

---

**Algorithm 1:** Training Procedure.

---

**Input:** Forward model  $f$ , prior over physical parameters  $P(\theta)$ .

**Output:** Approximate posterior  $Q_\phi(\theta|\mathbf{x})$ . Also a likelihood  $P_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{x}|\theta)$ .

**1 repeat**

**2**    Simulate  $\{(\theta_i, \mathbf{x}_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  pairs, using  $\mathbf{x}_i \leftarrow f(\theta_i)$ ,  $\theta_i \sim P(\theta_i)$ .

**3**    Train  $Q_\phi(\theta|\mathbf{x})$  via ML:

$$\arg \max_{\phi} \sum_{i=1}^N \log Q_\phi(\theta_i|\mathbf{x}_i)$$

**4**    Train a neural likelihood (or likelihood-ratio?)

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{w}} \sum_{i=1}^N \log P_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{x}_i|\theta_i)$$

**5**    Minimise a divergence (e.g.  $D_{\text{KL}}$ ):

$$\arg \min_{\phi} D_{\text{KL}}[Q_\phi(\theta|\mathbf{x}_{\text{true}}) \| P(\theta|\mathbf{x}_{\text{true}})]$$

where  $P(\theta|\mathbf{x}_{\text{true}}) \propto P_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{x}_{\text{true}}|\theta)P(\theta)$ .

**6 until** *Until reconstructions match the data*

---

The objective on line 5 has the following form:

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi) = \mathbb{E}_{Q_\phi(\theta|\mathbf{x}_{\text{true}})} [\log P(\theta, \mathbf{x}_{\text{true}}) - \log Q_\phi(\theta|\mathbf{x}_{\text{true}})] \quad (1)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{Q_\phi(\theta|\mathbf{x}_{\text{true}})} [\log P_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{x}_{\text{true}}|\theta)] - D_{\text{KL}}[Q_\phi(\theta|\mathbf{x}_{\text{true}}) \| P(\theta)] \quad (2)$$

We must be careful however, since each dimension of  $Q_\phi(\theta|\mathbf{x})$  (a Sequential Autoregressive Network) is a mixture distribution. In order to compute  $\nabla_{\phi} \mathcal{L}(\phi)$ , we must sample from the distribution in such a way that it can be reparametrised; by finding the expectation under each component individually, and then weighting these terms by the mixture weights. That is, for a mixture distribution  $Q_\phi(\theta|\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^K \varphi_\phi^k(\mathbf{x}) Q_\phi^k(\theta|\mathbf{x})$ , we can pull the mixture weights out of the expectation:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_\phi(\theta|\mathbf{x})} f(\theta) = \int_{\theta} f(\theta) \left( \sum_{k=1}^K \varphi_\phi^k(\mathbf{x}) Q_\phi^k(\theta|\mathbf{x}) \right) d\theta \quad (3)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^K \varphi_\phi^k(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\theta} f(\theta) Q_\phi^k(\theta|\mathbf{x}) d\theta \quad (4)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^K \varphi_\phi^k(\mathbf{x}) \mathbb{E}_{Q_\phi^k(\theta|\mathbf{x})} [f(\theta)]. \quad (5)$$

However, by simply substituting  $f(\theta) = \log P(\theta, \mathbf{x}) - Q_\phi(\theta|\mathbf{x})$  and optimising  $\mathcal{L}(\phi)$ , the mode-seeking behaviour of the KL-divergence will down-weight many components in the mixture. Roeder et al. (2017) propose to use importance sampling (an IWAE), where we first draw  $T$  iid. samples from the posterior. Combining the approach above leads to a “*stratified* IWAE”, which is computed as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}^T(\phi) = \mathbb{E}_{\{\theta_{kt} \sim Q_\phi^k(\theta|\mathbf{x}_{\text{true},j})\}_{k=1,t=1}^{K,T}} \left[ \log \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^K \varphi_\phi^k(\mathbf{x}_{\text{true},j}) \frac{P_{\mathbf{w}}(\theta_{kt}, \mathbf{x}_{\text{true},j})}{Q_\phi(\theta_{kt}|\mathbf{x}_{\text{true},j})} \right], \quad (6)$$

where the notation  $\{\theta_{kt} \sim Q_\phi^k(\theta|\mathbf{x})\}_{k=1,t=1}^{K,T}$  means, draw  $T$  samples from each of the  $K$  mixture components, and  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{true},j}$  is the  $j$ th observation from the catalogue of real observations.

## References

- D. Hafner, T. Lillicrap, M. Norouzi, and J. Ba. Mastering Atari with Discrete World Models. *arXiv:2010.02193 [cs, stat]*, Dec. 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2010.02193>.
- G. Roeder, Y. Wu, and D. K. Duvenaud. Sticking the Landing: Simple, Lower-Variance Gradient Estimators for Variational Inference. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/hash/e91068fff3d7fa1594dfdf3b4308433a-Abstract.html>.