

---

# Markov Chain Monte Carlo and Variational Inference: Bridging the Gap

---

Tim Salimans  
 Algoritmica  
 salimanstim@gmail.com

## Abstract

Recent advances in stochastic variational inference have made it possible to construct variational posterior approximations containing auxiliary random variables. This enables us to explore a new synthesis of variational inference and Monte Carlo methods where we incorporate one or more steps of MCMC into our variational approximation. This note describes the theoretical foundations that make this possible and shows some promising first results.

## 1 Stochastic variational inference

At the center of Bayesian analysis is the posterior distribution  $p(x|y)$ , where  $x$  is a set of unknown parameters or latent variables and  $y$  is the observed data. If the prior  $p(x)$  and likelihood  $p(y|x)$  have been specified, the posterior distribution can be computed using Bayes' rule. In practice this computation is often intractable and we have to resort to approximation methods. One such approximation method is *variational inference*, which uses a parameterized posterior approximation  $q_\theta(x)$  which is fit to the posterior distribution by maximizing a lower bound on the the marginal likelihood with respect to  $\theta$ :

$$\log p(y) \geq \mathbb{E}_{q(x)}[\log p(x, y) - \log q(x)]. \quad (1)$$

In order to maximize the lower bound we need to evaluate the expectation with respect to  $q(x)$ , which itself is often also intractable. Recent work in *stochastic variational inference* therefore proposes to approximate this expectation using Monte Carlo, by replacing (1) with a sample average using random draws from  $q(x)$ . In practice, drawing from  $q(x)$  often consists of two steps. In the first step we draw a set of *primitive random variables*  $u$  from a fixed distribution  $p(u)$ , and we then transform those as  $x = g(u)$  with  $g(\cdot)$  chosen in such a way that  $x$  has  $q(x)$  as its distribution. If this is the case, we can differentiate through the Monte Carlo approximation of the lower bound to obtain unbiased stochastic estimates of the gradient of the lower bound with respect to the parameters of our approximation  $q_\theta(x)$  [1, 2, 3]. Alternatively, the gradient of the lower bound may be approximated using Monte Carlo directly [4, 5]. Once we have obtained a stochastic estimate of the gradient of (1) with respect to  $\theta$ , we can use this estimate in a stochastic optimization algorithm for fitting our approximation  $q(x)$  to the true posterior  $p(x|y)$ .

### 1.1 Using auxiliary variables

One application of stochastic variational inference shown in our earlier work [1] is to fitting a posterior approximation containing *auxiliary random variables*. We do this by introducing a new set of random variables  $z$ , and lower bounding (1) by

$$\mathbb{E}_{q(x)}[\log p(x, y) - \log q(x)] \geq \mathbb{E}_{q(x, z)}[\log(p(x, y)p(z|x)) - \log q(x, z)], \quad (2)$$

where  $p(z|x)$  is an arbitrary distribution which we are free to choose, and our marginal posterior approximation is given by  $q(x) = \int q(x, z)dz$ . The marginal approximation  $q(x)$  is now a mixture

of distributions of the form  $q(x|z)$ . Since this is a very rich class of distributions, this method may be used to obtain a closer fit to the exact posterior, see e.g. [1]. If we choose  $p(z|x) = q(z|x)$ , the bound is tight and (2) reduces to the usual lower bound. In practice, obtaining good results using auxiliary variables requires us to specify  $p(z|x)$  and  $q(z|x)$  to at least be reasonably close. One way this can be achieved is by specifying  $p(z|x)$  to be of some flexible parameterized form, and optimizing the lower bound over the parameters of this distribution.

## 2 Markov chain monte carlo

A popular alternative to variational inference is the method of *Markov Chain Monte Carlo* (MCMC). Like variational inference, MCMC starts by taking a random draw  $x'$  from some initial distribution  $q(x')$ . Rather than optimizing this distribution, however, MCMC methods subsequently apply a *stochastic transition operator* to the random draw  $x'$ . By judiciously choosing this transition operator, and by iteratively applying it many times, the outcome of this procedure will be a random variable that converges in distribution to the exact posterior  $p(x|y)$ . The advantage of MCMC is that the samples it gives us can approximate the exact posterior arbitrarily well if we are willing to apply the stochastic transition operator a sufficient number of times. The downside of MCMC is that in practice we do not know how many times is sufficient, and getting a good approximation using MCMC can take a very long time.

A general, but non-standard way of describing an MCMC algorithm is as follows:

---

**Algorithm 1** MCMC method for obtaining an approximate posterior draw

---

Obtain random draws  $(x', z') \sim q(x', z')$   
 Apply a deterministic transition operator:  $(x, z) = t(x', z')$   
**return**  $x$  as the approximate draw from  $p(x|y)$

---

where we have introduced a set of auxiliary random variables  $(z', z)$ . Although we only apply a deterministic transition operator once in this algorithm, the definition of  $t()$  and  $(z', z)$  is general enough for this to be equivalent to applying a random transition operator many times. For example, we might define  $z'$  to be the set of all *primitive random variables* of the MCMC algorithm as defined above, take  $t()$  to be the product of all corresponding stochastic transitions of  $x'$ , and define  $z = z'$ . Although awkward at first glance, this representation of the MCMC algorithm will prove useful for combining MCMC methods with variational inference.

## 3 Integrating MCMC into the variational approximation

For appropriately chosen  $q(x', z')$  and  $t(x', z')$  the MCMC algorithm described above effectively encodes a distribution  $q(x, z)$  for which the marginal  $q(x)$  converges to the posterior distribution  $p(x|y)$  with enough iterations. The central question of this paper is: What if we re-interpret  $q(x, z)$  as a variational approximation in an expanded space (see section 1.1) and optimize it using recently developed stochastic variational inference methods? To answer this question, we consider the special case where the transition operator  $t()$  is one-to-one and continuously differentiable in  $(x', z')$ . In that case we know from the change-of-variables technique that our distribution  $q(x, z)$  is given by

$$q(x, z) = |\mathbf{J}|q(x', z'), \tag{3}$$

where  $|\mathbf{J}|$  is the Jacobian determinant of the inverse of  $t()$  with respect to  $(x, z)$ , evaluated at  $(x', z') = t^{-1}(x, z)$ . Plugging in these expressions into the marginal likelihood lower bound, we get

$$\log p(y) \geq \mathbb{E}_{q(x', z')} \{ \log [p(x, y)p(z|x)] - \log [|\mathbf{J}|q(x', z')] \}, \tag{4}$$

with  $(x, z) = t(x', z')$ . If the log Jacobian determinant in this expression can be computed, we can apply stochastic optimization techniques to this expression directly. Here we instead focus on the more restricted, but more practical case where we know that  $|\mathbf{J}| = 1$ , in which case the bound simplifies to

$$\log p(y) \geq \mathbb{E}_{q(x', z')} \{ \log [p(x, y)p(z|x)] - \log [q(x', z')] \}. \tag{5}$$

A transition operator for which  $|\mathbf{J}| = 1$  for any  $x', z'$  is called *volume preserving* [6]. The most well-known and generally applicable volume preserving transition operator is *Hamiltonian dynamics*, which we will use in the remainder of this paper. Many other options are available as well, such as various forms of Gibbs sampling [7].

## 4 Hamiltonian variational approximation

One of the most efficient and widely applicable MCMC methods is *Hamiltonian Monte Carlo* (HMC) [6]. HMC is an MCMC method for approximating continuous distributions  $p(x|y)$  where the space of unknown variables is expanded to include a set of auxiliary variables  $z$  with the same dimension as  $x$ . These auxiliary variables are initialized with a random draw from a distribution  $z' \sim q(z'|x')$ , after which the method simulates the dynamics corresponding to the Hamiltonian  $H(x, z) = 0.5z^T M^{-1}z - \log p(x, y)$ , where  $x$  and  $z$  are iteratively updated using the *leapfrog integrator*, see [6].

Hamiltonian dynamics of this form is a very effective way of exploring the posterior distribution  $p(x|y)$  because the dynamics is guided by the gradient of the exact log posterior, and random walks are suppressed by the auxiliary variables  $z$ , which are also called *momentum variables*. Incorporating Hamiltonian dynamics into a variational approximation may help us to make use of these beneficial properties in a variational inference setting. This gives rise to the following algorithm:

---

### Algorithm 2 Hamiltonian Variational Inference

---

**Require:** Parameterized distributions  $q_\theta(x', z')$ ,  $p_\theta(z|x)$ , steplength  $\epsilon$  and mass matrix  $M$

**Require:** Number of iterations  $N$

**for**  $t = 1 : N$  **do**

Draw initial variables  $(x', z') \sim q_\theta(x', z')$

Set  $(x, z) = (x', z')$  before updating them using Hamiltonian dynamics

**for** number of leapfrog steps **do**

simulate Hamiltonian dynamics with steplength  $\epsilon$ , mass matrix  $M$ , and log posterior  $\log p(x, y)$

**end for**

Return the last iterates of  $(x, z)$ , as well as the initial values  $(x', z')$

Evaluate the lower bound:  $f^* = \log[p(x, y)p(z|x)] - \log[q(x', z')]$

Differentiate the sampled  $f^*$  with respect to all parameters  $\theta, \epsilon, M$  to get an unbiased gradient estimate, differentiating through the sampling procedure including the Hamiltonian dynamics

Update the parameters using the gradient estimate and any of the strategies from [1, 2, 3].

**end for**

**return** the optimized parameters  $\theta, \epsilon, M$ .

---

For simplicity, we have chosen not to *refresh the momentum*, i.e. resample  $z$  during the transition, but this could also be implemented. Compared to the usual MCMC algorithm we are also lacking a Metropolis-Hastings rejection step and a momentum flipping step: Such steps are not needed here.

After running Algorithm 2 to convergence, we have an optimized approximation  $q(x)$  of the posterior distribution. Because our approximation automatically adapts to the local shape of the exact posterior, this approximation will often be better than a variational approximation with a fixed functional form, provided  $p(z|x)$  and  $q(z|x)$  are at least reasonably close. In addition, we find that this automatic adaptation as a side effect reduces the variance in our stochastic gradient estimates, thereby speeding up the optimization. The downside of using this algorithm is that its computational cost per iteration is higher than when using an approximate  $q(x)$  of a fixed form, mainly owing to the need of calculating additional derivatives of  $\log p(x, y)$ . These derivatives may also be difficult to implement by hand, so it is advisable to use an automatic differentiation package such as Theano [8] instead.

Compared to the regular Hamiltonian Monte Carlo method, Algorithm 2 has a number of advantages: The samples drawn from  $q(x)$  are independent, the parameters of the transition operator  $(M, \epsilon)$  are automatically tuned, and there are no rejections of transitions. Furthermore, we optimize

a lower bound on the log marginal likelihood, and we can assess the approximation quality using the techniques discussed in [1]. By finding a good initial distribution  $q(x')$ , we may also speed up convergence to the true posterior. A downside is that Algorithm 2 will in general never match the true posterior exactly, while MCMC is asymptotically exact.

#### 4.1 Example: A beta-binomial model for overdispersion

To demonstrate Algorithm 2 we use an example from [9], which considers the problem of estimating the rates of death from stomach cancer for the largest cities in Missouri. The data is available from the R package LearnBayes. It consists of 20 pairs  $(n_j, y_j)$  where  $n_j$  contains the number of individuals that were at risk for cancer in city  $j$ , and  $y_j$  is the number of cancer deaths that occurred in that city. The counts  $y_j$  are overdispersed compared to what one could expect under a binomial model with constant probability, so [9] assumes a beta-binomial model. The resulting posterior distribution for this model is highly non-Gaussian, even after using multiple parameter transformations. We therefore consider approximating it using Algorithm 2.

We choose  $q_\theta(z')$ ,  $q_\theta(x')$ ,  $p_\theta(z|x)$  to all be multivariate Gaussian distributions with fully parameterized covariance matrices. The mean of  $p_\theta(z|x)$  is defined as a linear function in  $x$  and  $\nabla_x \log p(x, y)$ , with adjustable coefficients. The covariance matrix of  $p_\theta(z|x)$  is not made to depend on  $x$ . The approximation is run using different numbers of leapfrog steps. Since this is a low dimensional problem, we can easily visualize the result and compare the approximation accuracy with and without Hamiltonian dynamics.




Figure 1: Approximate posteriors for a varying number of leapfrog steps. Exact posterior at bottom right.





Figure 2: R-squared accuracy measure [1] for approximate posteriors using a varying number of leapfrog steps.

As can be seen from Figures 1 and ??, the Hamiltonian dynamics indeed helps us improve the posterior approximation.

#### 4.2 Example: Generative model for handwritten digits

Next, we apply the Hamiltonian variational approximation to the problem of learning a generative model for the MNIST data set of handwritten digits [10]. The model is of the kind used by [2], where the binarized pixels  $y$  of the digit images are assigned independent Bernoulli distributions given a set of latent variables  $x$ . These latent variables are given a standard normal prior, and the dependence of  $y$  on  $x$  is captured by a neural network with a single hidden layer. In order to maximize the likelihood of  $y$ , we need to infer the posterior distribution of  $x$  for each of the 60,000 training images in the data set. The authors of [2] do this by encoding the approximate posterior distribution by a second neural network. Here, we instead approximate the posterior by using the Hamiltonian variational approximation. We once again specify  $q_\theta(x')$ ,  $q_\theta(z'|x')$ ,  $p_\theta(z|x)$  to be multivariate normal distributions, but this time with diagonal covariance matrices. The means and inverse variances of  $q_\theta(z'|x')$ ,  $p_\theta(z|x)$  are made to depend on  $x$  via linear functions in  $x$  and  $\nabla_x \log p(x, y)$ . We use 5 leapfrog steps in the approximation.

Figure 3: Test log marginal likelihood lower bound for a model for handwritten digits. Our approach reaches a relatively high lower bound on the log marginal likelihood using only a few passes over the data, although these passes individually cost a low multiple of the time required by the iterations of the algorithm in [2]. The final lower bound reached is comparable to what can be obtained using their algorithm.



## 5 Conclusion

By using auxiliary variables in combination with stochastic variational inference we can construct approximations that are much better than can be obtained using only simpler exponential family forms. The possibilities here are endless and still remain largely unexplored despite recent advances in stochastic variational inference. One way of improving variational inference is by integrating one or more MCMC steps into the approximation. By doing so we can bridge the accuracy/speed gap between MCMC and variational inference and get the best of both worlds.

## References

- [1] Tim Salimans, David A Knowles, et al. Fixed-form variational posterior approximation through stochastic linear regression. *Bayesian Analysis*, 8(4):837–882, 2013.
- [2] Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- [3] Danilo J Rezende, Shakir Mohamed, and Daan Wierstra. Stochastic backpropagation and approximate inference in deep generative models. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-14)*, pages 1278–1286, 2014.
- [4] John Paisley, David Blei, and Michael Jordan. Variational bayesian inference with stochastic search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1206.6430*, 2012.
- [5] Andriy Mnih and Karol Gregor. Neural variational inference and learning in belief networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1402.0030*, 2014.
- [6] Radford Neal. Mcmc using hamiltonian dynamics. *Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo*, 2, 2011.
- [7] Radford M Neal. How to view an mcmc simulation as a permutation, with applications to parallel simulation and improved importance sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1205.0070*, 2012.
- [8] Frédéric Bastien, Pascal Lamblin, Razvan Pascanu, James Bergstra, Ian Goodfellow, Arnaud Bergeron, Nicolas Bouchard, David Warde-Farley, and Yoshua Bengio. Theano: new features and speed improvements. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1211.5590*, 2012.
- [9] Jim Albert. *Bayesian Computation with R*. Springer Science, New York. Second edition, 2009.
- [10] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.