Training neural networks using Metropolis Monte Carlo and an adaptive variant
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We examine the zero-temperature Metropolis Monte Carlo algorithm as a tool for training a neural network by minimizing a loss function. We find that, as expected on theoretical grounds and shown empirically by other authors, Metropolis Monte Carlo can train a neural net with an accuracy comparable to that of gradient descent, if not necessarily as quickly. The Metropolis algorithm does not fail automatically when the number of parameters of a neural network is large. It can fail when a neural network’s structure or neuron activations are strongly heterogeneous, and we introduce an adaptive Monte Carlo algorithm, aMC, to overcome these limitations. The intrinsic stochasticity of the Monte Carlo method allows aMC to train neural networks in which the gradient is too small to allow training by gradient descent. We suggest that, as for molecular simulation, Monte Carlo methods offer a complement to gradient-based methods for training neural networks, allowing access to a distinct set of network architectures and principles.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Metropolis Monte Carlo algorithm was developed in the 1950s in order to simulate molecular systems [1–4]. It consists of small, random moves of particles, accepted probabilistically. It is, along with other Monte Carlo (MC) algorithms, widely used as a tool to equilibrate molecular systems [5]. Equilibrating a molecular system is similar in key respects to training a neural network: both involve optimizing quantities derived from many degrees of freedom that interact in a nonlinear way. Despite this similarity, the Metropolis algorithm and its variants are not widely used as a tool for training neural networks by minimizing a loss function (for exceptions, see e.g. Refs. [6–8]). Instead, this is usually done by gradient-based algorithms [9, 10], and sometimes by population-based evolutionary or genetic algorithms [11–13] to which Monte Carlo methods are conceptually related.

In this paper we address the potential of the zero-temperature Metropolis Monte Carlo algorithm and an adaptive variant thereof as tools for neural-network training [14]. This class of algorithm involves taking a neural network of fixed structure, adding random numbers to all weights and biases simultaneously, and accepting the change if the loss function does not increase. For uncorrelated Gaussian random numbers this procedure is equivalent, for small updates, to clipped gradient descent in the presence of Gaussian white noise [15–17] [18], and so its ability to train a neural network should be similar to that of simple gradient descent (GD). We show in Section II A that, for a particular supervised-learning problem, this is the case, a finding consistent with results presented by other authors [6–8].

It is sometimes stated that the ability of stochastic algorithms to train neural networks diminishes sharply as the number of network parameters increases (particularly if all network parameters are updated simultaneously). However, population-based evolutionary algorithms have been used to train many-parameter networks [19], and in Section II B we show that the ability of Metropolis Monte Carlo to train a neural network is similar for networks with of order a hundred parameters or of order a million: there is no sharp decline of acceptance rate with network size.

What does thwart the Metropolis Monte Carlo algorithm is network heterogeneity. For instance, if the number of connections entering neurons differs markedly throughout the network (as is the case for networks with convolutional- and fully-connected layers) or if the outputs of neurons in different parts of a network differ markedly (as is the case for very deep networks) then stochastic weight changes of a given scale will saturate neurons in some parts of the network and scarcely effect change in other parts. The result is an inability to train. To address this problem we introduce a set of simple adaptive modifications of the Metropolis algorithm – a momentum-like term, an adaptive step-size scheduler, and a means of enacting heterogeneous weight updates – that are borrowed from ideas commonly used with gradient-based algorithms. This algorithm, which we call adaptive Monte Carlo or aMC, is substantially more efficient than the non-adaptive Metropolis algorithm in a variety of settings. In Section II B we show that the acceptance rate of aMC remains much higher than that of the Metropolis algorithm at low values of loss, and can be made almost insensitive to network width, depth, and size. In Section II C we show that its momentum-like term speeds the rate at which aMC can learn the high-frequency features of an objective function, much as adaptive methods such as Adam [20] can learn high-frequency features faster than regular gradient descent. In Section II D we show that the intrinsic stochasticity of the Monte Carlo method and the ability of aMC to enact heterogenous updates allows it to train very deep neural networks that gradient descent and Adam are unable...
to train. In Section II E we revisit the problem of Section II A using aMC and different types of minibatching. We introduce the elements of aMC throughout Section II and summarize the algorithm in Section III.

Our conclusion is that the Metropolis Monte Carlo algorithm and its adaptive variants such as aMC are viable ways of training neural networks, if less developed and optimized than modern gradient-based methods. In particular, Monte Carlo algorithms can, for small updates, effectively sense the gradient, and they do not fail simply because the number of parameters of a neural network becomes large. Monte Carlo algorithms should be considered a complement to gradient-based algorithms because they admit different design principles for neural networks. Given a network that permits gradient flow, modern gradient-based algorithms are fast and effective [9, 10, 21]. However, Monte Carlo algorithms free us from the requirement of ensuring reliable gradient flow (and gradients can be unreliable even in differentiable systems [22]). For example, to train the deep neural networks of Section II D by gradient descent we can add skip connections [23] or layer norm [24], but aMC requires neither of these things. One solution is architectural, the other algorithmic, and having both options offers more possibilities than having only one.

II. RESULTS

A. Metropolis Monte Carlo and its connection to gradient descent

We start with the zero-temperature Metropolis Monte Carlo algorithm. The zero-temperature limit is not often used in molecular simulation, but it and its variants are widely used (and sometimes called random-mutation hill climbing) for optimizing non-differentiable systems such as cellular automata [25, 26]. Consider a neural network with \( N \) parameters (weights and biases) \( \mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_i, \ldots, x_N\} \), and associated loss function \( U(\mathbf{x}) \). If we propose a change of each neural-network parameter by a Gaussian random number [27],

\[
x_i \to x_i + \epsilon_i \quad \text{with} \quad \epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2),
\]

and accept the proposal if the loss does not increase, then, when the basic move scale \( \sigma \) is small, the values \( x_i \) of the neural-net parameters evolve according to the Langevin equation [17]

\[
\frac{dx_i}{dt} = -\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{2\pi} |\nabla U(\mathbf{x})|} \frac{\partial U(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_i} + \eta_i(n).
\]

Here \( n \) is training time (epoch), and \( \eta \) is a Gaussian white noise with zero mean and variance \( \langle \eta_i(n)\eta_j(n') \rangle = \langle \sigma^2/2 \rangle \delta_{ij} \delta(n - n') \). That is, small stochastic perturbations of a network’s weights and biases, accepted if the loss function does not increase, is equivalent to noisy clipped gradient descent on the loss function.
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**FIG. 1.** Comparison of zero-temperature Metropolis Monte Carlo (MC) and gradient descent (GD) used to train a neural network to minimize the mean-squared error \( U \) on the MNIST training set. (a) MNIST test-set accuracy \( C_{10^5} \) after \( 10^5 \) epochs of batch learning as a function of MC step size \( \sigma \) (blue) or GD learning rate \( \alpha \) (gray). (b) Training loss \( U \) and test-set accuracy \( C \) versus epoch \( n \) for MC step size \( \sigma = 2 \times 10^{-3} \) (blue) and GD learning rate \( \alpha = 4.5 \times 10^{-2} \) (gray).

Given the success of gradient-based training methods, this correspondence shows the potential of the Metropolis algorithm to train neural networks. Consistent with this expectation, we show in Fig. 1 that the zero-temperature Metropolis algorithm can train a neural network. For comparison, we also train the network using simple gradient descent, \( \dot{x} = -\alpha \nabla U(\mathbf{x}) \), where \( \alpha \) is the learning rate and \( U(\mathbf{x}) \) the loss function.

We consider a standard supervised-learning problem, recognizing MNIST images [28, 29] using a fully connected, two-layer neural net. The net has 786 input neurons, 16 neurons in each hidden layer, and one output layer of 10 neurons. The hidden neurons have hyperbolic tangent activation functions, and the output neurons comprise a softmax function. The net has in total 13,002 parameters [30]. We did batch learning, with the loss function \( U \) being the mean-squared error on the MNIST training set of size \( 6 \times 10^4 \) (in the standard way we consider the ground truth for each training example to be a 1-hot encoding of the class label, and take the 10 outputs of the neural network as its prediction vector).

Fig. 1(a) shows the classification accuracy \( C_{10^5} \) on the MNIST test set of size \( 10^4 \) after \( 10^5 \) epochs of training. We show results for MC (blue) and GD (gray), for a range of values of step size \( \sigma \) and learning rate \( \alpha \), respectively. The initial neural-net parameters for MC simulations were \( x_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \). The two algorithms behave in a similar manner: each has a range of its single parameter over which it is effective, and displays a maximum at a particular value of that parameter. The value of the maximum for GD is slightly higher than that for MC (about 96% compared to about 95%), and GD achieves near-maximal results over a broader range of its single parameter than does MC.

Fig. 1(b) shows loss \( U \) and classification accuracy \( C \) as a function of epoch for two examples from panel (a). GD
trains faster with $n$ initially, but results are comparable near the end of the learning process. The learning dynamics of these algorithms is not the same: in the limit of small steps, this MC algorithm approaches clipped gradient descent, not standard gradient descent (and its equivalence to the former would only be seen with an appropriately rescaled horizontal axis). Nonetheless, MC can in effect sense the gradient, as long as the step size is relatively small, and for this problem the range of appropriate step sizes is small compared to the effective GD step size. GD therefore trains faster, but MC has similar capacity for learning. The computational cost of the two algorithms is of similar order, with MC being cheaper per epoch for batch learning: each MC step requires a forward pass through the data, and each GD step a forward and a backward pass.

There are many things that could be done to improve the learning precision of these algorithms (no preprocessing of data was done, and a basic neural net was used), but this comparison, given a neural net and a data set, confirms that Metropolis Monte Carlo can achieve results roughly comparable to gradient descent, even on a problem for which gradients are available. For this problem GD trains faster, but MC does work. It is worth noting that this conclusion follows from considering a range of step sizes $\sigma$; for a single choice of step size it would be possible to conclude that MC doesn’t work at all.

Similar findings have been noted previously: simulated annealing on the Metropolis algorithm [6,12] and a variant of zero-temperature Metropolis MC (applied weight-by-weight) [5] were used to train neural nets with an accuracy comparable to that of gradient-based algorithms. These results, and the correspondence described in Ref. [17] establish both theoretically and empirically the ability of Metropolis MC to train neural nets.

We next turn to the question of how the efficiency of Monte Carlo training scales with net parameters, and how to improve this efficiency by introducing adaptivity to the algorithm.

B. Metropolis acceptance rate as a function of net size

To examine how the efficiency of the Metropolis algorithm changes with neural-net size and architecture, we consider in this section a supervised-learning problem in which a neural net is trained by zero-temperature Metropolis MC to express the sine function $f_0(\theta) = \sin(2\pi\theta)$ on the interval $\theta \in [0, 1]$. The loss $U$ is the mean-squared error between $f_0(\theta)$ and the neural-net output $f_{\theta}(\theta)$, evaluated at $10^3$ evenly-spaced points on the interval. The neural net has one input neuron, which is fed the value $\theta$, and one output, which returns $f_{\theta}(\theta)$. Its internal structure is fully connected, with hyperbolic tangent nonlinearities. To explore the effect of varying width (panels (a) and (c) of Fig. 2) we set the depth to 2 and varied the width from 10 to $10^3$, these choices corresponding to a range from about $10^2$ to about $10^6$ parameters. To explore the effect of varying depth (panels (b) and (d) of Fig. 2) we set the width to 25 and varied the depth from 2 to 10, these choices corresponding to a
range from about $10^2$ to about $10^4$ parameters.

In Fig. 2(a, left) we show loss $U$ as a function of Metropolis acceptance rate $A$ for three different neural-net widths. The acceptance rate tells us, for fixed step size, the fraction of directions that point downhill in loss. It provides information similar to that shown in plots of the index of the critical points of a loss surface [31, 32], confirming that at large loss there are more downhill directions than at small loss. In Fig. 2(a, right) we plot the acceptance rate $A(U_0)$ at fixed loss $U_0$ as a function of the number of net parameters $N$ (obtained by taking horizontal cuts across panel (a)); note that more net sizes are shown in panel (b) than panel (a).

The acceptance rate decreases with increasing net size, but relatively slowly. Upon increasing the size of the net by 4 orders of magnitude, the acceptance rate decreases by about 1 order of magnitude. We have indicated an $N^{-1}$ scaling as a guide to the eye. If $N$ simultaneous parameter updates each had to be individually productive, the acceptance rate would decrease exponentially with $N$, which is clearly not the case. The more dramatic decrease in acceptance rate is with loss: at small loss the acceptance rate becomes very small.

Similar trends are seen with depth in Fig. 2(b). The acceptance rate declines sharply with loss and declines with the number of parameters, slightly more rapidly than in panel (a) but not dramatically.

Empirically, therefore, we do not see evidence of a fundamental inability of MC to cope with large numbers of parameters. In Section II D we discuss how network heterogeneity can impair the Metropolis algorithm’s ability to train a network. The solution, as we discuss there, is to introduce an adaptive Monte Carlo (aMC) variant of the Metropolis algorithm. We show in panels (c) and (d) the aMC analog of panels (a) and (b), respectively. The trends experienced by Metropolis have been annulled, the acceptance rates of aMC remaining large and essentially constant with loss or model size over the range of models considered. We now turn to a step-by-step introduction of the elements of aMC.

**C. Adaptivity speeds learning, particularly of high-frequency features**

Modern gradient-based methods are adaptive, allowing the learning rate for each neural-net parameter to differ and to change as a function of the gradients encountered during training [10] (adaptive learning is also used in evolutionary algorithms [33, 34]). We can copy this general idea in a simple way within a zero-temperature Metropolis Monte Carlo scheme by changing the proposed move of Eq. (1) to

$$\epsilon_i \sim N(\mu_i, \sigma^2).$$

The parameters $\mu_i$, set initially to zero, are updated after every accepted move according to

$$\mu_i \rightarrow \mu_i + \epsilon_i (\epsilon_i - \mu_i),$$

where $\epsilon$ is a hyperparameter of the method. This form of adaptation is similar to the inclusion of momentum in a gradient-based scheme: the center of each parameter update is similar to the inclusion of momentum $\mu_i$ [33].

We train a neural network to learn the function $f$ using two gradient-based methods (GD and Adam) and aMC with three values of the parameter $\epsilon$. (a) Loss $U$ as a function of training time $n$. (b) Pseudo-loss $U'$, which expresses the difference between the net function and the low-frequency term (the logarithm) of $U$. (c) Output of neural nets trained by aMC (colored lines) at fixed training time. The thicker and thinner black lines are the function $f$ and its low-frequency term, respectively. GD and Adam learning rate: $\alpha = 5 \times 10^{-3}$; aMC hyperparameters: $(\sigma_0, n_a) = (0.1, 50)$. 

In what follows we confirm that adaptivity speeds learning of high-frequency features in MC, as it does in gradient-based methods. The extent to which high-frequency features should be learned varies by application. For instance, if a training set contains high-frequency noise then we may wish to attenuate an algorithm’s ability to learn this noise in order to enhance its ability to generalize. This is the idea expressed in Fig. 2 of Ref. [36]. Empirical studies show that non-adaptive versions of gradient descent sometimes generalize better than their adaptive counterparts [37], in some cases be-
cause of the different abilities of these things to learn high-frequency features.

The aMC parameter $\epsilon$ can be used to control the rate of learning of high-frequency features. In Fig. 3 we consider a supervised-learning problem inspired by Fig. 2 of Ref. [36]. We use gradient-based methods (GD and Adam) and aMC to train a neural network to learn the function

$$f_{\theta}(\theta) = \ln(1 + 5\theta) + \frac{1}{10} \sin(20\pi\theta)$$

in $\theta \in [0,1]$. This function contains a low-frequency term, the logarithm, and a high-frequency term, the sine. The neural network has one input neuron, which is fed the value $\theta$, one output neuron, which returns $f_{\theta}(\theta)$, and a single hidden layer of 100 neurons with tanh activations. The parameters $\mathbf{x}$ of the network were set initially to random values $x_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2_x)$. We plot the simulation having the smallest loss $U$.

In Fig. 3(a) we show the training loss, the mean-squared difference $U$ between $f_{\theta}(\theta)$ and the neural-net output $f_{\theta}(\theta)$, evaluated at 1000 evenly-spaced points over the interval. At left we show GD and Adam, and at right we show aMC for three values of $\epsilon$, one positive ($\epsilon = 5 \times 10^{-3}$), one negative ($\epsilon = -5 \times 10^{-3}$), and zero. Of the gradient-based methods Adam trains faster than GD, while for aMC the training loss $U$ decreases fastest for positive $\epsilon$ and slowest for negative $\epsilon$. (We did not carry out a systematic search of learning rates in order to compare directly the gradient-based and Monte Carlo methods; our intent here is to illustrate how adaptivity matters within the two classes of algorithm.)

In Fig. 3(b) we show the pseudo-loss $U'$ that expresses the mean-squared difference between the net function $f_{\theta}(\theta)$ and the low-frequency logarithmic term of $f_{\theta}$. The net is not trained to minimize $U'$, but it happens during training that $U'$ becomes small as the net first learns the low-frequency component of $f_{\theta}$. Subsequently, $U'$ increases as the net also learns the high-frequency component of $f_{\theta}$.

Of the gradient-based methods Adam learns high-frequency features more readily than GD, which leads to larger values of $U'$. For aMC, the parameter $\epsilon$ controls the separation of timescales between the learning of the low- and high-frequency components of $f_{\theta}$. If we want to learn $f_{\theta}$ as quickly as possible then positive $\epsilon$ is the best choice. But if we consider the high-frequency component of $f_{\theta}$ to be noise, and regard $U'$ as a measure of the network’s generalization error, then negative $\epsilon$ is the best choice.

Panel (c) shows the aMC net functions at a time $n$ such that the net trained using $\epsilon = 0$ has begun to learn the high-frequency features of $f_{\theta}$. At the same time the nets trained using positive and negative $\epsilon$ have learned these features completely or not at all, respectively.

D. The intrinsic stochasticity of Monte Carlo is useful when gradients are small

MC algorithms are intrinsically stochastic. Stochasticity is significant in the absence of gradients, where pure gradient-based methods receive no signal [38, 39]. For vanishing gradients, the Metropolis Monte Carlo procedure is equivalent, for small steps, to the diffusive dynamics $\dot{x}_i = \xi_i(n)$, where $\xi_i$ is a Gaussian white noise with zero mean and variance $\sigma^2 \delta_{ij} \delta(n-n')$. Thus Metropolis MC will, in the absence of gradients, enact diffusion in parameter space until nonvanishing gradients are encountered, at which point learning can resume. We show in this section that this feature allows learning to proceed in very deep nets in which gradients are too small for gradient-based methods to learn on the timescales considered.

However, the ability of MC to enact diffusion in parameter space in the absence of gradients is not enough to ensure learning in very deep networks: it is also necessary to scale the step-size parameter $\epsilon$ for each neural-net parameter individually, adapting ideas used to develop gradient-based methods [40]. To this end we modify the proposal distribution of (3) to read

$$\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma^2_i),$$

where $\sigma_i = \lambda_i \sigma$. The $\lambda_i$ are parameters that are either set to unity (a condition we call “signal norm off”) or according to Eq. 6 in Section II C (“signal norm on”). The parameters $\mu_i$ and $\sigma$ are adjusted as in Section II C. The parameters $\lambda_i$, which are straightforwardly calculated during a forward pass through the net, ensure that the scale of signal change to each neuron is roughly constant. The intent of signal norm is similar to that of layer norm [24], except that the latter is an architectural solution – it entails a modification of the net, and is present at test time – while the former is an algorithmic solution and plays no role once the neural net has been trained.

In Fig. 4 we show the results of neural networks of depth $d$ trained by aMC and by gradient-based methods to express a step function $f_0(\theta)$ that is equal to 1/2 if $1/2 < \theta < 3/4$ and is zero otherwise. The neural nets have one input neuron, which is fed the value $\theta$, and one output neuron, which returns $f_0(\theta)$. They have 10 neurons in the penultimate hidden layer, and 4 neurons in each of the other $d−1$ hidden layers, the intent being to allow very deep nets with relatively few neurons. All neurons have tanh activation functions.

In Fig. 4(a) we show loss $U$ as a function of epoch $n$ for four algorithms: GD (gray); Adam (blue); and aMC with signal norm off (green dotted) and on (green). For each algorithm we ran 20 independent simulations, 10 using Kaiming initialization and 10 initialized with Gaussian random numbers $x_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2_\theta)$, where $\sigma_\theta = 10^{-2}$. We plot the simulation having the smallest $U$ after $10^6$ epochs. As the depth of the network increases beyond 4 layers, GD and aMC with signal norm off stop learning on the timescales shown. Above 32 layers, Adam also stops.
learning on the timescale shown. (For depth 64 we tried a broad range of learning rates for GD and Adam, from $10^{-6}$, none of which was successful. We also varied the Adam hyperparameters $\beta_1, \beta_2$ over a small range of values, without success. It may be that hyperparameters that enable training do exist, but we were not able to find them.) aMC with signal norm on continues to learn up to a depth of 128 (we also verified that aMC trains nets of depth 256), and so can successfully train deep nets in which gradient-based algorithms receive too little signal to train.

In Fig. 4(b) we show net outputs at $n = 10^6$ epochs for three algorithms and two depths. As discussed in Section II C the adaptive algorithms Adam and aMC learn the sharp features of the target function more quickly than does GD. For the deeper net, the gradient-based algorithms GD and Adam do not receive sufficient signal to train.

In Fig. 4(c) we show 10 simulations for each of Adam and aMC for the deeper nets. The outcome of training is stochastic, resembling a nucleation dynamics with an induction time that increases with net depth. For some initial conditions both algorithms fail to train on the allotted timescale. In general, the rate of nucleation is higher for aMC than Adam, and remains measurable for all depths shown.

We verified that introducing skip connections [23] or layer norm [24] to the neural nets enabled Adam to train at depth 64. These architectural modifications allowed it to learn in the presence of numerically small gradients. (a) Loss function $U$ versus epoch $n$ for deep nets trained to express a step function by GD (gray), Adam (blue), and aMC with signal norm off (green dashed) and on (green). The latter is able to train for all depths shown. (b) Net outputs after $10^6$ epochs against the target function for two depths. (c) 10 independent simulations for each of Adam and aMC for the deeper nets. GD learning rate: $\alpha = 10^{-3}$; Adam hyperparameters: $(\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2) = (10^{-4}, 0.9, 0.999)$; aMC hyperparameters: $(\sigma_0, \epsilon, \eta_0) = (10^{-2}, 10^{-2}, 10^2)$.

E. Best practices for training neural nets using MC await development

In this section we revisit Fig. 1 using aMC, and we present data indicating that numerical best practices for training nets using MC may differ from those developed for gradient-based algorithms.

In Fig. 5(a) we reproduce Fig. 1(b) with the addition of an aMC simulation (green) in which we use aMC’s adaptive step-size attenuation (with $n_s = 20$) and signal norm. These features allow us to choose an initial step-size parameter $\sigma_0 = 10^{-2}$ larger than the optimum value for Metropolis MC (see Fig. 1(a)). As a result, training proceeds faster than for MC, at a rate comparable to the GD result shown. Training-set loss and test-set accuracy at long times are similar for all three algorithms.

In Fig. 5(b) we compare the aMC result of panel (a), which uses batch learning (green), with two additional
A. An adaptive version of the Metropolis algorithm for training neural networks

In this section we summarize aMC, the adaptive Monte Carlo algorithm used in this paper. It is based on the Metropolis MC algorithm, modified to allow the move-proposal distribution to adapt in response to accepted and rejected moves. The Metropolis acceptance criterion is \( \min(1, e^{-\Delta U/T}) \), where \( \Delta U \) is the change of loss and \( T \) is temperature. For nonzero temperature the algorithm allows moves uphill in loss. We focus here on the limit of zero temperature, which allows no uphill moves in loss. This choice is motivated by the success of gradient-descent algorithms and the intuition in deep learning (suggested by the structure of high-dimensional Gaussian random surfaces) that at large loss most stationary points on the loss surface are saddle points that can be escaped by moving downhill [31, 32].

aMC is specified by four hyperparameters: \( \sigma_0 \), the initial move scale; \( \epsilon \), the rate at which the mean of the move-proposal distribution is modified; \( n_s \), the number of consecutive rejected moves allowed before rescaling the parameters of the move-proposal distribution; and by the choice of signal norm being on or off.

We introduce a counter \( n_{cr} = 0 \) to record the number of consecutive rejected moves. We initialize the parameters (weights and biases) \( \mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_i, \ldots, x_N\} \) of the neural network using Gaussian random numbers \( x_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_0^2) \). aMC proceeds as follows.

1. **Current state.** Record the current neural-network parameter set \( \mathbf{x} \). Select the data (defining the batch, episode, etc.) and record the current value of the loss \( U(\mathbf{x}) \) on the data (for batch learning and the progressive batch learning of Section II E the value \( U(\mathbf{x}) \) is known from the previous step of the algorithm). If signal norm is on, calculate the values \( \lambda_i \) specified by Eq. [16], the relevant quantities having been calculated in the course of computing \( U(\mathbf{x}) \).

2. **Proposed move.** Propose a change

\[
x_i \rightarrow x_i' = x_i + \epsilon_i \quad \text{with} \quad \epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)
\]

of each neural-network parameter \( i \), where \( \sigma_i = \lambda_i \sigma \). Initially, \( \mu_i = 0 \) and \( \sigma = \sigma_0 \), where \( \sigma_0 \) is the initial move scale. The parameters \( \lambda_i \) are set either to unity (“signal norm off”) or by Eq. [16] (“signal norm on”). Evaluate the loss \( U(\mathbf{x}') \) at the set of coordinates \( \mathbf{x}' \) resulting from the proposal \( \{7\} \). If \( U(\mathbf{x}') \leq U(\mathbf{x}) \) then we accept the move and go to Step 3. Otherwise we reject the move and go to Step 4.

3. **Accept move.** Make the proposed coordinates \( \mathbf{x}' \) the current coordinates \( \mathbf{x} \). Set \( n_{cr} = 0 \). For each
neural-network parameter \(i\), set
\[
\mu_i \rightarrow \mu_i + \epsilon (\epsilon_i - \mu_i) \tag{8}
\]
using the values \(\epsilon_i\) calculated in (7). Return to Step 1.

4. **Reject move.** Retain the set of coordinates \(x\) recorded in Step 1. Set \(n_{cr} \rightarrow n_{cr} + 1\). If \(n_{cr} = n_s\) then set \(n_{cr} = 0\), \(\sigma \rightarrow 0.95\sigma\), and (for all \(i\)) \(\mu_i = 0\). Return to Step 1.

The computational cost of one move is the cost to draw \(N\) Gaussian random numbers and to calculate the loss function twice (once for batch learning). The memory cost is the cost to hold two versions of the model in memory, and (if \(\epsilon \neq 0\) and signal norm is on) the values \(\mu_i\) and \(\lambda_i\) for each neural-net parameter. Note that the algorithm requires calculation of the loss \(U(x)\) only, and not of gradients of the loss with respect to the net parameters.

We refer to this algorithm as aMC, for adaptive Monte Carlo (the term “adaptive Metropolis algorithm” has been used in a different context 42). Standard zero-temperature Metropolis Monte Carlo is recovered in the limit \(\epsilon = 0, n_s = \infty\), and \(\lambda_i = 1\).

**B. Signal norm: enacting heterogeneous weight updates in order to keep roughly constant the change of neuron inputs**

The proposal step (7) contains the parameter step size \(\sigma_i = \lambda_i \sigma\). For some applications, particularly involving deep or heterogeneous networks, it is useful to choose the \(\lambda_i\) in order to keep the scale of updates for each neuron approximately equal, following ideas applied to gradient-based methods 40. We call this concept signal norm; when signal norm is off, all \(\lambda_i = 1\). When it is on, we proceed as follows.

Consider the class of neural networks for which the input to neuron \(j\) is
\[
I_j^\alpha = \sum_{i \rightarrow j} N_j x_i S_j^{\alpha}, \tag{9}
\]
where the sum runs over all weights \(x_i\) feeding into neuron \(j\); \(N_j\) is the fan-in of \(j\) (the number of connections entering \(j\)); and \(S_j^{\alpha}\) is the output of neuron \(i\) (the neuron that the weight \(x_i\) connects to neuron \(j\)) given one particular evaluation \(\alpha\) of the neural network. Under the proposal (7), the change of input to neuron \(j\) is approximately 43
\[
\Delta_j^\alpha = \sum_{i \rightarrow j} \epsilon_i S_i^{\alpha}. \tag{10}
\]
We therefore have
\[
\langle \Delta_j^\alpha \rangle = \sum_{i \rightarrow j} \mu_i S_i^{\alpha} \tag{11}
\]
and
\[
\langle (\Delta_j^\alpha)^2 \rangle = \sum_{i \rightarrow j} \sum_{k \rightarrow j} \mu_i \mu_k (1 - \delta_{ik}) + (\sigma_i^2 + \mu_i^2) \delta_{ik} S_i^\alpha S_k^\alpha, \tag{12}
\]
where \(\langle \cdot \rangle\) is the expectation over the move-proposal distribution (7), and \(\delta_{ik}\) is the Kronecker delta. The expected approximate variance of the change of input to neuron \(j\) under the move (7) is therefore
\[
\langle (\Delta_j^\alpha)^2 \rangle - \langle \Delta_j^\alpha \rangle^2 = \sigma^2 \sum_{i \rightarrow j} \lambda_i^2 (S_i^\alpha)^2. \tag{13}
\]
This quantity, averaged over all \(N_{\text{data}}\) neural-net calls required to calculate the loss, is
\[
[\langle (\Delta_j^\alpha)^2 \rangle - \langle \Delta_j^\alpha \rangle^2]_{\text{data}} = \sigma^2 N_{\text{data}}^{-1} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_j} \sum_{i \rightarrow j} \lambda_i^2 (S_i^\alpha)^2. \tag{14}
\]
We can choose the values of the \(\lambda_i\) in order to ensure that the right-hand side of (14) is always \(\sigma^2\). A simple way to do so is to set equal the \(\lambda_i\) for all weights \(x_i\) feeding neuron \(j\), in which case
\[
\lambda_i = \left( N_{\text{data}}^{-1} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_j} \sum_{i \rightarrow j} (S_i^\alpha)^2 \right)^{-1/2}. \tag{15}
\]
If neuron outputs vanish identically then the above expression must be regularized; one option is to set \(\lambda_i = 1\) for weights feeding a neuron whose input neurons are zero for a given pass through the data. Recall that the sum \(\alpha\) runs over the input data; the sum \(i' \rightarrow j\) runs over all neurons \(i'\) whose connections feed \(j\); \(N_j\) is the fan-in of \(j\) (the number of connections entering \(j\)); and \(S_i^\alpha\) is the output of neuron \(i\) given a particular evaluation \(\alpha\) of the neuronal network. The values (15) can be calculated from the pass through the data immediately before the proposed move.

Under (15), weights on connections that feed into a neuron receiving many other connections will experience a smaller basic move scale than weights on connections that feed into a neuron receiving few connections. Similarly, weights on connections fed by active neurons will experience a smaller basic move scale than weights on connections fed by relatively inactive neurons.

Finally, if the parameter \(x_i\) is a bias we choose \(\lambda_i = 1\).

To summarize, we consider two settings for the parameters \(\lambda_i\) that set the step-size parameters \(\sigma_i = \lambda_i \sigma\) in the proposal (7). The first setting, “signal norm off” (used in Fig. 1 Fig. 2a,b), and Fig. 3, has \(\lambda_i = 1\) for all parameters \(x_i\).
The second setting, called “signal norm on” (used in Fig. 2(c,d), Fig. 3 and Fig. 5), has

\[
x_i = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } x_i \text{ is a bias;} \\
\text{Eq. 15} & \text{if } x_i \text{ is a weight into neuron } j.
\end{cases}
\]

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have examined the Metropolis Monte Carlo algorithm as a tool for training neural networks, and have introduced aMC, an adaptive variant of it. Monte Carlo methods are closely related to evolutionary algorithms, which are used to train neural networks [11][13][19], but the latter are usually applied to populations of individuals; the MC algorithms we have considered here are applied to populations of size 1, just as gradient descent is. For sufficiently small moves the Metropolis algorithm is effectively gradient descent in the presence of white noise. Thus on theoretical grounds it should possess the ability to train a neural network to values of a loss function similar to those achieved by GD, if not necessarily as quickly: this is indeed what we (and others [6][8]) have observed empirically. aMC is an adaptive version of the Metropolis algorithm. The efficiency of aMC diminishes less quickly with decreasing loss and increasing net size than does the efficiency of the Metropolis algorithm, and aMC can train faster than Metropolis, just as adaptive gradient-based methods can train faster than pure gradient descent.

The Metropolis algorithm and aMC offer a complement to gradient-based methods in that they can sense the gradient when it exists but can work without it. In particular, aMC can train nets in which the gradient is too small to allow gradient-based methods to train on the timescales simulated. The design principles of neural nets optimal for Monte Carlo algorithms are largely unexplored but are likely distinct from those optimal for gradient-based methods, and having both sets of algorithms offers more choices for net design than having only one. Finally, we note that while Metropolis and aMC have a fundamental connection to gradient-based methods in the small-step-size limit, Monte Carlo algorithms more generally can enact large-scale nonlocal or collective changes that cannot be made by integrating gradient-based equations of motion [5][14][18]. The analogy suggests that improved Monte Carlo algorithms for training neural networks await development.
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[14] Zero temperature means that moves that increase the loss are not accepted. This choice is motivated by the empirical success in machine learning of gradient-descent methods, and by the intuition, derived from Gaussian random surfaces, that loss surfaces possess more downhill
directions at large values of the loss [31][32].


[18] Note that algorithms of this nature do not constitute random search. The proposal step is random (related conceptually to the idea of weight guessing, a method used in the presence of vanishing gradients [33]) but the acceptance criterion is a form of importance sampling, and leads to a dynamics equivalent to noisy gradient descent.


[27] In Metropolis Monte Carlo simulations of molecular systems it is usual to propose moves of one particle at a time. If we consider neural-net parameters to be akin to particle coordinates then the analog would be to make changes to one neural-net parameter at a time; see e.g. Ref. [3]. However, there is no formal mapping between particles and a neural network, and we could equally well consider the neural-net parameters to be akin to the coordinates of a single particle, in a high-dimensional space, in an external potential equal to the loss function. In the latter case the analog would be to propose a change of all neural-net parameters simultaneously, as we do here.


[30] https://www.youtube.com/3blue1brown


[43] This approximation assumes that the output neurons do not change under the move. This is not true, but the intent here is to set the basic move scale, and absolute precision is not necessary.


