TTIC 31230, Fundamentals of Deep Learning

David McAllester, Autumn 2023

Variational Auto-Encoders (VAEs)

Generative AI: Autoregression and GANs

For an autoregressive language model we can compute $P_{gen}(y)$ and train a generative model by cross-entropy loss.

$$\operatorname{gen}^* = \underset{\operatorname{gen}}{\operatorname{argmin}} E_{y \sim \operatorname{Pop}} - \ln P_{\operatorname{gen}}(y)$$

But it is not obvious how to this for continuous signals like sounds and images.

GANs replace the cross-entropy loss with an adversarial discrimation loss.

Generative AI for Continuous Data: Flow Models

$$\operatorname{gen}^* = \underset{\operatorname{gen}}{\operatorname{argmin}} E_{y \sim \operatorname{pop}(y)} - \ln p_{\operatorname{gen}}(y)$$

Flow-based generative models work with Jacobians over continuous transformations (no ReLUs) and can be directly trained with cross-entropy loss.

But flow models have not caught on and we will not cover them.

Generative AI for Continuous Data: VAEs

A variational autoencoder (VAE) is defined by three parts:

- An encoder distribution $P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)$.
- A "prior" distribution $P_{\text{pri}}(z)$
- A generator distribution $P_{\text{gen}}(y|z)$

VAE generation uses $P_{\text{pri}}(z)$ and $P_{\text{gen}}(y|z)$ (like a GAN).

VAE training uses a "GAN inverter" $P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)$.

We will rely on expectatin notation and will not distinguish disctrete distributions from densities.

Cross-Entropy for Continuous Data: L_2 Loss

Define $p_{\text{gen}}(y|z)$ by

$$y = \hat{y}_{gen}(z) + \sigma \epsilon, \quad \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$$

We then get that

$$-\ln p_{\text{gen}}(y|z) = \frac{||\hat{y}_{\text{gen}}(z) - y||^2}{2\sigma^2} + \ln Z(\sigma)$$

For a fixed σ we can ignore $\ln Z(\sigma)$ and we get L_2 distortion loss.

Cross-Entropy for Continuous Data: L_2 Loss

$$-\ln p_{\text{gen}}(y|z) = \frac{||\hat{y}_{\text{gen}}(z) - y||^2}{2\sigma^2} + \ln Z(\sigma)$$

For all the VAE models we will discuss, cross-entropy loss for continuous distributions will be measured by L_2 distortion.

When using L_2 distortion loss z should nearly specify y.

Diffusion Model Preview

A diffusion model multi-step (Markovian) VAE where each step adds a small amount of noise.

Each step of a diffusion model is a VAE:

- $P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)$ is defined by adding a small amount of noise to y.
- $P_{\text{pri}}(z)$ is trained to model the marginal onto z of $\text{Pop}(y)P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)$.
- A "denoising" $\hat{y}_{gen}(z)$ is computed by a U-Net.

Here z contains almost all the information in y.

Fixed Encoder Training

In a diffusion model the encoder is fixed.

$$\operatorname{pri}^*, \operatorname{gen}^* = \underset{\operatorname{pri}, \operatorname{gen}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \ E_{y \sim \operatorname{Pop}(y), z \sim \operatorname{enc}(z|y)} \left[-\ln P_{\operatorname{pri}}(z) P_{\operatorname{gen}}(y|z) \right]$$

This is a cross-entropy loss from a joint "population distribution" $P_{\text{Pop,enc}}(y,z)$ to a model distribution $P_{\text{pri,gen}}(y,z)$.

Assuming universality we get $P_{\text{pri*,gen*}}(z,y) = P_{\text{Pop,enc}}(z,y)$ which implies $P_{\text{pri*,gen*}}(y) = \text{Pop}(y)$.

Training the Encoder (The Bayesian Interpretation)

VAEs were originally motivated by a Bayesian interpretation:

- $P_{\text{pri}}(z)$ is the Bayesian prior on hypothesis z.
- $P_{\text{gen}}(y|z)$ is the propability of the "evidence" y given hypothesis z.
- $P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)$ is a model approximating the Bayesian posterior on hypothesis z given evidence y.

The Bayesian motivation is to train $P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)$ to approximate Bayesian inference.

Training the Encoder (Bayesian Interpretation)

enc*, pri*, gen* = argmin
$$E_{y \sim \text{Pop}, z \sim P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)} \mathcal{L}(y, z)$$
 enc, pri, gen

$$\mathcal{L}(y,z) = -\ln \frac{P_{\text{pri}}(z)P_{\text{gen}}(y|z)}{P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)}$$

Here we can hope to train the encoder to capture a causal origin for y.

Training the Encoder (Bayesian Interpretation)

Consider training P_{enc} while holding P_{pri} and P_{gen} fixed.

$$\operatorname{enc}^{*} = \underset{\operatorname{enc}}{\operatorname{argmin}} E_{y \sim \operatorname{Pop}(y), z \sim \operatorname{enc}(z|y)} - \ln \frac{P_{\operatorname{pri}}(z) P_{\operatorname{gen}}(y|z)}{P_{\operatorname{enc}}(z|y)}$$

$$= \underset{\operatorname{enc}}{\operatorname{argmin}} E_{y \sim \operatorname{Pop}(y), z \sim \operatorname{enc}(z|y)} - \ln \frac{P_{\operatorname{pri}, \operatorname{gen}}(y) P_{\operatorname{pri}, \operatorname{gen}}(z|y)}{P_{\operatorname{enc}}(z|y)}$$

$$= \underset{\operatorname{enc}}{\operatorname{argmin}} E_{y \sim \operatorname{Pop}(y)} KL(P_{\operatorname{enc}}(z|y), P_{\operatorname{pri}, \operatorname{gen}}(z|y)) + E_{y \sim \operatorname{Pop}(y)} [-\ln P_{\operatorname{pri}, \operatorname{gen}}(y)]$$

Training $P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)$ to equal $P_{\text{pri,gen}}(z|y)$ can drive the KL term to zero.

Training $P_{\text{pri}}(z)$ and $P_{\text{gen}}(y|z)$ can drive the cross-entropy term to H(Pop).

The Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO)

The previous derivation can be applied to an arbitrary fixed value of y yielding.

$$\ln P_{\text{pri,gen}}(y) \ge E_{z \sim P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)} \ln \frac{P_{\text{pri}}(z)P_{\text{gen}}(y|z)}{P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)}$$

$$= E_{z \sim P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)} [-\mathcal{L}(y,z)]$$

A Bayesian thinks of y as "evidence" for hypothesis z in the Bayesian model. This method of training $P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)$ is called variational Bayesian inference.

Under the Bayesian interpretation the negative of the VAE loss is called the evidence lower bound (ELBO).

Training the Ecoder: Posterior Collapse

enc*, pri*, gen* = argmin
$$E_{y \sim \text{Pop}, z \sim P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)} \mathcal{L}(y, z)$$
 enc, pri, gen

$$\mathcal{L}(y,z) = -\ln \frac{P_{\text{pri}}(z)P_{\text{gen}}(y|z)}{P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)}$$

The objective is fully optimized whenever

$$P_{\text{pri}}(z)P_{\text{gen}}(y|z) = \text{Pop}(y)P_{\text{enc}}(z_y)$$

Training the Ecoder: Posterior Collapse

Under the Bayesian interpretation we would like z to provide useful information about (a causal origin of) y.

However the objective function only produces

$$P_{\text{pri}}(z)P_{\text{gen}}(y|z) = \text{Pop}(y)P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)$$

If the cross-entropy loss is measured by L_2 distortion we need z to nearly specify y.

However, for discrete models, such as langauge models, we can campute $P_{gen}(y|z)$ even if z carries no information about y.

Training the Ecoder: Posterior Collapse

$$P_{\text{pri}}(z)P_{\text{gen}}(y|z) = \text{Pop}(y)P_{\text{enc}}(z|y)$$

For language models training the encoder allows the encoder to ignore y.

This is called "posterior collapse".

Optimizing the Encoder: The Reparameterization Trick

$$\operatorname{enc}^* = \underset{\operatorname{enc}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \quad E_{y \sim \operatorname{Pop}(y), z \sim P_{\operatorname{enc}}(z|y)} \quad \left[-\ln \frac{P_{\operatorname{pri}}(z) P_{\operatorname{gen}}(y|z)}{P_{\operatorname{enc}}(z|y)} \right]$$

Gradient descent on the encoder parameters must take into account the fact that we are sampling from the encoder.

To handle this we sample noise ϵ from a fixed noise distribution and replace z with a determinant function $z_{\text{enc}}(y, \epsilon)$

$$\mathrm{enc}^*, \mathrm{pri}^*, \mathrm{gen}^* = \underset{\mathrm{enc}, \mathrm{pri}, \mathrm{gen}}{\mathrm{argmin}} \quad E_{y, \epsilon, z = z_{\mathrm{enc}}(y, \epsilon)} \quad \left[-\ln \frac{P_{\mathrm{pri}}(z) P_{\mathrm{gen}}(y|z)}{P_{\mathrm{enc}}(z|y)} \right]$$

The Re-Parameterization Trick

$$\mathrm{enc}^*, \mathrm{pri}^*, \mathrm{gen}^* = \underset{\mathrm{enc}, \mathrm{pri}, \mathrm{gen}}{\mathrm{argmin}} \quad E_{y, \epsilon, z = z_{\mathrm{enc}}(y, \epsilon)} \quad \left[-\ln \frac{P_{\mathrm{pri}}(z) P_{\mathrm{gen}}(y|z)}{P_{\mathrm{enc}}(z|y)} \right]$$

To get gradients we must have that $z_{\text{enc}}(y, \epsilon)$ is a smooth function of the encoder parameters and all probabilties must be a smooth function of z.

Commonly we use

$$\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I), \quad z_{\text{enc}}(y, \epsilon) = \hat{z}_{\text{enc}}(y) + \sigma \epsilon$$

Optimizing the encoder is tricky for discrete z. Discrete z is handled effectively in EM algorithms and in VQ-VAEs.

EM is Alternating Optimization of the ELBO Loss

Expectation Maximimization (EM) applies in the (highly special) case where the exact posterior $P_{\text{pri,gen}}(z|y)$ is samplable and computable. EM alternates exact optimization of enc and the pair (pri, gen) in:

VAE:
$$\operatorname{pri}^*, \operatorname{gen}^* = \operatorname{argmin} \min_{\operatorname{enc}} E_y, z \sim P_{\operatorname{enc}}(z|y) - \ln \frac{P_{\operatorname{pri},\operatorname{gen}}(z,y)}{P_{\operatorname{enc}}(z|y)}$$

EM:
$$\operatorname{pri}^{t+1}, \operatorname{gen}^{t+1} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\operatorname{pri}, \operatorname{gen}} E_y, z \sim P_{\operatorname{pri}^t, \operatorname{gen}^t}(z|y) - \ln P_{\operatorname{pri}, \operatorname{gen}}(z, y)$$

Inference Update (E Step) (M Step)
$$P_{\text{enc}}(z|y) = P_{\text{pri}_{,\text{gen}_{}^{t}}}(z|y) \quad \text{Hold } P_{\text{enc}}(z|y) \text{ fixed}$$

\mathbf{END}