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## MOTIVATION <br> Can neural networks learn Fibonacci sequence?

A question anybody can ask but nobody had answered
Quick test results: CNNs find it easy, but RNNs find it hard
The study is about why this observation happens
Basic idea: view CNNs as combinatorial logic and RNNs as sequential state automata

## TWO TYPES OF THE PROBLEMS

## Number-level (CNN)



## COMPUTATIONAL POWERS


$\rightarrow$ Digit-level Fibonacci prediction

$\rightarrow$ Number-level Fibonacci prediction
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## NUMBER-LEVEL DATA LAYOUT

2-dimensional grid of digits


## NUMBER-LEVEL SEQUENCES

Order-k linear homogeneous recurrence

- Order-2 relations: $A_{n+2}=p A_{n+1}+q A_{n}$
- Fibonacci: $(p, q)=(1,1) /$ Arithmetic: $(p, q)=(2,-1)$
- Order-3 relations: $A_{n+3}=p A_{n+2}+q A_{n+1}+r A_{n}$
- Progression: $(p, q, r)=(3,-3,1) / J u m p i n g ~ F i b o n a c c i: ~(p, q, r)=(1,0,1)$
- Number-level prediction is learning a combinatorial function of $\left(A_{n-k}, \ldots A_{n}\right) \rightarrow A_{n+1}$


## DIFFICULTY AND COMPLEXITY

## The number of logical gates and the depth of the circuit



Order-2 relation
Width $=\theta\left(b^{2}\right)$
Depth $=1$


Order-3 relation

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Width }=\theta\left(b^{3}\right) \\
\text { Depth }=1
\end{gathered}
$$



Order-3 relation Width $=\theta\left(b^{2}\right)$

$$
\text { Depth }=2
$$
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## DIGIT-LEVEL DATA LAYOUT

## Sequence of digits

$$
\begin{array}{llllllll}
a_{1} & a_{2} & a_{3} & a_{4} & a_{5} & a_{6} & a_{7} & a_{8} \\
& \square & \square & \square & 2 & 1 & \square & 1
\end{array} \square \square \square \square \square \text { Single-digit data per a time step }
$$

- Little-endian order (smaller digits first)
- Input: $n$ digits $a_{1 \ldots n}$ followed by $s$ blanks


$$
\begin{array}{llll}
a_{9} & a_{10} & a_{11} & a_{12}
\end{array}
$$

- Target: $n$ blanks followed by $a_{n \ldots n+s}$


## DIGIT-LEVEL SEQUENCES <br> Their complexities correspond to sequential state machines

- Counting sequences: Finite automata
- $A_{n+1}=A_{n}+c($ fixed $c)$
- Palindromes: Pushdown automata
- Finite length palindromes are solvable by finite automata
- Training with length 1~12 / Validation with length 16
- Fibonacci/Arithmetic/Geometric: Queue automata
- Cannot be solved by stack calculator in this setup
- Queue automata are equivalent to Turing machines
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## NUMBER-LEVEL CNN MODEL



- Residual CNNs with dilated convolutions
- 12 (1 block) / 21 (2 blocks) / 30 (3 blocks) layer configurations
- 64 / 128 / 192 internal channels
- Input and output have same dimensions


## NUMBER-LEVEL RESULTS

## Deep / Shallow \& Wide / Deeper \& narrow

$$
A_{n}=2 A_{n-1}-A_{n-2}+A_{n-3}
$$


$(p, q) \in\{(1,1),(2,-1),(3,-2),(1,2)\}$

$A_{n}=4 A_{n-1}-6 A_{n-2}+4 A_{n-3}-A_{n-4}$


Depth of a problem is a better indicator for the complexity
CNNs tend to learn deep but narrow rules
Could not solve 3+ deep problems

## DIGIT-LEVEL MODELS



Recurrent Module: LSTM, GRU, Stack-RNN, or Neural Turing Machine
Encoder-decoder model with Attention

## DIGIT-LEVEL RESULTS

| Tasks | Reverse-order (training) | Geometric | Arithmetic | Fibonacci |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LSTM | $28.4 \%(1.2 \%)$ | $79.4 \%$ | $77.1 \%$ | $80.5 \%$ |
| GRU | $51.9 \%(0.9 \%)$ | $69.0 \%$ | $77.1 \%$ | $79.3 \%$ |
| Attention(unidirectional) | $42.0 \%(8.8 \%)$ | $62.8 \%$ | $77.0 \%$ | $69.3 \%$ |
| Attention(bidirectional) | $0.0 \%(0.0 \%)$ | $51.0 \%$ | $72.9 \%$ | $60.9 \%$ |
| Stack-RNN | $\mathbf{0 . 0 \%}(0.0 \%)$ | $64.1 \%$ | $63.8 \%$ | $69.4 \%$ |
| NTM | $\mathbf{0 . 0 \%}(0.0 \%)$ | $57.1 \%$ | $65.7 \%$ | $68.1 \%$ |

Palindrome training errors suggest that all of them can simulate finite automata
Memory-augmented models could simulate up to pushdown automata
None of them could solve problems with complexity of queue automata
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## CONTRIBUTIONS

- Suggested an algorithmic task suite for machine learning
- Well-defined and possible to generate arbitrary number of examples
- Defined the complexities of the sequence generation rules
- Effective ways to predict the difficulties of the problems
- Showed that computational powers of current deep learning models are limited
- Even complex memory augmented models are not Turing-capable yet


## DISCUSSIONS \& FUTURE WORKS <br> Possible ways to overcome the computational limits

- Architecture-level
- Turing-capable memory architectures
- CNN achitecture for deeper combinatorial logic
- Training-level
- Decouple number of inputs and computation steps
- Reinforcement learning, Incremental training with transfer learning, etc.
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