Deep Generative Models

Lecture 2

Roman Isachenko

AI Masters

2026, Spring

Recap of Previous Lecture

We're given **finite** number of i.i.d. samples $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{n} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ drawn from an **unknown** distribution $p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})$.

Objective

Our aim is to learn a distribution $p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})$ that allows us to:

- ▶ Generate new samples from $p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})$ (sample $\mathbf{x} \sim p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})$) — **generation**.
- ▶ Evaluate $p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})$ on novel data (answering "How likely is an object $\mathbf{x}$?") — **density estimation**;

Divergence Minimization Task

- ▶ $D(\pi \| p) \geq 0$ for all $\pi, p \in \mathcal{P}$;
- ▶ $D(\pi \| p) = 0$ if and only if $\pi \equiv p$.

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} D(p_{\text{data}} \| p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$$

Recap of Previous Lecture

Forward KL Divergence

$$\text{KL}(p_{\text{data}} \| p_\theta) = \int \pi(\mathbf{x}) \log \frac{p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})}{p_\theta(\mathbf{x})} \, d\mathbf{x} \to \min_\theta$$

Reverse KL Divergence

$$\text{KL}(p_\theta \| p_{\text{data}}) = \int p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \log \frac{p_\theta(\mathbf{x})}{p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})} \, d\mathbf{x} \to \min_\theta$$

Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE)

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \arg\max_\theta \prod_{i=1}^n p_\theta(\mathbf{x}_i) = \arg\max_\theta \sum_{i=1}^n \log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}_i)$$

Maximum likelihood estimation is equivalent to minimizing the Monte Carlo estimate of the forward KL divergence.

Recap of Previous Lecture

Likelihood as Product of Conditionals
Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, and define $\mathbf{x}_{1:j} = (x_1, \ldots, x_j)$. Then,

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^{m} p_\theta(x_j | \mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \quad \log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \log p_\theta(x_j | \mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})$$

MLE for Autoregressive Models
$$\theta^* = \arg\max_\theta \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \log p_\theta(x_{ij} | \mathbf{x}_{i,1:j-1})$$

Sampling

$$\hat{x}_1 \sim p_\theta(x_1), \quad \hat{x}_2 \sim p_\theta(x_2 | \hat{x}_1), \quad \ldots, \quad \hat{x}_m \sim p_\theta(x_m | \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{1:m-1})$$

The generated sample is $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \ldots, \hat{x}_m)$.

Recap of Previous Lecture

## Autoregressive MLP

Autoregressive Transformer

Image credit: https://jmtomczak.github.io/blog/2/2_ARM.html

Chen M. et al. Generative Pretraining from Pixels, 2020

Outline

Outline

Generative Models Taxonomy

Normalizing Flows: Prerequisites

Jacobian Matrix

Let $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be a differentiable function.

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{J} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{z}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial z_1}{\partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial z_1}{\partial x_m} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial z_m}{\partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial z_m}{\partial x_m} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$$

Normalizing Flows: Prerequisites

Jacobian Matrix

Let $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be a differentiable function.

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{J} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{z}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial z_1}{\partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial z_1}{\partial x_m} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial z_m}{\partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial z_m}{\partial x_m} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$$

Change of Variables Theorem (CoV)

Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be a random vector with density $p(\mathbf{x})$, and let
$\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be a C^1-diffeomorphism ($\mathbf{f}$ and $\mathbf{f}^{-1}$ are continuously
differentiable mappings). If $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$, then

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{z})|\det(\mathbf{J_f})| = p(\mathbf{z}) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{z}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \right|$$

Normalizing Flows: Prerequisites

Jacobian Matrix

Let $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be a differentiable function.

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{J} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{z}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial z_1}{\partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial z_1}{\partial x_m} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial z_m}{\partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial z_m}{\partial x_m} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$$

Change of Variables Theorem (CoV)

Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be a random vector with density $p(\mathbf{x})$, and let $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be a C^1-diffeomorphism ($\mathbf{f}$ and $\mathbf{f}^{-1}$ are continuously differentiable mappings). If $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$, then

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{z})|\det(\mathbf{J_f})| = p(\mathbf{z}) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{z}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \right| = p(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \right|$$

Normalizing Flows: Prerequisites

Jacobian Matrix

Let $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be a differentiable function.

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{J} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{z}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial z_1}{\partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial z_1}{\partial x_m} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial z_m}{\partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial z_m}{\partial x_m} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$$

Change of Variables Theorem (CoV)

Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be a random vector with density $p(\mathbf{x})$, and let $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be a C^1-diffeomorphism ($\mathbf{f}$ and $\mathbf{f}^{-1}$ are continuously differentiable mappings). If $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$, then

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{z})|\det(\mathbf{J_f})| = p(\mathbf{z}) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{z}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\right) \right| = p(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\right) \right|$$

$$p(\mathbf{z}) = p(\mathbf{x})|\det(\mathbf{J_{f^{-1}}})| = p(\mathbf{x}) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \mathbf{z}}\right) \right| = p(\mathbf{f}^{-1}(\mathbf{z})) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}^{-1}(\mathbf{z})}{\partial \mathbf{z}}\right) \right|$$

Jacobian Determinant

Inverse Function Theorem
If the function **f** is invertible and its Jacobian is continuous and non-singular, then

$$\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}^{-1}} = \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}}^{-1};$$

Jacobian Determinant

Inverse Function Theorem
If the function $\mathbf{f}$ is invertible and its Jacobian is continuous and non-singular, then

$$\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}^{-1}} = \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}}^{-1}; \quad |\det(\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}^{-1}})| = \frac{1}{|\det(\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}})|}$$

Jacobian Determinant

Inverse Function Theorem

If the function $\mathbf{f}$ is invertible and its Jacobian is continuous and non-singular, then

$$\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}^{-1}} = \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}}^{-1}; \quad |\det(\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}^{-1}})| = \frac{1}{|\det(\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}})|}$$

▶ $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{z}$ reside in the same space ($\mathbb{R}^m$).

▶ $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$ is a parameterized transformation.

Jacobian Determinant

Inverse Function Theorem

If the function $\mathbf{f}$ is invertible and its Jacobian is continuous and non-singular, then

$$\mathbf{J_{f^{-1}}} = \mathbf{J_f^{-1}}; \quad |\det(\mathbf{J_{f^{-1}}})| = \frac{1}{|\det(\mathbf{J_f})|}$$

- $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{z}$ reside in the same space $(\mathbb{R}^m)$.

- $\mathbf{f_\theta(x)}$ is a parameterized transformation.

- The determinant of the Jacobian $\mathbf{J} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f_\theta(x)}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$ quantifies how the volume is changed by the transformation.

https://jmtomczak.github.io/blog/3/3_flows.html

Fitting Normalizing Flows

MLE Problem

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{z}) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{z}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\right) \right| = p(\mathbf{f}_\theta(\mathbf{x})) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_\theta(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\right) \right|$$

Dinh L., Sohl-Dickstein J., Bengio S. Density Estimation Using Real NVP, 2016

Fitting Normalizing Flows

MLE Problem

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{z}) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{z}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\right) \right| = p(\mathbf{f}_\theta(\mathbf{x})) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_\theta(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\right) \right|$$

$$\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \log p(\mathbf{f}_\theta(\mathbf{x})) + \log|\det(\mathbf{J}_\mathbf{f})| \to \max_\theta$$

Dinh L., Sohl-Dickstein J., Bengio S. Density Estimation Using Real NVP, 2016

Fitting Normalizing Flows

MLE Problem

$$p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{z}) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{z}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\right) \right| = p(\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\right) \right|$$

$$\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \log p(\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})) + \log |\det(\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}})| \to \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$$

Data space $\mathcal{X}$ Latent space $\mathcal{Z}$

Inference
$x \sim \hat{p}_X$
$z = f(x)$

$\Rightarrow$

Generation
$z \sim p_Z$
$x = f^{-1}(z)$

$\Leftarrow$

Dinh L., Sohl-Dickstein J., Bengio S. Density Estimation Using Real NVP, 2016

Composition of Normalizing Flows

Composition of Normalizing Flows

Theorem

If every $\{\mathbf{f}_k\}_{k=1}^{K}$ satisfies the conditions of the change-of-variables theorem, then the composition $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{f}_K \circ \ldots \circ \mathbf{f}_1(\mathbf{x})$ also satisfies them.

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \right|$$

Composition of Normalizing Flows

Theorem
If every $\{\mathbf{f}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ satisfies the conditions of the change-of-variables theorem, then the composition $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{f}_K \circ \ldots \circ \mathbf{f}_1(\mathbf{x})$ also satisfies them.

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \right| = p(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_K}{\partial \mathbf{f}_{K-1}} \ldots \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_1}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \right|$$

Composition of Normalizing Flows

Theorem

If every $\{\mathbf{f}_k\}_{k=1}^{K}$ satisfies the conditions of the change-of-variables theorem, then the composition $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{f}_K \circ \ldots \circ \mathbf{f}_1(\mathbf{x})$ also satisfies them.

$$
p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\right) \right| = p(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_K}{\partial \mathbf{f}_{K-1}} \ldots \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_1}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\right) \right| =
$$

$$
= p(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \prod_{k=1}^{K} \left| \det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_k}{\partial \mathbf{f}_{k-1}}\right) \right| = p(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \prod_{k=1}^{K} |\det(\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}_k})|
$$

https://lilianweng.github.io/lil-log/2018/10/13/flow-based-deep-generative-models.html

Normalizing Flows (NF)

$$\log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \log p(\mathbf{f}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})) + \log |\det(\mathbf{J_f})|$$

Definition
A normalizing flow is a C^1-diffeomorphism that transforms data $\mathbf{x}$ to noise $\mathbf{z}$.

Normalizing Flows (NF)

$$\log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \log p(\mathbf{f}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})) + \log |\det(\mathbf{J_f})|$$

Definition

A normalizing flow is a C^1-diffeomorphism that transforms data $\mathbf{x}$ to noise $\mathbf{z}$.

- **Normalizing** refers to mapping samples from $p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})$ to a base distribution $p(\mathbf{z})$.
- **Flow** describes the sequence of transformations that maps samples from $p(\mathbf{z})$ to the target, more complex distribution.

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}_K \circ \ldots \circ \mathbf{f}_1(\mathbf{x}); \quad \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{f}_1^{-1} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbf{f}_K^{-1}(\mathbf{z})$$

Normalizing Flows (NF)

$$\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \log p(\mathbf{f}_\theta(\mathbf{x})) + \log |\det(\mathbf{J_f})|$$

Definition
A normalizing flow is a C^1-diffeomorphism that transforms data $\mathbf{x}$ to noise $\mathbf{z}$.

- ▶ **Normalizing** refers to mapping samples from $p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})$ to a base distribution $p(\mathbf{z})$.
- ▶ **Flow** describes the sequence of transformations that maps samples from $p(\mathbf{z})$ to the target, more complex distribution.

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}_K \circ \ldots \circ \mathbf{f}_1(\mathbf{x}); \quad \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{f}_1^{-1} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbf{f}_K^{-1}(\mathbf{z})$$

Log-Likelihood
$$\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \log p(\mathbf{f}_K \circ \ldots \circ \mathbf{f}_1(\mathbf{x})) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \log |\det(\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}_k})|$$

where $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}_k} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_k}{\partial \mathbf{f}_{k-1}}$.

Normalizing Flows (NF)

$$\log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \log p(\mathbf{f}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})) + \log |\det(\mathbf{J_f})|$$

Definition
A normalizing flow is a C^1-diffeomorphism that transforms data $\mathbf{x}$ to noise $\mathbf{z}$.

▶ **Normalizing** refers to mapping samples from $p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})$ to a base distribution $p(\mathbf{z})$.

▶ **Flow** describes the sequence of transformations that maps samples from $p(\mathbf{z})$ to the target, more complex distribution.

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}_K \circ \ldots \circ \mathbf{f}_1(\mathbf{x}); \quad \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{f}_1^{-1} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbf{f}_K^{-1}(\mathbf{z})$$

Log-Likelihood

$$\log p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \log p(\mathbf{f}_K \circ \ldots \circ \mathbf{f}_1(\mathbf{x})) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \log |\det(\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}_k})|$$

where $\mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{f}_k} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_k}{\partial \mathbf{f}_{k-1}}$.

Note: Here we consider only **continuous** random variables.

Normalizing Flows

Example: 4-Step NF

Papamakarios G. et al. Normalizing Flows for Probabilistic Modeling and Inference, 2019

Normalizing Flows

Example: 4-Step NF

NF Log-Likelihood

$$\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \log p(\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})) + \log|\det(\mathbf{J_f})|$$

What's the computational complexity of evaluating this determinant?

Papamakarios G. et al. Normalizing Flows for Probabilistic Modeling and Inference, 2019

Normalizing Flows

Example: 4-Step NF

NF Log-Likelihood

$$\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \log p(\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})) + \log |\det(\mathbf{J_f})|$$

What's the computational complexity of evaluating this determinant?

Requirements

► Efficient computation of the Jacobian $\mathbf{J_f} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$

► Efficient inversion of the transformation $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$

Outline

Outline

Jacobian Structure

Normalizing Flows Log-Likelihood

$$\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \log p(\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})) + \log \left| \det \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \right|$$

The principal computational challenge is evaluating the Jacobian determinant.

Jacobian Structure

Normalizing Flows Log-Likelihood

$$\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \log p(\mathbf{f}_\theta(\mathbf{x})) + \log \left| \det \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_\theta(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \right|$$

The principal computational challenge is evaluating the Jacobian determinant.

What is $\det(\mathbf{J})$ in These Cases?

Consider a linear layer $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$.

1. $\mathbf{z}$ is a permutation of $\mathbf{x}$.

Jacobian Structure

Normalizing Flows Log-Likelihood

$$\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \log p(\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})) + \log \left| \det \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \right|$$

The principal computational challenge is evaluating the Jacobian determinant.

What is $\det(\mathbf{J})$ in These Cases?

Consider a linear layer $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$.

1. $\mathbf{z}$ is a permutation of $\mathbf{x}$.
2. z_j depends only on x_j.

Jacobian Structure

Normalizing Flows Log-Likelihood

$$\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \log p(\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})) + \log \left| \det \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \right|$$

The principal computational challenge is evaluating the Jacobian determinant.

What is det($\mathbf{J}$) in These Cases?

Consider a linear layer $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$.

1. $\mathbf{z}$ is a permutation of $\mathbf{x}$.
2. z_j depends only on x_j.

$$\log \left| \det \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \right| = \log \left| \prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{\partial f_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x_j)}{\partial x_j} \right| = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \log \left| \frac{\partial f_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x_j)}{\partial x_j} \right|$$

Jacobian Structure

Normalizing Flows Log-Likelihood

$$\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \log p(\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})) + \log \left| \det \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \right|$$

The principal computational challenge is evaluating the Jacobian determinant.

What is $\det(\mathbf{J})$ in These Cases?

Consider a linear layer $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$.

1. $\mathbf{z}$ is a permutation of $\mathbf{x}$.
2. z_j depends only on x_j.

$$\log \left| \det \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) \right| = \log \left| \prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{\partial f_{j,\theta}(x_j)}{\partial x_j} \right| = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \log \left| \frac{\partial f_{j,\theta}(x_j)}{\partial x_j} \right|$$

3. z_j depends only on $\mathbf{x}_{1:j}$ (autoregressive dependency).

Linear Normalizing Flows

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}, \quad \boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{W}, \quad \mathbf{J_f} = \mathbf{W}^{\top}$$

In general, matrix inversion has computational complexity $O(m^3)$.

Papamakarios G. et al. Normalizing Flows for Probabilistic Modeling and Inference, 2019

Linear Normalizing Flows

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f_\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}, \quad \boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{W}, \quad \mathbf{J_f} = \mathbf{W}^\top$$

In general, matrix inversion has computational complexity $O(m^3)$.

Invertibility

- ▶ Diagonal matrix: $O(m)$.
- ▶ Triangular matrix: $O(m^2)$.
- ▶ Directly parameterizing all invertible matrices in a continuous way is infeasible
  (there is not surjective function from $\mathbb{R}^{m^2}$ to the set of all invertible matrices of size $m \times m$).

Papamakarios G. et al. Normalizing Flows for Probabilistic Modeling and Inference, 2019

Linear Normalizing Flows

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}, \quad \boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{W}, \quad \mathbf{J_f} = \mathbf{W}^{\top}$$

Kingma D. P., et al. Glow: Generative Flow with Invertible 1x1 Convolutions, 2018
Hoogeboom E., et al. Emerging Convolutions for Generative Normalizing Flows, 2019

Linear Normalizing Flows

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}, \quad \boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{W}, \quad \mathbf{J_f} = \mathbf{W}^{\top}$$

Matrix Decompositions

▶ **LU Decomposition:**

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{PLU},$$

where $\mathbf{P}$ is a permutation matrix, $\mathbf{L}$ is lower triangular with positive diagonal, and $\mathbf{U}$ is upper triangular with positive diagonal.

Kingma D. P., et al. Glow: Generative Flow with Invertible 1x1 Convolutions, 2018
Hoogeboom E., et al. Emerging Convolutions for Generative Normalizing Flows, 2019

Linear Normalizing Flows

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}, \quad \boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{W}, \quad \mathbf{J_f} = \mathbf{W}^\top$$

Matrix Decompositions

▶ **LU Decomposition:**

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{L}\mathbf{U},$$

where $\mathbf{P}$ is a permutation matrix, $\mathbf{L}$ is lower triangular with positive diagonal, and $\mathbf{U}$ is upper triangular with positive diagonal.

▶ **QR Decomposition:**

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R},$$

where $\mathbf{Q}$ is orthogonal, and $\mathbf{R}$ is upper triangular with positive diagonal.

Kingma D. P., et al. Glow: Generative Flow with Invertible 1x1 Convolutions, 2018
Hoogeboom E., et al. Emerging Convolutions for Generative Normalizing Flows, 2019

Linear Normalizing Flows

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x}, \quad \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}, \quad \boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{W}, \quad \mathbf{J_f} = \mathbf{W}^{\top}$$

Matrix Decompositions

▶ **LU Decomposition:**

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{PLU},$$

where $\mathbf{P}$ is a permutation matrix, $\mathbf{L}$ is lower triangular with positive diagonal, and $\mathbf{U}$ is upper triangular with positive diagonal.

▶ **QR Decomposition:**

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{QR},$$

where $\mathbf{Q}$ is orthogonal, and $\mathbf{R}$ is upper triangular with positive diagonal.

Decomposition is performed only at initialization; the decomposed matrices ($\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{L}, \mathbf{U}$ or $\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{R}$) are optimized during training.

Kingma D. P., et al. Glow: Generative Flow with Invertible 1x1 Convolutions, 2018
Hoogeboom E., et al. Emerging Convolutions for Generative Normalizing Flows, 2019

Outline

Gaussian Autoregressive Model

Consider the autoregressive model:

$$p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^{m} p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x_j|\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \quad p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x_j|\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}) = \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \sigma^2_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})\right)$$

Kingma D. P. et al. Improving Variational Inference with Inverse Autoregressive Flow, 2016

Gaussian Autoregressive Model

Consider the autoregressive model:

$$p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^{m} p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x_j|\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \quad p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x_j|\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}) = \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \sigma_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})\right)$$

Sampling

$$x_j = \sigma_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}) \cdot z_j + \mu_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \quad z_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$$

Kingma D. P. et al. Improving Variational Inference with Inverse Autoregressive Flow, 2016

Gaussian Autoregressive Model

Consider the autoregressive model:

$$p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^{m} p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x_j|\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \quad p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(x_j|\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}) = \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \sigma_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})\right)$$

Sampling

$$x_j = \sigma_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}) \cdot z_j + \mu_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \quad z_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$$

Inverse Transformation

$$z_j = \frac{x_j - \mu_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})}{\sigma_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})}$$

Kingma D. P. et al. *Improving Variational Inference with Inverse Autoregressive Flow*, 2016

Gaussian Autoregressive Model

Consider the autoregressive model:

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^{m} p_\theta(x_j | \mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \quad p_\theta(x_j | \mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}) = \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \sigma_{j,\theta}^2(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})\right)$$

Sampling

$$x_j = \sigma_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}) \cdot z_j + \mu_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \quad z_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$$

Inverse Transformation

$$z_j = \frac{x_j - \mu_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})}{\sigma_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})}$$

▶ This gives an C^1-**diffeomorphism** from $p(\mathbf{z})$ to $p_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ (assume that $\sigma_j \neq 0$).

Kingma D. P. et al. Improving Variational Inference with Inverse Autoregressive Flow, 2016

Gaussian Autoregressive Model

Consider the autoregressive model:

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^{m} p_\theta(x_j|\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \quad p_\theta(x_j|\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}) = \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \sigma_{j,\theta}^2(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})\right)$$

Sampling

$$x_j = \sigma_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}) \cdot z_j + \mu_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \quad z_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$$

Inverse Transformation

$$z_j = \frac{x_j - \mu_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})}{\sigma_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})}$$

▶ This gives an C^1-**diffeomorphism** from $p(\mathbf{z})$ to $p_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ (assume that $\sigma_j \neq 0$).

▶ This model is called an autoregressive (AR) NF with base distribution $p(\mathbf{z}) = \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$.

Kingma D. P. et al. Improving Variational Inference with Inverse Autoregressive Flow, 2016

Gaussian Autoregressive Model

Consider the autoregressive model:

$$p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^{m} p_{\theta}(x_j|\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \quad p_{\theta}(x_j|\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}) = \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \sigma_{j,\theta}^2(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})\right)$$

Sampling

$$x_j = \sigma_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}) \cdot z_j + \mu_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}), \quad z_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$$

Inverse Transformation

$$z_j = \frac{x_j - \mu_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})}{\sigma_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})}$$

▶ This gives an C^1-**diffeomorphism** from $p(\mathbf{z})$ to $p_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$ (assume that $\sigma_j \neq 0$).

▶ This model is called an autoregressive (AR) NF with base distribution $p(\mathbf{z}) = \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$.

▶ The Jacobian matrix of this transformation is triangular.

Kingma D. P. et al. *Improving Variational Inference with Inverse Autoregressive Flow*, 2016

Gaussian Autoregressive NF

Forward Transformation: $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$$

$$z_j = \frac{x_j - \mu_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})}{\sigma_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})}$$

Papamakarios G., Pavlakou T., Murray I. Masked Autoregressive Flow for Density Estimation, 2017

Gaussian Autoregressive NF

Forward Transformation: $\mathbf{f_\theta(x)}$

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f_\theta(x)}$$

$$z_j = \frac{x_j - \mu_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})}{\sigma_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})}$$

Inverse Transformation: $\mathbf{f_\theta^{-1}(z)}$

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{f_\theta^{-1}(z)}$$

$$x_j = \sigma_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}) \cdot z_j + \mu_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})$$

Papamakarios G., Pavlakou T., Murray I. Masked Autoregressive Flow for Density Estimation, 2017

Gaussian Autoregressive NF

Forward Transformation: $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$$

$$z_j = \frac{x_j - \mu_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})}{\sigma_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})}$$

Inverse Transformation: $\mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1}(\mathbf{z})$

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{f}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{-1}(\mathbf{z})$$

$$x_j = \sigma_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}) \cdot z_j + \mu_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})$$

▶ Sampling must be done sequentially, but density estimation can be parallelized.

▶ The forward KL divergence is a natural objective for training.

Papamakarios G., Pavlakou T., Murray I. Masked Autoregressive Flow for Density Estimation, 2017

Outline

RealNVP

Split **x** and **z** into two parts:

$$\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2] = [\mathbf{x}_{1:d}, \mathbf{x}_{d+1:m}]; \quad \mathbf{z} = [\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2] = [\mathbf{z}_{1:d}, \mathbf{z}_{d+1:m}]$$

Dinh L., Sohl-Dickstein J., Bengio S. Density Estimation Using Real NVP, 2016

RealNVP

Split **x** and **z** into two parts:

$$\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2] = [\mathbf{x}_{1:d}, \mathbf{x}_{d+1:m}]; \quad \mathbf{z} = [\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2] = [\mathbf{z}_{1:d}, \mathbf{z}_{d+1:m}]$$

Coupling Layer

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{z}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{z}_2 \odot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{z}_1) + \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{z}_1) \end{cases}$$

Dinh L., Sohl-Dickstein J., Bengio S. Density Estimation Using Real NVP, 2016

RealNVP

Split **x** and **z** into two parts:

$$\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2] = [\mathbf{x}_{1:d}, \mathbf{x}_{d+1:m}]; \quad \mathbf{z} = [\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2] = [\mathbf{z}_{1:d}, \mathbf{z}_{d+1:m}]$$

Coupling Layer

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{z}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{z}_2 \odot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{z}_1) + \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{z}_1) \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{z}_2 = (\mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_1)) \odot \frac{1}{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_1)} \end{cases}$$

Dinh L., Sohl-Dickstein J., Bengio S. Density Estimation Using Real NVP, 2016

RealNVP

Split $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{z}$ into two parts:

$$\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2] = [\mathbf{x}_{1:d}, \mathbf{x}_{d+1:m}]; \quad \mathbf{z} = [\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2] = [\mathbf{z}_{1:d}, \mathbf{z}_{d+1:m}]$$

Coupling Layer

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{z}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{z}_2 \odot \boldsymbol{\sigma_\theta}(\mathbf{z}_1) + \boldsymbol{\mu_\theta}(\mathbf{z}_1) \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{z}_2 = (\mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu_\theta}(\mathbf{x}_1)) \odot \frac{1}{\boldsymbol{\sigma_\theta}(\mathbf{x}_1)} \end{cases}$$

Image Partitioning

- ▶ Checkerboard ordering corresponds to masking.
- ▶ Channelwise ordering relies on splitting.

Dinh L., Sohl-Dickstein J., Bengio S. Density Estimation Using Real NVP, 2016

RealNVP

Coupling Layer

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{z}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{z}_2 \odot \boldsymbol{\sigma_\theta}(\mathbf{z}_1) + \boldsymbol{\mu_\theta}(\mathbf{z}_1) \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{z}_2 = (\mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu_\theta}(\mathbf{x}_1)) \odot \frac{1}{\boldsymbol{\sigma_\theta}(\mathbf{x}_1)} \end{cases}$$

In both training and sampling, only a single forward pass is needed!

Dinh L., Sohl-Dickstein J., Bengio S. Density Estimation Using Real NVP, 2016

RealNVP

Coupling Layer

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{z}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{z}_2 \odot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{z}_1) + \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{z}_1) \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{z}_2 = (\mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_1)) \odot \frac{1}{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_1)} \end{cases}$$

In both training and sampling, only a single forward pass is needed!

Jacobian

$$\det \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{z}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right) = \det \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d & 0_{d \times m-d} \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{z}_2}{\partial \mathbf{x}_1} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{z}_2}{\partial \mathbf{x}_2} \end{pmatrix}$$

Dinh L., Sohl-Dickstein J., Bengio S. Density Estimation Using Real NVP, 2016

RealNVP

Coupling Layer

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{z}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{z}_2 \odot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{z}_1) + \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{z}_1) \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{z}_2 = (\mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_1)) \odot \frac{1}{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_1)} \end{cases}$$

In both training and sampling, only a single forward pass is needed!

Jacobian

$$\det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{z}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\right) = \det\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d & 0_{d \times m-d} \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{z}_2}{\partial \mathbf{x}_1} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{z}_2}{\partial \mathbf{x}_2} \end{pmatrix} = \prod_{j=1}^{m-d} \frac{1}{\sigma_{j,\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_1)}$$

Dinh L., Sohl-Dickstein J., Bengio S. Density Estimation Using Real NVP, 2016

RealNVP

Coupling Layer

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{z}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{z}_2 \odot \boldsymbol{\sigma_\theta}(\mathbf{z}_1) + \boldsymbol{\mu_\theta}(\mathbf{z}_1) \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{z}_2 = (\mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu_\theta}(\mathbf{x}_1)) \odot \frac{1}{\boldsymbol{\sigma_\theta}(\mathbf{x}_1)} \end{cases}$$

In both training and sampling, only a single forward pass is needed!

Jacobian

$$\det\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{z}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}\right) = \det\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d & 0_{d \times m-d} \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{z}_2}{\partial \mathbf{x}_1} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{z}_2}{\partial \mathbf{x}_2} \end{pmatrix} = \prod_{j=1}^{m-d} \frac{1}{\sigma_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_1)}$$

Gaussian AR NF

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{f}_\theta^{-1}(\mathbf{z}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad x_j = \sigma_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1}) \cdot z_j + \mu_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})$$

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f}_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad z_j = (x_j - \mu_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})) \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma_{j,\theta}(\mathbf{x}_{1:j-1})}.$$

How can the RealNVP layer be derived as a special instance of the
<u>Gaussian autoregressive</u> NF?

Dinh L., Sohl-Dickstein J., Bengio S. Density Estimation Using Real NVP, 2016

Outline

Bayesian Framework

Bayes' Theorem

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{p(\mathbf{x})} = \frac{p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\int p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})d\boldsymbol{\theta}}$$

- $\mathbf{x}$: observed variables;
- $\boldsymbol{\theta}$: unknown latent variables/parameters;
- $p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$: likelihood;
- $p(\mathbf{x}) = \int p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})d\boldsymbol{\theta}$: evidence;
- $p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$: prior distribution;
- $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{x})$: posterior distribution.

Bayesian Framework

Bayes' Theorem

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{p(\mathbf{x})} = \frac{p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\int p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})d\boldsymbol{\theta}}$$

- ▶ $\mathbf{x}$: observed variables;
- ▶ $\boldsymbol{\theta}$: unknown latent variables/parameters;
- ▶ $p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$: likelihood;
- ▶ $p(\mathbf{x}) = \int p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})d\boldsymbol{\theta}$: evidence;
- ▶ $p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$: prior distribution;
- ▶ $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{x})$: posterior distribution.

Interpretation

- ▶ We begin with unknown variables $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and a prior belief $p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.
- ▶ Once data $\mathbf{x}$ is observed, the posterior $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{x})$ incorporates both prior beliefs and evidence from the data.

Bayesian Framework

Consider the case where the unobserved variables $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are model parameters (i.e., $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are random variables).

- $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{n}$: observed samples;
- $p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$: prior distribution.

Bayesian Framework

Consider the case where the unobserved variables $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are model parameters (i.e., $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are random variables).

- $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{n}$: observed samples;
- $p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$: prior distribution.

Posterior Distribution

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{X}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{X}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{p(\mathbf{X})} = \frac{p(\mathbf{X}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\int p(\mathbf{X}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})d\boldsymbol{\theta}}$$

Bayesian Framework

Consider the case where the unobserved variables $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are model parameters (i.e., $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are random variables).

▶ $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^{n}$: observed samples;

▶ $p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$: prior distribution.

Posterior Distribution

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{X}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{X}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{p(\mathbf{X})} = \frac{p(\mathbf{X}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\int p(\mathbf{X}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})d\boldsymbol{\theta}}$$

If the evidence $p(\mathbf{X})$ is intractable (due to high-dimensional integration), the posterior cannot be computed exactly.

Bayesian Framework

Consider the case where the unobserved variables $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are model parameters (i.e., $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are random variables).

- $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$: observed samples;
- $p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$: prior distribution.

Posterior Distribution

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{X}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{X}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{p(\mathbf{X})} = \frac{p(\mathbf{X}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\int p(\mathbf{X}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})d\boldsymbol{\theta}}$$

If the evidence $p(\mathbf{X})$ is intractable (due to high-dimensional integration), the posterior cannot be computed exactly.

Maximum a Posteriori (MAP) Estimation

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{X}) = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\log p(\mathbf{X}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \log p(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$$

Latent Variable Models (LVM)

Maximum Likelihood Extimation (MLE) Problem

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{X}) = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i).$$

Latent Variable Models (LVM)

Maximum Likelihood Extimation (MLE) Problem

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{X}) = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i).$$

The distribution $p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$ can be highly complex and often intractable (just like the true data distribution $p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})$).

Latent Variable Models (LVM)

Maximum Likelihood Extimation (MLE) Problem

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{X}) = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i).$$

The distribution $p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$ can be highly complex and often intractable (just like the true data distribution $p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})$).

Extended Probabilistic Model

Introduce a latent variable $\mathbf{z}$ for each observed sample $\mathbf{x}$:

$$p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})p(\mathbf{z}); \quad \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}) + \log p(\mathbf{z}).$$

Latent Variable Models (LVM)

Maximum Likelihood Extimation (MLE) Problem

$$\theta^* = \arg\max_{\theta} p_\theta(\mathbf{X}) = \arg\max_{\theta} \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_\theta(\mathbf{x}_i) = \arg\max_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}_i).$$

The distribution $p_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ can be highly complex and often intractable (just like the true data distribution $p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})$).

Extended Probabilistic Model
Introduce a latent variable $\mathbf{z}$ for each observed sample $\mathbf{x}$:

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})p(\mathbf{z}); \quad \log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}) + \log p(\mathbf{z}).$$

$$p_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \int p_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})d\mathbf{z} = \int p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})p(\mathbf{z})d\mathbf{z}.$$

Latent Variable Models (LVM)

Maximum Likelihood Extimation (MLE) Problem

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{X}) = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i).$$

The distribution $p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$ can be highly complex and often intractable (just like the true data distribution $p_{\text{data}}(\mathbf{x})$).

Extended Probabilistic Model
Introduce a latent variable $\mathbf{z}$ for each observed sample $\mathbf{x}$:

$$p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})p(\mathbf{z}); \quad \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}) + \log p(\mathbf{z}).$$

$$p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \int p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})d\mathbf{z} = \int p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})p(\mathbf{z})d\mathbf{z}.$$

Motivation
Both $p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})$ and $p(\mathbf{z})$ are usually much simpler than $p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$.

Summary

▶ The CoV theorem provides a method for computing a random variable's density under an invertible transformation.

▶ Normalizing flows transform a simple base distribution into a complex one via a sequence of invertible mappings, each with efficient Jacobian determinants.

▶ Linear NFs capture invertible matrices by using matrix decompositions.

▶ Gaussian autoregressive NFs are AR models with triangular Jacobians.

▶ The RealNVP coupling layer provides an efficient normalizing flow (a special case of AR NF), supporting fast inference and sampling.

▶ The Bayesian framework generalizes nearly all standard machine learning methods.