

Comparative Learning Using Traditional Gradient Descent and the Φ Function

James F. Lynn

April 22, 2025

Abstract

This paper compares two learning strategies - Traditional Gradient Descent and a Φ (Phi)-modulated adaptive method - designed to reach a numerical goal through iterative refinement. Using a visual simulation with tunable parameters (α , β , γ), we explore how traditional fixed-rate learning differs from an adaptive Φ -driven process. Graphs show the progression of values over time, with highlighted points indicating which method reaches the goal first. This system allows for user-defined start values and target goals, providing an experimental platform to observe learning behavior.

1 Introduction

Learning algorithms often adjust values over time to converge toward a desired target or goal. The method by which they adapt affects speed, stability, and efficiency. In this simulation, we compare two methods:

- **Traditional Learning** - Fixed-step gradient descent.
- **Φ -Modulated Learning** - Dynamically modulated by system feedback.

We analyze the iterative behavior of both systems when attempting to reach a goal value, starting from an initial value either specified by the user or randomly chosen between 1 and 100.

2 Traditional Learning Method

The traditional method uses a fixed learning rate (η) to minimize error:

$$\text{adjustment} = \eta \cdot (\text{goal} - \text{value})$$

$$\text{value}_{t+1} = \text{value}_t + \text{adjustment}$$

This approach consistently reduces error in a smooth, predictable fashion. The closer the value gets to the goal, the smaller the steps become.

3 Φ -Modulated Learning Method

The Φ -enhanced learner adjusts its learning step dynamically based on recent changes in complexity, entropy, and effort:

$$\Phi = \alpha \cdot \frac{dC}{dt} - \beta \cdot \frac{dS}{dt} + \gamma \cdot \frac{dE}{dt}$$

Where:

- $\frac{dC}{dt}$ measures change in complexity: $\frac{1}{1+\text{error}^2}$
- $\frac{dS}{dt}$ measures change in entropy (error magnitude)
- $\frac{dE}{dt}$ measures change in effort (adjustment size)

The final update step becomes:

$$\text{adjustment} = \eta \cdot \text{error} \cdot (1 + \Phi)$$

A cap is applied to adjustments to prevent instability:

$$\text{adjustment} \in [-2.0, +2.0]$$

4 Simulation Parameters

- **Start Value:** Random in $[1, 100]$, or user-defined.
- **Goal:** User-defined target (default 100).
- **Learning Rate:** Fixed at 0.02.
- **Adjustable Weights:** α, β, γ control Φ 's sensitivity.

5 Graph Description

The graph plots both learning methods over 100 iterations. The X-axis represents time steps; the Y-axis shows the current value as it approaches the goal.

- **Gray Line:** Traditional method
- **Blue Line:** Φ -modulated method
- **Red Dot:** First point where Traditional reaches the goal
- **Green Dot:** First point where Φ -modulated reaches the goal

Displayed below the graph:

- Current goal value
- Starting value
- Step count at which each method reaches the goal (or Not reached)

6 Observations

In most cases:

- Traditional learning proceeds linearly and slows near the target.
- Φ -modulated learning adapts, sometimes overshooting or accelerating when conditions are favorable.

Because of this adaptivity, Φ learning can converge faster - but may also become unstable without tuning.

7 Summary Comparison

Feature	Traditional	Φ -Modulated
Speed	Steady	Adaptive
Adaptivity	None	High
Control	Learning rate (η)	α, β, γ
Behavior	Linear, smooth	Nonlinear, responsive
Ideal For	Simplicity	Complex, changing systems

8 Conclusion

This experiment demonstrates how traditional and Φ -enhanced systems behave differently when approaching a goal. While traditional learning is predictable and stable, Φ introduces adaptivity based on system dynamics.

[Launch Live \$\Phi\$ Simulation](#)