

Bridging the Gaps Between Residual Learning, Recurrent Neural Networks and Visual Cortex

Qianli Liao and Tomaso Poggio

Center for Brains, Minds, and Machines, McGovern Institute for Brain Research,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, 02139.

Sept. 15, 2016 *

Abstract

We discuss relations between Residual Networks (ResNet), Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) and the primate visual cortex. We begin with the observation that a special type of shallow RNN is exactly equivalent to a very deep ResNet with weight sharing among the layers. A direct implementation of such a RNN, although having orders of magnitude fewer parameters, leads to a performance similar to the corresponding ResNet. We propose 1) a generalization of both RNN and ResNet architectures and 2) the conjecture that a class of moderately deep RNNs is a biologically-plausible model of the ventral stream in visual cortex. We demonstrate the effectiveness of the architectures by testing them on the CIFAR-10 and ImageNet dataset.¹

1 Introduction

Residual learning [He et al., 2015a], a novel deep learning scheme characterized by ultra-deep architectures has recently achieved state-of-the-art performance on several popular vision benchmarks. The most recent incarnation of this idea [He et al., 2016] with hundreds of layers demonstrate consistent performance improvement over shallower networks. The 3.57% top-5 error achieved by residual networks on the ImageNet test set arguably rivals human performance.

Because of recent claims [Yamins and Dicarlo, 2016] that networks of the AlexNet[Krizhevsky et al., 2012] type successfully predict properties of neurons in visual cortex, one natural question arises: how similar is an ultra-deep residual network to the primate cortex? A notable difference is the depth. While a residual network has as many as 1202 layers[He et al., 2015a], biological systems seem to have one or two orders of magnitude less, if we make the customary assumption that a weighted linear combination layer (plus a nonlinearity) in the NN architecture corresponds to a cortical area. In fact, there are about half a dozen areas in the ventral stream of visual cortex from the retina to the Inferior Temporal cortex. Notice that it takes in the order of 10ms for neural activity to propagate from one neuron to another one (remember that spiking activity of cortical neurons is usually well below 100 Hz). The evolutionary advantage of having fewer layers is apparent: it supports rapid (100msec from image onset to meaningful information in IT neural population) visual recognition, which is a key ability of human and non-human primates [Thorpe et al., 1996, Serre et al., 2007].

It is intriguingly possible to account for this discrepancy by taking into account recurrent connections within each visual area. Areas in visual cortex comprise six different layers with lateral and feedback connections [Lamme et al., 1998], which are believed to mediate some attentional effects [Büchel and Friston, 1997, Lamme et al., 1998, Ito and Gilbert, 1999, Rao and Ballard, 1999, Hupe et al., 1998] and even learning (such as backpropagation [Liao et al., 2015]). “Unrolling” in time the recurrent computations carried out by the visual

*Written in 2016, released as it is.

¹Pretrained model on ImageNet is available in https://gitlab.com/liaoq/biological_rnn_resnet

cortex provides an equivalent “ultra-deep” feedforward network, which might represent a more appropriate comparison with the state-of-the-art computer vision models.

In addition, we conjecture that the effectiveness of recent “ultra-deep” neural networks primarily come from the fact they can efficiently model the recurrent computations that are required by the recognition task. We show evidence for this conjecture by demonstrating that 1. a deep residual network is formally equivalent to a specific shallow RNN²; 2. such a RNN with weight sharing, thus with orders of magnitude less parameters (depending on the unrolling depth), can retain most of the performance of the corresponding deep residual network.

Furthermore, we generalize such a RNN to a class of more biologically plausible models of visual cortex to account for multi-stage recurrent processing and show their effectiveness on the CIFAR-10 and ImageNet dataset.

Another minor contribution of this work is that, we propose using *time-specific* batch normalization (TSBN, defined in Section 3) in hidden-to-hidden transitions of RNN. We are also the first to show when TSBN is used, there is no difficulty training RNNs (even multi-state fully recurrent ones) with ReLUs. This was previously believed to be difficult without careful weight initializations [Le et al., 2015]. See supplementary materials for additional experiments on character-level language modeling using our model.

2 Equivalence of ResNet and a specific RNN

2.1 Intuition

We discuss here a very simple observation: a Residual Network (ResNet) approximates a specific, standard Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) implementing the discrete dynamical system described by

$$h_t = K \circ (h_{t-1}) + h_{t-1} \quad (1)$$

where h_t is the activity of the neural layer at time t and K is a nonlinear operator. Such a dynamical system corresponds to the feedback system of Figure 1 (B). Figure 1 (A) shows that unrolling in (discrete) time the feedback system gives a deep residual network with the same (that is, shared) weights among the layers. The number of layers in the unrolled network corresponds to the discrete time iterations of the dynamical system. The identity shortcut mapping that characterizes residual learning appears in the figure.

From a biological perspective, a neuron’s current activation, characterized by Excitatory Postsynaptic Potential (EPSP) of soma (i.e., activation before nonlinearity) is roughly the sum of inputs plus the residual EPSP from the previous time step. The latter corresponds naturally to the identity shortcut mapping (especially the pre-activation scheme in [He et al., 2016], which we adopted in this paper).

2.2 Formulation in terms of Dynamical Systems

We frame recurrent and residual neural networks in the language of dynamical systems. We consider here dynamical systems in discrete time, though most of the definitions carry over to continuous time. A neural network (that we assume for simplicity to have a single layer with n neurons) can be a dynamical system with a dynamics defined as

$$h_{t+1} = f(h_t; w_t) + x_t \quad (2)$$

where $h_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the activity of the n neurons in the layer at time t and $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a continuous, bounded function parametrized by the vector of weights w_t . In a typical neural network, f is synthesized by the following relation between the activity y_t of a single neuron and its inputs x_{t-1} :

$$y_t = \sigma(\langle w, x_{t-1} \rangle + b), \quad (3)$$

where σ is a nonlinear function such as the linear rectifier $\sigma(\cdot) = |\cdot|_+$.

A standard classification of dynamical systems defines the system as

²We use the term “RNN” to broadly refer to any neural network with recurrent activations, not the “vanilla/plain RNN” (the baseline model people often use to compare with LSTMs).




Figure 1: A formal equivalence of a ResNet (A) with weight sharing and a RNN (B). I is the identity operator. K is an operator denoting the nonlinear transformation called f in the main text. x_t is the value of the input at time t . δ_t is a Kronecker delta function.

1. *homogeneous* if $x_t = 0, \forall t > 0$ (alternatively the equation reads as $h_{t+1} = f(h_t; w_t)$ with the initial condition $h_0 = x_0$)
2. *time invariant* if $w_t = w$.

Residual networks with weight sharing thus correspond to *homogeneous, time-invariant* systems which in turn correspond to a feedback system (see Figure 1) with an input which is non-zero only at time $t = 0$ ($x_{t=0} = x_0, x_t = 0 \forall t > 0$) and with $f(z) = (K + I) \circ z$:

$$h_n = f(h_t; w_t) = (K + I)^n \circ x_0 \quad (4)$$

“Normal” residual networks correspond to *homogeneous, time-variant* systems. An analysis of the corresponding *inhomogeneous, time-invariant* system is provided in the supplementary materials.

3 A Generalized RNN for Multi-stage Fully Recurrent Processing

As shown in the previous section, the recurrent form of a ResNet is actually shallow (if we ignore the possible depth of the operator K). In this section, we generalize it into a moderately deep RNN that reflects the multi-stage processing in the primate visual cortex.

Multi-state Graph We propose a general formulation that can capture the computations performed by a multi-stage processing hierarchy with full recurrent connections. Such a hierarchy can be characterized by

Model	Error (%)	Depth	Training Epochs
All-CNN [Springenberg et al., 2014]	7.25%	11	350
Highway Network [Srivastava et al., 2015]	7.72%	19	400
ResNet-110 [He et al., 2016]	6.61%	110	200
ResNet-164	5.46%	164	200
ResNet-1001 [He et al., 2016]	4.69%	1001	200
Human[Karpathy, 2011]	$\approx 6\%$	Recurrent	-
Same FRNN with different readout time		Recurrent	
3-state FRNN (readout t=5)	7.44%	13 (unrolled)	60
3-state FRNN (readout t=10)	6.86%	23 (unrolled)	60

Table 1: Compare our model (FRNN) with other best models (prior to our work) on CIFAR-10. All models were trained with simple translation and mirror augmentation. The depth is the number of weighted linear combination layers and pooling layers. All of our models were trained with 60 epochs for consistency, since we did not focus on the absolute performance. We expect better performance if more epochs are used (will report in the next revision). Nevertheless, these models are all at the level of human performance. We believe at this point biological consistency is more interesting than marginal performance differences. Also our models achieve high performance with small latency (i.e., depth), which supports rapid visual recognition and is crucial for organism’s survival.

a directed (cyclic) graph G with vertices V and edges E : $G = \{V, E\}$. where vertices V is a set contains all the processing stages (i.e., we also call them states). Take the ventral stream of visual cortex for example, $V = \{LGN, V1, V2, V4, IT\}$. Note that retina is not listed since there is no known feedback from primate cortex to the retina. The edges E are a set that contains all the connections (i.e., transition functions) between all vertices/states, e.g., $V1-V2$, $V1-V4$, $V2-IT$, etc. One example of such a graph is in Figure 2 (A).

Pre-net and Post-net The multi-state fully recurrent system does not have to receive raw inputs. Rather, a (deep) neural network can serve as a preprocessor. We call the preprocessor a “pre-net” as shown in Figure 2 (B). On the other hand, one also needs a “post-net” as a postprocessor and provide supervisory signals to the recurrent system and the pre-net. The pre-net, recurrent system and post-net are trained in an end-to-end fashion with backpropagation.

For most models in this paper, unless stated otherwise, the pre-net is a simple 3×3 convolutional layer and the post-net is a pipeline of a batch normalization, a ReLU, a global average pooling and a fully connected layer (or a 1×1 convolution, we use these terms interchangeably).

Take primate visual system for instance, the retina is a part of the “pre-net”. It does not receive any feedback from the cortex and thus can be separated from the recurrent system for simplicity. In Section 5, we also tried 3 layers of 3×3 convolutions as an pre-net, which might be more similar to a retina, and observed slightly better performance.

Transition Matrix The connections between states over time can be represented by a 3-D matrix where each element (i, j, t) represents the *transition function* from state i to state j at time t . This formulation is flexible in the sense that transition functions can vary over time (e.g., being blocked from time t_1 to time t_2 , etc.). This formulation allows us to design a system where multiple locally recurrent systems are connected sequentially: a downstream recurrent system only receives inputs when its upstream recurrent system finishes, similar to recurrent convolutional neural networks (e.g., [Liang and Hu, 2015]). This system with non-shared weights can also represent exactly the state-of-the-art ResNet (see supplementary materials for detailed illustrations). Example transition matrices used in this paper are shown in Figure 2 (C). When there are multiple transition




Figure 2: (A) Modeling the ventral stream of visual cortex using a multi-state fully recurrent neural network. (B) the model consists of an input, a recurrent part and an output. (C) Examples of the recurrent part of the model and corresponding transition matrices used in the paper. “BN” denotes Batch Normalization and “Conv” denotes convolution. Deconvolution layer (denoted by “Deconv”) is [Zeiler et al., 2010] used as a transition function from a spatially small state to a spatially large one. BRCx2/BRDx2 denotes a BN-ReLU-Conv/Deconv-BN-ReLU-Conv/Deconv pipeline (similar to a residual module [He et al., 2016]). There is always a 2x2 subsampling/upsampling between nearby states (e.g., V1/h1: 32x32, V2/h2: 16x16, V4/h3: 8x8, IT: 4x4). Stride 2 (convolution) or upsampling 2 (deconvolution) is used in transition functions to match the spatial sizes of input and output states. The intermediate feature sizes of transition function BRCx2/BRDx2 or BRCx3/BRDx3 are chosen to be the average feature size of input and output states. “+I” denotes a identity shortcut mapping.




Figure 3: The performance of 4-state and 3-state models. The state sizes of the 4-state model are: 32x32x8, 16x16x16, 8x8x32, 4x4x64. The state sizes of the 3-state model are: 32x32x64, 16x16x128, 8x8x256. Only small 4-state models were tried since they are very computationally heavy. The readout time is $t=5$ for both models. All models are time-invariant systems (i.e., weights are shared across time).

functions to a state, their outputs are summed (for ResNet) or averaged (for our fully recurrent neural networks (FRNN)). Averaging gives slightly better performance for FRNN (about 1%).

Weight sharing Given an unrolled network, a weight sharing configuration can be described as a set S , whose element is a set of tied weights $s = \{W_{i_1, j_1, t_1}, \dots, W_{i_m, j_m, t_m}\}$, where W_{i_m, j_m, t_m} denotes the weight of the transition functions from state i_m to j_m at time t_m . This requires: 1. all weights $W_{i_m, j_m, t_m} \in s$ have the same initial values. 2. the actual gradients used for updating each element of s is the sum of the gradients of all elements in s : $\forall W \in s, (\frac{\partial E}{\partial W})_{used} = \sum_{W' \in s} (\frac{\partial E}{\partial W'})_{original}$, where E is the training objective.

Notations: Unrolling Depth vs. Readout Time The meaning of “unrolling depth” may vary in different RNN models since “unrolling” a cyclic graph is not well defined. In this paper, we adopt a biologically-plausible definition: we simulate the time after the onset of the visual stimuli assuming each transition function takes constant time 1. We use the term “readout time” to refer to the time the post-net reads the data from the last state. Regarding the initial values, at $t = 0$ all states are empty except that the first state has some data received from the pre-net. We only start simulate a transition function when its input state is populated.

This definition in principle allows one to have quantitative comparisons with biological systems. e.g., for a model with readout time t in this paper, the wall clock time can be estimated to be $20t$ to $50t$ ms, considering the latency of a single layer of biological neurons.

Sequential vs. Static Inputs/Outputs As a RNN, our model supports sequential data processing and in principle all other tasks supported by traditional RNNs. See supplementary materials for illustrations and experiments on character-level language modeling.

Batch Normalizations for RNNs As an additional observation, we found that it generally hurts performance when the normalization statistics (i.e., average, standard deviation) in batch normalization are shared across time. This may explain the difficulties observed in [Laurent et al., 2015]. However, good performance is restored if we apply a procedure we call a “time-specific normalization”: mean and standard deviation are calculated independently for every t (using training set). In CIFAR-10 experiments (except Table 1) we do not use the learnable parameters of BN. In ImageNet experiments, we do use the learnable parameters (shared over time).

since they noticeably improves performance.

4 Related Work

Deep Recurrent Neural Networks: Our final model is deep and similar to a stacked RNN [Schmidhuber, 1992, El Hhi and Bengio, , Graves, 2013] with several main differences: 1. our model has feedback transitions between hidden layers and self-transition from each hidden layer to itself. 2. our model has identity shortcut mappings inspired by residual learning. 3. our transition functions are deep and convolutional. As suggested by [Pascanu et al., 2013], the term depth in RNN could also refer to input-to-hidden, hidden-to-hidden or hidden-to-output connections. Our model is deep in all of these senses. See Section 3.

Recursive Neural Networks and Convolutional Recurrent Neural Networks: When unfolding RNN into a feedforward network, the weights of many layers are tied. This is reminiscent of Recursive Neural Networks (Recursive NN), first proposed by [Socher et al., 2011]. Recursive NN are characterized by applying same operations recursively on a structure. The convolutional version was first studied by [Eigen et al., 2013]. Subsequent related work includes [Pinheiro and Collobert, 2013] and [Liang and Hu, 2015]. One characteristic distinguishes our model and residual learning from Recursive NN and convolutional recurrent NN is whether there are identity shortcut mappings. This discrepancy seems to account for the superior performance of residual learning and of our model over the latters.

Our work may explain the seemingly surprising observation of “stochastic depth” [Huang et al., 2016] that randomly replacing a subset of layers of ResNet by identity mappings during training does not hurt performance — if they are similar refinements performed repeatedly, dropping a few of them should not be catastrophic. A recent report [Caswell et al., 2016] we became aware of after we finished this work discusses the idea of imitating cortical feedback by introducing loops into neural networks. A Highway Network [Srivastava et al., 2015] is a feedforward network inspired by Long Short Term Memory [Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997] featuring gated shortcut mappings (instead of hardwired identity mappings used by ResNet).

5 Experiments

Dataset and training details We test most models on the standard CIFAR-10 [Krizhevsky, 2009] dataset. All images are 32x32 pixels with color. Data augmentation is performed in the same way as [He et al., 2015a]. Momentum was used with hyperparameter 0.9. Experiments were run for 60 epochs with batchsize 64 unless stated otherwise. The learning rates are 0.01 for the first 40 epochs, 0.001 for epoch 41 to 50 and 0.0001 for the last 10 epochs. All experiments used the cross-entropy loss function and softmax for classification. Batch Normalization (BN) [Ioffe and Szegedy, 2015] is used for all experiments. But the learnable scaling and shifting parameters are not used in the recurrent parts of the model unless stated otherwise. Network weights were initialized with the method described in [He et al., 2015b]. The implementations are based on MatConvNet[Vedaldi and Lenc, 2015].

ResNet with Shared Weights Across Time We conjecture that the effectiveness of ResNet mainly comes from the fact that it efficiently models the recurrent computations required by the recognition task. If this is the case, one should be able to reinterpret ResNet as a RNN with weight sharing and achieve comparable performance to the original version. We demonstrate various incarnations of this idea and show it is indeed the case (See Figure 4 and Figure 6).

Fully Recurrent Neural Networks with Shared and Non-shared Weights Although a RNN is usually implemented with shared weights across time, it is however possible to unshare the weights and use an independent set of weights at every time t . For practical applications, whenever one can have a initial $t = 0$ and enumerate all possible ts , a RNN with non-shared weights should be feasible, similar to the time-specific batch normalization described in 3. The results of 2-state fully recurrent neural networks with shared and non-shared weights are shown in Figure 4 (C).

The Effect of Readout Time In visual cortex, useful information increases as time proceeds from the onset of the visual stimuli. This suggests that recurrent system might have better representational power as more time




Figure 4: The transition matrices of all models are shown in Figure 2C. “#Param” denotes the number of parameters. For each model, the effective unrolling factors “ xN ” are determined by the readout time t (See Section 3 for the definition). Dashed lines are training errors. For multi-state ResNet, a downstream state only executes after receiving inputs from upstream states. For fully recurrent nets, all transitions execute concurrently. The state sizes are shown above. (A) **A 2-state ResNet with the second state only unrolled once. This architecture always works better with shared rather than non-shared weights on CIFAR-10. In general, we empirically observe that weight sharing in the 1st state of a multi-state system is often beneficial (even in ImageNet).** One conjecture is that our transition function might match better low-level visual recurrent computations. (B) Standard 3-state ResNet. (C) 2-state fully recurrent NN. (D) Different readout time of (A). (E) A 2-state fully recurrent network with different readout time. There is consistent performance improvement as t increases. The number of parameters changes since at some t , some recurrent connections have not been contributing to the output and thus their number of parameters are subtracted from the total. We observe in (D) and (E) that error reduces as t increases, while #param. is kept the same.

is allowed. We tried training and testing 2-state ResNet and FRNN with various readout time (i.e., unrolling depth, see Section 3) and observe similar effects. Results are shown in Figure 4 (D) and (E). The difference from Figure 5 (A) is that training and testing readout times are the same in this experiment.

Larger Models With More States

The results of 3-state and 4-state FRNNs are shown in Figure 3 and Table 1. 3-state models seem to generally outperform 2-state ones. This is expected since more parameters are introduced. We compare the 3-state models with existing best models on CIFAR-10 in Table 1. Next, for computational efficiency, we tried only allowing each state to have transitions to adjacent states and to itself by disabling bypass connections (e.g., Figure 3 top). In this case, the number of transitions scales linearly as the number of states increases, instead of quadratically. This setting performs well with 3-state networks and slightly less well with 4-state networks (perhaps as a result of small feature/parameter sizes). Finally, for 4-state fully recurrent networks, the models tend to become overly computationally heavy if we train it with large t or large number of feature maps. With small t and feature maps, we have not achieved better performance than 3-state networks. For experiments in this subsection, we choose a moderately deep pre-net of three 3x3 convolutional layers to model the layers between retina and V1: Conv-BN-ReLU-Conv-BN-ReLU-Conv. This is not essential but outperforms shallow pre-net slightly (within 1% validation error).

Generalization Across Readout Time As a RNN, our model supports training and testing with different readout times. Based on our theoretical analyses in Section 2.2, the representation is usually not guaranteed to converge when running a model with time $t \rightarrow \infty$. Nevertheless, the model exhibits good generalization over time. Results are shown in Figure 5 and supplementary materials.

Experiments on ImageNet We also evaluated weight sharing on ImageNet 1000-way classification task. The results are shown in Figure 6.

6 Discussion

When is Weight Sharing Good/Bad? We observe that (e.g., in Figure 4 A), sharing weights over time in the first stage of ResNet always improves performance. However, sharing weights in the later stages does sometimes slightly lower performance. We conjecture that whenever our prior — the transition function (e.g., BN-ReLU-Conv x2) is “similar” to the underlying recurrent function used by visual cortex, weight sharing will be beneficial. This would imply that our transition function happen to better model recurrent computations in early visual areas than later stages.

Psychophysics Support: After our work, [Eberhardt et al., 2016] reported that while higher layers of deep networks enjoy better performance on a visual recognition task, only intermediate (instead of last) layers agree best with human rapid predictions ($t = 50$ to 500ms). Given that a deep network’s output layer is trained to match human predictions at $t = \infty$. It is interesting to see an intermediate layer matches best an intermediate time, consistent with what we predict.

Future Directions: 1. The dark secret of Deep Networks: trying to imitate Recurrent Shallow Networks? The results of this paper lead to the following conjecture: the effectiveness of most of the deep feedforward neural networks, including but not limited to ResNet, can be attributed to their ability to approximate recurrent computations that are prevalent in most tasks with larger t than shallow feedforward networks. This may offer a new perspective on the theoretical pursuit of the long-standing question “why is deep better than shallow” [Montufar et al., 2014, Mhaskar et al., 2016]. **2. Conjecture about Cortex and Recurrent Computations in Cortical Areas:** Most of the models of cortex that led to the Deep Convolutional architectures and followed them – such as the Neocognitron [Fukushima, 1980], HMAX [Riesenhuber and Poggio, 1999] and more recent models [Yamins and Dicarlo, 2016] – have neglected the layering in each cortical area and the feedforward and recurrent connections within each area and between them. They also neglected the time evolution of selectivity and invariance in each of the areas. Our proposal makes several interesting predictions. Each cortical area would correspond to a recurrent network and thus to a system with a temporal dynamics even for flashed inputs; with increasing time one expects asymptotically better performance; masking with a mask an input image flashed briefly should disrupt recurrent computations in each area; performance should increase with time even without a mask for briefly flashed images; the cortex and each of its component areas




Figure 5: (A) Training and testing with different readout time. A 2-state ResNet with shared weights is trained with readout time $t=13$ (i.e., 1st state unrolling factor $N=t-3=10$) and tested with t from 7 to 23. The model can generalize well to readout time that are not trained with. There even seems to be tiny performance improvement (on test set) when testing with slightly larger readout time than training. (B) Biological Plausibility of Time-specific Batch Normalization (TSBN): we show the normalization statistics of a batch normalization module in the model in part (B) (which was trained with $t=23$). Each line represents the statistics of a feature channel over time. TSBN seems to implement a simple decay, thus it may be biologically-plausible.




Figure 6: ImageNet experiment with a 4-state ResNet with non-shared vs. shared weights. Train: training error. Val: validation error. No scaling augmentation is done. Performances are all based on single-crop. We trained the models with 12 epochs and logarithmically decaying learning rates (i.e., `logspace(-1, -4, N)` in Matlab, where $N=12$ is the number of epochs). The logarithmic learning rates make the model converge much faster than the usual three stage learning rates (i.e., dividing by 10 every some epochs), thus the models have already converged well and the performance differences are representative.

are RNNs and, unlike relatively shallow feedforward networks, are computationally as powerful as universal Turing machine [Siegelmann and Sontag, 1992].

References

- [Büchel and Friston, 1997] Büchel, C. and Friston, K. (1997). Modulation of connectivity in visual pathways by attention: cortical interactions evaluated with structural equation modelling and fmri. *Cerebral cortex*, 7(8):768–778.
- [Caswell et al., 2016] Caswell, I., Shen, C., and Wang, L. (2016, http://cs231n.stanford.edu/reports2016/110_Report.pdf. Google Scholar time stamp: March 25th, 2016). Loopy neural nets: Imitating feedback loops in the human brain. *CS231n Report, Stanford*.
- [Eberhardt et al., 2016] Eberhardt, S., Cader, J., and Serre, T. (2016). How deep is the feature analysis underlying rapid visual categorization? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01167*.
- [Eigen et al., 2013] Eigen, D., Rolfe, J., Fergus, R., and LeCun, Y. (2013). Understanding deep architectures using a recursive convolutional network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.1847*.
- [El Hihi and Bengio,] El Hihi, S. and Bengio, Y. Hierarchical recurrent neural networks for long-term dependencies. Citeseer.
- [Fukushima, 1980] Fukushima, K. (1980). Neocognitron: A self-organizing neural network model for a mechanism of pattern recognition unaffected by shift in position. *Biological Cybernetics*, 36(4):193–202.
- [Graves, 2013] Graves, A. (2013). Generating sequences with recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1308.0850*.
- [He et al., 2015a] He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. (2015a). Deep residual learning for image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.03385*.
- [He et al., 2015b] He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. (2015b). Delving deep into rectifiers: Surpassing human-level performance on imagenet classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1026–1034.
- [He et al., 2016] He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. (2016). Identity mappings in deep residual networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.05027*.
- [Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997] Hochreiter, S. and Schmidhuber, J. (1997). Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780.
- [Huang et al., 2016] Huang, G., Sun, Y., Liu, Z., Sedra, D., and Weinberger, K. (2016). Deep networks with stochastic depth. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.09382*.
- [Hupe et al., 1998] Hupe, J., James, A., Payne, B., Lomber, S., Girard, P., and Bullier, J. (1998). Cortical feedback improves discrimination between figure and background by v1, v2 and v3 neurons. *Nature*, 394(6695):784–787.
- [Ioffe and Szegedy, 2015] Ioffe, S. and Szegedy, C. (2015). Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.03167*.
- [Ito and Gilbert, 1999] Ito, M. and Gilbert, C. D. (1999). Attention modulates contextual influences in the primary visual cortex of alert monkeys. *Neuron*, 22(3):593–604.
- [Karpathy, 2011] Karpathy, A. (2011). Lessons learned from manually classifying cifar-10.
- [Krizhevsky, 2009] Krizhevsky, A. (2009). Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images.

- [Krizhevsky et al., 2012] Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I., and Hinton, G. E. (2012). Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 1097–1105.
- [Lamme et al., 1998] Lamme, V. A., Super, H., and Spekreijse, H. (1998). Feedforward, horizontal, and feedback processing in the visual cortex. *Current opinion in neurobiology*, 8(4):529–535.
- [Laurent et al., 2015] Laurent, C., Pereyra, G., Brakel, P., Zhang, Y., and Bengio, Y. (2015). Batch normalized recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.01378*.
- [Le et al., 2015] Le, Q. V., Jaitly, N., and Hinton, G. E. (2015). A simple way to initialize recurrent networks of rectified linear units. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.00941*.
- [Liang and Hu, 2015] Liang, M. and Hu, X. (2015). Recurrent convolutional neural network for object recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3367–3375.
- [Liao et al., 2015] Liao, Q., Leibo, J. Z., and Poggio, T. (2015). How important is weight symmetry in backpropagation? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.05067*.
- [Mhaskar et al., 2016] Mhaskar, H., Liao, Q., and Poggio, T. (2016). Learning real and boolean functions: When is deep better than shallow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.00988*.
- [Montufar et al., 2014] Montufar, G. F., Pascanu, R., Cho, K., and Bengio, Y. (2014). On the number of linear regions of deep neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2924–2932.
- [Pascanu et al., 2013] Pascanu, R., Gulcehre, C., Cho, K., and Bengio, Y. (2013). How to construct deep recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6026*.
- [Pinheiro and Collobert, 2013] Pinheiro, P. H. and Collobert, R. (2013). Recurrent convolutional neural networks for scene parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.2795*.
- [Rao and Ballard, 1999] Rao, R. P. and Ballard, D. H. (1999). Predictive coding in the visual cortex: a functional interpretation of some extra-classical receptive-field effects. *Nature neuroscience*, 2(1):79–87.
- [Riesenhuber and Poggio, 1999] Riesenhuber, M. and Poggio, T. (1999). Hierarchical models of object recognition in cortex. *Nature Neuroscience*, 2(11):1019–1025.
- [Schmidhuber, 1992] Schmidhuber, J. (1992). Learning complex, extended sequences using the principle of history compression. *Neural Computation*, 4(2):234–242.
- [Serre et al., 2007] Serre, T., Oliva, A., and Poggio, T. (2007). A feedforward architecture accounts for rapid categorization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 104(15):6424–6429.
- [Siegelmann and Sontag, 1992] Siegelmann, H. T. and Sontag, E. D. (1992). On the computational power of neural nets. In *Proceedings of the fifth annual workshop on Computational learning theory*, pages 440–449. ACM.
- [Socher et al., 2011] Socher, R., Lin, C. C., Manning, C., and Ng, A. Y. (2011). Parsing natural scenes and natural language with recursive neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on machine learning (ICML-11)*, pages 129–136.
- [Springenberg et al., 2014] Springenberg, J. T., Dosovitskiy, A., Brox, T., and Riedmiller, M. (2014). Striving for simplicity: The all convolutional net. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6806*.
- [Srivastava et al., 2015] Srivastava, R. K., Greff, K., and Schmidhuber, J. (2015). Highway networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.00387*.

- [Thorpe et al., 1996] Thorpe, S., Fize, D., Marlot, C., et al. (1996). Speed of processing in the human visual system. *nature*, 381(6582):520–522.
- [Vedaldi and Lenc, 2015] Vedaldi, A. and Lenc, K. (2015). Matconvnet: Convolutional neural networks for matlab. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual ACM Conference on Multimedia Conference*, pages 689–692. ACM.
- [Yamins and Dicarlo, 2016] Yamins, D. and Dicarlo, J. (2016). Using goal-driven deep learning models to understand sensory cortex.
- [Zeiler et al., 2010] Zeiler, M. D., Krishnan, D., Taylor, G. W., and Fergus, R. (2010). Deconvolutional networks. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2010 IEEE Conference on*, pages 2528–2535. IEEE.