Automatic Differentiation Variational Inference

Philip Schulz and Wilker Aziz

https:
//github.com/philschulz/VITutorial

DGMs:

▶ DGMs: probabilistic models parameterised by neural networks

- DGMs: probabilistic models parameterised by neural networks
- Objective:

- DGMs: probabilistic models parameterised by neural networks
- Objective: lowerbound on log-likelihood (ELBO)

- DGMs: probabilistic models parameterised by neural networks
- Objective: lowerbound on log-likelihood (ELBO)
 - cannot be computed exactly

- DGMs: probabilistic models parameterised by neural networks
- Objective: lowerbound on log-likelihood (ELBO)
 - cannot be computed exactly we resort to Monte Carlo estimation

- DGMs: probabilistic models parameterised by neural networks
- Objective: lowerbound on log-likelihood (ELBO)
 - cannot be computed exactly we resort to Monte Carlo estimation
- ▶ But the MC estimator is not differentiable

- DGMs: probabilistic models parameterised by neural networks
- Objective: lowerbound on log-likelihood (ELBO)
 - cannot be computed exactly we resort to Monte Carlo estimation
- But the MC estimator is not differentiable
 - Score function estimator: applicable to any model

- DGMs: probabilistic models parameterised by neural networks
- Objective: lowerbound on log-likelihood (ELBO)
 - cannot be computed exactly we resort to Monte Carlo estimation
- But the MC estimator is not differentiable
 - Score function estimator: applicable to any model
 - Reparameterised gradients so far seems applicable only to Gaussian variables

Multivariate calculus recap

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^K$ and let $\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{R}^K \to \mathbb{R}^K$ be differentiable and invertible

- $ightharpoonup y = \mathcal{T}(x)$
- $ightharpoonup x = \mathcal{T}^{-1}(y)$

Jacobian

The Jacobian matrix $\mathbf{J} = J_{\mathcal{T}}(x)$ of \mathcal{T} assessed at x is the matrix of partial derivatives

$$J_{ij} = \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial x_j}$$

Jacobian

The Jacobian matrix $\mathbf{J} = J_{\mathcal{T}}(x)$ of \mathcal{T} assessed at x is the matrix of partial derivatives

$$J_{ij} = \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial x_j}$$

Inverse function theorem

$$J_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}}(y) = \left(J_{\mathcal{T}}(x)\right)^{-1}$$

The **differential** dx of x refers to an *infinitely small* change in x

The **differential** dx of x refers to an *infinitely small* change in x

We can relate the differential dy of $y = \mathcal{T}(x)$ to dx

The **differential** dx of x refers to an *infinitely small* change in x

We can relate the differential dy of $y = \mathcal{T}(x)$ to dx

Scalar case

$$dy = T'(x)dx = \frac{dy}{dx}dx = \frac{d}{dx}T(x)dx$$

where $\frac{dy}{dx}$ is the *derivative* of y wrt x

The **differential** dx of x refers to an *infinitely small* change in x

We can relate the differential dy of $y = \mathcal{T}(x)$ to dx

Scalar case

$$dy = T'(x)dx = \frac{dy}{dx}dx = \frac{d}{dx}T(x)dx$$

where $\frac{dy}{dx}$ is the *derivative* of y wrt x

Multivariate case

$$\mathrm{d}y = |\det J_{\mathcal{T}}(x)| \mathrm{d}x$$

the absolute value absorbs the orientation

We can integrate a function g(x) by substituting $x = \mathcal{T}^{-1}(y)$

$$\int g(x) \mathrm{d}x$$

We can integrate a function g(x) by substituting $x = \mathcal{T}^{-1}(y)$

$$\int g(x) dx = \int g(\underbrace{\mathcal{T}^{-1}(y)}_{x}) \underbrace{|\det J_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}}(y)| dy}_{dx}$$

We can integrate a function g(x) by substituting $x = \mathcal{T}^{-1}(y)$

$$\int g(x) dx = \int g(\underbrace{\mathcal{T}^{-1}(y)}_{x}) \underbrace{|\det J_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}}(y)| dy}_{dx}$$

and similarly for a function h(y)

$$\int h(y)\mathrm{d}y$$

We can integrate a function g(x) by substituting $x = \mathcal{T}^{-1}(y)$

$$\int g(x) dx = \int g(\underbrace{\mathcal{T}^{-1}(y)}_{x}) \underbrace{|\det J_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}}(y)| dy}_{dx}$$

and similarly for a function h(y)

$$\int h(y)\mathrm{d}y = \int h(\mathcal{T}(x))|\det J_{\mathcal{T}}(x)|\mathrm{d}x$$

Let X take on values in \mathbb{R}^K with density $f_X(x)$

Let X take on values in \mathbb{R}^K with density $f_X(x)$ and recall that $y = \mathcal{T}(x)$ and $x = \mathcal{T}^{-1}(y)$

Let X take on values in \mathbb{R}^K with density $f_X(x)$ and recall that $y = \mathcal{T}(x)$ and $x = \mathcal{T}^{-1}(y)$

Then \mathcal{T} induces a density $f_Y(y)$ expressed as

$$f_Y(y) = f_X(\mathcal{T}^{-1}(y)) |\det J_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}}(y)|$$

Let X take on values in \mathbb{R}^K with density $f_X(x)$ and recall that $y = \mathcal{T}(x)$ and $x = \mathcal{T}^{-1}(y)$

Then \mathcal{T} induces a density $f_Y(y)$ expressed as

$$f_Y(y) = f_X(\mathcal{T}^{-1}(y)) |\det J_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}}(y)|$$

and then it follows that

$$f_X(x) = f_Y(\mathcal{T}(x)) |\det J_{\mathcal{T}}(x)|$$

Let Z take on values in \mathbb{R}^K with pdf $q(z|\lambda)$

Let Z take on values in \mathbb{R}^K with pdf $q(z|\lambda)$

The idea is to count on a standardisation procedure

Let Z take on values in \mathbb{R}^K with pdf $q(z|\lambda)$

The idea is to count on a *standardisation* procedure a transformation $S_{\lambda}: \mathbb{R}^K \to \mathbb{R}^K$ such that

Let Z take on values in \mathbb{R}^K with pdf $q(z|\lambda)$

The idea is to count on a *standardisation* procedure a transformation $S_{\lambda}: \mathbb{R}^{K} \to \mathbb{R}^{K}$ such that

$$\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(z) \sim \pi(\epsilon) \ \mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon) \sim q(z|\lambda)$$

 \blacktriangleright $\pi(\epsilon)$ does not depend on parameters λ we call it a *standard* density

Let Z take on values in \mathbb{R}^K with pdf $q(z|\lambda)$

The idea is to count on a *standardisation* procedure a transformation $S_{\lambda}: \mathbb{R}^K \to \mathbb{R}^K$ such that

$$\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(z) \sim \pi(\epsilon) \ \mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon) \sim q(z|\lambda)$$

- \blacktriangleright $\pi(\epsilon)$ does not depend on parameters λ we call it a *standard* density
- \triangleright $S_{\lambda}(z)$ absorbs dependency on λ

$$\mathbb{E}_{q(z|\lambda)}[g(z)]$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{q(z|\lambda)}[g(z)] = \int q(z|\lambda)g(z)dz$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{q(z|\lambda)}[g(z)] = \int q(z|\lambda)g(z)dz$$

$$= \int \underbrace{\pi(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(z))|\det J_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}}(z)|}_{\text{change of density}}g(z)dz$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{q(z|\lambda)}[g(z)] = \int \frac{q(z|\lambda)g(z)\mathrm{d}z}{\mathrm{d}z}$$

$$= \int \underbrace{\pi(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(z))|\det J_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}}(z)|}_{\text{change of density}} g(z)\mathrm{d}z$$

$$= \int \pi(\epsilon)$$

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}_{q(z|\lambda)}\left[g(z)\right] &= \int q(z|\lambda)g(z)\mathrm{d}z \\ &= \int \underbrace{\pi(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(z))|\det J_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}}(z)|}_{\text{change of density}} g(z)\mathrm{d}z \\ &= \int \pi(\epsilon) \underbrace{\left|\det J_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}}(\epsilon)\right|^{-1}}_{\text{inv func theorem}} \end{split}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{q(z|\lambda)}\left[g(z)\right] = \int q(z|\lambda)g(z)\mathrm{d}z$$

$$= \int \underbrace{\pi(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(z))|\det J_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}}(z)|}_{\text{change of density}} g(z)\mathrm{d}z$$

$$= \int \pi(\epsilon) \underbrace{\left|\det J_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}}(\epsilon)\right|^{-1}}_{\text{inv func theorem}} g(\underbrace{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon)}_{z})$$

Reparameterised expectations

If we are interested in

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}_{q(z|\lambda)}\left[g(z)\right] &= \int q(z|\lambda)g(z)\mathrm{d}z \\ &= \int \underbrace{\pi(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(z))|\det J_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}}(z)|}_{\text{change of density}} g(z)\mathrm{d}z \\ &= \int \pi(\epsilon) \underbrace{\left|\det J_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}}(\epsilon)\right|^{-1}}_{\text{inv func theorem}} g\underbrace{\left(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon)\right)}_{z} \underbrace{\left|\det J_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}}(\epsilon)\right|}_{\text{change of var}} \end{split}$$

Reparameterised expectations

If we are interested in

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}_{q(z|\lambda)}\left[g(z)\right] &= \int q(z|\lambda)g(z)\mathrm{d}z \\ &= \int \underbrace{\pi(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(z))|\det J_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}}(z)|}_{\text{change of density}} g(z)\mathrm{d}z \\ &= \int \pi(\epsilon) \underbrace{\left|\det J_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}}(\epsilon)\right|^{-1}}_{\text{inv func theorem}} g\underbrace{\left(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon)\right)}_{z} \underbrace{\left|\det J_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}}(\epsilon)\right|}_{\text{change of var}} \\ &= \int \pi(\epsilon)g(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon))\mathrm{d}\epsilon \end{split}$$

Reparameterised expectations

If we are interested in

$$\begin{split} &\mathbb{E}_{q(z|\lambda)}\left[g(z)\right] = \int q(z|\lambda)g(z)\mathrm{d}z \\ &= \int \underbrace{\pi(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(z))|\det J_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}}(z)|}_{\text{change of density}} g(z)\mathrm{d}z \\ &= \int \pi(\epsilon) \underbrace{\left|\det J_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}}(\epsilon)\right|^{-1}}_{\text{inv func theorem}} g\underbrace{\left(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon)\right)}_{z} \underbrace{\left|\det J_{\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}}(\epsilon)\right|}_{\text{change of var}} \\ &= \int \pi(\epsilon)g(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon))\mathrm{d}\epsilon = \mathbb{E}_{\pi(\epsilon)}\left[g(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon))\right] \end{split}$$

Reparameterised gradients

For optimisation, we need tractable gradients

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z|\lambda)}[g(z)] = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{\pi(\epsilon)}\left[g(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon))\right]$$

Reparameterised gradients

For optimisation, we need tractable gradients

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z|\lambda)}[g(z)] = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{\pi(\epsilon)}[g(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon))]$$

since now the density does not depend on λ , we can obtain a gradient estimate

$$rac{\partial}{\partial \pmb{\lambda}} \mathbb{E}_{m{q}(\pmb{z}|\pmb{\lambda})}\left[g(\pmb{z})
ight] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi(\epsilon)}\left[rac{\partial}{\partial \pmb{\lambda}}g(\mathcal{S}^{-1}_{\pmb{\lambda}}(\epsilon))
ight]$$

Reparameterised gradients

For optimisation, we need tractable gradients

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{q}(z|\lambda)}[g(z)] = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{\pi(\epsilon)}\left[g(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon))\right]$$

since now the density does not depend on λ , we can obtain a gradient estimate

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z|\lambda)}[g(z)] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi(\epsilon)} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} g(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon)) \right]$$

$$\stackrel{\mathsf{MC}}{\approx} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\substack{i=1\\\epsilon_i \sim \pi(\epsilon)}}^{M} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} g(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon_i))$$

Location-scale family

▶ a family of distributions where for $F_X(x) = \Pr\{X \le x\}$ if Y = a + bX, then $F_Y(y|a,b) = F_X(\frac{z-a}{b})$

Location-scale family

- ▶ a family of distributions where for $F_X(x) = \Pr\{X \le x\}$ if Y = a + bX, then $F_Y(y|a,b) = F_X(\frac{z-a}{b})$
- if we can draw from $f_X(x)$, we can draw from $f_Y(y|a,b)$

Location-scale family

- ▶ a family of distributions where for $F_X(x) = \Pr\{X \le x\}$ if Y = a + bX, then $F_Y(y|a,b) = F_X(\frac{z-a}{b})$
- if we can draw from $f_X(x)$, we can draw from $f_Y(y|a,b)$
- ▶ the transformation absorbs the parameters a, b

Location-scale family

- ▶ a family of distributions where for $F_X(x) = \Pr\{X \le x\}$ if Y = a + bX, then $F_Y(y|a,b) = F_X(\frac{z-a}{b})$
- if we can draw from $f_X(x)$, we can draw from $f_Y(y|a,b)$
- ▶ the transformation absorbs the parameters *a*, *b*

Examples: Gaussian, Laplace, Cauchy, Uniform

We have seen one case, namely, if $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ and $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$

We have seen one case, namely, if $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ and $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ Then

$$Z \sim \mu + \sigma \epsilon$$

and

$$rac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(z|\mu,\sigma^2)} \left[g(z) \right]$$

We have seen one case, namely, if $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ and $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ Then

$$Z \sim \mu + \sigma \epsilon$$

and

$$\begin{split} & \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(z|\mu,\sigma^2)} \left[g(z) \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(0,I)} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} g(z = \mu + \sigma \epsilon) \right] \end{split}$$

We have seen one case, namely, if $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ and $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$

$$Z \sim \mu + \sigma \epsilon$$

and

Then

$$\begin{split} & \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(z|\mu,\sigma^2)} \left[g(z) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(0,I)} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} g(z = \mu + \sigma \epsilon) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(0,I)} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial z} g(z = \mu + \sigma \epsilon) \frac{\partial z}{\partial \lambda} \right] \end{split}$$

Location

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(z|\mu,\sigma^2)} \left[g(z) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(0,I)} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial z} g(z = \mu + \sigma \epsilon) \frac{\partial z}{\partial \mu} \right]$$

Location

$$\begin{split} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(z|\mu,\sigma^2)} \left[g(z) \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(0,I)} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial z} g(z = \mu + \sigma \epsilon) \frac{\partial z}{\partial \mu} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(0,I)} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial z} g(z = \mu + \sigma \epsilon) \right] \end{split}$$

Location

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(z|\mu,\sigma^2)} [g(z)] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(0,I)} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial z} g(z = \mu + \sigma \epsilon) \frac{\partial z}{\partial \mu} \right] \\
= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(0,I)} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial z} g(z = \mu + \sigma \epsilon) \right]$$

Scale

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(z|\mu,\sigma^2)}[g(z)] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(0,I)} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial z} g(z = \mu + \sigma \epsilon) \frac{\partial z}{\partial \sigma} \right]$$

Location

$$\begin{split} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(z|\mu,\sigma^2)} \left[g(z) \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(0,I)} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial z} g(z = \mu + \sigma \epsilon) \frac{\partial z}{\partial \mu} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(0,I)} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial z} g(z = \mu + \sigma \epsilon) \right] \end{split}$$

Scale

$$egin{aligned} rac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(z|\mu,\sigma^2)} \left[g(z)
ight] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(0,I)} \left[rac{\partial}{\partial z} g(z = \mu + \sigma \epsilon) rac{\partial z}{\partial \sigma}
ight] \ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(0,I)} \left[rac{\partial}{\partial z} g(z = \mu + \sigma \epsilon) \epsilon
ight] \end{aligned}$$

Standardisation functions (cont.)

Inverse cdf

▶ for univariate Z with pdf $f_Z(z)$ and cdf $F_Z(z)$

$$P \sim \mathcal{U}(0,1)$$
 $Z \sim F_Z^{-1}(P)$

where $F_Z^{-1}(p)$ is the quantile function

Standardisation functions (cont.)

Inverse cdf

▶ for univariate Z with pdf $f_Z(z)$ and cdf $F_Z(z)$

$$P \sim \mathcal{U}(0,1)$$
 $Z \sim F_Z^{-1}(P)$

where $F_Z^{-1}(p)$ is the quantile function

Gumbel distribution

- $f_Z(z|\mu,\beta) = \beta^{-1} \exp(-z \exp(-z))$
- $F_Z(z|\mu,\beta) = \exp\left(-\exp\left(-\frac{z-\mu}{\beta}\right)\right)$
- $F_Z^{-1}(p) = \mu \beta \log(-\log p)$

Beyond

Many interesting densities are not location-scale families

e.g. Beta, Gamma

Beyond

Many interesting densities are not location-scale families

e.g. Beta, Gamma

The inverse cdf of a multivariate rv is seldom known in closed-form

▶ Dirichlet, von Mises-Fisher

Motivation

 many models have intractable posteriors their normalising constants (evidence) lacks analytic solutions

Motivation

- many models have intractable posteriors their normalising constants (evidence) lacks analytic solutions
- but many models are differentiable that's the main constraint for using NNs

Motivation

- many models have intractable posteriors their normalising constants (evidence) lacks analytic solutions
- but many models are differentiable that's the main constraint for using NNs

Reparameterised gradients are a step towards automatising VI for differentiable models

Motivation

- many models have intractable posteriors their normalising constants (evidence) lacks analytic solutions
- but many models are differentiable that's the main constraint for using NNs

Reparameterised gradients are a step towards automatising VI for differentiable models

but not every model of interest employs rvs for which a standardisation function is known

Example

Suppose we have some ordinal data which we assume to be Poisson-distributed

$$X|\lambda \sim \mathsf{Poisson}(\lambda)$$

and suppose we want to impose

Differentiable models

We focus on differentiable probability models

$$p(x,z)=p(x|z)p(z)$$

Differentiable models

We focus on differentiable probability models

$$p(x,z) = p(x|z)p(z)$$

members of this class have continuous latent variables z

Differentiable models

We focus on differentiable probability models

$$p(x,z) = p(x|z)p(z)$$

- members of this class have continuous latent variables z
- ▶ and the gradient $\nabla_z \log p(x, z)$ is valid within the *support* of the prior $\sup(p(z)) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^K : p(z) > 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^K$

Recall the gradient of the ELBO

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right] - \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{H} \left(q(z;\lambda) \right)$$

Recall the gradient of the ELBO

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right] - \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{H} \left(q(z;\lambda) \right)$$

Recall the gradient of the ELBO

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right] - \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{H} \left(q(z;\lambda) \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right]$$

Recall the gradient of the ELBO

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right] - \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{H} \left(q(z;\lambda) \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi(\epsilon)} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log p(x,z = \mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon)) \right]$$

Recall the gradient of the ELBO

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right] - \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{H} \left(q(z;\lambda) \right)$$

$$egin{aligned} rac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z)
ight] &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi(\epsilon)} \left[rac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log p(x,z)
ight. &= \mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon)
ight)
ight] \ &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi(\epsilon)} \left[rac{\partial}{\partial z} \log p(x,z) rac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^{-1}(\epsilon)
ight] \end{aligned}$$

VI optimisation problem

Let's focus on the design and optimisation of the variational approximation

$$\underset{q(z)}{\operatorname{arg min }} \mathsf{KL}\left(q(z) \mid\mid p(z|x)\right)$$

VI optimisation problem

Let's focus on the design and optimisation of the variational approximation

$$\underset{q(z)}{\operatorname{arg min }} \mathsf{KL}\left(q(z) \mid\mid p(z|x)\right)$$

To automatise the search for a variational approximation q(z) we must ensure that

$$\operatorname{supp}(q(z)) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(p(z|x))$$

VI optimisation problem

Let's focus on the design and optimisation of the variational approximation

$$\underset{q(z)}{\operatorname{arg min }} \mathsf{KL}\left(q(z) \mid\mid p(z|x)\right)$$

To automatise the search for a variational approximation q(z) we must ensure that

$$supp(q(z)) \subseteq supp(p(z|x))$$

• otherwise KL is not defined $\mathsf{KL}\left(q\mid\mid p\right) = \mathbb{E}_q\left[\log q\right] - \mathbb{E}_q\left[\log p\right] = \infty$

So let's constrain q(z) to a family $\mathcal Q$ whose support is included in the support of the posterior

$$\underset{q(z) \in \mathcal{Q}}{\operatorname{arg min } \mathsf{KL} \left(q(z) \mid\mid p(z|x) \right)}$$

where

$$Q = \{q(z) : \operatorname{supp}(q(z)) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(p(z|x))\}$$

So let's constrain q(z) to a family Q whose support is included in the support of the posterior

$$\underset{q(z) \in \mathcal{Q}}{\operatorname{arg min}} \operatorname{KL} \left(q(z) \mid\mid p(z|x) \right)$$

where

$$Q = \{q(z) : \operatorname{supp}(q(z)) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(p(z|x))\}$$

But what is the support of p(z|x)?

So let's constrain q(z) to a family $\mathcal Q$ whose support is included in the support of the posterior

$$\underset{q(z) \in \mathcal{Q}}{\operatorname{arg min } \mathsf{KL}} \left(q(z) \mid\mid p(z|x) \right)$$

where

$$Q = \{q(z) : \operatorname{supp}(q(z)) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(p(z|x))\}$$

But what is the support of p(z|x)?

ightharpoonup typically the same as the support of p(z)

So let's constrain q(z) to a family Q whose support is included in the support of the posterior

$$\underset{q(z) \in \mathcal{Q}}{\operatorname{arg min } \mathsf{KL} \left(q(z) \mid\mid p(z|x) \right)}$$

where

$$Q = \{q(z) : \operatorname{supp}(q(z)) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(p(z|x))\}$$

But what is the support of p(z|x)?

▶ typically the same as the support of p(z) as long as p(x, z) > 0 if p(z) > 0

Parametric family

So let's constrain q(z) to a family $\mathcal Q$ whose support is included in the support of the prior

$$\underset{q(z) \in \mathcal{Q}}{\operatorname{arg min } \mathsf{KL}} \left(q(z) \mid\mid p(z|x) \right)$$

where

$$Q = \{q(z; \lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda, \operatorname{supp}(q(z; \lambda)) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(p(z))\}$$

Parametric family

So let's constrain q(z) to a family $\mathcal Q$ whose support is included in the support of the prior

$$\underset{q(z) \in \mathcal{Q}}{\operatorname{arg min } \mathsf{KL}} \left(q(z) \mid\mid p(z|x) \right)$$

where

$$Q = \{q(z; \lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda, \operatorname{supp}(q(z; \lambda)) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(p(z))\}$$

ightharpoonup a parameter vector λ picks out a member of the family

We maximise the ELBO

$$\operatorname{arg\,max} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right] + \mathbb{H} \left(q(z;\lambda) \right)$$

We maximise the ELBO

$$rg \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right] + \mathbb{H} \left(q(z;\lambda) \right)$$

subject to

$$Q = \{q(z; \lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda, \operatorname{supp}(q(z; \lambda)) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(p(z))\}$$

We maximise the ELBO

$$rg \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right] + \mathbb{H} \left(q(z;\lambda) \right)$$

subject to

$$Q = \{q(z; \lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda, \operatorname{supp}(q(z; \lambda)) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(p(z))\}$$

There are really two constraints here

We maximise the ELBO

$$rg \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right] + \mathbb{H} \left(q(z;\lambda) \right)$$

subject to

$$Q = \{q(z; \lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda, \operatorname{supp}(q(z; \lambda)) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(p(z))\}$$

There are really two constraints here

support matching constraint

We maximise the ELBO

$$rg \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right] + \mathbb{H} \left(q(z;\lambda) \right)$$

subject to

$$Q = \{q(z; \lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda, \operatorname{supp}(q(z; \lambda)) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(p(z))\}$$

There are really two constraints here

- support matching constraint
- \triangleright Λ can be an intricate subset of \mathbb{R}^D

We maximise the ELBO

$$rg \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right] + \mathbb{H} \left(q(z;\lambda) \right)$$

subject to

$$Q = \{q(z; \lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda, \operatorname{supp}(q(z; \lambda)) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(p(z))\}$$

There are really two constraints here

- support matching constraint
- ► Λ can be an intricate subset of \mathbb{R}^D e.g. univariate Gaussian location lives in \mathbb{R} but scale lives in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$

- we just need to use an appropriate activation Example

It is easy to make sure parameters are unconstrained

we just need to use an appropriate activation Example

It is easy to make sure parameters are unconstrained

we just need to use an appropriate activation Example

- $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma)$ where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^d_{>0}$

 - $ightharpoonup \sigma = \operatorname{softplus}(\lambda_{\sigma}) \text{ and } \lambda_{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^d$

- we just need to use an appropriate activation Example
 - ► $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma)$ where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^d_{>0}$ ► $\mu = \lambda_{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ► $\sigma = \text{softplus}(\lambda_{\sigma})$ and $\lambda_{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^d$
 - $lacksquare Z \sim \mathsf{vMF}(\mu, \kappa)$ where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|\mu\|_2 = 1$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$

- we just need to use an appropriate activation Example
 - ► $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma)$ where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^d_{>0}$ ► $\mu = \lambda_{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ► $\sigma = \text{softplus}(\lambda_{\sigma})$ and $\lambda_{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^d$
 - $Z \sim \mathsf{vMF}(\mu, \kappa)$ where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|\mu\|_2 = 1$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$

- we just need to use an appropriate activation Example
 - ► $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma)$ where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^d_{>0}$ ► $\mu = \lambda_{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ► $\sigma = \text{softplus}(\lambda_{\sigma})$ and $\lambda_{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^d$
 - $igwedge Z \sim \mathsf{vMF}(\mu, \kappa)$ where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|\mu\|_2 = 1$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$
 - $\mu = \frac{\lambda_{\mu}}{\|\lambda_{\mu}\|_{2}} \text{ for } \lambda_{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$
 - $\kappa = \mathsf{softplus}(\lambda_\kappa) \text{ and } \lambda_\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$

We maximise the ELBO

$$rg \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^D} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right] + \mathbb{H} \left(q(z;\lambda) \right)$$

We maximise the ELBO

$$rg \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^D} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right] + \mathbb{H} \left(q(z;\lambda) \right)$$

subject to

$$Q = \{q(z; \lambda) : \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^D, \operatorname{supp}(q(z; \lambda)) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(p(z))\}$$

There is one constraint left

We maximise the FLBO

$$rg \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^D} \mathbb{E}_{q(z;\lambda)} \left[\log p(x,z) \right] + \mathbb{H} \left(q(z;\lambda) \right)$$

subject to

$$Q = \{q(z; \lambda) : \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^D, \operatorname{supp}(q(z; \lambda)) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(p(z))\}$$

There is one constraint left

▶ support of $q(z; \lambda)$ depends on the choice of prior and thus may be an intricate subset of \mathbb{R}^K

A gradient-based black-box VI procedure

1. Custom parameter space

- 1. Custom parameter space
 - Appropriate transformations of unconstrained parameters!

- 1. Custom parameter space
 - Appropriate transformations of unconstrained parameters!
- 2. Custom supp(p(z))

- 1. Custom parameter space
 - Appropriate transformations of unconstrained parameters!
- 2. Custom supp(p(z))
 - Express $z \in \operatorname{supp}(p(z)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^K$ as a transformation of some unconstrained $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^K$

- 1. Custom parameter space
 - Appropriate transformations of unconstrained parameters!
- 2. Custom supp(p(z))
 - ▶ Express $z \in \text{supp}(p(z)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^K$ as a transformation of some unconstrained $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^K$
 - ► Pick a variational family over the entire real coordinate space

- 1. Custom parameter space
 - Appropriate transformations of unconstrained parameters!
- 2. Custom supp(p(z))
 - ▶ Express $z \in \text{supp}(p(z)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^K$ as a transformation of some unconstrained $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^K$
 - Pick a variational family over the entire real coordinate space
 - ► And pick one for which a standardisation exists!

- 1. Custom parameter space
 - Appropriate transformations of unconstrained parameters!
- 2. Custom supp(p(z))
 - Express $z \in \text{supp}(p(z)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^K$ as a transformation of some unconstrained $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^K$
 - Pick a variational family over the entire real coordinate space
 - ► And pick one for which a standardisation exists!
- 3. Intractable expectations

- 1. Custom parameter space
 - Appropriate transformations of unconstrained parameters!
- 2. Custom supp(p(z))
 - ▶ Express $z \in \text{supp}(p(z)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^K$ as a transformation of some unconstrained $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^K$
 - Pick a variational family over the entire real coordinate space
 - ► And pick one for which a standardisation exists!
- 3. Intractable expectations
 - ► Reparameterised Gradients!

Let's introduce an invertible and differentiable transformation

$$\mathcal{T}: \mathsf{supp}(p(z)) o \mathbb{R}^K$$

Let's introduce an invertible and differentiable transformation

$$\mathcal{T}: \mathsf{supp}(p(z)) o \mathbb{R}^K$$

and define a transformed variable $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^K$

$$\zeta = \mathcal{T}(z)$$

Let's introduce an invertible and differentiable transformation

$$\mathcal{T}: \mathsf{supp}(p(z)) o \mathbb{R}^K$$

and define a transformed variable $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^K$

$$\zeta = \mathcal{T}(z)$$

Recall that we have a joint density p(x, z)

Let's introduce an invertible and differentiable transformation

$$\mathcal{T}: \mathsf{supp}(p(z)) o \mathbb{R}^K$$

and define a transformed variable $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^K$

$$\zeta = \mathcal{T}(z)$$

Recall that we have a joint density p(x, z) which we can use to construct $p(x, \zeta)$

Joint model in real coordinate space

Let's introduce an invertible and differentiable transformation

$$\mathcal{T}: \mathsf{supp}(p(z)) o \mathbb{R}^K$$

and define a transformed variable $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^K$

$$\zeta = \mathcal{T}(z)$$

Recall that we have a joint density p(x, z) which we can use to construct $p(x, \zeta)$

$$p(x,\zeta) = p(x,\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\zeta))|\det J_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}}(\zeta)|$$

We can design a posterior approximation whose support is \mathbb{R}^K

We can design a posterior approximation whose support is \mathbb{R}^K

$$q(\zeta;\lambda)$$

We can design a posterior approximation whose support is \mathbb{R}^K

$$q(\zeta;\lambda) = \underbrace{\prod_{k=1}^{K} q(\zeta_k;\lambda)}_{ ext{mean field}}$$

We can design a posterior approximation whose support is \mathbb{R}^K

$$q(\zeta;\lambda) = \prod_{k=1}^{K} q(\zeta_k;\lambda) = \prod_{k=1}^{K} \mathcal{N}(\zeta_k|\mu_k,\sigma_k^2)$$
mean field

where

$$\blacktriangleright \mu_k = \lambda_{\mu_k} \text{ for } \lambda_{\mu_k} \in \mathbb{R}^K$$

$$ightharpoonup \sigma_k = \operatorname{softplus}(\lambda_{\sigma_k}) \text{ for } \lambda_{\sigma_k} \in \mathbb{R}^K$$

 $\log p(x)$

$$\log p(x) = \log \int p(x, z) dz$$

$$\log p(x) = \log \int p(x, \mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z}$$
$$= \log \int p(x, \mathbf{T}^{-1}(\zeta)) |\det J_{\mathbf{T}^{-1}}(\zeta)| d\zeta$$

$$\log p(x) = \log \int p(x, \mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z}$$

$$= \log \int p(x, \mathbf{T}^{-1}(\zeta)) |\det J_{\mathbf{T}^{-1}}(\zeta)| d\zeta$$

$$= \log \int q(\zeta) \frac{p(x, \mathbf{T}^{-1}(\zeta)) |\det J_{\mathbf{T}^{-1}}(\zeta)|}{q(\zeta)} d\zeta$$

$$\log p(x) = \log \int p(x, z) dz$$

$$= \log \int p(x, \mathcal{T}^{-1}(\zeta)) |\det J_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}}(\zeta)| d\zeta$$

$$= \log \int q(\zeta) \frac{p(x, \mathcal{T}^{-1}(\zeta)) |\det J_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}}(\zeta)|}{q(\zeta)} d\zeta$$

$$\stackrel{\text{JI}}{\geq} \int q(\zeta) \log \frac{p(x, \mathcal{T}^{-1}(\zeta)) |\det J_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}}(\zeta)|}{q(\zeta)} d\zeta$$

$$\log p(x) = \log \int p(x, \mathbf{Z}) d\mathbf{Z}$$

$$= \log \int p(x, \mathbf{T}^{-1}(\zeta)) |\det J_{\mathbf{T}^{-1}}(\zeta)| d\zeta$$

$$= \log \int q(\zeta) \frac{p(x, \mathbf{T}^{-1}(\zeta)) |\det J_{\mathbf{T}^{-1}}(\zeta)|}{q(\zeta)} d\zeta$$

$$\stackrel{|}{\geq} \int q(\zeta) \log \frac{p(x, \mathbf{T}^{-1}(\zeta)) |\det J_{\mathbf{T}^{-1}}(\zeta)|}{q(\zeta)} d\zeta$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{q(\zeta)} \left[\log p(x, \mathbf{T}^{-1}(\zeta)) + \log |\det J_{\mathbf{T}^{-1}}(\zeta)| \right] + \mathbb{H} \left(q(\zeta) \right)$$

Reparameterised ELBO

Recall that for Gaussians we have a standardisation procedure $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(z) \sim \mathcal{N}(\epsilon|0,I)$

$$\mathbb{E}_{q(\zeta;\lambda)}\left[\log p(x,\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\zeta)) + \log \left| \det J_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}}(\zeta) \right| \right] + \mathbb{H}\left(q(\zeta;\lambda)\right)$$

Reparameterised ELBO

Recall that for Gaussians we have a standardisation procedure $\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(z) \sim \mathcal{N}(\epsilon|0,I)$

$$\mathbb{E}_{q(\zeta;\lambda)}\left[\log p(x,\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\zeta)) + \log \left|\det J_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}}(\zeta)\right|\right] + \mathbb{H}\left(q(\zeta;\lambda)\right) \\ = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(\epsilon|0,l)}\left[\log p(x,\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(\epsilon))) + \log \left|\det J_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}}(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(\epsilon))\right|\right] \\ + \mathbb{H}\left(q(\zeta;\lambda)\right)$$

For
$$\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \operatorname{ELBO}(\lambda)$$

For
$$\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \mathsf{ELBO}(\lambda) \overset{\mathsf{MC}}{\approx} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log \underbrace{p(x | \mathcal{T}^{-1}(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(\epsilon_{i})))}_{\mathsf{likelihood}}$$

For
$$\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$$

$$\begin{split} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \, \mathsf{ELBO}(\lambda) & \stackrel{\mathsf{MC}}{\approx} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log \underbrace{p(x | \mathcal{T}^{-1}(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(\epsilon_{i})))}_{\text{likelihood}} \\ & + \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log \underbrace{p(\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(\epsilon_{i})))}_{\text{prior}} \end{split}$$

For
$$\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$$

$$\begin{split} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \, \mathsf{ELBO}(\lambda) & \stackrel{\mathsf{MC}}{\approx} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log \underbrace{p(x | \mathcal{T}^{-1}(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(\epsilon_{i})))}_{\text{likelihood}} \\ & + \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log \underbrace{p(\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(\epsilon_{i})))}_{\text{prior}} \\ & + \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log \underbrace{|\det J_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}}(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(\epsilon_{i}))|}_{\text{change of space}} \end{split}$$

For
$$\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$$

$$\begin{split} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \, \mathsf{ELBO}(\lambda) & \stackrel{\mathsf{MC}}{\approx} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log \underbrace{p(x | \mathcal{T}^{-1}(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(\epsilon_{i})))}_{\text{likelihood}} \\ & + \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log \underbrace{p(\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(\epsilon_{i})))}_{\text{prior}} \\ & + \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log \underbrace{|\det J_{\mathcal{T}^{-1}}(\mathcal{S}_{\lambda}(\epsilon_{i}))|}_{\text{change of space}} \\ & + \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \underbrace{\mathbb{H} \left(q(\zeta; \lambda)\right)}_{\text{analaytic}} \end{split}$$

Relevance

Many software packages know how to transform the support of various distributions

- Stan
- ► Tensorflow tf.probability
- Pytorch torch.distributions

LDA

Wait... no deep learning?

Example