LEARNING ARBITRARY LOGICAL FORMULA AS A SPARSE NEURAL NETWORK MODULE

Anonymous authors

Paper under double-blind review

ABSTRACT

NeSy (Neuro-Symbolic) predictors are hybrid models composed of symbolic predictive models chained after neural networks. Most existing NeSy predictors require either given symbolic knowledge or iterative training. DSL (Deep Symbolic Learning) is the first NeSy predictor that supports fully end-to-end training from scratch, but it learns a look-up table rather than arbitrary programs or formulas. We propose the Logical Formula Learner framework, a general framework of network modules that explicitly equate a logical formula after convergence. We then propose 3 novel designs within the LFL framework with different levels of combinatorial search freedom: LFL-Type1 learns arbitrary logical formula, LFL-Type2 learns a look-up table, and LFL-Type2 show improvements over previous designs, and all three types can be wrapped into NeSy predictors. To our knowledge, LFL-Type1-based NeSy predictor is the first NeSy predictor that supports fully end-to-end training from scratch and explicitly learns arbitrary logical formulas.

024 025 026

027

004

010 011

012

013

014

015

016

017

018

019

021

1 INTRODUCTION

In a special lecture of NIPS 2019, Yoshua Bengio suggested that studies in deep learning should
expand from System 1 to System 2 (Bengio, 2019), where System 1 means the intuitive, black-box
parts and System 2 means the symbolic, white-box parts of either human or artificial intelligence.
Works in multiple research directions can be seen as attempting to approach System 2 intelligence,
such as those combining deep learning with Symbolic Regression (SR) (Makke & Chawla, 2024) or
Inductive Logic Programming (ILP) (Zhang et al., 2023) methods, while the term Neuro-Symbolic
(NeSy) refers to the general research field of combining neural systems and symbolic reasoning
(Marra et al., 2024).

A subset of NeSy methods is NeSy predictors defined in Marconato et al. (2024), members of which present hybrid models composed of symbolic predictive models chained after neural net-037 works. Some NeSy predictors combine neural networks with a given symbolic program or knowledge base so that the neural network can be trained by symbolic constraints (Manhaeve et al., 2018; Huang et al., 2021; Badreddine et al., 2022; Winters et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2023). Some other 040 NeSy predictors attempt to learn the symbolic predictor jointly with the neural networks, most of 041 them requiring iteratively training the symbolic predictor and the neural networks while fixing the 042 other (Duan et al., 2022; Cunnington et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2023); some of them also require 043 pre-training the neural networks beforehand. Then DSL (Deep Symbolic Learning) (Daniele et al., 044 2022) presents a fully differentiable NeSy predictor that allows for end-to-end training of a differentiable logic module chained after neural networks, both from scratch. The major limitation of DSL 046 is that its differentiable logic module equates a look-up table that maps each of the input concepts' 047 cartesian product to one of the possible output symbols, while many other NeSy predictors learn arbitrary logical circuits or programs. 048

The idea of designing a differentiable module that becomes equivalent to a symbolic expression is also seen in a line of research starting from EQL (Equation Learner) (Martius & Lampert, 2016), a differentiable module designed for SR. An EQL network is a neural network module that equates an arithmetic formula after convergence, archived by introducing diverse activation functions and

⁰⁵³

¹Code available at: https://anonymous.4open.science/r/logical-formula-learner-693B

075

076

077 078 079

081 082

084 085

087 088



Figure 1: An intuitive illustration of how an EQL or LFL converges into symbolic expressions. In all network architecture figures of this paper, red-colored objects represent input values, yellow ones represent output values, orange ones represent intermediate values, green ones represent trainable modules or neurons, and blue ones represent transformations that contain no trainable parameters.

	DSL		dNL	
	LFL-Type2	LFL-Type3	LFL-Type1	
				\longrightarrow
less freedom	frozen AND layer + OR layer with softmax membership	frozen AND layer + OR layer with sigmoid membership	all neurons use sigmoid membership	more freedom

Figure 2: Comparison of LFL variations in terms of freedom of their combinatorial search spaces.

sparsity constraints into an MLP network. Another method with a similar philosophy is dNL (differentiable Neural Logic Network) (Payani & Fekri, 2019a). A dNL network is composed of logical neurons designed with Product t-norm that express AND or OR relationships and thus can be equivalent to any arbitrary logical formula, experimented mainly on ILP tasks.

Inspired by them, in this work we propose a general framework of differentiable modules that equate
 logical formulas after convergence, named Logical Formula Learner (LFL). An LFL network uses
 customized neurons that relax binary logic symbols with fuzzy logic operations and converges into a
 sparse network equating a relatively simple logical formula. Figure 1 shows an intuitive comparison
 between EQL and LFL.

099 Both DSL and dNL fit into the LFL framework. Apart from them, we propose three novel designs 100 within the LFL framework with different levels of combinatorial search freedom (Figure 2): LFL-101 Type1 learns arbitrary logical formulas like dNL, LFL-Type2 learns a look-up table like DSL, and 102 LFL-Type3 has combinatorial search freedom between them. LFL-Type1 works a little better than 103 dNL on learning logical formulas from binary data when the number of hidden neurons is limited. 104 LFL-Type2 and LFL-Type3 work as well as DSL's logic module in NeSy predictors with better 105 consistency between training and inference behaviours. Although directly using LFL-Type1 in NeSy predictors makes the network struggle to converge, we tackle this problem by adding an MLP as 106 gradient shortcut. This, to our knowledge, results in the first NeSy predictor that satisfies: (1) Being 107 end-to-end differentiable; (2) Training all modules from scratch and achieving joint convergence in a single run; (3) Explicitly learning arbitrary logical formula (within limited complexity) with its symbolic module.

111 112

2 THE LOGICAL FORMULA LEARNER FRAMEWORK

113 114 2.1 Relaxing binary logical neurons into fuzzy, differentiable ones

It is straightforward to define binary neurons that describe the logical AND, OR or NOT relation ships:

118 119

120 121 122

123

128

136

 $f_{binary_AND}(\boldsymbol{x}^n) = \bigwedge_{i} \left(\overline{m_i} \lor x_i \right) \tag{1}$

$$f_{binary_OR}(\boldsymbol{x}^n) = \bigvee_i (m_i \wedge x_i)$$
⁽²⁾

$$f_{binary_NOT}(x) = \overline{x} \tag{3}$$

where f means the neuron's output, $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$ means the neuron's *i*th input, and $m_i \in \{0, 1\}$ means the "membership" of the input which decides whether the input is a member of the AND/OR operation. The NOT operation applies on a single input.

To make our logical neurons differentiable and trainable, we need to replace the binary logical operations with fuzzy ones and the binary memberships with continuous values in range [0, 1]:

$$f_{AND}(\boldsymbol{x}^{n}) = \bigotimes_{i} \left(\left(1 - g\left(w_{i} \right) \right) \oplus x_{i} \right) = \bigotimes_{i} \left(1 - g\left(w_{i} \right) \otimes \left(1 - x_{i} \right) \right)$$
(4)

$$f_{OR}(\boldsymbol{x}^n) = \bigoplus_i \left(g\left(w_i\right) \otimes x_i \right) = 1 - \bigotimes_i \left(1 - g\left(w_i\right) \otimes x_i \right)$$
(5)

$$f_{NOT}(x) = 1 - x$$

(6)

137 where f means the neuron's output, $x_i \in [0, 1]$ means the neuron's ith input, \otimes and \bigotimes mean cho-138 sen differentiable fuzzy t-norm operations, \oplus and \bigoplus mean chosen differentiable fuzzy t-conorm operations, w_i means the control parameters for the membership value, and q means a chosen dif-139 ferentiable function that maps w_i into [0,1]. An LFL network can be constructed by arbitrarily 140 combining these differentiable neurons. The selected g may produce soft, stochastic membership 141 values during training. During inference, we set the memberships to binary, deterministic values in 142 $\{0,1\}$ according to the trained parameters w_i so that the LFL module strictly equates a fuzzy logical 143 formula. 144

2.2 How existing methods fit into the LFL framework

2.2.1 DIFFERENTIABLE NEURAL LOGIC NETWORK (DNL)

The logical neurons proposed in dNL can be obtained by substituting Product t-norm and the corresponding t-conorm as chosen fuzzy logic operations and the sigmoid function σ as g into equations 4 and 5²:

152 153

154

145

146 147

148

$$f_{dNL-AND}(\boldsymbol{x}^{n}) = \prod_{i} \left(1 - \sigma\left(w_{i}\right)\left(1 - x_{i}\right)\right)$$
(7)

$$f_{dNL-OR}(\boldsymbol{x}^n) = 1 - \prod_i \left(1 - \sigma\left(w_i\right) x_i\right) \tag{8}$$

156 157

A dNL network can thus be constructed by arbitrarily combining the AND/OR neurons defined above and the NOT neurons defined in 6.

²The original design in dNL multiplies w_i with a hyperparameter c, i.e. $g(w_i) = \sigma(cw_i)$. The hyperparameter c seems redundant since scaling the trainable control parameters is equivalent to scaling the learning rate.

162 2.2.2 DEEP SYMBOLIC LEARNING (DSL)

As a fully differentiable NeSy predictor, a DSL network consists of black-box neural classifiers that map high-dimensional input to symbolic representations and a differentiable logic module that equates a look-up table after convergence, indicating that the logic module should also fit into the LFL framework. In this subsection, we describe an LFL module that is equivalent to the original definition of DSL's logic module.

Say there are multiple neural classifiers with their number of classes denoted as $\{n_1, n_2, n_3, ...\}$ and the *j*th unnormalized prediction of the *i*th classifier as $N_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$. Each classifier's predictions are sparsified by ϵ -greedy policy:

172 173

174 175

183

185 186

187

 $x_{k} = \begin{cases} \text{softmax}_{j} (N_{ij}), & \text{if } j \text{ is the chosen symbol of classifier } i \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ (9)

where $k \in [1, \sum_{i} n_{i}]$, softmax_j means applying softmax on the j dimension, and $x_{k} \in (0, 1)$ is the LFL module's kth input. For each classifier, its predicted class is chosen with probability $1 - \epsilon_{1}$, and a random class is chosen with probability ϵ_{1} .

The LFL module uses Gödel t-norm and t-conorm. Its first layer consists of AND neurons with memberships frozen such that each AND neuron represents a member of the cartesian product of the module's input concepts:

$$h_l = \min_k \left(1 - \min\left(m_{kl}, 1 - x_k \right) \right) \tag{10}$$

 $m_{kl} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the } k\text{th symbol is a member of the } l\text{th cartesian product of all class symbols} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ (11)

where $l \in [1, \prod_i n_i]$, m_{kl} is the *l*th AND neuron's *k*th membership value, and h_l is the neuron's output.

191 The second layer consists of OR neurons with trainable memberships generated with softmax and 192 ϵ -greedy policy, producing the final class prediction from n_p classes:

$$y_p = \max_l \left(\min\left(m_{lp}, h_l\right) \right) \tag{12}$$

$$m_{lp} = \begin{cases} \operatorname{softmax}_{p} (w_{lp}), & \text{if } p \text{ is the chosen symbol of input } l \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
(13)

197 198

196

193 194 195

where $p \in [1, n_p]$, m_{lp} is the *p*th OR neuron's *l*th membership value, w_{lp} is the trainable control parameter for m_{lp} , softmax_p means applying softmax on the *p* dimension, and y_p is the neuron's output. For each input h_l , its maximal m_{lp} is chosen with probability $1 - \epsilon_2$, and a random one of the memberships is chosen with probability ϵ_2 .

During each individual input sample's forward pass, the above design assures that only one value in x, h or y is non-zero, so that the original definition of DSL could focus only on the non-zero values. The non-zero value of y then defines the network's predicted class and truth value. Furthermore, the module can predict multiple class labels by concatenating outputs of multiple OR layers defined above.

209 2.3 OUR NEW DESIGNS

210 211

One difference between dNL and DSL is that the latter uses noisy input symbols and memberships
with Gödel t-(co)norm, which may allow the network to explore more of the possible combinatorial
search space. We also notice that the Concrete distribution (Maddison et al., 2016) provides an
elegant way of adding noise to soft symbolic values. So in this subsection, we introduce three
novel designs within the LFL framework, all of which utilize Gödel t-(co)norm and the Concrete
distribution.

216 2.3.1 LFL-Type1: LEARNING ARBITRARY LOGICAL FORMULA LIKE DNL, BUT WITH 217 GÖDEL T-(CO)NORM AND NOISY WEIGHTS 218

Substituting Gödel t-(co)norm as chosen fuzzy operations and the Binary Concrete distribution as ginto 4 and 5, we get:

$$f_{LFL-AND}(\boldsymbol{x}^{n}) = \min_{i} \left(1 - \min \left(\sigma \left(w_{i} + \eta \left(\log(u_{i}) - \log(1 - u_{i}) \right) \right), 1 - x_{i} \right) \right)$$
(14)

$$f_{LFL_OR}(\boldsymbol{x}^n) = \max_{i} \left(\min\left(\sigma\left(w_i + \eta\left(\log(u_i) - \log(1 - u_i)\right)\right), x_i\right) \right)$$
(15)

where u_i is sampled independently from uniform distribution in (0,1) and η is a hyperparameter controlling the noise scale³. An LFL-Type1 network can thus be constructed by arbitrarily combining them and the NOT neurons 6.

2.3.2 LFL-TYPE2: LEARNING A LOOK-UP TABLE LIKE DSL, BUT WITH DENSE, NOISY SYMBOLS AND WEIGHTS

DSL used ϵ -greedy policy to produce sparse, noisy symbolic input and predictions in 9 and 13. In LFL-Type2 we replace them with dense, noisy values generated by the Concrete distribution:

235 236

219

220 221 222

224 225 226

227

228

229 230

231

232

233

234

237

238

243

244

245

246

247

248

250

$$x_k = \operatorname{softmax}_j \left(N_{ij} - \eta_0 \log\left(-\log\left(u_k\right)\right) \right)$$
(16)

$$m_{lp} = \operatorname{softmax}_p \left(w_{lp} - \eta_1 \log \left(-\log \left(u_{lp} \right) \right) \right)$$
(17)

239 where u_k and u_{lp} are sampled independently from uniform distribution in (0,1), η_0 and η_1 are 240 hyperparameters controlling the noise scales. 16 is also used when wrapping LFL-Type1 or LFL-241 Type3 into NeSy predictors. 242

2.3.3 LFL-Type3: Using frozen AND layer like DSL, but with independent WEIGHTS FOR THE OR LAYER

In LFL-Type1 all memberships are independently trained, while LFL-Type2 consists of a frozen, predefined layer of AND neurons and a layer of OR neurons where memberships correlate through softmax. Then it's natural to experiment with a third design, in which LFL-Type2's OR layer 17 is replaced by a layer of LFL-Type1's OR neurons where all memberships are freely trainable: 249

$$m_{lp} = \sigma \left(w_{lp} + \eta_1 \left(\log(u_{lp}) - \log(1 - u_{lp}) \right) \right)$$
(18)

251 253

254

255

256

2.4 NETWORK ARCHITECTURE FOR LFL-BASED DIFFERENTIABLE NESY PREDICTORS

In this subsection, we describe the network architectures that wrap LFL modules into NeSy predictors for direct or recurrent NeSy tasks defined in DSL, such as MNIST Sum and MNIST Multi-digit Sum. How these architectures are applied to the MNIST Arithmetic tasks is shown in Figure 3.

257 258 259

2.4.1 DSL'S VANILLA ARCHITECTURE

260 In DSL, the differentiable logic module is chained after CNN classifiers so that the whole network 261 works as a NeSy predictor. In this work, we add linear reconstruction models that allow us to 262 visualize the symbols learned by CNN classifiers, with stop gradient operations so that they don't 263 affect other network components during training, as shown in Figure 3(a). 264

For recurrent NeSy tasks, recurrent values (such as c) are passed forward through the recurrent 265 blocks, as shown in Figure 3(c). 266

²⁶⁷ ³The original paper (Maddison et al., 2016) wrote the Binary Concrete distribution in a slightly different 268 form, where $\log \alpha$ replaced the control parameter w_i and a "temperature" parameter λ that divides both the noise and the control parameter replaced η . The same difference applies to the softmax-like Concrete distribu-269 tion used in section 2.3.2.



predictions, fuzzher means softmax-like transformation such as 9 or 16, x and y mean the LFL module's input and output symbols, c means the carry symbols in MNIST Multi-digit Sum, "stop gradient" means detaching the tensor to block gradient backpropagation, "random choice" means randomly choosing one of the input tensors as output for each sample, and each red square contains a recurrent block for MNIST Multi-digit Sum. Parameters are shared among CNNs or linear reconstruction layers. Similar to the membership values in LFL, the fuzzifier layers also output binary, deterministic symbols during inference.

324 2.4.2 OUR NEW TRICK: ADDING AN MLP AS GRADIENT SHORTCUT 325

326 In our early experiments, we found that using freely trainable LFL variations like dNL or LFL-Type1 in the vanilla architecture results in a network that struggles to converge. A similar convergence 327 problem has been encountered in training deep CNNs, where it was resolved by adding "shortcut" 328 connections that allow gradients to back-propagate through (He et al., 2016). Inspired by this, we add an MLP that shares the same input and output with the LFL module so that gradients can 330 back-propagate through the MLP, allowing the whole network to converge into an optimal or sub-331 optimal solution, as shown in Figure 3(b). The MLP uses sigmoid activation in its output layer for 332 consistency. 333

For recurrent NeSy tasks, the LFL and MLP predict two different versions of the recurrent values 334 c, as shown in Figure 3(d). During training, each of them is randomly selected at sample level with 335 probability 0.5 for the next recurrence; during inference, the LFL's prediction is used for the next 336 recurrence.

- 337 338
- 339

2.5 Loss functions and regularizations

340 For all network architectures described above, the LFL's supervision loss \mathcal{L}_{sup} is measured by the 341 binary cross-entropy loss. For DSL, the loss applies only on its non-zero prediction values. 342

Another loss term is an L2 reconstruction loss \mathcal{L}_{rec} that trains the linear reconstruction layer. The 343 stop gradient operation stops the reconstruction loss from affecting other modules. 344

345 Similar to EQL, we need sparsity constraints to make the LFL modules learn logical formulas in their relatively simple forms. In DSL and LFL-Type2 all trainable memberships are generated with 346 softmax-like transformations 13 17 so that they are always sparse. For memberships generated with 347 sigmoid-like transformations 7 8 14 15 18, we apply a sparsity constraint loss: 348

$$\mathcal{L}_{reg} = \sum_{k} \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{ij} \sigma(w_{ijk}) \tag{19}$$

350 351 352

353 354

349

where $\sigma(w_{ijk})$ is the median membership of the *i*th input of the *j*th neuron of the *k*th layer with sigmoid-like memberships, and n_k means the number of such memberships in the kth layer.

355 For network architectures with the MLP gradient shortcut, another binary cross-entropy loss \mathcal{L}_{MLP} 356 applies on the MLP's prediction. In these networks we also constraint the distribution of LFLs' 357 input symbol x such that the average of x in each batch is close to even distribution over each neural classifier's predicted labels:

359 360

361 362

367 368 369

374

375

$$\mathcal{L}_{label} = \sum_{i} \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j} \text{BCE}(\frac{1}{n_i}, \frac{1}{b} \sum_{k} x_{ijk})$$
(20)

363 where BCE means the binary cross-entropy loss, x_{ijk} means the normalized LFL input correspond-364 ing to the *j*th class predicted by the *i*th classifier from the *k*th sample in a batch, b means the batch 365 size, and n_i means classifier *i*'s number of predicted classes. 366

So the overall loss function used in our experiments is

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{sup} + \mathcal{L}_{rec} + \beta_1 \mathcal{L}_{reg} + \beta_2 \mathcal{L}_{MLP} + \beta_3 \mathcal{L}_{label}$$
(21)

370 for the network architectures with MLP gradient shortcut. Only \mathcal{L}_{sup} , \mathcal{L}_{rec} and \mathcal{L}_{reg} are used for 371 those without the MLP gradient shortcut, and only \mathcal{L}_{sup} and \mathcal{L}_{rec} are used for those with DSL or 372 LFL-Type2. β_1 , β_2 and β_3 are hyperparameters adjusting the loss terms' weights. 373

EXPERIMENTS 3

376 In previous works, dNL has been experimented on ILP tasks that require learning logical formu-377 las from binary training data, and DSL has been experimented on MNIST Arithmetic tasks. We



Table 1: Results of MNIST Arithmetic experiments. **MLP** means whether MLP gradient shortcut is used, \mathcal{L}_{label} means whether \mathcal{L}_{label} is used, **Correct formula** means whether the LFL learns a correct formula. For MNIST Multi-digit Sum two accuracies are evaluated on test datasets with $n_{digit} = 3$ and $n_{digit} = 128$.

	MLP	\mathcal{L}_{label}	Task	Accuracy(%)	Correct formula
DSL	X	Х	Sum	97.8	\checkmark
LFL-Type2	X	Х	Sum	98.1	\checkmark
I EL Type?	X	Х	Sum	98.1	\checkmark
LI ⁻ L-Type3	X	×	Multi-digit Sum	97.7/96.9	\checkmark
	\checkmark	\checkmark	Sum	98.3	\checkmark
	X	\checkmark	Sum	16.3	×
IEI Tunal	\checkmark	×	Sum	65.8	X
LFL-Type1	\checkmark	\checkmark	Multi-digit Sum	98.5/98.1	\checkmark
	X	\checkmark	Multi-digit Sum	20.2/10.3	×
	\checkmark	×	Multi-digit Sum	81.8/75.0	×

evaluate and compare LFL variations on these task types. Test set accuracies of MNIST Arithmetic
 experiments are shown in Table 1. Note that difference in accuracies among successful MNIST
 Arithmetic experiments doesn't really matter because mistakes are caused only by CNN classifiers
 when the LFL learns a correct formula.

432 433 434 3.1 COMPARING DNL AND LFL-TYPE1 ON LEARNING LOGICAL FORMULA FROM BINARY DATA

Since dNL has been proven to work well on learning simple logical formulas with 2-layer network
architectures (Payani & Fekri, 2019a), we evaluate dNL and LFL-Type1 on two possibly harder
tasks: learning a 3-layer logical formula with NOT neurons and learning MNIST Sum's logical
formula with limited number of hidden neurons.

439 440

3.1.1 LEARNING A 3-LAYER LOGICAL FORMULA WITH NEGATION

The 3-layer logical formula to be learned has 8 input concepts and 2 outputs. The 8 input concepts and their negations form 16 input concepts, and the formula then requires at least 8 hidden neurons in an AND layer and 4 neurons in an OR layer to learn (Appendix B). Both dNL and LFL-Type1 learn it successfully with the architecture in Figure 4(a)

445 446

447

3.1.2 LEARNING MNIST SUM'S FORMULA WITH LIMITED NUMBER OF HIDDEN NEURONS

The MNIST Sum task requires learning a 2-layer logical formula with 20 inputs, 19 outputs, and 100
hidden concepts. Both dNL and LFL-Type1 can learn it from binary training data with 256 hidden
neurons, but LFL-Type1 maintains higher accuracies when the number of hidden neurons reduces
towards 100 (Figure 4(c)). The network architecture shown in Figure 4(b) is used for this task and
the following experiments where LFL-Type1 is used in NeSy predictors.

453

3.2 COMPARING DSL AND LFL-TYPE2 ON MNIST SUM

LFL-Type2 has the same combinatorial search freedom as DSL's logic module and converges as well as the latter on MNIST Sum. A minor limitation of DSL is that its ϵ -greedy search policy keeps producing random label choices with probability ϵ after convergence, creating a significant gap between training and inference behaviors. The limitation doesn't exist in LFL-Type2's Concrete noise distribution, as shown in Figure 4(d).

460 461

462

463

3.3 EXPERIMENTING LFL-TYPE3 AND LFL-TYPE1 ON MNIST SUM AND MULTI-DIGIT SUM

LFL-Type3 and LFL-Type1 have larger combinatorial search freedom than DSL, and we evaluate 464 them on MNIST Sum and Multi-digit Sum. LFL-Type3 converges well on MNIST Sum and Multi-465 digit Sum using DSL's vanilla network architecture, and it actually converges faster than DSL or 466 LFL-Type2 with automatically tuned hyperparameters, as shown in Figure 4(d). LFL-Type1 also 467 converges well with our new architecture that contains the MLP gradient shortcut. In MNIST Sum 468 the formula learned by LFL-Type1 is the same as that of LFL-Type3. In MNIST Multi-digit Sum 469 LFL-Type1 learns a formula different from LFL-Type3 for predicting the next carry, proving LFL-470 Type1's ability to learn more arbitrary logical formulas in NeSy predictors. See Appendix D for the 471 learned formulas.

- 472
- 473 3.4 ABLATION STUDY 474

Two additional tricks have been used in NeSy predictors with LFL-Type1: the MLP gradient shortcut
and the classification label distribution loss 20. Removing either of them results in failure of joint
convergence on MNIST-Sum and MNIST Multi-digit Sum.

478 479

480

482

- 4 RELATED WORKS
- 481

4.1 NEURO-SYMBOLIC PREDICTORS

The recent interest in NeSy predictors started with DeepProbLog (Manhaeve et al., 2018), in which
 programs written in ProbLog (De Raedt et al., 2007) are translated into differentiable arithmetic
 circuits connected with neural networks, allowing for end-to-end training. ABLSim (Huang et al., 2021) trains neural networks by minimizing the inconsistency between them and given background

knowledge. Logic Tensor Networks (Badreddine et al., 2022) encode symbolic knowledge into differentiable regularizations for training neural networks. DeepStochLog (Winters et al., 2022) extends DeepProbLog with stochastic definite clause grammars. NeurASP (Yang et al., 2023) improves pre-trained neural networks with given Answer Set Programs.

The above methods require given symbolic knowledge, while some other NeSy predictors require iterative training. DeepLogic (Duan et al., 2022) iteratively trains a non-differentiable Deep Logic Module with neural networks. NSIL (Cunnington et al., 2022) iteratively trains an ASP program with neural classifiers. NTOC (Liu et al., 2023) iteratively trains neural networks and symbolic rules, where the symbolic rules can be translated into fixed differentiable circuits. Then DSL (Daniele et al., 2022) is our most closely related work, in which a differentiable logic module that equates a look-up table and fits into the LFL framework is wrapped into a NeSy predictor.

497 498

499

4.2 DIFFFERENTIABLE MODULES FOR SYMBOLIC REGRESSION

This work takes initial inspiration from EQL (Martius & Lampert, 2016). An EQL network equates an arithmetic expression after convergence in a way similar to LFL networks, originally proposed for Symbolic Regression. EQL[÷] (Sahoo et al., 2018) and GMEQL (Chen, 2020) explore different EQL variations, while OccamNet (Dugan et al., 2020) and KAN (Liu et al., 2024) extend the idea with more network designs. EQL's differentiability allows people to connect it with CNNs for joint learning (Kim et al., 2020) and NeSy RL (Luo et al., 2024).

506 507 508

509

4.3 INTEGRAGING NEURAL NETWORKS FOR INDUCTIVE LOGIC PROGRAMMING

As another closely related method, dNL fits into the LFL framework and has been experimented
on ILP tasks (Payani & Fekri, 2019a). NLN (Payani & Fekri, 2019b) extends dNL with XOR
neurons, and Payani & Fekri (2020) uses dNL to incorporate symbolic knowledge for RL. Works
such as ∂ILP (Evans & Grefenstette, 2018), NLIL (Yang & Song, 2019), and DLM (Zimmer et al.,
2021) also integrate neural networks for ILP tasks. LNN (Riegel et al., 2020; Sen et al., 2022)
proposes customized neurons with Łukasiewicz t-(co)norm for ILP tasks, but their neuron designs
don't strictly fit into the LFL framework.

516 517 518

519 520

521

522

523

524

525

526

5 CONCLUTION AND FUTURE WORK

In this work, we present the Logical Formula Learner framework and three novel designs within it. The LFL framework summarizes previous designs into a general framework of network modules that explicitly equate a logical formula after convergence. The proposed LFL-Type1 and LFL-Type2 show improvements over previous designs, and LFL-Type3 works fine with combinatorial search freedom between the two. Furthermore, by wrapping LFL-Type1 into NeSy predictors with MLP gradient shortcut, we obtain the first end-to-end differentiable NeSy predictor that converges from scratch in one single run and explicitly learns an arbitrary logical formula.

Future directions based on this work include:

531 532

- 1. Experimenting with other possible neuron designs within the LFL framework, such as using other t-(co)norm choices or introducing annealing schedules for the noise scales.
- 2. Using logical neurons defined in this work in layers other than fully connected ones. For example, using them in convolutional layers may produce white-box CNNs with better interpretability or adversarial robustness.
- 3. Integrating LFL networks into other neural network applications, such as image or video caption, model-free RL, model-based RL, etc. Particularly, integrating LFLs into model-based RL agents may allow such agents to describe their internal representations with sound symbolic logic, opening up a new path toward reliable language generation and understanding.

540 REFERENCES

547

576

577

578

- Takuya Akiba, Shotaro Sano, Toshihiko Yanase, Takeru Ohta, and Masanori Koyama. Optuna:
 A next-generation hyperparameter optimization framework. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pp. 2623–2631, 2019.
- Samy Badreddine, Artur d'Avila Garcez, Luciano Serafini, and Michael Spranger. Logic tensor
 networks. *Artificial Intelligence*, 303:103649, 2022.
- Yoshua Bengio. From system 1 deep learning to system 2 deep learning. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- Gang Chen. Learning symbolic expressions via gumbel-max equation learner networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.06921*, 2020.
- Daniel Cunnington, Mark Law, Jorge Lobo, and Alessandra Russo. Neuro-symbolic learning of answer set programs from raw data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12735*, 2022.
- Alessandro Daniele, Tommaso Campari, Sagar Malhotra, and Luciano Serafini. Deep symbolic
 learning: Discovering symbols and rules from perceptions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.11561*, 2022.
- Luc De Raedt, Angelika Kimmig, and Hannu Toivonen. Problog: A probabilistic prolog and its application in link discovery. In *IJCAI*, volume 7, pp. 2462–2467. Hyderabad, 2007.
- Aaron Defazio and Samy Jelassi. A momentumized, adaptive, dual averaged gradient method.
 Journal of Machine Learning Research, 23(144):1–34, 2022.
- 563 Xuguang Duan, Xin Wang, Peilin Zhao, Guangyao Shen, and Wenwu Zhu. Deeplogic: Joint learning
 564 of neural perception and logical reasoning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine* 565 *Intelligence*, 45(4):4321–4334, 2022.
- Owen Dugan, Rumen Dangovski, Allan Costa, Samuel Kim, Pawan Goyal, Joseph Jacobson, and Marin Soljačić. Occamnet: A fast neural model for symbolic regression at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.10784*, 2020.
- Richard Evans and Edward Grefenstette. Learning explanatory rules from noisy data. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 61:1–64, 2018.
- 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*, pp. 770–778, 2016.
 - Yu-Xuan Huang, Wang-Zhou Dai, Le-Wen Cai, Stephen H Muggleton, and Yuan Jiang. Fast abductive learning by similarity-based consistency optimization. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 34:26574–26584, 2021.
- Samuel Kim, Peter Y Lu, Srijon Mukherjee, Michael Gilbert, Li Jing, Vladimir Čeperić, and Marin Soljačić. Integration of neural network-based symbolic regression in deep learning for scientific discovery. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 32(9):4166–4177, 2020.
- Anji Liu, Hongming Xu, Guy Van den Broeck, and Yitao Liang. Out-of-distribution generalization
 by neural-symbolic joint training. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pp. 12252–12259, 2023.
- Ziming Liu, Yixuan Wang, Sachin Vaidya, Fabian Ruehle, James Halverson, Marin Soljačić, Thomas Y Hou, and Max Tegmark. Kan: Kolmogorov-arnold networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.19756*, 2024.
- Lirui Luo, Guoxi Zhang, Hongming Xu, Yaodong Yang, Cong Fang, and Qing Li. Insight: End-to-end neuro-symbolic visual reinforcement learning with language explanations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12451*, 2024.
- ⁵⁹³ Chris J Maddison, Andriy Mnih, and Yee Whye Teh. The concrete distribution: A continuous relaxation of discrete random variables. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.00712*, 2016.

604

616

619

623

632

636

637

638 639

640

- Nour Makke and Sanjay Chawla. Interpretable scientific discovery with symbolic regression: a review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 57(1):2, 2024.
- Robin Manhaeve, Sebastijan Dumancic, Angelika Kimmig, Thomas Demeester, and Luc De Raedt.
 Deepproblog: Neural probabilistic logic programming. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Emanuele Marconato, Stefano Teso, Antonio Vergari, and Andrea Passerini. Not all neuro-symbolic
 concepts are created equal: Analysis and mitigation of reasoning shortcuts. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Giuseppe Marra, Sebastijan Dumančić, Robin Manhaeve, and Luc De Raedt. From statistical re lational to neurosymbolic artificial intelligence: A survey. *Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 104062, 2024.
- Georg Martius and Christoph H Lampert. Extrapolation and learning equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.02995*, 2016.
- Ali Payani and Faramarz Fekri. Inductive logic programming via differentiable deep neural logic networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03523*, 2019a.
- Ali Payani and Faramarz Fekri. Learning algorithms via neural logic networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.01554*, 2019b.
- Ali Payani and Faramarz Fekri. Incorporating relational background knowledge into reinforcement
 learning via differentiable inductive logic programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.10386*, 2020.
- Ryan Riegel, Alexander Gray, Francois Luus, Naweed Khan, Ndivhuwo Makondo, Ismail Yunus
 Akhalwaya, Haifeng Qian, Ronald Fagin, Francisco Barahona, Udit Sharma, et al. Logical neural
 networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.13155*, 2020.
- Subham Sahoo, Christoph Lampert, and Georg Martius. Learning equations for extrapolation and control. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 4442–4450. Pmlr, 2018.
- Prithviraj Sen, Breno WSR de Carvalho, Ryan Riegel, and Alexander Gray. Neuro-symbolic inductive logic programming with logical neural networks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 36, pp. 8212–8219, 2022.
- Shuhei Watanabe. Tree-structured parzen estimator: Understanding its algorithm components and
 their roles for better empirical performance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11127*, 2023.
- Thomas Winters, Giuseppe Marra, Robin Manhaeve, and Luc De Raedt. Deepstochlog: Neural
 stochastic logic programming. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*,
 volume 36, pp. 10090–10100, 2022.
 - Yuan Yang and Le Song. Learn to explain efficiently via neural logic inductive learning. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:1910.02481, 2019.
 - Zhun Yang, Adam Ishay, and Joohyung Lee. Neurasp: Embracing neural networks into answer set programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07700*, 2023.
- ⁶⁴²
 ⁶⁴³ Zheng Zhang, Levent Yilmaz, and Bo Liu. A critical review of inductive logic programming techniques for explainable ai. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2023.
- Matthieu Zimmer, Xuening Feng, Claire Glanois, Zhaohui Jiang, Jianyi Zhang, Paul Weng, Dong Li, Jianye Hao, and Wulong Liu. Differentiable logic machines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.11529*, 2021.

648 A IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

All experiments are implemented with Python. The neural network modules are implemented with
Pytorch, and symbolic expressions are extracted from LFL modules' trained weights with SymPy.
MadGrad optimizer (Defazio & Jelassi, 2022) is used for all trainable modules, with learning rates
independently tuned for CNN, LFL, and MLP modules. Random seed 42 is used for all experiments,
and hyperparameters are selected automatically with Optuna's (Akiba et al., 2019) implementation
of Tree-Structured Parzen Estimator (Watanabe, 2023). Pytorch's GPU version is required to run
the experiments efficiently.

B DATASET DESCRIPTION

Experiment 3.1.1 uses a binary dataset with size $2^8 = 256$. The inputs and outputs are generated with the following logical formula:

661 662 663

657 658

659

6/

666

667

664 665

where x means the dataset's input, y means its output, h_1 and h_2 mean intermediate variables that hidden neurons might learn to represent.

Experiment 3.1.2 uses a binary dataset with size $10^2 = 100$. The inputs and outputs are generated with the following logical formula:

673

$$l = [l_0, l_1, \dots, l_9]$$

 674
 $r = [r_0, r_1, \dots, r_9]$

 675
 $y = [y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{18}]$

 676
 $y_k = \bigvee_{i+j=k} (l_i \wedge r_j)$

 678
 (23)

where l and r mean input symbols representing values of the two digits, y_k means the output symbol representing that the sum is k. This is the same formula that LFL modules are expected to learn when wrapped into a NeSy predictor for MNIST Sum.

 $\begin{array}{ll} 682\\ 683\\ 683\\ 684\\ 684\\ 685\\ \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ll} MNIST Sum is a standard benchmark for testing NeSy predictors, first used in Manhaeve et al.\\ (2018). Each sample of the MNIST Sum task takes 2 handwritten digits as input and requires a model to predict their sum in [0, 18] as a 19-class classification task. For example, a sample of the dataset has input ($ **4**,**7**) and classification label 11.

686 687 688 689 689 689 680 MNIST Multi-digit Sum is an extension of MNIST Sum that requires a model to predict labels for summing two multi-digit handwritten numbers. The two numbers' length n_{digits} is a property of the dataset. The inputs and labels are provided in reverse order. For example, a sample of the dataset with $n_{digits} = 2$ has input [(9,7),(5,4)] and classification label [6,0,1] (since 59+47=106).

The MNIST Sum training dataset uses two MNIST images from its training set for each sample, so its actual size is $60000^2 = 3.6 \times 10^9$, making it impractical to actually train a full epoch. In our implementations, we take 8192 randomly generated samples as a pseudo-epoch of the dataset. To generate a sample, we first randomly choose two digits in 0 to 9, then randomly select two handwritten digit images that correspond to the chosen digits.

The MNIST Multi-digit Sum training dataset is implemented in a similar way, where 8192 randomly generated samples are treated as a pseudo-epoch.

The MNIST Sum test dataset uses MNIST test set images instead of training set images and treats 699 65536 samples as a pseudo-epoch. The MNIST Multi-digit Sum test dataset also uses MNIST 700 test set images, treating 65536 samples as a pseudo-epoch for $n_{digit} = 3$ and 8192 samples as a 701 pseudo-epoch for $n_{digit} = 128$. The accuracies in Table 1 are evaluated on one pseudo-epoch of 701 test datasets.

702 C HYPERPARAMETERS

Since the linear reconstruction layer and its reconstruction loss term don't affect other network
components, we fix their loss weight to 1 and learning rate to 0.001. For our novel LFL variations,
we describe the manually chosen hyperparameters in text and put the hyperparameters chosen by
Optuna in tables. For DSL we use default hyperparameters found in the original implementation.

709 C.1 EXPERIMENT 3.1.1 710

Both dNL and LFL-Type1 are trained for 256 epochs, with 32 and 16 neurons in their hidden layers.

dNL's Hyperparameters:

714

715 716 717

725 726

727

745 746

755

	Meaning	Value
lr	learning rate	60.74940936219056
β_1	regularization loss weight	0.13347185900881423

LFL-Type1's Hyperparameters:

	Meaning	Value
lr	learning rate	28.353628505319445
η_1	noise scale of the 1st layer	0.8044418562388825
η_2	noise scale of the 2nd layer	0.09504842110818068
η_3	noise scale of the 3rd layer	0.42150252547988554
$\dot{\beta}_1$	regularization loss weight	0.05891286543711857

C.2 EXPERIMENT 3.1.2

Both dNL and LFL-Type1 are trained for 4096 epochs in every run, allowing them to fully converge with a limited number of hidden neurons. The hyperparameters are chosen with 256 hidden neurons in each network.

dNL's Hyperparameters:

	Meaning	Value
lr	learning rate	3.721338105780261
β_1	regularization loss weight	0.5163968434483255

LFL-Type1's Hyperparameters:

	Meaning	Value
lr	learning rate	20.743324016859198
η_1	noise scale of the 1st layer	0.9772471411825822
η_2	noise scale of the 2nd layer	0.8185423593180111
$\dot{\beta}_1$	regularization loss weight	0.1485845565420301

C.3 DSL ON MNIST SUM

The network is trained for 128 pseudo-epochs.

	Meaning	Value
lr_{LFL}	the logic module's learning rate	0.11639833786002995
lr_{CNN}	the CNN's learning rate	0.001
ϵ_{symbol}	ϵ of the fuzzifier	0.2807344052335263
$\tilde{\epsilon_{rule}}$	ϵ of the OR layer	0.1077119516324264

754 C.4 LFL-Type2 on MNIST Sum

The network is trained for 128 pseudo-epochs.

C.5 LFL-T	$\frac{lr_{LFL}}{lr_{CNN}}$ $\frac{\eta_0}{\eta_1}$ $\frac{\eta_1}{\eta_1}$ Solve the strained for the strained fo	the LFL's learning rate the CNN's learning rate noise scale of the fuzzifier noise scale of the OR layer	$\begin{array}{c} 0.03233368589774149\\ 0.0013455349127554875\\ 0.21398889643701835\\ 0.9837843300240907 \end{array}$
C.5 LFL-T ⁻ The network is	lr_{CNN} η_0 η_1 YPE3 ON M	the CNN's learning rate noise scale of the fuzzifier noise scale of the OR layer	0.0013455349127554875 0.21398889643701835 0.9837843300240907
C.5 LFL-T	η_0 η_1 YPE3 ON M s trained for	Inoise scale of the fuzzifier noise scale of the OR layer	0.21398889643701835 0.9837843300240907
C.5 LFL-T	η ₁ YPE3 ON M s trained for	1NIST SUM	0.9857845500240907
C.5 LFL-T	YPE3 ON M	INIST SUM	
C.5 LFL-T [*]	YPE3 ON M	INIST SUM	
The network is	s trained for		
The network is	s trained for		
		r 128 pseudo-epochs.	
		Meaning	Value
	lr_{LFL}	the LFL's learning rate	9.613947918454464
	lr_{CNN}	the CNN's learning rate	0.0019151515603726996
	η_0	noise scale of the fuzzifier	0.9113745711049871
	η_1	noise scale of the OR layer	0.5785108825130485
	β_1	regularization loss weight	0.07854073377893649
	VDE3 ON N	ANIST MULTI DICIT SUM	
C.0 LI'L-I	IPES ON W	INIST MULTI-DIGIT SUM	
The network i	s trained fo	or up to 256 pseudo-epochs on	datasets with $n_{distance} = 1, 2, 3$ se
with early stor	pring if the	average supervision BCE loss	falls below 0.001 at any epoch
with early stop	philo in the	average supervision Dell 1055	fails below 0.001 at any epoen.
			X 7 1
	1	Meaning	
	lT_{LFL}	the CNN's learning rate	4.303908038031322
	tr_{CNN}	noise seels of the fuggifier	0.0047303401090141010
	η_0	noise scale of the OP layer	0.8052755589984255
	η_1	regularization loss weight	0.9407031818141409
	ρ_1	regularization loss weight	0.09120039331403411
	VDE1 ON M	ANIST SUM	
C./ LIL-I	IFEI ON M	111151 50M	
The network is	s trained for	r 128 pseudo-epochs, with 512	hidden neurons in the LFL-Type
	I	Mooning	Valua
	1122-	the L FL's learning rate	<u> </u>
		the CNN's learning rate	0.006208460070100641
	L'E CLEAR A	the Civity's realining rate	0.0627384382035572
	lr.com	the MI P's learning rate	0.002/3043020333/2
	$\left \frac{lr_{CNN}}{lr_{MLP}} \right $	the MLP's learning rate	0 3761108683081010
	$\begin{array}{c c} \iota r_{CNN} \\ lr_{MLP} \\ \eta_0 \\ \end{array}$	the MLP's learning rate noise scale of the fuzzifier	0.3761108683081919
	$ \begin{vmatrix} tr_{CNN} \\ lr_{MLP} \\ \eta_0 \\ \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \end{vmatrix} $	the MLP's learning rate noise scale of the fuzzifier noise scale of the AND layer	0.3761108683081919 0.9385093053957093 0.5471963095839101
	$\begin{array}{c} lr_{CNN} \\ lr_{MLP} \\ \eta_0 \\ \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \beta_c \end{array}$	the MLP's learning rate noise scale of the fuzzifier noise scale of the AND layer noise scale of the OR layer regularization loss weight	0.3761108683081919 0.9385093053957093 0.5471963095839101 0.4498676093863323
	$\begin{array}{c} lr_{CNN} \\ lr_{MLP} \\ \eta_0 \\ \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \end{array}$	the MLP's learning rate noise scale of the fuzzifier noise scale of the AND layer noise scale of the OR layer regularization loss weight MLP loss weight	0.3761108683081919 0.9385093053957093 0.5471963095839101 0.4498676093863323 21.454211508035232
	$ \begin{array}{c} \iota_{TCNN} \\ lr_{MLP} \\ \eta_0 \\ \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_c \end{array} $	the MLP's learning rate noise scale of the fuzzifier noise scale of the AND layer noise scale of the OR layer regularization loss weight MLP loss weight label distribution loss weight	0.3761108683081919 0.9385093053957093 0.5471963095839101 0.4498676093863323 21.454211508035232 3.7151918234461507
	$ \begin{array}{c} \iota r_{CNN} \\ lr_{MLP} \\ \eta_0 \\ \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \end{array} \right $	the MLP's learning rate noise scale of the fuzzifier noise scale of the AND layer noise scale of the OR layer regularization loss weight MLP loss weight label distribution loss weight	0.3761108683081919 0.9385093053957093 0.5471963095839101 0.4498676093863323 21.454211508035232 3.7151918234461507
	$\begin{array}{c} \iota_{TCNN} \\ lr_{MLP} \\ \eta_0 \\ \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \end{array}$	the MLP's learning rate noise scale of the fuzzifier noise scale of the AND layer noise scale of the OR layer regularization loss weight MLP loss weight label distribution loss weight	0.3761108683081919 0.9385093053957093 0.5471963095839101 0.4498676093863323 21.454211508035232 3.7151918234461507
C 8 I FI - T'	$\begin{array}{c} \iota r_{CNN} \\ lr_{MLP} \\ \eta_0 \\ \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \end{array}$	the MLP's learning rate noise scale of the fuzzifier noise scale of the AND layer noise scale of the OR layer regularization loss weight MLP loss weight label distribution loss weight	0.3761108683081919 0.9385093053957093 0.5471963095839101 0.4498676093863323 21.454211508035232 3.7151918234461507
C.8 LFL-T	$\begin{array}{c} lr_{CNN} \\ lr_{MLP} \\ \eta_0 \\ \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \end{array}$	the MLP's learning rate noise scale of the fuzzifier noise scale of the AND layer noise scale of the OR layer regularization loss weight MLP loss weight label distribution loss weight	0.3761108683081919 0.9385093053957093 0.5471963095839101 0.4498676093863323 21.454211508035232 3.7151918234461507
C.8 LFL-T	$\begin{array}{c} lr_{CNN} \\ lr_{MLP} \\ \eta_0 \\ \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} p_1 \\ p_2 \\ \beta_3 \end{array}$	the MLP's learning rate noise scale of the fuzzifier noise scale of the AND layer noise scale of the OR layer regularization loss weight MLP loss weight label distribution loss weight	0.3761108683081919 0.9385093053957093 0.5471963095839101 0.4498676093863323 21.454211508035232 3.7151918234461507
C.8 LFL-T The network i	$\begin{array}{c} lr_{CNN} \\ lr_{MLP} \\ \eta_0 \\ \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} P_1 \\ P_2 \\ P_3 \\ P_3 \\ P_4 \\ $	the MLP's learning rate noise scale of the fuzzifier noise scale of the AND layer noise scale of the OR layer regularization loss weight MLP loss weight label distribution loss weight INIST MULTI-DIGIT SUM	0.3761108683081919 0.9385093053957093 0.5471963095839101 0.4498676093863323 21.454211508035232 3.7151918234461507
C.8 LFL-T The network i training on n	$\frac{lr_{CNN}}{lr_{MLP}}$ $\frac{\eta_0}{\eta_1}$ $\frac{\eta_2}{\beta_1}$ $\frac{\beta_2}{\beta_3}$ $\frac{\beta_3}{\beta_3}$ $\frac{1}{\beta_2}$ $\frac{\beta_3}{\beta_3}$	the MLP's learning rate noise scale of the fuzzifier noise scale of the AND layer noise scale of the OR layer regularization loss weight MLP loss weight label distribution loss weight INIST MULTI-DIGIT SUM or up to 256 pseudo-epochs of would allow LFL-Type1 to co	0.3761108683081919 0.9385093053957093 0.5471963095839101 0.4498676093863323 21.454211508035232 3.7151918234461507 n datasets with $n_{digits} = 2,3$ see ompletely ignore input carries),

									1	vican	ung					va.	uu					
				l	\overline{r}_{LF}			the	LFI	's lea	arning	rate		11.	331	405	298	874	264			
				li	r_{CN}	$^{\prime}N$		the	CN	N's le	arning	g rate		0.00	057	148	227	640	619	7		
				l	r_{MI}	DP		the	ML	P's le	arning	g rate		0.01	243	776	194	851	930	7		
					η_0		n	oise	e sca	le of	the fu	zzifie	r	0.3	115	310	029:	581	702			
					η_1		no	ise	scale	e of th	ne AN	D lay	/er	0.8	485	090	728′	796	351			
					η_2		n	oise	scal	le of t	the OF	R laye	er	0.9	770	926	024	145	439	_		
					β_1		r	egu	lariz	ation	loss v	veigh	t	0.1.	3687	7607	266	6487	7536	5		
					β_2				ML	P loss	weigl	ht .		8.4	4732	2816	533	3241	152			
					β_3		lat	bel c	listri	but10	on loss	weig	ght	1.	2660)689	550)378	383			
D	D	EΤλ	AII	LEI) E	XPI	ERI	ME	NT	RESU	ULTS											
Here	e we	de	mc	onst	rate	wh	at th	e N	eSv	predi	ctors l	nave	learn	ed w	ith c	onfi	isio	n m	atri	ces	of tł	neir i
class	sifie	rs a	ind	log	gical	l for	mul	as 1	earn	ed by	their	LFL	mod	ules.	In	thes	e lo	gica	al fo	orm	ulas	we
sent	dig	it s	ym	bol	s wi	ith t	heir	line	ear r	econs	structi	on la	yer's	reco	nstr	ucti	on c	of co	orre	spo	ndir	ng oi
tens	ors.	Tł	ie i	reco	onsti	ruct	ed i	mag	ges a	re co	lored	in ye	llow	or c	yan,	rep	rese	entir	ng s	sym	bols	pre
from	ı tw	o ii	npu	ıt ir	nag	es.	In N	ЛŇĪ	ST 1	Multi	-digit	Sum	we a	lenot	te th	e ca	rry	syn	nbo	ls a	s C_0	for
carr	y be	ing	; Ō,	C_1	for	inp	ut ca	arry	bein	ig 1, (C'_0 for	outp	ut ca	rry b	eing	g 0 a	nd (C'_1 f	for o	outp	ut c	arry
1.																						
D 1	D	SI	. 01	NΝ	INI	ST	SUN	Л														
2.1	2	S.L	. 01				001															
Con	fusi	on	ma	tric	es o	n M	INIS	ST ti	raini	ng an	nd test	datas	set:									
										0												
				М	INIST	-Sun	ו DSL	. trai	n						Ν	1NIST	-Sun	n DS	L tes	st		
c	o - (0	0	0	0	5915	0	5	0 3	3		0 - 0	0	1	0	0	977	0	2	0	0
, ,	C		0	0 2	0 0	0 0	5915 0	0 0	5 6740	0 3	3		0 - 0 1 - 0	0	1 0	0	0 0	977 0	0 0	2 1135	0 0	0
• •	0 - 0 0	58	0 0 390	0 2 19	0 0 6	0	5915 0 2	0 0	5 6740 31	0 3	3		0 - 0	0 0 1017	1 0 6	0 0 1	0 0	977 0 2	0	2 1135 4	0 0 0	0 0 2
, , ,	0 - 0 0 1	58	0 0 390	0 2 19	0 0 6	0 0 0	5915 0 2	0 0 0	5 6740 31	0 3 0 0 1 8	3	-	0 - 0	0 0 1017	1 0 6	0 0 1	0 0 0	977 0 2	0 0 0	2 1135 4	0 0 0	0 2
label	0 - 0 0 1 m - 0	58	0 0 390 2	0 2 19 8	0 0 6 5	0 0 2	5915 0 2 2	0 0 3	5 6740 31 6 6	0 3 0 0 1 8 5102 1	3	label	0 - 0 0 - 1 0 - 3 0 - 3 0 - 0	0 0 1017 1	1 0 6 1	0 0 1 0	0 0 0 2	977 0 2 0	0 0 0 1	2 1135 4 0	0 0 0 1005	0 0 2 0
vIST label	0 - 0 11 - 0 ∼ - 1 m - 0 1 - 58) . 58) 18	0 0 <mark>390</mark> 2 0	0 2 19 8 2	0 0 6 5 0	0 0 2 0	5915 0 2 2 2	0 0 3 5	5 6740 31 6 4	0 3 0 0 1 8 5102 1 0 1	3) 3 L	VIST label	0 - 0 - - 0 ∼ - 0 m - 0 + - 97	0 0 1017 1 7 0	1 0 6 1 0	0 0 1 0 1	0 0 2 0	977 0 2 0 0	0 0 1 4	2 1135 4 0 0	0 0 0 1005 0	0 0 2 0 0
al MNIST label	0 - () 58 18	0 0 390 2 0	0 2 19 8 2 0	0 6 5 0 5	0 0 2 0 5384	5915 0 2 2 2 2 5	0 0 3 5 2	5 6740 31 6 6 14 5	0 3 0 0 1 8 5102 1 0 1 3 16	3 3 1 1 6	al MNIST label	0 - 0 1 - 0 m - 0 m - 0 97 0 - 0	0 0 1017 1 0 0	1 0 6 1 0 1	0 0 1 0 1 2	0 0 2 0 879	977 0 2 0 0 1	0 0 1 4 1	2 1135 4 0 0 0	0 0 1005 0 5	0 2 0 0 3
iginal MNIST label	0 - () 11 - () m - () m - () m - () m - ()	58 18	0 0 390 2 0 1	0 2 19 8 2 0	0 6 5 0 5	0 0 2 0 5384	5915 0 2 2 2 5 5	0 0 3 5 2	5 6740 31 6 14 5 7	0 3 0 0 1 8 5102 1 0 1 3 16	3 3 1 1 6	iginal MNIST label	0 - 0 1 - 0 m - 0 m - 0 4 - 97 1 - 0	0 0 1017 1 0 0	1 0 6 1 0 1	0 0 1 0 1 2	0 0 2 0 879	977 0 2 0 0 1	0 0 1 4 1	2 1135 4 0 0 0	0 0 1005 0 5	0 0 2 0 0 3
original MNIST label	0 - () 11 - () m - () 4 - 58 6 - () 0 - 3	18	0 890 2 0 1	0 2 19 8 2 0	0 6 5 0 5 2	0 0 2 0 5384 0	5915 0 2 2 2 5 3	0 0 3 5 2 0	5 6740 31 6 14 5 7	0 3 0 0 1 8 5102 1 0 1 3 16 0 590	3 3 4 4 6 0 3	original MNIST label	 ○ - 0 □ - 0 ∞ - 1 	0 0 1017 1 0 0 0	1 0 1 0 1	0 0 1 0 1 2 1	0 0 2 0 879 2	977 0 2 0 0 1 3	0 0 1 4 1 0	2 1135 4 0 0 0 5	0 0 1005 0 5 0	0 2 0 0 3 946
original MNIST label	0 - 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 3 4) 58 18 ;	0 0 890 2 0 1 0 0	0 2 19 8 2 0 0 0	0 6 5 0 5 2 1	0 0 2 0 5384 0 0	5915 0 2 2 2 5 3 0	0 0 3 5 2 0 8	5 6740 31 6 14 5 7 47	0 3 0 0 1 8 5102 1 0 1 3 16 0 590 0 0	3 3 1 1 6 0 3	original MNIST label	0 - 0 1 - 0 1 - 0 1 - 0 1 - 0 1 - 0 1 - 0 0 - 1 1 - 0	0 0 1017 1 0 0 0 1	1 0 1 0 1 0	0 1 0 1 2 1 0	0 0 2 0 879 2 0	977 0 2 0 1 3 0	0 0 1 4 1 0 2	2 1135 4 0 0 0 5 16	0 0 1005 0 5 0 0	0 2 0 0 3 946 0
original MNIST label	0 - 0 -1 -) 58 18	0 890 2 0 1 0 0 0	0 2 19 8 2 0 0 5205	0 6 5 0 5 2 1 5792	0 0 2 0 5384 0 0 1	5915 0 2 2 2 5 3 0 4	0 0 3 5 2 0 8 5	5 6740 31 6 14 5 7 47 37	0 3 0 0 1 8 5102 1 0 1 3 16 0 590 0 0 2 8	3 3 4 4 6 0 3	original MNIST label		0 0 1017 1 0 0 0 1 0	1 0 1 0 1 0 1009 1	0 1 0 1 2 1 0 961	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1	977 0 2 0 1 3 0 3	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4	2 1135 4 0 0 5 16 2	0 0 1005 0 5 0 0 1	0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1
original MNIST label	0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0) 58 18	0 0 390 2 0 1 0 0 0	0 2 19 8 2 0 0 0 5205 0	0 0 5 0 5 2 1 5792	0 0 2 0 5384 0 1	5915 0 2 2 5 3 0 4 5	0 0 3 5 2 0 8 5 5	5 6740 31 6 14 5 7 47 37	0 3 0 0 1 8 5102 1 0 1 3 16 0 590 0 0 2 8 0 1	3 3 4 4 6 0 3 3	original MNIST label	0 - 0 1 - 0 0	0 0 1017 1 0 0 0 1 0	1 0 6 1 0 1 0 1009 1 2	0 1 0 1 2 1 0 961	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1	977 0 2 0 0 1 3 0 3 1	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4	2 1135 4 0 0 5 16 2 6	0 0 1005 0 5 0 0 1 0	0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1
original MNIST label	$ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 $) 58 18 ; ; ;	0 0 2 0 1 0 0 0 0	0 2 19 8 2 0 0 0 5205 7	0 0 5 0 5 2 1 5792 2	0 0 2 0 5384 0 1 1	5915 0 2 2 2 2 5 3 0 4 5	0 0 3 5 2 0 8 5 5 908	5 6740 31 6 14 5 7 47 37 37 15	0 3 0 0 1 8 5102 1 0 1 3 16 0 590 0 0 2 8 0 1 		original MNIST label		0 0 1017 1 0 0 0 1 0 1	1 0 6 1 0 1 0 1009 1 2	0 0 1 0 1 2 1 0 961 0	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1 4	977 0 2 0 0 1 3 0 3 1 1	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 988	2 1135 4 0 0 0 5 16 2 6	0 0 1005 0 5 0 0 1 0	0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0
original MNIST label) 58 18 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	0 0 390 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 1	0 2 19 8 2 0 0 5205 0 7 7 2	0 0 5 0 5 2 1 5792 2 2 3 pr	0 0 2 0 5384 0 0 1 1 1 4 edicte	5915 0 2 2 2 2 5 3 3 0 4 5 4 5 5 5	0 0 3 5 2 0 8 5 5 908 6 6	5 31 31 6 4 1 4 5 7 4 7 3 7 1 5 7	0 3 0 0 1 8 5102 1 0 1 3 1 0 59 0 0 2 8 0 1 8 9		original MNIST label		0 0 1017 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1	1 0 6 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 2 2	0 1 0 1 2 1 0 961 0 3 pr	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1 4 4 4 4	977 0 2 0 0 1 3 0 3 1 1 5 sed lab	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 988 6 eel	2 11355 4 0 0 0 5 16 2 2 6 4 7	0 0 1005 0 5 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 8	0 0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0 0 9 9
original MNIST label	$ \begin{array}{c} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 &$) 58 18 3 3 4 3 4 3 4 5 8 4 5 8 5 8 5 8 5 8 5 8 5 8 5 8 5 8	0 0 890 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 2 19 8 2 0 0 0 5 205 0 7 7 2	0 0 5 0 5 2 1 5792 2 3 pr	0 0 2 0 5384 0 0 1 1 1 4 eedicte	5915 0 2 2 2 5 3 3 0 4 5 5 4 5 5 6 4 1ab	0 0 3 5 2 0 8 5 5 908 6 el	5 6740 31 6 6 14 5 7 47 37 15 7 7	0 3 0 0 1 8 5102 1 0 1 3 16 0 590 0 0 2 8 0 1 8 9		original MNIST label		0 0 1017 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1	1 0 6 1 0 1 0 1009 1 2 2	0 1 0 1 2 1 0 961 0 3 pr	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1 4 4 4 4 4	977 0 2 0 0 1 3 0 3 1 5 sed lab	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 988 6 6	2 11135 4 0 0 0 5 16 2 6 7	0 0 1005 0 0 1 0 1 0 8	0 0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0 1 0 9
original MNIST label		18 18	0 0 890 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 	0 2 19 8 2 0 0 5205 7 2 2	0 0 5 0 5 2 1 5792 2 3 pr	0 0 2 0 5384 0 0 1 1 1 4 edicte	5915 0 2 2 2 3 3 0 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	0 0 3 5 2 0 8 5 9 0 8 5 9 0 8 6 6 6	5 6740 31 - 6 6 14 5 7 47 37 15 7	0 3 0 0 1 8 102 1 0 1 3 16 0 590 0 0 2 8 0 1 8 9		original MNIST label	- 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0	0 0 1017 1 2 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1	1 0 6 1 0 1 0 1009 1 2 2	0 1 0 1 2 1 0 961 0 3 pr	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1 4 4 eedicte	977 0 2 0 0 1 3 3 0 3 3 1 5 ed lab	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 988 6 6	2 11135 4 0 0 5 16 2 6 7	0 0 1005 0 5 0 0 1 0 1 0 8	0 0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0 9 9
original MNIST label	rned	58 18 0 0 for	0 0 890 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 2 19 8 2 0 0 0 0 5 205 7 2 2	0 0 5 2 1 5792 2 3 pr	0 0 2 0 5384 0 0 1 1 1 4 eedicte	5915 0 2 2 2 2 3 3 0 4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	0 0 3 5 2 0 8 5 5 908 6 6 8	5 6740 31 - 6 6 6 14 5 7 47 37 15 7	0 3 0 0 1 8 0 1 3 10 0 590 0 0 2 8 0 1 1 1 3 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		original MNIST label	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0 0 1017 1 2 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 1	1 0 6 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 2 2	0 1 0 1 2 1 0 961 0 3 pr	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1 4 4 4 4	977 0 2 0 0 1 3 0 3 3 1 1 5 5 ed lab	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 988 6 6	2 1135 4 0 0 5 16 2 6 7	0 0 1005 0 5 0 0 1 0 1 0 8	0 0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0 0 1 0 9
Lean $y_0 =$	rrred = 0 - 100	18 18 5 5 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	0 0 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 2 19 8 2 0 0 5205 7 2 2 1 1 a:	0 0 5 0 2 1 5792 2 5792 2 5792	0 0 2 0 5384 0 0 1 1 1 4 edicte	5915 0 2 2 2 3 3 0 4 5 5 5 5 5	0 0 3 5 2 0 8 5 9 0 8 5 9 0 8 5 9 0 8 5 9 0 8 5 9 0 8 5 9 0 8 5 9 0 8 8 5 9 9 9 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	5 6740 31 41 5 7 47 47 37 15 7	0 3 0 0 1 8 0 2 1 8 0 1 1 3 1 1 0 1 3 10 0 0 0 0 2 8 0 1 8 9 0 1 8 9 0 1 1 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		original MNIST label	- 0 - 0 - 1 - 0 - 0	0 0 1017 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1	1 0 6 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 2 2	0 1 0 1 2 0 961 0 3 pr	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1 4 4 4 edicte	977 0 2 0 0 1 3 3 0 3 1 1 5 sed lab	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 988 6 6	2 1135 4 0 0 5 16 2 6 7	0 0 1005 0 0 1 0 1 0 8	0 0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0 1 0 9
Lean $y_0 = y_1 =$	rned = ((()))	58 118 for	0 0 890 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 2 19 8 2 0 0 5205 0 7 2 2 11a:	0 6 5 0 5 2 1 5792 2 3 pr	0 0 2 0 5384 0 0 1 1 1 4 edicte	5915 0 2 2 2 2 3 3 0 4 5 5 ed lab	0 0 3 5 2 0 8 5 9 0 8 5 9 0 8 5 9 0 8 5 6 6 6	5 6740 31 40 6 4 7 7 47 37 15 7 7	0 3 0 0 1 8 5002 1 1 3 10 0 1 3 10 0 0 2 8 0 1 8 9	3 3 4 4 6 0 3 3 4 9	original MNIST label	- 0 - 0 - 1 - 0 - 0	0 0 1017 1 0 0 1 0 1 1	1 0 6 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 2 2	0 1 0 1 2 1 0 961 0 3 pr	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1 4 4 edicte	977 0 2 0 0 1 3 0 3 1 5 5 ed lab	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 9888 6 6 eel	2 1135 4 0 0 0 5 16 2 6 7	0 0 1005 0 0 1 0 1 0 8	0 0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0 9 9
Lean $y_0 = y_1 = z$	- -	18 18 for	0 0 8900 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 2 19 8 2 0 0 5205 0 7 2 2 11a:	0 0 5 0 5 2 1 5792 2 3 pr	0 0 2 0 5 384 0 1 1 1 4 edicte	5915 0 2 2 3 3 0 4 5 5 2 3 0 4 5 5 2 1 2 0 4 5 5 2 0 4 5 5 2 2 0 4 4 5 5 5 2 2 2 5 5 3 0 0 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 6 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	0 0 3 5 2 0 8 5 5 908 6 el	5 6740 31 40 5 7 47 37 15 7	0 3 0 0 1 8 102 1 1 0 1 3 1 0 1 0 2 8 0 1 2 8 0 1 8 9 0 1 8 9 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0	3 3 4 4 6 0 3 3 4	original MNIST label	- 0 - 0 - 1 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0	0 0 1017 1 2 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 1	1 0 6 1 0 1 0 1 0 9 1 2 2	0 1 0 1 2 1 0 961 0 3 pr	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1 4 4 4 4 edicte	977 0 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 1 5 ed lab	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 988 6 6	2 11355 4 0 0 5 16 2 6 7	0 0 1005 0 0 1 0 1 0 8	0 0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0 9
Lean $y_0 =$ $y_1 =$ $y_2 =$	$rned = \left($	18 18 for ∧	0 0 890 2 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 2 19 8 2 0 0 5205 7 2 2 11a:) ∨	0 6 5 2 1 5792 2 3 9 r (1 (2 (2 (2 2 3 9 r	0 0 2 0 5384 0 1 1 1 4 edicte	5915 0 2 2 3 3 0 4 5 5 5 5 4 1 ab	0 0 3 5 2 2 0 8 5 5 908 6 el	5 6740 31 4 5 7 47 37 15 7	0 3 0 0 1 8 102 1 0 1 3 10 0 59 0 0 2 8 0 1 8 9 1 8 9		original MNIST label		0 0 1017 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 1	1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 2 2	0 1 0 1 2 961 0 961	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1 4 4 4 edicte	977 0 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 5 5 eed lab	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 9888 6 eel	2 11355 4 0 0 5 16 2 6 7	0 0 1005 0 0 1 0 1 0 8	0 0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0 9 9
Lean $y_0 =$ $y_1 =$ $y_2 =$ $y_3 =$	= - (() = - () =	58 118 for 0	0 0 890 2 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1	0 2 19 8 2 0 5205 7 2 2 11a:) ∨) ∨	0 6 5 2 1 5792 2 2 3 pr	0 0 2 0 5384 0 0 1 1 1 4 4 4 4 0 0 0	5915 0 2 2 3 3 0 4 5 5 3 0 4 5 5 3 0 4 5 5 2 0 0 4 5 5 3 0 0 4 5 5 3 0 0 4 5 5 3 3 0 0 0 4 5 5 3 3 0 0 2 1 2 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1	0 0 3 5 2 0 8 5 5 908 6 6 el	5 6740 31 6 6 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	0 3 0 0 1 8 102 1 0 1 3 10 0 590 0 0 2 8 0 1 8 9 1 8 9		original MNST label	- 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 1 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0	0 0 1017 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 1	1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 2 2 2	0 1 0 1 2 1 0 961 0 3 pr	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1 4 4 4 edicte	977 0 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 5 5 ed lab	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 9888 6 6 6	2 11135 4 0 0 5 16 2 6 7	0 0 1005 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 8	0 0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0 9 9 6
Lean $y_0 =$ $y_1 =$ $y_2 =$ $y_3 =$	= - (2) +	55 118 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	0 0 890 2 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1	0 2 19 8 2 0 0 5205 7 2 7 2 2 1 1 a:) ∨) ∨	0 6 5 2 1 5792 2 3 pr	0 0 2 0 5384 0 0 1 1 1 4 edicte	5915 0 2 2 3 0 4 5 5 6 d lab	0 0 3 5 2 0 8 5 5 908 6 6 6 6 √ (] 2 0 8 5 908 6 6 7 908 7 909 7 909 7 909 7 909 7 909 7 909 7 90 90 7 90 7 90 7 90 7 90 90 90 90 7 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90	5 6740 31 6 6 6 7 7 47 37 15 7 7	0 3 0 0 1 8 102 1 0 1 3 14 0 59 0 0 2 8 0 1 8 9 1 8 9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		original MNST label	V (()	0 0 1017 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1	1 0 1 0 1009 1 2 2 2	0 1 0 1 2 1 0 961 0 3 pr	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1 4 4 4 4	977 0 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 5 5 ed lab	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 988 6 el	2 1135 4 0 0 5 16 2 6 7	0 0 1005 0 0 1 0 1 0 8	0 0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0 9
Lean $y_0 =$ $y_1 =$ $y_2 =$ $y_3 =$ $y_4 =$	= - (2) +	for	0 0 890 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 2 19 8 2 0 0 5205 7 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 6 5 2 1 5792 2 3 pr	0 0 2 0 5384 0 0 1 1 1 4 edicte	5915 0 2 2 3 0 4 5 6 1 2 0 4 5 6 1 2 1 2 2 2 2 3 0 4 5 5 3 0 4 5 5 3 0 0 4 5 5 3 0 0 4 5 5 3 0 0 4 5 5 3 0 0 4 5 5 5 3 0 0 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	0 0 3 2 0 8 5 5 908 6 6 6 0 7 0 8 7 0 8 7 0 8 7 0 8 7 0 8 7 0 8 7 7 0 8 7 7 7 0 8 7 7 7 7	5 6740 31 6 6 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	0 3 0 0 1 8 10 1 1 3 1 0 1 3 1 4 0 1 3 14 0 2 8 0 1 8 9 1 8 9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		original MNIST label	∨ (0 0 1017 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1	1 0 1 0 1009 1 2 2 2	0 1 0 1 2 1 0 961 0 3 pr	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1 4 4 4 edicte	977 0 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 5 ed lab	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 988 6 6	2 11355 4 0 0 5 16 2 6 7	0 0 1005 0 0 1 0 1 0 8	0 0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0 9 9
Lean $y_0 =$ $y_1 =$ $y_2 =$ $y_3 =$ $y_4 =$ $y_5 =$	= - (2) = -		0 0 2 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1	0 2 19 8 2 0 5 205 0 7 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 6 5 2 1 5792 2 3 pr (] (] (] (] (] (] (] (] (] (]	0 0 2 0 5384 0 0 1 1 1 4 edicte	5915 0 2 2 3 3 0 4 5 5 3 0 4 5 5 6 1 ab	0 0 3 2 2 0 8 5 5 908 6 el	5 6740 31 6 6 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	0 3 1 8 8 1 0 1 3 1 0 59 0 0 2 8 0 1 8 9 1 8 9 9 1 1 1 1 1 1		original MNIST label	○ - 0 ○	0 0 1017 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1	1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 2 2 2	0 0 1 0 961 0 3 pr	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1 4 4 4 edicte	977 0 2 0 0 1 3 0 3 1 5 ed lab	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 988 6 6	2 111355 4 0 0 5 16 2 6 7	0 0 1005 0 1 0 1 0 8	0 0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0 1 0 9
Lean $y_0 =$ $y_1 =$ $y_2 =$ $y_3 =$ $y_4 =$ $y_5 =$ $y_5 =$	= - (2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2		0 0 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1	0 2 19 8 2 0 5205 0 5205 0 7 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 0 5 0 5 2 1 5792 2 3 pr (] (] (] (] (] 2 () (] 2 (] (] 2 () () () () () () () () () ()	0 0 2 0 5384 0 1 1 1 4 edicte	5915 0 2 2 3 0 4 5 5 3 0 4 5 6 4 5 6 1 8 0 4 5 7 0 4 5 7 1 9 7 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9	0 0 3 5 2 0 8 5 5 908 6 el √ (2 0 0 8 5 908 6 6 0 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5 6740 31 6 6 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	0 3 1 8 3 10 1 3 0 1 3 10 2 8 0 1 3 1 0 590 0 0 2 8 3 1 4 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 3 1 4 1 4 1 5 1 5 1 6 1 7 1		original MNIST label	○ - 0 ○	0 0 1017 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1	1 0 6 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 2 2 2	0 0 1 0 961 0 97	0 0 2 0 879 2 0 1 4 4 edicte	977 0 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 5 5 ed lab	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 988 6 6 eel	2 111355 4 0 0 5 16 2 6 7	0 0 1005 0 0 1 0 1 0 8	0 0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0 1 0 9
Lean $y_0 =$ $y_1 =$ $y_2 =$ $y_3 =$ $y_4 =$ $y_5 =$ $y_6 =$	= - (2) = -	for	0 0 890 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0	0 2 19 8 2 0 5205 0 5205 7 2 1) √ 1) √ 1) √ 1) √ 1) √ 1) √	0 0 5 0 5 1 5 7 2 2 3 pr (2 ((2 ((2 () (2 ()) ()) ())) ())))	0 0 2 0 5384 0 1 1 1 4 edicte	5915 0 2 2 3 0 4 5 5 3 0 4 5 5 6 0 4 5 5 6 0 4 5 5 0 0 4 5 5 0 0 4 5 5 3 0 0 4 5 5 3 0 0 4 5 5 3 0 0 4 5 5 3 0 0 2 2 2 2 5 5 3 0 0 0 4 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	0 0 3 5 2 0 8 5 5 908 6 el	5 6740 31 6 6 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	0 3 0 0 1 8 5102 1 3 10 0 590 0 0 2 8 0 1 2 8 0 1 2 8 3 1 4 1 2 1 2 2 4 1 2 1 2 2 4 1 2 2 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1		original MNIST label	○ - 0 ○	0 0 1017 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1	1 0 6 1 0 1 0 1 2 2 2	0 0 1 0 961 0 3 pr	0 0 2 0 879 2 1 4 4 4 edicte	977 0 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 5 5 ed lab	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 988 6 6 eel	2 111355 4 0 0 5 16 2 6 7	0 0 1005 0 1 0 1 0 8	0 0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0 9
Lean $y_0 =$ $y_1 =$ $y_2 =$ $y_3 =$ $y_4 =$ $y_5 =$ $y_6 =$ $y_7 =$	= - (2) = -	for 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	0 0 890 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 2 19 8 2 0 5205 0 5205 7 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 0 5 0 5 1 5792 2 3 pr () () () () () () () () () ()	0 0 2 0 5384 0 1 1 1 4 edicte	5915 0 2 2 3 0 4 5 5 3 0 4 5 5 6 1 8 0 4 5 5 6 1 8 0 1 4 5 1 8 1 8 1 8 1 8 1 8 1 8 1 8 1 8 1 8 1	0 0 3 5 2 0 8 5 5 908 6 el √ (2 √ (2 √ (2 √ (2 √ (2 √ (2 √ (2 √ (2) 0 8 5 5 5 908 6 6 9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	5 6740 31 6 6 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	0 3 1 8 5102 1 3 10 3 10 0 590 0 0 2 8 3 1 4 1 5 1 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 3 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1 4 1		original MNIST label	○ - 0 ○ - 0 ○ - 0 ○ - 1 ○ - 0 ○ - 0 ○ - 0 ○ - 0 ○ - 0 ○ - 1 ○ 0 - 1 ○ 0 - 1 ○ 0 - 1 ○ 0 - 1 0 0 - 1 0 0 - 1 0 0 0 - 1 0 0 - 1 0 <p0< p=""> 0 0 <p0< p=""></p0<></p0<>	0 0 1017 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1	1 0 6 1 0 1 0 1 2 2 2	0 0 1 0 961 0 97 9 7 0 9 61 0 9 7 0 9 7	0 0 2 0 1 4 4 4 edicte	977 0 2 0 1 3 0 3 1 5 5 ed lab	0 0 1 4 1 0 2 4 9888 6 eel	2 111355 4 0 0 5 16 2 6 7 7	0 0 1005 0 1 0 1 0 8	0 0 2 0 0 3 946 0 1 0 9 9





D.3 LFL-TYPE3 ON MNIST SUM

Confusion matrices on MNIST training and test dataset:









1026	$y_6 = (C_0 \land \checkmark \land \checkmark) \lor (C_0 \land \checkmark \land \land \checkmark) \lor (C_0 \land \checkmark \land \land \checkmark) \lor (C_0 \land \checkmark \land $
1027	$\boxed{O} \land \boxed{O} \lor (\overline{C_0} \land \boxed{O} \land \boxed{O}) \lor (\overline{C_1} \land \boxed{O} \land O) \lor (\overline{C_1} \land \boxed{O} \land O) \lor (\overline{O} $
1028	$(C_1 \land \boxed{6} \land \boxed{9}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{2} \land \boxed{3}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{2} \land \boxed{4}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{6} \land \boxed{9}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{6} \land \boxed{5}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{2} \land \boxed{6}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{6} \land \boxed{5}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{6} \land \boxed{6}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{6} \land \boxed{6} \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{6} \land \boxed{6}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{6} \land \boxed{6} \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{6} \land \boxed{6} \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{6} \land (C_1 \land \boxed{6} \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{6} \land (C_1 \land \boxed{6} \lor (C_1 \land (C_1 \land (C_1 \land (C_1 \land (C_1 \land (C_1 \land C_1 \land (C_1 \land (C_1 \land C_1 \land (C_1 \land (C_1$
1029	$(C_1 \land 2 \land 7) \lor (C_1 \land 3 \land 2) \lor (C_1 \land 9 \land 6)$
1030	$y_7 = (C_0 \land \checkmark \land \curlyvee \land \curlyvee \land \checkmark \land \checkmark \land \checkmark \land \checkmark \land \land \land \land \land \land$
1031	$\boxed{O} \land \boxed{2} \lor \lor (\overline{C_0} \land \boxed{2} \land \boxed{O}) \lor (\overline{C_0} \land \boxed{2} \land \boxed{2}) \lor (\overline{C_0} \land \boxed{3} \land \boxed{4}) \lor (\overline{C_0} \land \boxed{2} \land \boxed{2}) \lor (\overline{C_1} \land \boxed{4} \land \boxed{2}) \lor$
1032	$(C_1 \land \textcircled{O} \land \textcircled{O}) \lor (C_1 \land \textcircled{O} \land (C_1 \land (C_$
1033	$(C_1 \land 2 \land 2) \lor (C_1 \land 3 \land 3) \lor (C_1 \land 2 \land 7)$
1035	$y_8 = (C_0 \land \checkmark \land \checkmark) \lor (C_0 \land \checkmark \land \checkmark) \lor (C_0 \land \land \land \land \checkmark) \lor (C_0 \land \checkmark \land $
1036	$\boxed{O} \land \boxed{2} \lor \lor (C_0 \land \boxed{2} \land \boxed{1}) \lor (C_0 \land \boxed{2} \land \boxed{O}) \lor (C_0 \land \boxed{3} \land \boxed{5}) \lor (C_0 \land \boxed{9} \land \boxed{9}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{4} \land \boxed{3}) \lor$
1037	$(C_1 \land \boxed{6} \land \boxed{7}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{2} \land \boxed{5}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{7} \land \boxed{6}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{5} \land \boxed{2}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{6} \land \boxed{7}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{7} \land \boxed{7})$
1038	$(C_1 \land 2 \land 2) \lor (C_1 \land 3 \land 4) \lor (C_1 \land 2 \land 2)$
1039	$y_9 = (C_0 \land \underbrace{4}^{\vee} \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{6}^{\vee} \land \underbrace{3}^{\vee}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{2}^{\vee} \land \underbrace{7}^{\vee}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{1}^{\vee} \land \underbrace{8}^{\vee}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee} \land \underbrace{4}^{\vee}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee} \land \underbrace{4}^{\vee}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee} \land \underbrace{4}^{\vee}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee} \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee} \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee} \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee} \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee} \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee} \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee} \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee} \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{5}^{\vee} \lor$
1040	$\textcircled{O} \land \textcircled{O} \lor (C_0 \land \fbox{O} \land \textcircled{O}) \lor (C_0 \land \textcircled{O} \land \textcircled{O}) \lor (C_0 \land \textcircled{O} \land \textcircled{O}) \lor (C_1 \land (C_1 \land \textcircled{O} \land \textcircled{O}) \lor (C_1 \land (C_1 \land \textcircled{O} \land (C_1 \land$
1041	$(C_1 \land \textcircled{0} \land \textcircled{2}) \lor (C_1 \land \textcircled{2} \land \textcircled{0}) \lor (C_1 \land \textcircled{1} \land \textcircled{2}) \lor (C_1 \land \textcircled{3} \land \textcircled{3}) \lor (C_1 \land \textcircled{0} \land \textcircled{2}) \lor (C_1 \land \fbox{0} \land \textcircled{1}) \lor (C_1 \land \textcircled{1} \land (C_1 \land \textcircled{1}) \lor (C_1 \land \textcircled{1}) \lor (C_1 \land \textcircled{1}) \lor (C_1 \land \textcircled{1}) \lor (C_1 \land (C_1 \land \textcircled{1}) \lor (C_1 \land (C_1 \land \textcircled{1}) \lor (C_1 \land (C_1$
1042	$\blacksquare) \lor (C_1 \land \textcircled{2} \land \textcircled{0}) \lor (C_1 \land \textcircled{3} \land \textcircled{5}) \lor (C_1 \land \textcircled{2} \land \textcircled{2})$
1043	$C_0' = (C_0 \land 4 \land 4) \lor (C_0 \land 4 \land 2) \lor (C_0 \land 4 \land 1) \lor (C_0 \land 4 \land 5) \lor (C_0 \land 4 \land 0) \lor (C_0 \land 4 \land$
1044	$ \underbrace{3} \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{6} \land \underbrace{2}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{6} \land \underbrace{7}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{6} \land \underbrace{0}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{6} \land \underbrace{3}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{2} \land \underbrace{4}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{4} \lor \underbrace{4}) \lor (C_0 \land \underbrace{4} \lor \underbrace{4} $
1045	$ (C_0 \land 2 \land 2) \lor (C_0 \land 2 \land 1) \lor (C_0 \land 2 \land 5) \lor (C_0 \land 2 \land 2) \lor (C_0 \land 2) \lor (C_$
1046	$ (C_0 \land (C_0 ($
1047	$(C_0 \land (C_0 \land $
1048	$(C_0 \land O \land O) \lor (C_0 \land O$
1049	$(\overrightarrow{C_0} \land \overrightarrow{2} \land \overrightarrow{4}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_0} \land \overrightarrow{2} \land \overrightarrow{2}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_0} \land \overrightarrow{2} \land \overrightarrow{4}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_0} \land \overrightarrow{2} \land \overrightarrow{2}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_0} \land \overrightarrow{3} \land \overrightarrow{4}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_0} \land \overrightarrow{4}) \lor (\overrightarrow{4}) \lor (\overrightarrow{4}) \lor (\overrightarrow{4}) \lor (\overrightarrow{4}) \lor {4}) \lor (\overrightarrow{4}) \lor {4}) \lor (\overrightarrow{4}) \lor (\overrightarrow{4}) \lor {4}) $
1050	$ \underbrace{3}_{2} \vee (C_0 \wedge \underbrace{3}_{2} \wedge \underbrace{3}_{2}) \vee (C_0 \wedge \mathbf$
1051	$ (C_1 \land (C_1 \land$
1053	$(C_1 \land C_1 \land C_1$
1054	$ (C_1 \land T \land Q) \lor (C_1 \land T \land T \land Q) \lor (C_1 \land $
1055	$(C_1 \land \boxed{5} \land \boxed{3}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{0} \land \boxed{4}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{0} \land \boxed{5}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{0} \land \boxed{2}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{0} \land \boxed{4}) \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{0} \land \boxed{5}) \lor (C_1 \land @C_1 \land @C_1 \land (C_1 \land @C_1 \land $
1056	$\boxed{O} \land \boxed{O} \lor (\overline{C_1} \land \boxed{O} \land \boxed{O}) \lor (\overline{C_1} \land \boxed{O} \land O) \lor (\overline{C_1} \land O)$
1057	$\bigcirc \lor (C_1 \land \exists \land \checkmark) \lor (C_1 \land \lor \land \land \land \lor) \lor (C_1 \land \lor \land \land \land \lor) \lor (C_1 \land \lor \land \land \land \land \lor) \lor (C_1 \land \lor \land \lor \land \land \land \land \land \land $
1058	$C_1' = (C_0 \land 4 \land 6) \lor (C_0 \land 4 \land 7) \lor (C_0 \land 4 \land 8) \lor (C_0 \land 4 \land 7) \lor (C_0 \land 6 \land 4) \lor (C_0 \land 6 \land$
1059	$\textcircled{0} \lor (C_0 \land \fbox{0} \land \fbox{0}) \lor (C_0 \land \vcenter{0} \land \fbox{0}) \lor (C_0 \land \vcenter{0} \land \vcenter{0}) \lor (C_0 \land \vcenter{0} \land \operatornamewithlimits{0}) \lor (C_0 \lor $
1060	$ \begin{array}{c} \textbf{9} \end{array} \lor (C_0 \land \textbf{7} \land \textbf{9}) \lor (C_0 \land \textbf{5} \land \textbf{6}) \lor (C_0 \land \textbf{5} \land \textbf{5}) \lor (C_0 \land \textbf{5} \land \textbf{7}) \lor (C_0 \land \textbf{5} \land \textbf{2}) \lor (C_0 \land \textbf{5} \land \textbf{7}) \lor (C_0 $
1061	$ (C_0 \land 7 \land 6) \lor (C_0 \land 7 \land 5) \lor (C_0 \land 7 \land 5) \lor (C_0 \land 7 \land 7) \lor (C_0 \land 7 \land 5) \lor (C_0 \land 7 \land 5)$
1062	$(C_0 \land \textbf{2} \land \textbf{3}) \lor (C_0 \land \textbf{2} \land \textbf{3}) \lor (C_0 \land \textbf{3} \land \textbf{3}) $
1064	$(C_0 \land 2 \land 6) \lor (C_0 \land 2 \land 2) \lor (C_0 \land 2 \land 1) \lor (C_0 \land 2 \land 5) \lor (C_0 \land 2 \land 7) \lor (C_0 \land 2 \land 2) \lor$
1065	$(\underline{C_0} \land \underline{\textbf{9}} \land \underline{\textbf{3}}) \lor (\underline{C_0} \land \underline{\textbf{9}} \land \underline{\textbf{9}}) \lor (\underline{C_1} \land \underline{\textbf{4}} \land \underline{\textbf{6}}) \lor (\underline{C_1} \land \underline{\textbf{4}} \land \underline{\textbf{5}}) \lor (\underline{C_1} \land \underline{\textbf{4}} \land \underline{\textbf{7}}) \lor (\underline{C_1} \land \underline{\textbf{7}} \land \underline{\textbf{7}}) \lor (\underline{C_1} \land$
1066	$ \underbrace{ \mathbf{\mathscr{G}} \land \mathbf{\mathscr{G}} }_{\mathbf{\mathscr{G}}} \lor (C_1 \land \underbrace{ \mathbf{\mathscr{G}} \land \mathbf{\mathscr{G}} }_{\mathbf{\mathscr{G}}}) $
1067	$ (C_1 \land (C_1 \land$
1068	$(C_1 \land C_1 \land C_1$
1069	$(C_1 \land (C_1 \land $
1070	$(\overrightarrow{C_1} \land \overrightarrow{2} \land \overrightarrow{3}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_1} \land \overrightarrow{3} \land \overrightarrow{4}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_1} \land \overrightarrow{4}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_1} \land \overrightarrow{4}) \lor (\overrightarrow{A}) $
1071	$3 \land 7) \lor (C_1 \land 3 \land 8) \lor (C_1 \land 3 \land 9) \lor (C_1 \land 9 \land 4) \lor (C_1 \land 9 \land 6) \lor (C_1 \land 9 \land 2) \lor (C_1 \land 9 \land 3) \lor (C_1 \land $
1072	$\blacksquare \lor (C_1 \land \underline{9} \land \underline{5}) \lor (C_1 \land \underline{9} \land \underline{0}) \lor (C_1 \land \underline{9} \land \underline{7}) \lor (C_1 \land \underline{9} \land \underline{2}) \lor (C_1 \land \underline{9} \land \underline{3}) \lor (C_1 \land \underline{9} \land \underline{9})$
1073	
1074	
1075	
1070	D.5 LFL-TYPE1 ON MNIST SUM
1078	
1079	
	Confusion matrices on MNIST training and test dataset:





$ \begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & $
$\begin{array}{c} (1 \land 3 \land 4) \lor \\ (1 \land 3 \land 2 \land 3) \lor \\ (2 \lor 3) \lor \\ (2 \land 3) \lor \\ (2 \lor 3) \lor $ (2 \lor 3) \lor \\ (2 \lor 3) \lor
$\begin{array}{c} C_1 \land \boxed{3} \land \boxed{2} \land \\ \hline 1 \land \boxed{3} \lor (\boxed{9} \land \\ \hline 2 \land \boxed{3}) \lor (\boxed{9} \land \\ \hline 2 \land \boxed{3}) \lor (\boxed{9} \land \\ \hline 2 \land \boxed{2} \land \boxed{3}) \\ \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{3} \land \\ \lor (C_1 \land \boxed{3} \land \\ \hline 2) \lor (\boxed{9} \land \\ 2) \lor (\boxed{9} \lor (\boxed{9} \lor \\ 2) \lor (\boxed{9} \lor (1) \lor (\boxed{9} \lor \\ 2) \lor (1) \lor (1)$
$ \begin{array}{c} (3) \lor (9 \land \\ (C_0 \land 2 \land \\ (C_1 \land 5 \land \\ (C_1 \land 3 \land \\ (C_1 \land) \\ (C_1 \land) \\ (C_1 \land (C_1 \land) \\ (C_1 \land)) \\ (C_1 \land) \\ (C_1 \land))) $
$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\$
$ \begin{array}{c} \lor (C_0 \land 2 \land \\ \lor (C_1 \land 5 \land \\ \lor (C_1 \land 3 \land \\) \lor (I \land 5 \land \\ \land 2) \lor (I \land 5 \land \\ \land 2) \lor (I \land 5 \land \\ \land 2) \lor (I \land 5 \land \\ \lor (C_1 \land 5 \land \\ \lor (C_1 \land 5 \land \\ \lor (C_1 \land 3 \land \\ \land 0 \land 4)) \lor \\ \swarrow (I \land 3 \land \\ ? \land 6 \land 3 \land \\ \end{array} $
$ \begin{array}{c} (C_{1} \land \bigcirc \land \land \land \land \lor (C_{1} \land \bigcirc \land \land \land) \lor (C_{1} \land \bigcirc \land \land \land \land \land) \lor (P \land \bigcirc \land \land \land \land \land \land) \lor (P \land $
$ \begin{array}{c} (C_1 \land \bigcirc \land \land) \land (C_1 \land \bigcirc \land \land) \land (C_1 \land \bigcirc \land \land \land \land \land) \land (C_1 \land \bigcirc \land \land \land \land) \land (C_1 \land \bigcirc \land $
$(7 \land 5 \land 2) \lor (7 \land 5 \land 2) \lor (7 \land 5 \land 2) \lor (7 \land 2) \lor (7 \land 2) \lor (7 \land 2) \lor (C_1 \land 5 \land \lor (C_1 \land 5 \land \lor (C_1 \land 3 \land 2) \lor (C_1 \land 3 \land 2) \lor (T_1 \land 2) \land 3 \land 2) \land (T_1 \land 2) \land (T_1 \land 3) \land (T_1 \land 3)$
$ \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \\ c \\$
$\begin{array}{c} \land \bigcirc \land \frown \frown$
$ \begin{array}{c} & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ $
$ \begin{array}{c c} \lor (C_0 \land \textcircled{2} \land \\ \lor (C_1 \land \textcircled{3} \land \\ \lor (C_1 \land \textcircled{3} \land \\ \land (O \land \textcircled{4}) \lor \\ \checkmark (O \land \textcircled{4}) \lor \\ \land (O \land \lor (O \land \lor)) \lor \\ \land (O \land \lor (O \land \lor)) \lor (O \land \lor) \land (O \land \lor) (O \land \lor)$
$ \begin{array}{c} \langle (C_0 \land \blacksquare \land $
$(C_1 \land 3 \land (C_1 \land 3 \land 3 \land 2 \land 3 \land 3 \land 3 \land 3 \land 3 \land 3 \land 3$
∧ ⊘ ∧ ♥) ∨ 7₁ ∧ 7 ∧ 3 ∧ 7 ∧ 6 ∧ 3 ∧
7 ~ 7 ~ 3 ^ 7 ^ 6 ^ 3 ^
7^6^3^
⊈∧ 5∧⊘)
′ο Λ 🗖 Λ 🍊) \ /
$\land \blacksquare) \lor (C_1 \land$
$\vee (C_1 \land O \land$
$) \vee (\boxed{2} \land \boxed{4} \land$
) ∨ (🦉 ∧ 🖊 ∧
8 ^ 2 ^ 3)
$\vee (C_{\circ} \land \square \land$
$\vee (C_1 \land \Box \land$
$\vee (C_1 \wedge \mathbb{S} \wedge$
$\vee (C_1 \wedge \mathbf{I} \wedge$
$\land 4$
∧ 6 ∧ 9)∨
2 ^ 3 ^ 4)
$C_0 \wedge 7 \wedge 7) \vee$
$\wedge \boxed{2} \vee (C_0 \wedge$
$\mathcal{V}_0 \land \boxed{2} \land \boxed{5} \lor \lor$
$\wedge \blacksquare) \lor (C_0 \land$
/₀∧≤≤∧(≤))∨
$\bigwedge 6 \lor \lor (C_0 \land$
$\bigwedge^{\bullet} \bullet \bullet \circ \circ$
$\tilde{\land} \textcircled{6} \lor (C_0 \land \land$
$ \widehat{ \left(\begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \right) \lor (C_0 \land \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $
$ \widehat{ C} (C_0 \land \widehat{ C} \land \widehat{ C}) \lor (C_0 \land \widehat{ C}) \lor (C_1 \land (C_1 \land \widehat{ C}) \lor (C_1 \land (C_1 \land$
$ (C_0 \land (C_0 \land (C_0 \land (C_0 \land (C_0 \land (C_1 \land (C_1$
$ (C_0 \land (C_0$
$ \begin{array}{c} \land \bullet \bullet \bullet \\ \circ \circ$
$ \begin{array}{c} \land \bullet \bullet \bullet \\ & \circ $
$ \begin{array}{c} \land \bullet \bullet \bullet \\ & \land \\ & \bullet \\ & \land \\ \\ \\ & \land \\ \\ \\ & \land \\ \\ \\ \\$
$ \begin{array}{c} \land & \bullet \\ & \bullet \\ & \circ \\ & $
$ \begin{array}{c} \land \bullet \bullet \bullet \\ & \circ $
$ \begin{array}{c} \land \bullet \bullet \bullet \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & &$
$ \begin{array}{c} \land \bullet \bullet \bullet \\ & \land \\ \\ \\ & \land \\ \\ \\ & \land \\ \\ \\ \\$
$ \begin{pmatrix} \land & \bullet \\ & \bullet \\ & \circ \\ & & \circ \\ & &$

1242	$(C_0 \land 2 \land 2) \lor (C_0 \land 2 \land 2) \lor (C_0 \land 6 \land 5) \lor (C_0 \land 6 \land 2) \lor (C_0 \land 6 \land 7) \lor (C_0 \land 7) \lor ($
1243	$= (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{6} \wedge \boxed{6}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{6} \wedge \boxed{4}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{3} \wedge \boxed{2}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{3} \wedge \boxed{7}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{4} \wedge \boxed{8}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{4} \wedge \boxed{7}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{3} \wedge \boxed{7}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{4} \wedge \boxed{7}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{3} \wedge \boxed{7}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{4} \wedge \boxed{7}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{3} \wedge \boxed{7}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{4} \wedge \boxed{7}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{3} \wedge \boxed{7}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{3} \wedge \boxed{7}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{4} \wedge \boxed{7}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{3} \wedge \boxed{7}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{3} \wedge \boxed{7}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 \wedge \boxed{3} \wedge \boxed{7}) \vee (\widetilde{C}_0 $
1244	$\underbrace{\mathbf{W} \land \mathbf{Q}} \lor (\overrightarrow{C_0} \land \underbrace{\mathbf{W} \land \mathbf{G}}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_1} \land \underbrace{\mathbf{V} \land \mathbf{Q}}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_1} \land \underbrace{\mathbf{V} \land \mathbf{Q}}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_1} \land \underbrace{\mathbf{G} \land \mathbf{G}}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_1} \land \underbrace{\mathbf{G} \land \mathbf{Q}}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_1} \land \underbrace{\mathbf{G} \land \mathbf{Q}}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_1} \land \underbrace{\mathbf{G} \land \mathbf{G}}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_1} \land \underbrace{\mathbf{G} \land \mathbf{Q}}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_1} \land \underbrace{\mathbf{G} \land \mathbf{G}}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_1} \land \underbrace{\mathbf{G} \lor \mathbf{G}}) \lor (\overrightarrow{C_1} \lor \mathbf$
1245	$7) \vee (C_1 \wedge 5 \wedge 7) \vee (C_1 \wedge 5 \wedge 6) \vee (C_1 \wedge 5 \wedge 4) \vee (C_1 \wedge 2 \wedge 7) \vee (C_1 \wedge 2 \wedge 5) \vee (C_1 \wedge 2 \wedge 7) \vee (C_1 \wedge 5 \wedge 7) \vee (C_1 \wedge 7 $
1246	$(C_1 \land 2 \land 7) \lor (C_1 \land 2 \land 7) \lor (C_1 \land 2 \land 3) \lor (C_1 \land 2 \land 3) \lor (C_1 \land 2 \land 4) \lor (C_1 \land 7 \land 5) \lor (C_1 \land 7 \land$
1247	$2 \land 2) \lor (C_1 \land 7 \land 2) \lor (C_1 \land 7 \land 2) \lor (C_1 \land 7 \land 6) \lor (C_1 \land 7 \land 3) \lor (C_1 \land 7 \land 4) \lor (C_1 \land$
1248	$(C_1 \land 2 \land 5) \lor (C_1 \land 2 \land 2) \lor (C_1 \land 2 \land 2) \lor (C_1 \land 2 \land 2) \lor (C_1 \land 2 \land 5) \lor (C_1 \land 5 \land 5 \land 5) \lor (C_1 \land 5 \land 5 \land 5 \land 5 \land 5 \lor $
1249	$(C_1 \land \underline{9} \land \underline{0}) \lor (C_1 \land \underline{9} \land \underline{4}) \lor (C_1 \land \underline{2} \land \underline{8}) \lor (C_1 \land \underline{2} \land \underline{7}) \lor (C_1 \land \underline{2} \land \underline{9}) \lor (C_1 \land \underline{6} \land \underline{5}) \lor (C_1 \land \underline{6} \land \underline{6} \land \underline{6}) \lor (C_1 \land \underline{6} \land \underline{6} \land \underline{6}) \lor (C_1 \land$
1250	$ \overset{\bullet}{(C_1 \land \bullet \land \bullet)} \lor (C_1 \land \bullet \land \bullet) \lor (C_1 \land \bullet \circ \land \bullet) \lor (C_1 \land \bullet \circ \land \bullet) \lor (C_1 \land \bullet \circ \circ$
1251	$ (C_1 \land 3 \land 7) \lor (C_1 \land 3 \land 6) \lor (C_1 \land 6 \land 7) \lor (C_1 \land 6 \land 5) \lor (C_1 \land 6 \land 7) \lor (C_1 \land 7 \land 7)$
1252	
1253	
1254	$= 0) \lor (0 \land 0 \land 0) \lor (0 \lor ($
1255	
1256	
1257	2 ^ 7 ^ 2) × (2 ^ 9 ^ 7 ^ 3) × (2 ^ 9 ^ 9 ^ 9) × (2 ^ 9 ^ 9 ^ 9) × (2 ^ 9 ^ 9 ^ 9) × (0 ^ 9 ^ 9 ^ 5 ^ 7) × (0 ^ 9 ^ 9 ^ 7)
1258	5 ^ 7 ^ 3) v (7 ^ 5 ^ 3 ^ 4) v (7 ^ 9 ^ 0 ^ 4) v (7 ^ 7 ^ 3 ^ 7 ^ 6) v (5 ^ 2 ^ 3 ^ 7 ^
1259	6) v (7 ^ 9 ^ 6 ^ 4 ^ 7) v (7 ^ 6 ^ 1 ^ 7 ^ 3) v (9 ^ 2 ^ 4 ^ 7 ^ 0) v (9 ^ 2 ^ 9 ^ 3 ^ 4)
1260	
1261	
1262	
1263	
1264	
1265	
1265	
1200	
1207	
1200	
1209	
1270	
1271	
1272	
1273	
1274	
1275	
1276	
1277	
1278	
1279	
1280	
1281	
1282	
1283	
1284	
1285	
1286	
1287	
1288	
1289	
1290	
1291	
1292	
1293	
1294	
1201	