
Discrete Restricted Boltzmann Machines

Guido F. Montúfar*

Department of Mathematics
 Pennsylvania State University
 University Park, PA 16802
 gfm10@psu.edu

Jason Morton

Department of Mathematics
 Pennsylvania State University
 University Park, PA 16802
 morton@math.psu.edu

Abstract

In this paper we describe discrete restricted Boltzmann machines: graphical probability models with bipartite interactions between discrete visible and hidden variables. These models generalize standard binary restricted Boltzmann machines and discrete naïve Bayes models. For a given number of visible variables and cardinalities of their state spaces, we bound the number of hidden variables, depending on the cardinalities of their state spaces, for which the model is a universal approximator of probability distributions. More generally, we describe tractable exponential subfamilies and use them to bound the maximal and expected Kullback-Leibler approximation errors of these models from above. We discuss inference functions, mixtures of product distributions with shared parameters, and patterns of strong modes of probability distributions represented by discrete restricted Boltzmann machines in terms of configurations of projected products of simplices in normal fans of products of simplices. Finally, we use tropicalization and coding theory to study the geometry of these models, and show that in many cases they have the expected dimension but in some cases they do not.

Keywords: expected dimension, tropical statistical model, distributed representation, q -ary variable, Kullback-Leibler divergence, hierarchical model, mixture model, Hadamard product, universal approximation, covering code

1 Introduction

A restricted Boltzmann machine (RBM) is a stochastic network with bipartite interactions between an observed set of units and a hidden set of units (see [31, 10, 13, 14]). The RBM probability model is the set of joint probability distributions on the states of the observed units for all possible choices of interaction weights in the network. Typically RBMs are defined with binary units. In this paper we describe discrete restricted Boltzmann machines, which are RBMs with units taking finitely many values. While each unit X_i of a binary RBM has $\{0, 1\}$ as state space, each unit X_i of a discrete RBM has a finite set $\mathcal{X}_i = \{0, 1, \dots, r_i - 1\}$ as state space. We generalize previous results on standard, binary, RBMs and discrete naïve Bayes models to discrete RBMs.

Previous generalizations of standard RBMs include higher order interaction Boltzmann machines [30, 20], semi-restricted Boltzmann machines, which include certain interactions among visible or hidden units [26], and RBMs with continuous Gaussian units [19, 33, 29]. So far however general discrete RBMs have not been addressed explicitly.

A characterizing property of RBMs is that the conditional probability distributions on the states of the observed units are independent given the states of the hidden units, and vice versa the conditional distributions on the states of the hidden units are independent given the states of the visible units. This is a consequence of the bipartiteness of the interaction graph, irrespectively of the units' state

*www.personal.psu.edu/gfm10/blogs/gfmc_blog/




Figure 1: Illustration of graphical probability models treated in this paper, in the special case of binary visible variables. The light (dark) nodes represent visible (hidden) variables. The number inside each node indicates the cardinality of the state space of the corresponding variable. Each variable takes any particular state in its state space with a probability that depends on the states of the adjacent variables (the nodes it is connected to by an edge) and the interaction parameters. From left to right this figure shows: a standard binary RBM; a binary semi-restricted Boltzmann machine with lateral connections between hidden variables; a discrete RBM with an 8-valued and a binary hidden unit; and a binary naïve Bayes model with 16 hidden classes. The total number of parameters of each model is indicated at the top.

spaces. Like binary RBMs, discrete RBMs can be trained using contrastive divergence (CD) [12, 13, 5], or a combination of CD and expectation-maximization (EM) methods [9], and can be used to train the parameters of deep learning systems layer by layer [15, 4]. Compared with general network based models with hidden variables, RBMs are much more tractable, even if finding maximum likelihood estimates of target data distributions is usually difficult in either case.

A discrete RBM is a *product of experts* [12] with one expert, a mixture model of product distributions, or naïve Bayes model, per hidden unit. In algebraic geometrical terms this is a Hadamard product of a collection of secant varieties of the Segre embedding of the product of a collection of projective spaces. The class of models “discrete RBMs” interpolates between standard binary RBMs and naïve Bayes models, which are just discrete RBMs with one single hidden unit. They can serve, in particular, to contrast distributed (restricted) mixture representations [3, 23] from binary RBMs and non-distributed (unrestricted) mixture representations from naïve Bayes models. Figure 1 illustrates these relations with a simple example. A variable X with composite (not prime) state space cardinality can be decomposed into a tuple of fully interacting variables with smaller state spaces, together with all possible higher-order interactions between them and any variable connected to X . Variables with a state space of prime cardinality however, can not be decomposed without introducing zero-probability states.

Naïve Bayes models have been studied across many disciplines. In machine learning they are most commonly used for classification and clustering, but have also been considered for probabilistic modelling [18]. Naïve Bayes models can be trained using EM methods. It is known that they can represent any probability distribution if the number of hidden classes is large enough, see [21] for tight bounds. The geometry of these models is cornerstone of tensor rank analysis, and is an active research topic in algebraic geometry. In spite of their seeming simplicity, the geometry of these models is by far not fully understood. Only recently it was shown that the naïve Bayes models with five or more observed binary variables have the dimension expected from counting parameters (equal to the total number of parameters or to the dimension of the ambient space of probability distributions), for any number of hidden classes [6].

Recent theoretical work on binary RBMs includes universal approximation properties [10, 16, 22], dimension and parameter identifiability [8], Bayesian learning coefficients [2], complexity [17], approximation errors [25], and distributed mixture representations [23]. In this paper we generalize some of these results.

Section 2 collects basic facts about independence models and hierarchical models, and briefly reviews the theory of naïve Bayes models and binary RBMs. Section 3 defines discrete RBMs formally as marginals of hierarchical models with sufficient statistics equal to the Kronecker product of the sufficient statistics of the independence model of the hidden variables and the sufficient statistics of the independence model of the visible variables. Section 4 gives a non-technical outline of our main results and Section 5 discusses them.

The detailed exposition of our results and their proofs are contained in the remainder of the paper, which is organized as follows: Section VI describes discrete RBMs as (i) Hadamard products of mixtures of products, and (ii) as restricted mixtures of products. Section VII elaborates on the distributed mixtures of products and the inference functions represented by discrete RBMs in terms of configurations of Cartesian products of simplices in normal fans of products of simplices. Section VIII addresses the expressive power of discrete RBMs by describing tractable explicit submodels. It contains results on universal approximation, maximal approximation errors, and expected approximation errors. Section IX discusses the geometry of discrete RBMs from an algebraic perspective; their tropicalization and dimension as semi-algebraic sets. Appendix A briefly comments on RBM-like models with interactions between hidden variables, and Appendix B gives CD and maximum likelihood (ML) parameter updates for training discrete RBMs.

2 Preliminaries

A real valued function on a finite set \mathcal{X} is a vector $f = (f(x))_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}$. A probability distribution on \mathcal{X} is a non-negative function on \mathcal{X} with entries adding to one. We denote by $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ the set of all probability distributions on \mathcal{X} . This is the $(|\mathcal{X}| - 1)$ -dimensional simplex with vertices $\{\delta_y\}_{y \in \mathcal{X}}$, where $\delta_y(x) = 1$ if $x = y$, and $\delta_y(x) = 0$ else. Let A be a $d \times |\mathcal{X}|$ matrix with columns $A_x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$. The *exponential family with sufficient statistics A* and reference measure $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_{>}^{\mathcal{X}}$ is the subset of $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{E}_{A,\nu} = \left\{ p_{\theta}(x) = \frac{1}{Z_{\theta}} \nu(x) \exp(\langle \theta, A_x \rangle) \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{X}: \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the standard inner product of \mathbb{R}^d , and $Z_{\theta} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \nu(x) \exp(\langle \theta, A_x \rangle)$ is a normalization factor called partition function. We will only consider exponential families with uniform reference measure, $\nu = (1, \dots, 1) =: \mathbf{1}$, and write $\mathcal{E}_A \equiv \mathcal{E}_{A,\mathbf{1}}$ for simplicity. Further, we assume without loss of generality that $\mathbf{1}$ is a row of the matrix A . In this case the dimension of the exponential family is equal to the rank of A minus one (see, e.g., [1]). The *convex support* of \mathcal{E}_A is the convex polytope defined by the convex hull of the columns of A (modulo affine transformations preserving the row span of A).

Given any set $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$, we write $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ for the closure of \mathcal{M} in the standard topology of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}$. When $\overline{\mathcal{M}} = \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$, the model \mathcal{M} is called a *universal approximator* of probability distributions on \mathcal{X} .

2.1 Independence models

Consider a system of $n < \infty$ random variables X_1, \dots, X_n . Assume that X_i takes states x_i in a finite set \mathcal{X}_i , $|\mathcal{X}_i| = r_i < \infty$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} =: [n]$. The state space of the entire system is $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_n$. We write $x_{\lambda} = (x_i)_{i \in \lambda}$ for a joint state of the variables with index $i \in \lambda$ for any $\lambda \subseteq [n]$, and $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for a joint state of all variables.

The *independence model* of the variables X_1, \dots, X_n is the set of *product distributions* $p(x) = \prod_{i \in [n]} p_i(x_i)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where p_i is a probability distribution from $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}_i}$ for all $i \in [n]$. This model is the closure $\overline{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}}$ of the exponential family $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}} \equiv \mathcal{E}_{A^{(\mathcal{X})}}$ with sufficient statistics

$$A^{(\mathcal{X})}((i, x'_i); x) = \delta_{x'_i}(x_i) \quad \text{for all } i \in [n], x'_i \in \mathcal{X}_i \setminus \{0\} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (2)$$

We supplement this matrix for technical reasons but without loss of generality by a constant row $A^{(\mathcal{X})}(\emptyset; x) = 1$ for all x . The dimension of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is $\dim(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} (|\mathcal{X}_i| - 1)$. Note that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ only contains strictly positive probability distributions, i.e., distributions $p \in \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ with support $\text{supp}(p) := \{x \in \mathcal{X}: p(x) > 0\}$ equal to \mathcal{X} . For simplicity we call both $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}}$ independence models.

We write $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{X}}$ for the set $\{A_x^{(\mathcal{X})}\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ of columns of $A^{(\mathcal{X})}$. Let Δ_{r-1} denote a $(r - 1)$ -dimensional simplex. The convex support of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is a Cartesian product of simplices $Q_{\mathcal{X}} := \text{conv}(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{X}}) = \Delta_{r_1-1} \times \dots \times \Delta_{r_n-1}$. When $n = 1$, the independence model $\overline{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}}$ is equal to the probability simplex $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$, and its convex support $Q_{\mathcal{X}}$ is a $(|\mathcal{X}| - 1)$ -simplex.




Figure 2: The convex supports of the independence models of three binary variables (left), and of two variables, one binary and one ternary (right). Both are three-dimensional polytopes. The prism has fewer vertices than the cube and is in this sense more similar to a 3-simplex.

Example 1. The sufficient statistics of the independence models $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}'}$ with $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}^3$ and $\mathcal{X}' = \{0, 1, 2\} \times \{0, 1\}$ are

$$A^{(\mathcal{X})} = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} x_3 = 1 \\ x_2 = 1 \\ x_1 = 1 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{matrix} \end{pmatrix} \quad A^{(\mathcal{X}')} = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} x_2 = 1 \\ x_1 = 2 \\ x_1 = 1 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{matrix} \end{pmatrix}$$

In the first case the convex support is a cube; in the second it is a prism. See Figure 2.

2.2 Hierarchical models

Given a family of *interaction sets* $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$, the *hierarchical model* $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}}$ on $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_n$ is defined as the set of all probability distributions of the form

$$p(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{I}} f_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \right) \quad \text{for all } (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (3)$$

where $f_{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}$ is a function that only depends on x_{λ} , i.e., $f_{\lambda}(x) = f_{\lambda}(x_{\lambda})$, for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{I}$. Any tuple of functions that linearly spans the space of functions of the form $\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{I}} f_{\lambda}(x)$ up to additive constants, serves as sufficient statistics of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}}$. One possible choice is the set $\{\delta_{y_{\lambda}}\}_{\lambda, y_{\lambda}}$ of Dirac-delta distributions $\delta_{y_{\lambda}}$, defined by $\delta_{y_{\lambda}}(x) = 1$ if $x_{\lambda} = y_{\lambda}$ and $\delta_{y_{\lambda}}(x) = 0$ else, for all interaction sets $\lambda \in \mathcal{I}$ and all possible states y_{λ} .

2.3 Naïve Bayes models

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The *k-mixture* of the independence model, or *naïve Bayes model* with k hidden classes, of the variables X_1, \dots, X_n is the set of all probability distributions expressible as convex combinations of k points in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}, k} := \left\{ \sum_{i \in [k]} \lambda_i p^{(i)} : \lambda_i \geq 0, p^{(i)} \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}} \forall i \in [k], \sum_{i \in [k]} \lambda_i = 1 \right\}. \quad (4)$$

We write $\mathcal{M}_{n, k}$ for the k -mixture of the independence model of n binary variables. The dimension of these models is known:

Theorem 2 (Catalisano, Geramita, and Gimigliano [6]). *The mixture models of binary product distributions $\mathcal{M}_{n, k}$ have the dimension expected from counting parameters, $\min\{nk + (k - 1), 2^n - 1\}$, except when $n = 4$ and $k = 3$, when $\mathcal{M}_{n, k}$ has dimension 13 instead of 14.*

Let $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(2)$ denote the maximal cardinality of a subset of \mathcal{X} of minimum Hamming distance at least two, i.e., the maximal cardinality of a subset $\mathcal{X}' \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ with $d_H(x, y) \geq 2$ for all distinct points

$x, y \in \mathcal{X}'$, where $d_H(x, y) := |\{i \in [n]: x_i \neq y_i\}|$. The function $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is familiar in coding theory. The k -mixtures of independence models are universal approximators when k is large enough. This can be made precise in terms of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(2)$:

Theorem 3 ([21]). *The k -mixture of $\overline{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}}$ is equal to $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ if $k \geq |\mathcal{X}| / \max_{i \in [n]} |\mathcal{X}_i|$ and only if $k \geq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(2)$.*

When $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}^n$ and q is a prime power, then $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(2) = q^{n-1}$ (see [11, 32]), and by Theorem 3 $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X},k}$ is equal to $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ if and only if $k \geq q^{n-1}$. In particular, the smallest mixture of binary product distributions that is a universal approximator of distributions on $\{0, 1\}^n$ has $2^{n-1}(n+1) - 1$ parameters.

A point $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is a *mode* of $p \in \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ if $p(x) > p(y)$ for all y with $d_H(x, y) = 1$. The point x is a *strong mode* of p if $p(x) > \sum_{y: d_H(x,y)=1} p(y)$.

Lemma 4 ([21]). *If a mixture $p = \sum_i \lambda_i p^{(i)}$ of discrete product distributions has strong modes $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, then there is a mixture component $p^{(i)}$ with mode x for each $x \in \mathcal{C}$. In particular a mixture of k product distributions has at most k strong modes.*

2.4 Binary restricted Boltzmann machines

The RBM model with n visible and m hidden binary units, denoted $\text{RBM}_{n,m}$, is the set of distributions on $\{0, 1\}^n$ of the form

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{h \in \{0,1\}^m} \exp(h^\top Wx + B^\top x + C^\top h) \quad \text{for all } x \in \{0, 1\}^n, \quad (5)$$

where x denotes states of the visible units, h denotes states of the hidden units, $W = (W_{ji})_{ji} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is a matrix of interaction weights between hidden and visible units, $B \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector of bias weights for the visible units, $C \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a vector of bias weights for the hidden units, and $Z = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} \sum_{h \in \{0,1\}^m} \exp(h^\top Wx + B^\top x + C^\top h)$.

Remark 5. The exponent in eq. 5 can be written as $(h^\top Wv + B^\top v + C^\top h) = \langle \theta, A_{(x,h)} \rangle$ for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and $h \in \{0, 1\}^m$, where $A_{(x,h)}$ are the columns of the Kronecker product $V \otimes H$ of the matrix V with columns $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ v \end{pmatrix}$, $v \in \{0, 1\}$ and the matrix H with columns $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ h \end{pmatrix}$, $h \in \{0, 1\}^m$. Note that V and H are sufficient statistics of the independence models of n , resp. m , binary variables. The vector θ is the column by column vectorization of $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & B^\top \\ C & W^\top \end{pmatrix}$.

It is known that these models have the expected dimension for many choices of n and m :

Theorem 6 ([8]). *The dimension of $\text{RBM}_{n,m}$ is equal to the number of parameters, $nm + n + m$, when $m + 1 \leq 2^{n - \lceil \log_2(n+1) \rceil}$, and equal to $2^n - 1$ when $m \geq 2^{n - \lceil \log_2(n+1) \rceil}$.*

We may view any $p \in \text{RBM}_{n,m}$ as a mixture of 2^m product distributions $p(x|h) = \exp((hW + B)x) / \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^n} \exp((hW + B)y) \in \mathcal{M}_{n,1}$ for $h \in \{0, 1\}^m$. In general these mixtures are very restricted; the dimension of the mixture model $\mathcal{M}_{n,2^m}$ is much larger than that of $\text{RBM}_{n,m}$.

Theorem 7 ([22]). *The model $\overline{\text{RBM}_{n,m}}$ equals $\Delta_{\{0,1\}^n}$ whenever $m \geq 2^{n-1} - 1$.*

This result improves [16, Theorem 2.4], which states that the binary RBM with $2^n + 1$ hidden units is a universal approximator. It is not known whether the bound from Theorem 7 is always tight, but it shows that the smallest RBM universal approximator of distributions on $\{0, 1\}^n$ has at most $2^{n-1}(n+1) - 1$ parameters, and hence not more than the smallest mixture of products universal approximator.

In [25] it is shown that $\overline{\text{RBM}_{n,m}}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{M}_{n,m+1}}$ intersect at sets of dimension of order $(m+1)n + (m+1) + n - (m-1)\log_2(m+1)$, and in [23] it is shown that when $2m \leq n$ and $n \neq 4$ or $m+1 \neq 3$, the two models intersect at sets of relative measure zero (sets of dimension strictly less than $nm + n + m$).

In [23] the number of strong modes of probability distributions is used to compare mixtures of products and products of mixtures with binary variables, and show that the smallest k for which $\mathcal{M}_{n,k}$ contains $\text{RBM}_{n,m}$ satisfies $\log_2(k) = \Theta(\min\{n, m\})$.

3 Discrete restricted Boltzmann machines

Consider a system of random variables X_i for $i \in [n]$ and Y_j for $j \in [m]$, with state spaces \mathcal{X}_i , $|\mathcal{X}_i| = r_i$ for $i \in [n]$ and \mathcal{Y}_j , $|\mathcal{Y}_j| = s_j$ for $j \in [m]$. Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{X}_n$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{Y}_m$. We assume without loss of generality that $s_i, r_j \geq 2$ for all $i \in [n], j \in [m]$.

Definition 8. The *joint discrete restricted Boltzmann machine model* $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ is the hierarchical model $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}}$ on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ with interaction sets $\mathcal{I} = \{\{i, j\}: i \in [n], j \in [m]\}$.

The *discrete restricted Boltzmann machine model* $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ is the set of marginal distributions on \mathcal{X} of the joint RBM model $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$:

$$\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}} := \left\{ \sum_{h \in \mathcal{Y}} p(x, h) : p \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}} \right\}. \quad (6)$$

The sufficient statistics of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ can be written as a Kronecker product

$$A^{(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y})} = A^{(\mathcal{X})} \otimes A^{(\mathcal{Y})}, \quad (7)$$

where $A^{(\mathcal{X})}$ is a sufficient statistics of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ including a constant row, and $A^{(\mathcal{Y})}$ is a sufficient statistics of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ including a constant row. As a consequence, the conditionals $p(X|Y = y)$ and $p(Y|X = x)$ are product distributions. This is a key property which simplifies inference and training.

If $A^{(\mathcal{X})}$ and $A^{(\mathcal{Y})}$ are chosen minimal, as in eq. (2), then $A^{(\mathcal{X})} \otimes A^{(\mathcal{Y})}$ is a minimal sufficient statistics of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ with entries

$$A^{(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y})}(\{i, j\}, (x'_i, y'_j); (x, y)) = \delta_{x'_i}(x_i) \delta_{y'_j}(y_j), \quad (8)$$

for all $\{i, j\} \in ([n] \cup \emptyset) \times ([m] \cup \emptyset)$ and $(x'_i, y'_j) \in \mathcal{X}_i \setminus \{0\} \times \mathcal{Y}_j \setminus \{0\}$, for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, with the convention $\delta_{x_0} = \mathbb{1}$. This matrix consists of $\left(\sum_{i \in [n]} (|\mathcal{X}_i| - 1) + 1 \right) \left(\sum_{j \in [m]} (|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 1) + 1 \right)$ linearly independent rows, indexed by pairs $\{i, j\}$ and states (x'_i, y'_j) , and $|\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}|$ columns, indexed by the joint states of all variables. The parametrization

$$p_{\theta}(x, y) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(\langle \theta, A_{x,y}^{(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y})} \rangle) \quad \text{for all } (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \quad (9)$$

of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ by θ is one-to-one, disregarding the coordinate of θ that corresponds to the constant row of $A^{(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y})}$ (which invariably cancels out with the normalization constant Z). The dimension of the joint RBM model is

$$\dim(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}) = \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} (|\mathcal{X}_i| - 1) + 1 \right) \left(\sum_{j \in [m]} (|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 1) + 1 \right) - 1. \quad (10)$$

The expected dimension of $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ is equal to $\min\{\dim(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}), |\mathcal{X}| - 1\}$.

Remark 9.

- When $m = 1$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1, \dots, k - 1\}$, then $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ is the k -mixture of the independence model $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. In this case the sufficient statistics of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ is a block diagonal matrix with copies of $A^{(\mathcal{X})}$ in the diagonal.
- When $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}^n$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}^m$, then $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ is the standard binary RBM with n visible and m hidden units, $\text{RBM}_{n,m}$. See Remark 5.
- Consider any $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{V}_n$ with $\mathcal{V}_i \subseteq \mathcal{X}_i$ for all $i \in [n]$, and $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{Z}_k$ with $\mathcal{Z}_l = \times_{j \in \varrho_l} \mathcal{Y}_j$ for a partition $\varrho = \{\varrho_1, \dots, \varrho_k\}$ of $[m]$. Then $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{V},\mathcal{Z}} \subseteq \text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$.

4 Results

Here we give a non-technical outline of our main results. Details and proofs are contained in Sections VI, VII, VIII, and IX.

Consider the discrete RBM model $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ with visible variables X_1, \dots, X_n with \mathcal{X}_i , $|\mathcal{X}_i| = r_i$ for all $i \in [n]$, and hidden variables Y_1, \dots, Y_m with \mathcal{Y}_j , $|\mathcal{Y}_j| = s_j$ for all $j \in [m]$. We show:

- When the sum of the cardinalities of the state spaces of the hidden variables minus m is not less than the product of the cardinalities of the state spaces of $n - 1$ visible variables minus one, $\sum_{j \in [m]} (s_j - 1) \geq (\prod_{i \in [n]} r_i / \max_{i' \in [n]} r_{i'}) - 1$, then the model $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ is a universal approximator of distributions on $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{X}_n$ (Theorem 28). This generalizes [22, Theorem 1], which states that a binary RBM with $2^{n-1} - 1$ hidden units is a universal approximator of distributions on $\{0, 1\}^n$. This result also generalizes [21, Theorem 15], which in simplified terms states that the naïve Bayes model for n q -ary variables is a universal approximator when the number of hidden classes is q^{n-1} or more.

- Given an observed state and a choice of model parameters, the *inference function* of the discrete RBM model computes the most likely state of the hidden variables. The inference functions can be described in terms of configurations of projections of the vertex set of the Cartesian product of simplices $\Delta_{r_1-1} \times \cdots \times \Delta_{r_n-1}$ in the normal fan of the product of simplices $\Delta_{s_1-1} \times \cdots \times \Delta_{s_m-1}$. We show that discrete RBMs can represent probability distributions with a number of strong modes (Hamming-local maxima on $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{X}_n$) that is exponential in the number of hidden units, but not necessarily exponential in the number of model parameters (Proposition 22). Our bounds generalize [23, Theorem 29], which states that the binary RBM can represent probability distributions with a log number of strong modes $\Theta(\min\{n, m\})$, and [23, Theorem 5], which states that a naïve Bayes model can not represent probability distributions with more than k strong modes, where k is the number of hidden classes.

- The closure $\overline{\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}}$ contains many mixtures of product distributions (Lemma 25) and exponential families such as *mixtures of products with disjoint supports* (Corollary 27). In particular, the discrete RBM model can approximate any mixture of K product distributions with disjoint supports arbitrarily well, where K is the sum of the cardinalities of the state spaces of the hidden variables minus $m - 1$. These results generalize [25, Theorem 4.1], which states that the binary RBM can approximate any mixture of $m + 1$ product distributions arbitrarily well, given that $m - k$ mixture components have disjoint supports, and k mixture components have support of cardinality two, for any $0 \leq k \leq m$.

- The maximal Kullback-Leibler (KL) approximation error $\max_{q \in \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}} \text{KL}(q \| \overline{\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}})$ is bounded from above by $\log(\prod_{i \in [n]} r_i) - \log(\sum_{j \in [m]} (s_j - 1))$ (Theorem 29). This generalizes [25, Theorem 5.1], which states, in simplified terms, that the maximal KL approximation error of the binary model $\text{RBM}_{n, m}$ is at most $n - \log_2(m)$. Using results from [24] and the exponential subfamilies of $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ described in this paper we bound the expected Kullback-Leibler approximation errors $\int_{\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}} \text{KL}(q \| \text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}) \text{Dir}_{\alpha}(q) dq$ with respect to the Dirichlet priors Dir_{α} on the probability simplex $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ (Theorem 29).

- Finally, we study the tropical [27] discrete RBM model (Theorem 35) and show that $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ has the expected dimension (equal to the minimum of the number of parameters and the dimension of the ambient probability simplex) for many choices of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , for example: when $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}^m$ and \mathcal{X} contains $m + 1$ disjoint unit Hamming balls, $m + 1 \leq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(3)$, or \mathcal{X} is contained in $m + 1$ unit Hamming balls, $m + 1 \geq \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{X}}(1)$ (Corollary 44); or for any \mathcal{Y} when \mathcal{X} contains m disjoint Hamming balls of radii $2|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 3$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$ plus one disjoint unit Hamming ball (Corollary 49). These results generalize [8, Theorem 1.1], which states that the binary model $\text{RBM}_{n, m}$ has dimension $\min\{nm + n + m, 2^n - 1\}$ for a large range of m depending on n . On the other hand, as Hadamard product of naïve Bayes models, $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ has dimension less than expected whenever for some $j \in [m]$ the $(|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 1)$ -mixture of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ has dimension less than expected (Remark 32).

5 Discussion

In this paper we describe restricted Boltzmann machine models with finite valued variables. We generalize many theoretical results on binary RBMs and naïve Bayes models to the more general class of discrete RBMs. We highlight and contrast geometric and combinatorial properties of distributed products of experts and non-distributed mixtures of experts. Our analysis is mainly theoretical, but it may serve as starting point for an implementation of novel machine learning algorithms that exploit advantages of both model classes. We saved an empirical evaluation of discrete RBMs for future work.

Various long standing theoretical questions remain unsettled: What is the exact dimension of the naïve Bayes models with general discrete variables? What is exactly the smallest number of hidden

variables that make an RBM a universal approximator? Does the binary RBM always have the expected dimension? The geometric-combinatorial picture of RBMs presented in this paper may be helpful in solving these problems. Hereto we propose a more detailed characterization of possible slicings of products of simplices by normal fans of products of simplices.

Acknowledgments

The first author is grateful to Nihat Ay and Johannes Rauh. Part of this work was accomplished while he visited the Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Leipzig, Germany, in September and October 2012. This work is supported in part by DARPA grant FA8650-11-1-7145.

References

- [1] S. Amari and H. Nagaoka. *Methods of information geometry*, volume 191. Oxford University Press, 2000. Translations of mathematical monographs.
- [2] M. Aoyagi. Stochastic complexity and generalization error of a Restricted Boltzmann Machine in Bayesian estimation. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 99:1243–1272, August 2010.
- [3] Y. Bengio. Learning deep architectures for AI. *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.*, 2(1):1–127, 2009.
- [4] Y. Bengio, P. Lamblin, D. Popovici, and H. Larochelle. Greedy layer-wise training of deep networks. In B. Schölkopf, J. Platt, and T. Hoffman, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 19*, pages 153–160. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2007.
- [5] M. A. Carreira-Perpiñán and G. E. Hinton. On contrastive divergence learning. In *Proceedings of the 10-th Interantional Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2005.
- [6] M. V. Catalisano, A. V. Geramita, and A. Gimigliano. Secant varieties of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{P}^1$ (n -times) are not defective for $n \geq 5$. *J. Algebraic Geometry*, 20:295–327, 2011.
- [7] G. Cohen, I. Honkala, S. Litsyn, and A. Lobstein. *Covering Codes*. North-Holland Mathematical Library. Elsevier Science, 2005.
- [8] M. A. Cueto, J. Morton, and B. Sturmfels. Geometry of the restricted Boltzmann machine. In M. A. G. Viana and H. P. Wynn, editors, *Algebraic methods in statistics and probability II, AMS Special Session*, volume 2. American Mathematical Society, 2010.
- [9] A. P. Dempster, N. M. Laird, and D. B. Rubin. Maximum Likelihood from Incomplete Data via the EM Algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 39(1):1–38, 1977.
- [10] Y. Freund and D. Haussler. Unsupervised learning of distributions on binary vectors using 2-layer networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 4*, pages 912–919. 1992.
- [11] E. Gilbert. A comparison of signalling alphabets. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 31:504–522, 1952.
- [12] G. E. Hinton. Products of experts. In *Proceedings 9-th ICANN*, volume 1, pages 1–6, 1999.
- [13] G. E. Hinton. Training products of experts by minimizing contrastive divergence. *Neural Computation*, 14:1771–1800, 2002.
- [14] G. E. Hinton. A practical guide to training restricted Boltzmann machines, version 1. Technical report, UTML2010-003, University of Toronto, 2010.
- [15] G. E. Hinton, S. Osindero, and Y. Teh. A fast learning algorithm for deep belief nets. *Neural Computation*, 18:1527–1554, 2006.
- [16] N. Le Roux and Y. Bengio. Representational power of restricted Boltzmann machines and deep belief networks. *Neural Computation*, 20(6):1631–1649, 2008.
- [17] P. M. Long and R. A. Servedio. Restricted Boltzmann machines are hard to approximately evaluate or simulate. In J. Fürnkranz and T. Joachims, editors, *ICML*, pages 703–710. Omnipress, 2010.
- [18] D. Lowd and P. Domingos. Naive Bayes models for probability estimation. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 529–536. ACM Press, 2005.
- [19] T. K. Marks and J. R. Movellan. Diffusion networks, products of experts, and factor analysis. In *Proc. 3rd Int. Conf. Independent Component Anal. Signal Separation*, pages 481–485, 2001.
- [20] R. Memisevic and G. E. Hinton. Learning to represent spatial transformations with factored higher-order Boltzmann machines. *Neural Computation*, 22(6):1473–1492, June 2010.
- [21] G. F. Montúfar. Mixture decompositions of exponential families using a decomposition of their sample spaces. *Kybernetika*, 49(1), 2013. Preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1008.0204>.
- [22] G. F. Montúfar and N. Ay. Refinements of universal approximation results for deep belief networks and restricted Boltzmann machines. *Neural Computation*, 23(5):1306–1319, 2011.

- [23] G. F. Montúfar and J. Morton. When does a mixture of products contain a product of mixtures? *Submitted*, 2012. Preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1206.0387>.
- [24] G. F. Montúfar and J. Rauh. Scaling of model approximation errors and expected entropy distances. In *Proc. of the 9th Workshop on Uncertainty Processing (WUPES 2012)*, pages 137–148, 2012. Preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1207.3399>.
- [25] G. F. Montúfar, J. Rauh, and N. Ay. Expressive power and approximation errors of restricted Boltzmann machines. In J. Shawe-Taylor, R. Zemel, P. Bartlett, F. Pereira, and K. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 24*, pages 415–423, 2011.
- [26] S. Osindero and G. Hinton. Modeling image patches with a directed hierarchy of Markov random fields. In J. Platt, D. Koller, Y. Singer, and S. Roweis, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20*, pages 1121–1128. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2008.
- [27] L. Pachter and B. Sturmfels. Tropical geometry of statistical models. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 101(46):16132–16137, Nov. 2004.
- [28] W. E. Roth. On direct product matrices. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 40:461–468, 1934.
- [29] R. Salakhutdinov, A. Mnih, and G. Hinton. Restricted Boltzmann machines for collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on Machine learning, ICML '07*, pages 791–798, New York, NY, USA, 2007. ACM.
- [30] T. J. Sejnowski. Higher-order Boltzmann machines. In *Neural Networks for Computing*, pages 398–403. American Institute of Physics, 1986.
- [31] P. Smolensky. Information processing in dynamical systems: foundations of harmony theory. In *Symposium on Parallel and Distributed Processing*, 1986.
- [32] R. Varshamov. Estimate of the number of signals in error correcting codes. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 117:739–741, 1957.
- [33] M. Welling, M. Rosen-Zvi, and G. Hinton. Exponential family harmoniums with an application to information retrieval. In L. K. Saul, Y. Weiss, and L. Bottou, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 17*, pages 1481–1488. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2005.
- [34] D. Wolpert and D. Wolf. Estimating functions of probability distributions from a finite set of samples. *Physical Review E*, 52(6):6841–6854, 1995.

Detailed exposition and proofs

VI Products of mixtures and mixtures of products

Binary RBMs can be seen as a restricted form of naïve Bayes models with many hidden classes but only few parameters shared across all classes. Standard naïve Bayes models on the other hand have one single hidden variable, relatively few hidden states and many parameters.

In [23] it is shown that the smallest naïve Bayes model containing a binary RBMs has exponentially many more parameters. In the following we describe discrete RBMs from two complementary perspectives: (i) as products of experts, where each expert is a mixture of products, and (ii) as restricted mixtures of product distributions.

The *Hadamard product* of two probability distributions $p, q \in \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is the renormalized entry-wise product $p \circ q = (p(x)q(x))_{x \in \mathcal{X}} / \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} p(y)q(y)$. The Hadamard product $\mathcal{M} \circ \mathcal{M}'$ of two sets $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}' \subseteq \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is the set $\{p \circ q : p \in \mathcal{M}, q \in \mathcal{M}'\}$.

Proposition 10. *The model $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ is a Hadamard product of mixtures of product distributions:*

$$\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}, |\mathcal{Y}_1|} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}, |\mathcal{Y}_m|}.$$

Proof. We abbreviate $A^{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})}$ by A . We write $A_{j,:}$ for the matrix containing the rows of A with indexes $(\{j, i\}, (h_j, x_i))$ for all $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ for all $i \in [n]$. We write $A(x, h)$ for the (x, h) -column of

A. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
p(x) &= \frac{1}{Z} \sum_h \exp(\langle \theta, A(x, h) \rangle) \\
&= \frac{1}{Z} \sum_h \exp(\langle \theta_{1,:}, A_{1,:}(x, h) \rangle) \exp(\langle \theta_{2,:}, A_{2,:}(x, h) \rangle) \cdots \exp(\langle \theta_{m,:}, A_{m,:}(x, h) \rangle) \\
&= \frac{1}{Z} \left(\sum_{h_1} \exp(\langle \theta_{1,:}, A_{1,:}(x, h_1) \rangle) \right) \cdots \left(\sum_{h_m} \exp(\langle \theta_{m,:}, A_{m,:}(x, h_m) \rangle) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{Z} (Z_1 p^{(1)}(x)) \cdots (Z_m p^{(m)}(x)) = \frac{1}{Z} p^{(1)}(x) \cdots p^{(m)}(x),
\end{aligned}$$

where $p^{(j)} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}, |\mathcal{Y}_j|}$, and $Z_j = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{h_j \in \mathcal{Y}_j} \exp(\langle \theta_{j,:}, A_{j,:}(x, h_j) \rangle)$ for all $j \in [m]$. Since the vectors $\theta_{j,:}$ can be chosen arbitrarily for all j , the factors $p^{(j)}$ can be made arbitrary within $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}, |\mathcal{Y}_j|}$. \square

Every distribution in the RBM model is a mixture of products; we have the inclusion $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}, |\mathcal{Y}|}$. In general this inclusion is strict. The set of conditional probability distributions $p(x|h)$ of $\text{RBM}_{n,m}$ is a tuple of 2^m product distributions with natural parameters $\{hW + B : h \in \{0, 1\}^m\}$ a projection of the vertices $\{0, 1\}^m$ of the m -dimensional cube. The following gives a corresponding picture of general discrete RBMs:

The points $p_\theta(x) = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_h \exp(\langle \theta, A_{(x,h)}^{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})} \rangle)$ in $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ are mixture distributions

$$p_\theta(x) = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{Y}} p(x|h) q(h) \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (11)$$

with mixture weights given by the marginal distribution $q(h)$ on \mathcal{Y} of the joint RBM model, and mixture components equal to the conditional distributions

$$p(x|h) = \frac{1}{Z_h} \exp(\langle \theta_h, A_x^{(\mathcal{X})} \rangle) \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (12)$$

Proposition 11. *The set of conditional distributions $p(x|h)$, $h \in \mathcal{Y}$ of the joint RBM model $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ is the tuple of points in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ with natural parameters $\theta_h = \Theta^\top A_h^{(\mathcal{Y})}$, $h \in \mathcal{Y}$, a linear projection of the vertex set $\{A_h^{(\mathcal{Y})} : h \in \mathcal{Y}\}$ of the Cartesian product of simplices $\Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_1} \times \cdots \times \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_m}$.*

Proof. Let $d_{\mathcal{X}}$, resp. $d_{\mathcal{Y}}$, denote the number of rows of $A^{(\mathcal{X})}$, resp. $A^{(\mathcal{Y})}$. The claim follows from writing the product $\theta^\top (A^{(\mathcal{X})} \otimes A^{(\mathcal{Y})}) = c \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}|}$ in the exponent of the joint RBM distribution as $(A^{(\mathcal{X})})^\top \Theta^\top A^{(\mathcal{Y})} = C^\top$, where Θ^\top is the $d_{\mathcal{X}} \times d_{\mathcal{Y}}$ matrix with row by row vectorization equal to θ , and C is the $|\mathcal{X}| \times |\mathcal{Y}|$ matrix with row by row vectorization equal to c . The equivalence of both expressions follows from Roth's lemma [28].

Geometrically $\Theta^\top A^{(\mathcal{Y})}$ is a linear projection of the columns of $A^{(\mathcal{Y})}$ into the natural parameter space of the independence model on \mathcal{X} . The columns of $A^{(\mathcal{Y})}$ are the vertices of a Cartesian product of simplices $\times_{j \in [m]} \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_j}$. \square

VII Products of simplices in normal fans of products of simplices

Subdivisions of independence models

A *polyhedral cone* is the intersection of a number of closed halfspaces in Euclidian space. A *polyhedral fan* \mathcal{F} is a family of polyhedral cones with the property that if $F, G \in \mathcal{F}$, then $F \cap G \in \mathcal{F}$. The *normal cone* to a convex set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ at a point $x \in Q$ is the set of all vectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\langle v, (x - y) \rangle \geq 0$ for all $y \in Q$. The *normal fan* of polytope is the polyhedral fan generated by intersections of the polyhedral cones of its vertices.




Figure 3: Three 3-slicings of the 2-cube, and the polyhedral fan of the 2-simplex with maximal cones R_0 , R_1 , and R_2 . Each vertex of the 2-cube is a column vector of the sufficient statistics of the 2-bit independence model. Each vertex of the 2-simplex is a column vector of the sufficient statistics of the independence model of one single ternary variable (equal to $\Delta_{\{0,1,2\}}$).

We write R_x for the normal cone of $Q_{\mathcal{X}} = \text{conv}\{A_x^{(\mathcal{X})}\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ at the vertex $A_x^{(\mathcal{X})}$, and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}}$ for the normal fan generated by the R_x . The relative interiors of the cones in the normal fan $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}}$ partition the natural parameter space of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$.

Proposition 12. *The probability distributions $p_{\theta} \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ strictly maximized at $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $p_{\theta}(x) > p_{\theta}(y) \forall y \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \{x\}$, are the distributions with natural parameter θ in the non-empty relative interior of R_x .*

Proof. A probability distribution $p_{\theta}(y) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(\langle \theta, A_y \rangle)$ is maximized at x when $\langle \theta, A_x \rangle > \langle \theta, A_y \rangle$, i.e., $\langle \theta, (A_x - A_y) \rangle > 0$ for all $y \neq x$. The claims follow from the convexity of $Q_{\mathcal{X}}$ and the fact that every $A_x^{(\mathcal{X})}$ is a vertex of $Q_{\mathcal{X}}$. \square

Example 13. Let $|\mathcal{X}| = N$. Each cone R_x in the fan of the simplex $\Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is bounded by the hyperplanes $\{e_x - e_y = 0\}$ for all $y \in \mathcal{X}, y \neq x$, and can be identified with the closure of the union of $(N - 1)!$ cells of the *Braid arrangement* \mathcal{B}_N , which is the collection of hyperplanes in \mathbb{R}^N defined by $\{x_i - x_j = 0\}$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq N$.

Inference functions and slicings

For any choice of parameters of $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$, an inference function $\pi: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, or $\pi: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{Y}}$, computes the most likely hidden state, or set of equally most likely hidden states, given a visible state. These functions are not necessarily injective nor surjective. For a visible state x , the conditional distribution on the hidden states is a product distribution $p(y|X = x) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(\langle \Theta A_x^{(\mathcal{X})}, A_y^{(\mathcal{Y})} \rangle)$, maximized at the y for which $\Theta A_x^{(\mathcal{X})} \in R_y$. The inference function π can be described by a linear projection of the vertex-set of the product of simplices $\times_{i \in [n]} \Delta_{\mathcal{X}_i}$ into the cells of the polyhedral fan $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ of the product of simplices $\times_{j \in [m]} \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_j}$:

Observation 14. A function $f: \mathcal{X} \mapsto 2^{\mathcal{Y}}$ is an inference function of $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ iff there is a matrix Θ with $\Theta A_x^{(\mathcal{X})} \in \cap_{y \in f(x)} R_y$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

The map Θ naturally extends to $\mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathcal{X}}}$, with $d_{\mathcal{X}}$ equal to the number of rows of $A^{(\mathcal{X})}$. For any y the preimage $\Theta^{-1}(R_y)$, or $\Theta^{-1}(R_y \cap \Theta \cdot \mathbb{R}^d)$ if Θ is not surjective, is the set of inputs z for which $\frac{1}{Z} \exp(\langle \Theta z, \cdot \rangle): \{A_h^{(\mathcal{Y})}\}_h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is maximized at $A_y^{(\mathcal{Y})}$. The preimages $\Theta^{-1}(R_y)$ partition the input space $\mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathcal{X}}}$, and are called *inference regions*. See Figure 3.

Definition 15. A \mathcal{Y} -slicing of $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{X}} = \{A_x^{(\mathcal{X})}: x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is a partition of $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{X}}$ into the preimages $(\Theta|_{\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{X}}})^{-1}(R_y), y \in \mathcal{Y}$ of the maximal cones R_y of the polyhedral fan $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Y}}$, by a linear map Θ .

This definition assumes tacitly that Θ is generic, such that it maps each point in $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{X}}$ into the interior of some full dimensional cone R_y .

Example 16. If $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}$, then the fan $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ is the hyperplane with normal $\text{aff}(Q_{\mathcal{Y}})$ and the two closed halfspaces defined by that hyperplane. In this case a \mathcal{Y} -slicing of a point set \mathcal{Z} is a slicing

in the usual sense; a partition of \mathcal{Z} into the two subsets contained in the two different sides of the complement of a hyperplane.

Proposition 17. *If $\mathcal{Y}' \subseteq \mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$, then every \mathcal{Y}' -slicing of $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is a \mathcal{Y} -slicing.*

Proof. This is because any affine linear map defining a \mathcal{Y} -slicing can be composed with a projection of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ onto the tangent space of $\text{aff}\{A_y^{(\mathcal{Y})}\}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}'}$. \square

We will use the following lemma in some proofs in Section IX.

Lemma 18. *Any slicing by $k-1$ parallel hyperplanes is a $\{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$ -slicing.*

Proof. First we show that there is a one-dimensional affine linear space \mathcal{L} intersecting all cells of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{Y}}$, $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$. Let $\mathcal{L} = \{\lambda r + b: \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$ for some $r, b \in \mathbb{R}^k$. We have to show that for all $y \in [k]$, there is an interval $I_y \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $\langle \lambda r + b, (y-z) \rangle > 0$ for all $z \in [k], z \neq y$ for all $\lambda \in I_y$. This is, $\lambda \frac{(r_y - r_z)}{(b_y - b_z)} > 1$ when $(b_y - b_z) > 0$ and $\lambda \frac{(r_y - r_z)}{(b_y - b_z)} < 1$ when $(b_y - b_z) < 0$. For the choice $b = (b_1, \dots, b_k) = (1, 2, \dots, k)$, the left hand side describes finite differences of a function $r: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $r(\{1, \dots, k\}) = \lambda r$. Let $r = (-e^{-1}, \dots, -e^{-k})$ and $r = -\lambda \exp(-x)$. The derivative of r is larger than one iff $\log \lambda - x > 0$ and smaller iff $\log \lambda - x < 0$. Choosing $I_y = \{e^y\}$ satisfies all conditions (use Rolle's theorem).

Now, the intervals I_1, \dots, I_k can be chosen with lengths $\infty, l_2, \dots, l_{k-1}, \infty$ for any $l_2, \dots, l_{k-1} \in \mathbb{R}_{>}$, by choosing b with $b_1 < b_2 < \dots < b_k$ and suitable $b_{j+1} - b_j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k-1$. \square

VIII Expressive power

Strong modes

Lemma 19. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a code of minimum distance at least two. If the model $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ contains a probability distribution with strong modes \mathcal{C} , then there is a linear map of the vertices of $\times_{j \in [m]} \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_j}$ into the \mathcal{C} -cells of the fan $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}}$.*

By this lemma, if $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ is a universal approximator of distributions on \mathcal{X} , then $|\mathcal{Y}| \geq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(2)$.

Proof of Lemma 19. This is by Proposition 11, Lemma 4 and Proposition 12. \square

Remark 20. Lemma 19 shows that discrete RBMs may not be universal approximators even when they have the same dimension as the ambient probability simplex. The lemma implies, for example, that $\text{RBM}_{3,1}$ is not a universal approximator of distributions on $\{0, 1\}^3$. In the case of one single hidden unit, the lemma in fact yields tight bounds for the minimal size of universal approximators, see Theorem 3.

Example 21. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1, 2\}^n$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1, \dots, 4\}^m$. In this case $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(2) = 3^{n-1}$. When $n = 3$ or $n = 4$, if $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ is a universal approximator, then $m \geq 2$ and $m \geq 3$. On the other hand, the smallest m for which $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ has $3^n - 1$ parameters is $m = 1$ and $m = 2$.

Proposition 22. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. If there is a linear map Θ of the vertices of $\times_{j \in [m]} \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_j}$ into the \mathcal{C} -cells R_x , $x \in \mathcal{C}$ of the fan $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{X}}$, with $\max_x \{\langle \Theta^\top A_y^{(\mathcal{Y})}, A_x^{(\mathcal{X})} \rangle\} = c$ for all y , then $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ contains a probability distribution with strong modes \mathcal{C} .*

Proposition 23. *If $4 \lceil m/3 \rceil \leq n$, then $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ contains distributions with 2^m strong modes.*

Proof. This follows immediately from [23, Theorem 29] using that: If $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{Z}_n$ is a subset of $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_n$, $\mathcal{Z}_i \subseteq \mathcal{X}_i$ for all $i \in [n]$, then $\overline{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}} \supseteq \overline{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y}}}$. \square

Example 24. The maximal cones of the normal fan of the n -cube with vertices $\{0, 1\}^n$ are the closed orthants of \mathbb{R}^n . Let $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1, 2\} \times \{0, 1\}$. The 6 vertices $\{A_h^{(\mathcal{Y})}: h \in \mathcal{Y}\}$ of the prism

$\Delta_2 \times \Delta_1$ can be mapped into 6 orthants of \mathbb{R}^4 with even number of positive coordinates:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 3 & -2 & -2 & -2 \\ 1 & 2 & -2 & -2 \\ 1 & -2 & -2 & 2 \\ 1 & -2 & 2 & -2 \end{pmatrix}_{\Theta^\top} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{A^{(\mathcal{Y})}} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 \\ 1 & 1 & 3 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\ -3 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 3 & 1 \\ 1 & -3 & -1 & 3 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

Starting from this observation one can show that when $\mathcal{Y} = \times_{j=1}^k \{0, 1, 2\} \times \{0, 1\}$, the points $\{A_h^{(\mathcal{Y})} : h \in \mathcal{Y}\}$ can be linearly mapped into vectors of equal l_1 -norm in 6^k even orthants of \mathbb{R}^{4k} . As a consequence, when $4k \leq n$, then $\overline{\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}}$ contains probability distributions supported on codes $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{X}$ of minimum distance two and cardinality 6^k .

Exponential subfamilies

The support sets of probability distributions contained in the closure of an exponential family are called *facial sets*, they correspond to maximal sets $\mathcal{X}' \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ such that $\{A_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}'}$ is contained in a face of the convex support polytope. A subset $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is called an *S-set* of a model $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ iff $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ contains $\Delta_{\mathcal{Z}}$.

The facial sets of the independence model $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ are the sets of the form

$$\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{Z}_n, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{Z}_j \subseteq \mathcal{X}_j \text{ for all } j \in [n]. \quad (14)$$

The *S*-sets of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ are the facial sets with $|\mathcal{Z}_i| = 1$ for all $i \in [n]$ except one:

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1\} \times \cdots \times \{z_{k-1}\} \times \mathcal{Z}_k \times \{z_{k+1}\} \times \cdots \times \{z_n\}, \quad z_i \in \mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{Z}_k \subseteq \mathcal{X}_k. \quad (15)$$

Given a partition $\varrho = \{\mathcal{X}^1, \dots, \mathcal{X}^k\}$ of \mathcal{X} , the *partition model* with partition ϱ is the convex hull of the uniform distributions on the blocks of the partition:

$$\Delta_{\varrho} := \text{conv}\{u_{\mathcal{X}^s}\}_{s \in [k]}, \quad (16)$$

where $u_{\mathcal{X}^i}(x) = 1/|\mathcal{X}^i|$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}^i$ and $u_{\mathcal{X}^i}(x) = 0$ for all $x \notin \mathcal{X}^i$.

Given a partition $\varrho = \{\mathcal{X}^1, \dots, \mathcal{X}^k\}$ of \mathcal{X} into k facial sets of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$, the *mixture of products with disjoint supports* ϱ is defined as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}, \varrho} := \left\{ \sum_{s \in [k]} \lambda_s p^{(s)} : \sum_{s \in [k]} \lambda_s = 1, \lambda_s \geq 0, p^{(s)} \in \overline{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}^s}}, \text{ for all } s \in [k] \right\}. \quad (17)$$

Lemma 25. *The model $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ approximates any probability distribution of the following form arbitrarily well:*

- *The mixture of one product distribution, $\sum_{j=1}^m (|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 1) - k$ product distributions with disjoint supports, and an arbitrary distribution supported on the union of k S-sets of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$.*
- *Any mixture of $1 + \sum_{j=1}^m (|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 1)$ product distributions with disjoint supports.*
- *Any probability distribution supported on the union of $1 + \sum_{j=1}^m (|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 1)$ S-sets of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 10. See [25] for details on this approach. \square

Remark 26. Given k exponential families $\mathcal{E}^s \subseteq \Delta_{\mathcal{X}^s}$, $s \in [k]$ with disjoint sets \mathcal{X}^s , the mixture model $\text{Mixt}(\mathcal{E}^1, \dots, \mathcal{E}^k) := \{\sum_{s \in [k]} \lambda_s p^{(s)} : p^{(s)} \in \mathcal{E}^s, \lambda_s \geq 0, \sum_{s \in [k]} \lambda_s = 1\}$ is equal to the exponential family with sufficient statistics $A = \oplus_{s \in [k]} A^s$, where A^s is a sufficient statistics of \mathcal{E}^s including a constant row for all $s \in [k]$.

Theorem 27. *Let $\{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_K\}$ be a partition of $[m]$. For each $k \in [K]$ let ϱ_k be a partition of \mathcal{X} into $1 + \sum_{j \in \zeta_k} (|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 1)$ facial sets of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$, and let A^k denote a sufficient statistics of the mixture of products with disjoint supports ϱ_k . Then:*

- The model $\overline{\text{RBM}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ contains the exponential family with sufficient statistics $\begin{pmatrix} A^1 \\ \vdots \\ A^K \end{pmatrix}$.
- In particular, the dimension of the model $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ is bounded from below by the maximal rank of a matrix A with block rows A^k , $k \in [K]$ minus one. If such a matrix has rank $|\mathcal{X}|$, then the model is a universal approximator.

Proof. The claim follows from Lemma 25, Remark 26, Proposition 10, and the fact that the Hadamard product of two exponential families is the smallest exponential family containing both of them. \square

Universal approximation

Theorem 28. *The model $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ is a universal approximator of probability distributions on \mathcal{X} if $\sum_{j \in [m]} (|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 1) \geq \frac{|\mathcal{X}|}{\max_{i \in [m]} |\mathcal{X}_i|} - 1$, and only if $|\mathcal{Y}| \geq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(2)$.*

Proof. The S -sets of discrete independence models are the one-dimensional cylinder subsets of \mathcal{X} . The state space \mathcal{X} can be partitioned into $|\mathcal{X}|/\max_i |\mathcal{X}_i|$ such S -sets. The second statement is by Lemma 19. See [21] for details on this approach. \square

Approximation errors

The Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence from q to p is defined as

$$\text{KL}(q\|p) := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} q(x) \log \frac{q(x)}{p(x)}, \quad (18)$$

when $\text{supp}(p) \supseteq \text{supp}(q)$ and it is set to ∞ otherwise. The KL-divergence from a point $q \in \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ to a model $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ is $\text{KL}(q\|\mathcal{M}) := \inf_{p \in \mathcal{M}} \text{KL}(q\|p)$.

Theorem 29. *Let $\varrho = \{\mathcal{Z}^1, \dots, \mathcal{Z}^k\}$ be a partition of \mathcal{X} into $k = 1 + \sum_{j \in [m]} (|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 1)$ support sets of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$. The maximal Kullback-Leibler approximation error to $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ is not more than*

$$\max_{q \in \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}} \text{KL}(q\|\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}) \leq \max_{q \in \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}} \text{KL}(q\|\Delta_{\varrho}) = \log \max_{s \in [k]} |\mathcal{Z}^s|.$$

Proof. By Lemma 25, item two, the partition model Δ_{ϱ} is contained in $\overline{\text{RBM}}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$. The maximal approximation error of Δ_{ϱ} can be found in [25]. \square

The expected KL-divergences of partition models and mixtures of products with disjoint supports have been studied in [24] based on [34].

The Dirichlet prior Dir_{α} with concentration parameter $\alpha = (\alpha_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \in \mathbb{R}_{>}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ is defined by

$$\text{Dir}_{\alpha}(q) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{X}|}} \frac{\Gamma(\sum_x \alpha_x)}{\prod_x \Gamma(\alpha_x)} \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}} q(x)^{\alpha_x - 1} \quad \text{for all } q \in \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}. \quad (19)$$

Let $h(z) = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{z}$, $z \in \mathbb{N}$ denote the harmonic numbers. The function h has a natural analytic extension $h(z) = \partial_z \log(\Gamma(z+1)) + \gamma$, $z \in \mathbb{R}_{>}$, where Γ is the gamma function and γ is the Euler-Mascheroni constant.

Theorem 30 ([24]). *Let $\varrho = \{\mathcal{Z}^1, \dots, \mathcal{Z}^k\}$ be a partition of \mathcal{X} into k support sets of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$, and let $q \sim \text{Dir}_{(\alpha_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}}$. Then the expected Kullback-Leibler divergence from q to the mixture $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X},\varrho}$ is*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{KL}(q\|\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X},\varrho}) \rangle &= \sum_x \frac{\alpha_x}{\alpha} (h(\alpha_x) - h(\alpha)) + \sum_{s=1}^k (|G_s| - 1) \frac{\alpha_s^{\varrho}}{\alpha} (h(\alpha_s^{\varrho}) - h(\alpha)) \\ &\quad - \sum_{s=1}^k \sum_{j \in G_s} \sum_{x_j \in \mathcal{Z}_j^s} \frac{\alpha^{s,x_j}}{\alpha} (h(\alpha^{s,x_j}) - h(\alpha)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha_s^g = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{Z}^s} \alpha_x$, $\alpha^{s,x_j} = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Z}^s: y_j=x_j} \alpha_y$, and $G_s \subset [n]$ is the set of coordinates $\{j \in [n]: |\mathcal{Z}_j^s| > 1\}$ that take more than one value in the set $\mathcal{Z}^s = \mathcal{Z}_1^s \times \dots \times \mathcal{Z}_n^s$.

Theorem 31. *The expected KL-divergence from $q \sim \text{Dir}(\alpha_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ to $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ is bounded from above by $\langle \text{KL}(q \parallel \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X},\rho}) \rangle$ as given in Theorem 30, with $k = 1 + \sum_{j \in [m]} (|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 1)$.*

Proof. This is by Lemma 25. □

IX Geometry

In this section we are mainly interested in the dimension of $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$. Our analysis builds on [8], where the binary RBM was treated. The idea is to bound the dimension of the discrete RBM model from below by the dimension of the tropical model (a simplified version of the original model), and from above by the expected dimension.

Before going into the tropical model, we show that the dimension of the discrete RBM model can be bounded from above not only by its expected dimension, but also by a function of the dimension of its Hadamard factors.

From Proposition 10 and the relation $\text{Mixt}^k(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}) \circ \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}} = \text{Mixt}^k(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ we deduce that

$$\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}} = \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}} \circ \text{Mixt}(\mathbf{1}, \text{Mixt}^{|\mathcal{Y}_1|-1}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})) \circ \dots \circ \text{Mixt}(\mathbf{1}, \text{Mixt}^{|\mathcal{Y}_m|-1}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})), \quad (20)$$

which implies that

$$\dim(\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}) \leq \dim(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}) + m + \sum_{j \in [m]} \dim(\text{Mixt}^{|\mathcal{Y}_j|-1}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})). \quad (21)$$

Remark 32. The model $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ can only have the expected dimension, equal to

$$\min\left\{\left(\sum_{i \in [n]} (|\mathcal{X}_i| - 1) + 1\right)\left(\sum_{j \in [m]} (|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 1) + 1\right) - 1, |\mathcal{X}| - 1\right\},$$

if each mixture model $\text{Mixt}^{|\mathcal{Y}_j|-1}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}})$ has the expected dimension, equal to $(|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 1) \dim(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}) + (|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 2)$, for all $j \in [m]$.

We discuss the discrete RBMs with two visible variables as an example:

Two visible units

The product distributions of two variables X_1 and X_2 are, up to multiplication by positive numbers, the non-negative $|\mathcal{X}_1| \times |\mathcal{X}_2|$ rank-one matrices. It is a basic fact of linear algebra that a matrix has rank k if and only if it can be written as the sum of k rank-one matrices and not less; if and only if its largest non-vanishing minor has order k . The sums of k rank-one matrices are characterized algebraically by the vanishing of all minors of order $k+1$. This implies that the k -mixture of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2}$ has dimension less than expected whenever $2 \leq k < \min\{|\mathcal{X}_1|, |\mathcal{X}_2|\}$, and by Remark 32:

Proposition 33. *If $(\sum_{j \in [m]} (|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 1) + 1) \leq |\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2| / (|\mathcal{X}_1| + |\mathcal{X}_2| - 1)$ and $|\mathcal{Y}_j| < \min\{|\mathcal{X}_1|, |\mathcal{X}_2|\}$ for some $j \in [m]$, then $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{Y}}$ does not have the expected dimension.*

IX.1 Tropical model

We first show that a discrete RBM is the image of a polynomial map: The distributions from the joint discrete RBM model $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ can be parametrized by the square free monomials

$$p(v, h) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{\substack{\{j,i\} \in [m] \times [m], \\ (y'_j, x'_i) \in \mathcal{Y}_j \times \mathcal{X}_i}} (\gamma_{\{j,i\}, (y'_j, x'_i)})^{\delta_{y'_j}(h_j) \delta_{x'_i}(v_i)} \quad \forall (v, h) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}, \quad (22)$$

with $\gamma_{\{j,i\}, (y'_j, x'_i)} = \exp(\theta_{\{j,i\}, (y'_j, x'_i)}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>}$. The visible discrete RBM probability distributions can be written as

$$p(v) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{j \in [m]} \left(\sum_{h_j \in \mathcal{Y}_j} \gamma_{\{j,1\}, (h_j, v_1)} \cdots \gamma_{\{j,n\}, (h_j, v_n)} \right). \quad (23)$$

Hence $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ is the image of a polynomial map $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \Delta_{\mathcal{X}}$ with $d = |\{\{j, i\}, (y'_j, x'_i) : \{j, i\} \in [m] \times [n], (y'_j, x'_i) \in \mathcal{Y}_j \times \mathcal{X}_i\}|$ and the coordinates given in eq. (23).

Let $p_\theta(v) = \sum_h p_\theta(v, h) = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_h \exp(\langle \theta, A_{(v,h)}^{(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y})} \rangle)$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a parametrization of the visible RBM distributions, as in eq. (9).

Definition 34. The *tropical discrete restricted Boltzmann machine model* $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}^{\text{tropical}}$ is the image of the tropical morphism Φ , which evaluates $\log(p_\theta(v)) = \log(\sum_h p_\theta(v, h))$ for all $v \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ within the max-plus algebra (addition becomes $a + b = \max\{a, b\}$) and only up to additive constants independent of v (i.e., disregarding the normalization constant Z).

The idea behind this definition is that $\log(\exp(a) + \exp(b)) \approx \max\{a, b\}$, when a and b have a different order of magnitude. We have

$$\Phi(v; \theta) = \max\{\langle \theta, A_{(v,h)}^{(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y})} \rangle : h \in \mathcal{Y}\} \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{X}, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (24)$$

The tropical model captures important properties of the original model. Of particular interest is the relation

$$\dim(\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}^{\text{tropical}}) \leq \dim(\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}) \leq \min\{\dim(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}), |\mathcal{X}| - 1\}, \quad (25)$$

which gives us a tool to estimate the dimension of the discrete RBM model.

Dimension

In the following Theorem 35 we express the dimension of the tropical RBM model in terms of the maximum rank of a class of matrices defined by slicings of the convex support of the independence model $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ by the normal fan of the convex support of the independence model $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y}}$.

Let $j \in [m]$. Consider a \mathcal{Y}_j -slicing $C_j = \{C_{j,1}, \dots, C_{j,|\mathcal{Y}_j|}\}$ of $\{A_x^{(\mathcal{X})} : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ (see Definition 15). Here $A^{(\mathcal{X})}$ is a sufficient statistics of the independence model $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ including a constant row. For each $k = 1, \dots, |\mathcal{Y}_j|$ let $A_{C_{j,k}}$ be a matrix with rows indexed by the states $x \in \mathcal{X}$ with x th row equal to the transpose of the column vector $A_x^{(\mathcal{X})}$ when $x \in C_{j,k}$, and x th row equal to a row of zeros when $x \notin C_{j,k}$. Finally let $A_{C_j} = (A_{C_{j,1}} | \dots | A_{C_{j,|\mathcal{Y}_j|}})$.

Theorem 35. *On each region of linearity, the tropical morphism $\Phi: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}^{\text{tropical}}$ is the linear map represented by the $|\mathcal{X}| \times d$ -matrix*

$$\mathcal{A} = (A_{C_1} | \dots | A_{C_m}),$$

modulo the constant functions, where C_j is a \mathcal{Y}_j -slicing of $\{A_x^{(\mathcal{X})} : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ for all $j \in [m]$. The dimension of $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}^{\text{tropical}}$ is the maximum rank of \mathcal{A} over all possible \mathcal{Y} -slicings (minus one when the column span of \mathcal{A} contains $\mathbb{1}$).

Proof. Let $\theta_{h_j} = (\theta_{\{j,i\},(h_j,x_i)})_{i \in [n], x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i}$ and denote by A_{h_j} the submatrix of $A^{(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y})}$ containing the rows with indices $\{\{j, i\}, (h_j, x_i) : i \in [n], x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i\}$. For a given $v \in \mathcal{X}$ we have

$$\max\{\langle \theta, A_{(v,h)}^{(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y})} \rangle : h \in \mathcal{Y}\} = \sum_{j \in [m]} \max\{\langle \theta_{h_j}, A_{h_j}(v, h_j) \rangle : h_j \in \mathcal{Y}_j\}.$$

This completes the proof. □

Remark 36. The matrix \mathcal{A} defining Φ can also be written as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = ((A^{(\mathcal{X})})^\top | \tilde{A}_{C_1} | \dots | \tilde{A}_{C_m}), \quad (26)$$

where $\tilde{A}_{C_j} = (A_{C_{j,1}} | \dots | A_{j,|\mathcal{Y}_j|-1})$ are the first $|\mathcal{Y}_j| - 1$ blocks of A_{C_j} for all $j \in [m]$.

In the following we evaluate the rank of the matrix \mathcal{A} from Theorem 35 for various choices of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} .

Mixtures of binary products

The dimension of the mixture models of binary product distributions is known (see Section 2.3). Here we are interested in the rank of the matrix \mathcal{A} for slicings of the n -cube by parallel hyperplanes. We will use this analysis to treat more general models later in this section.

Lemma 37. *Let $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}^n$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$. For each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ there is a slicing $\{C_{1,1}, \dots, C_{1,k}\}$ of \mathcal{X} by $k-1$ parallel hyperplanes such that $\cup_{l=1}^{k-1} C_{1,l} = B_x(2k-3)$ is the Hamming ball of radius $2k-3$ centered at x , and $(A_{C_{1,1}} | \dots | A_{C_{1,k-1}})$ has the maximal possible rank.*

Corollary 38. *If $2 \leq k < \frac{n}{2} + 1$, then $\text{RBM}_{\{0,1\}^n, \{0,1,\dots,k-1\}}^{\text{tropical}} = \mathcal{M}_{\{0,1\}^n, k}^{\text{tropical}}$ has the expected dimension $\min\{k(n+1)-1, 2^n-1\}$. If $k = \frac{n}{2} + 1$, then it has dimension at least $\min\{k(n+1)-2, 2^n-1\}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 17 any slicing of $Q_{\mathcal{X}}$ by k parallel hyperplanes is a $\{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$ -slicing. Consider any vertex x of the n -cube, and the slicing $\{x \oplus_2 \mathbb{1}_\lambda : \lambda \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, n\}, 2j \leq |\lambda| \leq 2j+1\}$, for $j = 0, \dots, k-2$, and $\{x \oplus_2 \mathbb{1}_\lambda : \lambda \subseteq [n], 2(k-1) \leq |\lambda|\}$. The first $k-1$ blocks are pairs of Hamming spheres around x , and the last block is their complement. This slicing is realized by k hyperplanes with normal $\mathbb{1} - 2x$. Each $A_{C_{1,j}}$, $j = 0, \dots, k-2$ has rank $n+1$, and $A_{C_{1,k-1}}$ has rank $n+1$ if $2(k-1) < n$, and n if $2(k-1) = n$. Hence the rank of \mathcal{A} , disregarding constant functions, is $k(n+1)-1$ if $2(k-1) < n$, and $(k-1)(n+1)+n-1$ if $2(k-1) = n$. \square

Example 39. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}^4$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1, 2\}$. The set of columns of $A^{(x)}$ is the set of vertices of a 4-cube, and can be \mathcal{Y} -sliced into the sets $\{C_{1,1}, C_{1,2}, C_{1,3}\}$ with indexes $\{x : \langle \mathbb{1}, x \rangle \leq 1\}$, $\{x : \langle \mathbb{1}, x \rangle = 2\}$, and $\{x : \langle \mathbb{1}, x \rangle \geq 3\}$. The matrix \mathcal{A} is then

$$\mathcal{A} = (A_{C_{1,1}} | A_{C_{1,2}} | A_{C_{1,3}}) = \left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} 10000 & & & & & \\ 10001 & & & & & \\ 10010 & & & & & \\ 10100 & & & & & \\ 11000 & & & & & \\ \hline & 10011 & & & & \\ & 10101 & & & & \\ & 10110 & & & & \\ & 11001 & & & & \\ & 11010 & & & & \\ & 11100 & & & & \\ \hline & & & 10111 & & \\ & & & 11011 & & \\ & & & 11101 & & \\ & & & 11110 & & \\ & & & 11111 & & \end{array} \right) \begin{array}{l} C_{1,1} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ C_{1,2} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ C_{1,3} \end{array} \quad (27)$$

This matrix has rank $5 + 4 + 5 = 14$ and contains $\mathbb{1}$ in its column span. This shows $\dim(\mathcal{M}_{4,3}) \geq \dim(\mathcal{M}_{4,3}^{\text{tropical}}) \geq 13$. In fact equality holds, by [6] (see Theorem 2).

Binary visible units

For an arbitrary \mathcal{Y} and binary visible units we have:

Corollary 40. *Let $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}^n$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{Y}_m$ with $|\mathcal{Y}_j| = s_j$, $j \in [m]$. If $\{0, 1\}^n$ contains m disjoint Hamming balls of radii $2s_j-3$, $j \in [m]$ whose complement has maximum rank, then $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}^{\text{tropical}}$ has dimension $\min\{\sum_{j \in [m]} (s_j-1)(n+1) + n, 2^n-1\}$, as expected from counting parameters.*

Let $\mathcal{A}_q(n, d)$ denote the maximal cardinality of a q -ary code of length n and minimum Hamming distance (at least) d . It is known (Gilbert-Varshamov [11, 32]) that $\mathcal{A}_q(n, d) \geq \frac{q^n}{\sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \binom{n}{j} (q-1)^j}$, and that if q is a prime power ($q = p^t$ for some prime number p and some positive integer t), then $\mathcal{A}_q(n, d) \geq q^k$, where k is the largest integer with $q^k < \frac{q^n}{\sum_{j=0}^{d-2} \binom{n-1}{j} (q-1)^j}$.

Corollary 41. *Let $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}^n$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1, \dots, s-1\}^m$. If $m < \mathcal{A}_2(n, d)$, $d = 4(s-1)-1$, then $\dim(\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}^{\text{tropical}}) \geq \min\{m(s-1)(n+1) + n, 2^n-1\}$, as expected from counting parameters.*

Example 42. If all hidden units are binary, then $s_j = s = 2$ for all $j \in [m]$ and $4(s-1) - 1 = 3$. In this case we have $\mathcal{A}_2(n, 3) \geq 2^k$, where k is the largest integer with $2^k < \frac{2^n}{(n-1)+1} = 2^{n-\log_2(n)}$, i.e., $k = n - \lceil \log_2(n+1) \rceil$, and by Corollary 41: If $m < 2^{n-\lceil \log_2(n+1) \rceil}$, then $\text{RBM}_{\{0,1\}^n, \{0,1\}^m}$ has the expected dimension. This was also shown previously in [8].

Similarly, if the hidden units are homogeneous, not necessarily binary, $s_j = s$ for all $j \in [m]$, for some $s \in \mathbb{N}$, and $m < 2^{n-\lceil \log_2(\sum_{j=0}^{d-2} \binom{n-1}{j}) \rceil}$, $d = 4(s-1) - 1$, then $\text{RBM}_{\{0,1\}^n, \{0,1,\dots,s-1\}^m}$ has the expected dimension.

Remark 43. If $m > \mathcal{A}_2(n, d)$, then $\dim(\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}) \geq \min\{\dim(\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \times_{j=1}^m \mathcal{Y}_j}) + (m - \mathcal{A}_2(n, d)s, 2^n - 1)\}$, by Lemma 25.

Binary hidden units

Let $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(d)$ denote the maximal cardinality of a subset of \mathcal{X} of minimum Hamming distance at least d . Further, let $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{X}}(d)$ denote the minimal cardinality of a subset of \mathcal{X} with covering Hamming radius d , i.e., the minimal cardinality of a subset $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ such that every x in \mathcal{X} is in the radius- d Hamming ball centered at some $z \in \mathcal{Z}$.

The vertices of the product of simplices $Q_{\mathcal{X}}$ are labeled by the vectors $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{X}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_n = \mathcal{X}$. If \mathcal{Z} is a radius-one Hamming ball in \mathcal{X} , then the $1 + \sum_{i \in [n]} (|\mathcal{X}_i| - 1)$ vertices of $Q_{\mathcal{X}}$ with labels \mathcal{Z} are affinely independent. Hence

Corollary 44. If $m + 1 \leq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(3)$, then $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \{0,1\}^m}^{\text{tropical}}$ has dimension $(1 + m)(1 + \sum_{i \in [n]} (|\mathcal{X}_i| - 1)) - 1$. If $m + 1 \geq \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{X}}(1)$, then $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \{0,1\}^m}^{\text{tropical}}$ has dimension $|\mathcal{X}| - 1$.

Example 45. If q is a prime power and $m + 1 \leq q^{n-\lceil \log_q(1+(n-1)(q-1)+1) \rceil}$, then $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \{0,1\}^m}^{\text{tropical}}$ has dimension $(1 + m)(1 + \sum_{i \in [n]} (|\mathcal{X}_i| - 1)) - 1$.

Example 46. The q -ary Hamming codes are perfect linear codes over the finite field \mathbb{F}_q of length $n = (q^r - 1)/(q - 1)$ minimum Hamming distance three and covering radius one.

If q is a prime power and $n = (q^r - 1)/(q - 1)$ for some $r \geq 2$, then $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{X}}(3) = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{X}}(1)$ for $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}^n$, and $\text{RBM}_{\{0,1,\dots,q-1\}^n, \{0,1\}^m}^{\text{tropical}}$ has the expected dimension for any m .

Example 47. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{1, 2, \dots, s\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, s\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$, $s \leq t$. The minimum cardinality $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{X}}(1)$ of a code $C \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ with covering radius one equals $s^2 - \lfloor \frac{(3s-t)^2}{8} \rfloor$ if $t \leq 3s$, and s^2 otherwise, see [7, Theorem 3.7.4]. Hence $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \{0,1\}^m}^{\text{tropical}}$ has dimension $|\mathcal{X}| - 1$ when $m + 1 \geq s^2 - \lfloor \frac{(3s-t)^2}{8} \rfloor$ and $t \leq 3s$, and when $m + 1 \geq s^2$ and $t > 3s$.

General case

The following proposition allows us to use the ideas from the foregoing two paragraphs to make statements about the dimension of discrete RBM models with arbitrary \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} .

Proposition 48. For any $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ and $0 < k < n$ the affine hull of the set $\{A_x^{(\mathcal{X})} : d_H(x, x^*) = k\}$ has dimension $\sum_{i \in [n]} (|\mathcal{X}_i| - 1) - 1$.

Proof. The set $\mathcal{Z}^k := \{A_x^{(\mathcal{X})} : d_H(x, x^*) = k\}$ is the subset of vertices of the product of simplices $Q_{\mathcal{X}}$ contained in the hyperplane $H^k := \{z : \langle \mathbf{1}, z \rangle = k + 1\}$. We have that $\text{conv}(\mathcal{Z}^k) = Q_{\mathcal{X}} \cap H^k$, because if not, H^k would slice an edge of $Q_{\mathcal{X}}$. On the other hand the two vertices of any edge of $Q_{\mathcal{X}}$ lie in two parallel hyperplanes H^l and H^{l+1} , and hence $\langle \mathbf{1}, z \rangle \notin \mathbb{N}$ for any point z in the relative interior of an edge of $Q_{\mathcal{X}}$. The set \mathcal{Z}^k is not contained in any proper face of $Q_{\mathcal{X}}$ and hence $\text{conv}(\mathcal{Z}^k)$ intersects the interior of $Q_{\mathcal{X}}$. Thus $\dim(\text{conv}(\mathcal{Z}^k)) = \dim(Q_{\mathcal{X}}) - 1$, as was claimed. \square

Corollary 49. If \mathcal{X} contains $m + 1$ disjoint Hamming balls of radii $1, 2|\mathcal{Y}_1| - 3, \dots, 2|\mathcal{Y}_m| - 3$, then $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}^{\text{tropical}}$ has the expected dimension.

λ	x_λ	$\begin{pmatrix} h_a \\ h_b \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}$	0000	0000	1111	1111
			0000	1111	0000	1111
			0011	0011	0011	0011
			0101	0101	0101	0101
$\{a, 1\}$	(0, 0)		1100	1100		
$\{a, 1\}$	(0, 1)		0011	0011		
$\{a, 2\}$	(0, 0)		1010	1010		
$\{a, 2\}$	(0, 1)		0101	0101		
$\{a, 1\}$	(1, 0)				1100	1100
$\{a, 1\}$	(1, 1)				0011	0011
$\{a, 2\}$	(1, 0)				1010	1010
$\{a, 2\}$	(1, 1)				0101	0101
$\{b, 1\}$	(0, 0)		1100		1100	
$\{b, 1\}$	(0, 1)		0011		0011	
$\{b, 2\}$	(0, 0)		1010		1010	
$\{b, 2\}$	(0, 1)		0101		0101	
$\{b, 1\}$	(1, 0)			1100		1100
$\{b, 1\}$	(1, 1)			0011		0011
$\{b, 2\}$	(1, 0)			1010		1010
$\{b, 2\}$	(1, 1)			0101		0101
$\{a, b\}$	(0, 0)		1111	0000	0000	0000
$\{a, b\}$	(0, 1)		0000	1111	0000	0000
$\{a, b\}$	(1, 0)		0000	0000	1111	0000
$\{a, b\}$	(1, 1)		0000	0000	0000	1111

Table 1: A sufficient statistics matrix for the hierarchical model representing the joint probability distributions of a binary RBM with two hidden units, two visible units, and an additional interaction edge between the two hidden units.

Appendix

A Interactions within layers

As we have seen, RBMs represent mixtures of product distributions restricted in two ways: firstly, the mixture weights are given by the marginal distributions of the hidden variables, and depend on the mixture components; secondly, the mixture components are tuples of product distributions with natural parameters given by projections of simplices (in [23] in the case of binary hidden units, these parameter tuples are called *zonosets*). In this passage we discuss how these restrictions are relaxed when the interactions of an RBM are augmented by “lateral” interactions among hidden variables.

Definition 50. The product of simplices mixture of products model $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ is the set of all mixtures of tuples $\{p^{(h)} : h \in \mathcal{Y}\}$ of distributions in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$ with natural parameters $\{\theta^{(h)} : h \in \mathcal{Y}\}$ equal to a linear projection of the vertices of $\times_{j \in [m]} \Delta_{\mathcal{Y}_j}$.

Proposition 51. *The RBM-like model with interactions between hidden variables, but no higher order interactions between groups of hidden and visible variables, is contained in the product-of-simplices mixture of products model.*

Adding lateral connections to the hidden units of an RBM allows for more control on the mixture weights but not on the mixture components of the mixtures of products represented by the original RBM without lateral connections. Table 1 shows a small example.

B Training

The points in $\text{RBM}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ are parametrized by a vector

$$\theta = (\theta_{\{i,j\}, x_i, y_j})_{i \in [n]^0, j \in [m]^0, x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i \setminus \{0\}, y_j \in \mathcal{Y}_j \setminus \{0\}} \cdot \quad (28)$$

The entries of this vector can be grouped as $(\theta^{j,y_j})_{j \in [m]^0, y_j \in \mathcal{Y}_j \setminus \{0\}}$, where $\theta^{j,y_j} = (\theta_{\{i,j\}, x_i, y_j})_{i \in [n]^0, x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i \setminus \{0\}}$ for all $j \in [m]^0, y_j \in \mathcal{Y}_j \setminus \{0\}$. Each θ^{j,y_j} can be viewed as the natural parameter vector of a distribution in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}}$.

The conditional distribution $p(Y|X = x; \theta) = \prod_{j \in [m]} p(Y_j|X = x; \theta)$ is the product distribution $\frac{1}{Z} \exp(\langle \theta^x, A^{(\mathcal{Y})} \rangle) \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ with parameter vector

$$\theta^x = (\theta_{j,y_j}^x)_{j \in [m]^0, y_j \in \mathcal{Y}_j \setminus \{0\}} := \sum_{i \in [n]^0 : x_j \neq 0} \theta^{j,x_j}. \quad (29)$$

The factors of this product distribution are

$$p(Y_j|X = x; \theta) = [1 : \exp(\theta_{j,1}^x) : \exp(\theta_{j,2}^x) : \cdots : \exp(\theta_{j,|\mathcal{Y}_j|-1}^x)]. \quad (30)$$

Similarly, the conditional probability distribution $p(X|Y = h; \theta) = \prod_{i \in [n]} p(X_i|Y = h; \theta)$ has factors $p(X_i|Y = h; \theta) = [1 : \exp(\theta_{i,1}^h) : \exp(\theta_{i,2}^h) : \cdots : \exp(\theta_{i,|\mathcal{X}_i|-1}^h)]$.

Parameter updates

The Contrastive Divergence (CD) algorithm was proposed by Hinton [13] for training a general class of models called products of experts. Discrete RBMs are products of experts and as such we can use CD methods to train them efficiently. We describe this briefly:

Let $\tilde{X} = \{\tilde{x}^1, \dots, \tilde{x}^K\}$ be K data points in \mathcal{X} . The data distribution is $p_0(x) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \delta_{\tilde{x}^k}(x)$. After repeated Gibbs sampling we get a distribution $p_n = T^n p_0$, where $T = T_x T_y$, with $T_y = (p(Y = y|X = x; \theta))_{x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ and $T_x = (p(X = x|Y = y; \theta))_{y \in \mathcal{Y}, x \in \mathcal{X}}$.

The CD_n parameter updates are:

$$\theta_{\{i,j\}, x'_i, y'_j}^{(\tau+1)} = \theta_{\{i,j\}, x'_i, y'_j}^{(\tau)} + \eta \left(\left\langle \langle \delta_{i,x'_i}(x) \delta_{j,y'_j}(y) \rangle_{p(Y|X;\theta)} \right\rangle_0 - \left\langle \langle \delta_{i,x'_i}(x) \delta_{j,y'_j}(y) \rangle_{p(Y|X;\theta)} \right\rangle_n \right). \quad (31)$$

The ML parameter updates are:

$$\theta_{\{i,j\}, x'_i, y'_j}^{(\tau+1)} = \theta_{\{i,j\}, x'_i, y'_j}^{(\tau)} + \eta \left(\left\langle \langle \delta_{i,x'_i}(x) \delta_{j,y'_j}(y) \rangle_{p(Y|X;\theta)} \right\rangle_0 - \left\langle \delta_{i,x'_i}(x) \delta_{j,y'_j}(y) \right\rangle_{\theta} \right), \quad (32)$$

where p_{θ} is the distribution in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}$ with parameter θ . **b**