A Formulation of Knowledge Restructuring Type TAM Network
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Abstract – The TAM (Topographic Attentive Mapping) network is a biologically-motivated neural network. In the TAM network algorithm, knowledge is acquired from the TAM network structure through a pruning method, and the acquired knowledge is stored in an independent module. In this paper, three measures of similarity used to compare these independent knowledge storage modules will be discussed.
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1 Introduction

Several models which translate the neural network structure into knowledge representation have been proposed [8], [9], [5]. However, these models only rehash the neural network structure as knowledge representation. There isn’t enough discussion how to built groupings of knowledge and how to restructure the knowledge representation. Fischer[3] claims knowledge management means a loop process of creation, integration and dissemination. Nonaka[11] claims there are four stages of knowledge representation which are Socialization, Externalization, Combination and Internalization. Amitani[1] has explained a method of knowledge creation and reconstruction. Carpenter[2] has mentioned that even humans cannot easily correlate knowledge representations (class) of instances acquired by experience with a class name when he / she first experience that instance. For example, children can distinguish and gather similar shapes of drink holders, e.g., cup, glass and mug, but they can’t tell whether these holder should be called as “cups”, “glasses” or something else until their mother teaches them what the class names are (See Figure 1). In general, a class name is given while denoting and item to the represent a grouping or a concept after instances are collected and grouped. Thus, the important thing is how to group the instances and restructure the instances, not name the class.

In this paper, we propose a new knowledge system with restructuring mechanism of knowledge. We called the knowledge system the knowledge restructuring type TAM network (shortly, KRT-TAM network). Figure 2 shows the diagram of the KRT-TAM network. TAM (Topographic Attentive Mapping) network[12], [6], [7] is based on a biologically-motivated framework and possesses a powerful learning mechanism[4], [10]. TAM’s feature layer is constructed to imitate the retina, the category layer imitates the LGN (lateral geniculate nucleus) and the output layer imitates visual cortex. After learning the TAM network, knowledge representation acquired from the TAM network are memorized to a knowledge part as a formula of fuzzy rules. The knowledge part is constructed by classes, cases and fuzzy rules (instances). The fuzzy rules are restructured whenever the incremental learning of the TAM network is accomplished. We discuss here how to formulate the KRT-TAM network and show the usefulness of the KRT-TAM network through concrete examples.

2 TAM Network

The structure of the TAM Network is shown in Figure 3. When feature maps, \( f_{ih} \), are given, the output signal to the category layer, \( y_j \), are calculated using the node’s weights, \( w_{jih} \).

\[
y_j = \prod_{i=1}^{M} x_{ji} \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L} f_{il} w_{jih}}{1 + \rho b_{ji}} \quad (1)
\]
where $x_{ji}$ are activities, $\rho$ represents the vigilance parameter and $b_{ji}$ are inhibitory weights.

The output prediction, $K$, is calculated as follows:

$$K = \left\{ k \mid \max_k z_k \right\}$$

$$K = \left\{ k \mid \max_k \sum_{j=1}^{N} y_{j} p_{jk} \right\}$$

where, $z_k$ are the output at each node of output layer and $p_{jk}$ are weighted connections.

The output prediction, $y_j^*$ is calculated for the learning step.

$$y_j^* = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{M} x_{ji} \times \sum_{k=1}^{U} z_k^* p_{jk}}{\sum_{j'=1}^{N} \prod_{i=1}^{M} x_{ji'} \times \sum_{k=1}^{U} z_k^* p_{jk}}$$

$$z_k^* = 1 \text{ if } k = K^*; \quad z_k^* = 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

where, $K^*$ is the index of the “correct” supervised output class. If the network’s output prediction $K$ is not similar enough to $K^*$, we do $\rho - \rho + \rho^{(\text{step})}$ until either $z_{K^*/zK} \geq OC$ or $\rho \geq \rho^{(\text{max})}$, where $OC$ is the maximal vigilance level. Once the subject of $z_{K^*/zK} \geq OC$ is satisfied, the learning parameters, $w_{jih}$, $y^*$, $b_{ji}$, are obtained as follows:

$$\Delta w_{jih} = \alpha y_j^*(1 - \lambda^*/M)(f_{ih} - w_{jih})$$

$$\Delta p_{jk} = \alpha y_j^*(z_{k^*} - p_{jk})$$

$$\Delta b_{ji} = b_j^{(\text{rate})} y_j^*(x_{ji} - b_{ji})$$

$$\Delta n_j = \alpha y_j^*(1 - n_j)$$

where, $\alpha$, $\lambda$ and $b_j^{(\text{rate})}$ are parameters.

The learning parameters, $w_{jih}$, $y^*$, $b_{ji}$, are updated.

Step 2] If $z_{K^*/zK} \geq OC$, the learning step starts. Parameters, $w_{jih}$, $p_{jk}$ and $b_{ji}$, are updated.

Step 3] Until $z_{K^*/zK} \geq OC$, let the algorithm repeat from step 1 to step 3.

Step 5] After learning, the pruning step starts. The data set in which $f_{si}$, $s = 1, 2, \cdots, R$ is divided into learning data and checking data. The information entropy, $H(i)$, is calculated using the learning data for feature selections, where $\psi_k$ is a set of the data of the class $k$.

$$H(i) = - \sum_{j=1}^{N} g_j \sum_{k=1}^{U} G_{jk} \log_2 G_{jk}$$

$$g_j = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{R} x_{jis}}{\sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{R} x_{jis}}$$

$$G_{jk} = \frac{\sum_{x_i \in \psi_k} \gamma_{js} \times P_{jk}}{\sum_{x_i \in \psi_k} \gamma_{js} \times P_{jk}}$$

$$\gamma_{js} = \prod_{i \in I^*} x_{jis} \times x_{jis}$$

Step 6] The following feature $i^*$ is extracted as an important feature and we set $I^* = \{ i^* \}$.

$$i^* = \left\{ i \mid \max_i H(i) \right\}$$

Step 7] If the following condition is satisfied for checking data at a category $j$, the link connections between $j$ and outputs $k'$, $k' = 1, 2, \cdots, U$, $k' \neq k$, are removed. Simultaneously, the connections between $j$ and features $i' \notin I^*$, are removed, where $\eta$ is a threshold.

$$G_{jk} \geq \eta$$
[Step 8] If the following condition is satisfied for checking data at the category $j$, the link connections between $j$ and $i$, and $i' \notin I^*$, are removed, where $\theta$ is a threshold.

$$\frac{1}{R} \sum_{s=1}^{R} \gamma_{js} < \theta$$

(15)

[Step 9] If the following condition is satisfied for checking data at $K$, the link connections between $K$ and categories, $j'$, $j' = 1, 2, \cdots, N$, $j' \neq j$, are removed, where $\xi$ is a threshold.

$$\varphi_{jK} - \frac{\sum_{a \in \Gamma_K} \gamma_{ja} \times p_{jK}}{\sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{a \in \Gamma_K} \gamma_{ja} \times p_{jK}} \geq \xi$$

(16)

[Step 10] When a category has lost connections to all outputs or features, the category is removed. Any output and feature which has been disconnected from all categories is also removed.

[Step 11] Until all features are selected at step 6, let the algorithm repeat from step 5 to step 10.

When the algorithm is terminated, the neural network whose needless connections and nodes are pruned is obtained. We should notice that the algorithm is a kind of fuzzy tuning methods since the data procedure is the same as that of fuzzy logic. Thus, we can acquire fuzzy rules from the TAM network as a knowledge representation.

3 Knowledge of the KRT-TAM Network

The knowledge acquired from the TAM network are memorized to knowledge part as the following fuzzy rule format:

$$
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
r_1 & : \text{if } f_1 \text{ is } z_{11} \text{ and } \cdots \text{ and } f_M \text{ is } z_{1M} \\
        & \text{then } C_1 = o_{11}, \cdots, C_U = o_{1U} \\
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
r_2 & : \text{if } f_1 \text{ is } z_{21} \text{ and } \cdots \text{ and } f_M \text{ is } z_{2M} \\
        & \text{then } C_1 = o_{21}, \cdots, C_U = o_{2U} \\
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
\vdots
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
r_N & : \text{if } f_1 \text{ is } z_{N1} \text{ and } \cdots \text{ and } f_M \text{ is } z_{NM} \\
        & \text{then } C_1 = o_{N1}, \cdots, C_U = o_{NU} \\
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
$$

(17)

where $z_{ji}$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, N$, $i = 1, 2, \cdots, M$ are the fuzzy sets, which were the node’s weights, $w_{ji}$, in TAM network. The resultant numbers, $o_{jk}$, were the weighted connections of output nodes, $p_{jk}$, of the TAM network.

The each rule is ranked according to $\varphi_{jk}$ of the equation (16) as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
C_1 & : r_1(\varphi_{11}) \geq r_2(\varphi_{12}) \geq \cdots \geq r_N(\varphi_{N1}) \\
C_2 & : r_1(\varphi_{12}) \geq r_2(\varphi_{22}) \geq \cdots \geq r_N(\varphi_{N2}) \\
\vdots
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
C_U : r_1(\varphi_{1U}) \geq r_2(\varphi_{2U}) \geq \cdots \geq r_N(\varphi_{NU}).
\end{align*}
$$

(18)

In the knowledge part, we have “Class” and “Case”. A case means a general structure of knowledge acquired from the TAM network. The similar cases are grouped and the supervisor then gives the group a class name. Figure 4 shows an example, in which there are two classes, “Cups” with three cases and “Glasses” with two cases.

Figure 4: Example of Knowledge Part

When a knowledge representaion of fuzzy rules moves to the knowledge part from the TAM network, we need to define a similarity measure between the knowledge and cases which exist in the knowledge part in order to decide which class should incorporate the knowledge. We define here the following three types of similarity measures.

1) $\Omega - \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
- & -\tau < I_1^* < 0 \\
+ & 0 \leq I_1^* < \tau \\
F & |I_1^*| \geq \tau
\end{array} \right.$

(19)

$$I_1^* = \{I_1 \mid \min_{\text{Case}} |I_1| \}$$

$$I_1 = \frac{1}{UNL} \sum_{k=1}^{U} \sum_{N}^{N} \sum_{M+1}^{M+L} \sum_{i=1}^{L} \sum_{h=1}^{L} \mu_{w_{ji}}(f_{ih}) \mu_{s_{ji}}(f_{ih})$$

2) $\Omega - \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
- & \max \{+, \tau, \} \text{ count}_{k,j} \omega = \{-\} \\
+ & \max \{+, \tau, \} \text{ count}_{k,j} \omega = \{+\} \\
F & \max \{+, \tau, \} \text{ count}_{k,j} \omega = \{F\}
\end{array} \right.$

(20)

$$I_2^* = \{I_2 \mid \min_{\text{Case}} |I_2| \}$$

$$I_2 = \frac{1}{M+1} \sum_{i=1}^{M+1} \sum_{h=1}^{L} \mu_{w_{ji}}(f_{ih}) \mu_{s_{ji}}(f_{ih})$$

3) $\Omega - \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
- & \max \{-, +, \} \text{ count}_{k,j} \omega = \{-\} \\
+ & \max \{-, +, \} \text{ count}_{k,j} \omega = \{+\} \\
F & \max \{-, +, \} \text{ count}_{k,j} \omega = \{F\}
\end{array} \right.$

(21)

$$I_3^* = \{I_3 \mid \min_{\text{Case}} |I_3| \}$$

$$I_3 = \frac{1}{M+1} \sum_{i=1}^{M+1} \sum_{h=1}^{L} \mu_{w_{ji}}(f_{ih}) \mu_{s_{ji}}(f_{ih})$$

where, $\mu_{w_{jM+1}}(f_{M+1}) - p_{jk}$ and $\mu_{s_{jM+1}}(f_{M+1}) - o_{jk}$, the “count$_{k,j}$ $\omega$” means the number of counting $\omega$ in the
class $k$ and $j$, and $N' \leq N$ and $\tau$ is a threshold.

The algorithm for restructuring cases is achieved according to the following steps.

[Step 1] Rank the knowledge acquired from the TAM network according to $\varphi_{jk}$ of the equation (18).
[Step 2] Calculate the similarity measure $\Omega$ among the equations (19) to (21).
[Step 3] In the case of $\Omega = \{ \varnothing \}$, the acquired knowledge is registered as a case of a new class. The learning of the TAM network is continued.
[Step 4] In the case of $\Omega = \{+\}$, the acquired knowledge is registered as a new case of the existing class of $I^*_g \cdot g = 1, 2, 3$. The learning of the TAM network is continued.
[Step 5] In the case of $\Omega = \{-\}$, the acquired knowledge is presumed to be the same as the case of $I^*_g$. We let the TAM network relearn from $b_j, w_j(z_{ji})$ and $p_j(z_{ji})$ of the case of $I^*_g$ as the initial parameter values. After learning, the resultant knowledge of the TAM network is exchanged to the existing case in the knowledge part.

## 4 Examples

In this section, three types of similarity measures are compared each other through an image example and an example of how to restructure cases is presented.

The ellipse image shown in (a) of Figure 6 is compared with two kinds of original images, circle and square, shown in (a) and (b) of Figure 5. The comparison is using knowledge representation of fuzzy rules acquired from TAM network. The output images of TAM network after learning are shown in (c) and (d) of Figure 5, and in (b) of Figure 6, respectively. The parameters of the TAM network are set as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{lcl}
L & = & 10 \\
OC & = & 0.8 \\
\alpha & = & 0.0000001 \\
\lambda & = & 0.33 \\
\eta & = & 0.8 \\
\xi & = & 0.5 \\
\end{array}
\]

The result is shown in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3. The eight fuzzy rules are acquired from the circle image, eleven from the square image and six from the ellipse image. All similarity measure indicate that the ellipse image is more similar to circle than to square. However, both the second similarity measure and the third similarity measure depend on the threshold of $\tau$ value, so we should discuss the problems more in the near future.

Next, we show an example of how to restructure cases using here the first similarity measure. Three data sets which include "\text{C}3'" and "\text{C}5'" are shown in Figure 7. The boundaries between "\text{C}3'" and "\text{C}5'" in the first data set and the third data set are represented by around the function $y = x$. Alternatively, the boundary of the second data set is $y = -x$. The
Table 1: Result of Similarity Measure 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarity Measure 1</th>
<th>Similarity between Circle and Ellipse</th>
<th>32.45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similarity between Square and Ellipse</td>
<td>65.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Result of Similarity Measure 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarity Measure 2</th>
<th>Similarity between Circle and Ellipse</th>
<th>10 0 6 5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similarity between Square and Ellipse</td>
<td>0 0 24 5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Result of Similarity Measure 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarity Measure 3</th>
<th>Similarity between Circle and Ellipse</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>τ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 0 2 5.0</td>
<td>12 0 0 7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 12 5.0</td>
<td>6 0 6 7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Result of I(W,Z)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1 in Knowledge Part</th>
<th>Case 2 in Knowledge Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>-2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Correct Rate and Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct Rate</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>KRT-TAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking Data</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Conclusions

We formulated here KRT-TAM network and showed the usefulness of KRT-TAM network through examples. This research is partially supported by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan.
Japan under Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research number 14580433.
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