for learning. In biology, this means that neurons who do not have feedback connections can still receive a global learning signal. In hardware, this means that global learning (e.g. supervised or reinforcement) is possible even though there is no backward connectivity. At its core, sigprop generates targets from learning signals and then re-uses the forward path to propagate those targets. With this combination, there are no additional structural or computational requirements for learning. Furthermore, the network parameters are updated as soon as they are reached by a forward pass. So, sigprop learning is ideal for parallel training of layers or modules.
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