

Implicit sampling: drawing samples by solving eqns
(non-Gaussian proposal)

Observation: we can draw samples by solving algebraic equations.

Example: Solve: $\frac{1}{2}(x-\mu)^T C^{-1}(x-\mu) = \frac{1}{2} \xi^T \xi$, $\xi \sim N(0, I)$

for x . Solution:

$$x = \mu + C^{1/2} \xi \rightarrow x \sim N(\mu, C)$$

works well for Gaussian, but how about other distributions?

Set up:

Target distribution: $p(x) \propto \exp(-F(x))$

Reference distribution: $g(x) \propto \exp(-G(x))$

Reference dist.
↓ solve eqns
Proposal dist.
↓ weights
Target

Assume: $G(x) \geq 0$, e.g. $G(x) = \frac{1}{2} x^T C^{-1} x$.

Try to solve: $\underbrace{F(x) - \phi}_{\geq 0} = \underbrace{G(x)}_{\geq 0}$, $\xi \sim g(\cdot)$
 $\phi = \min F(x)$

→ "Should have a solution,
possibly many"

→ 1 eqn in n variables.

→ we need more eqns!

Try this: $G(x) = \frac{1}{2} x^T C^{-1} x$, $C = LL^T$, $\phi = \min F$, $\mu = \arg \min F$.

$$\left. \begin{aligned} F(x) - \phi &= \frac{1}{2} \xi^T C^{-1} \xi \\ x &= \mu + L \xi \end{aligned} \right\} \begin{array}{l} n+1 \text{ eqns in } n+1 \\ \text{variables!} \end{array}$$

This set of eqns is "easy" to solve.

$$F(x + \lambda L\xi) - \phi = \frac{1}{2} \xi^T C^{-1} \xi \rightarrow \text{solve scalar eqn for scalar } \lambda.$$

Question: What is the distribution of samples generated by solving these eqns repeatedly?

$$q(x) \propto q(\xi) \left| \frac{dx}{d\xi} \right| \quad (\text{Change of vars!})$$

$$q(\xi) \propto \exp(-\frac{1}{2} \xi^T C^{-1} \xi)$$

$$\left| \frac{dx}{d\xi} \right| = ?$$

$$x = \mu + \lambda L\xi$$

$$\frac{dx}{d\xi} = \lambda L^T + \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \xi} (L^T \xi) \quad \begin{matrix} \nwarrow \\ \text{a row vector!} \end{matrix}$$

$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \xi} = \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \phi} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \xi} \quad , \quad \phi = \frac{1}{2} \xi^T C^{-1} \xi$$

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \xi} = C^{-1} \xi$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \xi} = \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \phi} \cdot \overset{\substack{\text{scalar!} \\ \downarrow}}{(C^{-1} \xi)^T}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \frac{dx}{d\xi} &= \lambda L^T + \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \phi} \underbrace{(L^T \xi)}_{\text{scalar}} (C^{-1} \xi)^T \\ &= L^T \left(\lambda I + \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \phi} \xi (C^{-1} \xi)^T \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\left| \frac{dx}{d\xi} \right| = \left| \det \left(L^T \left(\lambda I + \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \xi} \xi (C\xi)^T \right) \right) \right|$$

$$= \det(L) \cdot \left| \det \left(\lambda I + \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \xi} \xi (C\xi)^T \right) \right|$$

Recall: $\det(A+BC) = \det(A) \det(I+BA^{-1}C)$

$$= \det(L) \cdot \det(\lambda I) \det \left(I + \underbrace{\left(\xi^T C^{-1} \xi \right)}_{=2\xi} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \xi} \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda} \right)$$

$$= \det(L) \left| \lambda^n \left(1 + 2 \frac{\partial \lambda}{\lambda \partial \xi} \right) \right|$$

$$= \det(L) \left| \lambda^{n-1} \left(\lambda + 2\xi \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \xi} \right) \right|$$

↳ Distribution of Samples:

$$q(x) \propto \exp \left(- \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \xi^T C^{-1} \xi}_{=F(x) - \phi} \right) \left| \frac{dx}{d\xi} \right|$$

$$q(x) \propto \exp(-F(x)) \left| \lambda^{n-1} \left(\lambda + 2\xi \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \xi} \right) \right|$$

• Not a Gaussian

• Samples are "easy" to obtain \rightarrow solve scalar eq.

• $q(x)$ is "easy" to compute \rightarrow scalar derivative.

More on computing the derivative:

$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \xi} = ? \quad \text{Try implicit differentiation.}$$

$$F(x) - \phi = \frac{1}{2} \xi^T C^{-1} \xi$$

$$F(\mu + \lambda L\xi) - \phi = 0$$

Take derivatives:

$$\nabla F \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} (\mu + \lambda L\xi) = 1$$

$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \xi} L\xi$$


$$\Rightarrow \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \xi} = \frac{1}{\nabla F \cdot L\xi}$$

More on geometry

$$F(x) - \phi = \frac{1}{2} \xi^T C^{-1} \xi$$

$$F(x) = \phi + \frac{1}{2} \xi^T C^{-1} \xi$$

→ choosing a ξ fixes a level set of F

→ we look for an x s.t. $H.v$

$$F(x) = \phi + \frac{1}{2} \xi^T C^{-1} \xi$$

→ we look in direction $L\xi$

$$x = \mu + \lambda L\xi$$



→ all we need is be able to compute ∇F , which we do already when minimizing F .

Implicit sampling algorithm.

(1) Solve optimization problem $\phi = \min F$ $\mu = \arg \min F$

(2) Solve $F(x) - \phi = \frac{1}{2} \xi^T C^{-1} \xi$, $\xi \sim N(0, C)$

$$x = \mu + \lambda L\xi$$

(3) proposal distribution: $q_\lambda(x) \propto \exp(-F(x)) \left| \lambda^{n-1} (\lambda + 2\xi^T \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \xi}) \right|$

(4) weights: $w \propto \frac{p(x)}{q_\lambda(x)} \propto \left| \lambda^{n-1} (\lambda + 2\xi^T \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \xi}) \right|$

How to choose the matrix L ?

Try Gaussian case: $F(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x-\mu)^T H (x-\mu)$, $\phi = 0$

$$F(x) - \phi = \frac{1}{2} \xi^T C \xi$$

$$x = \mu + L \xi$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \lambda^2 \xi^T L^T H L \xi = \frac{1}{2} \xi^T C \xi$$

pres: $C = I$

$$H = L^T L^{-1} \quad \left(\begin{array}{l} H^{-1} = L L^T \\ \text{~~not } H^{-1} = L^{-T} L \end{array} \right)~~$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \lambda^2 \xi^T \underbrace{L^T L^{-1} L L^{-1}}_{=I} \xi = \frac{1}{2} \xi^T \xi$$

$$\Rightarrow \underline{\lambda = \pm 1}$$

→ For non-Gaussian: $H = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x^2} \Big|_{x=\mu}$

Notes: • Implicit sampling with random maps:

$$x = \mu + L \xi, \quad \xi \sim N(0, I)$$

$$w(x) \propto \left| \lambda \left(\lambda + 2 \xi \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \xi} \right) \right| \quad \begin{array}{l} H^{-1} = L L^T \\ \lambda \text{ solves eq.} \end{array}$$

• Gaussian / generalized approximation

$$x = \mu + L \xi$$

$$w(x) \propto \exp(-(F(x) - Q(x)))$$

→ Sim. 2nd: Both algorithms also Sim. 2nd to 4P-var / optm. 2nd.

One can show:

$$p(x) \propto \exp(-F(x))$$

$$F(x) = \phi + \frac{1}{2}(x-\mu)^T H(x-\mu) + \cancel{\epsilon^2} \epsilon^2 C_3 + \epsilon C_4 + o(\epsilon^{3/2})$$

$$\rho = 1 + \epsilon \frac{\text{var}(G)}{E[\cancel{G^2}(x)]} \frac{(1+d)^2}{(2+d)(4+d)}$$

→ does not give much of an edge if
Gaussian proposals: ϵ is small (problem is nearly
Gaussian).

One can also symmetrize the algorithm to get

$$\underline{\rho \approx 1 + \epsilon^2 \cdot (\dots)}$$