
Divide-and-Conquer Predictive Coding: a structured Bayesian inference algorithm

Anonymous Author(s)

Affiliation

Address

email

Abstract

1 Unexpected stimuli induce “error” or “surprise” signals in the brain. The theory
2 of predictive coding promises to explain these observations in terms of Bayesian
3 inference by suggesting that the cortex implements variational inference in a proba-
4 bilistic graphical model. However, when applied to machine learning tasks, this
5 family of algorithms has yet to perform on par with other variational approaches in
6 high-dimensional, structured inference problems. To address this, we introduce a
7 novel predictive coding algorithm for structured generative models, that we call
8 divide-and-conquer predictive coding (DCPC). DCPC differs from other formula-
9 tions of predictive coding, as it respects the correlation structure of the generative
10 model and provably performs maximum-likelihood updates of model parameters,
11 all without sacrificing biological plausibility. Empirically, DCPC achieves better
12 numerical performance than competing algorithms and provides accurate inference
13 in a number of problems not previously addressed with predictive coding.

14 1 Introduction

15 In recent decades, the fields of cognitive science, machine learning, and theoretical neuroscience have
16 borne witness to a flowering of successes in modeling intelligent behavior via statistical learning.
17 Each of these fields has taken a different approach: cognitive science has studied probabilistic
18 *inverse inference* [Chater et al., 2006, Pouget et al., 2013, Lake et al., 2017] in models of each task
19 and environment, machine learning has employed the backpropagation of errors [Rumelhart et al.,
20 1986, Lecun et al., 2015, Schmidhuber, 2015], and neuroscience has hypothesized that *predictive*
21 *coding* [Srinivasan et al., 1982, Rao and Ballard, 1999, Friston, 2005, Bastos et al., 2012, Spratling,
22 2017, Hutchinson and Barrett, 2019, Millidge et al., 2021] (PC) may explain neural activity in
23 perceptual tasks. These approaches share in common a commitment to “deep” models, in which task
24 processing emerges from the composition of elementary units.

25 At the computational level, probabilistic theories of perception suggest that the brain is an hypothesis
26 testing machine, where the world is perceived via Bayesian inference [Doya, 2007]. In the PC
27 framework, hypothesis correspond to prediction signals that flow down the cortical hierarchy to inhibit
28 the bottom-up processing of predictable (or irrelevant) stimuli. Combining these top-down predictions
29 with a bottom-up stimulus signal generates prediction errors, defined as the (weighted) difference
30 between predicted and actual signals [Hoemann et al., 2017, Barrett, 2022]. Algorithmically, PC
31 implements variational inference [Friston et al., 2006]: under some specific assumptions, a prediction
32 error ε is the gradient of a variational free energy defined over a hierarchical Gaussian generative
33 model, i.e., $\varepsilon := \nabla_{\mu} \log \mathcal{N}(\mu, \tau) = \tau(x - \mu)$, with respect to the location parameter μ , of a Gaussian
34 $x \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \tau)$ log-density parameterized by mean μ and precision τ .

35 In machine learning, predictive coding algorithms have recently gained popularity, as they provide a
36 more biologically plausible alternative to backpropagation for training neural networks [Salvatori
37 et al., 2023, Song et al., 2024]. However, PC does not perform comparably in these tasks to

backpropagation due to limitations in current formulations. First, predictive coding for gradient calculation typically models every node in the computation graph with a Gaussian, and hence fails to express many common generative models. Recent work on PC has addressed this by allowing approximating non-Gaussian energy functions with samples [Pinchetti et al., 2022]. Second, the Laplace approximation to the posterior infers only a maximum-a-posteriori (MAP) estimate and Gaussian covariance for each latent variable, keeping PC from capturing multimodal or correlated distributions. Third, this loose approximation to the posterior distribution results in inaccurate, high-variance updates to the generative model’s parameters.

In this work we propose a new algorithm, *divide-and-conquer predictive coding* (DCPC), for approximating structured target distributions with populations of Monte Carlo samples. DCPC goes beyond Gaussian assumptions, and decomposes the problem of sampling from structured targets into local coordinate updates to individual random variables. These local updates are informed by unadjusted Langevin proposals parameterized in terms of biologically plausible prediction errors. Nesting the local updates within divide-and-conquer Sequential Monte Carlo [Lindsten et al., 2017, Kuntz et al., 2024] ensures that DCPC can target any statically structured graphical model, while Theorem 2 provides a locally factorized way to learn model parameters by maximum marginal likelihood.

DCPC also provides a computational perspective on the canonical cortical microcircuit [Bastos et al., 2012, 2020, Campagnola et al., 2022] hypothesis in neuroscience. Experiments have suggested that deep laminar layers in the cortical microcircuit represent sensory imagery, while superficial laminar represent raw stimulus information [Bergmann et al., 2024]; experiments in a predictive coding paradigm specifically suggested that the deep layers represent “predictions” while the shallow layers represent “prediction errors”. This circuitry may provide the brain with its fast, scalable, generic Bayesian inference capabilities. Figure 1 suggests how DCPC could map onto a subset of the microcircuit connections documented here. The following sections detail this work’s contributions:

- Section 3 defines the divide-and-conquer predictive coding algorithm and shows how to use it as a variational inference algorithm;
- Section 4 examines under what assumptions the cortex could plausibly implement DCPC, proving two theorems that contribute to biological plausibility;
- Section 5 demonstrates DCPC experimentally in head-to-head comparisons against recent generative models and inference algorithms from the predictive coding literature.

Section 2 will review the background for Section 3’s algorithm: the problem predictive coding aims to solve and a line of recent work addressing that problem from which this paper draws.

2 Background

This section reviews the background necessary to construct the divide-and-conquer predictive coding algorithm in Section 3. Let us assume we have a directed, acyclic graphical model with a joint density split into observations $x \in \mathbf{x}$ and latents $z \in \mathbf{z}$, parameterized by some θ at each conditional density

$$p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) := \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}} p_{\theta}(x \mid \text{Pa}(x)) \prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} p_{\theta}(z \mid \text{Pa}(z)), \quad (1)$$

where $\text{Pa}(z)$ denotes the parents of the random variable $z \in \mathbf{z}$, while $\text{Ch}(z)$ denotes its children.

Empirical Bayes *Empirical Bayes* consists of jointly estimating, in light of the data, both the parameters θ^* and the Bayesian posterior over the latent variables \mathbf{z} , that is:

$$\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta} p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \max_{\theta} \int_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{Z}} p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z}, \quad p_{\theta^*}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{x}) := \frac{p_{\theta^*}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})}{p_{\theta^*}(\mathbf{x})}.$$

Typically the marginal and posterior densities have no closed form, so learning and inference algorithms treat the joint distribution as a closed-form *unnormalized* density over the latent variables; its integral then gives the normalizing constant for approximation

$$\gamma_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}) := p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}), \quad Z_{\theta} := \int_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{Z}} \gamma_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z} = p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \pi_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}) := \frac{\gamma_{\theta}(\mathbf{z})}{Z_{\theta}}.$$

80 Neal and Hinton [1998] reduced empirical Bayes to minimization of the *variational free energy*:

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta, q) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim q(\mathbf{z})} \left[-\log \frac{\gamma_{\theta}(\mathbf{z})}{q(\mathbf{z})} \right] \geq -\log Z(\theta). \quad (2)$$

81 The ratio of densities in Equation 2 is an example of a *weight* used to approximate a distribution
 82 known only up to its normalizing constant. The *proposal* distribution $q(\mathbf{z})$ admits tractable sampling,
 83 while the unnormalized *target* density $\gamma_{\theta}(\mathbf{z})$ admits tractable, pointwise density evaluation.

84 **Predictive Coding** Computational neuroscientists now often hypothesize that *predictive coding*
 85 (PC) can optimize the above family of objective functionals in a local, neurally plausible way
 86 [Millidge et al., 2021, 2023]. More in detail, it is possible to define this class of algorithms as follows:

87 **Definition 1** (Predictive Coding Algorithm). *Consider approximate inference in a model $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$*
 88 *using an algorithm \mathcal{A} . Salvatori et al. [2023] calls \mathcal{A} a predictive coding algorithm if and only if:*

- 89 1. *It maximizes the model evidence $\log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$ by minimizing a variational free energy;*
- 90 2. *The proposal $q(\mathbf{z}) = \prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} q(z)$ factorizes via a mean-field approximation; and*
- 91 3. *Each proposal factor is a Laplace approximation (i.e. $q_{\mu}(z) := \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma(\mu))$).*

92 **Particle Algorithms** In contrast to predictive coding, particle algorithms approach empirical Bayes
 93 problems by setting the proposal to a collection of weighted particles (w^k, \mathbf{z}^k) drawn from a sampling
 94 algorithm meeting certain conditions (see Definition 2 in Appendix B). Any proposal meeting these
 95 conditions (see Proposition 1 in Appendix B and Naesseth et al. [2015], Stites et al. [2021]) defines a
 96 free energy functional, analogous to Equation 2 in upper-bounding the model surprisal:

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta, q) := \mathbb{E}_{w, \mathbf{z} \sim q(w, \mathbf{z})} [-\log w] \implies \mathcal{F}(\theta, q) \geq -\log Z(\theta).$$

97 This paper builds on the particle gradient descent (PGD) algorithm of Kuntz et al. [2023], that works
 98 as follows: At each iteration t , PGD diffuses the particle cloud $q_K(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \delta_{\mathbf{z}^k}(\mathbf{z})$ across
 99 the target log-density with a learning rate η and independent Gaussian noise; it then updates the
 100 parameters θ by ascending the gradient of the log-likelihood, estimated by averaging over the particles.
 101 The update rules are then the following:

$$\mathbf{z}^{t+1,k} := \mathbf{z}^{t,k} + \eta \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \log \gamma_{\theta^t}(\mathbf{z}^{t,k}) + \sqrt{2\eta} \xi^k, \quad (3)$$

$$\theta^{t+1} := \theta^t + \eta \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \nabla_{\theta} \log \gamma_{\theta^t}(\mathbf{z}^{t+1,k}) \right). \quad (4)$$

102 The above equations target the joint density of an entire graphical model¹. When the prior $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{z})$
 103 factorizes into many separate conditional densities, achieving high inference performance often
 104 requires factorizing the inference network or algorithm into conditionals as well [Webb et al., 2018].
 105 Estimating the gradient of the entire log-joint, as in PGD and amortized inference [Dasgupta et al.,
 106 2020, Peters et al., 2024], also requires nonlocal backpropagation. To provide a generic inference
 107 algorithm for high-dimensional, structured models using only local computations, Section 3 will apply
 108 Equation 3 to sample individual random variables in a joint density, combine the coordinate updates
 109 via sequential Monte Carlo, and locally estimate gradients for model parameters via Equation 4.

110 3 Divide-and-Conquer Predictive Coding

111 The previous section provided a mathematical toolbox for constructing Monte Carlo algorithms based
 112 on gradient updates and a working definition of predictive coding. This section will combine those
 113 tools to generalize the above notion of predictive coding, yielding the novel *divide-and-conquer*
 114 *predictive coding* (DCPC) algorithm. Given a causal graphical model, DCPC will approximate the
 115 posterior with a population $q(\mathbf{z})$ of K samples, while also learning θ explaining the data. This will
 116 require deriving local coordinate updates and then parameterizing them in terms of prediction errors.

117 Let us assume we again have a causal graphical model $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ locally parameterized by θ and
 118 factorized (as in Equation 1) into conditional densities for each $x \in \mathbf{x}$ and $z \in \mathbf{z}$. DCPC then requires

¹Kuntz et al. [2023] also interpreted Equation 3 as an update step along the Wasserstein gradient in the space of probability measures. Appendix C extends this perspective to predictive coding of discrete random variables.

	PC	LPC	MCPC	DCPC (ours)
Generative density	Gaussian	Differentiable	Gaussian	Differentiable
Inference approximation	Laplace	Gaussian	Empirical	Empirical
Posterior conditional structure	\times	\times	\times	\checkmark

Table 1: Comparison of divide-and-conquer predictive coding (DCPC) against other predictive coding algorithms. DCPC provides the greatest flexibility: arbitrary differentiable generative models, an empirical approximation to the posterior, and sampling according to the target’s conditional structure.

two hyperparameters: a learning rate $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and particle count $K \in \mathbb{N}^+$, and is initialized (at $t = 0$) via a population of predictions by ancestor sampling defined as $\mathbf{z}^0 \sim \prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} p_\theta(z^0 \mid \text{Pa}(z^0))$.

To respect the graphical structure of the generative model with only local computations, DCPC recursively targets each variable’s (unnormalized) *complete conditional* density:

$$\gamma_\theta(z; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}) = p_\theta(z \mid \text{Pa}(z)) \prod_{v \in \text{Ch}(z)} p_\theta(v \mid \text{Pa}(v)). \quad (5)$$

We observe that the prediction errors ε_z in classical predictive coding, usually defined as the precision weighted difference between predicted and actual value of a variable, can be seen as the *score function* of a Gaussian, where the score is the gradient with respect to the parameter z of the log-likelihood:

$$\varepsilon_z := \nabla_z \log \mathcal{N}(z, \tau) = \tau(x - z);$$

When given the ground-truth parameter z , the *expected* score function $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim p(x|z)} [\nabla_z \log p(x|z)] = 0$ under the likelihood becomes zero, making score functions a good candidate for implementing predictive coding. We therefore define ε_z in DCPC as the complete conditional’s score function

$$\varepsilon_z := \nabla_z \log \gamma_\theta(z; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}) = \nabla_z \log p_\theta(z \mid \text{Pa}(z)) + \sum_{v \in \text{Ch}(z)} \nabla_z \log p_\theta(v \mid \text{Pa}(v)). \quad (6)$$

This gradient consists of a sum of local prediction-error terms: one for the local “prior” on z and one for each local “likelihood” of a child variable. Defining the prediction error by a locally computable gradient lets us write Equation 3 in terms of ε_z (Equation 6):

$$q_\eta(z^t \mid \varepsilon_z^t, z^{t-1}) := \mathcal{N}(z^{t-1} + \eta \varepsilon_z^t, 2\eta I_z).$$

The resulting proposal now targets the complete conditional density (Equation 5), simultaneously meeting the informal requirement of Definition 1 for purely local proposal computations while also “dividing and conquering” the sampling problem into lower-dimensional coordinate updates.

DCPC assigns the proposed samples importance weights for the complete conditional density

$$z^t \sim q_\eta(z^t \mid z^{t-1}, \varepsilon_z^t) \quad u_z^t = \frac{\gamma_{\theta^{t-1}}(z^t; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})}{q_\eta(z^t \mid z^{t-1}, \varepsilon_z^t)}; \quad (7)$$

resampling with respect to these weights corrects for discretization error, yields particles distributed according to the true complete conditional, and estimates the complete conditional’s normalizer

$$\text{RESAMPLE}(z^t, u_z^t) \sim \pi_{\theta^{t-1}}(z^t \mid \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}), \quad \hat{Z}_{\theta^{t-1}}(\mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})^t := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K u_z^{t,k}.$$

The recursive step of “Divide and Conquer” Sequential Monte Carlo [Lindsten et al., 2017, Kuntz et al., 2024] exploits the estimates $\hat{Z}_{\theta^{t-1}}(\mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})^t$ to weigh the samples for the complete target density

$$w_{\theta^{t-1}}^t = \frac{p_{\theta^{t-1}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^t)}{\prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} \gamma_\theta(z^t; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})} \prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} \hat{Z}_{\theta^{t-1}}(\mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})^t. \quad (8)$$

This weight gives rise to a free energy by Proposition 1, whose gradient (Theorem 3 in Appendix B) equals the expectation, under the proposal, of the complete log-joint density

$$\mathcal{F}^t := \mathbb{E}_q[-\log w_{\theta^{t-1}}^t] \quad \nabla_{\theta^{t-1}} \mathcal{F}^t = \mathbb{E}_q[-\nabla_{\theta^{t-1}} \log p_{\theta^{t-1}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^t)].$$

Descending this gradient $\theta^t := \theta^{t-1} - \eta \nabla_{\theta^{t-1}} \mathcal{F}^t$ enables DCPC to learn model parameters θ .

The above steps describe a single pass of divide-and-conquer predictive coding over a causal graphical model. Algorithm 1 shows the complete algorithm, consisting of nested iterations over latent variables $z \in \mathbf{z}$ (inner loop) and iterations $t \in T$ (outer loop). DCPC satisfies criteria (1) and (2) of Definition 1, and relaxes criterion (3) to allow gradient-based proposals beyond the Laplace assumption. As with Pinchetti et al. [2022] and Oliviers et al. [2024], relaxing the Laplace assumption enables much greater flexibility in approximating the model’s true posterior distribution.

Algorithm 1 Divide-and-Conquer Predictive Coding for empirical Bayes

Require: learning rate $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^+$, particle count $K \in \mathbb{N}$, number of sweeps $S \in \mathbb{N}$

Require: initial particle vector \mathbf{z}^0 , initial parameters θ^0 , observations $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$

```

1: for  $t \in [1 \dots T]$  do                                ▷ Loop through predictive coding steps
2:   for  $s \in [1 \dots S]$  do                                ▷ Loop through Gibbs sweeps over graphical model
3:     for  $z \in \mathbf{z}$  do                                    ▷ Loop through latent variables in graphical model
4:        $\varepsilon_z \leftarrow \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \log p_{\theta^{t-1}}(z \mid \text{Pa}(z))$                                 ▷ Local prediction error
5:        $\varepsilon_z \leftarrow \varepsilon_z + \sum_{v \in \text{Ch}(z)} \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \log p_{\theta^{t-1}}(v \mid \text{Pa}(v))$                                 ▷ Children's prediction errors
6:        $z^t \sim q_{\eta}(z^t \mid \varepsilon_z, z^{t-1})$                                 ▷ Sample coordinate update
7:        $u_z^t \leftarrow \frac{\gamma_{\theta^{t-1}}(z^t; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})}{q_{\eta}(z^t \mid \varepsilon_z, z^{t-1})}$                                 ▷ Correct coordinate update by weighing
8:        $z^t \leftarrow \text{RESAMPLE}(z^t, u_z^t)$                                 ▷ Resample from true coordinate update
9:        $\hat{Z}_{\theta^{t-1}}(\mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})^t \leftarrow \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K u_z^{t,k}$                                 ▷ Estimate coordinate update's normalizer
10:     $\mathcal{F}^t \leftarrow -\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \log \left( \frac{p_{\theta^{t-1}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^{t,k})}{\prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} \gamma_{\theta^{t-1}}(z^t, k; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^{t,k})} \prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} \hat{Z}_{\theta^{t-1}}(\mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})^t \right)$                                 ▷ Update free energy
11:     $\theta^t \leftarrow \theta^{t-1} + \eta \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \nabla_{\theta^{t-1}} \log p_{\theta^{t-1}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^{t,k})$                                 ▷ Update parameters
12: return  $\mathbf{z}^T, \theta^T, \mathcal{F}^T$                                 ▷ Output: updated particles, parameters, free energy

```

4 Biological plausibility

Different works in the literature consider different criteria for biological plausibility. This paper follows the non-spiking predictive coding literature and considers an algorithm biologically plausible if it performs only spatially local computations in a probabilistic graphical model [Whittington and Bogacz, 2017], without requiring a global control of computation. However, while in the standard literature locality is either directly defined in the objective function [Rao and Ballard, 1999], or derived from a mean-field approximation to the joint density [Friston, 2005], showing that the updates of the parameters of DCPC require only local information is not as trivial. To this end, in this section we first formally show that DCPC achieves decentralized inference of latent variables \mathbf{z} (Theorem 1), and then that also the parameters θ are updated via local information (Theorem 2).

Gibbs sampling provides the most widely-used algorithm for sampling from a high-dimensional probability distribution by local signaling. It consists of successively sampling coordinate updates to individual nodes in the graphical model by targeting their complete conditional densities $\pi_{\theta}(z \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})$. Theorem 1 demonstrates that DCPC's coordinate updates approximate Gibbs sampling.

Theorem 1 (DCPC coordinate updates sample from the true complete conditionals). *Each DCPC coordinate update (Equation 7) for a latent $z \in \mathbf{z}$ samples from z 's complete conditional (the normalization of Equation 5). Formally, for every measurable $h : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, resampled expectations with respect to the DCPC coordinate update equal those with respect to the complete conditional*

$$\mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_{\eta}(z \mid z^{t-1}, \varepsilon_z^t)} [\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \delta(u), z' \sim \text{RESAMPLE}(z, u_z)} [h(z)]] = \int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z) \pi_{\theta}(z \mid \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}) dz.$$

Proof. See Corollary 4.1 in Appendix B. □

We follow the canonical cortical microcircuit hypothesis of predictive coding [Bastos et al., 2012, Gillon et al., 2023] or predictive routing [Bastos et al., 2020]. Consider a cortical column representing $z \in \mathbf{z}$; the θ , α/β , and γ frequency bands of neuronal oscillations [Buzsáki and Draguhn, 2004] could synchronize parallelizations (known to exist for simple Gibbs sampling in a causal graphical model [Gonzalez et al., 2011]) of the loops in Algorithm 1. From the innermost to the outermost and following the neurophysiological findings of Bastos et al. [2015], Fries [2015], γ -band oscillations could synchronize the bottom-up conveyance of prediction errors (lines 4-6) from L2/3 of lower cortical columns to L4 of higher columns, β -band oscillations could synchronize the top-down conveyance of fresh predictions (implied in passing from s to $s + 1$ in the loop of lines 2-9) from L5/6 of higher columns to L1+L6 of lower columns, and θ -band oscillations could synchronize complete attention-directed sampling of stimulus representations (lines 1-11). Figure 1 visualizes these hypotheses for how neuronal areas and connections could implement DCPC.




Figure 1: Divide-and-conquer predictive coding provides an algorithmic interpretation for some of the connections mapped in the canonical neocortical microcircuit [Bastos et al., 2012, 2020, Campagnola et al., 2022]: prediction errors (red) arrive through ascending pathways into the central laminar layer 4, which transmits them up to layers 2/3 (green). These layers combine the incoming errors with a present posterior estimate (green L5→L2/3 connection) to generate prediction errors for the next cortical area. Eventually the updated predictions flow back down the cortical hierarchy (blue).

Biological neurons often spike to represent *changes* in their membrane voltage [Mainen and Sejnowski, 1995, Lundstrom et al., 2008, Forkosh, 2022], and some have even been tested and found to signal the temporal derivative of the logarithm of an underlying signal [Adler and Alon, 2018, Borba et al., 2021]. Theorists have also proposed models [Chavlis and Poirazi, 2021, Moldwin et al., 2021] under which single neurons could calculate gradients internally. In short, if neurons can represent probability densities, as many theoretical proposals and experiments suggest they can, then they can likely also calculate the prediction errors used in DCPC. Theorem 2 will demonstrate that given the “factorization” above, DCPC’s model learning requires only local prediction errors.

Theorem 2 (DCPC parameter learning requires only local gradients in a factorized generative model). *Consider a graphical model factorized according to Equation 1, with the additional assumption that the model parameters $\theta \in \Theta = \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}} \Theta_x \times \prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} \Theta_z$ factorize disjointly. Then the gradient $\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{F}(\theta, q)$ of DCPC’s free energy similarly factorizes into a sum of local particle averages*

$$\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{F} = \mathbb{E}_q [-\nabla_{\theta} \log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})] \approx - \sum_{v \in (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \nabla_{\theta_v} \log p_{\theta_v}(v^k \mid \text{Pa}(v)^k). \quad (9)$$

Proof. See Proposition 5 in Appendix B. □

Our practical implementation of DCPC, evaluated in the experiments above, takes advantage of Theorem 2 to save memory by detaching samples from the automatic differentiation graph in the forward ancestor-sampling pass through the generative model.

Finally, DCPC passes from local coordinate updates to the joint target density via an importance resampling operation, requiring that implementations synchronously transmit numerical densities or log-densities for the freshly proposed particle population. While phase-locking to a cortical oscillation may make this biologically feasible, resampling then requires normalizing the weights. Thankfully, divisive normalization appears ubiquitously throughout the brain [Carandini and Heeger, 2012], as well as just the type of “winner-take-all” circuit that implements a softmax function (e.g. for normalizing and resampling importance weights) being ubiquitous in crosstalk between superficial and deep layers of the cortical column [Liu, 1999, Douglas and Martin, 2004].

Section 5 will now demonstrate the effectiveness of DCPC in experiments.

Inference algorithm	Dataset	NLL ↓	Mean Squared Error ↓
MCPC	MNIST	144.6 ± 0.7	$(8.29 \pm 0.05) \times 10^{-2}$
DCPC	MNIST	102.5 ± 0.01	$0.01 \pm 7.2 \times 10^{-6}$
DCPC	EMNIST	160.8 ± 0.05	$3.3 \times 10^{-6} \pm 3.5 \times 10^{-9}$
DCPC	Fashion MNIST	284.1 ± 0.05	$0.03 \pm 2.7 \times 10^{-5}$

Table 2: Negative log-likelihood and mean squared error for MCPC against DCPC on held-out images from the MNISTs. Means and standard deviations are taken across five random seeds.

5 Experiments

Divide-and-conquer predictive coding is not the first predictive coding algorithm to incorporate sampling into the inference process, and certainly not the first variational inference algorithm for structured graphical models. This section therefore evaluates DCPC’s performance against both models from the predictive coding literature and against a standard deep generative model. Each experiment holds the generative model, dataset, and hyperparameters constant except where noted.

We have implemented DCPC as a variational proposal or “guide” program in the deep probabilistic programming language Pyro [Bingham et al., 2019]; doing so enables us to compute free energy and prediction errors efficiently in graphical models involving neural networks. Since the experiments below involve minibatched subsampling of observations $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{B}$ from a dataset $\mathcal{D} \sim p(\mathcal{D})$ of unknown distribution, we replace Equation 9 with a subsampled form (see Welling and Teh [2011] for derivation) of the variational Sequential Monte Carlo gradient estimator [Naesseth et al., 2018]

$$\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{F} \approx |\mathcal{D}| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{B} \sim p(\mathcal{D})} \left[\frac{1}{|\mathcal{B}|} \sum_{\mathbf{x}^b \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{z}, w)^{1:K} \sim q} \left[\log \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K w^k \right) \mid \mathbf{x}^b \right] \right]. \quad (10)$$

We optimized the free energy in all experiments using Adam [Kingma and Ba, 2014], making sure to call `detach()` after every Pyro `sample()` operation to implement the purely local gradient calculations of Theorem 2 and Equation 10. The first experiment below considers a hierarchical Gaussian model on three simple datasets. The model consists of two latent codes above an observation.

Deep latent Gaussian models with predictive coding Oliviers et al. [2024] brought together predictive coding with neural sampling hypotheses in a single model: Monte Carlo predictive coding (MCPC). Their inference algorithm functionally backpropagated the score function of a log-likelihood, applying Langevin proposals to sample latent variables from the posterior joint density along the way. They evaluated MCPC’s performance on MNIST with a deep latent Gaussian model [Rezende et al., 2014] (DLGM). Their model’s conditional densities consisted of nonlinearities followed by linear transformations to parameterize the mean of each Gaussian conditional, with learned covariances. Figure 2 shows that the DLGM structure already requires DCPC to respect hierarchical dependencies.




Figure 2: Hierarchical graphical model for DLGM’s.

We tested DCPC’s performance on elementary reconstruction and generation tasks by using it to train this exact generative model, changing only the likelihood from a discrete Bernoulli to a continuous Bernoulli [Loaiza-Ganem and Cunningham, 2019]. After training we evaluated with a discrete Bernoulli likelihood. Table 2 shows that in terms of both surprise (negative log evidence, with the discrete Bernoulli likelihood) and mean squared reconstruction error, DCPC enjoys better average performance with a lower standard deviation of performance, the latter by an order of magnitude. All experiments used a learning rate $\eta = 0.1$ and $K = 4$ particles.

Figure 3 shows an extension of this experiment to EMNIST [Cohen et al., 2017] and Fashion MNIST [Xiao et al., 2017] as well as the original MNIST, with ground-truth images in the top row and their reconstructions from DCPC-inferred latent codes below. The ground-truth images come from a 10% validation split of each data-set, on which DCPC only infers particles $q_{K=4}(\mathbf{z})$.

The above datasets do not typically challenge a new inference algorithm. The next experiment will thus attempt to learn representations of color images, as in the widely-used variational autoencoder [Kingma and Welling, 2013] framework, without an encoder network.

Algorithm	Particles	Resolution \uparrow	∇_{θ} -evaluations \times Epochs \downarrow	FID \downarrow
PGD	10	32×32	1×100	100 ± 2.7
DCPC	10	32×32	1×100	89.6 ± 0.6
LPC	1	64×64	300×15	120 (approximate)
DCPC	16	64×64	10×450	147.8 ± 3.1

Table 3: FID score comparisons on the CelebA dataset [Liu et al., 2015]. The score for LPC comes from Figure 2 in Zahid et al. [2024], where they ablated warm-starts and initialized from the prior.

Image generation with representation learning Zahid et al. [2024] have also recently designed and evaluated Langevin predictive coding (LPC), with differences from both MCPC and DCPC. While MCPC sends prediction errors up through a hierarchical model, LPC computed as its prediction error the log-joint gradient for all latent variables in the generative model. This meant that biological plausibility, and their goal of amortizing predictive coding inference, restricted them to a one-level generative VAE architecture adapted from Higgins et al. [2017]. Lacking a reported likelihood variance, we fixed the likelihood to $\mathcal{N}(\mu_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}), 0.01^2)$ in place of the reported “discretised Gaussian”.

We compare DCPC to LPC using Frechet Inception Distance (FID) [Seitzer, 2020] featured in Zahid et al. [2024], holding constant the prior, neural network architecture, learning rate on θ , and number of gradient evaluations used to train the parameters θ and latents \mathbf{z} . Zahid et al. [2024] evaluated a variety of scenarios and reported that their training could converge quite quickly when counted in epochs, but they accumulated gradients of θ over inference steps. We compare to the results they report after 15 epochs with 300 inference steps applied to latents initialized from the prior, equivalent to $15 \times 300 = 4500$ gradient steps on θ per batch, replicating their batch size of 64. Since Algorithm 1 updates θ only in its outer loop, we set $S = 10$ and ran DCPC for 450 epochs. Table 3 shows that LPC’s momentum-based Langevin dynamics suggests a potential improvement to DCPC.

Figure 4 shows reconstructed images from the validation set (left) and samples from the posterior predictive generative model (right). There is blurriness in the reconstructions, as often occurs with variational autoencoders, but DCPC training allows the network to capture background color, hair color, direction in which a face is looking, and other visual properties. Figure 4a shows reconstructions over the validation set, while Figure 4b shows samples from the predictive distribution.

Kuntz et al. [2023] also reported an experiment on CelebA in terms of FID score, at the lower 32×32 resolution. Since they provided both source code and an exact mathematical description, we were able to run an exact, head-to-head comparison with PGD. The line in Table 3 evaluating DCPC with PGD’s example neural architecture at the 32×32 resolution demonstrates a significant improvement in FID for DCPC, alongside a reduction in variance across random samples.

6 Related Work

Pinchetti et al. [2022] expanded predictive coding beyond Gaussian generative models for the first time, applying the resulting algorithm to train variational autoencoders by variational inference and transformer architectures by maximum likelihood. DCPC, in turn, broadens predictive coding to target arbitrary probabilistic graphical models, following the broadening in Salvatori et al. [2022] to arbitrary deterministic computation graphs. DCPC follows on incremental predictive coding [Salvatori et al., 2024] in quickly alternating between updates to random variables and model parameters, giving an incremental EM algorithm [Neal and Hinton, 1998]. Finally, Zahid et al. [2024] and Oliviers et al. [2024] also recognized the analogy between predictive coding’s prediction errors and the score functions used in Langevin dynamics for continuous random variables.





Figure 3: **Top**: images from validation sets of MNIST (left), EMNIST (middle), and Fashion MNIST (right). **Bottom**: reconstructions by deep latent Gaussian models trained with DCPC for MNIST (left), EMNIST (middle), and Fashion MNIST (right), averaging over $K = 4$ particles. DCPC achieves quality reconstructions by inference over \mathbf{z} without training an inference network.



(a) Reconstructions of the CelebA validation set (b) Samples drawn *de novo* from the posterior predictive distribution of the trained network.

Figure 4: **Left:** reconstructions from the CelebA validation set. **Right:** samples from the generative model. DCPC achieves quality reconstructions by inference over \mathbf{z} with $K = 16$ particles and no inference network, while the learned generative model captures variation in the data.

There exists a large body of work on how neurobiologically plausible circuits could implement probabilistic inference. Classic work by Shi and Griffiths [2009] provided a biologically plausible implementation of hierarchical inference via importance sampling; DCPC proceeds from importance sampling as a foundation, while parameterizing the proposal distribution via prediction errors. Recent work by Fang et al. [2022] studied neurally plausible algorithms for sampling-based inference with Langevin dynamics, though only for a Gaussian generative model of sparse coding. Golkar et al. [2022] imposed a whitening constraint on a Gaussian generative model for biological plausibility. Finally, Dong and Wu [2023] and Zahid et al. [2024] both suggest mechanisms for employing momentum to reduce gradient noise in a biologically plausible sampling algorithm; the former intriguingly analogize their momentum term to neuronal adaptation.

7 Conclusion

This paper proposed divide-and-conquer predictive coding (DCPC), an algorithm that efficiently and scalably approximates Gibbs samplers by importance sampling; DCPC parameterizes efficient proposals for a model’s complete conditional densities using local prediction errors. Section 4 showed how Monte Carlo sampling can implement a form of “prospective configuration” [Song et al., 2024], first inferring a sample from the joint posterior density (Theorem 1) and then updating the generative model without a global backpropagation pass (Theorem 2). Experiments in Section 5 showed that DCPC outperforms the state of the art Monte Carlo Predictive Coding from computational neuroscience, head-to-head, on the simple generative models typically considered in theoretical neuroscience; DCPC also outperforms the particle gradient descent algorithm of Kuntz et al. [2023] while under the constraint of purely local computation. DCPC’s Langevin proposals admit the same extension to constrained sample spaces as applied in Hamiltonian Monte Carlo [Brubaker et al., 2012]; our Pyro implementation includes this extension via Pyro’s preexisting support for HMC.

DCPC offers a number of ways forward. Particularly, this paper employed naive Langevin proposals, while Dong and Wu [2023], Zahid et al. [2024] applied momentum-based preconditioning to take advantage of the target’s geometry. Yin and Ao [2006] demonstrated that gradient flows of this general kind can also provide more efficient samplers by breaking the detailed-balance condition necessary for the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm, motivating the choice of SMC over MCMC to correct proposal bias. Appendix C derives a mathematical background for an extension of DCPC to discrete random variables. Future work could follow Marino et al. [2018], Taniguchi et al. [2022] in using a neural network to iteratively map from particles and prediction errors to proposal parameters.

7.1 Limitations

DCPC’s main limitations are its longer training time, and greater sensitivity to learning rates, than state-of-the-art amortized variational inference trained end-to-end. Such limitations occur frequently in the literature on neuroscience-inspired learning algorithms, as well as in the literature on particle-based algorithms with no parametric form. Scaling up neuroscience-inspired algorithms is an active area of research, and successes in this direction will naturally apply to DCPC, enabling the training of larger models on more complex datasets by predictive coding. This work has no singular ethical concerns specific only to DCPC, rather than the broader implications and responsibilities accompanying advancements in biologically plausible learning and Bayesian inference.

References

- Miri Adler and Uri Alon. Fold-change detection in biological systems. *Current Opinion in Systems Biology*, 8:81–89, April 2018. ISSN 2452-3100. doi: 10.1016/j.coisb.2017.12.005.
- Lisa Feldman Barrett. Context reconsidered: Complex signal ensembles, relational meaning, and population thinking in psychological science. *American Psychologist*, 77(8):894, 2022.
- Andre M Bastos, Julien Vezoli, and Pascal Fries. Communication through coherence with inter-areal delays. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 31:173–180, April 2015. ISSN 09594388. doi: 10.1016/j.conb.2014.11.001.
- André M. Bastos, W Martin Usrey, Rick A Adams, George R Mangun, Pascal Fries, and Karl J Friston. Canonical microcircuits for predictive coding. *Neuron*, 76(4):695–711, 2012.
- André M. Bastos, Mikael Lundqvist, Ayan S. Waite, Nancy Kopell, and Earl K. Miller. Layer and rhythm specificity for predictive routing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(49):31459–31469, December 2020. ISSN 0027-8424, 1091-6490. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2014868117.
- Johanna Bergmann, Lucy S Petro, Clement Abbatecola, Min S Li, A Tyler Morgan, and Lars Muckli. Cortical depth profiles in primary visual cortex for illusory and imaginary experiences. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):1002, 2024.
- Eli Bingham, Jonathan P. Chen, Martin Jankowiak, Fritz Obermeyer, Neeraj Pradhan, Theofanis Karaletsos, Rohit Singh, Paul Szerlip, Paul Horsfall, and Noah D. Goodman. Pyro: Deep universal probabilistic programming. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(28):1–6, 2019. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v20/18-403.html>.
- Cezar Borba, Matthew J Kourakis, Shea Schwennecke, Lorena Brasnic, and William C Smith. Fold change detection in visual processing. *Frontiers in Neural Circuits*, 15:705161, 2021.
- Marcus Brubaker, Mathieu Salzmann, and Raquel Urtasun. A family of mcmc methods on implicitly defined manifolds. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 161–172. PMLR, 2012.
- György Buzsáki and Andreas Draguhn. Neuronal oscillations in cortical networks. *Science*, 304(5679):1926–1929, June 2004. ISSN 0036-8075, 1095-9203. doi: 10.1126/science.1099745.
- Luke Campagnola, Stephanie C. Seeman, Thomas Chartrand, Lisa Kim, Alex Hoggarth, Clare Gamlin, Shinya Ito, Jessica Trinh, Pasha Davoudian, Cristina Radaelli, Mean-Hwan Kim, Travis Hage, Thomas Braun, Lauren Alfiler, Julia Andrade, Phillip Bohn, Rachel Dalley, Alex Henry, Sara Kebede, Alice Mukora, David Sandman, Grace Williams, Rachael Larsen, Corinne Teeter, Tanya L. Daigle, Kyla Berry, Nadia Dotson, Rachel Enstrom, Melissa Gorham, Madie Hupp, Samuel Dingman Lee, Kiet Ngo, Philip R. Nicovich, Lydia Potekhina, Shea Ransford, Amanda Gary, Jeff Goldy, Delissa McMillen, Trangthanh Pham, Michael Tieu, La’Akea Siverts, Miranda Walker, Colin Farrell, Martin Schroedter, Cliff Slaughterbeck, Charles Cobb, Richard Ellenbogen, Ryder P. Gwinn, C. Dirk Keene, Andrew L. Ko, Jeffrey G. Ojemann, Daniel L. Silbergeld, Daniel Carey, Tamara Casper, Kirsten Crichton, Michael Clark, Nick Dee, Lauren Ellingwood, Jessica Gloe, Matthew Kroll, Josef Sulc, Herman Tung, Katherine Wadhwani, Krissy Brouner, Tom Egdorf, Michelle Maxwell, Medea McGraw, Christina Alice Pom, Augustin Ruiz, Jasmine Bomben, David Feng, Nika Hejazinia, Shu Shi, Aaron Szafer, Wayne Wakeman, John Phillips, Amy Bernard, Luke Esposito, Florence D. D’Orazi, Susan Sunkin, Kimberly Smith, Bosiljka Tasic, Anton Arkhipov,

363 Staci Sorensen, Ed Lein, Christof Koch, Gabe Murphy, Hongkui Zeng, and Tim Jarsky. Local
364 connectivity and synaptic dynamics in mouse and human neocortex. *Science*, 375(6585):eabj5861,
365 2022. doi: 10.1126/science.abj5861. URL [https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/](https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.abj5861)
366 [science.abj5861](https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.abj5861).

367 Matteo Carandini and David J Heeger. Normalization as a canonical neural computation. *Nature*
368 *reviews neuroscience*, 13(1):51–62, 2012.

369 Nick Chater, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Alan Yuille. Probabilistic models of cognition: Conceptual
370 foundations. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 10(7):287–291, 2006.

371 Spyridon Chavlis and Panayiota Poirazi. Drawing inspiration from biological dendrites to empower
372 artificial neural networks. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 70:1–10, October 2021. ISSN
373 0959-4388. doi: 10.1016/j.conb.2021.04.007.

374 Gregory Cohen, Saeed Afshar, Jonathan Tapson, and Andre Van Schaik. Emnist: Extending mnist to
375 handwritten letters. In *2017 international joint conference on neural networks (IJCNN)*, pages
376 2921–2926. IEEE, 2017.

377 Ishita Dasgupta, Eric Schulz, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Samuel J Gershman. A theory of learning to
378 infer. *Psychological review*, 127(3):412, 2020.

379 Xingsi Dong and Si Wu. Neural Sampling in Hierarchical Exponential-family Energy-based Models.
380 In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, New Orleans, LA, 2023. Curran Associates
381 Inc.

382 Rodney J Douglas and Kevan AC Martin. Neuronal circuits of the neocortex. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.*,
383 27(1):419–451, 2004.

384 Kenji Doya. *Bayesian brain: Probabilistic approaches to neural coding*. MIT press, 2007.

385 Michael Y-S Fang, Mayur Mudigonda, Ryan Zarcone, Amir Khosrowshahi, and Bruno A Olshausen.
386 Learning and inference in sparse coding models with langevin dynamics. *Neural Computation*, 34
387 (8):1676–1700, 2022.

388 Oren Forkosh. Memoryless optimality: Neurons do not need adaptation to optimally encode stimuli
389 with arbitrarily complex statistics. *Neural Computation*, 34(12):2374–2387, November 2022.
390 ISSN 0899-7667, 1530-888X. doi: 10.1162/neco_a_01543.

391 Pascal Fries. Rhythms for cognition: Communication through coherence. *Neuron*, 88(1):220–235,
392 October 2015. ISSN 0896-6273. doi: 10.1016/j.neuron.2015.09.034.

393 Karl Friston. A theory of cortical responses. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society B:*
394 *Biological sciences*, 360(1456):815–836, 2005.

395 Karl Friston, James Kilner, and Lee Harrison. A free energy principle for the brain. *Journal*
396 *of Physiology-Paris*, 100(1):70–87, 2006. ISSN 0928-4257. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jphysparis.2006.10.001)
397 [jphysparis.2006.10.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jphysparis.2006.10.001). URL [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S092842570600060X)
398 [S092842570600060X](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S092842570600060X). Theoretical and Computational Neuroscience: Understanding Brain Func-
399 tions.

400 Colleen J. Gillon, Jason E. Pina, Jérôme A. Lecoq, Ruweida Ahmed, Yazan N. Billeh, Shiella
401 Caldejon, Peter Groblewski, Timothy M. Henley, India Kato, Eric Lee, Jennifer Luviano, Kyla
402 Mace, Chelsea Nayan, Thuyanh V. Nguyen, Kat North, Jed Perkins, Sam Seid, Matthew T. Valley,
403 Ali Williford, Yoshua Bengio, Timothy P. Lillicrap, Blake A. Richards, and Joel Zylberberg.
404 Learning from unexpected events in the neocortical microcircuit. *bioRxiv*, 2023. doi: 10.1101/
405 2021.01.15.426915. URL [https://www.biorxiv.org/content/early/2023/04/06/2021.](https://www.biorxiv.org/content/early/2023/04/06/2021.01.15.426915)
406 [01.15.426915](https://www.biorxiv.org/content/early/2023/04/06/2021.01.15.426915).

407 Siavash Golkar, Tiberiu Tesileanu, Yanis Bahroun, Anirvan Sengupta, and Dmitri Chklovskii.
408 Constrained predictive coding as a biologically plausible model of the cortical hierarchy. In
409 S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in*
410 *Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 14155–14169. Curran Associates,
411 Inc., 2022. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/5b5de8526aac159e37ff9547713677ed-Paper-Conference.pdf)
412 [5b5de8526aac159e37ff9547713677ed-Paper-Conference.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/5b5de8526aac159e37ff9547713677ed-Paper-Conference.pdf).

413 Joseph Gonzalez, Yucheng Low, Arthur Gretton, and Carlos Guestrin. Parallel gibbs sampling:
 414 From colored fields to thin junction trees. In Geoffrey Gordon, David Dunson, and Miroslav
 415 Dudík, editors, *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence
 416 and Statistics*, volume 15 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 324–332, Fort
 417 Lauderdale, FL, USA, 11–13 Apr 2011. PMLR. URL [https://proceedings.mlr.press/
 418 v15/gonzalez11a.html](https://proceedings.mlr.press/v15/gonzalez11a.html).

419 Irina Higgins, Loic Matthey, Arka Pal, Christopher Burgess, Xavier Glorot, Matthew Botvinick,
 420 Shakir Mohamed, and Alexander Lerchner. beta-VAE: Learning basic visual concepts with a
 421 constrained variational framework. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*,
 422 2017. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Sy2fzU9gl>.

423 Katie Hoemann, Maria Gendron, and Lisa Feldman Barrett. Mixed emotions in the predictive
 424 brain. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 15:51–57, 2017. ISSN 2352-1546. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2017.05.013>. URL [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/
 425 //doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2017.05.013](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352154616302686). URL [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/
 426 article/pii/S2352154616302686](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352154616302686). Mixed emotions.

427 J. Benjamin Hutchinson and Lisa Feldman Barrett. The Power of Predictions: An Emerging Paradigm
 428 for Psychological Research. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 2019. ISSN 14678721.
 429 doi: 10.1177/0963721419831992.

430 Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint
 431 arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.

432 Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint
 433 arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.

434 Juan Kuntz, Jen Ning Lim, and Adam M Johansen. Particle algorithms for maximum likelihood
 435 training of latent variable models. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Artificial
 436 Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 206, Valencia, Spain, April 2023. Proceedings of Machine
 437 Learning Research.

438 Juan Kuntz, Francesca R. Crucinio, and Adam M. Johansen. The divide-and-conquer sequential Monte
 439 Carlo algorithm: Theoretical properties and limit theorems. *The Annals of Applied Probability*,
 440 34(1B):1469 – 1523, 2024. doi: 10.1214/23-AAP1996. URL [https://doi.org/10.1214/
 441 23-AAP1996](https://doi.org/10.1214/23-AAP1996).

442 Brenden M. Lake, Tomer D. Ullman, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Samuel J. Gershman. Building
 443 machines that learn and think like people. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 40:e253, 2017. doi:
 444 10.1017/S0140525X16001837.

445 Yann Lecun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. Deep learning. *Nature*, 521(7553):436–444,
 446 2015. ISSN 14764687. doi: 10.1038/nature14539. Citation Key: Lecun2015.

447 F. Lindsten, A. M. Johansen, C. A. Naesseth, B. Kirkpatrick, T. B. Schön, J. A.D. Aston, and
 448 A. Bouchard-Côté. Divide-and-conquer with sequential monte carlo. *Journal of Computational and
 449 Graphical Statistics*, 26(2):445–458, 2017. ISSN 15372715. doi: 10.1080/10618600.2016.1237363.
 450 arXiv: 1406.4993 Citation Key: Lindsten2017.

451 Shih-Chii Liu. A winner-take-all circuit with controllable soft max property. In S. Solla, T. Leen,
 452 and K. Müller, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 12. MIT
 453 Press, 1999. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/1999/file/
 454 3e7e0224018ab3cf51abb96464d518cd-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/1999/file/3e7e0224018ab3cf51abb96464d518cd-Paper.pdf).

455 Ziwei Liu, Ping Luo, Xiaogang Wang, and Xiaoou Tang. Deep learning face attributes in the wild. In
 456 *Proceedings of International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, December 2015.

457 Gabriel Loaiza-Ganem and John P Cunningham. The continuous bernoulli: fixing a pervasive error
 458 in variational autoencoders. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32.
 459 Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/hash/
 460 f82798ec8909d23e55679ee26bb26437-Abstract.html](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/hash/f82798ec8909d23e55679ee26bb26437-Abstract.html).

461 Brian N. Lundstrom, Matthew H. Higgs, William J. Spain, and Adrienne L. Fairhall. Fractional differ-
462 entiation by neocortical pyramidal neurons. *Nature Neuroscience*, 11(11):1335–1342, November
463 2008. ISSN 1546-1726. doi: 10.1038/nn.2212.

464 Zachary F Mainen and Terrence J Sejnowski. Reliability of spike timing in neocortical neurons.
465 *Science*, 268(5216):1503–1506, 1995.

466 Joseph Marino, Yisong Yue, and Stephan Mandt. Iterative amortized inference. In *35th International*
467 *Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018*, volume 8, page 5444–5462, 2018. ISBN 978-1-
468 5108-6796-3. arXiv: 1807.09356 Citation Key: Marino2018a.

469 Beren Millidge, Anil Seth, and Christopher L Buckley. Predictive coding: a theoretical and experi-
470 mental review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.12979*, 2021.

471 Beren Millidge, Yuhang Song, Tommaso Salvatori, Thomas Lukasiewicz, and Rafal Bogacz. A
472 theoretical framework for inference and learning in predictive coding networks. In *The Eleventh*
473 *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL [https://openreview.net/](https://openreview.net/forum?id=ZCTvSF_uVM4)
474 [forum?id=ZCTvSF_uVM4](https://openreview.net/forum?id=ZCTvSF_uVM4).

475 Toviah Moldwin, Menachem Kalmenson, and Idan Segev. The gradient clusteron: A model neuron
476 that learns to solve classification tasks via dendritic nonlinearities, structural plasticity, and gradient
477 descent. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 17(5):e1009015, May 2021. ISSN 1553-7358. doi:
478 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009015.

479 Christian Naesseth, Fredrik Lindsten, and Thomas Schon. Nested sequential monte carlo methods.
480 In Francis Bach and David Blei, editors, *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference*
481 *on Machine Learning*, volume 37 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1292–
482 1301, Lille, France, 07–09 Jul 2015. PMLR. URL [https://proceedings.mlr.press/v37/](https://proceedings.mlr.press/v37/naesseth15.html)
483 [naesseth15.html](https://proceedings.mlr.press/v37/naesseth15.html).

484 Christian Naesseth, Scott Linderman, Rajesh Ranganath, and David Blei. Variational sequen-
485 tial monte carlo. In Amos Storkey and Fernando Perez-Cruz, editors, *Proceedings of the*
486 *Twenty-First International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 84 of
487 *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 968–977. PMLR, 09–11 Apr 2018. URL
488 <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v84/naesseth18a.html>.

489 Radford M. Neal and Geoffrey E. Hinton. *A View of the EM Algorithm that Justifies Incremental,*
490 *Sparse, and other Variants*, page 355–368. NATO ASI Series. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht,
491 1998. ISBN 978-94-011-5014-9. doi: 10.1007/978-94-011-5014-9_12. URL [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5014-9_12)
492 [10.1007/978-94-011-5014-9_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5014-9_12).

493 Gaspard Oliviers, Rafal Bogacz, and Alexander Meulemans. Learning probability distributions of
494 sensory inputs with monte carlo predictive coding. *bioRxiv*, 2024.

495 Benjamin Peters, James J DiCarlo, Todd Gureckis, Ralf Haefner, Leyla Isik, Joshua Tenenbaum, Talia
496 Konkle, Thomas Naselaris, Kimberly Stachenfeld, Zenna Tavares, et al. How does the primate
497 brain combine generative and discriminative computations in vision? *ArXiv*, 2024.

498 Luca Pinchetti, Tommaso Salvatori, Yordan Yordanov, Beren Millidge, Yuhang Song, and
499 Thomas Lukasiewicz. Predictive coding beyond gaussian distributions. In S. Koyejo,
500 S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neu-*
501 *ral Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 1280–1293. Curran Associates,
502 Inc., 2022. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/08f9de0232c0b485110237f6e6cf88f1-Paper-Conference.pdf)
503 [08f9de0232c0b485110237f6e6cf88f1-Paper-Conference.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/08f9de0232c0b485110237f6e6cf88f1-Paper-Conference.pdf).

504 Alexandre Pouget, Jeffrey M Beck, Wei Ji Ma, and Peter E Latham. Probabilistic brains: knowns and
505 unknowns. *Nature neuroscience*, 16(9):1170–1178, 2013.

506 Rajesh P N Rao and Dana H Ballard. Predictive coding in the visual cortex: a functional interpretation
507 of some extra-classical receptive-field effects. *Nature neuroscience*, 2(1):79–87, 1999. ISSN
508 1097-6256. doi: 10.1038/4580. URL [http://www.nature.com/neuro/](http://www.nature.com/neuro/journal/v2/n1/abs/nn0199_79.html)
509 [journal/v2/n1/abs/nn0199_79.html](http://www.nature.com/neuro/journal/v2/n1/abs/nn0199_79.html).

510 Danilo Jimenez Rezende, Shakir Mohamed, and Daan Wierstra. Stochastic backpropagation and
511 approximate inference in deep generative models. In *Proceedings of the 31st International
512 Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 4, page 3057–3070, Beijing, China, 2014. arXiv:
513 1401.4082 Citation Key: Rezende2014 ISBN: 9781634393973.

514 David E Rumelhart, Geoffrey E Hinton, and Ronald J Williams. Learning representations by
515 back-propagating errors. *Nature*, 323(6088):533–536, 1986.

516 Tommaso Salvatori, Luca Pinchetti, Beren Millidge, Yuhang Song, Tianyi Bao, Rafal Bogacz, and
517 Thomas Lukasiewicz. Learning on arbitrary graph topologies via predictive coding. *Advances in
518 neural information processing systems*, 35:38232–38244, 2022.

519 Tommaso Salvatori, Ankur Mali, Christopher L Buckley, Thomas Lukasiewicz, Rajesh PN Rao, Karl
520 Friston, and Alexander Ororbia. Brain-inspired computational intelligence via predictive coding.
521 *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07870*, 2023.

522 Tommaso Salvatori, Yuhang Song, Yordan Yordanov, Beren Millidge, Cornelius Emde, Zhenghua
523 Xu, Lei Sha, Rafal Bogacz, and Thomas Lukasiewicz. A stable, fast, and fully automatic learning
524 algorithm for predictive coding networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*,
525 2024.

526 Jürgen Schmidhuber. Deep learning in neural networks: An overview. *Neural Networks*, 61:85–117,
527 2015. ISSN 18792782. doi: 10.1016/j.neunet.2014.09.003. Citation Key: Schmidhuber2015.

528 Maximilian Seitzer. pytorch-fid: FID Score for PyTorch. [https://github.com/mseitzer/
529 pytorch-fid](https://github.com/mseitzer/pytorch-fid), August 2020. Version 0.3.0.

530 Lei Shi and Thomas L. Griffiths. Neural implementation of hierarchical bayesian inference by
531 importance sampling. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, page 1669–1677,
532 2009. ISBN 978-1-61567-911-9. Citation Key: Shi2009.

533 Yuhang Song, Beren Millidge, Tommaso Salvatori, Thomas Lukasiewicz, Zhenghua Xu, and
534 Rafal Bogacz. Inferring neural activity before plasticity as a foundation for learning beyond
535 backpropagation. *Nature Neuroscience*, page 1–11, January 2024. ISSN 1546-1726. doi:
536 10.1038/s41593-023-01514-1.

537 M. W. Spratling. A review of predictive coding algorithms. *Brain and Cognition*, 112:92–97, 2017.
538 ISSN 10902147. doi: 10.1016/j.bandc.2015.11.003.

539 M. V. Srinivasan, S. B. Laughlin, and A. Dubs. Predictive coding: A fresh view of inhibition in the
540 retina. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London - Biological Sciences*, 216(1205):427–459,
541 1982. ISSN 09628452. doi: 10.1098/rspb.1982.0085.

542 Sam Stites, Heiko Zimmermann, Hao Wu, Eli Sennesh, and Jan-Willem Van de Meent. Learning
543 proposals for probabilistic programs with inference combinators. *37th Conference on Uncertainty
544 in Artificial Intelligence (UAI 2021)*, 2021.

545 Shohei Taniguchi, Yusuke Iwasawa, Wataru Kumagai, and Yutaka Matsuo. Langevin autoencoders
546 for learning deep latent variable models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:
547 13277–13289, 2022. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/
548 hash/565f995643da6329cec701f26f8579f5-Abstract-Conference.html](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/565f995643da6329cec701f26f8579f5-Abstract-Conference.html).

549 Stefan Webb, Adam Golinski, Rob Zinkov, Siddharth N, Tom Rainforth, Yee Whye Teh, and
550 Frank Wood. Faithful inversion of generative models for effective amortized inference. In
551 S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, ed-
552 itors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates,
553 Inc., 2018. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2018/file/
554 894b77f805bd94d292574c38c5d628d5-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2018/file/894b77f805bd94d292574c38c5d628d5-Paper.pdf).

555 Max Welling and Yee Whye Teh. Bayesian learning via stochastic gradient langevin dynamics. In
556 *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2011*, Bellevue,
557 WA, USA, 2011. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research.

- 558 James CR Whittington and Rafal Bogacz. An approximation of the error backpropagation algorithm
559 in a predictive coding network with local hebbian synaptic plasticity. *Neural computation*, 29(5):
560 1229–1262, 2017.
- 561 Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking
562 machine learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747*, 2017.
- 563 L. Yin and P. Ao. Existence and construction of dynamical potential in nonequilibrium processes
564 without detailed balance. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 39(27):8593, June
565 2006. ISSN 0305-4470. doi: 10.1088/0305-4470/39/27/003. URL [https://dx.doi.org/10.](https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/39/27/003)
566 1088/0305-4470/39/27/003.
- 567 Umair Zahid, Qinghai Guo, and Zafeirios Fountas. Sample as you infer: Predictive coding with
568 langevin dynamics. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*,
569 volume 235, Vienna, Austria, 2024. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research.

570 A Further experiments and results

571 **Alternate image generation/ representation learning** As indicated in Section 2, this paper builds
 572 upon the particle gradient descent (PGD) algorithm; Kuntz et al. [2023] demonstrated the algorithm’s
 573 performance by training a generator network on CelebA. Their network employed a Gaussian
 574 likelihood with a fixed standard deviation of 0.01, and evaluated a log-joint objective over 100 epochs
 575 on exactly 10,000 subsampled data points. The paper then evaluated mean squared error on an
 576 inpainting task and the Frechet Inception Distance over data images.

577 When applied to the resulting target density, DCPC amounts to PGD with a resampling step. Table 4
 578 shows the results of training and evaluating the same model described above with DCPC. Since PGD
 579 trained for 100 epochs with a batch size of 128, albeit on a 10,000-image subsample of CelebA, we
 580 trained with the entire dataset for 100 epochs with batch-size 128.

Inference type	Log-joint	FID ↓
PGD ($K = 10$)	-3.80355946×10^5	100 ± 2.7
DCPC (ours, $K = 10$)	-3.1153605×10^6	89.6 ± 0.6

Table 4: Log-joint probabilities, mean squared error (MSE) on an inpainting task, and FID metrics show that DCPC performs competitively against the original particle gradient descent.

581 B Importance sampling and gradient estimation proofs

582 **Definition 2** (Strict proper weighting for a density). *Given an unnormalized density $\gamma_\theta(\mathbf{z})$ with*
 583 *corresponding normalizing constant $Z(\theta)$ and normalized density $\pi_\theta(\mathbf{z})$*

$$Z(\theta) := \int_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} \gamma_\theta(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z} \quad \pi_\theta(\mathbf{z}) := \frac{\gamma_\theta(\mathbf{z})}{Z(\theta)},$$

584 *the random variables $w, \mathbf{z} \sim q(w, \mathbf{z})$ are strictly properly weighted [Naesseth et al., 2015] with*
 585 *respect to $\gamma_\theta(\mathbf{z})$ if and only if for any measurable test function $h : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the weighted expectation*
 586 *over the proposal $q(w, \mathbf{z})$ equals the expectation under the target $\gamma_\theta(\mathbf{z})$*

$$\mathbb{E}_{w, \mathbf{z} \sim q(w, \mathbf{z})} [wh(\mathbf{z})] = \int_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} h(\mathbf{z}) \gamma_\theta(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z}. \quad (11)$$

587 The first two propositions come from the previous work by Wu et al. [2020], Stites et al. [2021] and
 588 Zimmermann et al. [2021]. The reader looking for foundations can see Naesseth et al. [2015] or
 589 Chopin and Papaspiliopoulos [2020].

590 **Proposition 1** (The free energy upper-bounds the surprisal). *Given a proposal $q_\phi(w, \mathbf{z})$ strictly*
 591 *properly weighted (Definition 2) for the target $\gamma_\theta(\mathbf{z})$, the variational free energy provides an upper*
 592 *bound to the target’s surprisal*

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta, q) \geq -\log Z(\theta). \quad (12)$$

593 *Proof.* I begin by writing out the free energy (Equation 2) as an expectation of a negative logarithm

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta, q) = \mathbb{E}_{z, w \sim q(z, w)} [-\log w].$$

594 Jensen’s Inequality allows moving the expectation into the negative logarithm by relaxing the
 595 definition of the variational free energy from an equality to an upper bound

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta, q) \geq -\log \mathbb{E}_{z, w \sim q(z, w)} [w].$$

596 Setting $h(z) = 1$, strict proper weighting for an unnormalized density (Definition 2) says the expected
 597 weight will be the normalizing constant

$$\mathbb{E}_{z, w \sim q(z, w)} [w] = Z(\theta)$$

598 which I substitute back in to obtain the desired inequality $\mathcal{F}(\theta, q) \geq -\log Z(\theta)$. \square

599 **Proposition 2** (Weighted expectations approximate the normalized target up to a constant). *Given*
600 *a proposal $q_\phi(w, \mathbf{z})$ strictly properly weighted (Definition 2) for the target $\gamma_\theta(\mathbf{z})$ and a measurable*
601 *test function $h : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, weighted expectations under the proposal equal the target's normalizing*
602 *constant times the test function's expectation under the normalized target*

$$\mathbb{E}_{(w, \mathbf{z}) \sim q_\phi(w, \mathbf{z})} [wh(\mathbf{z})] = Z(\theta) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z} \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot)} [h(\mathbf{z})].$$

603 *Proof.* Strict proper weighting (Equation 11) states that weighted expectations under the proposal
604 equal integrals over the unnormalized target, and by definition the normalized target equals the
605 unnormalized density over its normalizing constant

$$\mathbb{E}_{w, \mathbf{z} \sim q(w, \mathbf{z})} [wh(\mathbf{z})] = \int_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} h(\mathbf{z}) \gamma_\theta(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z}, \quad \pi_\theta(\mathbf{z}) := \frac{\gamma_\theta(\mathbf{z})}{Z(\theta)}.$$

606 The second equation expresses the unnormalized target in terms of the normalized one

$$Z(\theta) \pi_\theta(\mathbf{z}) = \gamma_\theta(\mathbf{z}),$$

607 and substituting this expression into the definition of strict proper weighting leads to the desired result

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} h(\mathbf{z}) \gamma_\theta(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z} &= \int_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} h(\mathbf{z}) Z(\theta) \pi_\theta(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z}, \\ &= Z(\theta) \int_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} h(\mathbf{z}) \pi_\theta(\mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z} \\ \mathbb{E}_{w, \mathbf{z} \sim q(w, \mathbf{z})} [wh(\mathbf{z})] &= Z(\theta) \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta(\mathbf{z})} [h(\mathbf{z})]. \end{aligned}$$

□

608 **Proposition 3** (DCPC's free energy has a pathwise derivative). *The free energy $\mathcal{F}^{t+1} =$*
609 *$\mathbb{E}_q [-\log w_{\theta^t}^{t+1}]$ constructed by the population predictive coding algorithm (Algorithm 1) has a*
610 *pathwise derivative as the expectation of the negative gradient of the log-joint density*

$$\nabla_{\theta^t} \mathcal{F}^{t+1} = \mathbb{E}_q [-\nabla_{\theta^t} \log p_{\theta^t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^{t+1})].$$

611 *Proof.* The free energy has an expression in terms of Equation 8

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^{t+1} &= \mathbb{E}_q [-\log w_{\theta^t}^{t+1}] & w_{\theta^t}^{t+1} &= \frac{p_{\theta^t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})}{\prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} \gamma_\theta(z_b^{t+1}; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})} \prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} \hat{Z}_{\theta^t}(\mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})^{t+1}, \\ \hat{Z}_{\theta^t}(\mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})^{t+1} &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K u_b^{t+1, k} & u_z^{t+1} &= \frac{\gamma_\theta(z^{t+1}; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})}{q(z^{t+1} | \varepsilon_z(z^t))}, \end{aligned}$$

612 and writing out the free energy itself in full shows that many terms cancel

$$\begin{aligned} q(\mathbf{z}^{t+1} | \mathbf{z}^t) &= \prod_{z_b^{t+1} \in \mathbf{z}^{t+1}} q(z^{t+1} | z^t), \\ \mathcal{F}^{t+1} &= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}^{t+1} | \mathbf{z}^t)} \left[-\log \frac{p_{\theta^t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})}{\prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} \gamma_\theta(z_b^{t+1}; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})} \prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\gamma_\theta(z_b^{t+1}; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})}{q(z^{t+1} | \varepsilon_z(z^t))} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}^{t+1} | \mathbf{z}^t)} \left[-\log \frac{p_{\theta^t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})}{\prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} \gamma_\theta(z_b^{t+1}; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})} \frac{\prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} \gamma_\theta(z_b^{t+1}; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})}{\prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} q(z^{t+1} | \varepsilon_z(z^t))} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}^{t+1} | \mathbf{z}^t)} \left[-\log \frac{p_{\theta^t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})}{q(\mathbf{z}^{t+1} | \mathbf{z}^t)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

613 The proposal distribution q is a function of the random variable values themselves through the
614 prediction errors, not of the parameters θ . The above expression therefore admits a pathwise

615 derivative [Schulman et al., 2015], moving the gradient operator into the expectation

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{\theta^t} \mathcal{F}^{t+1} &= \nabla_{\theta^t} \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}^{t+1}|\mathbf{z}^t)} \left[-\log \frac{p_{\theta^t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^{t+1})}{q(\mathbf{z}^{t+1}|\mathbf{z}^t)} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}^{t+1}|\mathbf{z}^t)} \left[\nabla_{\theta^t} -\log \frac{p_{\theta^t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^{t+1})}{q(\mathbf{z}^{t+1}|\mathbf{z}^t)} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}^{t+1}|\mathbf{z}^t)} \left[\nabla_{\theta^t} - [\log p_{\theta^t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^{t+1}) - \log q(\mathbf{z}^{t+1}|\mathbf{z}^t)] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}^{t+1}|\mathbf{z}^t)} \left[-[\nabla_{\theta^t} \log p_{\theta^t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^{t+1}) - \nabla_{\theta^t} \log q(\mathbf{z}^{t+1}|\mathbf{z}^t)] \right] \\
\nabla_{\theta^t} \mathcal{F}^{t+1} &= \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}^{t+1}|\mathbf{z}^t)} \left[-\nabla_{\theta^t} \log p_{\theta^t}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^{t+1}) \right]. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

616 **Proposition 4** (DCPC coordinate updates are strictly properly weighted for the complete conditionals).
617 *Each DCPC coordinate update (Equation 7) for a latent variable $z \in \mathbf{z}$ is strictly properly weighted*
618 *(Definition 2) for z 's unnormalized complete conditional. For every measurable $h : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$*

$$\mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_{\eta}(z^t|z^{t-1}, \varepsilon_z^t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \delta(u), z' \sim \text{RESAMPLE}(z, u_z)} [h(z')] \right] = \int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z) \gamma_{\theta}(z; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}) dz. \quad (13)$$

619 *Proof.* Expanding the outer expectation into an integral and replacing the Dirac delta with the
620 expression for the local weights transforms Equation 13 into

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{\gamma_{\theta}(z; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})}{q_{\eta}(z|z^{t-1}, \varepsilon_z^t)} \mathbb{E}_{z' \sim \text{RESAMPLE}(z, u_z)} [h(z')] q_{\eta}(z|z^{t-1}, \varepsilon_z^t) dz &= \\
&= \int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z) \gamma_{\theta}(z; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}) dz;
\end{aligned}$$

621 importance resampling also preserves strict proper weighting (see Naesseth et al. [2015], Stites et al.
622 [2021] and Chopin and Papaspiliopoulos [2020] for proofs), and so this yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbb{E}_{z' \sim \text{RESAMPLE}(z, u_z)} [h(z')] \gamma_{\theta}(z; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}) dz &= \int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z) \gamma_{\theta}(z; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}) dz \\
\int_{z' \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z') \gamma_{\theta}(z'; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}) dz' &= \int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z) \gamma_{\theta}(z; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}) dz.
\end{aligned}$$

623 □

624 **Corollary 4.1** (DCPC coordinate updates sample from the true complete conditionals). *Each DCPC*
625 *coordinate update (Equation 7) for a latent $z \in \mathbf{z}$ samples from z 's complete conditional (the*
626 *normalization of Equation 5). Formally, for every measurable $h : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, resampled expectations*
627 *with respect to the DCPC coordinate update equal those with respect to the complete conditional*

$$\mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_{\eta}(z|z^{t-1}, \varepsilon_z^t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \delta(u), z' \sim \text{RESAMPLE}(z, u_z)} [h(z')] \right] = \int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z) \pi_{\theta}(z | \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}) dz.$$

628 *Proof.* Proposition 4 in Appendix B provides a lemma

$$\mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_{\eta}(z|z^{t-1}, \varepsilon_z^t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \delta(u), z' \sim \text{RESAMPLE}(z, u_z)} [h(z')] \right] = \int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z) \gamma_{\theta}(z; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}) dz,$$

629 which we can apply by observing that resampling sums over self-normalized weights

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_{\eta}(z|z^{t-1}, \varepsilon_z^t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \delta(u), z' \sim \text{RESAMPLE}(z, u_z)} [h(z)] \right] &= \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_{\eta}(z|z^{t-1}, \varepsilon_z^t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \delta(u)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{z' \sim \frac{u \delta_z(\cdot)}{\sum u'}} [h(z')] \right] \right],
\end{aligned}$$

630 which is just a weighted sum that by Definition 2 is itself properly weighted

$$\mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_{\eta}(z|z^{t-1}, \varepsilon_z^t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \delta(u)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{z' \sim \frac{u \delta_z(\cdot)}{\sum u'}} [h(z')] \right] \right] = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_{\eta}(z|z^{t-1}, \varepsilon_z^t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \delta(u)} \left[\frac{u}{\sum u} h(z) \right] \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_\eta(z|z^{t-1}, \varepsilon_z^t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \delta(u)} \left[\frac{1}{\sum u} \int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z) \gamma_\theta(z; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_\setminus) dz \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{z \sim q_\eta(z|z^{t-1}, \varepsilon_z^t)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{u \sim \delta(u)} \left[\frac{1}{\sum u} \frac{Z_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_\setminus)}{Z_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} \int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z) \pi_\theta(z | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_\setminus) dz \right] \right] \\
&= \int_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z) \pi_\theta(z | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_\setminus) dz. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

632 **Proposition 5** (DCPC parameter learning requires only local gradients in a factorized generative
633 model). *Consider a graphical model factorized according to Equation 1, with the additional assump-*
634 *tion that the model parameters $\theta \in \Theta = \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}} \Theta_x \times \prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} \Theta_z$ share that factorization. Then the*
635 *gradient $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{F}(\theta, q)$ of DCPC's free energy similarly factorizes into a sum of local particle averages*

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_\theta \mathcal{F} &= \mathbb{E}_q [-\nabla_\theta \log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})] \\
&= \sum_{v \in (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} \mathbb{E}_{q(v, \text{Pa}(v) | \varepsilon_v, \varepsilon_{\text{Pa}(v)})} [-\nabla_{\theta_v} \log p_{\theta_v}(v | \text{Pa}(v))] \\
&= - \sum_{v \in (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \nabla_{\theta_v} \log p_{\theta_v}(v^k | \text{Pa}(v)^k).
\end{aligned}$$

636 *Proof.* Proposition 3 provides the lemma that $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{F} = \mathbb{E}_q [-\nabla_\theta \log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})]$, and applying the
637 factorization of the generative model demonstrates that

$$\nabla_\theta \mathcal{F} = \mathbb{E}_q \left[-\nabla_\theta \sum_{v \in (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} \log p_\theta(v | \text{Pa}(v)) \right].$$

638 Since the proposal q does not depend on any θ and consists of a particle cloud, we can rewrite it as a
639 mixture over the particles (after sampling is performed)

$$\nabla_\theta \mathcal{F} \approx \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K -\nabla_\theta \sum_{v \in (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} \log p_\theta(v^k | \text{Pa}(v)^k),$$

640 and then finally apply the assumption of this theorem that $\theta \in \Theta = \prod_{x \in \mathbf{x}} \Theta_x \times \prod_{z \in \mathbf{z}} \Theta_z$, moving
641 the gradient operation into the sum over individual random variables

$$\approx \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{v \in (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} -\nabla_{\theta_v} \log p_{\theta_v}(v^k | \text{Pa}(v)^k). \quad \square$$

642 C Extension to discrete sample spaces

643 Contemporaneously to the work of Kuntz et al. [2023] on particle gradient descent, Sun et al.
644 [2023] derived a novel Wasserstein gradient flow and corresponding descent algorithm for discrete
645 distributions. In their setting, each Wasserstein gradient step constructs a D -dimensional, finitely
646 supported distribution over the C -Hamming ball of the starting sample, such that the distribution
647 has DC possible states in total. Let $z^{t+h} \in N_C(z^t)$ denote the resulting discrete random variable
648 in the C -neighborhood around z^t with respect to the Hamming distance. The update rule relies on
649 simulating the gradient flow for time h , sampling from a Markov jump process at time $t + h$

$$z^{t+h} \sim \prod_{d \in [1 \dots D]} q(z_d^{t+h} | z_d^t).$$

650 A rate matrix $Q_d(z^t)$ defined by the entire discrete variable z^t parameterizes the proposal distribution

$$q_h(z_d^{t+h} | z^t) = \exp(Q_d(z^t)h). \quad (14)$$

the rate matrix will have nondiagonal entries at indices $i \neq j \in [1 \dots C]$ in the neighborhood $N_C(z^t)$,

$$Q_d(z^t)_{i,j} = w_{i,j} g \left(\frac{\pi_\theta(z_{\setminus d}^t, z'_{d,j})}{\pi_\theta(z_{\setminus d}^t, z'_{d,i})} \right).$$

The above equation requires that $\forall i, j \in [1 \dots C]$, $w_{i,j} = w_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $g(a) = ag(\frac{1}{a})$. The ratio of normalized target densities π will equal the ratio of unnormalized densities γ

$$\frac{\pi_\theta(z_{\setminus d}^t, z'_{d,j})}{\pi_\theta(z_{\setminus d}^t, z'_{d,i})} = \frac{\gamma_\theta(z'_{d,j}; z_{\setminus d}^t) \cancel{Z_{z_d}(z_{\setminus d}^t, \theta)}}{\cancel{Z_{z_d}(z_{\setminus d}^t)} \gamma_\theta(z'_{d,i}; z_{\setminus d}^t)}$$

$$g \left(\frac{\pi_\theta(z_{\setminus d}^t, z'_{d,j})}{\pi_\theta(z_{\setminus d}^t, z'_{d,i})} \right) = g \left(\frac{\gamma_\theta(z'_{d,j}; z_{\setminus d}^t)}{\gamma_\theta(z'_{d,i}; z_{\setminus d}^t)} \right).$$

Based on the experimental recommendations of Sun et al. [2023], let $w_{i,j} = w_{j,i} = 1$ and $g(a) = \sqrt{a}$. The rate matrix then simplifies to nondiagonal and diagonal terms

$$Q_d(z^t)_{i,j} = \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_\theta(z'_{d,j}; z_{\setminus d}^t)}{\gamma_\theta(z'_{d,i}; z_{\setminus d}^t)}}, \quad Q_d(z^t)_{i,i} = - \sum_{j \neq i} Q_d(z^t)_{i,j}. \quad (15)$$

Equations 14 and 15 give a distribution descending the Wasserstein gradient of the free energy with respect to a particle cloud in a discrete sample space. Applying Equation 15 to $\gamma_\theta(z; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z})$ yields a factorization in log space

$$Q(z^t)_{i,j} = \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_\theta(z^t + i; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t)}{\gamma_\theta(z^t + j; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t)}} \log Q(z^t)_{i,j} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\log \gamma_\theta(z^t + i; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t) - \log \gamma_\theta(z^t + j; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t) \right).$$

This difference can be written as a difference of differences

$$\log \gamma_\theta(z^t + i; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t) - \log \gamma_\theta(z^t + j; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t) =$$

$$\left(\log \gamma_\theta(z^t + i; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t) - \log \gamma_\theta(z^t; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t) \right) - \left(\log \gamma_\theta(z^t + j; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t) - \log \gamma_\theta(z^t; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t) \right). \quad (16)$$

Recent work on efficient sampling for discrete distributions has focused on approximating density ratios, such as the one in Equation 15, with series expansions parameterized by error vectors. When the underlying discrete densities consist of exponentiating a differentiable energy function, as in Grathwohl et al. [2021], these error vectors have taken the form of gradients and the finite-series expansions have been Taylor series. When they do not, Xiang et al. [2023] showed how they take the form of finite differences and Newton's series

$$\log \gamma(z') - \log \gamma(z) \approx \Delta_1 (\log \gamma(z))^\top \cdot (z' - z). \quad (17)$$

Discrete DCPC would therefore use finite differences as discrete prediction errors, breaking each discrete $z \in \mathbf{z}$ into dimensions and incrementing each dimension separately to construct a vector

$$\Delta_1 f(z) := (f(z_1 + 1, z_{2:D}), \dots, f(z_{1:i}, z_i + 1, z_{i+1:D}), \dots, f(z_{1:D-1}, z_D + 1)) \ominus f(z), \quad (18)$$

where \ominus subtracts the scalar $f(z)$ from the vector elements and $f : \mathbb{Z}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the target function. This would lead to defining the discrete prediction error as the finite difference

$$\varepsilon_z := \Delta_1 \log \gamma_\theta(z^t; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t). \quad (19)$$

Applying Equation 17 to the two terms of Equation 16, we obtain the approximations

$$\log \gamma_\theta(z^t + i; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t) - \log \gamma_\theta(z^t; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t) \approx \Delta_1 \left(\log \gamma_\theta(z^t; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t) \right)^\top \cdot ((z^t + i) - z^t)$$

$$\approx \varepsilon_z(z^t)^\top \cdot i$$

$$\log \gamma_\theta(z^t + j; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t) - \log \gamma_\theta(z^t; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t) \approx \Delta_1 \left(\log \gamma_\theta(z^t; \mathbf{z}_{\setminus z}^t) \right)^\top \cdot ((z^t + j) - z^t)$$

$$\approx \varepsilon_z(z^t)^\top \cdot j,$$

$$\log Q(z^t)_{i,j} \approx \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_z(z^t)^\top (i - j).$$

671 Discrete DCPC would thus parameterize its discrete proposal (Equation 14) in terms of ε_z (Equa-
672 tion 19), so that Equation 15 comes out to the (matrix) exponential of the (elementwise) exponential

$$q_h(z^{t+h} \mid \varepsilon_z) = \exp(Q(\varepsilon_z)h) \quad Q_d(\varepsilon_z)_{i,j} = \exp\left(\frac{(\varepsilon_z)_d^\top (i_d - j_d)}{2}\right).$$

Supplementary References

- Nicolas Chopin and Omiros Papaspiliopoulos. *An Introduction to Sequential Monte Carlo*. Springer, 2020. ISBN 978-3-030-47844-5. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-47845-2. Citation Key: Chopin2020 ISSN: 2197-568X.
- Will Grathwohl, Kevin Swersky, Milad Hashemi, David Duvenaud, and Chris Maddison. Oops I took a gradient: Scalable sampling for discrete distributions. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, page 3831–3841. PMLR, July 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/grathwohl21a.html>.
- John Schulman, Nicolas Heess, Theophane Weber, and Pieter Abbeel. Gradient estimation using stochastic computation graphs. In C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2015/file/de03beffeed9da5f3639a621bcab5dd4-Paper.pdf.
- Haoran Sun, Hanjun Dai, Bo Dai, Haomin Zhou, and Dale Schuurmans. Discrete Langevin Samplers via Wasserstein Gradient Flow. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, Valencia, Spain, April 2023. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research.
- Hao Wu, Heiko Zimmermann, Eli Sennesh, Tuan Anh Le, and Jan Willem van de Meent. Amortized population Gibbs samplers with neural sufficient statistics. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.
- Yue Xiang, Dongyao Zhu, Bowen Lei, Dongkuan Xu, and Ruqi Zhang. Efficient Informed Proposals for Discrete Distributions via Newton’s Series Approximation. In *Proceedings of The 26th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 7288–7310. PMLR, April 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v206/xiang23a.html>. ISSN: 2640-3498.
- Heiko Zimmermann, Hao Wu, Babak Esmaeili, and Jan-Willem van de Meent. Nested variational inference. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 20423–20435. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2021/file/ab49b208848abe14418090d95df0d590-Paper.pdf.

NeurIPS Paper Checklist

The checklist is designed to encourage best practices for responsible machine learning research, addressing issues of reproducibility, transparency, research ethics, and societal impact. Do not remove the checklist: **The papers not including the checklist will be desk rejected.** The checklist should follow the references and follow the (optional) supplemental material. The checklist does NOT count towards the page limit.

Please read the checklist guidelines carefully for information on how to answer these questions. For each question in the checklist:

- You should answer [Yes], [No], or [NA].
- [NA] means either that the question is Not Applicable for that particular paper or the relevant information is Not Available.
- Please provide a short (1–2 sentence) justification right after your answer (even for NA).

The checklist answers are an integral part of your paper submission. They are visible to the reviewers, area chairs, senior area chairs, and ethics reviewers. You will be asked to also include it (after eventual revisions) with the final version of your paper, and its final version will be published with the paper.

The reviewers of your paper will be asked to use the checklist as one of the factors in their evaluation. While "[Yes]" is generally preferable to "[No]", it is perfectly acceptable to answer "[No]" provided a proper justification is given (e.g., "error bars are not reported because it would be too computationally expensive" or "we were unable to find the license for the dataset we used"). In general, answering "[No]" or "[NA]" is not grounds for rejection. While the questions are phrased in a binary way, we acknowledge that the true answer is often more nuanced, so please just use your best judgment and write a justification to elaborate. All supporting evidence can appear either in the main paper or the supplemental material, provided in appendix. If you answer [Yes] to a question, in the justification please point to the section(s) where related material for the question can be found.

IMPORTANT, please:

- Delete this instruction block, but keep the section heading "NeurIPS paper checklist",
- Keep the checklist subsection headings, questions/answers and guidelines below.
- Do not modify the questions and only use the provided macros for your answers.

1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: [NA]

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A No or NA answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: [TODO]

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper has no limitation while the answer No means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

3. Theory Assumptions and Proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: They can be found in the supplementary material

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

4. Experimental Result Reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: [TODO]

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.

- If the paper includes experiments, a No answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
 - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
 - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
 - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
 - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We will release the code in case of acceptance.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so “No” is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).

- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

6. Experimental Setting/Details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyper-parameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer, etc.) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [TODO]

Justification: [TODO]

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

7. Experiment Statistical Significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [TODO]

Justification: [TODO]

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer "Yes" if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.
- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).
- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.
- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g. negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, The authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

8. Experiments Compute Resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [TODO]

Justification: [TODO]

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.

- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

9. Code Of Ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics <https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines>?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: [NA]

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer No, they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

10. Broader Impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: We propose a novel neuroscience-inspired learning algorithm, that does not constitute any harm.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer NA or No, they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.
- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.
- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pretrained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: We do not release models, nor we use data that is not already available online.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: [NA]

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, paperswithcode.com/datasets has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.
- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.
- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset's creators.

13. New Assets

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [No]

Justification: [NA]

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

14. Crowdsourcing and Research with Human Subjects

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [NA]

1008 Justification: [NA]

1009 Guidelines:

- 1010 • The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with
- 1011 human subjects.
- 1012 • Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribu-
- 1013 tion of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be
- 1014 included in the main paper.
- 1015 • According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation,
- 1016 or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data
- 1017 collector.

1018 **15. Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approvals or Equivalent for Research with Human**

1019 **Subjects**

1020 Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether

1021 such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB)

1022 approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or

1023 institution) were obtained?

1024 Answer: [NA]

1025 Justification: [NA]

1026 Guidelines:

- 1027 • The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with
- 1028 human subjects.
- 1029 • Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent)
- 1030 may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you
- 1031 should clearly state this in the paper.
- 1032 • We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions
- 1033 and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the
- 1034 guidelines for their institution.
- 1035 • For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if
- 1036 applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.