

Preconditioning for Accelerated Gradient Descent Optimization and Regularization

Qiang Ye*

Abstract

Accelerated training algorithms, such as adaptive learning rates and various normalization methods, are widely used but not fully understood. When regularization is introduced, standard optimizers like adaptive learning rates may not perform effectively. This raises the need for alternative regularization approaches and the question of how to properly combine regularization with preconditioning. In this paper, we address these challenges using the theory of preconditioning as follows: (1) We explain how preconditioning with AdaGrad, RMSProp, and Adam accelerates training; (2) We explore the interaction between regularization and preconditioning, outlining different options for selecting the variables for regularization, and in particular we discuss how to implement that for the gradient regularization; and (3) We demonstrate how normalization methods accelerate training by improving Hessian conditioning, and discuss how this perspective can lead to new preconditioning training algorithms. Our findings offer a unified mathematical framework for understanding various acceleration techniques and deriving appropriate regularization schemes.

Introduction

Accelerated gradient descent algorithms such as AdaGrad, RMSProp, and Adam have played a pivotal role in the success of deep learning. However, their underlying mechanisms are not yet fully understood. These methods are widely interpreted as adaptive learning rate methods where the learning rate for each individual parameter adapts according to the magnitude of the partial derivative with respect to that parameter so that a smaller learning rate is used for a parameter with a larger derivative; see [6, Sec. 8.5] and [4, Sec. 7.3.3]. One limitation of this interpretation is that if the adaptive learning rate is simply inversely proportional to the absolute value of the derivative, it would eliminate all the gradient information except the signs. On the other hand, these algorithms are also frequently considered as

preconditioning methods [13, Sec. 8.4.6], though it remains unclear why the specific preconditioners defined by these algorithms are effective.

Of more practical importance is how we use adaptive learning rate in combination with regularization. [11] point out that directly applying an adaptive learning rate method to a L_2 regularized loss leads to an algorithm that differ from weight decay. They further show that the L_2 regularization is not effective with Adam and advocate the use of AdamW, which decouples weight decay from the adaptive learning. This discrepancy in the preconditioning setting raises important questions about how to properly combine adaptive learning rates with regularization. This is important as the answer is even less clear for non-conventional regularization such as gradient regularization [3, 8, 16, 18].

Normalization methods such as data normalization and batch normalization are also critical in training. Intuitively, normalizing all inputs or hidden variables to have similar magnitudes prevents the situation that, when an input/variable is much larger than others, a small change in the corresponding weight causes a disproportionately large change in the output [4, Sec. 7.4]. However, the exact benefits of normalization in improving optimization are not fully understood.

In this paper, we address these challenges using the theory of preconditioning as follows: (1) We explain how preconditioning with AdaGrad, RMSProp, and Adam accelerates training; (2) We explore the interaction between regularization and preconditioning, outlining different options for selecting the variables for regularization, and in particular we discuss how to implement that for the gradient regularization; and (3) We demonstrate how normalization methods accelerate training by improving Hessian conditioning, and discuss how this perspective can lead to new preconditioning training algorithms. Our findings offer a unified mathematical framework for understanding various acceleration techniques and deriving appropriate regularization schemes.

We note that the theory of preconditioning is limited to full-batch gradient descent (GD). Recent works have explored the convergence of adaptive gradient methods with stochastic gradient descent (SGD); see [2, 9, 5].

*Department of Mathematics, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506. qye3@uky.edu. Research supported in part by NSF Grants IIS-2327113, ITE-2433190 and DMS-2208314.

While these analyses often establish sublinear convergence rates like $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T})$, in practice, SGD often exhibits faster, near-linear convergence. Extending condition number-based convergence theory to the SGD setting remains an interesting open problem.

Throughout, algebraic operations or functions of vectors such as $v^2, 1/v$ are entrywise. $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the 2-norm unless specified otherwise.

Theory for Preconditioned Gradient Descent

Given a loss function $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p})$, the gradient descent (GD) method updates an approximate minimizer \mathbf{p}_t as:

$$\mathbf{p}_{t+1} = \mathbf{p}_t - \alpha \nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_t), \quad \text{for } t = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (1)$$

where α is a learning rate. We use $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ (or simply λ_{\min} and λ_{\max}) to denote respectively the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of a square matrix A , and use $\kappa(A) := \frac{\lambda_{\max}(A)}{\lambda_{\min}(A)}$ to denote the spectral condition number of a symmetric positive definite A . A general local convergence result to a local minimizer describes the asymptotic convergence rate in terms of the condition number of Hessian.

Theorem 1 *Assume $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is twice continuously differentiable and \mathbf{p}^* is such that $\nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*) = 0$ and the Hessian matrix $\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*)$ is positive definite. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a small neighborhood around \mathbf{p}^* such that, for any initial approximation \mathbf{p}_0 in that neighborhood, the GD iterations satisfy*

$$\|\mathbf{p}_{t+1} - \mathbf{p}^*\| \leq (r + \epsilon) \|\mathbf{p}_t - \mathbf{p}^*\|, \quad (2)$$

where $r = \max\{|1 - \alpha\lambda_{\min}|, |1 - \alpha\lambda_{\max}|\}$, $\lambda_{\min} = \lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*))$ and $\lambda_{\max} = \lambda_{\max}(\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*))$. Furthermore, $\alpha = \frac{2}{\lambda_{\min} + \lambda_{\max}}$ leads to the optimal convergence rate

$$r = \frac{\kappa - 1}{\kappa + 1}, \quad \text{where } \kappa = \kappa(\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*)) = \frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\lambda_{\min}}. \quad (3)$$

This local linear convergence result can be found in [14, Theorem 9], but for quadratic functions, it is available in [15, Example 4.1]. The bound is based on optimal learning rate. In practice, a nearly optimal learning rate can be obtained through tuning. We will assume optimal α when discussing convergence rate.

For minimizers with an ill-conditioned Hessian, preconditioning is a modified iteration to accelerate local convergence. Although it is an essential method in solving linear systems of equations (i.e. quadratic optimization), it is less discussed for general optimization problems. Here, we consider a preconditioning acceleration of gradient descent through a change of parameter as presented in [10].

Let P be an invertible matrix and consider a change of parameters $\mathbf{p} = P\mathbf{z}$, which we call a *preconditioning transformation*. Writing $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(P\mathbf{z})$, GD in \mathbf{z} is

$$\mathbf{z}_{t+1} = \mathbf{z}_t - \alpha \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \mathcal{L}(P\mathbf{z}_t) = \mathbf{z}_t - \alpha P^T \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_t), \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{p}_t = P\mathbf{z}_t$ and $\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \mathcal{L}(P\mathbf{z}) = P^T \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p})$. Let $\mathbf{z}^* = P^{-1}\mathbf{p}^*$. The corresponding optimal convergence bound is

$$\|\mathbf{z}_{t+1} - \mathbf{z}^*\| \leq (r + \epsilon) \|\mathbf{z}_t - \mathbf{z}^*\|$$

with r as determined by (3) and the Hessian of \mathcal{L} with respect to \mathbf{z} : $\nabla_{\mathbf{z}}^2 \mathcal{L}(P\mathbf{z}^*) = P^T \nabla_{\mathbf{p}}^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*) P$.

If P is such that $P^T \nabla_{\mathbf{p}}^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*) P$ has a better condition number than $\nabla_{\mathbf{p}}^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*)$, r is reduced and the convergence accelerated. Multiplying (4) by P , we obtain the equivalent update scheme in $\mathbf{p}_t = P\mathbf{z}_t$:

$$\mathbf{p}_{t+1} = \mathbf{p}_t - \alpha M \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_t). \quad (5)$$

We call $M := PP^T$ a preconditioner. (In some literature, $(PP^T)^{-1}$ is called a preconditioner.) Then (5) is an implicit implementation of the iteration (4), where \mathbf{z}_t and the preconditioning transformation are not explicitly invoked and the modifying iteration (5) in \mathbf{p}_t is all that is needed. However, (4) in \mathbf{z}_t is the underlying iteration and hence the local rate of convergence is $r_M = \frac{\kappa_M - 1}{\kappa_M + 1}$, where $\kappa_M = \kappa(P^T \nabla_{\mathbf{p}}^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*) P) = \lambda_{\max}(M \nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*)) / \lambda_{\min}(M \nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*))$. (Note that the eigenvalues of $P^T \nabla_{\mathbf{p}}^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*) P$ are the same as those of $M \nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*)$). So, if κ_M is smaller than κ , preconditioning accelerates the convergence.

The above theory assumes $\lambda_{\min} > 0$ (i.e. strong local convexity) at a local minimum. This may not hold for a neural network that has *positively scale-invariant property* [12]. Fortunately, the above theory can be adapted to this situation with λ_{\min} replaced by the smallest positive eigenvalue; see [10] for details. For the rest of this paper, we assume a local minimum has positive definite Hessian.

Understanding Adaptive Learning Rate

Adaptive learning rate algorithms like AdaGrad, RMSProp, and Adams have been recognized as a preconditioned iteration (5) with a certain M ; see [13]. However, how these choices of M lead to improved conditioning is unclear. Here, we use the convergence theory discussed above to show how these adaptive learning rate methods improve the condition number of the Hessian and thereby accelerate convergence.

It is well known that one way for a matrix to become ill-conditioned is its rows (or columns) have unbalanced scaling in norm. This can be fixed by simply scaling its rows (or columns) to have similar magnitudes.

Theorem 2 [17] *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ have full column rank and for any fixed $t > 0$, let $D = t \text{diag}\{\|a_1\|^{-1}, \dots, \|a_n\|^{-1}\}$, where a_i^T is the i -th row of A . We have*

$$\kappa(DA) \leq \sqrt{m} \min_{D_0 \text{ is diagonal}} \kappa(D_0 A).$$

Namely, scaling all rows of A to have the same norm achieves near optimal conditioning number among all possible scalings. The same holds for column scaling of A .

We construct a diagonal preconditioner $M = \text{diag}\{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n\}$ for the Hessian $\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*)$, where m_i has approximately the same magnitude as the i -th row of $\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*)$. In general, it is too costly to estimate the Hessian, but the gradient itself can provide some information on the rows of the Hessian as follows.

If \mathbf{p}^* is a local minimum, then $\nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*) = 0$ and it follows from the Taylor expansion of $\nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p})$ at \mathbf{p}^* that

$$\nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}) = \nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*)(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^*) + O(\|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^*\|^2).$$

If we write $\mathbf{g} = \nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p})$ and its i -th entry $g_i = \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_i}$, and if \mathbf{h}_i^T is the i^{th} row of $\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}^*)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} g_i &= \mathbf{h}_i^T (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^*) + O(\|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^*\|^2) \\ &= \|\mathbf{h}_i\| \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^*\| \cos \angle(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^*) + O(\|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^*\|^2) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, barring the situation that \mathbf{h}_i is nearly orthogonal to $\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}^*$, $|g_i|$ is proportional to $\|\mathbf{h}_i\|$ in magnitude. While the near orthogonality may hold for one particular \mathbf{p}_t , it is unlikely to occur for many different iterates \mathbf{p}_t . Thus, if we set m_i^{-1} to be some average of $|g_i|$ over many iterates \mathbf{p}_t , then M should be a good preconditioner.

We illustrate the danger of using a single gradient to estimate $\|\mathbf{h}_i\|$ with an example. If we use $|\nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_t)|$ at step t to construct $M = \text{diag}\{1/|\nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_t)|\}$, which would appear perfectly fine in terms of adapting the learning rate to each partial derivative, the preconditioned gradient $M \nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_t) = \text{sign}(\nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_t))$ has all the gradient information wiped out other than its signs. It is therefore important that we use some average $\bar{\mathbf{g}}$ of $|\nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_t)|$ to construct preconditioner $M = \text{diag}\{1/\bar{\mathbf{g}}\}$. This average needs not to be quite accurate, as only its magnitude is interesting.

AdaGrad computes the gradient $\mathbf{g}_t = \nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_t)$ at step t and accumulates the sum of square of all the previous gradients and updates as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}_{t+1} &\leftarrow \mathbf{r}_t + \mathbf{g}_t^2 \\ \mathbf{p}_{t+1} &\leftarrow \mathbf{p}_t - \alpha M_t \mathbf{g}_t \end{aligned}$$

where $M_t = \text{diag}\{1/\sqrt{\mathbf{r}_t}\}$. Clearly $\mathbf{r}_t = \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{g}_i^2$ and $\sqrt{\mathbf{r}_t} = \sqrt{t} \bar{\mathbf{g}}$ where $\bar{\mathbf{g}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{g}_i^2}$ is an average of $|\mathbf{g}_i|$. Thus AdaGrad is a preconditioning method where the preconditioner is based on average magnitude of the gradient $\bar{\mathbf{g}}$ with a uniform scaling \sqrt{t} . The scaling by \sqrt{t} does not affect the preconditioning property but has the effect of learning rate decay.

RMSProp replaces the updating formula for \mathbf{r} in AdaGrad by using a running average of \mathbf{g}_t :

$$\mathbf{r}_{t+1} \leftarrow \rho \mathbf{r}_t + (1 - \rho) \mathbf{g}_t^2, \quad 0 < \rho < 1. \quad (6)$$

If we initially set $\mathbf{r}_1 \leftarrow \mathbf{g}_1^2$ for $t = 1$, then it can be checked that at step $t > 1$,

$$\mathbf{r}_t = \rho^{t-1} \mathbf{g}_1^2 + (1 - \rho^{t-1}) \frac{\sum_{i=2}^t \rho^{t-i} \mathbf{g}_i^2}{\sum_{i=2}^t \rho^{t-i}}. \quad (7)$$

Therefore, \mathbf{r}_t is a weighted average of \mathbf{g}_i^2 with larger weights on later iterates and RMSProp is a preconditioning method where a weighted $\bar{\mathbf{g}} = \sqrt{\mathbf{r}_t}$ is used to approximate average magnitude of the gradient.

Adam combines RMSProp (6) with a momentum modified gradient that is updated as a moving average.

$$\mathbf{m}_{t+1} \leftarrow \hat{\rho} \mathbf{m}_t + (1 - \hat{\rho}) \mathbf{g}_t, \quad 0 < \hat{\rho} < 1. \quad (8)$$

If we initially set $\mathbf{r}_1 \leftarrow \mathbf{g}_1^2$ and $\mathbf{m}_1 \leftarrow \mathbf{g}_1$, then \mathbf{r}_t at step t can be written as in (7) with a similar formula for \mathbf{m}_t . In that case, they are some averages of \mathbf{g}_i^2 and \mathbf{g}_i respectively. In this way, Adam is a preconditioning method with a momentum.

Note that in the original Adam, \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{m} are initially set to 0, i.e. for $t = 0$, $\mathbf{r}_0 \leftarrow 0$ and $\mathbf{m}_0 \leftarrow 0$. Then correspondingly, (7) becomes $\mathbf{r}_t = (1 - \rho^t) \frac{\sum_{i=1}^t \rho^{t-i} \mathbf{g}_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^t \rho^{t-i}}$ and similarly $\mathbf{m}_t = (1 - \hat{\rho}^t) \frac{\sum_{i=1}^t \hat{\rho}^{t-i} \mathbf{g}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^t \hat{\rho}^{t-i}}$. Then \mathbf{r}_t and \mathbf{m}_t are not averages but has a bias $1 - \rho^t$ and $1 - \hat{\rho}^t$ resp. Adam employs a bias correction by dividing this bias factor to turn them into a weighted average, although, if the initialization starts with $t = 1$, this bias correction is not needed.

Regularization with Preconditioning

Another difficulty caused by the lack of understanding of adaptive learning rate arises when we have to combine them with a regularization method. For example, the L_2 -regularization of a simple gradient descent is equivalent to learning rate decay. However, it is observed in [11] that this equivalency does not hold when an adaptive learning rate method is used. Specifically, [11] considers a preconditioned optimizer $\mathbf{p}_{t+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{p}_t - \alpha M_t \nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_t)$ with $M_t \neq I$. It is shown [11] that there exists no λ such that applying the optimizer to an L_2 -regularized loss $\mathcal{L}^{reg}(\mathbf{p}) := \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}) + \lambda \|\mathbf{p}\|_2^2$ is equivalent to applying the optimizer to $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p})$ with weight decay (i.e. $\mathbf{p}_{t+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{p}_t - \alpha M_t \nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_t) - \epsilon \mathbf{p}_t$). It is further shown that, if $M_t = \text{diag}(1/\mathbf{r})$ for some $\mathbf{r} > 0$, the optimizer with weight decay is equivalent to a scale-adjusted regularization with $\mathcal{L}^{sreg}(\mathbf{p}) := \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}) + \lambda \|\mathbf{p} \sqrt{\mathbf{r}}\|_2^2$. For the Adam optimizer, [11] suggests that Adam with weight decay performs better, which is called AdamW. The intuition is that L_2 -regularization leads to weights with large gradient amplitudes being regularized less than what they would be when using weight decay.

When we consider an optimizer as preconditioning, it is immediately clear from the theory that there are two different ways to regularize the loss. Recall that preconditioned GD $\mathbf{p}_{t+1} = \mathbf{p}_t - \alpha M_t \nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_t)$ is just the implicit form of the underlying GD in \mathbf{z} :

$$\mathbf{z}_{t+1} = \mathbf{z}_t - \alpha \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \mathcal{L}(P \mathbf{z}_t)$$

through the transformation $\mathbf{p} = P \mathbf{z}$. Since the loss $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(P \mathbf{z})$ is a function in \mathbf{z} now, it is natural to regularize with respect to \mathbf{z} :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{z}}^{reg}(\mathbf{p}) := \mathcal{L}(P \mathbf{z}) + \lambda \|\mathbf{z}\|_2^2 = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}) + \lambda \|P^{-1} \mathbf{p}\|_2^2. \quad (9)$$

This is the same loss as $\mathcal{L}^{sreg}(\mathbf{p})$ for weight decay discussed above, where P (or M) is diagonal. Then the GD in \mathbf{z} with $\mathcal{L}_z^{reg}(\mathbf{p})$ gives

$$\mathbf{z}_{t+1} = \mathbf{z}_t - \alpha (P^T \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{L}(P\mathbf{z}_t) + 2\lambda \mathbf{z}_t)$$

and multiplying by P to get

$$\mathbf{p}_{t+1} = \mathbf{p}_t - \alpha M \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_t) - 2\alpha \lambda \mathbf{p}_t.$$

Namely, regularization with $\|\mathbf{z}\|_2^2$ is equivalent to a weight decay.

On the other hand, we may regularize with respect to the original parameters \mathbf{p} using the loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{p}}^{reg}(\mathbf{p}) := \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}) + \lambda \|\mathbf{p}\|_2^2 = \mathcal{L}(P\mathbf{z}) + \lambda \|P\mathbf{z}\|_2^2. \quad (10)$$

Then the GD in z gives

$$\mathbf{z}_{t+1} = \mathbf{z}_t - \alpha (P^T \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{L}(P\mathbf{z}_t) + 2\lambda P^T P\mathbf{z}_t)$$

and multiplying by P to get

$$\mathbf{p}_{t+1} = \mathbf{p}_t - \alpha M (\nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_t) - 2\lambda \mathbf{p}_t).$$

Namely, regularization with $\|\mathbf{p}\|_2^2$ is the same as applying M directly to the gradient of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{p}}^{reg}(\mathbf{p})$ without taking into account of the implicit transform $\mathbf{p} = P\mathbf{z}$.

When considering the two regularization schemes, if we assume the preconditioner M is such that the Hessian has a better condition number, then implicitly \mathbf{z} is a better parameterization than \mathbf{p} . For example, for diagonal preconditioner, \mathbf{z} can be expected to have a better or more uniform scaling than \mathbf{p} . Then regularizing with $\|\mathbf{z}\|_2^2$, which places equal weights on all the components of \mathbf{z} , would provide a balanced approach, while $\|\mathbf{p}\|_2^2$ would favor larger components. We therefore suggest that a proper regularization should be in terms of \mathbf{z} .

Gradient Regularization. Recently, there have been significant interests in a regularization scheme called gradient regularization [3, 8, 16], where a square 2-norm of gradient is the regularization term:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{p}}^{reg}(\mathbf{p}) := \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}) + \lambda R(\mathbf{p}), R(\mathbf{p}) := \|\nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p})\|_2^2. \quad (11)$$

A similar regularization using a non-squared p-norm $R(\mathbf{p}) = \|\nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p})\|_p$ has also been studied in [18]. In implementation, $\nabla_{\mathbf{p}} R(\mathbf{p})$ can be computed by a finite difference approximation or double backpropagation [8].

The gradient regularization has been shown to improve generalization performance. Indeed, [18, 8] show that the sharpness-aware minimization (SAM) [1] for finding a smooth minima can be viewed as a gradient regularization. [3] shows that plain SGD without regularization is an implicit gradient regularization with a small λ , while (11) uses an explicit gradient regularization. Interestingly, only SGD optimizer has been implemented for gradient regularization (11).

From the discussions above on the L_2 regularization, there are also two ways to regularize the loss when preconditioning is used. One may directly regularize with respect to the original parameters \mathbf{p} as in (11), namely $\mathbf{p}_{t+1} = \mathbf{p}_t - \alpha M \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{p}}^{reg}(\mathbf{p})$. This

ignores the underlying preconditioning transformation $\mathbf{p} = P\mathbf{z}$. Alternatively, it is more natural to regularize $R(\mathbf{z}) := \|\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \mathcal{L}(P\mathbf{z})\|_2^2$ in \mathbf{z} , namely using

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{z}}^{reg}(\mathbf{z}) := \mathcal{L}(P\mathbf{z}) + \lambda \|\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \mathcal{L}(P\mathbf{z})\|_2^2 \quad (12)$$

Taking the gradient in z :

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} R(\mathbf{z}) &= 2\nabla_{\mathbf{z}}^2 \mathcal{L}(P\mathbf{z}) \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \mathcal{L}(P\mathbf{z}) \\ &= 2P^T \nabla_{\mathbf{p}}^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}) M \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}) \end{aligned}$$

we have the GD in z as

$$\mathbf{z}_{t+1} = \mathbf{z}_t - \alpha P^T (\nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{L}(P\mathbf{z}_t) + 2\lambda \nabla_{\mathbf{p}}^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}) M \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}))$$

and multiplying by P to get

$$\mathbf{p}_{t+1} = \mathbf{p}_t - \alpha M \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}_t) - 2\alpha \lambda M \nabla_{\mathbf{p}}^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}) M \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}).$$

Again, this regularization should have an advantage by working with the better parameter \mathbf{z} .

Normalization Methods as Preconditioning

Normalization techniques such as the input data normalization/standardization and batch normalization can significantly accelerates training; see [4]. Although they are not training algorithms, we will show that they improve Hessian condition numbers. We will also describe the recent work to implement normalization through preconditioning. We consider the setting of training a fully connect neural network.

Let $y = f(x, \mathbf{p}) : x \in \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a neural network whose ℓ -th hidden layer is defined by

$$h^{(\ell)} = g \left(W^{(\ell)} h^{(\ell-1)} + b^{(\ell)} \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\ell}}; \quad h^{(0)} = x \quad (13)$$

where $W^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\ell} \times n_{\ell-1}}$, $b^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\ell}}$, and $g(s)$ is an activation function. Let \mathbf{p} be the vector of all trainable parameters (i.e. all $W^{(\ell)}, b^{(\ell)}$). Let $a_i^{(\ell)} = w_i^{(\ell)T} h^{(\ell-1)} + b_i^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}$, where $w_i^{(\ell)T} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n_{\ell-1}}$ and $b_i^{(\ell)}$ are the respective i th row and entry of $W^{(\ell)}$ and $b^{(\ell)}$. Let $h_i^{(\ell)} = g \left(a_i^{(\ell)} \right)$ be the i th entry of $h^{(\ell)}$.

Given a labeled dataset $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$, let $L(\hat{y}, y)$ be some loss function for the predicted output $\hat{y} := f(x, \mathbf{p})$. We minimize the mean loss:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p}) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L(f(x_i, \mathbf{p}), y_i) \quad (14)$$

We will consider the Hessian of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{p})$ with respect to the weight/bias for one activation $a_i^{(\ell)} = w_i^{(\ell)T} h^{(\ell-1)} + b_i^{(\ell)}$.

For some fixed ℓ and i , let

$$\hat{w}^T = \left[b_i^{(\ell)}, w_i^{(\ell)T} \right], \quad \hat{h} = \left[\frac{1}{h^{(\ell-1)}} \right] \quad \text{and} \quad a_i^{(\ell)} = \hat{w}^T \hat{h}. \quad (15)$$

Then, the output $\hat{y} = f(x, \mathbf{p})$ and hence the loss $L = L(\hat{y}, y)$ is a function of $\hat{w}^T = \left[b_i^{(\ell)}, w_i^{(\ell)T} \right]$ through

$a_i^{(\ell)} = \widehat{w}^T \widehat{x}$ only. We write this function as $L = L_i^{(\ell)}(a_i^{(\ell)}) = L_i^{(\ell)}(\widehat{w}^T \widehat{x})$. For notational simplicity, we drop ℓ and i to write the function as $L = L(a_i^{(1)}) = L(\widehat{w}^T \widehat{x})$ but note that $L(a_i^{(1)})$ is not the same as $L(\widehat{y}, y)$ even though we use the same letter L . Then the Hessian of the mean loss with respect to \widehat{w} has a simple structure as follows; see [10].

Theorem 3 Let $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N\}$ be the data inputs to a neural network (13) and let $\{h_1^{(\ell-1)}, h_2^{(\ell-1)}, \dots, h_N^{(\ell-1)}\}$ be the corresponding hidden variables $h^{(\ell-1)}$. Let $\widehat{h}_j = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ h_j^{(\ell-1)} \end{bmatrix}$ and let

$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(\widehat{w}) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N L(\widehat{w}^T \widehat{h}_j)$ be the mean loss. Then, its Hessian with respect to \widehat{w} is

$$\nabla_{\widehat{w}}^2 \mathcal{L}(\widehat{w}) = H_e S H_e^T \quad (16)$$

where

$$H_e = \begin{bmatrix} e^T \\ H \end{bmatrix}, S = \frac{1}{N} \begin{bmatrix} L''(\widehat{w}^T \widehat{h}_1) & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & L''(\widehat{w}^T \widehat{h}_N) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

$e = [1, \dots, 1]^T$, and $H = [h_1^{(\ell-1)}, \dots, h_N^{(\ell-1)}]$.

We illustrate this result with linear regression and logistic regression. Consider the linear regression model $\widehat{y} := w^T x + b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $L(\widehat{y}, y) = \frac{1}{2} \|\widehat{y} - y\|^2$. By writing $\widehat{w}^T = [b, w^T]$, the Hessian of the mean square loss is $\nabla_{\widehat{w}}^2 \mathcal{L}(\widehat{w}) = \frac{1}{N} X_e X_e^T$ where

$$X_e = \begin{bmatrix} e^T \\ X \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+1) \times N} \text{ and } X = [x_1, \dots, x_N] \quad (18)$$

This is a special case of (16).

Similarly, for the logistic regression model $\widehat{y} := \sigma(w^T x + b) \in \mathbb{R}$ with the cross-entropy loss $L(\widehat{y}, y) = -y \log \widehat{y} - (1 - y) \cdot \log(1 - \widehat{y})$, where $\sigma(s) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-s}}$ is the logistic sigmoid function, we have

$$\nabla_{\widehat{w}}^2 \mathcal{L} = X_e S X_e^T, \quad S = \frac{1}{N} \text{diag}\{\widehat{y}_i(1 - \widehat{y}_i)\},$$

where $\widehat{y}_i = \sigma(w^T x_i + b)$. Again, it is a special case of (16). So Theorem 3 is a generalization of the Hessian formulas for the linear regression and the logistic regression.

Input Data Normalization

Input data normalization is to transform the input data $\{x_i\}$ so that all input features (the components of x) follow a similar distribution. There are two common ways of normalization: one is to center the data points and then normalize by the standard deviation, often called standardization; the other is to shift and scale each

feature to be bounded between 0 and 1, often called normalization. As discussed in the introduction, the normalization makes intuitive sense but how it really benefits learning is not clear. Here we show that the input data standardization/normalization improves the Hessian conditioning for the input layer parameter.

Consider the input layer (i.e. $\ell = 1$). For a fixed i , let

$$\widehat{w}^T = [b_i^{(1)}, w_i^{(1)T}] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times (n+1)}, \quad \widehat{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ x \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times 1}, \quad (19)$$

Then $a_i^{(1)} = \widehat{w}^T \widehat{x}$. Applying Theorem 3 to the case $\ell = 1$, the Hessian of the mean loss with respect to \widehat{w} is

$$\nabla_{\widehat{w}}^2 \mathcal{L}(\widehat{w}) = X_e S X_e^T \quad (20)$$

where X_e is as defined in (18). We call X the data matrix and X_e the extended data matrix.

(20) shows that the condition number of the Hessian $\nabla_{\widehat{w}}^2 \mathcal{L}$ is roughly proportional to the square of the condition number of the extended data matrix X_e . Indeed, $\kappa(\nabla_{\widehat{w}}^2 \mathcal{L}) \leq \kappa(X_e)^2 \kappa(S)$. If the n features of the input x are of different scales, the rows of X_e are of different scales, which lead to ill-conditioned X_e and hence ill-conditioned Hessian $\nabla_{\widehat{w}}^2 \mathcal{L}(\widehat{w})$. We now show that the input normalization improves the condition number of X_e .

First consider the input standardization

$$\tilde{x}_j = (x_j - \mu) / \sigma = D_0(x_j - \mu)$$

where μ and σ^2 are the vector mean and variance of the dataset $\{x_j\}$ respectively, and $D_0 = \text{diag}\{\sigma^{-1}\}$. Using the standardized dataset $\{\tilde{x}_j\}$ as the input, the Hessian matrix becomes $\tilde{X}_e S \tilde{X}_e^T$, where

$$\tilde{X}_e = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ D_0(x_1 - \mu) & \cdots & D_0(x_N - \mu) \end{bmatrix} = D \begin{bmatrix} e^T \\ X - \mu e^T \end{bmatrix}$$

where $D = \text{diag}\{1, D_0\}$. The centered data matrix $X - \mu e^T$ is orthogonal to the first row e^T because $(X - \mu e^T)e = X e - N \mu = 0$. This orthogonality improves the conditioning by Theorem 4 of [10] as follows.

Theorem 4 For $\mu = \frac{1}{N} X e$, we have

$$\kappa \left(\begin{bmatrix} e^T \\ X - \mu e^T \end{bmatrix} \right) \leq \kappa \left(\begin{bmatrix} e^T \\ X \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

The amount of the improvement in conditioning depends on how large μ is. For example, if $\mu = 0$, i.e. the data is already centered, then centering does not change the data and hence the conditioning.

Furthermore, the norm of the i -th row of $X - \mu e^T$ is $\sqrt{N} \sigma_i$. Then, after the scaling by σ_i , the i -th row of \tilde{X}_e has norm \sqrt{N} . Thus all rows of \tilde{X}_e have the same norm \sqrt{N} , including the first row e^T . As seen in Theorem 2, this provides nearly optimal condition number under scaling. Therefore, the standardization improves the conditioning of the extended data matrix \tilde{X}_e in two ways: orthogonality and constant row norms.

Now, consider normalization such as $\tilde{x}_i = (x_i - x_{\min})/(x_{\max} - x_{\min})$, where x_{\min} and x_{\max} are respectively the entrywise minimum and maximum vector of $\{x_i\}$, e.g. the j -th entry of x_{\min} is the minimum of the j -th entries of $\{x_i\}$. In this case, each entry of \tilde{x}_i is bounded between 0 and 1, and then the 1-norm of each row of \tilde{X}_e is bounded by N , including the first row. (The 2-norm of the rows are bounded by \sqrt{N} .) So, this normalization scales all rows of \tilde{X}_e to have similar norms, which by Theorem 2 should improve the conditioning.

Batch Normalization

Batch Normalization (BN) [7] generalizes the idea of input normalization to hidden layers of neural network. BN for the ℓ th layer is a linear layer inserted between the hidden layers $h^{(\ell-1)}$ and $h^{(\ell)}$ to center and scale the variable $h^{(\ell-1)}$ to have zero mean and unit variance across the mini-batch features. Specifically, BN replaces the ℓ -th hidden layer (13) by

$$h^{(\ell)} = g\left(W^{(\ell)}\mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma}(h^{(\ell-1)}) + b^{(\ell)}\right) \quad (21)$$

where

$$\mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma}\left(h^{(\ell-1)}\right) := \gamma \frac{h^{(\ell-1)} - \mu_H}{\sigma_H} + \beta, \quad (22)$$

$$\mu_H := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N h_j^{(\ell-1)}, \quad \sigma_H^2 := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (h_j^{(\ell-1)} - \mu_H)^2 \quad (23)$$

are the (vector) mean and variance of $\{h_j^{(\ell-1)}\}$ respectively, and γ, β are the respective trainable re-scaling and re-centering parameter vectors. The β and γ are trainable parameters. Note that BN described above is also referred to as a *post-activation* version. We will discuss this version only.

There is a vast literature that analyzes various aspects of BN. A review is beyond the scope of this work. Our goal is to understand BN through preconditioning. In training a BN network, μ_H and σ_H are considered functions of the parameters of previous layers and the gradient with respect to those parameters would pass through μ_H and σ_H . This significantly complicates the analysis. To this end we make two simplifying assumptions.

We first observe that a post-activation BN layer defined in (21) can be written as

$$h^{(\ell)} = g\left(\widehat{W}\mathcal{B}_{0,1}\left(h^{(\ell-1)}\right) + \widehat{b}\right)$$

where $\widehat{W} = W^{(\ell)}\text{diag}(\gamma)$ and $\widehat{b} = W^{(\ell)}\beta + b^{(\ell)}$. Namely, the ℓ -th layer with BN operator $\mathcal{B}_{\beta,\gamma}(\cdot)$ is equivalent to one with the transformed parameters \widehat{W}, \widehat{b} but normalized with $\mathcal{B}_{0,1}(\cdot)$ (that is no re-scaling and re-centering). Namely, the representation of the ℓ -th layer by the parameters $W^{(\ell)}, b^{(\ell)}, \beta, \gamma$ is an over-parameterized version and is equivalent to one using the parameters \widehat{W}, \widehat{b}

only. Therefore, for our analysis, we will consider normalization with $\mathcal{B}_{0,1}(\cdot)$ only.

We also assume that the gradients are not passed through μ_H and σ_H . Namely, we assume μ_H and σ_H are constants when computing gradients for training. Under this assumption, we rewrite (21) as

$$h^{(\ell)} = g\left(W^{(\ell)}\tilde{h}^{(\ell-1)} + b^{(\ell)}\right); \quad \tilde{h}^{(\ell-1)} := \mathcal{B}_{0,1}\left(h^{(\ell-1)}\right).$$

Applying Theorem 3 to the above form, we obtain

$$\nabla_{\tilde{w}}^2 \mathcal{L}(\tilde{w}) = \tilde{H}_e S \tilde{H}_e^T$$

where

$$\tilde{H}_e = \begin{bmatrix} e^T \\ \tilde{H} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and } \tilde{H} = [\tilde{h}_1^{(\ell-1)}, \dots, \tilde{h}_N^{(\ell-1)}]. \quad (24)$$

Namely, BN changes the Hessian in the same way as the input data normalization. Since $\{\tilde{h}_i^{(\ell-1)}\}$ is standardized, the same discussions on improved conditioning of the extended data matrix \tilde{X}_e are valid for \tilde{H}_e here and show that \tilde{H}_e has an improved conditioning through orthogonality and row scaling. Thus, $\nabla_{\tilde{w}}^2 \mathcal{L}(\tilde{w})$ has better conditioning and that is how BN accelerates training.

BN may be considered an explicit form of preconditioning where we change the network architecture and hidden variables to improve the conditioning. Preconditioning, on the other hand, implicitly transform the parameters to improve conditioning. Following this idea, a preconditioning approach that exploits the standardization $\{\tilde{h}_i^{(\ell-1)}\}$ has been developed in [10], called Batch Normalization Preconditioning (BNP). In this setting, BNP is based on the original network (13) (i.e. without any normalization) but introduces the transformation $\tilde{w} = Pz$ for the parameter in the ℓ -th layer, where

$$P := UD, \quad U := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\mu_H^T \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}, \quad D := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{diag}(\sigma_H) \end{bmatrix}^{-1}, \quad (25)$$

and μ_H and σ_H^2 are the mean and variance vector as defined in (23). Then, with this preconditioning, the corresponding Hessian matrix in z is

$$\nabla_z^2 \mathcal{L} = P^T \nabla_{\tilde{w}}^2 \mathcal{L} P = P^T H_e S H_e^T P = G_e S G_e.$$

where

$$G_e = P^T H_e = \begin{bmatrix} e^T \\ G \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and } G = \text{diag}(\sigma_H^{-1})(H - \mu_H e^T) \quad (26)$$

Namely, the columns of G are standardized H . As before, G_e improves conditioning of H_e through orthogonality and row scaling. Thus, the conditioning of the Hessian is improved.

Although G_e and \tilde{H}_e may appear to be the same, they are different as the corresponding networks (13) and (21) are different and hence they have different $h^{(\ell-1)}$ from which G_e and \tilde{H}_e are defined.

The preconditioned iteration is implemented implicitly through modifying the gradient; see (5). Namely,

BNP updates the parameter $\hat{w}^T = [b_i^{(\ell)}, w_i^{(\ell)T}]$ as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} b_i^{(\ell)T} \\ w_i^{(\ell)T} \end{bmatrix} \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} b_i^{(\ell)T} \\ w_i^{(\ell)T} \end{bmatrix} - \alpha P P^T \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial b_i^{(\ell)}} \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial w_i^{(\ell)T}} \end{bmatrix} \quad (27)$$

Note that the gradient transformation defined by P and P^T can be simplified to involve vector operations only rather than the matrix multiplications.

We finally remark that, for mini-batch training with BNP, μ and σ may be the mini-batch statistics as in BN but can also be some averages of them as they are independent of the network; they are only used to define the preconditioner PP^T . With this flexibility, the mean and variance may be estimated using the running averages over many iterations. They are more stable and works better when we deal with small mini-batch sizes. Another advantage of BNP is that, during gradient update, the network is only changed by the parameter update, while a training step in BN would involve a change of parameters as well as the mini-batch statistics that defines the network. Thus, even we start from the same network and happen to have same parameter updates, the network would be different at the next training step because BN network changes with a new mini-batch.

References

- [1] Maksym Andriushchenko and Nicolas Flammarion. Towards understanding sharpness-aware minimization. In Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvari, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 639–668. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022.
- [2] Amit Attia and Tomer Koren. Sgd with adagrad step-sizes: Full adaptivity with high probability to unknown parameters, unbounded gradients and affine variance. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1147–1171. PMLR, 2023.
- [3] David GT Barrett and Benoit Dherin. Implicit gradient regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [4] Christopher Michael Bishop and Hugh Bishop. *Deep Learning - Foundations and Concepts*. 1 edition, 2023.
- [5] Matthew Faw, Isidoros Tziotis, Constantine Caramanis, Aryan Mokhtari, Sanjay Shakkottai, and Rachel Ward. The power of adaptivity in sgd: Self-tuning step sizes with unbounded gradients and affine variance. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 313–355. PMLR, 2022.
- [6] Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep Learning*. MIT Press, 2016.
- [7] S. Ioffe and C. Szegedy. Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML32)*, volume 37, Lille, France, 2015. JMLR: W&CP.
- [8] Ryo Karakida, Tomoumi Takase, Tomohiro Hayase, and Kazuki Osawa. Understanding gradient regularization in deep learning: Efficient finite-difference computation and implicit bias. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 15809–15827. PMLR, 2023.
- [9] Tomer Koren, Roi Livni, Yishay Mansour, and Uri Sherman. Benign underfitting of stochastic gradient descent. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:19605–19617, 2022.
- [10] Susanna Lange, Kyle Helfrich, and Qiang Ye. Batch normalization preconditioning for neural network training. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(72):1–41, 2022.
- [11] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [12] Qi Meng, Shuxin Zheng, Huishuai Zhang, Wei Chen, Zhi-Ming Ma, and Tie-Yan Liu. G-SGD: Optimizing reLU neural networks in its positively scale-invariant space. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [13] Kevin P. Murphy. *Machine learning : a probabilistic perspective*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass. [u.a.], 2013.
- [14] Boris Polyak. Some methods of speeding up the convergence of iteration methods. *Ussr Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 4:1–17, 12 1964.
- [15] Y. Saad. *Iterative Methods for Sparse Linear Systems*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, USA, 2nd edition, 2003.
- [16] Samuel L Smith, Benoit Dherin, David Barrett, and Soham De. On the origin of implicit regularization in stochastic gradient descent. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [17] Abraham Van der Sluis. Condition numbers and equilibration of matrices. *Numerische Mathematik*, 14(1):14–23, 1969.
- [18] Yang Zhao, Hao Zhang, and Xiuyuan Hu. Penalizing gradient norm for efficiently improving generalization in deep learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 26982–26992. PMLR, 2022.