

---

# ZORB: A Derivative-Free Backpropagation Algorithm for Neural Networks

---

Anonymous Author(s)

Affiliation

Address

email

## Abstract

1 The backpropagation algorithm, together with Gradient Descent (GD), is the  
2 workhorse of learning with modern neural networks. In this paper, we present a  
3 faster alternative based on the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse, namely the Zeroth-  
4 Order Relaxed Backpropagation (ZORB) algorithm. Unlike GD, which makes  
5 use of a first-order approximation method, ZORB does not require the calculation  
6 of gradients. ZORB instead calculates the pseudoinverse layer-wise to propagate  
7 information in the backward pass. As a result, ZORB is able to converge much  
8 faster in wall-clock time compared to GD. While ZORB is designed to reduce the  
9 time required to train deep neural networks, it still achieves comparable accuracy to  
10 backpropagation with GD. To illustrate the speed up, we trained a neural network  
11 with 11 layers on MNIST and observed that ZORB converged 300 times faster than  
12 Adam. We provide further experiments on standard classification and regression  
13 benchmarks to demonstrate ZORB's speed up over Adam.

## 14 1 Introduction

15 Artificial Neural Networks (ANN), inspired by biological neural networks, are based on a collection of  
16 connected units or nodes called artificial neurons ?. These neural architectures are used conjunction  
17 with an optimization objective and a learning algorithm to achieve state of the art performance  
18 on various tasks (?). In particular, ANNs are based on the multilayer perceptron model ? which  
19 are defined as feedforward artificial neural networks, consisting of at least three layers of neurons.  
20 Learning occurs in the perceptron by changing connection weights after each batch of data is  
21 processed, based on the amount of error in the output compared to the expected result. This is an  
22 example of supervised learning, and is carried out through backpropagation ?, a generalization of the  
23 least mean squares algorithm in the linear perceptron. Essentially, the backpropagation algorithm  
24 uses Gradient Descent (GD) with a clever application of the chain rule with caching ?. The multilayer  
25 perceptron model coupled with the backpropagation algorithm gives rise to the current deep learning  
26 paradigm ?.

27 There are several limitations of training neural networks with backpropagation and GD. Firstly,  
28 it can be slow to converge to the local minima of the function ?. This is because the first-order  
29 approximation of a function becomes more inaccurate as we move away from the initial values of  
30 the parameters. Second-order optimization approaches ? do a better job at representing the error  
31 function surface, but requires the calculation of the Hessian matrix in each iteration. This is so  
32 computationally expensive that practitioners of the field resort to Quasi-Newton methods ? that better  
33 the first-order approach by approximating the Hessian matrix. Second, GD can be susceptible to  
34 undesirable stationary points, such as saddle points ?. These saddle points are analogous to plateaus  
35 on the error surface and do not provide any information about the curvature of the error function, thus  
36 inhibiting GD from finding a local minima. Lastly, GD methods are ill-defined for non-differentiable

37 functions. While the practitioner has control over the architecture, and thus can design differentiable  
38 architectures, it is often the case that outputs are discrete and do not admit useful derivatives.

39 To make matters worse, the training of neural networks requires strenuous amounts of user interven-  
40 tion. GD based approaches employ several hyperparameters such as learning rate, batch size, epochs,  
41 momentum rate, etc. The values of these hyperparameters are crucial for a successful training of the  
42 network ?. Unfortunately, there is comparatively little work that tackles the theoretical aspects of  
43 choosing the values for these hyperparameters. Moreover, optimal values for these hyperparameters  
44 vary widely from one dataset to another. This requires the user to perform a hyperparameter tuning  
45 such as Grid Search ?. Grid Search trains a model multiple times over a set of hyperparameters and  
46 compares the performance to choose an optimal value. This will prove very expensive on machines  
47 with low compute power, such as embedded systems.

48 Relaxation methods ? are iterative methods for solving systems of equations, including nonlinear  
49 systems. These methods use concepts from linear algebra to search for parameters that reduce an  
50 error function, such as the mean squared error. Related to neural networks are a class of algorithms  
51 called Extreme Learning Machines (ELMs) ?. ELMs are interesting algorithms that use randomly  
52 extracted features to make a prediction. ELM, and it's variants ?, are feedforward networks that are  
53 trained without a backpropagation step. The parameters of the hidden layers are never tuned. They  
54 serve the purpose of randomly projecting the input into a higher dimensional representation with  
55 nonlinear transformation. Although the goals of the ELM ? line of research align with the goals of  
56 the presented approach, ELMs do not perform as well as the GD based backpropagation algorithm  
57 on real world datasets. ZORB bridges the best of both worlds, the rapid training of ELMs and the  
58 performance with backpropagation.

59 The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 2 introduces background material on optimization  
60 and the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse. Section 3 discusses relevant work on optimization, back-  
61 propagation and current alternatives. Section 4 introduces ZORB, a derivative-free backpropagation  
62 algorithm for neural networks. In Section 5, details of the experiments across several datasets are  
63 described. This section also displays the results from experiments that verify the working of ZORB.  
64 Lastly, Section 6 discusses future research directions for this work and summarizes the contributions  
65 of this paper.

## 66 2 Preliminaries

### 67 2.1 Gradient Descent

68 Gradient Descent ? is an iterative optimization algorithm to find a local minima of an error function  
69 surface. It is based on the intuition that if the multivariable cost function  $c(w_0)$  is defined and  
70 differentiable in a neighborhood of a point  $w_0$ , then  $c(w)$  decreases fastest if one goes from  $w_0$  in  
71 the direction of the negative gradient of  $c$  at  $w_0$ , that is,  $-\nabla c(w_0)$ . It involves approximating the  
72 function using the Taylor series, given by:

$$c(w) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{c^{(n)}(w_0)}{n!} (w - w_0)^n \quad (1)$$

73 where  $c^{(n)}(w_0)$  is the  $n^{th}$  derivative of the function  $c(w)$  evaluated at point  $w_0$ . Newton's method  
74 uses a second-order approximation of this Taylor series by using only the first three terms. A  
75 stationary point of the approximated error function can be found by setting the derivative of the  
76 function to zero and solving for the required parameters.

$$c'(w) \approx c'(w_0) + (w - w_0)c''(w_0) = 0 \quad (2)$$

77 Upon solving for the parameter  $w$ , we arrive at the following expression.

$$w = w_0 - \frac{c'(w_0)}{c''(w_0)} \quad (3)$$

78 Since this parameter update is based off an approximation of the error function, it is iteratively  
79 updated based on the current parameter values. This requires the recomputation of both the first  
80 derivative and the second derivative of the function. Compared to computing the first derivative,  
81 computing the second derivative is quite expensive. Instead, one approximates the second-order  
82 derivative using a constant value called step size or learning rate ?. The first-order GD update rule is  
83 given by substituting a learning rate in place of second derivative information  $\mu \approx c''(w_0)$ .

## 84 2.2 Moore-Penrose Pseudoinverse

85 The pseudoinverse  $A^+$  of a matrix  $A$  is a generalization of the inverse matrix. The most widely known  
86 type of matrix pseudoinverse is the Moore-Penrose Inverse  $\dagger$ . A common use of the pseudoinverse  
87 operation is to find the minimum (Euclidean) norm solution to a system of linear equations with  
88 multiple solutions  $\dagger$ . To leverage parallelization, it is usually computed using the singular value  
89 decomposition. The pseudoinverse operation allows us to find a set of values for variables involved in  
90 a equation. These values correspond to a local minima while reducing the mean squared error loss.  
91 Motivated readers may refer to the supplementary material for the derivation of the Moore-Penrose  
92 pseudoinverse and proofs regarding the quality of the solution obtained.

## 93 3 Previous Work

### 94 3.1 Backpropagation using Gradient Descent

95 Backpropagation is the most commonly used learning algorithm to optimize the weights of a neural  
96 network with respect to an error function. The main idea involves calculating the error contribution of  
97 each neuron after a batch of data is processed. It utilizes the Reverse-Mode Automatic Differentiation  
98  $\dagger$ , an efficient algorithm to find the derivatives of a function composed of differentiable steps.

99 Once the gradient of each neuron in the network is calculated, the weights are updated using the GD  
100 update rule as shown in equation 3. There are several variants of the GD that has been applied in  
101 the context of neural networks. Batch Gradient Descent (BGD) involves updating the weights of  
102 the network after accumulating the gradients calculated for every sample in the dataset. Although  
103 this procedure is guaranteed to reach the local minima of a smooth convex error function, it has  
104 slower convergence rate since the gradients have to be computed for each sample in the dataset  
105 before updating the network. Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) uses a single sample to approximate  
106 the gradient. This results in faster convergence, but is certainly not the best approach to solving  
107 the problem. Since SGD approximates the gradient using a single example, a noisier gradient is  
108 calculated, which can bump the weights out of a local minima. Mini-batch Gradient Descent  $\dagger$   
109 combines both the ideas by using a subset of the dataset to calculate the gradient.

110 Several modifications have been made to the GD update rule. Momentum  $\dagger$  accelerates GD to move  
111 out of a local minima for the search of a better local minima. This often leads to convergence to  
112 a saddle point. Nesterov  $\dagger$  gives momentum a prior knowledge about the curvature of the error  
113 function. This prevents momentum from moving the optimizer too quickly, moving the weights out  
114 of a local minima. Adagrad  $\dagger$  adjusts the learning rate to the parameters. Parameters that did not  
115 change too often had a higher step size than those parameters that changed frequently. This led to  
116 increased robustness compared to SGD. RMSProp  $\dagger$  and Adadelta  $\dagger$  was developed to overcome  
117 Adagrad's radically diminishing learning rates. Adam  $\dagger$  is another method that computes the step  
118 size for each parameter. In addition to storing an exponentially decaying average of past squared  
119 gradients like AdaDelta and RMSProp, Adam also keeps an exponentially decaying average of past  
120 gradients, like momentum. It can be viewed as RMSProp with Momentum. Adam also removes the  
121 bias towards zero values present in the average squared gradients and average gradients. AMSGrad  
122  $\dagger$  fixes convergence issues with Adam by incorporating a "long-term memory" of past gradients.  
123 Currently, the Adam update rule produces the fastest convergence rates compared to other update  
124 rules described in this subsection.

125 Despite several modifications, backpropagation with GD still suffers from problems. Apart from  
126 the issues discussed in Section 1, there is another major issue. In deep neural networks with many  
127 layers, the backpropagated derivatives shrink multiplicatively at each layer. This phenomenon is  
128 known as Vanishing Gradients  $\dagger$ . As the errors are backpropagated, they start to shrink, which  
129 results in insignificant training of the initial layers. This results in ineffective training, and a waste of  
130 computational resources. Initial layers are often crucial to recognizing the core elements of the input  
131 data, it can lead to overall inaccuracy of the whole network.

132 In this paper, we will compare the performance of ZORB to the Backpropagation algorithm with the  
133 Adam update rule. ZORB differs from the traditional backpropagation algorithm in several aspects.  
134 A single iteration of the ZORB algorithm is sufficient to train the network. ZORB updates each layer  
135 only once, where as, the backpropagation algorithm updates every layer after processing a batch of  
136 samples, leading to several update operations. ZORB does not require a learning rate hyperparameter,

137 whereas the hyperparameter tuning of learning is crucial to the quality of solution obtained in the  
 138 traditional backpropagation algorithm. ZORB does not experience the vanishing gradients problem  
 139 since layers closer to the input are trained first, so that better representations of the input can be  
 140 generated for the latter layers. The traditional backpropagation algorithm requires activation functions  
 141 to be differentiable, although work-arounds have been developed. In constrast, ZORB does away  
 142 with this requirement. The inverse of the activation function is used instead.

### 143 3.2 Extreme Learning Machines

144 Extreme Learning Machines (ELMs) have been proposed to provide fast solutions to feed-forward  
 145 networks ?, also see similar ideas in ???. ELMs are Single Layered Feed-forward Networks (SLFN)  
 146 that randomly extract features from the input vector, perform a non-linear projection of these features  
 147 to a higher dimensional and fit the data to the required output using the pseudoinverse operation. The  
 148 input weights are set to random values and the output weights  $\beta$  are calculated using the following  
 149 equation:

$$\beta = (H^T H)^{-1} H^T Y \quad (4)$$

150 where  $H$  is the activated output from the hidden layer and  $Y$  is the required output matrix. ELMs  
 151 share similar goals to ZORB: maintain accuracy, decrease user intervention and increase learning  
 152 speeds.

153 There are several variants of the SLFN ELM, but our study pertains to the Multi-layered setting.  
 154 However, a notable extension includes the ELM - AutoEncoder (ELM-AE) ? which randomly projects  
 155 the input data to a non-linear space, and searches for a function that maps back to the original data.  
 156 The output weights of the ELM-AE are calculated using the following equation:

$$\beta = \left( \frac{1}{\lambda} + H^T H \right)^{-1} H^T X \quad (5)$$

157 where  $X$  is the input matrix, and  $\lambda$  is a parameter for the  $l_2$  regularization term.

158 The ELM-AE forms the building block for the Multi-layer ELM (ML-ELM) ?, which comprises  
 159 of several hidden layers. Each hidden layer behaves like an ELM-AE, which converts the input  
 160 vector into several representations before it can be processed by the output layer, whose weights are  
 161 calculated like an ELM, as described in equation 4.

162 Although ELMs are a relatively new line of study, they are not competitive to traditional neural  
 163 networks trained using the backpropagation algorithm. Due to the assumptions required to train  
 164 ELMs, they do not provide the accuracy of backpropagation. Randomly choosing features from  
 165 inputs may help reduce the training time, but does not provide the output layer with vital information  
 166 that may have been ignored during the randomization of weights in the hidden layer.

### 167 3.3 Target Propagation

168 Target Propagation ? is another line of research that aims at training feed-forward neural networks.  
 169 The target propagation approach is very similar to ours: find appropriate targets for each layer such  
 170 that the global loss will reduce. After the targets for each layer have been calculated, each layer is  
 171 trained separately and in parallel.

172 Although there are similarities, ZORB varies from Target Propagation in several aspects. Both ZORB  
 173 and target propagation algorithms require an inverse activation operation. In ZORB, the true inverse  
 174 of an activation function is used, while allowing the activation layer to perform linear corrections by  
 175 performing shift and scale operations to match the range of the function. In Target Propagation, a  
 176 decoder network is used to perform the inverse mapping. This causes an increase in the number of  
 177 training parameters. ZORB relies on the pseudoinverse to find solution for equations whereas Target  
 178 Propagation uses GD.

179 The performance achieved by target propagation algorithms are comparable to backpropagation. An  
 180 important pitfall of target propagation is that it is significantly slower than backpropagation. This is  
 181 because of the extra gradient steps required to find the target for each layer and to train the decoder  
 182 used for the inverse map. Moreover, due to separate training of each layer, several hyperparameters  
 183 are induced which effectively slows down the training process.

184 For the sake of brevity, we do not compare target propagation algorithms to ZORB. The aim of this  
 185 paper is to present ZORB as a faster alternative to backpropagation using Adam, while achieving  
 186 comparable errors and accuracies. Target Propagation is much slower than backpropagation and  
 187 therefore we omit it from our experiments.

## 188 4 Zeroth-Order Relaxed Backpropagation (ZORB)

189 In this section, we will present the Zeroth-Order Relaxed Backpropagation (ZORB) Algorithm for  
 190 neural networks. ZORB is a derivative-free backpropagation algorithm for neural networks. The  
 191 “Zeroth-Order” phrase arises from the fact that ZORB does not use the derivatives or gradients of the  
 192 error function. The “Relaxed” term emerges because ZORB uses concepts from linear algebra to  
 193 optimize the weights of a neural network.

---

### Algorithm 1 ZORB Algorithm for Neural Networks

---

**Input:** Input  $X \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times d_{in}}$ , Output  $Y \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times d_{out}}$ , Network  $N$   
**for**  $i \leftarrow 0$  to  $N.n\_layers - 1$  **do**  
  **if**  $N.layers[i]$  is ‘neurons’ **then**  
     $X \leftarrow$  Concatenate  $\mathbb{1} \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times 1}$  to  $X$   
     $F \leftarrow Y$   
  **for**  $j \leftarrow N.n\_layers - 1$  to  $i + 1$  **do**  
    **if**  $N.layers[j]$  is ‘neurons’ **then**  
       $F \leftarrow (F - N.layers[j].B) \times N.layers[j].W^+$   
    **else if**  $N.layers[j]$  is ‘activation’ **then**  
       $F \leftarrow N.layers[j].deactivate(F)$   
    **end if**  
  **end for**  
   $\begin{bmatrix} N.layers[i].W \\ N.layers[i].B \end{bmatrix} \leftarrow X^+ \times F$   
   $X \leftarrow X \times \begin{bmatrix} N.layers[i].W \\ N.layers[i].B \end{bmatrix}$   
  **else if**  $N.layers[i]$  is ‘activation’ **then**  
     $X \leftarrow N.layers[i].activate(X)$   
  **end if**  
**end for**

---

### 194 4.1 Motivation

195 The motivation behind ZORB is four fold. The first motivation is to reduce the training time of neural  
 196 networks. The traditional backpropagation algorithm performs several updates to the weights of the  
 197 network, where each update moves the weights such that the error moves towards a local minima.  
 198 While backpropagation with GD updates to all layers in each iteration, ZORB only trains each layer  
 199 once. Once a layer is trained, it remains constant throughout the remainder of the process. The second  
 200 motivation arises from the extensive hyperparameter tuning required for modern neural networks.  
 201 For example, if the learning rate is too high, the optimization process will bound the weights around  
 202 the local minima, inhibiting convergence. Moreover, there is almost no theoretical basis for choosing  
 203 optimization hyperparameters for neural networks. The optimal values for each hyperparameter vary  
 204 widely from one dataset to another. In contrast, ZORB does not employ any hyperparameters. The  
 205 third motivation lies with the vanishing gradients problems. When the traditional backpropagation  
 206 algorithm is applied to deep neural networks, the error gradients shrink while it propagates to the  
 207 initial layers. This causes little or no updates in the initial layers which are vital for extracting features  
 208 from the input. This inhibits the overall performance of the network. ZORB ensures the error is  
 209 backpropagated to the input layer, thus allowing all layers to be trained. The fourth motivation is to  
 210 bridge the training speed of ELMs with the accuracy of backpropagation. While ELMs are not able  
 211 to achieve the same accuracy as backpropagation, their training is efficient and can be done quickly.

## 212 4.2 Training the network

213 Let us first tackle the problem of training a network that does not involve any activation functions.  
214 We also add a column of 1's to the input to each layer to allow incorporating bias in each neuron  
215 while taking advantage of vectorized matrix operations.  $X \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times d_{in}}$  represents the matrix of the  
216 inputs, with  $n$  being the number of samples, and  $d_{in}$  is the dimension of the input vector in a sample.  
217  $Y \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times d_{out}}$  represents the matrix of the outputs, where  $d_{out}$  is the dimension of the output vector  
218 in a sample. The weights of each hidden layer  $l$  is represented by  $W_l \in \mathcal{R}^{d_{l-1} \times d_l}$  where  $d_{l-1}$  is the  
219 input dimension of a sample to that layer and  $d_l$  is the number of neurons in that layer.

220 The basic idea behind ZORB is to receive a better representation of the input from a layer  $l - 1$  before  
221 training layer  $l$ . The ZORB forward pass is similar to backpropagation with GD. However during the  
222 single forward pass, ZORB uses multiple backward passes, one for each layer. The goal of ZORB  
223 is to match the predicted vectors with the target vectors. This would implicitly reduce the sum of  
224 squared errors. Instead of training the output layer, the output layer backpropagates information, as  
225 feedback, to the last hidden layer. This feedback is the expected matrix input that would allow the  
226 output layer to give correct predictions. This feedback  $F$  to the last hidden layer can be given by the  
227 following equation,

$$F_{L-1} = (Y - B_L) \times W_L^+ \quad (6)$$

228 where  $F_{L-1}$  is the feedback from the output layer  $l = L$  to the last hidden layer  $L - 1$ ,  $B_L$  is the biases  
229 of the output layer,  $W_L$  is the weights of the output layer and  $(\cdot)^+$  represents the Moore-Penrose  
230 pseudoinverse of a matrix.  $F_{L-1}$  behaves as the target vectors for the last hidden layer. The last  
231 hidden layer  $L - 1$  gives a feedback to the penultimate hidden layer  $L - 2$  in an approach similar to  
232 equation 6.  $Y$  is replaced with  $F_{L-1}$ ,  $B_L$  is replaced with  $B_{L-1}$  and  $W_L$  is replaced with  $W_{L-1}$ .

233 This process continues until the first hidden layer is reached. Since the first hidden layer receives  
234 input from the dataset, it cannot give feedback to the input layer. Instead, the weights of first hidden  
235 layer are updated. The update rule is given by the following equation.

$$\begin{bmatrix} W_1 \\ B_1 \end{bmatrix} = X^+ \times F_1 \quad (7)$$

236 where  $W_1$  is the weight matrix for the first hidden layer,  $B_1$  are the biases for the first hidden layer,  
237 and  $F_1$  is the feedback received by the first hidden layer from the second hidden layer. Once the  
238 weights of the layer are calculated, the input  $X$  is forward propagated through the first hidden layer.  
239 The output from the first hidden layer now acts as the input the rest of the network. The whole process  
240 repeats until all layers are trained.

## 241 4.3 Introducing non-linearity

242 Activation functions allow for the non-linear projection of vectors. ZORB does not require any  
243 derivatives and can use any (invertible) activation function. The forward propagation through an  
244 activation function is the same as the traditional backpropagation step. While backpropagating the  
245 feedback from the output layer to the input layer, the feedback must be deactivated, i.e. the inverse of  
246 the activation function must be applied. However, the range and domain of most activation functions  
247 are not the same. Therefore, activation functions are modified in this paper to store and apply linear  
248 scaling/shifting operations. This involves storing the minimum and/or maximum value in the feedback  
249 matrix, shifting or scaling the feedback matrix to match the range of the activation function, and  
250 deactivating the feedback. This new matrix becomes the feedback that is backpropagated through the  
251 rest of the network. On continuing the forward propagation step, the activation functions perform  
252 the reverse shifting and scaling operations and the new activated matrix is forward propagated to the  
253 output layer. For the next backpropagation step, the stored minimum and/or maximum values, from  
254 new feedback matrices, are updated again. Additional information about the activation functions and  
255 their linear correction operations can be found in the supplementary material.

## 256 5 Experiments and Results

### 257 5.1 Experimental Setup

258 To verify the working of ZORB and to compare its performance against other training algorithms,  
259 several standard datasets were chosen. The dataset statistics have been presented in table 1 of

260 the supplementary material. ZORB was implemented using NumPy ?. The implementation of  
 261 ML-ELM, adopted from ?, uses NumPy for consistency in optimization across algorithms. The  
 262 backpropagation algorithm with the Adam update rule was implemented using NumPy and Autograd  
 263 ?, a package that performs automatic differentiation and optimization using NumPy. Each experiment  
 264 was run 10 times, with weights randomly initialized using Glorot Uniform ?. During a run, the  
 265 initialization for each architecture of neural networks was kept constant across all algorithms. The  
 266 experiments were performed on a system with a 12-core Intel i7-6850K (@ 3.60GHz) processor  
 267 with a RAM size of 64GB. For experiments involving the Adam optimizer, the learning rate ( $\mu \in$   
 268  $\{0.01, 0.005, 0.001, 0.0005, 0.0001\}$ ) hyperparameter was tuned for the lowest error. A batch size of  
 269 32 was maintained across all experiments. To save time and computational resources, the maximum  
 270 number of iterations of the backpropagation algorithm was set to 5000. To keep the optimization  
 271 objective consistent among all algorithms, the sum of squared error was chosen. The time displayed  
 272 in tables for the Adam optimizer is minimum between the time taken to reach ZORB’s error rate and  
 273 time taken for 5000 iterations.

274 Codes and detailed experimental results are provided in the supplementary material.

## 275 5.2 Regression

276 To test the performance of ZORB against ML-ELMs and Adam on regression tasks, two standard  
 277 datasets were used: Boston Housing dataset ? and Sinc function ?. Table 1 displays the performance  
 278 of the algorithms.

### 279 5.2.1 Boston Housing (Linear Regression)

280 A simple ANN was designed, comprising of 1 hidden layer with 32 neurons. The neurons were  
 281 activated using the sigmoid function ?. A single non-activated (linear) neuron was used for prediction.  
 282 From table 1, it can be observed that ZORB achieves the lowest error rate on the training set, and  
 283 performed comparably to ML-ELM on the test set. Adam did not perform well on this dataset. ZORB  
 284 trained the network significantly faster than Adam.

### 285 5.2.2 Sinc Function (Non-Linear Regression)

286 The Sinc function is a good method to test the generalization of models to non-linear data. It is also  
 287 an effective experiment to evaluate the extrapolation ability of a model. The Sinc function is given  
 288 by:

$$Sinc(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sin(x)}{x} & \text{if } x \neq 0 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

289

Dataset	Metric		Adam	MLELM	ZORB
Boston Housing	Train Error	$\mu$	4.182	3.109	<b>2.597</b>
		$\sigma$	0.135	0.102	<b>0.048</b>
	Test Error	$\mu$	4.405	<b>3.543</b>	3.567
		$\sigma$	<b>0.056</b>	0.108	0.070
	Time	$\mu$	15.07	0.028	<b>0.025</b>
		$\sigma$	0.133	0.003	<b>0.002</b>
Sinc	Train Error	$\mu$	0.043	<b>0.002</b>	0.015
		$\sigma$	0.003	<b>0.002</b>	0.006
	Test Error	$\mu$	<b>0.104</b>	$5.2 \times 10^4$	0.130
		$\sigma$	<b>0.015</b>	$1.5 \times 10^4$	0.05
	Time	$\mu$	122.4	<b>0.378</b>	0.414
		$\sigma$	2.862	0.038	<b>0.004</b>

Table 1: Performance of ZORB against Adam and ML-ELM on regression tasks. Lower mean  $\mu$  and standard deviation  $\sigma$  values are preferred. It can be observed that ZORB achieves comparable accuracies and error rates. ZORB is significantly faster than Adam.

Dataset	Split	Metric	Adam	MLELM	ZORB
Iris	Train	Error	$0.075 \pm 0.005$	$0.586 \pm 0.012$	$0.048 \pm 0.010$
		Accuracy	$97.90 \pm 0.83$	$95.71 \pm 1.49$	$96.95 \pm 1.26$
	Test	Error	$0.079 \pm 0.013$	$0.586 \pm 0.014$	$0.041 \pm 0.021$
		Accuracy	$97.56 \pm 1.20$	$96.00 \pm 3.27$	$98.22 \pm 1.66$
		Time	$4.087 \pm 0.069$	$0.004 \pm 0.001$	$0.005 \pm 0.001$
XOR	Train	Error	$0.035 \pm 0.015$	$0.438 \pm 0.017$	$0.039 \pm 0.007$
		Accuracy	$97.73 \pm 1.10$	$59.97 \pm 3.00$	$96.86 \pm 0.81$
	Test	Error	$0.052 \pm 0.015$	$0.451 \pm 0.016$	$0.049 \pm 0.009$
		Accuracy	$97.48 \pm 1.32$	$54.75 \pm 2.89$	$95.94 \pm 1.02$
		Time	$17.425 \pm 3.339$	$0.048 \pm 0.003$	$0.068 \pm 0.006$
Two Spirals	Train	Error	$0.023 \pm 0.064$	$0.495 \pm 0.003$	$0.153 \pm 0.043$
		Accuracy	$96.18 \pm 5.19$	$50.00 \pm 0.00$	$84.89 \pm 3.91$
	Test	Error	$0.104 \pm 0.067$	$0.496 \pm 0.003$	$0.168 \pm 0.035$
		Accuracy	$92.58 \pm 6.17$	$50.00 \pm 0.00$	$83.50 \pm 3.94$
		Time	$7.459 \pm 3.789$	$0.032 \pm 0.002$	$0.039 \pm 0.004$

Table 2: Performance of the algorithms on classification tasks. ML-ELMs do not perform well on non-linear classification tasks. ZORB performs comparably to Adam but trains the networks significantly faster.

290 A training set  $(X_i, Y_i)$  and testing set  $(X_j, Y_j)$  with 2,001 samples and 6,001 samples were generated.  
291  $X_i$  in the training data was distributed in  $[-10, +10]$  with uniform step length of 0.01 whereas  $X_j$   
292 in the testing data was distributed in  $[-30, +30]$  with uniform step length of 0.01. To assess the  
293 quality of the learned model and its extrapolation ability, the range  $[-30, +30]$  of testing data is longer  
294 than that of the training data. We trained a deep neural network with 2 hidden layers each with 200  
295 neurons and sigmoid activations. Figure 1-top shows the performance of the algorithms on the test  
296 set. ML-ELMs were unable to generalize to the unseen input values. Although the network trained  
297 using Adam obtained the lowest error on the test data, it does not model the crests and troughs of the  
298 function beyond the range  $[-10, +10]$ . Instead, it simply maps values  $[-30, -10] \cup [+10, +30]$  to a  
299 constant value. On the other hand, ZORB trained the network to recognize the non-linearity outside  
300 the range  $[-10, +10]$ . We can see that ZORB is able to better generalize the Sinc function than Adam  
301 and ML-ELMs. Following the previous case, ZORB is significantly faster than Adam.




Figure 1: Visualization of the performance of Adam vs ZORB on the Sinc function, XOR dataset and TwoSpirals problem. We omit visualizations from ML-ELM experiments due to its poor performance. Left: Adam. Right: ZORB. Top: Sinc. Center: XOR. Bottom: Two Spirals. Both Adam and ZORB train networks to perform similarly.

302 **5.3 Classification**

303 To demonstrate the performance of ZORB on classification tasks, three standard datasets were chosen:  
304 Iris ?, XOR ?, and Two Spirals ?. Table 2 compares the performance of ZORB against Adam and  
305 ML-ELM on the classification tasks.

306 **5.3.1 Iris (Linear Classification)**

307 For this simple dataset, an ANN comprising of 8 sigmoid activated neurons in the hidden layer was  
308 employed. The output layer consisted of 3 neurons, activated by the softmax function ?. From table  
309 2, it can be observed that the ANN trained using ZORB achieves the lowest train and test error.  
310 The ZORB network also attains the highest accuracy on the test set. We again see that ZORB is  
311 significantly faster than Adam.

312 **5.3.2 XOR (Non-Linear Classification)**

313 To demonstrate ZORB’s ability to train a network to distinguish classes that are linearly unseparable  
314 ?, we trained a deep neural network with 2 hidden layers on the XOR dataset. The first hidden layer  
315 had 16 neurons that were activated by the Tanh function ?. The second hidden layer had 8 neurons,  
316 activated by the ReLU function ?. Figure 1-center demonstrates the performance of the algorithms  
317 on the XOR dataset. ML-ELMs were not able to separate the two classes accurately. The networks  
318 trained with ZORB and Adam performed comparably, almost perfectly separating the data points  
319 of the two classes. While the accuracies obtained by the Adam network is slightly higher than the  
320 ZORB network, the training time required by ZORB is considerably lower than the time consumed  
321 by the Adam optimizer.

322 **5.3.3 Two Spirals (Non-Linear Classification)**

323 To further demonstrate the performance of ZORB, the famous ‘Telling two spirals apart’ ? task was  
324 chosen. This is a useful benchmark test to observe the performance of neural networks. Although this  
325 task is easy to visualize, it is fundamentally difficult for neural network to learn due to its extreme  
326 non-linearity. For this task, we trained a deep neural network with 4 hidden layers. The architecture  
327 of the network was T(32)-R(16)-T(8)-R(4)-S(1); where ‘T’ is Tanh, ‘R’ is ReLU and ‘S’ is sigmoid.  
328 We can observe that network trained using the ML-ELM algorithm was unable to distinguish between  
329 the two spirals. Figure 1-bottom shows that the Adam network could almost perfectly distinguish  
330 between the two spirals. Although the performance of the ZORB network was slightly lower than the  
331 Adam network, ZORB trained the network much faster than Adam.




Figure 2: The Error vs Time plot comparing the three algorithms on a 11-layered deep neural network. ML-ELM lose vital information from the input by random extracting features. Hence, the low accuracy. ZORB is 300 times faster than Adam, achieves comparable accuracies, without any hyperparameter tuning.

Layers	Metric	Adam	MLELM	ZORB
6	Tr. Err.	0.090	0.884	<b>0.079</b>
	Tr. Acc.	<b>95.29</b>	82.26	94.43
	Te. Err.	<b>0.095</b>	0.883	0.105
	Te. Acc.	<b>94.83</b>	82.27	92.52
	Time	$5.8 \times 10^4$	178.815	<b>135.125</b>
8	Tr. Err.	0.097	0.899	<b>0.079</b>
	Tr. Acc.	<b>95.19</b>	73.55	94.47
	Te. Err.	<b>0.098</b>	0.898	0.113
	Te. Acc.	<b>94.96</b>	74.21	91.93
	Time	$7.9 \times 10^4$	288.693	<b>207.276</b>
11	Tr. Err.	0.117	0.925	<b>0.074</b>
	Tr. Acc.	93.90	52.37	<b>94.79</b>
	Te. Err.	0.120	0.925	<b>0.111</b>
	Te. Acc.	<b>93.61</b>	53.11	92.15
	Time	$1.1 \times 10^5$	543.330	<b>376.133</b>

Table 3: Performance of the three algorithms on three deep neural networks with varying number of layers. ‘Tr’ = Train, ‘Te’ = Test, ‘Err’ = Error, ‘Acc’ = Accuracy. ML-ELMs do not perform as well ZORB and Adam. ZORB attains the lowest training error on all networks. The accuracies attained by the ZORB and Adam networks are comparable. ZORB is magnitudes faster than Adam.

## 332 5.4 On the MNIST dataset

333 To effectively evaluate the speed up achieved by ZORB, we trained 3 deep neural networks of  
334 varying depths, on the relatively large MNIST dataset. The 3 neural networks had 6, 8, and 11 layers  
335 respectively. To alleviate the problem of vanishing gradients for the networks trained on Adam,  
336 the hidden layers were activated using the Tanh function ?. Further details of the architectures are  
337 available in the supplementary material. Table 3 presents the results from the experiments. As the  
338 number of layers increases, ML-ELMs are not able to efficiently extract vital information from the  
339 input. This causes a steady drop in accuracy. On comparing the performance of the Adam and ZORB  
340 networks, we notice that the ZORB networks achieves a lower error on the train set. ZORB networks  
341 perform comparably to Adam networks in terms of error and accuracy. On observing the time taken  
342 to train the networks, we can see that ZORB significantly outperforms Adam. ZORB trained the  
343 11-layered neural network 300 times faster than Adam on the large MNIST dataset, without any  
344 hyperparameter tuning.

## 345 6 Future Work and Conclusion

346 We now consider a non-exhaustive list of future directions to improve and extend ZORB. First,  
347 ZORB does not rely on gradients and hence can be extended to novel activation functions and  
348 attention mechanisms ?. Next, a regularized pseudoinverse procedure proposed by Barata et al. ?  
349 may be adopted to provide a self-regularized solution for the weights of a network. In particular,  
350 this would enable ZORB in the online learning regime. Principles from Griville’s Theorem ? and  
351 the Bordering Algorithm ? may be used to recalculate the SVD and therefore, the pseudoinverse of  
352 matrices. This would provide a new direction for warm starting techniques ?, which is known to be  
353 a difficult task. We also leave the extension of ZORB to Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs)  
354 ? and Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) ? as future work. In particular, RNNs trained using the  
355 traditional backpropagation algorithm face the problem of vanishing gradients ?. Applying ZORB to  
356 RNNs should circumvent this issue and may open new lines of RNN research.

357 This paper introduced a novel training algorithm for neural networks called Zeroth-Order Relaxed  
358 Backpropagation (ZORB). ZORB is a derivative-free backpropagation algorithm used to train the  
359 weights of a neural network. ZORB combines the rapid training of ELMs with the accuracy of  
360 backpropagation. Experiments have been conducted on several datasets, and results from these  
361 experiments verify the working of the proposed backpropagation algorithm. We have seen that ZORB  
362 can train a deep neural network approximately 300 times faster than Adam while achieving a lower  
363 training error, without any hyperparameter tuning.