

# Adaptive Stochastic Weight Averaging

Caglar Demir

Arnab Sharma

Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo

*Data Science Research Group, Paderborn University*

CAGLAR.DEMIR@UPB.DE

ARNAB.SHARMA@UPB.DE

AXEL.NGONGA@UPB.DE

## Abstract

Ensemble models often improve generalization performances in challenging tasks. Yet, traditional techniques based on prediction averaging incur three well-known disadvantages: the computational overhead of training multiple models, increased latency, and memory requirements at test time. To address these issues, the Stochastic Weight Averaging (SWA) technique maintains a running average of model parameters from a specific epoch onward. Despite its potential benefits, maintaining a running average of parameters can hinder generalization, as an underlying running model begins to overfit. Conversely, an inadequately chosen starting point can render SWA more susceptible to underfitting compared to an underlying running model. In this work, we propose Adaptive Stochastic Weight Averaging (ASWA) technique that updates a running average of model parameters, only when generalization performance is improved on the validation dataset. Hence, ASWA can be seen as a combination of SWA with the early stopping technique, where the former accepts all updates on a parameter ensemble model and the latter rejects any update on an underlying running model. We conducted extensive experiments ranging from image classification to multi-hop reasoning over knowledge graphs. Our experiments over 11 benchmark datasets with 7 baseline models suggest that ASWA leads to a statistically better generalization across models and datasets<sup>1</sup>.

**Keywords:** Stochastic Weight Averaging, Early Stopping, Ensemble Learning

## 1. Introduction

Ensemble learning is one of the most effective techniques to improve the generalization of Machine Learning (ML) algorithms across challenging tasks (Dietterich, 2000; Murphy, 2012; Goodfellow et al., 2016). In its simplest form, an ensemble model is constructed from a set of  $K$  different learners over the same training set (Breiman, 1996). At test time, a new data point is classified by taking a (weighted) average of  $K$  the predictions of the  $K$  learners (Sagi and Rokach, 2018). Although prediction averaging often improves the predictive accuracy, uncertainty estimation, and out-of-distribution robustness (Garipov et al. (2018); Liu et al. (2022)), it incurs three disadvantages: the computational overhead of training  $K$  models and increased latency and memory requirements at test time (Liu et al., 2022).

Recently, Izmailov et al. (2018) show that Stochastic Weight Averaging (SWA) technique often improves the generalization performance of a neural network by averaging  $K$  *snapshots* of parameters at the end of each epoch from a specific epoch onward. Therefore, while a neural network being trained (called an underlying running model), an ensemble

1. <https://github.com/dice-group/aswa>

model is constructed through averaging the trajectory of an underlying running model in a parameter space. Therefore, at test time, the time and memory requirements of using SWA parameter ensemble is identical to the requirements of using a single neural network, e.g., the 160th of 200 training epoch across models on the CIFAR datasets.

Although the idea of averaging parameters of linear models to accelerate Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) on convex problems dates back to [Polyak and Juditsky \(1992\)](#), [Izmailov et al. \(2018\)](#) show that an effective parameter ensemble of a neural network architecture can be built by solely maintaining a running average of parameters from a specific epoch onward. Yet, Selecting an unfittingly low number of training epochs leads SWA to suffer more from underfitting compared to an underlying running model. In other words, a parameter ensemble model is heavily influenced by the early stages of training. Conversely, accepting all updates on a parameter ensemble model can hinder generalization, as an underlying running model begins to overfit. Therefore, striking the right balance in the choice of training epochs is crucial for harnessing the full potential of SWA in enhancing neural network generalization.

Here, we propose Adaptive Stochastic Weight Averaging (ASWA) technique that extends SWA by building a parameter ensemble based on an adaptive schema governed by the generalization trajectory on the validation dataset. More specifically, while a neural network is being trained, ASWA builds a parameter ensemble model by applying *soft*, *hard*, and *reject* updates:

- *Soft updates* refer to updating a parameter ensemble w.r.t. the parameters of running neural model to maintain a running average.
- *Hard updates* refer to reinitialization of a parameter ensemble model with parameters of a running model.
- *Reject updates* refer to the rejection of soft and hard updates.

ASWA can be seen as a combination of SWA with the early stopping technique, as SWA accepts all soft updates on a parameter ensemble, while the early stopping technique rejects any updates on a running model. Although ASWA introduces additional computations caused by monitoring the validation performance (as the early stopping technique does), ASWA does not require any hyperparameter to be optimized on the validation dataset. Our extensive experiments on 11 benchmark datasets for image classification, link prediction and multi-hop query answering with 7 state-of-the-art models suggest that ASWA improves the generalization performance over SWA, prediction averaging over multiple predictions, and early stopping across datasets and models. The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

1. We propose a novel approach called ASWA which improves over the existing parameter ensemble approach SWA by exploiting the early stopping technique.
2. We perform extensive evaluations considering different domains to quantify the effectiveness of ASWA with using.
3. We provide an open-source implementation of ASWA, including training and evaluation scripts along the experiment log files.

## 2. Related Work & Background

### 2.1. Ensemble Learning

Ensemble learning has been extensively studied in the literature (Bishop and Nasrabadi, 2006; Murphy, 2012). In its simplest form, an ensemble model is constructed from a set of  $K$  learners by averaging  $K$  predictions (Breiman, 1996). At test time, a final prediction is obtained by averaging  $K$  predictions of the  $K$  learners.

For instance, averaging predictions of  $K$  independently-trained neural networks of the same architecture can significantly boost the prediction accuracy over the test set. Although this technique introduces the computational overhead of training multiple models and/or increases latency and memory requirements at test time, it often improves the generalization performance in different learning problems (Murphy, 2012).

Attempts to alleviate the computational overhead of training multiple models have been extensively studied. For instance, Xie et al. (2013) show that saving parameters of a neural network periodically during training and composing a final prediction via a voting schema improves the generalization performance. Moreover, the dropout technique can also be seen as a form of ensemble learning (Hinton et al., 2012; Srivastava et al., 2014). More specifically, preventing the co-adaptation of parameters by stochastically forcing them to be zero can be seen as a *geometric averaging* (Warde-Farley et al., 2013; Baldi and Sadowski, 2013; Goodfellow et al., 2016). Similarly, Monte Carlo Dropout can be seen as a variant of the Dropout that is used to approximate model uncertainty without sacrificing either computational complexity or test accuracy (Gal and Ghahramani, 2016). Garipov et al. (2018) show that an optima of neural networks are connected by simple pathways having near constant training accuracy Draxler et al. (2018). Garipov et al. (2018) proposed FGE model to construct a ensemble model by averaging predictions of such neural networks is a promising means to improve the generalization performance. Although the computational overhead of training multiple models can be alleviated by the aforementioned approaches, the increased latency and memory requirement remain unchanged at test time.

### 2.2. Stochastic Weight Averaging

Izmailov et al. (2018) propose Stochastic Weight Averaging (SWA) that builds a high-performing parameter ensemble model having *almost* the same training and exact test time cost of a single model. An SWA ensemble parameter update is performed as follows

$$\Theta_{\text{SWA}} \leftarrow \frac{\Theta_{\text{SWA}} \cdot n_{\text{models}} + \Theta}{n_{\text{models}} + 1} \quad (1)$$

where  $\Theta_{\text{SWA}}$  and  $\Theta$  denote the parameters of the ensemble model and the parameters of the running model, respectively. At each SWA update,  $n_{\text{models}}$  is incremented by 1. Expectedly, finding a *good* start epoch for SWA is important. Selecting an unfittingly low start point and total number of epochs can lead SWA to underfit. Similarly, starting SWA only on the last few epochs does not lead to an improvement as shown in Izmailov et al. (2018).

### 2.3. Early Stopping

The early stopping technique aims to avoid overfitting by stopping the training process before the convergence at training time. It is considered as one of the simplest techniques

Table 1: Overview of KGE models.  $\mathbf{e}$  denotes an embedding vector,  $d$  is the embedding vector size,  $\bar{\mathbf{e}} \in \mathbb{C}$  corresponds to the complex conjugate of  $\mathbf{e}$ .  $\times_n$  denotes the tensor product along the  $n$ -th mode.  $\otimes, \circ, \cdot$  stand for the Hamilton, Hadamard, and inner product, respectively.

Model	Scoring Function	Vector Space	Additional
RESCAL <a href="#">Nickel et al. (2011)</a>	$\mathbf{e}_h \cdot \mathcal{W}_r \cdot \mathbf{e}_t$	$\mathbf{e}_h, \mathbf{e}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$	$\mathcal{W}_r \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$
DistMult <a href="#">Yang et al., 2015)</a>	$\mathbf{e}_h \circ \mathbf{e}_r \cdot \mathbf{e}_t$	$\mathbf{e}_h, \mathbf{e}_r, \mathbf{e}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$	-
ComplEx <a href="#">(Trouillon et al., 2016)</a>	$\text{Re}(\langle \mathbf{e}_h, \mathbf{e}_r, \bar{\mathbf{e}}_t \rangle)$	$\mathbf{e}_h, \mathbf{e}_r, \mathbf{e}_t \in \mathbb{C}^d$	-
TuckER <a href="#">Balazević et al. (2019)</a>	$\mathcal{W} \times_1 \mathbf{e}_h \times_2 \mathbf{e}_r \times_3 \mathbf{e}_t$	$\mathbf{e}_h, \mathbf{e}_r, \mathbf{e}_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$	$\mathcal{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d^3}$
QMult <a href="#">(Demir et al., 2021)</a>	$\mathbf{e}_h \otimes \mathbf{e}_r \cdot \mathbf{e}_t$	$\mathbf{e}_h, \mathbf{e}_r, \mathbf{e}_t \in \mathbb{H}^d$	-
Keci <a href="#">(Demir and Ngonga Ngomo, 2023)</a>	$\mathbf{e}_h \circ \mathbf{e}_r \cdot \mathbf{e}_t$	$\mathbf{e}_h, \mathbf{e}_r, \mathbf{e}_t \in Cl_{p,q}(\mathbb{R}^d)$	-

to improve generalization performance ([Prechelt, 2002](#)). A safe strategy to find a good early stopping point is to monitor the performance on the validation dataset during training and consider the parameters leading to the lowest error rate on the validation set as the best parameter to be used at test time ([Müller, 2012](#)). Validation performances can be monitored at each epoch or according to an ad-hoc schema. Expectedly, this yields a trade-off between a good generalization performance and the training runtime.

#### 2.4. Link Predictors & Image Classifiers

In our experiments, we evaluated the performance of SWA with various neural network architectures in image classification and link prediction tasks. In this subsection, we briefly elucidate neural network architectures. Most Knowledge Graph Embedding (KGE) models are designed to learn continuous vector representations (*embeddings*) of entities and relations tailored towards link prediction/single-hop reasoning ([Dettmers et al., 2018](#)). They are often formalized as parameterized scoring functions  $\phi_\Theta : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{E} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\mathcal{E}$  denotes a set of entities, and  $\mathcal{R}$  stands for a set of relations.  $\Theta$  often consists of a  $d$ -dimensional entity embedding matrix  $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}| \times d}$  and a  $d$ -dimensional relation embedding matrix  $\mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}| \times d}$ . Table 1 provides an overview of selected KGE models. Here, we focus on KGE models based on multiplicative interactions, as recent works suggests that these multiplicative KGE models often yield state-of-the-art performance if they are optimized well ([Ruffinelli et al., 2020](#)). Moreover, these models perform well on multi-hop reasoning tasks ([Ren et al., 2023](#)).

Recent results show that constructing an ensemble of KGE models through prediction averaging improves the link prediction performance across datasets and KGE models ([Demir et al., 2021](#); [Xu et al., 2021](#)). Yet, as  $|\mathcal{E}| + |\mathcal{R}|$  grows, leveraging the prediction average technique becomes computationally prohibitive as it increases the memory requirement  $K$  times, where  $K$  denotes the number of models forming ensembles. To the best of our knowledge, constructing a parameter ensemble in the context of knowledge graph embeddings has not yet been studied. Hence, we perform parameter ensemble of knowledge graph embeddings which, to the best of our knowledge, not yet been studied.

We evaluate the performance of ASWA with well-known neural network image classifiers, including VGG ([Simonyan and Zisserman, 2014](#)) and ResNet ([He et al., 2016](#)). Briefly, VGG consists of convolutional layers followed by max-pooling layers and topped with fully connected layers. The key characteristic of VGG is its deep architecture, with configurations ranging from VGG11 (11 layers) to VGG19. ResNet addresses the vanishing gradient

problem associated with training very deep neural networks by introducing skip connections or shortcut connections. These connections allow the network to learn residual mappings, making it easier to optimize deeper architectures. ResNet is characterized by its residual blocks, where the input to a block is added to the output of the block before applying the activation function. ResNet architectures come in various depths, with deeper models achieving better performance on image classification and other computer vision tasks. In this work, we consider the ResNet model with 164 layers.

### 3. Adaptive Stochastic Weight Averaging

Here, we introduce our approach ASWA defined as

$$\Theta_{\text{ASWA}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \odot \Theta_i, \quad (2)$$

where  $\Theta_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  stands for a parameter vector of a running model at the  $i$ -th iteration.  $\odot$  denotes the scalar vector multiplication. An ensemble coefficient  $\alpha_i \in [0, 1]$  is a scalar value denoting the weight of  $\Theta_i$  in  $\Theta_{\text{ASWA}}$ . An iteration can be chosen as an iteration over a training dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$  over a mini-batch  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ , or a single data point  $(\mathbf{x}, y) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$  at an epoch interval. Here,  $N$  denotes the number of epochs as does in SWA (Izmailov et al., 2018). Relationships between ASWA and an underlying running model, the early stopping technique, and SWA can be explicitly shown:

1.  $\Theta_{\text{ASWA}}$  corresponds to a parameter vector learned by a selected optimizer (e.g. SGD or Adam), if  $\alpha_{0:N-1} = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\alpha_N = 1$ .
2.  $\Theta_{\text{ASWA}}$  corresponds to a parameter vector learned by an early stopping technique that terminates the training process at the  $j$ -th iteration,  $\alpha_{0:j-1} = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\alpha_j = 1$  and  $\alpha_{j+1:N} = \mathbf{0}$ .
3.  $\Theta_{\text{ASWA}}$  becomes equivalent of  $\Theta_{\text{SWA}}$  starting from the first iteration, if  $\alpha = \frac{1}{N}$ .
4.  $\Theta_{\text{ASWA}}$  becomes equivalent of  $\Theta_{\text{SWA}}$  starting from the  $j$ -th iteration if  $\alpha_{0:j} = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\alpha_{j+1:N} = \frac{1}{N-j}$ .

Here, we elucidate ASWA and the impact of the start point  $j$ . Let  $\Theta_0$  denote randomly initialized  $d$  dimensional parameter vector. Then  $\Theta_1$  can be defined as the difference between  $\Theta_0$  and  $T$  consecutive parameter updates on  $\Theta_0$

$$\Theta_1 = \Theta_0 - \sum_{t=1}^T \eta_{(0,t)} \nabla_{\Theta} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}_{(0,t)}}(\Theta_{(0,t)}), \quad (3)$$

where  $T$  denotes the number of mini-batches to iterate over the training dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ .  $\nabla_{\Theta} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}_{(0,t)}}$  denotes the gradients of the loss on the bases of the random mini-batch w.r.t.  $\Theta_{(0,t)}$  at the  $t$ -th parameter update.  $\eta_{(0,t)}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}_{(0,t)}}(\Theta_{(0,t)})$  denote the learning rate and the incurred mini-batch loss for the  $t$ -th parameter update, respectively. Let  $T = N = 2$ ,  $\eta$  and  $\Theta_0$  be given. Then,  $\Theta_{\text{ASWA}}$  after the first iteration can be obtained as

$$\Theta_{\text{ASWA}}^1 = \alpha_1 \odot \Theta_1 \quad (4)$$

where  $\Theta_1 = (\Theta_0 - (\eta_{(0,1)} \nabla_{\Theta} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}_{(0,1)}} + \eta_{(0,2)} \nabla_{\Theta} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}_{(0,2)}}))$ . Therefore,  $\Theta_{\text{ASWA}}$  at  $N = 2$  can be obtained as

$$\Theta_{\text{ASWA}}^2 = (\alpha_1 \odot \Theta_1) + (\alpha_2 \odot \Theta_2), \quad (5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_2 = \Theta_0 - & (\eta_{(0,1)} \nabla_{\Theta} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}_{(0,1)}} + \eta_{(0,1)} \nabla_{\Theta} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}_{(0,2)}} \\ & + \eta_{(1,1)} \nabla_{\Theta} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}_{(1,1)}} + \eta_{(2,1)} \nabla_{\Theta} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}_{(1,2)}}) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

With  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 1/2$ , we obtained the following parameter ensemble

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\text{ASWA}}^2 = \Theta_0 - & \left( \eta_{(0,1)} \nabla_{\Theta} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}_{(0,1)}} + \eta_{(0,2)} \nabla_{\Theta} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}_{(0,2)}} + \right. \\ & \left. \frac{\eta_{(2,2)} \nabla_{\Theta} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}_{(1,1)}}}{2} + \frac{\eta_{(2,2)} \nabla_{\Theta} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}_{(2,2)}}}{2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the influence of the running model seen at  $N = 2$  is less than the running model seen at  $N = 1$ . More generally, using ASWA with equal ensemble weights  $\alpha_{0:j} = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\alpha_{j+1:N} = \frac{1}{N-j}$  can be rewritten as

$$\Theta_{\text{ASWA}} = \Theta_j - \left( \sum_{i=j+1}^N \sum_t \frac{\eta_{(i,t)} \nabla_{\Theta} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{B}_{(i,t)}}}{i} \right). \quad (7)$$

Therefore, as  $i \rightarrow N$ , the influence of the parameter updates on  $\Theta_{\text{ASWA}}$  decreases. Recall that Equation (7) corresponds to applying SWA on the  $j$ -th epoch onward. Therefore, finding a suitable  $j$  epoch to start maintaining a parameter average is important to alleviate underfitting. We argue that updating a parameter ensemble model with the parameters of an underlying running model suffering from overfitting may hinder the generalization performance. Constructing a parameter ensemble by averaging over multiple nonadjacent epoch intervals (e.g. two nonadjacent epoch intervals  $i$  to  $j$  and  $k$  to  $m$  s.t.  $m \geq k + 1 \geq j + 1 \geq i$ ) may be more advantageous than selecting a single start epoch. With these considerations, we argue that determining  $\alpha$  according to an adaptive schema governed by the generalization trajectory on the validation dataset can be more advantageous than using a prefixed schema.

### 3.1. Determining Adaptive Ensemble Weights $\alpha$

Parameter ensemble weights  $\alpha$  can be determined in a fashion akin to early stopping technique. More specifically, the trajectory of the validation losses can be tracked at end of the each epoch (Prechelt, 2002). By this, as the generalization performances degenerates, the training can be stopped. This heuristic is known as early stopping technique.

In Algorithm 1, we describe ASWA with soft ensemble updates and rejection according to the trajectories of the validation performance of a running model  $\Theta$  and a parameter ensemble model  $\Theta_{\text{ASWA}}$ . By incorporating the validation performance of the running model, hard ensemble updates can be performed, i.e., if the validation performance of a running model is greater than the validation performances of the current ensemble model and the look-head. Therefore, the hard ensemble update, restarts the process of maintaining the

running average of parameters, whereas the soft update, updates the current parameter ensemble with the running average of parameters seen after the hard update. The validation performance of  $\Theta_{\text{ASWA}}$  cannot be less than the validation performance of  $\Theta$ . Hence, a possible underfitting depending on  $N$  is mitigated with the expense of computing the validation performances. Importantly, the validation performance of  $\Theta_{\text{ASWA}}$  cannot be less than the validation performance of  $\Theta_{\text{SWA}}$  due to the rejection criterion, i.e., a parameter ensemble model is only updated if the validation performance is increased.

---

**Algorithm 1** Adaptive Stochastic Weight Averaging (ASWA)

---

**Input:** Initial model parameters  $\Theta_0$ , number of iterations  $N$ , training dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ , validation dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$

**Output:**  $\Theta_{\text{ASWA}}$

```

 $\Theta_{\text{ASWA}} \leftarrow \Theta_0$  ; // Initialize Parameter Ensemble
 $\alpha \leftarrow \mathbf{0.0}$  ; // Initialize N coefficients
 $\text{val}_{\text{ASWA}} \leftarrow -1$ 
for  $i \leftarrow 0, 1, \dots, N$  do
     $\Theta_{i+1} \leftarrow \Theta_i - \alpha \nabla \mathcal{L}(\Theta_i)$  ; // Update Running Model
     $\hat{\Theta}_{\text{ASWA}} \leftarrow \frac{\Theta_{\text{ASWA}} \odot (\sum_{j=i}^N \alpha_j) + \Theta_{i+1}}{(\sum_{j=i}^N \alpha_j) + 1}$  ; // Look-Ahead
     $\text{val}_{\hat{\Theta}_{\text{ASWA}}} \leftarrow \text{Eval}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}, \hat{\Theta}_{\text{ASWA}})$ 
    if  $\text{val}_{\hat{\Theta}_{\text{ASWA}}} > \text{val}_{\text{ASWA}}$  then
         $\Theta_{\text{ASWA}} \leftarrow \hat{\Theta}_{\text{ASWA}}$ 
         $\alpha_{i+1} \leftarrow 1.0$ 
         $\text{val}_{\text{ASWA}} \leftarrow \text{val}_{\hat{\Theta}_{\text{ASWA}}}$ 
    end
    else
        | Do not update  $\Theta_{\text{ASWA}}$  ; // Reject Update
    end
end

```

---

### 3.2. Computational Complexity

At test time, the time and memory requirements of ASWA are identical to the requirements of conventional training as well as SWA. Yet, during training, the time overhead of ASWA is linear in the size of the validation dataset. This stems from the fact that at each epoch the validation performances are computed. Since ASWA does not introduce any hyperparameter to be tuned, ASWA can be more practical if the overall training and hyperparameter optimization phases are considered.

## 4. Experimental Setup

### 4.1. Datasets

In our experiments, we used the standard benchmark datasets for image classification, link prediction, and multi-hop query answering tasks. For the image classification tasks, CIFAR

10 and CIFAR 100 datasets are used. The CIFAR-10 dataset consists of 60000 32x32 color images in 10 classes, with 6000 images per class. There are 50000 training images and 10000 test images. Similar to CIFAR-10, the CIFAR-100 dataset has 100 classes. For the link prediction and multi-hop query answering tasks, we used UMLS, KINSHIP, Countries S1, Countries S2, Countries S3, NELL-995 h25, NELL-995 h50, NELL-995 h100, FB15K-237, YAGO3-10 benchmark datasets. Overviews of the datasets and queries are provided in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively.

Table 2: An overview of datasets in terms of the number of entities  $\mathcal{E}$ , number of relations  $\mathcal{R}$ , and the number of triples in each split of the knowledge graph datasets.

Dataset	$ \mathcal{E} $	$ \mathcal{R} $	$ \mathcal{G}^{\text{Train}} $	$ \mathcal{G}^{\text{Validation}} $	$ \mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}} $
Countries-S1	271	2	1111	24	24
Countries-S2	271	2	1063	24	24
Countries-S3	271	2	985	24	24
UMLS	135	46	5,216	652	661
KINSHIP	104	25	8,544	1,068	1,074
NELL-995 h100	22,411	43	50,314	3,763	3,746
NELL-995 h75	28,085	57	59,135	4,441	4,389
NELL-995 h50	34,667	86	72,767	5,440	5,393
FB15K-237	14,541	237	272,115	17,535	20,466
YAGO3-10	123,182	37	1,079,040	5,000	5,000

## 4.2. Training and Optimization

We followed standard experimental setups in our experiments. For the link prediction and multi-hop query answering, we followed the experimental setup used in [Trouillon et al. \(2016\)](#); [Ruffinelli et al. \(2020\)](#); [Arakelyan et al. \(2021\)](#); [Demir and Ngonga Ngomo \(2023\)](#). We trained DistMult, ComplEx, and QMult KGE models with the following hyperparameter configuration: the number of epochs  $N \in \{128, 256, 300\}$ , Adam optimizer with  $\eta = 0.1$ , batch size 1024, and an embedding vector size  $d = 128$ . Note that  $d = 128$  corresponds to 128 real-valued embedding vector size, hence 64 and 32 complex- and quaternion-valued embedding vector sizes respectively. We ensure that all models have the same number of parameters while exploring various  $d$ . Throughout our experiments, we used the KvsAll training strategy. We applied the beam search combinatorial search to apply pre-trained aforementioned KGE models to answer multi-hop queries. More specifically, we compute query scores for entities via the beam search combinatorial optimization procedure, we keep the top 10 most promising variable-to-entity substitutions. We follow the exact experimental setup used in [\(Izmailov et al., 2018\)](#) to perform experiments considering the CIFAR datasets. Hyperparameters on CIFAR100 and CIFAR10 are taken from [Izmailov et al. \(2018\)](#). We used the best found hyperparameters of SWA for ASWA. By this, we aim to observe whether ASWA performs well regardless of carefully selecting the start point. For the image classification experiments, we followed the experimental setup used in [Izmailov et al. \(2018\)](#). Herein, we compare our approach ASWA to SWA, SGD and Fast Geometric Ensembling (FGE) approaches. FGE method, introduced by [Garipov et al. \(2018\)](#) leverages cyclical learning rates to aggregate models that are spatially close to each other, however,



generating diverse predictions. This approach enables the creation of ensembles without added computational overhead. SWA is inspired by FGE (as claimed by the authors), aiming to find a single model approximating an FGE ensemble while offering interpretability, convenience, and scalability. Therefore, we consider both of approaches in our evaluation.

We conducted the experiments three times and reported the mean and standard deviation performances. Note that ASWA is only trained on 95% of the training dataset and the remaining 5% is used as a proxy for the validation performance.

### 4.3. Evaluation

To evaluate the link prediction and multi-hop query answering performances, we used standard metrics filtered mean reciprocal rank (MRR) and Hit@1, Hit@3, and Hit@10. To evaluate the multi-hop query answering performances, we followed the complex query decomposition framework (Arakelyan et al., 2021; Demir et al., 2023). Therein, a complex multi-hop query is decomposed into subqueries, where the truth value of each atom is computed by a pretrained knowledge graph embedding model/neural link predictor. Given a query, a prediction is obtained by ranking candidates in descending order of their aggregated scores. For each query type, we generate 500 queries to evaluate the performance. For the image classification task, we applied the standard setup (Krizhevsky et al., 2009) and repeated SWA experiments (Izmailov et al., 2018).

Table 3: Overview of different query types. Query types are taken from Demir et al. (2023).

<b>Multihop Queries</b>	
2p	$E_? . \exists E_1 : r_1(e, E_1) \wedge r_2(E_1, E_?)$
3p	$E_? . \exists E_1 E_2. r_1(e, E_1) \wedge r_2(E_1, E_2) \wedge r_3(E_2, E_?)$
2i	$E_? . r_1(e_1, E_?) \wedge r_2(e_2, E_?)$
3i	$E_? . r_1(e_1, E_?) \wedge r_2(e_2, E_?) \wedge r_3(e_3, E_?)$
ip	$E_? . \exists E_1. r_1(e_1, E_1) \wedge r_2(e_2, E_1) \wedge r_3(E_1, E_?)$
pi	$E_? . \exists E_1. r_1(e_1, E_1) \wedge r_2(E_1, E_?) \wedge r_3(e_2, E_?)$
2u	$E_? . r_1(e_1, E_?) \vee r_2(e_2, E_?)$
up	$E_? . \exists E_1. [r_1(e_1, E_1) \vee r_2(e_2, E_1)] \wedge r_3(E_1, E_?)$

### 4.4. Implementation

We provide an open-source implementation of ASWA, including training and evaluation scripts along the experiment log files <sup>2</sup>.

## 5. Results

### 5.1. Image Classification Results

Tables 4, 5, and 6 report the image classification performance on the CIFAR-100 and CIFAR-10 benchmark dataset. By following the experimental setup of Izmailov et al. (2018), we

<sup>2</sup>. <https://github.com/dice-group/aswa>

Table 4: Average accuracy (%) of SWA, SGD, FGE, and ASWA on the CIFAR datasets. ASWA is trained only 95% of the train data with best performing hyperparameters for SWA.

	ASWA	SGD	FGE	SWA
CIFAR-100				
VGG-16BN	71.9 ± 0.06	72.55 ± 0.10	74.26 ±	<b>74.27 ± 0.25</b>
ResNet-164	<b>81.6 ± 0.10</b>	78.49 ± 0.36	79.84 ±	80.35 ± 0.16
WRN-28-10	<b>82.9 ± 0.20</b>	80.82 ± 0.23	82.27 ±	82.15 ± 0.27
CIFAR-10				
VGG-16BN	<b>94.63 ± 0.20</b>	93.25 ± 0.16	93.52 ±	93.64 ± 0.18
ResNet-164	<b>96.27 ± 0.01</b>	95.28 ± 0.10	95.45 ±	95.83 ± 0.03
WRN-28-10	96.64 ± 0.10	96.18 ± 0.11	96.36 ±	<b>96.79 ± 0.05</b>

Table 5: Average accuracy (%) of SGD, SWA, ASWA between 300 and 1000 epochs on CIFAR-10. ASWA is trained only 95% of the train data with best performing hyperparameters for SWA reported.

	300	400	500	600	700	800	900	1000
ResNet164	93.7 ± 0.4	93.4 ± 0.1	93.4 ± 0.3	93.3 ± 0.3	93.5 ± 0.2	93.6 ± 0.0	93.9 ± 0.3	93.8 ± 0.1
ResNet164-SWA	95.7 ± 0.2	95.9 ± 0.2	<b>96.0 ± 0.2</b>	<b>96.0 ± 0.1</b>	96.0 ± 0.1	96.0 ± 0.1	96.0 ± 0.1	96.0 ± 0.1
ResNet164-ASWA	<b>95.8 ± 0.1</b>	<b>95.9 ± 0.1</b>	<b>96.0 ± 0.2</b>	<b>96.1 ± 0.2</b>	<b>96.1 ± 0.1</b>	<b>96.1 ± 0.1</b>	<b>96.1 ± 0.0</b>	<b>96.3 ± 0.1</b>
VGG16	89.5 ± 0.4	89.4 ± 0.9	90.0 ± 0.3	90.2 ± 0.3	89.1 ± 1.0	90.1 ± 0.2	89.5 ± 0.3	89.8 ± 0.3
VGG16-SWA	92.5 ± 0.2	92.6 ± 0.1	92.6 ± 0.2	92.6 ± 0.3	92.4 ± 0.2	92.4 ± 0.1	92.4 ± 0.2	92.4 ± 0.2
VGG16-ASWA	<b>92.7 ± 0.2</b>	<b>92.7 ± 0.2</b>	<b>92.8 ± 0.2</b>	<b>92.8 ± 0.1</b>	<b>92.7 ± 0.2</b>	<b>92.7 ± 0.2</b>	<b>92.8 ± 0.2</b>	<b>92.8 ± 0.2</b>
VGG16BN	90.7 ± 0.6	90.5 ± 0.3	90.4 ± 1.2	90.5 ± 0.6	90.4 ± 0.8	90.8 ± 0.3	91.0 ± 0.4	90.8 ± 0.3
VGG16BN-SWA	94.2 ± 0.0	94.3 ± 0.1	94.3 ± 0.0	94.4 ± 0.1	94.4 ± 0.1	94.4 ± 0.0	94.4 ± 0.1	94.4 ± 0.1
VGG16BN-ASWA	<b>94.3 ± 0.1</b>	<b>94.5 ± 0.1</b>	<b>94.5 ± 0.1</b>	<b>94.6 ± 0.0</b>	<b>94.6 ± 0.0</b>	<b>94.7 ± 0.1</b>	<b>94.7 ± 0.1</b>	<b>94.6 ± 0.2</b>

conduct the experiments three times and report the mean and standard deviation performances. Important to know that ASWA is only trained on 95% of the training dataset and the remaining 5% is used as a proxy for the validation performance. As it can be seen in Table 4, although we used the best performing hyperparameters of SWA for ASWA, ASWA on average outperforms SGD, FGE, and SWA, 1.3%, 1.1%, and 1% accuracy respectively. Table 5 shows that the generalization performance of a running model does not degenerate from 300 to 1000 epochs where ASWA slightly improves the results over SGD and SWA. For instance, the performance of ResNet164 does not change more than 0.1%, whereas SWA and ASWA slightly improve the results.

The benefits of ASWA become less tangible over ASWA provided that hyperparameters of a running model are optimized against overfitting, e.g., learning rate scheduling

Table 6: Average accuracy of ASWA across different epochs on CIFAR-10 with train and val ratios.

	300	400	500	600	700	800	900	1000
90/10								
VGG16	92.5 ± 0.3	92.6 ± 0.2	92.7 ± 0.3	92.7 ± 0.2	92.6 ± 0.2	92.6 ± 0.2	92.6 ± 0.2	92.7 ± 0.2
VGG16BN	94.1 ± 0.2	94.3 ± 0.2	94.3 ± 0.2	94.4 ± 0.2	94.5 ± 0.2	94.5 ± 0.2	94.5 ± 0.1	94.5 ± 0.1
80/20								
VGG16	92.1 ± 0.1	92.3 ± 0.2	92.3 ± 0.2	92.3 ± 0.2	92.3 ± 0.1	92.3 ± 0.1	92.3 ± 0.0	92.2 ± 0.1
VGG16BN	93.8 ± 0.1	93.9 ± 0.1	93.8 ± 0.1	94.0 ± 0.1	94.1 ± 0.1	94.1 ± 0.1	94.1 ± 0.1	94.2 ± 0.0

and weight decay are optimized in [Izmailov et al. \(2018\)](#). Due to the space constraint, we relegated other experiments to supplement materials. To quantify the impact of training and validation ratios on the performance of the ASWA, we conducted two additional experiments. Table 6 show that VGG16BN with ASWA trained only on the 80% of the training dataset outperforms VGG16BN with SWA trained on the full training dataset.

## 5.2. Link Prediction and Multi-hop Query Answering Results

Tables 7 to 10 report the link prediction and multi-hop query answering results on benchmark datasets. Overall, experimental results suggest that SWA and ASWA consistently lead to better generalization performance in all metrics than conventional training in the link prediction and multi-hop query answering tasks. Table 7 shows that SWA and ASWA outperform the conventional training on WN18RR, FB15k-237, and YAGO30 in 48 out of 48 scores. Important to note that ASWA outperforms SWA in 37 out of 48 scores. scores Table 8 shows that ASWA outperforms SWA in out 47 of 48 scores on NELL datasets.

Table 7: Link prediction results on WN18RR, FB15K-237 and YAGO3-10.

	WN18RR				FB15K-237				YAGO3-10			
	MRR	@1	@3	@10	MRR	@1	@3	@10	MRR	@1	@3	@10
DistMult	0.345	0.336	0.351	0.361	0.097	0.060	0.099	0.166	0.148	0.102	0.165	0.235
DistMult-SWA	<b>0.359</b>	<b>0.353</b>	<b>0.361</b>	<b>0.372</b>	0.154	0.104	0.164	0.247	0.343	0.265	0.383	0.497
DistMult-ASWA	0.354	0.349	0.356	0.363	<b>0.209</b>	<b>0.151</b>	<b>0.229</b>	<b>0.321</b>	<b>0.432</b>	<b>0.360</b>	<b>0.477</b>	<b>0.562</b>
ComplEx	0.285	0.258	0.304	0.336	0.100	0.063	0.105	0.170	0.195	0.124	0.226	0.334
ComplEx-SWA	0.289	0.262	0.307	0.334	0.143	0.095	0.153	0.234	<b>0.391</b>	<b>0.310</b>	<b>0.441</b>	0.541
ComplEx-ASWA	<b>0.354</b>	<b>0.343</b>	<b>0.360</b>	<b>0.315</b>	<b>0.206</b>	<b>0.148</b>	<b>0.223</b>	<b>0.315</b>	<b>0.391</b>	0.302	0.440	<b>0.548</b>
QMult	0.114	0.091	0.122	0.153	0.105	0.077	0.110	0.153	0.168	0.118	0.179	0.263
QMult-SWA	0.112	0.091	0.121	0.152	0.096	0.076	0.099	0.122	<b>0.398</b>	<b>0.329</b>	<b>0.439</b>	<b>0.525</b>
QMult-ASWA	<b>0.152</b>	<b>0.121</b>	<b>0.164</b>	<b>0.214</b>	<b>0.251</b>	<b>0.184</b>	<b>0.273</b>	<b>0.380</b>	0.377	0.310	0.417	0.507
Keci	0.336	0.316	0.351	0.366	0.148	0.096	0.154	0.252	0.294	0.219	0.328	0.440
Keci-SWA	0.337	0.317	0.351	0.366	0.217	0.148	0.235	0.354	0.388	0.314	0.428	0.527
Keci-ASWA	<b>0.355</b>	<b>0.348</b>	<b>0.358</b>	<b>0.368</b>	<b>0.256</b>	<b>0.184</b>	<b>0.279</b>	<b>0.398</b>	<b>0.397</b>	<b>0.322</b>	<b>0.441</b>	<b>0.543</b>

Table 8: Link prediction results on the NELL-995 benchmark datasets.

	h100				h75				h50			
	MRR	@1	@3	@10	MRR	@1	@3	@10	MRR	@1	@3	@10
DistMult	0.152	0.112	0.166	0.228	0.151	0.108	0.164	0.236	0.133	0.094	0.148	0.205
DistMult-SWA	0.206	0.143	0.231	0.334	0.168	0.127	0.182	0.250	0.198	0.148	0.220	0.290
DistMult-ASWA	<b>0.233</b>	<b>0.169</b>	<b>0.260</b>	<b>0.357</b>	<b>0.228</b>	<b>0.171</b>	<b>0.249</b>	<b>0.344</b>	<b>0.245</b>	<b>0.180</b>	<b>0.273</b>	<b>0.371</b>
ComplEx	0.202	0.144	0.225	0.321	0.200	0.142	0.223	0.312	0.208	0.150	0.231	0.323
ComplEx-SWA	0.202	0.143	0.221	0.319	0.194	0.137	0.214	0.307	0.232	<b>0.174</b>	0.256	0.346
ComplEx-ASWA	<b>0.228</b>	<b>0.164</b>	<b>0.250</b>	<b>0.359</b>	<b>0.223</b>	<b>0.160</b>	<b>0.246</b>	<b>0.346</b>	<b>0.236</b>	0.171	<b>0.263</b>	<b>0.361</b>
QMult	0.155	0.100	0.173	0.261	0.168	0.115	0.184	0.275	0.174	0.119	0.193	0.283
QMult-SWA	0.158	0.105	0.177	0.262	0.169	0.114	0.187	0.282	0.191	<b>0.134</b>	0.212	0.305
QMult-ASWA	<b>0.197</b>	<b>0.135</b>	<b>0.219</b>	<b>0.321</b>	<b>0.185</b>	<b>0.126</b>	<b>0.206</b>	<b>0.296</b>	<b>0.191</b>	0.130	<b>0.213</b>	<b>0.309</b>
Keci	0.198	0.143	0.219	0.312	0.188	0.131	0.206	0.303	0.203	0.153	0.222	0.301
Keci-SWA	0.208	0.153	0.231	0.316	0.222	0.158	0.245	0.346	0.229	0.174	0.253	0.335
Keci-ASWA	<b>0.257</b>	<b>0.182</b>	<b>0.287</b>	<b>0.406</b>	<b>0.231</b>	<b>0.165</b>	<b>0.255</b>	<b>0.361</b>	<b>0.237</b>	<b>0.177</b>	<b>0.263</b>	<b>0.351</b>

Table 9 reports the multi-hop query answering results on FB15k-237. Results suggest that the benefits of using ASWA become particularly tangible in answering 2 and up multi-hop queries involving  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$ .

Table 9: Multi-hop query answering MRR results on FB15k-237.

	<b>2p</b>	<b>3p</b>	<b>3i</b>	<b>ip</b>	<b>pi</b>	<b>2u</b>	<b>up</b>
DistMult	<b>0.007</b>	<b>0.007</b>	0.044	0.003	0.097	0.020	0.006
SWA	0.003	0.002	0.106	0.004	<b>0.098</b>	0.031	<b>0.007</b>
ASWA	0.002	0.003	<b>0.175</b>	<b>0.005</b>	0.092	<b>0.055</b>	0.002
ComplEx	<b>0.009</b>	0.001	0.036	0.003	0.092	0.014	<b>0.006</b>
SWA	0.002	0.002	0.136	<b>0.005</b>	<b>0.105</b>	0.030	0.005
ASWA	0.002	<b>0.003</b>	<b>0.155</b>	<b>0.005</b>	0.100	<b>0.049</b>	0.001
QMult	0.002	0.003	0.034	0.000	0.099	0.014	0.006
SWA	0.003	0.002	0.089	0.001	0.092	0.027	<b>0.007</b>
ASWA	<b>0.004</b>	<b>0.005</b>	<b>0.183</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.117</b>	<b>0.072</b>	0.003
Keci	<b>0.009</b>	0.005	0.052	0.002	0.085	0.027	0.013
SWA	0.007	0.005	0.101	0.002	0.097	0.059	<b>0.014</b>
ASWA	0.004	0.005	<b>0.165</b>	<b>0.007</b>	<b>0.106</b>	<b>0.064</b>	0.004

After these standard link prediction experiments, we delved into details to quantify the rate of overfitting (if any). Table 10 reports the link prediction performance on the training splits of the two largest benchmark datasets.

These results indicate that (1) SWA finds more accurate solutions than the conventional training (e.g. finding model parameters with Adam optimizer) and ASWA and (2) **maintaining a running average of model parameters can hinder generalization, as an underlying running model begins to overfit**. Pertaining to (1), on YAGO3-10, SWA finds model parameters leading to higher link prediction performance on the training data in all metrics. Given that KGE models have the same number of parameters (entities and relations are represented with  $d$  number of real numbers), this superior performance of SWA over the conventional training can be explained as the mitigation of the noisy parameter updates around minima. More specifically, maintaining a running unweighted average of parameters (see Equation (7)) particularly becomes particularly useful around a minima by means of reducing the noise in the gradients of loss w.r.t. parameters that is caused by the mini-batch training.

Pertaining to (2), ASWA renders itself as an effective combination of SWA with early stopping techniques, where the former accepts all parameter updates on a parameter ensemble model based on a running model and the former rejects parameter updates on a running model in the presence of overfitting. Since the ASWA does not update a parameter ensemble model if a running model begins to overfit, it acts as a regularization on a parameter ensemble. This regularization impact leads to a better generalization in all metrics.

## 6. Discussion

Our experimental results corroborate the findings of [Izmailov et al. \(2018\)](#): Constructing a parameter ensemble model by maintaining a running average of parameters at each epoch

Table 10: Link prediction results on the training splits of the two large link prediction datasets.

	FB15K-237				YAGO3-10			
	MRR	@1	@3	@10	MRR	@1	@3	@10
DistMult	0.780	0.729	0.809	0.872	0.773	0.709	0.819	0.883
DistMult-SWA	<b>0.802</b>	<b>0.749</b>	<b>0.834</b>	<b>0.901</b>	<b>0.980</b>	<b>0.970</b>	<b>0.988</b>	<b>0.995</b>
DistMult-ASWA	0.497	0.399	0.548	0.684	0.893	0.861	0.917	0.943
ComplEx	0.771	0.725	0.794	0.858	0.987	0.980	0.995	0.997
ComplEx-SWA	<b>0.789</b>	<b>0.734</b>	<b>0.822</b>	<b>0.890</b>	<b>0.998</b>	<b>0.998</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>1.000</b>
ComplEx-ASWA	0.448	0.349	0.496	0.637	0.925	0.899	0.945	0.967
QMult	<b>0.996</b>	<b>0.993</b>	<b>0.998</b>	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
QMult-SWA	0.995	0.991	<b>0.998</b>	<b>1.000</b>	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
QMult-ASWA	0.666	0.568	0.725	0.843	0.977	0.963	0.993	0.997
Keci	0.758	0.702	0.791	0.863	0.999	0.998	1.000	1.000
Keci-SWA	<b>0.822</b>	<b>0.755</b>	<b>0.870</b>	<b>0.945</b>	<b>0.999</b>	<b>0.999</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>1.000</b>
Keci-ASWA	0.554	0.443	0.617	0.767	0.919	0.880	0.952	0.974

interval improves the generalization performance across a wide range of datasets and models. Link prediction, multi-hop query answering, and image classification results show that SWA and ASWA find better solutions than conventional training based on ADAM and SGD optimizers. Our results also show that updating the parameter ensemble uniformly on each epoch leads to sub-optimal results as an underlying model begins to overfit. ASWA effectively rejects parameter updates if an underlying model begins to overfit. ASWA renders itself as an effective combination of SWA with early stopping, where the former accepts all updates on a parameter ensemble model, while the latter rejects updates on a running model that begins to overfit. Important, ASWA does not require an initial starting epoch to start constructing a parameter ensemble. Instead, the ASWA performs a hard update on a parameter ensemble model if a running model outperforms a current parameter ensemble model on a validation dataset. Yet, we observe that as the size of the validation dataset grows, the runtimes of ASWA also grows, while the runtime performance of SWA is not influenced by the size of the validation dataset.

## 7. Conclusion

In this work, we investigated techniques to construct a high performing ensemble model, while alleviating the overhead of training multiple models, and retaining efficient memory and inference requirements at test time. To this end, we propose an Adaptive Stochastic Weight Averaging (ASWA) technique that effectively combines the Stochastic Weight Averaging (SWA) technique with early stopping. ASWA extends SWA by building a parameter ensemble according to an adaptive schema governed by the generalization trajectory on the validation dataset. ASWA constructs a parameter ensemble model via its soft, hard, and reject updates. Our extensive experiments over 11 benchmark datasets ranging from image classification to multi-hop query answering with 7 baselines indicate that ASWA consistently improves generalization performances of baselines. ASWA more effectively alleviates overfitting than SWA across tasks.

## References

- Erik Arakelyan, Daniel Daza, Pasquale Minervini, and Michael Cochez. Complex query answering with neural link predictors. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Mos9F9kDwkz>.
- Ivana Balazević, Carl Allen, and Timothy M Hospedales. Tucker: Tensor factorization for knowledge graph completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.09590*, 2019.
- Pierre Baldi and Peter J Sadowski. Understanding dropout. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 26, 2013.
- Christopher M Bishop and Nasser M Nasrabadi. *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, volume 4. Springer, 2006.
- Leo Breiman. Bagging predictors. *Machine learning*, 24:123–140, 1996.
- Caglar Demir and Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo. Clifford embeddings—a generalized approach for embedding in normed algebras. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 567–582. Springer, 2023.
- Caglar Demir, Diego Moussallem, Stefan Heindorf, and Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo. Convolutional hypercomplex embeddings for link prediction. In Vineeth N. Balasubramanian and Ivor Tsang, editors, *Proceedings of The 13th Asian Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 157 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 656–671. PMLR, 17–19 Nov 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v157/demir21a.html>.
- Caglar Demir, Michel Wiebesiek, Renzhong Lu, Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo, and Stefan Heindorf. Litcqd: Multi-hop reasoning in incomplete knowledge graphs with numeric literals. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 617–633. Springer, 2023.
- Tim Dettmers, Pasquale Minervini, Pontus Stenetorp, and Sebastian Riedel. Convolutional 2d knowledge graph embeddings. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- Thomas G Dietterich. Ensemble methods in machine learning. In *International workshop on multiple classifier systems*, pages 1–15. Springer, 2000.
- Felix Draxler, Kambis Veschgini, Manfred Salmhofer, and Fred Hamprecht. Essentially no barriers in neural network energy landscape. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1309–1318. PMLR, 2018.
- Yarin Gal and Zoubin Ghahramani. Dropout as a bayesian approximation: Representing model uncertainty in deep learning. In *international conference on machine learning*, pages 1050–1059. PMLR, 2016.
- Timur Garipov, Pavel Izmailov, Dmitrii Podoprikin, Dmitry P Vetrov, and Andrew G Wilson. Loss surfaces, mode connectivity, and fast ensembling of dnns. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.

- Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep learning*. MIT press, 2016.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- Geoffrey E Hinton, Nitish Srivastava, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan R Salakhutdinov. Improving neural networks by preventing co-adaptation of feature detectors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1207.0580*, 2012.
- Pavel Izmailov, Dmitrii Podoprikin, Timur Garipov, Dmitry Vetrov, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. Averaging weights leads to wider optima and better generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05407*, 2018.
- Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.
- Shiwei Liu, Tianlong Chen, Zahra Atashgahi, Xiaohan Chen, Ghada Sokar, Elena Mocanu, Mykola Pechenizkiy, Zhangyang Wang, and Decebal Constantin Mocanu. Deep ensembling with no overhead for either training or testing: The all-round blessings of dynamic sparsity. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=RLtqs6pzj1->.
- Klaus-Robert Müller. Regularization techniques to improve generalization. *Neural Networks: Tricks of the Trade: Second Edition*, pages 49–51, 2012.
- Kevin P Murphy. *Machine learning: a probabilistic perspective*. MIT press, 2012.
- Maximilian Nickel, Volker Tresp, and Hans-Peter Kriegel. A three-way model for collective learning on multi-relational data. In *Icml*, 2011.
- Boris T Polyak and Anatoli B Juditsky. Acceleration of stochastic approximation by averaging. *SIAM journal on control and optimization*, 30(4):838–855, 1992.
- Lutz Prechelt. Early stopping-but when? In *Neural Networks: Tricks of the trade*, pages 55–69. Springer, 2002.
- Hongyu Ren, Mikhail Galkin, Michael Cochez, Zhaocheng Zhu, and Jure Leskovec. Neural graph reasoning: Complex logical query answering meets graph databases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14617*, 2023.
- Daniel Ruffinelli, Samuel Broscheit, and Rainer Gemulla. You can teach an old dog new tricks! on training knowledge graph embeddings. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=BkxSmlBFvr>.
- Omer Sagi and Lior Rokach. Ensemble learning: A survey. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 8(4):e1249, 2018.
- Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.

- Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *The journal of machine learning research*, 15(1):1929–1958, 2014.
- Théo Trouillon, Johannes Welbl, Sebastian Riedel, Éric Gaussier, and Guillaume Bouchard. Complex embeddings for simple link prediction. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2071–2080. PMLR, 2016.
- David Warde-Farley, Ian J Goodfellow, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. An empirical analysis of dropout in piecewise linear networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6197*, 2013.
- Jingjing Xie, Bing Xu, and Zhang Chuang. Horizontal and vertical ensemble with deep representation for classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.2759*, 2013.
- Chengjin Xu, Mojtaba Nayyeri, Sahar Vahdati, and Jens Lehmann. Multiple run ensemble learning with low-dimensional knowledge graph embeddings. In *2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2021.
- Bishan Yang, Wen-tau Yih, Xiaodong He, Jianfeng Gao, and Li Deng. Embedding entities and relations for learning and inference in knowledge bases. In *ICLR*, 2015.