
Variational Auto Encoder Latent Space Activity and Visualization

Jesse Bettencourt
Department of Mathematics
University of Toronto
Toronto, ON
jessbett@math.toronto.edu

Matt Craddock
Department of Computer Science
University of Toronto
Toronto, ON
matt.craddock@mail.utoronto.ca

Abstract

In this project we implement a Variational Auto Encoder (VAE) in Tensorflow. We compare experimental results for modifications to the VAE, including Importance Weighting, Batch Normalization, and Warm-Up. In particular, we consider how these additional methods affect the training rate and latent dimension activity. Finally, we demonstrate latent visualization techniques available with VAEs.

1 Introduction to Variational Autoencoders

Variational Auto Encoders (VAEs) were introduced by Kingma & Welling 2013 as generative analogues to the standard deterministic auto encoder [5]. As with deterministic auto encoders, VAEs pair a bottom-up inference network called an encoder with a top-down generative network called a decoder.

VAEs employ a probabilistic interpretation of these encoder and decoder networks. We assume that our dataset $\{x^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$ are N i.i.d. samples of some variable x . Further, we assume that the data was generated by a random process with continuous latent variable z . So we have that our data x was generated by some conditional distribution $p_\theta(x|z)$, where p_θ is a probability distribution with parameters θ . This provides a probabilistic interpretation of the decoder network, where given a latent variable or ‘code’ z we generate a sample x in the data space. Similarly, the role of the encoder would be to take a sample x from data space and give us a latent z sampled from the posterior density distribution $p_\theta(z|x)$.

However, this is where problems arise in the probabilistic interpretation. It is common that the posterior density distribution $p_\theta(z|x)$ is intractable. In order to learn an encoder-decoder network pair, VAEs instead learn a different inference model, $q_\phi(z|x)$, which approximates the true, intractable posterior distribution. Note that our approximate inference model, the encoder distribution, has parameters ϕ distinct from the θ of the true posterior and decoder network. Training a VAE will amount to jointly learning these parameters.

Variational auto encoders are further characterized by their training criterion. Instead of learning an often intractable log-likelihood, the training objective $\mathcal{L}(x)$ is a tractable lower bound to the log-likelihood:

$$\log p_\theta(x) \geq \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(z|x)} \left[\log \frac{p_\theta(x, z)}{q_\phi(z|x)} \right] = -\mathcal{L}(x) \quad (1)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}(x) = D_{KL}(q_\phi(z|x) || p_\theta(z)) - \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(z|x)} [\log p_\theta(x|z)] \quad (2)$$

Where D_{KL} is the Kullback-Leibler divergence. It will be useful later to directly identify the two components of our objective. The reconstruction error term $\mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(z|x)} [\log p_\theta(x|z)]$ is present in deterministic auto encoders, and represents the likelihood that the input data would be reconstructed by the model. The variational regularization term $D_{KL}(q_\phi(z|x)||p_\theta(z))$ represents the KL-divergence between the encoder induced latent distribution and the true prior on the latent distribution. This term encourages our approximate posterior $q_\phi(z|x)$ to be close to $p_\theta(z)$.

Finally, one last detail to discuss in the process of training a VAE is the reparametrization trick. Since the reconstruction error term is estimated by sampling $z \sim q_\phi(z|x)$, there is a problem with using gradient training methods through the sampling process. To address this, Kingma & Welling describe an alternative method for generating the samples, simply to let $z = g_\phi(x, \epsilon)$ be a deterministic function of ϕ and ϵ be some independent noise.

For example, in our implementation which we will soon describe in detail, we assume that the true posterior distribution can be approximated by a multivariate Gaussian with diagonal covariance. Therefore we let $q_\phi(z|x) = \mathcal{N}(z; \mu, \sigma^2 I)$. So the outputs of our encoder network are the μ and σ of our approximate posterior. Now in order to train with gradient methods, we reparameterize as described, letting $z = \mu + \sigma \epsilon$ where $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

2 Implementing Variational Autoencoders

2.1 Network Architecture

Each of the following methods were included into what will we call the ‘Vanilla VAE’. The network architecture for the Vanilla VAE and all additional methods is similar to the architecture introduced in the Section 3 example of Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes [5].

The encoder and decoder networks are symmetric, shallow, fully-connected neural networks, namely Multi Layer Perceptrons (MLP). Both feature two deterministic layers each with 200 dimensions (or nodes) per layer. A stochastic, or latent, layer with dimensions n_z receives the output from the final deterministic layer. In the nodes of the hidden layers the activation is determined by the softplus function, $\ln(1 + e^x)$.

Practically, the probabilistic encoder network takes data from the input space and encodes a representation into a latent space with dimension n_z . In particular, the latent representation, $q_\phi(z|x) = \mathcal{N}(z; \mu, \sigma^2 I)$ is a Gaussian distribution over the possible latent values of z from which data x could have been generated. The probabilistic decoder network takes a latent representation and produces a distribution $p_\theta(x | z)$ over possible data values x generated by z .

We implement this network and the following additional methods in Tensorflow. Our implementation follows from examples in Tensorflow and Theano [?, 7, 1]. In all examples we are training on the MNIST handwritten digit dataset. We learn the MLP weights and bias parameters, representing the ϕ and θ distribution parameters, with Adam optimization minimizing $\mathcal{L}(x)$ with parameters $\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.9, \epsilon = 10^{-4}$ a batch size of 100, and learning rate of 0.001, trained for 300 epochs.

2.2 Xavier Initialization

All parameters in the MLP were initialized with the Xavier-Glorot method outlined in [3]. Xavier-Glorot initialization is shown to improve learning in deep networks by establishing an effective range for initial values. In general, especially for deep networks, there is an initial value trade-off. If the initial weights are too small then the signal magnitude will decrease through the layers and the influence will tend too small to be useful. If the weights are too large then the signal will grow as it passes through the layers and will tend to be too large to be representative.

Xavier-Glorot initialization addresses this trade-off by sampling initialization weights from a Gaussian distribution with zero mean and variance as a function of the network connections for the node. The variance for weight w of a neuron is given as a function of the number of neurons feeding into it n_{in} and the number of neurons the result feeds to n_{out} . The function is defined to be
$$\text{Var}(w) = \frac{2}{n_{in} + n_{out}}.$$

2.3 Decoder Distribution

As mentioned previously, the probabilistic decoder network takes a latent representation z and produces a distribution over possible data values, $p_\theta(x | z)$. In our initial description of the network architecture we specified that output of the encoder MLP is Gaussian, but we made no specification to the decoder output distribution.

Two choices for decoder distributions, Gaussian and Bernoulli, were outlined in *Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes*, where the authors suggest that the choice of preferred decoder distribution depends on the type of data [5].

2.3.1 Gaussian Decoder and Encoder Structure

For continuous, real-valued data, Kingma & Welling suggest letting $p_\theta(x | z)$ be a multivariate Gaussian distribution. This gives the following structure for the decoder distribution with two hidden deterministic layers h_1 and h_2 :

$$\log p_\theta(x | z) = \log \mathcal{N}(x; \mu, \sigma^2 I)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mu &= \text{sigmoid}(W_\mu h_2 + b_\mu) \\ \log \sigma^2 &= \tanh(W_\sigma h_2 + b_\sigma) \\ h_2 &= \text{softplus}(W_2 h_1 + b_2) \\ h_1 &= \text{softplus}(W_1 z + b_1)\end{aligned}$$

Note that the parameters $\{W_1, W_2, W_\mu, W_\sigma, b_1, b_2, b_\mu, b_\sigma\}$ here are the learned parameters of the decoder MLP, and represent the decoder distribution parameter, θ in $p_\theta(x | z)$. Further, since our encoder distribution is always a multivariate Gaussian distribution, we use this structure for the encoder, where the z and x are swapped and the weights and biases represent the encoder distribution parameter, ϕ in $q_\phi(z | x)$.

2.3.2 Bernoulli Decoder Structure

For binary data, Kingma & Welling suggest letting $p_\theta(x | z)$ be a multivariate Bernoulli distribution. This gives the following structure for our decoder distribution with two hidden deterministic layers h_1 and h_2 :

$$\log p_\theta(x | z) = \sum_{i=1}^D x_i \log y_i + (1 - x_i) \cdot \log(1 - y_i)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}y &= \text{sigmoid}(W_\mu h_2 + b_\mu) \\ h_2 &= \text{softplus}(W_2 h_1 + b_2) \\ h_1 &= \text{softplus}(W_1 z + b_1)\end{aligned}$$

Again, here the Bernoulli decoder distribution parameter θ is represented by the learned MLP weights and biases $\theta = \{W_1, W_2, W_\mu, b_1, b_2, b_\mu\}$.

2.3.3 Comparing Decoder Distributions




Figure 1: Bernoulli v.s Gaussian decoder distributions

on VAEs with Bernoulli decoder distributions.

2.4 Importance Weighting




Figure 2: Variational v.s. Importance Weighted (IW)

bound on the log-likelihood which is strictly tighter than Eq.2.

Given K independent samples $\{z_1, \dots, z_K\}$ from the encoder distribution $z_k \sim q_\phi(z|x)$ we define the new lower bound given by the K -sample importance weighting expectation of the log-likelihood:

$$\mathcal{L}_K(x) = \mathbb{E}_{z_1, \dots, z_K \sim q_\phi(z|x)} \left[\log \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{p_\theta(x, z_k)}{q_\phi(z_k|x)} \right] \quad (3)$$

The term inside the sum is the normalized importance weights for the joint distribution. Note in particular that the case $K = 1$ corresponds exactly to Kingma & Welling’s $\mathcal{L}(x)$ from Eq.2. Burda, Grosse, and Salakhutdinov show that this importance weighted lower bound is strictly tighter than the vanilla lower bound. In particular, that $\log p(x) \geq \mathcal{L}_{K+1}(x) > \mathcal{L}_K(x)$. Our implementation of IWAE with this lower bound supports their findings. We observed that with $K = 5$ samples IWAE significantly improves the learned log-likelihood bound during training. The results of this experiment can be found in Figure 2.

Our findings support the recommendation by Kingma & Welling that Bernoulli decoder distribution performs better on binary data than a Gaussian decoder. The one-hot MNIST data used to train our VAE is binary, and thus we expected that the Bernoulli decoder would outperform the Gaussian decoder. The results of this experiment can be found in Figure 1. As expected, the Bernoulli distribution was able to learn a much tighter lower bound on the log-likelihood. It is important to note that VAE with the Gaussian decoder has converged to its lower bound, suggesting that even with longer training it would not learn a better model than the VAE with Bernoulli decoder distribution. Therefore, when implementing VAEs it is important to choose a decoder distribution that is representative of your data type.

Note that all further methods were implemented

In their 2015 publication *Importance Weighted Autoencoders*, Burda, Grosse, and Salakhutdinov observed that Kingma & Welling’s $\mathcal{L}(x)$ lower bound on the log-likelihood from Eq.2 made strong assumptions about the posterior inference, leading to overly simplified representations. They proposed an improvement called Importance Weighted Auto Encoders (IWAE), a generative model using the VAE network architecture with a few key improvements to model generalizability.

The critical feature of IWAE is that the encoder network uses multiple importance weighted samples to approximate the posterior, where the original VAE uses a single sample. This allows IWAE to approximate complex posteriors which are not available under the stronger VAE posterior assumptions.

By considering multiple importance weighted samples we introduce a new lower

Since importance weighting so significantly improved the performance of our Auto Encoder, all further methods were implemented on VAEs with importance weighting.

2.5 Batch Normalization




Figure 3: Effect of Batch Normalization (BN)

parameters in response to these distribution changes. The problem that batch normalization attempts to address is that changes in early layer output distributions can cause noisy changes to later layers.

Batch normalization functions by normalizing the inputs of the activation function for each layer so that the inputs across each training batch have a mean of 0 and a variance of 1. However, batch normalization restricts the representation of each layer by assuming this normal distribution. To alleviate some of this restriction, batch normalization introduces learnable parameters to scale the variance of the normal distribution, γ and shift the mean, β . Therefore, we transform each activation function input, x_i , with the batch normalization given by:

$$\text{BN}(x_i) = \gamma \left(\frac{x_i - \mu_B}{\sqrt{\sigma_B^2 + \epsilon}} \right) + \beta$$

where μ_B and σ_B are the mean and standard deviation of the layer’s activation function input across the batch, ϵ is a small constant addition to the variance to avoid division by 0, and γ and β are learnable scale and shift parameters. Note in particular that when learning with batch normalization, the learned shift parameter β for each layer replaces the need for bias terms added to that layer’s activation inputs.

To train our model we add batch normalization before the activation for all layers in our auto-encoder except the output layers, as described in [?]. See the result of training with batch normalization in Figure 3. Our experiments resulted in VAEs trained with batch normalization performing poorer than VAEs without batch normalization. While the literature suggests that batch normalization significantly improves training for deep networks, we found no improvements to our shallow VAEs. We suggest that the reason for this result is that the benefit of batch normalization is to stabilize the propagation of signal throughout the layers of a deep network. However, to achieve this stabilization, batch normalization imposes assumptions on the distribution of activation inputs for each layer. We suggest that batch normalization reduced performance on our VAEs because they were too shallow to receive any benefit from signal stabilization, and were made less effective by the normalization assumption.

2.6 Warm Up




Figure 4: Effect of Warm-Up

dimensions become inactive in training, they are unlikely be reactivated. This problem of early latent dimension pruning is particularly troublesome for deep VAEs, because deep latent layers depend on the shallow latent dimensions in the network. If shallow latent dimensions are pruned early, deep latent layers will not be able to learn useful representations [?].

To avoid the problem of early pruning due to the variational regularization, we ‘warm up’ our VAE. Warm-up is achieved by initializing the learning process with the objective of a standard deterministic autoencoder, and then linearly introducing the variational regularization. This way the latent dimensions have a chance to learn useful representations as in a deterministic autoencoder before being possibly pruned by variational regularization.

We introduce a warm-up parameter β to our objective function which increases linearly from 0 to 1 during the first N_T epochs of training:

$$-\mathcal{L}(x)_T = -\beta D_{KL}(q_\phi(z|x)||p_\theta(z)) + \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(z|x)}[\log p_\theta(x|z)] \quad (4)$$

Again, note that this causes the first epoch to initialize a standard deterministic autoencoder objective function, then linearly introduce the variational behaviour. Further, observe that after N_T epochs the model becomes a fully variational autoencoder. This warm-up can also be applied to the lower bound objective of the IWAE identically, by linearly scaling the variational regularization term. See the result of training with warm-up in Figure 4. We observe that VAEs with warmup learn at the same rate and converge to the same lower bound as VAEs without warmup. However, we will discuss later how warm-up improves early latent dimension pruning, as desired.

2.7 Latent Space Dimensionality




Figure 5: Latent Dimensionality

Recall that the log-likelihood lower bound in Eq.2 contains a reconstruction term and a variational regularization term. Further, notice that without that variational regularization term the lower bound becomes that of a standard deterministic autoencoder. It has been observed that the variational regularization term causes some latent dimensions to become inactive or ‘pruned’ during training [6, 2]. In the later sections of this report we consider the activity of the latent dimensions, and particularly how training prunes or preserves latent dimensions.

Pruning non-informative dimensions later in training could be considered advantageous for automatic relevance determination. However, if latent dimensions are pruned too early in training they will not have a chance to learn informative representations. Once the

Finally, we were interested in determining how the choice of latent space dimensionality affected the training of our model. As described previously, the number of latent dimensions, n_z is given by the number of nodes in the stochastic layer of the model.

To experiment with this parameter, we trained multiple Importance Weighted VAEs with dimensionality $n_z \in \{2, 5, 10, 20, 50, 100\}$. See the effect of dimensionality on training in Figure 5. Our experiments show that models with 2 or 5 latent dimensions were not trained as successfully as models with higher latent dimensions. Further, it is interesting to note

that all models with $n_z \geq 10$ converged to the same log-likelihood bound. This suggests to us that the additional latent dimensionality was not useful for learning latent representations of the MNIST data. In fact, $n_z = 10$ converged slightly faster than higher latent dimensional models, further suggesting that the additional dimensions were superfluous to training.

We were particularly interested in this question of latent space dimensionality. It is especially suggestive that models with $n_z \geq 10$ perform identically, given that there are 10 classes of digits in MNIST. This motivates our inquiry for the next section where we explore usefulness of latent dimensions by describing their activity.


3 Latent Dimension Activity

3.1 Activity Metric

In the previous sections we discussed the concept of activity. Here we define it explicitly, using a method set forward by Burda, Grosse, & Salakhutdinov [2]. Given that the distribution parameters of nodes in the latent space combine to form the latent representation of the data, they observed that if the parameters remain the same or very similar in the latent representations of all data in the training set, the “contribution” of those nodes to the understanding of the data is minor. As such, they defined a measurement of activity which amounts to a calculation of the variance of the expected value of the latent distribution:

$$Cov_{\mathbf{x}} (\mathbb{E}_{u \sim q(u|\mathbf{x})} [u]) > \epsilon \quad (5)$$

Where u represents a single dimension in the latent space, q is the generative distribution of the encoder network q_{ϕ} , and ϵ is a threshold value. Any dimension whose activity (represented by the left-hand side of the equation) exceeds ϵ is defined as “active” for the purposes of our experiment. The effect of the additional features described above averaged over multiple trials can be seen in the plots below.




(a) Effect of Importance Weighting (IW)

(b) Effect of Batch Normalization (BN)

(c) Effect of Warm-Up

3.2 Effects of Implementation on Activity

It is clear from the above that, as training converges, importance weighting tends to reduce the number of active dimensions, while batch normalization increases it. Warmup was not seen to affect the final dimensionality count, but did accelerate its convergence. The dimension-reducing effect of importance weighting is likely a result of its more accurate loss function, which reduces the capacity for error in the network and forces a more specific lower entropy latent representation of the data. The dimension-increasing effects of batch normalization are likely a result of its tendency to force a distribution on the output of the deterministic layers. This introduces noise in the form of an additional influence on the data that is passed to the latent layer, which it must then compensate for. The effect of warmup is likely a result of the distinct loss function, which punishes frivolous and incorrect information in the latent layer disproportionately in the early training stages.



(a) Effect of Latent Dimensionality

An interesting result can be seen in Figure 7a, in which the dimensionality is varied for models trained with importance weighting and neither batch normalization or warmup. As the dimensionality of the model increases, the number of active dimensions as the training converges tends to be constant at $\min(D_{init}, 10)$ where D_{init} is the number of dimensions being trained (the “initial” dimensionality of the latent space before pruning). This suggests that a fixed number of dimensions in the latent space may be ideal for representing a particular data set. In this case, 10. This is consistent with the results in Figure 5, which indicated that an increase in the dimensionality

beyond 10 had little effect on the loss function of the trained model.

3.2.1 Importance Weighting

3.2.2 Batch Normalization

3.2.3 Warm Up

3.2.4 Initial Latent Dimension

4 Latent Space Visualization


4.1 Data Reconstruction

4.2 Data Latent Transformation


4.3 Latent Hyperplane Lattice Generation

References


- [1] Arun Ahuja. Generative Models in Tensorflow.
- [2] Yuri Burda, Roger Grosse, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Importance Weighted Autoencoders. pages 1–12, 2015.
- [3] Xavier Glorot and Yoshua Bengio. Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks. *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 9:249–256, 2010.
- [4] Sergey Ioffe and Christian Szegedy. Batch Normalization: Accelerating Deep Network Training by Reducing Internal Covariate Shift. *arXiv*, 2015.
- [5] Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes. (MI):1–14, 2013.
- [6] David MacKay. Local minima, symmetry-breaking, and model pruning in variational free energy minimization. *Inference Group, Cavendish Laboratory*,, pages 1–10, 2001.
- [7] Jan Metzen. Variational Autoencoder in TensorFlow, 2015.




(a) Vanilla VAE with Bernoulli Decoder Distribution



(b) Importance Weighted (IW)



(c) IW + Batch Normalization (BN)



(d) IW + Warm Up (WU)