Deep Generative Models

Lecture 7

Roman Isachenko

Ozon Masters

Spring, 2022

Recap of previous lecture

Gaussian autoregressive flow (MAF)

$$\mathbf{x} = g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad x_i = \sigma_i(\mathbf{x}_{1:i-1}) \cdot z_i + \mu_i(\mathbf{x}_{1:i-1}).$$
$$\mathbf{z} = f(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad z_i = (x_i - \mu_i(\mathbf{x}_{1:i-1})) \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma_i(\mathbf{x}_{1:i-1})}.$$

Generation function $g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is **sequential**. Inference function $f(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is **not sequential**.

Inverse autoregressive flow (IAF)

$$\mathbf{x} = g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad x_i = \tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{z}_{1:i-1}) \cdot z_i + \tilde{\mu}_i(\mathbf{z}_{1:i-1})$$
$$\mathbf{z} = f(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad z_i = (x_i - \tilde{\mu}_i(\mathbf{z}_{1:i-1})) \cdot \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{z}_{1:i-1})}.$$

Papamakarios G., Pavlakou T., Murray I. Masked Autoregressive Flow for Density Estimation, 2017

Kingma D. P. et al. Improving Variational Inference with Inverse Autoregressive Flow, 2016

Recap of previous lecture

Autoregressive flows

RealNVP: Affine coupling law

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_{1:d} = \mathbf{x}_{1:d}; \\ \mathbf{z}_{d:m} = \tau(\mathbf{x}_{d:m}, c(\mathbf{x}_{1:d})); \end{cases} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_{1:d} = \mathbf{z}_{1:d}; \\ \mathbf{x}_{d:m} = \tau^{-1}(\mathbf{z}_{d:m}, c(\mathbf{z}_{1:d})). \end{cases}$$

Dinh L., Krueger D., Bengio Y. NICE: Non-linear Independent Components Estimation, 2014
Dinh L., Sohl-Dickstein J., Bengio S. Density estimation using Real NVP, 2016

Outline

Outline

Dequantization

- Images are discrete data, pixels lie in the $\{0, 255\}$ integer domain (the model is $P(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \text{Categorical}(\boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$).
- Flow is a continuous model (it works with continuous data $\mathbf{x}$).

By fitting a continuous density model to discrete data, one can produce a degenerate solution with all probability mass on discrete values.

How to convert a discrete data distribution to a continuous one?

Uniform dequantization

$$\mathbf{x} \sim \text{Categorical}(\boldsymbol{\pi})$$
$$\mathbf{u} \sim U[0, 1]$$

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u} \sim \text{Continuous}$$

Theis L., Oord A., Bethge M. A note on the evaluation of generative models. 2015

Uniform dequantization

Statement

Fitting continuous model $p(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ on uniformly dequantized data $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}$, $\mathbf{u} \sim U[0,1]$ is equivalent to maximization of a lower bound on log-likelihood for a discrete model:

$$P(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \int_{U[0,1]} p(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\mathbf{u}$$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_\pi \log p(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \int \pi(\mathbf{y}) \log p(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\mathbf{y} = \\
= \sum \pi(\mathbf{x}) \int_{U[0,1]} \log p(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\mathbf{u} \le \\
\le \sum \pi(\mathbf{x}) \log \int_{U[0,1]} p(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\mathbf{u} = \\
= \sum \pi(\mathbf{x}) \log P(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_\pi \log P(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}).
\end{aligned}$$

Theis L., Oord A., Bethge M. A note on the evaluation of generative models. 2015

Variational dequantization

- ▶ $p(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ assign unifrom density to unit hypercubes $\mathbf{x} + U[0,1]$ (left fig).
- ▶ Neural network density models are smooth function approximators (right fig).
- ▶ Smooth dequantization is more natural.

How to perform the smooth dequantization?

Flow++

Variational dequantization

Introduce variational dequantization noise distribution $q(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{x})$ and treat it as an approximate posterior.

Variational lower bound

$$\log P(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \left[\log \int q(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{x})\frac{p(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{q(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{x})}d\mathbf{u}\right] \geq$$
$$\geq \int q(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{x})\log\frac{p(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{q(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{x})}d\mathbf{u} = \mathcal{L}(q,\boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

Uniform dequantization bound

$$\log P(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \log \int_{U[0,1]} p(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta})d\mathbf{u} \geq \int_{U[0,1]} \log p(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta})d\mathbf{u}.$$

Uniform dequantization is a special case of variational dequantization ($q(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{x}) = U[0,1]$).

Ho J. et al. Flow++: Improving Flow-Based Generative Models with Variational Dequantization and Architecture Design, 2019

Flow++

Variational lower bound

$$\mathcal{L}(q, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \int q(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{x}) \log \frac{p(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{q(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{x})} d\mathbf{u}.$$

Let $\mathbf{u} = g(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is a flow model with base distribution $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sim p(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}) = \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$:

$$q(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{x}) = p(h^{-1}(\mathbf{u}, \phi)) \cdot \left| \det \frac{\partial g^{-1}(\mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}{\partial \mathbf{u}} \right|.$$

Flow-based variational dequantization

$$\log P(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq \mathcal{L}(\phi, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \int p(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}) \log \left(\frac{p(\mathbf{x} + g(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{p(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}) \cdot |\det \mathbf{J}_g|^{-1}} \right) d\boldsymbol{\epsilon}.$$

If $p(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is also a flow model, it is straightforward to calculate stochastic gradient of this ELBO.

Ho J. et al. Flow++: Improving Flow-Based Generative Models with Variational Dequantization and Architecture Design, 2019

Flow++

Flow-based variational dequantization

$$\log P(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq \int p(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}) \log \left(\frac{p(\mathbf{x} + g(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}))}{p(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}) \cdot |\det \mathbf{J}_g|^{-1}} \right) d\boldsymbol{\epsilon}.$$

Table 1. Unconditional image modeling results in bits/dim

Model family	Model	CIFAR10	ImageNet 32x32	ImageNet 64x64
Non-autoregressive	RealNVP (Dinh et al., 2016)	3.49	4.28	–
	Glow (Kingma & Dhariwal, 2018)	3.35	4.09	3.81
	IAF-VAE (Kingma et al., 2016)	3.11	–	–
	Flow++ (ours)	**3.08**	**3.86**	**3.69**
Autoregressive	Multiscale PixelCNN (Reed et al., 2017)	–	3.95	3.70
	PixelCNN (van den Oord et al., 2016b)	3.14	–	–
	PixelRNN (van den Oord et al., 2016b)	3.00	3.86	3.63
	Gated PixelCNN (van den Oord et al., 2016c)	3.03	3.83	3.57
	PixelCNN++ (Salimans et al., 2017)	2.92	–	–
	Image Transformer (Parmar et al., 2018)	2.90	3.77	–
	PixelSNAIL (Chen et al., 2017)	2.85	3.80	3.52

Outline

Likelihood-based models

Exact likelihood evaluation

► Autoregressive models (WaveNet, PixelCNN, PixelCNN++);
► Flow models (RealNVP, IAF, Glow).

Approximate likelihood evaluation

► Latent variable models (VAE).

What are the pros and cons of each of them?

VAE limitations

▶ Poor generative distribution (decoder)

$$p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\mu_\theta}(\mathbf{z}), \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{z})) \quad \text{or} \ = \text{Softmax}(\boldsymbol{\pi_\theta}(\mathbf{z})).$$

▶ Loose lower bound

$$\log p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathcal{L}(q, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = (?).$$

▶ **Poor prior distribution**

$$p(\mathbf{z}) = \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}).$$

▶ Poor variational posterior distribution (encoder)

$$q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{z}|\boldsymbol{\mu_\phi}(\mathbf{x}), \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{x})).$$

ELBO surgery

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathcal{L}_i(q,\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)}\log p(\mathbf{x}_i|\mathbf{z},\boldsymbol{\theta}) - KL(q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)||p(\mathbf{z}))\right].$$

Theorem

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}KL(q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)||p(\mathbf{z})) = KL(q_{\mathrm{agg}}(\mathbf{z})||p(\mathbf{z})) + \mathbb{I}_q[\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}],$$

▶ $q_{\mathrm{agg}}(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)$ – **aggregated** posterior distribution.

▶ $\mathbb{I}_q[\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}]$ – mutual information between $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{z}$ under empirical data distribution and distribution $q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$.

▶ First term pushes $q_{\mathrm{agg}}(\mathbf{z})$ towards the prior $p(\mathbf{z})$.

▶ Second term reduces the amount of information about $\mathbf{x}$ stored in $\mathbf{z}$.

Hoffman M. D., Johnson M. J. ELBO surgery: yet another way to carve up the variational evidence lower bound, 2016

ELBO surgery

Theorem

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} KL(q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)||p(\mathbf{z})) = KL(q_{\mathrm{agg}}(\mathbf{z})||p(\mathbf{z})) + \mathbb{I}_q[\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}].$$

Proof

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} KL(q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)||p(\mathbf{z})) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)\log\frac{q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)}{p(\mathbf{z})}d\mathbf{z} =$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)\log\frac{q_{\mathrm{agg}}(\mathbf{z})q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)}{p(\mathbf{z})q_{\mathrm{agg}}(\mathbf{z})}d\mathbf{z} = \int\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)\log\frac{q_{\mathrm{agg}}(\mathbf{z})}{p(\mathbf{z})}d\mathbf{z}+$$

$$+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)\log\frac{q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)}{q_{\mathrm{agg}}(\mathbf{z})}d\mathbf{z} = KL(q_{\mathrm{agg}}(\mathbf{z})||p(\mathbf{z}))+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}KL(q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)||q_{\mathrm{agg}}(\mathbf{z}))$$

Without proof:

$$\mathbb{I}_q[\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}] = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} KL(q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)||q_{\mathrm{agg}}(\mathbf{z})) \in [0, \log n].$$

Hoffman M. D., Johnson M. J. ELBO surgery: yet another way to carve up the variational evidence lower bound, 2016

ELBO surgery

ELBO revisiting

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathcal{L}_i(q, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)}\log p(\mathbf{x}_i|\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) - KL(q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)||p(\mathbf{z}))\right] =$$

$$= \underbrace{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i)}\log p(\mathbf{x}_i|\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}_{\text{Reconstruction loss}} - \underbrace{\mathbb{I}_q[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}]}_{\text{MI}} - \underbrace{KL(q_{\text{agg}}(\mathbf{z})||p(\mathbf{z}))}_{\text{Marginal KL}}$$

Prior distribution $p(\mathbf{z})$ is only in the last term.

Optimal VAE prior

$$KL(q_{\text{agg}}(\mathbf{z})||p(\mathbf{z})) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad p(\mathbf{z}) = q_{\text{agg}}(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i).$$

The optimal prior $p(\mathbf{z})$ is the aggregated posterior $q_{\text{agg}}(\mathbf{z})$.

Hoffman M. D., Johnson M. J. ELBO surgery: yet another way to carve up the variational evidence lower bound, 2016

Outline

Optimal VAE prior

How to choose the optimal $p(\mathbf{z})$?

- Standard Gaussian $p(\mathbf{z}) = \mathcal{N}(0, I) \Rightarrow$ over-regularization;
- $p(\mathbf{z}) = q_{\text{agg}}(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}_i) \Rightarrow$ overfitting and highly expensive.

Non learnable prior $p(\mathbf{z})$

Learnable prior $p(\mathbf{z}|\boldsymbol{\lambda})$

image credit: https://jmtomczak.github.io/blog/7/7_priors.html

Flows-based VAE prior

Flow model in latent space

$$\log p(\mathbf{z}|\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \log p(\mathbf{z}^*) + \log\left|\det\left(\frac{d\mathbf{z}^*}{d\mathbf{z}}\right)\right| = \log p(g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})) + \log|\det(\mathbf{J}_g)|$$

$$\mathbf{z} = f(\mathbf{z}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = g^{-1}(\mathbf{z}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$$

▶ RealNVP flow.
▶ Autoregressive flow (MAF).

Why it is not a good idea to use IAF for VAE prior?

ELBO with flow-based VAE prior

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\phi})}\left[\log p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \log p(\mathbf{z}|\boldsymbol{\lambda}) - \log q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\phi})\right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x},\boldsymbol{\phi})}\Big[\log p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \underbrace{\Big(\log p(g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})) + \log|\det(\mathbf{J}_g)|\Big)}_{\text{flow-based prior}} - \log q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\phi})\Big]$$

Chen X. et al. Variational Lossy Autoencoder, 2016

VAE limitations

▶ Poor generative distribution (decoder)

$$p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\mu_\theta}(\mathbf{z}), \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2(\mathbf{z})) \quad \text{or} \ = \text{Softmax}(\boldsymbol{\pi_\theta}(\mathbf{z})).$$

▶ Loose lower bound

$$\log p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathcal{L}(q, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = (?).$$

▶ Poor prior distribution

$$p(\mathbf{z}) = \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}).$$

▶ **Poor variational posterior distribution (encoder)**

$$q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{z}|\boldsymbol{\mu_\phi}(\mathbf{x}), \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^2(\mathbf{x})).$$

Outline

Variational posterior

ELBO

$$\log p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathcal{L}(q, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + KL(q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \phi)||p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})).$$

- ▶ In E-step of EM-algorithm we wish
  $KL(q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \phi)||p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})) = 0$.
  (In this case the lower bound is tight $\log p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathcal{L}(q, \boldsymbol{\theta})$).
- ▶ Normal variational distribution
  $q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \phi) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{z}|\boldsymbol{\mu}_\phi(\mathbf{x}), \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\phi^2(\mathbf{x}))$ is poor (e.g. has only one mode).
- ▶ Flows models convert a simple base distribution to a complex one using invertible transformation with simple Jacobian. How to use flows in VAE posterior?

Flows in VAE posterior

Apply a sequence of transformations to the random variable

$$\mathbf{z} \sim q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{z}|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{x}), \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^2(\mathbf{x})).$$

Let $q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\phi})$ (VAE encoder) be a base distribution for a flow model.

Flow model in latent space

$$\log q(\mathbf{z}^*|\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \log q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) + \log \left| \det \left(\frac{\partial g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}{\partial \mathbf{z}} \right) \right|$$

$$\mathbf{z}^* = g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = f^{-1}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$$

Here $g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is a flow model (e.g. stack of planar/coupling/AR layers) parameterized by $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$.
Let use $q(\mathbf{z}^*|\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ as a variational distribution. Here $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ – encoder parameters, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ – flow parameters.

Rezende D. J., Mohamed S. Variational Inference with Normalizing Flows, 2015

Flows-based VAE posterior

- Encoder outputs base distribution $q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \phi)$.
- Flow model $\mathbf{z}^* = g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ transforms the base distribution $q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \phi)$ to the distribution $q(\mathbf{z}^*|\mathbf{x}, \phi, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$.
- Distribution $q(\mathbf{z}^*|\mathbf{x}, \phi, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is used as a variational distribution for ELBO maximization.

Flow model in latent space

$$\log q(\mathbf{z}^*|\mathbf{x}, \phi, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \log q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \phi) + \log \left| \det \left(\frac{\partial g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}{\partial \mathbf{z}} \right) \right|$$

ELBO with flow-based VAE posterior

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}(\phi, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}^*|\mathbf{x}, \phi, \boldsymbol{\lambda})} \big[\log p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^*|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \log q(\mathbf{z}^*|\mathbf{x}, \phi, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) \big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}^*|\mathbf{x}, \phi, \boldsymbol{\lambda})} \log p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}) - KL(q(\mathbf{z}^*|\mathbf{x}, \phi, \boldsymbol{\lambda})||p(\mathbf{z}^*)).
\end{aligned}$$

The second term in ELBO is reverse KL divergence. Planar flows was originally proposed for variational inference in VAE.

Rezende D. J., Mohamed S. Variational Inference with Normalizing Flows, 2015

Flows-based VAE posterior

Flow model in latent space

$$\log q(\mathbf{z}^*|\mathbf{x}, \phi, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \log q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \phi) + \log \left| \det \left(\frac{\partial g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}{\partial \mathbf{z}} \right) \right|$$

ELBO objective

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}(\phi, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}^*|\mathbf{x}, \phi, \boldsymbol{\lambda})}\big[\log p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^*|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \log q(\mathbf{z}^*|\mathbf{x}, \phi, \boldsymbol{\lambda})\big] = \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \phi)} \left[\log p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^*|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \log q(\mathbf{z}^*|\mathbf{x}, \phi, \boldsymbol{\lambda})\right]\big|_{\mathbf{z}^* = g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})} = \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \phi)} \left[\log p(\mathbf{x}, g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \log q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \phi) - \log |\det(\mathbf{J}_g)| \right].
\end{aligned}
$$

▶ Obtain samples $\mathbf{z}$ from the encoder $q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \phi)$.
▶ Apply flow model $\mathbf{z}^* = g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$.
▶ Compute likelihood for $\mathbf{z}^*$ using the decoder, base distribution for $\mathbf{z}^*$ and the Jacobian.

Rezende D. J., Mohamed S. Variational Inference with Normalizing Flows, 2015

Inverse autoregressive flow (IAF)

$$\mathbf{x} = g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad x_i = \tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{z}_{1:i-1}) \cdot z_i + \tilde{\mu}_i(\mathbf{z}_{1:i-1}).$$

$$\mathbf{z} = f(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad z_i = (x_i - \tilde{\mu}_i(\mathbf{z}_{1:i-1})) \cdot \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{z}_{1:i-1})}.$$

Reverse KL for flow model

$$KL(p||\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbf{z})} \left[\log p(\mathbf{z}) - \log \left| \det \left(\frac{\partial g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \mathbf{z}} \right) \right| - \log \pi(g(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta})) \right]$$

▶ We don't need to think about computing the function $f(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$.

▶ Inverse autoregressive flow is a natural choice for using flows in VAE:

$$\mathbf{z} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}) \odot \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1); \quad \sim q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \phi).$$

$$\mathbf{z}_k = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_k(\mathbf{z}_{k-1}) \odot \mathbf{z}_{k-1} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_k(\mathbf{z}_{k-1}), \quad k \geq 1; \quad \sim q_k(\mathbf{z}_k|\mathbf{x}, \phi, \{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j\}_{j=1}^k).$$

Kingma D. P. et al. Improving Variational Inference with Inverse Autoregressive Flow, 2016

Inverse autoregressive flow (IAF)

(a) Prior distribution   (b) Posteriors in standard VAE   (c) Posteriors in VAE with IAF

Kingma D. P. et al. Improving Variational Inference with Inverse Autoregressive Flow, 2016

Flows-based VAE prior vs posterior

Theorem
VAE with the flow-based prior for latent code **z** is equivalent to VAE with flow-based posterior for latent code **z**.

Proof

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}(\phi, \theta, \lambda) &= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x},\phi)} \log p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}, \theta) - \underbrace{KL(q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \phi)||p(\mathbf{z}|\lambda))}_{\text{flow-based prior}} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x},\phi)} \log p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}, \theta) - \underbrace{KL(q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \phi, \lambda)||p(\mathbf{z}))}_{\text{flow-based posterior}}
\end{aligned}
$$

(Here we use Flow KL duality theorem from Lecture 5)

Flows in VAE posterior

$$
\mathcal{L}(\phi, \theta, \lambda) = \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x},\phi)} \bigg[\log p(\mathbf{x}, g(\mathbf{z}, \lambda)|\theta) - \log q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \phi) - \log |\det(\mathbf{J}_g)| \bigg].
$$

Chen X. et al. Variational Lossy Autoencoder, 2016

Flows-based VAE prior vs posterior

- ▶ IAF posterior decoder path: $p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$, $\mathbf{z} \sim p(\mathbf{z})$.
- ▶ AF prior decoder path: $p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$, $\mathbf{z} = f(\mathbf{z}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$, $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sim p(\mathbf{z}^*)$.

The AF prior and the IAF posterior have the same computation cost, so using the AF prior makes the model more expressive at no training time cost.

IAF Posterior   Autoregressive Prior

— Encoder
— Decoder

VAE limitations

▶ Poor generative distribution (decoder)

$$p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\mu_\theta}(\mathbf{z}), \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{z})) \quad \text{or} \ = \text{Softmax}(\boldsymbol{\pi_\theta}(\mathbf{z})).$$

▶ Loose lower bound

$$\log p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathcal{L}(q, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = (?).$$

▶ Poor prior distribution

$$p(\mathbf{z}) = \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}).$$

▶ Poor variational posterior distribution (encoder)

$$q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{z}|\boldsymbol{\mu_\phi}(\mathbf{x}), \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{x})).$$

Summary

▶ Dequantization allows to fit discrete data using continuous model.

▶ Uniform dequantization is the simplest form of dequantization. Variational dequantization is a more natural type that was proposed in Flow++ model.

▶ The ELBO surgery reveals insights about a prior distribution in VAE. The optimal prior is the aggregated posterior.

▶ We could use flow-based prior in VAE (moreover, autoregressive).

▶ We could use flows to make variational posterior more expressive. This is equivalent to the flow-based prior.