


Deep Generative Models

Lecture 11: Energy-Based Models

Aditya Grover

UCLA

Recap.




- Autoregressive models. $p_{\theta}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n p_{\theta}(x_i \mid x_{<i})$
- Normalizing flow models. $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{z}) |\det J_{f_{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})|$, where $\mathbf{z} = f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$.
- Variational autoencoders: $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \int p(\mathbf{z}) p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{z}) d\mathbf{z}$.

Cons: Model architectures are restricted.

Recap.



$x^{(j)} \sim P_{\text{data}}$
 $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$




- Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs).
 - $\min_{\theta} \max_{\phi} E_{\mathbf{x} \sim p_{\text{data}}} [\log D_{\phi}(\mathbf{x})] + E_{\mathbf{z} \sim p(\mathbf{z})} [\log(1 - D_{\phi}(G_{\theta}(\mathbf{z})))]$.
 - Two sample tests. Can optimize f -divergences and the Wasserstein distance.
 - Very flexible model architectures. But likelihood is intractable, training is unstable, hard to evaluate, and has mode collapse issues.

Today's lecture



$$x^{(j)} \sim P_{\text{data}} \\ j = 1, 2, \dots, m$$



Energy-based models (EBMs).

- Very flexible model architectures.
- Stable training.
- Relatively high sample quality.
- Flexible composition.

Parameterizing probability distributions

Probability distributions $p(x)$ are a key building block in generative modeling.

1. non-negative: $p(x) \geq 0$
2. sum-to-one: $\sum_x p(x) = 1$ (or $\int p(x)dx = 1$ for continuous variables)

Coming up with a non-negative function $p_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ is not hard.

Given any function $f_\theta(\mathbf{x})$, we can choose

- $g_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = f_\theta(\mathbf{x})^2$
- $g_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \exp(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}))$
- $g_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = |f_\theta(\mathbf{x})|$
- $g_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \log(1 + \exp(f_\theta(\mathbf{x})))$

Parameterizing probability distributions

Probability distributions $p(\mathbf{x})$ satisfy two key properties.

1. non-negative: $p(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$
2. sum-to-one: $\sum_{\mathbf{x}} p(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ (or $\int p(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = 1$ for continuous variables)

Sum-to-one is key:



Total “volume” is fixed: increasing $p(x_{train})$ guarantees that x_{train} becomes relatively more likely (compared to the rest).

Problem:

- $g_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ is easy, but $g_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$ might not sum-to-one.
- $\sum_{\mathbf{x}} g_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = Z(\theta) \neq 1$ in general, so $g_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$ is not a valid probability mass function or density

Parameterizing probability distributions

Problem: $g_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ is easy, but $g_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ might not be normalized

Solution:

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\text{Volume}(g_\theta)} g_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\int g_\theta(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}} g_\theta(\mathbf{x})$$

Then by definition, $\int p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = 1$.

Example: choose $g_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ so that we know the volume *analytically* as a function of θ .

1. $g_{(\mu, \sigma)}(x) = e^{-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}}$. **Volume** is: $\int e^{-\frac{x-\mu}{2\sigma^2}} dx = \sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}$. \rightarrow **Gaussian**

2. $g_\lambda(x) = e^{-\lambda x}$. **Volume** is: $\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} dx = \frac{1}{\lambda}$. \rightarrow **Exponential**

3. $g_\theta(x) = h(x) \exp\{\theta \cdot T(x)\}$. **Volume** is $\exp\{A(\theta)\}$, where $A(\theta) = \log \int h(x) \exp\{\theta \cdot T(x)\} d\mathbf{x}$. \rightarrow **Exponential family**
 - Normal, Poisson, exponential, Bernoulli
 - beta, gamma, Dirichlet, Wishart, etc.

Likelihood based learning

Problem: $g_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ is easy, but $g_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ might not be normalized

Solution:

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\text{Volume}(g_\theta)} g_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\int g_\theta(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}} g_\theta(\mathbf{x})$$

Typically, choose $g_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ so that we know the volume *analytically*. More complex models can be obtained by combining these building blocks.

1. **Autoregressive:** Products of normalized objects $p_\theta(\mathbf{x})p_{\theta'(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{y})$:

$$\int_{\mathbf{x}} \int_{\mathbf{y}} p_\theta(\mathbf{x})p_{\theta'(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{y} = \int_{\mathbf{x}} p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \underbrace{\int_{\mathbf{y}} p_{\theta'(\mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y}}_{=1} d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathbf{x}} p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = 1$$

2. **Latent variables:** Mixtures of normalized objects

$$\alpha p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) + (1 - \alpha)p_{\theta'}(\mathbf{x}) :$$

$$\int_{\mathbf{x}} \alpha p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) + (1 - \alpha)p_{\theta'}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \alpha + (1 - \alpha) = 1$$

How about using models where the “volume” /normalization constant of $g_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ is not easy to compute analytically?

Energy-based model

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\int \exp(f_\theta(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}} \exp(f_\theta(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{1}{Z(\theta)} \exp(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}))$$

The volume/normalization constant $Z(\theta) = \int \exp(f_\theta(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}$ is also called the partition function. Why exponential (and not e.g. $f_\theta(\mathbf{x})^2$)?

1. Want to capture very large variations in probability. Hence, log-probs is a natural scale. Otherwise need highly non-smooth f_θ .
2. Exponential families. Many common distributions can be written in this form.
3. These distributions arise under fairly general assumptions in statistical physics (maximum entropy, second law of thermodynamics).
 - $-f_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ is called the **energy**, hence the name.
 - Intuitively, configurations \mathbf{x} with low energy (high $f_\theta(\mathbf{x})$) are more likely.

Energy-based model

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\int \exp(f_\theta(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}} \exp(f_\theta(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{1}{Z(\theta)} \exp(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}))$$

Pros:

1. extreme flexibility: can use pretty much any function $f_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ you want

Cons:

1. Sampling from $p_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ is hard
2. Evaluating and optimizing likelihood $p_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ is hard (learning is hard)
3. No feature learning (but can add latent variables)

Curse of dimensionality: The fundamental issue is that computing $Z(\theta)$ numerically (when no analytic solution is available) scales exponentially in the number of dimensions of \mathbf{x} .

Applications of Energy-based models

$$p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\int \exp(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}} \exp(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{1}{Z(\theta)} \exp(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}))$$

- Given \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' evaluating $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$ or $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}')$ requires $Z(\theta)$.
- However, their ratio


$$\frac{p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})}{p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}')} = \exp(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) - f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}'))$$

does not involve $Z(\theta)$.

- This means we can easily check which one is more likely.
Applications:

1. anomaly detection
2. denoising


Applications of Energy-based models



Given a trained model, many applications require relative comparisons.
Hence $Z(\theta)$ is not needed.

Example: Ising Model

- There is a true image $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^{3 \times 3}$, and a corrupted image $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{3 \times 3}$. We know \mathbf{x} , and want to somehow recover \mathbf{y} .



- We model the joint probability distribution $p(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})$ as

$$p(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left(\sum_i \psi_i(x_i, y_i) + \sum_{(i,j) \in E} \psi_{ij}(y_i, y_j) \right)$$

- $\psi_i(x_i, y_i)$: the i -th corrupted pixel depends on the i -th original pixel
- $\psi_{ij}(y_i, y_j)$: neighboring pixels tend to have the same value
- How did the original image \mathbf{y} look like? Solution: maximize $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$. Or equivalently, maximize $p(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})$.

Example: Product of Experts

- Suppose you have trained several models $q_{\theta_1}(\mathbf{x})$, $r_{\theta_2}(\mathbf{x})$, $t_{\theta_3}(\mathbf{x})$. They can be different models (PixelCNN, Flow, etc.)
- Each one is like an *expert* that can be used to score how likely an input \mathbf{x} is.
- Assuming the experts make their judgments independently, it is tempting to ensemble them as

$$p_{\theta_1}(\mathbf{x})q_{\theta_2}(\mathbf{x})r_{\theta_3}(\mathbf{x})$$

- To get a valid probability distribution, we need to normalize

$$p_{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)} q_{\theta_1}(\mathbf{x})r_{\theta_2}(\mathbf{x})t_{\theta_3}(\mathbf{x})$$

- Note: similar to an AND operation (e.g., probability is zero as long as one model gives zero probability), unlike mixture models which behave more like OR

Example: Product of Experts





Image source: Du et al., 2020.

Example: Restricted Boltzmann machine (RBM)

- RBM: energy-based model with latent variables
- Two types of variables:
 1. $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ are visible variables (e.g., pixel values)
 2. $\mathbf{z} \in \{0, 1\}^m$ are latent ones
- The joint distribution is


$$p_{W,b,c}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left(\mathbf{x}^T W \mathbf{z} + b\mathbf{x} + c\mathbf{z} \right) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m x_i z_j w_{ij} + b\mathbf{x} + c\mathbf{z} \right)$$



- Restricted because there are no visible-visible and hidden-hidden connections, i.e., $x_i x_j$ or $z_i z_j$ terms in the objective

Example: Deep Boltzmann Machines

Stacked RBMs are one of the first deep generative models:



- Bottom layer variables v are pixel values. Layers above (h) represent “higher-level” features (corners, edges, etc).
- Early deep neural networks for *supervised learning* had to be pre-trained like this to make them work.

Deep Boltzmann Machines: samples




Image source: Salakhutdinov and Hinton, 2009.

Energy-based models: learning and inference

$$p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\int \exp(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}))} \exp(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{1}{Z(\theta)} \exp(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}))$$

Pros:

1. can plug in pretty much any function $f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$ you want

Cons (lots of them):

1. Sampling is hard
2. Evaluating likelihood (learning) is hard
3. No feature learning

Curse of dimensionality: The fundamental issue is that computing $Z(\theta)$ numerically (when no analytic solution is available) scales exponentially in the number of dimensions of \mathbf{x} .

Computing the normalization constant is hard

- As an example, the RBM joint distribution is


$$p_{W,b,c}(x,z) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(x^T W z + b x + c z)$$

- $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ are visible variables (e.g., pixel values)
 - $z \in \{0,1\}^m$ are latent ones
- The normalization constant (the “volume”) is

$$Z(W, b, c) = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} \sum_{z \in \{0,1\}^m} \exp(x^T W z + b x + c z)$$


- Note:** it is a well defined function of the parameters W, b, c , but no simple closed-form. Takes time exponential in n, m to compute. This means that *evaluating* the objective function $p_{W,b,c}(x,z)$ for likelihood based learning is hard.
- Observation:** Optimizing the likelihood $p_{W,b,c}(x,z)$ is difficult, but optimizing the un-normalized probability $\exp(x^T W z + b x + c z)$ (w.r.t. trainable parameters W, b, c)

Training intuition



- Goal: maximize $\frac{\exp\{f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{train})\}}{Z(\theta)}$. Increase numerator, decrease denominator.
- **Intuition:** because the model is not normalized, increasing the un-normalized log-probability $f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_{train})$ by changing θ does **not** guarantee that \mathbf{x}_{train} becomes relatively more likely (compared to the rest).
- We also need to take into account the effect on other “wrong points” and try to “push them down” to *also* make $Z(\theta)$ small.

Contrastive Divergence



- Goal: maximize $\frac{\exp\{f_\theta(x_{train})\}}{Z(\theta)}$
- Idea: Instead of evaluating $Z(\theta)$ exactly, use a Monte Carlo estimate.
- **Contrastive divergence algorithm:** sample $x_{sample} \sim p_\theta$, take step on $\nabla_\theta (f_\theta(x_{train}) - f_\theta(x_{sample}))$. Make training data more likely than typical sample from the model.

Contrastive Divergence

- Maximize log-likelihood: $\max_{\theta} f_{\theta}(x_{train}) - \log Z(\theta)$.
- Gradient of log-likelihood:

$$\begin{aligned}& \nabla_{\theta} f_{\theta}(x_{train}) - \nabla_{\theta} \log Z(\theta) \\&= \nabla_{\theta} f_{\theta}(x_{train}) - \frac{\nabla_{\theta} Z(\theta)}{Z(\theta)} \\&= \nabla_{\theta} f_{\theta}(x_{train}) - \frac{1}{Z(\theta)} \int \nabla_{\theta} \exp\{f_{\theta}(x)\} dx \\&= \nabla_{\theta} f_{\theta}(x_{train}) - \frac{1}{Z(\theta)} \int \exp\{f_{\theta}(x)\} \nabla_{\theta} f_{\theta}(x) dx \\&= \nabla_{\theta} f_{\theta}(x_{train}) - \int \frac{\exp\{f_{\theta}(x)\}}{Z(\theta)} \nabla_{\theta} f_{\theta}(x) dx \\&= \nabla_{\theta} f_{\theta}(x_{train}) - E_{x_{sample}}[\nabla_{\theta} f_{\theta}(x_{sample})] \\&\approx \nabla_{\theta} f_{\theta}(x_{train}) - \nabla_{\theta} f_{\theta}(x_{sample}),\end{aligned}$$

where $x_{sample} \sim \exp\{f_{\theta}(x_{sample})\}/Z(\theta)$.

- How to sample?

Sampling from energy-based models

$$p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\int \exp(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}))} \exp(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{1}{Z(\theta)} \exp(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}))$$

- No direct way to sample like in autoregressive or flow models.
Main issue: cannot easily compute how likely each possible sample is
- However, we can easily compare two samples \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' .
- Use an iterative approach called Markov Chain Monte Carlo:
 1. Initialize x^0 randomly, $t = 0$
 2. Let $x' = x^t + \text{noise}$
 - 2.1 If $f_{\theta}(x') > f_{\theta}(x^t)$, let $x^{t+1} = x'$
 - 2.2 Else let $x^{t+1} = x'$ with probability $\exp(f_{\theta}(x') - f_{\theta}(x^t))$
 3. Go to step 2
- Works in theory, but can take a very long time to converge

Sampling from energy-based models

- For any continuous distribution $p_\theta(\mathbf{x})$, suppose we can compute its gradient (the **score function**) $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p_\theta(\mathbf{x})$.
- Let $\pi(\mathbf{x})$ be a prior distribution that is easy to sample from.
- Langevin MCMC.
 - $\mathbf{x}^0 \sim \pi(\mathbf{x})$
 - Repeat $\mathbf{x}^{t+1} \sim \mathbf{x}^t + \epsilon \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}^t) + \sqrt{2\epsilon} \mathbf{z}^t$ for $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots, T - 1$, where $\mathbf{z}^t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$.
 - If $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\mathbf{x}^T \sim p_\theta(\mathbf{x})$.
- Note that for energy-based models

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) &= \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f_\theta(\mathbf{x}) - \underbrace{\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log Z(\theta)}_{=0} \\ &= \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} f_\theta(\mathbf{x})\end{aligned}$$

Modern energy-based models




Langevin sampling



Face samples

Image source: Nijkamp et al. 2019

Modern energy-based models



ImageNet samples

Image source: Du et al., 2019