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ABSTRACT

Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) techniques, mostly Back-Propagation Neural Network (BPNN) algorithm has been used as a tool for recognizing a mapping function among a known set of input and output examples. These networks can be trained with gradient descent back propagation. The algorithm is not definite in finding the global minimum of the error function since gradient descent may get stuck in local minima, where it may stay indefinitely. Among the conventional methods, some researchers prefer Levenberg-Marquardt (LM) because of its convergence speed and performance. On the other hand, LM algorithms which are derivative based algorithms still face a risk of getting stuck in local minima.

Recently, a novel meta-heuristic search technique called cuckoo search (CS) has gained a great deal of attention from researchers due to its efficient convergence towards optimal solution. But Cuckoo search is prone to less optimal solution during exploration and exploitation process due to large step lengths taken by CS due to Levy flight. It can also be used to improve the balance between exploration and exploitation of CS algorithm, and to increase the chances of the egg’s survival.

This research proposed an improved CS called hybrid Accelerated Cuckoo Particle Swarm Optimization algorithm (HACPSO) with Accelerated particle Swarm Optimization (APSO) algorithm. In the proposed HACPSO algorithm, initially accelerated particle swarm optimization (APSO) algorithm searches within the search space and finds the best sub-search space, and then the CS selects the best nest by traversing the sub-search space. This exploration and exploitation method followed in the proposed HACPSO algorithm makes it to converge to global optima with more efficiency than the original Cuckoo Search (CS) algorithm.
Finally, the proposed CS hybrid variants such as; HACPSO, HACPSO-BP, HACPSO-LM, CSBP, CSLM, CSERN, and CSLMERN are evaluated and compared with conventional Back propagation Neural Network (BPNN), Artificial Bee Colony Neural Network (ABCNN), Artificial Bee Colony Back propagation algorithm (ABC-BP), and Artificial Bee Colony Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm (ABC-LM). Specifically, 6 benchmark classification datasets are used for training the hybrid Artificial Neural Network algorithms. Overall from the simulation results, it is realized that the proposed CS based NN algorithms performs better than all other proposed and conventional models in terms of CPU Time, MSE, SD and accuracy.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Research

Classification is one of the main data mining processes that maps or sort items into a group of related predefined objects or classes. Data sorting however is a difficult practice, especially if it is carried out by hand. Data sorting is a vital step to gather useful information about an association’s working style. Data classification engages categorizing information to predefined levels or an object. For instance, to classify relevant data available (i.e. file type, working platform, normalizing file size in megabytes or gigabytes, to their appropriate groups or classes etc) a classification procedure is required which has to be done automatically (Chandra et al., 2011).

Machine learning techniques provide us one of the best classification approaches to perform the data organization in a systematic manner. The main goal of Machine Learning is to answer the rising levels of computerization in the information creation process, substituting a vast amount of time burly human activity with techniques that improve accuracy or efficiency by finding out and utilizing the irregularities in the training data. Many techniques are available under the machine learning and the most important objective of machine learning research is to automatically identify the complex patterns and construct intelligent decisions based on the data provided (Chandra et al., 2011).

Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) is an intelligent Machine Learning technique modeled on the human brain and includes processing units known as
artificial neurons that can be trained to perform complex calculations. Unlike conventional techniques in which an output is based on the input it gets, an ANN can be trained to learn and guess patterns without having the prior information about the form of the function (Zheng and Gong, 1992; Kosko, 1992; Basheer and Hajmeer, 2000; Krasnopolsky and Chevallier, 2003; Coppin, 2004). Multilayered ANN architectural models are most efficient when trained on complex patterns. Usually, multilayered networks are classified as Feed-Forward Networks and Recurrent Neural Networks with respect to the path of their connections (Haykin, 1994; Guler et al., 2005).

Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) can achieve incredibly non-linear vibrant mappings and thus have temporally complete applications, where multilayer feed forward networks are restrained to perform static mappings (Elman, 1990; Gupta et al., 2000; Saad et al., 1998). Fully recurrent networks use unrestricted fully interrelated architectures and learning algorithms that can deal with time varying inputs or outputs in a non-linear manner. Therefore, this research’s primary focus is on partially recurrent networks, where connections are mainly feed forward, and they comprise a carefully selected set of feedback associates. The reappearance allows the system to memorize past history from the precedent without complicating the learning extremly (Guler and Ubeysi et al., 2005). One example of partially RNN is Elman which is set up as a usual feed forward network (Elman, 1990).

Back-Propagation Neural Network (BPNN) is an ANN algorithm, used for recognizing a mapping function among a known set of inputs and outputs. The conventional BPNN method is very sensitive to the parameters such as initial weights as indicated by Kolen and Pollack (1991). Usually small random values are used to initialize weights in BPNN but an unsuitable weight value will cause the BPNN to be trapped in the local minima or face slow learning rate; whereas initializing large random weights can cause premature saturation. Therefore, careful selection of the initial weights is required to speed-up the slow learning process (Hyder et al., 2009). The Elman network which utilizes the gradient descent technique for convergence also has the problem of initial weights and slow convergence. This is because the gradient descent may get stuck in local minima,
where it may stay indefinitely and the global minima of the error function will never be achieved (Ahmed et al., 2001; Wen et al., 2000; Nawi et al., 2011).

A number of research studies have recently attempted to improve the convergence of the back propagation and Elman RNN. Second order optimization method such as; Levenberg-Marquardt (LM) has been used for network training (Levenberg, 1944; Marquardt, 1963; Nawi et al., 2010; Nawi et al., 2011; Yan, et al. 2009; Qing, et al., 2010; Bogdan and Wilamowski et al., 2007; Hagan and Menhaj, 1994). But, as LM also follows gradient descent, therefore it can get stuck in local minima for indefinite time and global minima will never be achieved (Karaboga et al., 2011).

Seeing the problem of convergence in deterministic methods, many nature inspired meta-heuristic methods have been used to solve non-linear optimization problems, such as; artificial bee colony (ABC) algorithm (Karaboga, and Basturk 2007), particle swarm optimization (PSO) algorithm (Zhang, et al., 2007), bat algorithm (BA) (Yang, 2011; Yang, and Gandomi, 2012), firefly algorithm (FA) (Yang, 2010; Gandomi et al., 2013), and krill herd (KH) algorithm (Gandomi, and Alavi, 2012). It has been found through experimentation that meta-heuristic techniques are highly suitable for finding the optimal solution. Since these methods are known to have the capability of avoiding the local minima, therefore they are used in selecting the best weights and biases for the BPNN and Elman RNN networks (Ozturk and Karaboga, 2011). However, the algorithms still have a problem of slow convergence to global minima which has rendered them useless in real environments where the time constraint exists.

Developed by Yang and Deb in 2009, a novel meta-heuristic search technique called cuckoo search (CS) has gained a great deal of attention from researchers due to its efficient convergence towards optimal solution. CS imitates the cuckoo behavior of laying its eggs in other birds nest in such a way that the other bird is not able to find out the difference between the foreign eggs and its own. CS algorithm uses levy flight which makes possible to reach the global optimal solution efficiently (Yang and Deb, 2009; Yang and Deb, 2010; Tuba and Subotic et al., 2011).
The Cuckoo search is prone to less optimal solution during exploration and exploitation process owing to large step lengths taken by CS due to Levy flight (Zheng and Zhou, 2012). Therefore, to improve the balance between exploration and exploitation of CS algorithm and to increase the chances of the egg’s survival which will lead to converge to global optimal solution, this research proposed an improved CS algorithm hybridized with Accelerated particle Swarm Optimization (APSO) algorithm.

The proposed hybrid Accelerated Cuckoo Particle Swarm Optimization (HACPSO) is used to train different variants of neural networks such as: simple Back propagation (Rumelhart and Hinton et al., 1986), feed forward neural network (FFNN), and Levenberg-Marquardt Back propagation Neural Network (Shereef and Baboo, 2011; Ozturk and Karaboga, 2011) by selecting the best weights and bias for avoiding the local minima and improving the convergence to global minimum.

1.2 Problem Statements

Back-Propagation Neural Network (BPNN) is a supervised learning Artificial Neural Network (ANN) algorithm that has been successfully applied in wide assortment of applications (Coppin, 2004). Nevertheless the back propagation is very sensitive to the parameters such as initial weights (Kolen and Pollack, 1991). Usually small random values are used to initialize weights. However, starting with unsuitable weight values will cause it to be trapped in the local minima or leads towards slow convergence. Since, it uses gradient descent and can easily get stuck in local minima where it may stay indefinitely (Nawi and Ransing et al., 2011; Ahmed et al., 2001; Wen et al.; 2000), a number of research studies have attempted to improve the convergence of the back propagation. Second order optimization methods such as quasi-Newton, and Levenberg-Marquardt (LM) have also been used for neural networks training (Hagan and Menhaj, 1994; Yusak and Tanoto et al., 2011; Wilamowski et al., 2007; Yan and Hui et al., 2009; Qing et al., 2010).
Among the conventional optimization methods researchers prefer Levenberg-Marquardt (LM) because of its convergence speed and performance. On the other hand, LM algorithm is derivative based having a risk of getting stuck local minima. To deal with this problem, global search optimized techniques, have gained great attention by researchers since they are known to have the capability of avoiding local minima (Ozturk and Karaboga, 2011).

Recently, natures inspired meta-heuristic based global search techniques have become popular in finding the global optimal solution (Yang, 2010). Cuckoo Search (CS) is a recently proposed meta-heuristic algorithm by Yang and Deb in 2009. CS is found to be quite efficient during convergence towards optimal solution but it is prone to less optimal solution during exploration and exploitation process due to large step lengths by Levy flight (Zheng and Zhou, 2012). Therefore, a modification of CS algorithm is needed to improve the balance between exploration and exploitation of CS algorithm, and to increase the chances of the cuckoo egg’s survival.

1.3 Aims of the Research

The research aims to develop improved Cuckoo Search (CS) based learning techniques to train Multilayer Perceptrons (MLP) for searching optimal solution during exploration and exploitation. The hybrid techniques will use accelerated particle swarm optimization (APSO) algorithm to search within the search space first and finds the best sub-search space. Then APSO finds the best solution or best nest from sub-search spaces and share this information with CS. The proposed algorithm is further integrated with different variants of neural networks such as; Levenberg-Marquardt Back propagation Neural Network (Shereef and Baboo, 2011; Ozturk and Karaboga, 2011), Simple Back propagation (Rumelhart and Hinton et al., 1986), Elman RNN, Back propagation Elman RNN, and Levenberg-Marquardt Elman RNN. The performance of the proposed techniques are compared with conventional Back propagation (BP), Artificial Bee Colony Neural Network (ABCNN), Artificial Bee Colony Back propagation algorithm (ABC-BP), and Artificial Bee Colony
Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm (ABC-LM) (Ozturk and Karaboga, 2011; Nandy et al., 2012; Karaboga and Ozturk, 2009; Rumelhart et al., 1986) on selected benchmark classification problems from UCI Machine Learning Repository.

1.4 Objectives of the Research

This research encompasses the following four objectives in order to achieve the research aims:

i. To implement and simulate the effect of levy flight in Cuckoo Search algorithm based on first and second order Neural Network algorithms in avoiding local minima towards converging to global minimum.

ii. To develop a hybrid algorithm known as HACPSO which further enhances CS by introducing APSO in finding the best solution or best nest from sub-search space and share this information to CS.

iii. To implement and assess the performance of the proposed HACPSO algorithm in (ii) to train the first and second order Neural Network to provide a better search direction for the network.

iv. To assess the performances of the proposed algorithms in terms of accuracy and mean square error comparing with conventional algorithms on selected benchmark classification problems.

1.5 Scope of the Research

This research is focused on enhancing the Cuckoo Search algorithm, with different variant of Neural Network in order to improve accuracy, network convergence, and to avoid local minimum. Initially Cuckoo Search algorithm was explored with first and second order ANN such as Back Propagation (BP) Elman Recurrent Network (ERN), Back propagation Elman Recurrent Network (BPERN), Levenberg-Marquardt Back propagation (LMBP), and Levenberg-Marquardt Elman Recurrent
Network (LMERN). Later, the proposed CS algorithm is integrated with Accelerated Particle Swarm Optimization (APSO) which is applied to first and second order Network. All these Networks were exploited on some selected benchmark datasets from University California Irvine Machine Learning Repository (UCIMLR) were employed in order to verify the efficiency of the proposed algorithm.

1.6 Significance of the Research

This research provides the following contributions to knowledge in the fields of meta-heuristic based learning algorithm for BPNN. In meta-heuristic learning algorithms, the performance highly depends on exploration and exploitation procedures:

i. Cuckoo Search with Levy flight algorithm has been simulated and implemented with different variants of Neural Network in order to remove the oscillations in the gradient path and to avoid local minima problem.

ii. An improved Hybrid Accelerated Cuckoo Particle Swarm Optimization (HACPSO) algorithm is proposed to improve the balance between exploration and exploitation of CS algorithm, and to increase the chances of the egg’s survival by intelligently selecting the best search space and the optimal solution in CS. This exploration method followed in the proposed HACPSO algorithm makes it to converge to global optimal solution with more efficiency than the original Cuckoo Search (CS) algorithm.

iii. In the first phase, this Research investigates the accuracy performance of the proposed HACPSO algorithm for training first order neural network, such as FFNN, BPNN, and second order network (LMBP) and compared with ABCNN, ABC-BP, ABC-LM, and conventional BPNN.
iv. Cuckoo Search with Levy flight and HCAPSO and their variants are finally compared by means of simulation on some selected benchmark classification problems taken from UCI Machine Learning Repository.

1.7 Thesis Outline

This thesis is divided into five chapters including the introduction and conclusion chapters. The outline of each chapter is given below:

Besides providing an outline of the thesis, Chapter 1, contains the overview on background of the Research, scope of the Research, objectives, aims, and significance of the Research.

Chapter 2 consists of some efficient learning methods for BPNN algorithm. The BPNN algorithm is one of the finest and widely used learning algorithms for Artificial Neural Network (ANN). However, BP algorithm has problem of slow convergence and local minima. This chapter reviews some of the fundamental theory about ANN, BPNN, Levenberg-Marquardt (LM) algorithm, and Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN). This chapter also sheds some light on the previous improvements proposed by various researchers on improving the training efficiency of these networks. Some of the fundamental theories about the meta-heuristics, such as; Cuckoo Search (CS) algorithm, Artificial Bee Colony (ABC) algorithm, Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) and Accelerated Particle Swarm Optimization (APSO) algorithms are also reviewed. The problem of slow convergence in Cuckoo Search (CS) due to large step lengths taken by levy flight and the poor communication among cuckoos in CS are identified in the Chapter 2.

Chapter 3 presents the main contribution of this research known as HACPSO to answer the slow convergence and poor communication abilities of cuckoos. The proposed algorithms based on CS with different variants of ANN are also presented and discussed in the Chapter 3. Finally, Chapter 3 discusses the research methodology used to carry out this Research in a systematic manner.
In Chapter 4, the new algorithms developed in Chapter 3 are further validated in terms of simulations on selected benchmark problems for UCI Machine Learning Repository. The performance evaluation is carried out based on accuracy and Mean Squared Error (MSE) and all the proposed algorithms are compared with conventional BPNN, ABCNN, ABC-BP, and ABC-LM algorithms.

Finally in Chapter 5, research contributions are summarised and recommendations for future work are proposed for further continuation in this field.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In the past two decades, much advancement has been done in the Information Technology (IT) field. Previously, accessing large information was a time consuming process but due to recent developments in Artificial Intelligence (AI) accessing large information has become much easier and less time consuming. Artificial Neural Network is powerful technique in solving complex and non-linear problems. The main reason for ANN being usually used is the ability to present some properties such as learning from training data.

This chapter is organized in the following manner. Section one gives an introduction to the most popular Artificial Neural network (ANN) architecture called multilayer perceptron (MLP) (Fung et al., 2005). Further in this chapter, the Elman Recurrent Neural Network (ERNN) and other training algorithms for the Elman network are discussed. Section two gives a deep review of Back Propagation Neural Network (BPNN) algorithm, which is one of the most novel and widely used algorithms for training neural networks. This chapter also highlights the limitations of the conventional BPNN training algorithm. Last but not least, this chapter also discusses some improvements and modifications of the BPNN learning algorithm which were done in the past. To improve the performance of the conventional BPNN this Chapter also focuses on some well-known meta-heuristic techniques used in this research, such as Cuckoo Search (CS) via levy flight, particle swarm optimization
(PSO), Accelerated Particle Swarm Optimization (APSO), and Artificial Bee Colony (ABC) algorithms.

2.2 Artificial Neural Network (ANN)

Artificial Neural Network (ANN) is an analytical procedure modeled on the learning of human cognitive system and neurological function of the brain. ANN is one of the most popular approaches used extensively in machine learning, which involves the development of the algorithms that enables the computer to learn (Negnevitsky, 2005). ANN works by processing information like human neurons in the brain and is composed of small interconnected processing elements known as nodes (neurons), which can be trained to perform complex computations (Chen and Pei, 2008). ANN is a powerful set of adaptive learning techniques that can be trained to store, recognize, estimate and adapt to new patterns without having the prior information of the function it receives (Popescu et al., 2009).

ANN can demonstrate a surprising number of characteristics of human brain, which has the ability to learn from training through examples fed to it (Elhag and Wang, 2007). Due to its ability to solve complex time critical problems, it has been widely used in the engineering fields such as biological modeling, financial forecasting, weather forecasting, decision modeling, control system, health and medicine, ocean and space exploration etc (Zhen and Gong, 1992; Basheer and Hajmeer, 2000; Kosko, 1992; Krasnopolsky and Chevallier, 2003; Coppin, 2004; Lee, 2008). One of the basic types of ANN is feed forward Neural Network (FFNN) which is capable of approximating generic classes of function which includes continuous and discrete values. And the most frequently used FFNN for pattern classification is the Multilayer Perceptron Neural Network (MLP) which is trained to generate a spatial output pattern in response to an input spatial one (Haykin, 1994).
2.3 Multilayer Perceptron (MLP)

Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) is the most popular Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) architecture used due to its simple construction (Popescu et al., 2009). MLP is also known as Multilayer Feedforward Neural Network (MLFNN), and consists of more than one layer of nodes and is appropriate for large number of applications (Fung et al., 2005). The MLP network comprises of a set of nodes (neurons) that represent the input layer one or more hidden layers of computation, and output layer of nodes that calculate the output of the network. In MLP, nodes in any layer of the network are connected to all other neurons in the adjacent layer. The input signal propagates in forward direction from left to right through the network. Figure 2.1 shows the MLP network structure which consist of three layers; one input, one hidden, and one output layer.

![Figure 2.1: Multilayer Perceptron (MLP)](image)

MLP training in feedforward neural network is also known as supervised learning process and can be interpreted as an example of an optimization method. The purpose of the learning process is to find a weight vector $W^*$ which minimizes the difference between the actual and predicted output which can be defined as following:
\[ \text{Err} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (T_i - Y_i)^2 \]  

(2.1)

where;

- **n**: Number of output nodes in the output layer.
- **T_i**: Desired output of the \(i^{th}\) output unit.
- **Y_i**: Network output of the \(i^{th}\) output unit.

Error function can be visualized in one dimensional weight space as shown in Figure 2.2.

![Figure 2.2: The MLP error function](image)

Figure 2.2 shows that the MLP error function is a non-linear function of the weights and have many minimum, which satisfies the following equation:

\[ \nabla \text{Err}(w) = 0 \]  

(2.2)

where, \( \nabla \text{Err}(w) \) denotes the gradient of the error, E with respect to weights. Figure 2.2, shows schematic error function for a single parameter \(w1\), showing four stationary points. The point at which the value of the error function is smallest (Point
D) is called global minima, while point A is called local minima. There may be also other points, which satisfy the error condition in Equation (2.2) for instance local maxima (point B) or saddle point (point C) (Nawi, 2007).

Generally the MLP network is trained with one of the most popular and traditional algorithm known as back propagation neural network (BPNN) algorithm which will be discussed in detail in Section 2.5.

Although, MLP is stable and popular but its mapping performance is fixed, therefore, the network is not suitable for processing temporal pattern. Many attempts have been made to use the MLP to classify temporal patterns by transforming the temporal domain in to a spatial domain. An alternate neural network approach is to use recurrent neural network (RNN) which has the memory to train on the past history. (Gupta and Mcavoy, 2000; Saad et al., 1998). RNN is discussed in more detail in the next section.

2.4 Recurrent Neural Network (RNN)

Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) is an alternate neural network architectural approach which has the ability to store past inputs to a node in its memory for future use. Unlike, multi-layer feed forward neural network (MLFNN), it can be trained on temporal data easily (Ubeyli, 2008a).

Recently, various types of RNNs have been suggested and they may be classified as partially recurrent or fully recurrent networks. RNN can carry out highly nonlinear dynamic mappings, therefore RNNs have been used in a number of interesting applications including associative memories, pattern classification control, optimization forecasting, and generalization of pattern sequence (Ubeyli 2008a, 2008c). In partially recurrent network, partial recurrence is produced by feedback delay hidden unit output or the output of the network as additional input units. The partially recurrent network whose links are mostly feed forward, also
contain a careful chosen set of feedback connections. One instance of such network is Elman which is usually set-up as a normal feed forward neural network (Elman, 1990).

2.4.1 Elman Recurrent Network (ERN)

Among some feasible network architectures, the feed forward and recurrent neural networks (RNN) are commonly used (Haykin, 1994). In a feed forward neural network the signals are transmitted only in one direction, starting from the input layer, consequently through the hidden layers to the output layer. A recurrent neural network (RNN) has local feedback connections to some of the previous layers. It is different from feed forward network architecture in the sense that there is at least one feedback loop. Thus in RNN, there can exist one layer with feedback connections as well as there can also be neurons with self-feedback link where the output of a neuron is fed back into itself as the input (Kazemy et al., 2007).

Thus, the partially recurrent network where the connections are largely feed forward consists of carefully chosen set feedback association. The recurrence allows the network to memorize output from the past without complicating the learning greatly (Ubeyli, 2008). One of the popular networks in the partially recurrent network is Elman Recurrent Network (ERN). An ERN is a network which in principle is set up as a normal feed forward network with a feedback connection from the hidden layer to the input layer. It means that all the neuron in one layer is connected with all neurons in the next layer called context layer which is a special container of hidden layer (Elman, 1990; Guler and Ubeyli et al., 2005).

The nodes in the context layer receive copy of the output of the hidden neurons. The output of every hidden node is copied into a specific neuron in the context layer (Ubeyli et al., 2005). The value of the context neuron is used as extra input for all the neurons in the hidden layer as time delay. Therefore the Elman
network has an open memory of one time delay (Elman, 1990; Ubeyli, 2008; Kazemy et al., 2007).

Like MLFNN, the strength of all association among nodes is represented with weights. Initially, all the weight values are represented randomly and changed during the training process. In the Elman RNN the weights from the hidden layer to the context layer is set to one, and kept fixed because the values of the context nodes have to be copied accurately (Elman, 1990).

A simple ERN is mostly used with one input layer, one hidden or state layer, and one output layer. Each layer will have its own index variable: \( k \) for output nodes, \( j \) and \( l \) for hidden, and \( i \) for input nodes. In a feed forward network, the input vector \( X \) is propagated through a weight layer \( V \):

\[
net_j(t) = \sum_i^n X_i(t)V_{ji} + b_j \quad (2.3)
\]

where, \( n \) is the number of inputs is, \( b_j \) is a bias, and \( f \) is an output function. In a simple recurrent network, the input vector is similarly propagated through a weight layer, but also combined with the previous state activation through an additional recurrent weight layer, \( U \);

\[
Y_j(t) = f(net_j(t)) \quad (2.4)
\]

\[
net_j(t - 1) = \sum_i^n X_i(t)V_{ji} + \sum_l^m Y_l(t - 1)U_{jl} + b_j(t) \quad (2.5)
\]

where, \( m \) is the number of ‘state’ nodes. The output of the network in both cases is determined by the state and a set of output weights \( W \);

\[
Y_k(t - 1) = g(net_j(t - 1)) \quad (2.6)
\]

\[
net_k(t) = \sum_j^m Y_k(t - 1)W_{kj} + b_k \quad (2.7)
\]
where, $g$ is an output function and $W_{kj}$ represents the weights from hidden to output layer.

In the next section, we will discuss the previous improvements by various researchers on Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN) to achieve faster convergence to global minima.

### 2.4.2 Previous improvements on RNN

There has been a lot of research on dynamic system modeling with recurrent neural networks (RNN). The Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN) has an inside feedback connection within the network which allows it to hold past presented pattern. This ability of dynamic modeling system makes this kind of neural network more superior than the conventional feed forward neural network because the system outputs are function of both the current inputs as well as their inner states (Barbounis et al., 2006; Peng et al., 2007).

As a part of supervised learning technique, different training algorithms were established for training the RNNs, such as BPNN through time (Ahmad et al., 2004) and second order optimization LM algorithm (Toha et al., 2008; Guler et al., 2005). However the existence of feedback loops in the network architecture, the calculation of the gradient becomes more complex which makes the BPNN procedure computationally more intricate. In addition the error surface of the recurrent network is more complex as compared to the static network. Therefore, the training is more likely to be trapped in to local minima (Peng et al., 2007).

Ahmad and Ismail et al. (2004) investigated a new method using Fully Connected Recurrent Neural Network (FCRNN) and Back Propagation Through Time (BPTT) algorithm to observed the difference of Arabic alphabetic like “alif” to “ya” and to improve the people’s knowledge and understanding of Arabic words using the proposed technique. The experimental results showed that the proposed method has better performance and can achieve high rate of convergence.
Peng *et al.*, (2007) trained RNN by integrating it with particle swarm optimization (PSO) and BPNN algorithm. The PSO-BP algorithm provides the optimal weights for identifying the frequency dependent impedance of power electronic system such as rectifiers, inverter and AC-DC converter. The experimental results showed that the proposed method successfully identified the impedance characteristics of the three phase inverter system, not only it can systematically help avoiding the training process getting trapped in local minima but also has better performance as compared to both simple BPNN and PSO algorithms.

Aziz and Hamed *et al.*, (2008) carried out a research to improve the performance in ERN training with PSO algorithm. To discover the classification accuracy and convergence rate, the proposed algorithm is compared with simple ERN and BPNN algorithms. Based on the simulation results, the proposed Elman recurrent network with particle swarm optimization (ERNPSO) algorithm has better performance than the Back Propagation Elman Recurrent Network (BPERN) in terms of classification accuracy. However, in terms of convergence time the BPERN is much better than the proposed ERNPSO algorithm.

Cheng and Shen (2010) proposed an improved ERN to calculate radio propagation loss with three dimensional parabola method in order to decrease calculation time and to improve approximation performance of the network. Based on the results, the improved ERNs showed high performance in predicting propagation loss than the simple ERN.

Wang and Gao *et al.* (2011) used the ERN to compute the Total Nitrogen (TN) Total Phosphorus (TP) and Dissolved Oxygen (DO) at three different sites of lake Taihu during the period of water diversion. The conceptual form of the ERN for different parameters was used by mean of the principle component analysis (PCA), to train and validate on daily dataset. The values of TS, TP, and DO was calculated by the model were ultimately related to their respective values. The simulated results showed that the PCA can efficiently accelerate the input parameters for the ERN and
can precisely compute and forecast the water quality parameters during the period of water diversion, but still it is not free from local minimum problem.

Tanoto and Ongsakul et al., (2011) proposed LM algorithm based on Elman and Jordan recurrent neural networks to forecast annual peak load of Java Madura Bali interconnection from 2009 to 2011. The research was carried out to check the performance of the proposed LM based recurrent networks with respect to their forecasting accuracy over the given time period. From the simulations, it is clear that the proposed LM based recurrent neural networks have better results.

Normally, most of the ERNs and FFNN are generally trained with back propagation (BP) algorithms, which will be explained in the next section.

### 2.5 Back Propagation Neural Network (BPNN)

Back propagation Neural Network (BPNN) is one of the most widely used supervisor learning model for updating the MLP weights during the training process. It was proposed in order to solve the problem of a single layer perceptron which fails to solve XOR patterns (Minsky and Papert, 1969). The BPNN algorithm has been individually calculated by many researchers working in different fields. Werbos (1974) presented the basic idea of BP algorithm while working on his doctoral thesis called back propagation of error. Parker (1985) redeveloped the BPNN algorithm and called it the learning logic algorithm. Finally Rumelhart et al., (1986) rediscovered the algorithm and since then the technique is commonly used. For this reason, the BPNN can be viewed as the standard method of complex patterns learning ANN technique. The BPNN learns by calculating the error of the output layer to find the error in the hidden layers. This capability makes it highly appropriate to be applied on problem in which no relation is set up between the output and the input.

The BPNN algorithm uses gradient descent method which requires careful selection of parameters such as network topology, initial weights, biases, learning
rate, and activation function. An inappropriate use of these parameters can lead to slow network convergence or even network stagnancy (Zawei and Althoefer, 2005). The issues of convergence in back propagation is really important and to solve these problems different techniques were developed. And new modification is given in the Section 2.7. However this section explains the traditional implementations of the BPNN algorithm which is known as batch or offline BPNN. The procedure for conventional back propagation is given as follows:

i. Initialize all weights and present input patterns to the neural network.

ii. Identify desired outputs for each input pattern.

iii. All the input is then propagated forward through the network, until the output layer.

iv. Calculate error by comparing the network output with the desired output using Equation (2.1).

v. The error is propagated backward through the network is used to adjust the weights using the following equation. The error for each unit $k$ in the output layer

$$\delta_k = Err_k (1 - Err_k) (T_k - Err_k)$$  

(2.8)

vi. The error is propagated backward to compute the error specifically, for each unit $j$ at the hidden layer. Using Equation (2.9);

$$\delta_j = Er_j (1 - Er_j) \sum_k \delta_k w_{jk}$$  

(2.9)

vii. The weights in the links connecting to output nodes, $(w_{jk})$, and hidden nodes, $(w_{ij})$, are then modified based on the gradient descent method as following:

$$\nabla w_{jk} = w_{jk} + \eta \delta_k h_j$$  

(2.10)

$$\nabla w_{ij} = w_{ij} + \eta \delta_j O_i$$  

(2.11)

where;
\( \delta_k \) : Is the error for the output layer at \( k^{th} \) node
\( \delta_j \) : Is the error for the hidden layer at \( j^{th} \) node
\( h_j \) : Output of the \( j^{th} \) hidden node
\( O_i \) : Output of the \( i^{th} \) input node
\( \eta \) : Learning rate
\( i, j, k \) : Subscripts \( i, j, \) and \( k \), corresponding to input, hidden and output nodes, respectively
\( w_{jk} \) : Weight on the link from hidden node \( j \) to output node \( k \)
\( w_{ij} \) : Weight on the link from input node \( i \) to hidden node \( j \)

Since, BPNN algorithm uses gradient descent (GD) to update weights therefore, BPNN cannot be guaranteed to reach global minima of the error function. This limitation of the BPNN will be explained in the next section.

2.6 The BP Training Algorithm Limitation

The traditional BP has been successfully applied in some real problems such as, predictions, pattern recognitions, and classifications. Despite providing many successful applications, BP faces several limitations which need to be solved. Since BP algorithm used gradient descent (GD) optimization technique to update weights, one of the limitations of these methods is that it does not guarantee to reach global minima of the error function (refer to Figure 2.2). BP contains slow learning convergence and can easily get trapped in local minima and fails to find the global best solution (Bi et al., 2005; Wang et al., 2004).

Although the gradient descent method is an iterative process to find the parameters that can minimize an error measure, the error surface normally possess properties that make this method too slow to converge. When the derivative of the weight is small in magnitude, the error surface is relatively smooth along a weight
dimension, thus the weight value is adjusted by a small amount and many procedures are required to make major reduction in error (Nawi, 2007).

Another cause for the slow speed of convergence of the gradient descent is that the negative gradient vector direction may not point directly toward the minimum of the error surface (Nawi, 2007). It is also noted that the neuron saturation in the hidden layer is closely associated with many local minima problems. When such saturation occurs, neuron in the hidden layer will lose their sensitivity to the input signals and propagated chain is blocked severely and in some situations, the network can no longer be trained. Moreover, the BP algorithm convergence behavior depends on the selection of network architecture, initial weights, biases, learning rate, momentum coefficient and the activation function.

In the last decade, a significant numbers of different learning algorithms have been introduced by researchers in order to overcome those limitations of BP algorithm. The next section will discuss some improvements of BP proposed by previous researchers.

2.7 Improvements on BP Algorithm

In recent years, with many improvements in the research and applications, researchers have been investigating the problems associated with the learning efficiency and convergence rate of the BP algorithm. Much work has been done to improve the general capacity of the network. Several learning acceleration techniques have been proposed as modification to the original BP algorithm. The research on BP falls in three categories:

i. Heuristic technique which include variation of learning rate, using momentum and gain tuning of the activation function.

ii. Second Order optimization techniques.
iii. Hybridization Techniques.

Based on the first category, various accelerating techniques have been proposed. This technique consists of Delta Bar Delta Rule, and involves varying the learning rate, momentum coefficient, and gain value of the activation function.

### 2.7.1 Delta Bar Delta Rule

The Delta- Bar- Delta rule, developed by Rich Sutton (1986) consists of a weights and learning rate update rule. The weights update rule is the same as the Delta Bar Delta rule in Equation (2.12):

$$W(t + 1) = w(t) - \alpha(t + 1) \frac{\delta x(t)}{\delta w(t)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.12)

Jacobs (1988) has introduced a Delta- Bar- Delta rule modification, which consist of weight update rule and learning update rule. From his research, it is noted that if the consecutive change of the weights $W(t + 1)$ and $w(t)$ in the opposite direction the weights value is oscillating, than the learning rate ($\alpha$), for that weight should be decremented. Similarly, if the consecutive derivative of the weights has the same direction than the learning rate for that weight should be increased. From the research, it is found the Delta -Bar-Delta shows a faster rate of convergence than the gradient descent.

### 2.7.2 Learning Rate ($\eta$)

One of the major issues with the BP algorithm is the fixed Learning rate $\eta$. In BP, it is very crucial to find the optimal value of $\eta$ that can cause great reduction in the network error value. The reliability of the training process depends closely on the
choice of $\eta$. Various methods have been developed to find out a better learning rate. However, these techniques are generally based on heuristics and do not present the best learning rate (Kandil et al., 1993).

Yu et al. (1995) proposed dynamic optimization of the learning rate using derivative information. It was shown that relatively large or less learning rates may change the training of BP algorithm and may be lead to failure of learning process.

While, Ye (2001) stated that the constant learning rate of the back propagation fails to improve the search for the optimal weight combination. Furthermore, Yemeni and Hong (2009) proposed an auto adapted learning rate, although the adjustment of the network weights is associated with error gradient during the training. When the training has fallen into a flat area, error gradient is closed to zero. Then the learning rate is large and the change of weights will be still slow, which may cause slow convergence to the target error.

Thota et al. (2013) proposed optimal learning rate for the stabilized and fast convergence of the BP learning algorithm. It was shown that the consistency of the total system mostly depends on the choice of $\eta$ value. A small value of $\eta$ results in slow learning while a great value of $\eta$ results in fast learning but may also face oscillations which leads to no learning at all. It states that 0.02 values is found to be the optimal learning rate value for minimum error, correct classification, and incorrect classification occurrence. Overall, it can be concluded that the small value of learning rate may cause slow convergence, and large value of the learning rate may lead towards oscillations.

### 2.7.3 Momentum Coefficient ($\alpha$)

Another efficient approach related to the speedup of the convergence and stabilized training process is by adding some momentum coefficient to the network.
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