

## Variational inference: Reparametrization tricks

Setup: Bayesian inference for some model with parameters  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$   
given some data  $\mathcal{D}$ :

$$\underbrace{p(\theta | \mathcal{D})}_{\text{intractable}} = \frac{p(\mathcal{D} | \theta) p(\theta)}{\underbrace{p(\mathcal{D})}}$$

Idea: Approximate  $p(\theta | \mathcal{D}) \approx q_{\phi}(\theta | \mathcal{D})$

e.g. mean-field:  $q_{\phi}(\theta | \mathcal{D}) = \prod_{i=1}^d \mathcal{N}(\theta_i | \mu_i, \sigma_i^2)$

$$\phi := \{\mu_1, \sigma_1^2, \dots, \mu_d, \sigma_d^2\}$$

Training:  $\phi^* = \underset{\phi}{\operatorname{argmin}} \operatorname{KL}[q_{\phi}(\theta | \mathcal{D}) || p(\theta | \mathcal{D})] := \mathcal{L}(\phi)$

$$\mathcal{L}(\phi) := \underbrace{-H[q_{\phi}(\theta | \mathcal{D})]}_{\text{computed analytically}} - \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim q_{\phi}(\theta | \mathcal{D})} [\log p(\mathcal{D} | \theta) + \log p(\theta)]}_{\text{computed via sampling}}$$

Optimize via SGD:  $\phi^{n+1} = \phi^n - \eta \underline{\underline{\nabla_{\phi} \mathcal{L}(\phi)}}$

Compute  $\nabla_{\phi} \mathcal{L}(\phi)$ :

$$\nabla_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim q_{\phi}(\theta | \mathcal{D})} [\log p(\mathcal{D} | \theta) + \log p(\theta)]$$

$$= \underbrace{\nabla_{\phi} \int \log p(\mathcal{D} | \theta) q_{\phi}(\theta | \mathcal{D}) d\theta}_{\text{...}} + \underbrace{\nabla_{\phi} \int \log p(\theta) q_{\phi}(\theta | \mathcal{D}) d\theta}_{\text{...}}$$

$$= \int \log p(D|\theta) \underbrace{\nabla_{\phi} q_{\phi}(\theta|D)}_{\neq 0} d\theta + \int \log p(\theta) \nabla_{\phi} q_{\phi}(\theta|D) d\theta \quad (1)$$

Recall:  $(\log f(x))' = \frac{f'(x)}{f(x)}$

$$\bullet \nabla_{\phi} \log q_{\phi}(\theta|D) = \frac{\nabla_{\phi} q_{\phi}(\theta|D)}{q_{\phi}(\theta|D)}$$

$$\Rightarrow \nabla_{\phi} q_{\phi}(\theta|D) = \nabla_{\phi} \log q_{\phi}(\theta|D) \cdot \underline{q_{\phi}(\theta|D)} \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \stackrel{(2)}{\Rightarrow} \underbrace{\nabla_{\phi} \mathcal{L}(\phi)} &= \int \log p(D|\theta) \nabla_{\phi} \log q_{\phi}(\theta|D) q_{\phi}(\theta|D) d\theta \\ &+ \int \log p(\theta) \nabla_{\phi} \log q_{\phi}(\theta|D) q_{\phi}(\theta|D) d\theta \end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim q_{\phi}(\theta|D)} \left[ \nabla_{\phi} \log q_{\phi}(\theta|D) (\log p(D|\theta) + \log p(\theta)) \right]$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{i=1}^S \nabla_{\phi} \log q_{\phi}(\theta_i|D) (\log p(D|\theta_i) + \log p(\theta_i)),$$

$$\theta_i \sim q_{\phi}(\theta|D) \stackrel{\text{m.f.}}{=} \mathcal{N}(\theta | \mu_{\phi}, \Sigma_{\phi})$$

$$\mu_{\phi} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mu_d \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Sigma_{\phi} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & \sigma_d^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

The above Monte Carlo estimator of  $\nabla_{\phi} \mathcal{L}(\phi)$  depends on  $\phi$  and in practice tends to exhibit very high variance (i.e. it is very inaccurate unless a very large number of samples are considered).

samples is cumbersome...

## Reparametrization trick:

Idea: Introduce a simple "change of variables" such that we compute expectations with respect to distributions that do not depend on  $\phi$ .

If we can find a function  $h: (\epsilon, \phi) \rightarrow \theta$ , where  $\epsilon \sim p(\epsilon)$ , then we can write:

$$\theta_i = h_\phi(\epsilon), \quad \epsilon \sim p(\epsilon), \quad \text{such that } \theta_i \sim q_\phi(\theta|D)$$

e.g. re-parametrize a Gaussian:

$$\theta_i \sim q_\phi(\theta|D) = \mathcal{N}(\theta_i | \mu_\phi, \Sigma_\phi)$$

In fact, we can generate samples  $\theta$  by sampling  $\epsilon \sim p(\epsilon)$

$$\theta = \mu_\phi + \epsilon \Sigma_\phi^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \text{where } \epsilon \sim p(\epsilon) = \mathcal{N}(0, I)$$

$$\theta = h_\phi(\epsilon)$$

Now recall the troublesome gradient term:

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla_\phi \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim q_\phi(\theta|D)} [\log p(D|\theta) + \log p(\theta)] = \\ & \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim q_\phi(\theta|D)} \left[ \nabla_\phi \log q_\phi(\theta|D) (\log p(D|\theta) + \log p(\theta)) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\rightarrow \nabla_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim p(\epsilon)} \left[ \log p(D | h_{\phi}(\epsilon)) + \log p(h_{\phi}(\epsilon)) \right]$$

$$\stackrel{\text{M.F.}}{=} \nabla_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} \left[ \log p(D | \underbrace{\mu_{\phi} + \epsilon \Sigma_{\phi}^{\frac{1}{2}}}_{\text{}}) + \log p(\underbrace{\mu_{\phi} + \epsilon \Sigma_{\phi}^{\frac{1}{2}}}_{\text{}}) \right]$$

Now the gradient is not related to the variational param  
(i.e. the distribution with respect to which the expectation is  
taken does not depend on  $\phi$ .)

Summary:  $\phi^* = \underset{\phi}{\operatorname{argmin}} \operatorname{KL}[q_{\phi}(\theta|D) || p(\theta|D)]$

$$L(\phi) := \underbrace{-H[q_{\phi}(\theta|D)]}_{\text{Evidence lower bound (ELBO)}} - \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim q_{\phi}(\theta|D)} [\log p(D|\theta) + \log p(\theta)]}_{\text{}} \quad \downarrow$$

Evidence  
lower  
bound (ELBO)

$$\text{If } \boxed{q_{\phi}(\theta|D) = \mathcal{N}(\theta; \mu_{\phi}, \Sigma_{\phi})}$$

1<sup>st</sup> term:  $-H[q_{\phi}(\theta|D)] = -\sum_{i=1}^d \log \sigma_i + \text{constant}$

$$-\nabla_{\phi} H[q_{\phi}(\theta|D)] = -\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma_i} \log \sigma_i = -\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{\sigma_i}$$

2<sup>nd</sup> term:

$$\nabla_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim q_{\phi}(\theta|D)} [\log p(D|\theta) + \log p(\theta)] =$$

$$\rightarrow \mathbb{E} \left[ \log p(D | \mu_{\phi} + \epsilon \Sigma_{\phi}^{\frac{1}{2}}) + \log p(\mu_{\phi} + \epsilon \Sigma_{\phi}^{\frac{1}{2}}) \right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} \left[ \nabla_{\theta} \log p(D | \mu_{\theta} + \epsilon \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}) \right]$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{i=1}^S \left[ \nabla_{\theta} \log p(D | \underbrace{\mu_{\theta} + \epsilon_i \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}}_{\theta}) \right] + \nabla_{\theta} \log p(\mu_{\theta} + \epsilon_i \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}})$$

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