Variational Autoencoders

Machine Learning and Data Mining, 2023

Presented by: Abdalaziz Al-Maeeni

Prepared by: Artem Maevskiy

National Research University Higher School of Economics

LAMBDA • HSE

Decr 16, 2023

A few definitions

Conditional probability (recap)

$$P(A \mid B) = \frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(B)}$$



For PDF: $$p(x \mid y) = \frac{p(x, y)}{p(y)}$$

– i.e. we're renormalizing $p(x, y)$ as a distribution of only x for some fixed y

Entropy

- Entropy of a distribution:

$$\mathscr{H}(p) = -\mathbb{E}_{x\sim p(x)}\log p(x)$$

  - measure uncertainty of the random variable x
  - e.g., for the normal distribution it is proportional to $\log\sigma^2$ (the wider the distribution, the more uncertainty there is)
- Note that it equals to the expected negative log likelihood of the correct hypothesis (i.e., when the data is actually distributed as p)

Cross-entropy

- Cross-entropy between two distributions:

$$\mathscr{H}\left(p, q\right) = -\mathbb{E}_{x \sim p(x)} \log q(x)$$

- May be thought of as the expected negative log likelihood of q when the data is actually distributed as p

Kullback–Leibler divergence

$$D_{\mathrm{KL}}(p \mid\mid q) \equiv \mathcal{H}(p, q) - \mathcal{H}(p)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p(x)} \log \frac{p(x)}{q(x)}$$

- Interpretation: expected logarithm of the likelihood ratio between the true data distribution and distribution q when the data is actually distributed as p

$$D_{\mathrm{KL}}(p \mid\mid q) \geq 0$$

$$D_{\mathrm{KL}}(p \mid\mid q) = 0 \iff p = q \text{ (almost everywhere)}$$

Generative modelling

Problem setup (recap)

- Given a set of training objects $\{x_i\}$
- We want to approximate their population distribution $p_{\text{data}}(x)$
- E.g., with some distribution $p_\theta(x)$ parametrized with θ
- To be able to sample new objects $x' \sim p_\theta$, that are similar to $\{x_i\}$

How can a neural network generate data? (recap)



- This makes the generated object being a differentiable function of the network parameters

Cat image attribution: https://pixabay.com/users/chiemsee2016-1892688/

Modelling the probability density

- Generated object: $x' = G_\theta(z)$,
- Latent code: $z \sim p_z$ (sampled from some fixed distribution)

Modelling the probability density

- Generated object: $x' = G_\theta(z)$,
- Latent code: $z \sim p_z$ (sampled from some fixed distribution)

- We can treat our model as a model for the probability density, e.g.:

$$p_\theta(x \mid z) = \mathcal{N}\left(x \middle| \mu = G_\theta(z),\ \Sigma = \mathbb{I}\sigma^2\right)$$

I.e. the network generates not just a single object, but rather the average object for the given latent code z

fixed parameter

Modelling the probability density

- Generated object: $x' = G_\theta(z)$,
- Latent code: $z \sim p_z$ (sampled from some fixed distribution)

- We can treat our model as a model for the probability density, e.g.:

$$p_\theta(x \mid z) = \mathcal{N}(x \mid \mu = G_\theta(z),\ \Sigma = \mathbb{I}\sigma^2)$$

I.e. the network generates not just a single object, but rather the average object for the given latent code z

fixed parameter

$$p_\theta(x) = \int p_\theta(x, z)dz = \int p_\theta(x \mid z)p_z(z)dz = \mathbb{E}_{z\sim p_z} p_\theta(x \mid z)$$

prior on z

How can we train it?

- To train the model, we'd want to maximize the expected log likelihood:

$$L = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_{\text{data}}} \log p_\theta(x) \to \max_\theta$$

How can we train it?

- To train the model, we'd want to maximize the expected log likelihood:

$$L = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_{\text{data}}} \log p_\theta(x) \to \max_\theta$$

- But $p_\theta(x) = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_z} p_\theta\left(x \mid z\right)$, i.e., it is not expressed in a closed form
  - we only have closed forms for $p_\theta\left(x \mid z\right)$ and $p_z(z)$

How can we train it?

- To train the model, we'd want to maximize the expected log likelihood:

$$L = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_{\text{data}}} \log p_\theta(x) \to \max_\theta$$

- But $p_\theta(x) = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_z} p_\theta\big(x \mid z\big)$, i.e., it is not expressed in a closed form
  - we only have closed forms for $p_\theta\big(x \mid z\big)$ and $p_z(z)$
- Sampling $z \sim p_z$, $x \sim p_{\text{data}}$ and then maximizing the likelihood is typically not very productive
  - Like this, z contains no information about x, and the network will likely learn just to ignore it and always predict the same object

The posterior

- Assume we're able to calculate (and sample from) the posterior $p_\theta(z \mid x)$
- Note that:

$$\log p_\theta(x) = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_\theta(z|x)} \log \left[p_\theta(x) \frac{p_\theta(z \mid x)}{p_\theta(z \mid x)} \right]$$

The posterior

- Assume we're able to calculate (and sample from) the posterior $p_\theta(z \mid x)$
- Note that:

$$\log p_\theta(x) = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_\theta(z|x)} \log \left[p_\theta(x) \frac{p_\theta(z \mid x)}{p_\theta(z \mid x)} \right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_\theta(z|x)} \left[\log p_\theta(x, z) - \log p_\theta(z \mid x) \right]$$

The posterior

- Assume we're able to calculate (and sample from) the posterior $p_\theta(z \mid x)$
- Note that:

$$\log p_\theta(x) = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_\theta(z|x)} \log \left[p_\theta(x) \frac{p_\theta(z \mid x)}{p_\theta(z \mid x)} \right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_\theta(z|x)} \left[\log p_\theta(x, z) - \log p_\theta(z \mid x) \right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_\theta(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x, z) + \mathscr{H}\left(p_\theta(z \mid x) \right)$$

The posterior

- Assume we're able to calculate (and sample from) the posterior $p_\theta(z \mid x)$
- Note that:

$$\log p_\theta(x) = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_\theta(z|x)} \log \left[p_\theta(x) \frac{p_\theta(z \mid x)}{p_\theta(z \mid x)} \right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_\theta(z|x)} \left[\log p_\theta(x, z) - \log p_\theta(z \mid x) \right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_\theta(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x, z) + \mathcal{H}\left(p_\theta(z \mid x) \right)$$

So, for the log-likelihood we're sampling not all z values, but only those corresponding to this particular x

Maximizing this encourages placing high probability mass on many z values that could've generated x

Approximate inference

Approximate inference

- In practice, $p_\theta(z \mid x)$ is typically intractable
- Let's try to approximate it with another parametric distribution $q_\phi(z \mid x)$
  - E.g., $q_\phi(z \mid x) = \mathcal{N}\left(z \middle| \mu_\phi(x), \mathbb{I}\sigma^2_\phi(x)\right)$, where μ_ϕ and σ^2_ϕ are outputs of a neural network
- And use it for the likelihood calculation, i.e.:

$$\left[\log p_\theta(x)\right]_{\text{approx.},\phi} = \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x, z) + \mathcal{H}\left(q_\phi(z \mid x)\right)$$

Approximate inference

- Let's check how bad this approximation is:

$$\log p_\theta(x) - \left[\log p_\theta(x)\right]_{\text{approx.},\phi} =$$

$$= \log p_\theta(x) - \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x, z) - \mathscr{H}\Big(q_\phi(z \,|\, x)\Big)$$

Approximate inference

- Let's check how bad this approximation is:

$$\log p_\theta(x) - \left[\log p_\theta(x)\right]_{\text{approx.},\phi} =$$

$$= \log p_\theta(x) - \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x, z) - \mathscr{H}\left(q_\phi(z \mid x)\right)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)} \left[\log p_\theta(x) - \log p_\theta(x, z) + \log q_\phi(z \mid x)\right]$$

Approximate inference

- Let's check how bad this approximation is:

$$\log p_\theta(x) - \left[\log p_\theta(x)\right]_{\text{approx.},\phi} =$$

$$= \log p_\theta(x) - \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x, z) - \mathscr{H}\Big(q_\phi(z\,|\,x)\Big)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)}\Big[\log p_\theta(x) - \log p_\theta(x, z) + \log q_\phi(z\,|\,x)\Big]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)}\Big[-\log p_\theta\big(z\,|\,x\big) + \log q_\phi(z\,|\,x)\Big]$$

$$= D_{\mathrm{KL}}\Big(q_\phi(z\,|\,x)\Big\|p_\theta(z\,|\,x)\Big) \geq 0$$

Approximate inference

- We've shown that:

$$\log p_\theta(x) - \left[\log p_\theta(x)\right]_{\text{approx.},\phi} = D_{\text{KL}}\left(q_\phi(z \mid x) \middle\| p_\theta(z \mid x)\right) \geq 0$$

- I.e., our approximate log-likelihood is the lower bound for the true log-likelihood
  - Also called evidence lower bound (ELBO) or variational lower bound

Approximate inference

- We've shown that:

$$\log p_\theta(x) - \left[\log p_\theta(x)\right]_{\text{approx.},\phi} = D_{\text{KL}}\left(q_\phi(z \mid x) \middle\| p_\theta(z \mid x)\right) \geq 0$$

- I.e., our approximate log-likelihood is the lower bound for the true log-likelihood
  - Also called evidence lower bound (ELBO) or variational lower bound
- The better q approximates the posterior – the closer the bound is to the actual log-likelihood
- Also, if we maximize the lower bound, we'll maximize the likelihood as well!

Alternative form

$$\text{ELBO} = \left[\log p_\theta(x)\right]_{\text{approx.},\phi} = \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x, z) + \mathscr{H}\Big(q_\phi(z\,|\,x)\Big)$$

Alternative form

$$\text{ELBO} = \left[\log p_\theta(x)\right]_{\text{approx.},\phi} = \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x, z) + \mathscr{H}\Big(q_\phi(z\,|\,x)\Big)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)} \Big[\log p_\theta(x\,|\,z) + \log p(z) - \log q_\phi(z\,|\,x)\Big]$$

Alternative form

$$\text{ELBO} = \left[\log p_\theta(x)\right]_{\text{approx.},\phi} = \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x, z) + \mathscr{H}\Big(q_\phi(z \,|\, x)\Big)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)} \Big[\log p_\theta(x \,|\, z) + \log p(z) - \log q_\phi(z \,|\, x)\Big]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x \,|\, z) - D_{KL}\Big(q_\phi(z \,|\, x) \Big\| p(z)\Big) \to \max_{\theta,\phi}$$

Alternative form

$$\text{ELBO} = \left[\log p_\theta(x)\right]_{\text{approx.},\phi} = \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x, z) + \mathscr{H}\Big(q_\phi(z \mid x)\Big)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)} \Big[\log p_\theta(x \mid z) + \log p(z) - \log q_\phi(z \mid x)\Big]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x \mid z) - D_{KL}\Big(q_\phi(z \mid x) \Big\| p(z)\Big) \to \max_{\theta,\phi}$$

Data term

Regularizer

Variational autoencoder (VAE)

Variational autoencoder

- Let's make use our choices for $p_\theta(x \mid z)$, $p_z(z)$ and $q_\phi(z \mid x)$:

$$p_z(z) = \mathcal{N}(z \mid 0, \mathbb{I})$$

$$p_\theta(x \mid z) = \mathcal{N}\left(x \mid \mu = G_\theta(z),\ \Sigma = \mathbb{I}\sigma^2\right)$$

$$q_\phi(z \mid x) = \mathcal{N}\left(z \mid \mu_\phi(x),\ \mathbb{I}\sigma^2_\phi(x)\right)$$

- And see how we can optimize the two ELBO terms:

$$\text{ELBO} = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_\phi(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x \mid z) - D_{KL}\left(q_\phi(z \mid x) \| p(z)\right) \to \max_{\theta,\phi}$$

Data term

Regularizer

The data term

$$\mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_\phi(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x \mid z)$$

- Take object x from the dataset
- Calculate the posterior $q_\phi(z \mid x)$
- Sample latent code z_ϕ from the posterior
- Calculate the log-likelihood for this pair $\left(x,\ z_\phi\right)$:

$$p_z(z) = \mathcal{N}(z \mid 0, \mathbb{I})$$

$$p_\theta(x \mid z) = \mathcal{N}\left(x \mid \mu = G_\theta(z),\ \Sigma = \mathbb{I}\sigma^2\right)$$

$$q_\phi(z \mid x) = \mathcal{N}\left(z \mid \mu_\phi(x),\ \mathbb{I}\sigma^2_\phi(x)\right)$$

$$\log p_\theta(x \mid z) = -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_i \left(x_i - G_\theta\left(z_\phi\right)_i\right)^2 + const$$

Sum over the components of the data vector

The data term

$$\mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_\phi(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x \mid z)$$

- Take object x from the dataset
- Calculate the posterior $q_\phi(z \mid x)$
- Sample latent code z_ϕ from the posterior
- Calculate the log-likelihood for this pair $\left(x,\ z_\phi\right)$:

$$p_z(z) = \mathcal{N}(z \mid 0, \mathbb{I})$$

$$p_\theta(x \mid z) = \mathcal{N}\left(x \mid \mu = G_\theta(z),\ \Sigma = \mathbb{I}\sigma^2\right)$$

$$q_\phi(z \mid x) = \mathcal{N}\left(z \mid \mu_\phi(x),\ \mathbb{I}\sigma^2_\phi(x)\right)$$

"encoder"

"decoder"

$$\log p_\theta(x \mid z) = -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_i \left(x_i - G_\theta\left(z_\phi\right)_i\right)^2 + const$$

Sum over the components of the data vector

The data term

$$\mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_\phi(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x \mid z)$$

- Take object x from the dataset
- Calculate the posterior $q_\phi(z \mid x)$
- Sample latent code z_ϕ from the posterior
- Calculate the log-likelihood for this pair $\left(x,\ z_\phi\right)$:

$$p_z(z) = \mathcal{N}(z \mid 0, \mathbb{I})$$

$$p_\theta(x \mid z) = \mathcal{N}\left(x \mid \mu = G_\theta(z),\ \Sigma = \mathbb{I}\sigma^2\right)$$

$$q_\phi(z \mid x) = \mathcal{N}\left(z \mid \mu_\phi(x),\ \mathbb{I}\sigma^2_\phi(x)\right)$$

"encoder"

"decoder"

$$\log p_\theta(x \mid z) = -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_i \left(x_i - G_\theta\left(z_\phi\right)_i\right)^2 + const$$

Sum over the components of the data vector

How do we backpropagate through z (to optimize wrt ϕ)?

Backpropagating through randomness

Reparametrization trick:

- To sample $z_\phi \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_\phi(x), \sigma^2_\phi(x)\right)$,
- we first sample $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$,
- then set $z_\phi = \xi \cdot \sigma_\phi(x) + \mu_\phi(x)$

Regularizer term

$$\text{ELBO} = \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q_\phi(z|x)} \log p_\theta(x \mid z) - D_{KL}\Big(q_\phi(z \mid x)\Big\|p(z)\Big) \to \max_{\theta,\phi}$$

Data term

Regularizer

- p_z is $\mathcal{N}(0,\mathbb{I})$
- $q_\phi(z \mid x)$ is a normal with $\mu = \mu_\phi(x),\ \Sigma = \mathbb{I}\sigma^2_\phi(x)$
- KL divergence between them can be calculated analytically
- Proove that:
  - KL is additive for factorizing distributions $D_{KL}(p_x p_y \| q_x q_y) = D_{KL}(p_x \| q_x) + D_{KL}(p_y \| q_y)$,
  - KL between two univariate normal distributions is:

$$D_{KL}\Big(\mathcal{N}\big(\mu_1, \sigma_1^2\big)\Big\|\mathcal{N}\big(\mu_2, \sigma_2^2\big)\Big) = \log\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1} + \frac{\sigma_1^2 + \big(\mu_2 - \mu_1\big)^2}{2\sigma_2^2} - \frac{1}{2}$$

Discussion

VAE vs GANs

- In the tasks of image generation GANs are typically better
  - VAEs tend to produce blurry results due to the nature of the MSE loss
  - Note that MSE loss between images does not reflect our perception of image quality or similarity:

(a) (b) (c)

Image (b) — slightly altered image (a), image (c) — image (a) shifted by several pixels.
Under MSE metric, image (b) is much closer to (a), than (c) to (a).

  - There are some further advancements in VAEs that perform better (e.g., adversarial VAE)

VAEs vs GANs

- VAE is easier to train – no min-max game, just a single optimization objective
- The encoder gives you the mapping from objects to the latent representation
  - This lets you do things like interpolation between objects, anaylyzing latent space, etc.
- VAEs give you explicit access to the estimated data PDF

Bayessian neural networks in a nutshell

- Variational inference and ELBO optimization are very powerful techniques
- Also applied in bayessian neural networks
- The main idea is to treat the weights as random variables, with some prior distribution on them, i.e., the model is $p\left(y \mid x\right) = \mathbb{E}_{w \sim p(w)}\left[p\left(y \mid x,\ w\right)\right]$
- Approximate posterior $p(w \mid X, Y)$ with a parametric distribution $q_\phi(w)$
  - Something easy to sample from - allowing for the reparametrisation trick, and allowing the analytic calculation of KL divergence wrt prior
- Optimize ELBO:

$$\text{ELBO} = \mathbb{E}_{w \sim q_\phi} \log p\left(y \mid x, w\right) - D_{\text{KL}}\left(q_\phi(w) \,\middle\|\, p(w)\right)$$

Bayessian neural networks in a nutshell

- Having found the approximate posterior $q_\phi(w)$, use expected w for prediction
- May also sample different weights from $q_\phi(w)$ to estimate the uncertainty of the prediction
- Different priors favor different properties of the network
  - E.g., log-uniform prior helps removing noisy weights and thus finding sparse solutions (as was shown in https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.05369)

Thank you!

al-maeeni@hse.ru

@afdee1c

@AFDEE1C