
Covariance Matrices for Mean Field Variational Bayes

Ryan Giordano
Department of Statistics
University of California, Berkeley
rgiordano@berkeley.edu

Tamara Broderick
Department of Statistics
University of California, Berkeley
tab@stat.berkeley.edu

1 Introduction

With increasingly efficient data collection methods, scientists are interested in quickly analyzing ever larger data sets. In particular, the promise of these large data sets is not simply to fit old models but instead to learn more nuanced patterns from data than has been possible in the past. In theory, the Bayesian paradigm promises exactly these desiderata. Hierarchical modeling allows practitioners to capture complex relationships between variables of interest. Moreover, Bayesian analysis allows practitioners to quantify the uncertainty in any model estimates—and to do so coherently across all of the model variables.

Mean Field Variational Bayes (MFVB), a method for approximating a Bayesian posterior distribution, has grown in popularity due to its fast runtime on large-scale data sets [1–3]. But it is well known that a major failing of MFVB is that it gives (sometimes severe) underestimates of the uncertainty of model variables and provides no information about how the uncertainties in different model variables interact [4–7]. We develop a fast, general methodology for exponential families that augments MFVB to deliver accurate uncertainty estimates for model variables—both for individual variables and coherently across variables. In particular, as we elaborate in Section 2, MFVB for exponential families defines a fixed-point equation in the means of the approximating posterior, and our approach yields a covariance estimate by perturbing this fixed point. Inspired by *linear response theory*, which has previously been applied to Boltzmann machines [8] and loopy belief propagation [9], we call our method *linear response variational Bayes* (LRVB).

We demonstrate the accuracy of our covariance estimates with experiments on simulated data from a mixture of normals. Specifically, we show that the LRVB variance estimates are nearly identical to those produced by a Metropolis-Hastings sampler, even when MFVB variance is dramatically underestimated. We also show how the ability to analytically propagate uncertainty through a graphical model allows the easy computation of the influence of data points on parameter point estimates, i.e. “graphical model leverage scores.” While the data sets we examine in our experiments below (Section 4) are simulated, in future work we will demonstrate the applicability and scalability of LRVB on larger, experimentally-obtained data sets.

2 Mean-field variational Bayes in exponential families

Denote our N observed data points by the N -long column vector x , and denote our unobserved model parameters by θ . Here, θ is a column vector residing in some space Θ ; it has J subgroups and total dimension D . Our model is specified by a distribution of the observed data given the model parameters—the likelihood $p(x|\theta)$ —and a prior distributional belief on the model parameters $p(\theta)$. Bayes’ Theorem yields the posterior $p(\theta|x)$.

MFVB approximates $p(\theta|x)$ by a factorized distribution of the form $q(\theta) = \prod_{j=1}^J q(\theta_j)$ such that the Kullback-Liebler divergence $\text{KL}(q||p)$ between q and p is minimized:

$$q^* := \arg \min_q \text{KL}(q||p) = \arg \min_q \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log p(\theta|x) - \sum_{j=1:J} \log q(\theta_j) \right].$$

By the assumed q factorization, the solution to this minimization obeys the following fixed point equations [5]:

$$\ln q_j^*(\theta_j) = \mathbb{E}_{q_{i:i \neq j}^*} \log p(\theta, x) + \text{constant}. \quad (1)$$

Now consider some particular θ_j and suppose that $p(\theta_j|\theta_{i:i \neq j}, x)$ is in natural exponential family form. Then we can write

$$p(\theta_j|\theta_{i:i \neq j}, x) = \exp(\eta_j^T \theta_j - A_j(\eta_j)) \quad (2)$$

for local natural parameter η_j and local log partition function A_j . Note that η_j may be a function of $\theta_{i:i \neq j}$ and x . Indeed, if the exponential family assumption above holds for every index j , then we can write $\eta_j = \sum_{s=1:S} G_s \prod_{r \in R_s} \theta_r$, where $R_s \subseteq \{1, \dots, J\} \setminus \{s\}$ and G_s is a constant in all of θ .

Then it follows from Eq. (1) and the assumed factorization of q^* that

$$\ln q_j^*(\theta_j) = \left\{ \sum_{s=1:S} G_s \prod_{r \in R_s} [\mathbb{E}_{q_r^*} \theta_r] \right\}^T \theta_j + \text{constant} \quad (3)$$

In particular, we see that q_j^* will then be in the same exponential family form as $p(\theta_j|\theta_{i:i \neq j}, x)$. Let $\tilde{\eta}_j$ denote the natural parameter of q_j^* , and denote the mean parameter of q_j^* as $m_j := \mathbb{E}_{q_j^*} \theta_j$. Then we see from Eq. (3) that $\tilde{\eta}_j = \sum_{s=1:S} G_s \prod_{r \in R_s} m_r$. Since $\mathbb{E}_{q_j^*} \theta_j$ is a function of $\tilde{\eta}_j$, we have the fixed point equations $m_j = M_j(m_{i:i \neq j})$ for mappings M_j across j and $m = M(m)$ for the vector of mappings M .

3 Linear response

Now define $p_t(\theta|x)$ such that its log is a linear perturbation of the log posterior:

$$\log p_t(\theta|x) = \log p(\theta|x) + t^T \theta - c(t),$$

where $c(t)$ is a constant in θ . Since $c(t)$ normalizes the $p_t(\theta|x)$ distribution, it is in fact the cumulant generating function of $p(\theta|x)$. Further, every conditional distribution $p_t(\theta_j|\theta_{i:i \neq j}, x)$ is in the same exponential family as every conditional distribution $p(\theta_j|\theta_{i:i \neq j}, x)$ by construction. So, for each t , we have mean field variational approximation q_t^* with marginal means $m_{t,j} := \mathbb{E}_{q_t^*} \theta_j$ and fixed point equations $m_{t,j} = M_{t,j}(m_{t,i:i \neq j})$ across j and hence $m_t = M_t(m_t)$. Taking derivatives of the latter relationship with respect to t , we find

$$\frac{dm_t}{dt^T} = \frac{\partial M_t}{\partial m_t^T} \frac{dm_t}{dt^T} + \frac{\partial M_t}{\partial t^T}. \quad (4)$$

In particular, note that t is a vector of size D (the total dimension of θ), and $\frac{dm_t}{dt^T}$, e.g., is matrix of size $D \times D$ with (a, b) th entry equal to the scalar $dm_{t,a}/dt_b$.

Since q_t^* is the MFVB approximation for the perturbed posterior $p_t(\theta|x)$, we may hope that $m_t = \mathbb{E}_{q_t^*} \theta$ is close to the perturbed-posterior mean $\mathbb{E}_{p_t} \theta$. The practical success of MFVB relies on the fact that this approximation is often good in practice. To derive interpretations of the individual terms in Eq. (4), we assume that this equality of means holds, but we indicate where we use this assumption with an approximation sign: $m_t \approx \mathbb{E}_{p_t} \theta$. A fuller derivation of the next set of equations is given in Appendix A.

$$\frac{dm_t}{dt^T} \approx \frac{d}{dt^T} \mathbb{E}_{p_t} \theta = \Sigma_{p_t} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial M_t}{\partial t^T} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t^T} \mathbb{E}_{q_t^*} \theta = \Sigma_{q_t^*} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{dM_t}{dm_t^T} = \Sigma_{q_t^*} \frac{\partial \eta_t}{\partial m_t^T}, \quad (5)$$

where Σ_{p_t} is the covariance matrix of θ under p_t , $\Sigma_{q_t^*}$ is the covariance matrix of θ under q_t^* , and $\eta_t = (\eta_{t,1}^T, \dots, \eta_{t,J}^T)^T$ is the vector defined by stacking natural parameters from each $q_{t,j}^*$ distribution.

Now let $H := \frac{\partial \eta_t}{\partial m_t} \Big|_{t=0}$. Then substituting Eq. (5) into Eq. (4) and evaluating at $t = 0$, we find

$$\Sigma_p \approx \Sigma_{q^*} H \Sigma_p + \Sigma_{q^*} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Sigma_p \approx (I - \Sigma_{q^*} H)^{-1} \Sigma_{q^*} \quad (6)$$

Thus, we call $\hat{\Sigma} := (I - \Sigma_{q^*} H)^{-1} \Sigma_{q^*}$ the LRVB estimate of the true posterior covariance Σ_p .¹

4 Experiments

4.1 Mixture of normals

Mixture models constitute some of the most popular models for MFVB application [1, 2] and are often used as an example of where MFVB covariance estimates may go awry [5, 7]. Here we focus on a K -component, one-dimensional mixture of normals likelihood. In what follows, π_k is the probability of the k th component, \mathcal{N} denotes the univariate normal distribution, μ_k is the mean of the k th component, and τ_k is the precision of the k th component (so τ_k^{-1} is variance). N is the number of data points, and x_n is the n th observed data point. Then the likelihood is

$$p(x|\pi, \mu, \tau) = \prod_{n=1:N} \sum_{k=1:K} \pi_k \mathcal{N}(x_n | \mu_k, \tau_k^{-1}). \quad (7)$$

To complete the generative model, we assign priors

$$\pi \sim \text{Dirichlet}_K(1), \quad \tau \sim \text{Gamma}(2.0001, 0.1), \quad \mu \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 100). \quad (8)$$

We wish to approximate the covariance matrix of the parameters $\log(\pi), \mu, \log(\tau)$ in the posterior distribution $p(\pi, \mu, \tau|x)$ from the preceding generative model. In our experiment, $K = 3$ and $N = 3000$ for each of 100 simulations. We compare three different approaches to compute the posterior covariance: a Metropolis-Hastings (MH) sampler, MFVB, and LRVB. The MH sampler draws independent proposals centered at the MAP estimate in order to avoid label-switching problems. We note that for each of the parameters $\log(\pi)$, μ , and $\log(\tau)$, both MH and MFVB produce point estimates close to the true values, so our key assumption in the LRVB derivations of Section 3 appears to hold. To compare the covariance matrices, we use MH as a ground truth; for the low-dimensional model we are using, it is reasonable to expect that MH should return a good approximation of the true posterior. We see in Figure 1 that the LRVB estimates agree with the MH posterior variance while MFVB consistently underestimates the posterior variance.




Figure 1: Comparison of estimates of the posterior standard deviation for each model parameter according to methods MH, MFVB, and LRVB and across 100 simulations.

¹The LRVB covariance estimate is similar in form to the *structured expectation maximization* (SEM) [10] estimate for the asymptotic covariance matrix of a maximum likelihood estimate derived from expectation maximization (EM). In fact, when a central limit theorem applies and the posterior is multivariate normal the LRVB covariance is exact and the two estimates coincide. See Appendix B for a proof.

4.2 Sensitivity analysis

Next consider a slight variation to the model of Section 4.1. We retain the distribution of $p(x|\pi, \mu, \tau)$ in Eq. (7) but now assume that the observed data x^* are actually independent noisy versions of x : $x_n^* \sim \mathcal{N}(x, \sigma^2)$, for a deterministic constant σ^2 . We retain the prior on μ in Eq. (8), but fix π and τ at their true values. In this new model, x and μ are the unknown parameters. Using LRVB, we can estimate the posterior covariance between any x_n and the mixture parameters μ . If we look at this covariance as $\sigma^2 \rightarrow 0$, we obtain a type of *leverage score*. That is, the limiting value of this covariance can be used to estimate the influence of observation x_n on the mixture parameters in the spirit of classical linear model leverage scores from the statistics literature. LRVB leads to a straightforward analytic expression for these covariances, which can be found in Eq. (13) in Appendix C.²

Note that these leverage scores are impossible to compute in naive MFVB, since they involve correlations between distinct mean field components, and difficult to compute using MH, since they require estimating a large number of very small covariances with a finite number of draws.

To evaluate these LRVB-derived leverage scores, we compare them to the effect of manually perturbing our data and re-fitting the model. Here, we choose $K = 2$ components in the mixture model and $N = 500$. (The small N is chosen to make the manual perturbation calculations more manageable.) The LRVB-derived leverage scores are plotted as a function of x_n location on the lefthand side of Figure 2. We can see from the comparison on the righthand side of Figure 2 that the LRVB-derived leverage scores match well with the results of manual perturbation, which took over 30 times longer to compute.




Figure 2: Left: LRVB leverage scores by data point location. Right: leverage comparison.

As expected, the data points with the greatest effect on the location of a component are the ones most likely to be assigned to the component. Interestingly, though, data still retain leverage on a component even when they are assigned with certainty to the other component. Indeed, a data point assigned to one component with probability close to one will affect that component’s mean, which in turn affects the classification of other data points, which then affects the location of the other component. In this way, we see that LRVB is estimating covariances that are the results of complex chains of correlations.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Michael I. Jordan for suggesting that we look at linear response theory and Alex Blocker for helpful comments. R. Giordano and T. Broderick were funded by Berkeley Fellowships.

²Appendix C also includes a proof that this LRVB-limiting method reproduces classical leverage scores when applied to linear regression.

References

- [1] D. M. Blei, A. Y. Ng, and M. I. Jordan. Latent Dirichlet allocation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:993–1022, 2003.
- [2] D. M. Blei and M. I. Jordan. Variational inference for Dirichlet process mixtures. *Bayesian Analysis*, 1(1):121–143, 2006.
- [3] M. D. Hoffman, D. M. Blei, C. Wang, and J. Paisley. Stochastic variational inference. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(1):1303–1347, 2013.
- [4] B. Wang and M. Titterton. Inadequacy of interval estimates corresponding to variational Bayesian approximations. In *Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 373–380, 2004.
- [5] C. M. Bishop. *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. Springer, New York, 2006. Chapter 10.
- [6] H. Rue, S. Martino, and N. Chopin. Approximate Bayesian inference for latent Gaussian models by using integrated nested Laplace approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (statistical methodology)*, 71(2):319–392, 2009.
- [7] R. E. Turner and M. Sahani. Two problems with variational expectation maximisation for time-series models. In D. Barber, A. T. Cemgil, and S. Chiappa, editors, *Bayesian Time Series Models*. 2011.
- [8] H. J. Kappen and F. B. Rodriguez. Efficient learning in Boltzmann machines using linear response theory. *Neural Computation*, 10(5):1137–1156, 1998.
- [9] M. Welling and Y. W. Teh. Linear response algorithms for approximate inference in graphical models. *Neural Computation*, 16(1):197–221, 2004.
- [10] X. L. Meng and D. B. Rubin. Using EM to obtain asymptotic variance-covariance matrices: The SEM algorithm. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 86(416):899–909, 1991.

Appendices

A Linear response derivations

In this appendix, we will derive the terms in Eq. (5). First, we show that $\frac{d}{dt}\mathbb{E}_{p_t}\theta \approx \Sigma_{p_t}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dm_t}{dt^T} &\approx \frac{d}{dt^T}\mathbb{E}_{p_t}\theta = \frac{d}{dt^T} \int_{\theta} \theta e^{t^T\theta - F(t)} p(\theta|x) d\theta \\ &= \int_{\theta} \theta \theta^T e^{t^T\theta - F(t)} p(\theta|x) d\theta - \int_{\theta} \theta e^{t^T\theta - F(t)} p(\theta|x) d\theta \cdot \frac{\partial F(t)}{\partial t^T} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{p_t} [\theta\theta^T] - \mathbb{E}_{p_t} [\theta] \mathbb{E}_{p_t} [\theta]^T = \Sigma_{p_t} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Observe that in $\frac{dm_t}{dt^T}$ we are taking the total derivative – that is, as we change t we are finding a new MFVB estimate, m_t , for the perturbed likelihood. It is reasonable to expect that this derivative will be approximately equal to Σ_{p_t} when this estimate closely tracks the true means as t varies.

In contrast, the partial derivative $\frac{\partial M_t}{\partial t^T}$ keeps the estimates of m fixed but perturbs the variational mean function. This means that unlike the total derivative, which estimates the covariance of the full distribution, the partial derivative estimates the covariance matrix of the variational distribution, $q_t^*(\theta)$.

To see this, observe from the perturbed version of Eq. (3) that the perturbed natural parameter of $q_{j,t}^*$ is

$$\tilde{\eta}_{j,t} = \sum_{s=1:S} G_s \prod_{r \in R_s} m_r + t_j = \tilde{\eta}_k + t_j \quad (10)$$

Here, t_j denotes the components of the vector t associated with θ_j . Since the mean equation is a function of the natural parameter,

$$\begin{aligned} M_{j,t} &= M_{j,t}(\tilde{\eta}_{j,t}) = M_{j,t}(\tilde{\eta}_k + t_j) \\ \frac{\partial M_{j,t}}{\partial t_j^T} &= \frac{\partial M_{j,t}(\tilde{\eta}_{j,t})}{\partial \tilde{\eta}_{j,t}^T} \frac{\partial \tilde{\eta}_{j,t}}{\partial t_j^T} \\ &= \Sigma_{q_{j,t}^*} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_j^T} (\tilde{\eta}_k + t_j) \\ &= \Sigma_{q_{j,t}^*} \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\Sigma_{q_{j,t}^*}$ is the covariance of the variational distribution q_j^* . The derivatives of $M_{j,t}$ with respect to all the components other than t_j are zero. Stacking the derivatives of each of the $M_{j,t}$ gives the second term in Eq. (5).

$$\frac{\partial M_t}{\partial t^T} = \Sigma_{q_t^*}$$

Finally, note that $\frac{\partial M_t}{\partial m_t^T}$, has a simple form given the assumed factorization and Eq. (10).

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial M_{t,j}}{\partial m_t^T} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial m_t^T} \int_{\theta_j} \theta_j \exp(\eta_{t,j}^T \theta_j - A_j(\eta_{t,j})) d\theta_j \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_{t,j}^T} \int_{\theta_j} \theta_j \exp(\eta_{t,j}^T \theta_j - A_j(\eta_{t,j})) d\theta_j \frac{\partial \eta_{t,j}}{\partial m_t^T} \\ &= \Sigma_{q_{t,j}^*} \frac{\partial \eta_{t,j}}{\partial m_t^T} \end{aligned}$$

Again, stacking the j terms gives the third term in Eq. (5).

$$\frac{dM_t}{dm_t^T} = \Sigma_{q_t^*} \frac{\partial \eta_t}{\partial m_t^T}$$

B Exactness of a multivariate normal mean and SEM

In this appendix, we show that LRVB covariance correction is exact for the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. This draws a connection between LRVB corrections and the “supplemented expectation-maximization” (SEM) method of [10]. When a central limit theorem applies and the posterior is approximately multivariate normal, the LRVB correction is exact and the two estimates coincide.

B.1 Multivariate normal mean

Assume that x is drawn from the following distribution:

$$x \sim N(\theta, \Sigma).$$

Let us imagine that Σ is known, but we want to see how much a MFVB estimate of θ underestimates the marginal variance when it assumes independence between components. Partition θ and define a variational distribution like so:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta &= (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_j, \dots, \theta_J) \\ x &= (x_1, \dots, x_j, \dots, x_J) \\ \Sigma &= \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \cdots & \Sigma_{1j} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \Sigma_{1j} & \cdots & \Sigma_{jj} \end{bmatrix} \\ \ln P(\theta|x) &= -\frac{1}{2}(\theta - x)^T \Sigma^{-1}(\theta - x) - \frac{1}{2} \ln |\Sigma| + C \\ \ln q_j^*(\theta_j) &= (\theta_j - \mu_j) V_j^{-1}(\theta_j - \mu_j) - \frac{1}{2} \ln |V_j| + C \end{aligned}$$

The sufficient statistics for q_j^* are θ_j and $\theta_j \theta_j^T$. It happens that the LRVB correction for θ_j does not depend on the second moments (for brevity, we omit the proof of this here), so to lighten notation, we will only consider the sufficient statistics θ_j and take $\eta_j = V_j^{-1} \mu_j$ in the notation of Eq. (3).

Let the subscript R , for “rest”, denote all but the first partition, e.g. $\theta_R = \theta_{i:i \neq 1}$. By standard properties of the normal distribution, the variational updates are given by the conditional mean and variance of θ_1 given θ_{-1} and x . At step s ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1^{s+1} &= x_1 + \Sigma_{1R} \Sigma_{RR}^{-1} (\mu_R^s - x_R) \\ V_1^{s+1} &= \Sigma_{11}^{-1} - \Sigma_{1R}^T \Sigma_{RR}^{-1} \Sigma_{R1}. \end{aligned}$$

From this, we can write out M_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\theta_1} &= \mu_1 = E_{q_1^*}[\theta_1] \\ M_{1\theta} (m_{\theta_R}) &= x_1 + \Sigma_{1R} \Sigma_{RR}^{-1} (\mu_R - x_R). \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The updates never change V , and the means converge to $\mu_j = x_j$. We can now write down the terms in formula Eq. (5). Here, we will suppress the t subscripts on m and M since we will eventually evaluate at $t = 0$. Denoting the LRVB estimate of Σ by S , we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} m &= \begin{pmatrix} m_1 \\ m_R \end{pmatrix} \\ \frac{dm}{dt^T} &= S = \begin{bmatrix} S_{11} & S_{1R} \\ S_{R1} & S_{RR} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

From Eq. (11), we then have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial M_1}{\partial m_R^T} &= \Sigma_{1R}\Sigma_{RR}^{-1} \\ \frac{\partial M}{\partial m^T} &= \begin{pmatrix} \partial M_1/\partial m_1 & \partial M_1/\partial m_R \\ \partial M_R/\partial m_1 & \partial M_R/\partial m_R \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Sigma_{1R}\Sigma_{RR}^{-1} \\ Q_{R1} & Q_{RR} \end{pmatrix}\end{aligned}$$

The placeholder matrices Q_{R1} and Q_{RR} will be similar to those for component 1 but will depend on the precise partition of the vector θ .

We can read the variational covariance matrix by inspection:

$$\frac{\partial M}{\partial t^T} = \Sigma_{q^*} = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} - \Sigma_{1R}^T \Sigma_{RR}^{-1} \Sigma_{R1} & 0 \\ 0 & V_{RR} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Again, the placeholder matrix V_{RR} will depend on the precise partitioning of θ . We can now apply Eq. (6) to write down the covariance estimate, S .

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} I & \Sigma_{1R}\Sigma_{RR}^{-1} \\ Q_{R1} & I - Q_{RR} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} - \Sigma_{1R}^T \Sigma_{RR}^{-1} \Sigma_{R1} & 0 \\ 0 & V_{\theta,RR} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Finally, use the Schur compliment to get the first row of S^{-1} :

$$\begin{aligned}S^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} - \Sigma_{1R}^T \Sigma_{RR}^{-1} \Sigma_{R1} & 0 \\ 0 & V_{RR} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} I & \Sigma_{1R}\Sigma_{RR}^{-1} \\ Q_{R1} & I - Q_{RR} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (\Sigma_{11}^{-1} - \Sigma_{1R}^T \Sigma_{RR}^{-1} \Sigma_{R1})^{-1} & (\Sigma_{11}^{-1} - \Sigma_{1R}^T \Sigma_{RR}^{-1} \Sigma_{R1})^{-1} \Sigma_{1R}\Sigma_{RR}^{-1} \\ V_{RR}^{-1} Q_{R1} & V_{RR}^{-1} (I - Q_{RR}) \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

The first row can be recognized as the first row of Σ^{-1} , partitioned to match the variational partitioning, as calculated with the Schur complement. Since index 1 was chosen without loss of generality, it follows that all the rows are equal, that $S^{-1} = \Sigma^{-1}$, and that the LRVB estimator of the covariance of θ is exact.

B.2 Comparison with SEM

With this result for the multivariate normal in hand, supplemented expectation-maximization (SEM) can be seen as an asymptotic version of the LRVB correction. We will draw a term-by-term analogy with the equations in [10], denoting variables from the SEM paper with a superscript “SEM” to avoid confusion. MFVB does not differentiate between missing data and parameters to be estimated, so our θ corresponds to $(\theta^{SEM}, Y_{mis}^{SEM})$ in [10]. In comparison with the previous section, let us assume that our θ_1 corresponds to their θ^{SEM} , the parameters of interest. SEM is an asymptotic theory, so we may assume that $(\theta^{SEM}, Y_{mis}^{SEM})$ have a multivariate normal distribution, and that we are interested in the mean and covariance of θ^{SEM} . Since mean and mode of a normal distribution are the same, the E and M steps both correspond to conditional MFVB updates. Given this fact, our M_{θ_1} and their M^{SEM} are the same, and our $\partial M/\partial m$ of Eq. (5) corresponds to the transpose of their DM^{SEM} , defined in [10] equation (2.2.1). Since the “complete information” corresponds to the variance of θ^{SEM} with fixed values for Y_{OBS}^{SEM} , this is the same as our $\Sigma_{q^*,11}$, the variational covariance, whose inverse is I_{oc}^{-1} . Taken all together, this means that equation (2.4.6) of [10] written as our Eq. (6).

$$\begin{aligned}V^{SEM} &= I_{oc}^{-1} (I - DM^{SEM})^{-1} \rightarrow \\ \Sigma &= \Sigma_{q^*} \left(I - \left(\frac{\partial M}{\partial m^T} \right)^T \right)^{-1} = \left(I - \frac{\partial M}{\partial m^T} \right)^{-1} \Sigma_{q^*}\end{aligned}$$

C Leverage scores

In a linear model $y_i = \beta^T x_i + \epsilon$, leverage score estimates how much influence each observation x_i has on its fitted value, $\hat{y}_i = \hat{\beta}^T x_i$, through its influence on $\hat{\beta}$. In an analogous Bayesian way, we can use LRVB to estimate the correlation between infinitesimal noise in our observed data and our posterior estimates of $\theta = (\mu, \sigma, p)$ in the model of Section 4 .

In this appendix, we first show that covariance-based “leverage scores” described in Section 4.2 are the same as classical leverage scores for linear models. Then, we derive the leverage scores for the means of a normal mixture model.

C.1 Linear model leverage scores

Let us define a classical linear regression with known variance as

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &\sim \mathcal{N}(\beta^T x_i, \sigma^2) \\ \log p(Y|\beta) &= -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \beta^T X^T X \beta + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} Y^T X \beta + \text{constant}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, in order to take advantage of familiar matrix formulas for linear regression, we will use capital letters to denote vectors and matrices in this section. That is, Y is the vector of scalars y_i , X is the matrix formed by stacking the observations x_i^T . To recover leverage scores, suppose that instead of y_i , we observe normal random variables y_i^* , where:

$$\begin{aligned} E(y_i^*) &= y_i \\ \text{Var}(y_i^*) &= \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The variables y_i and y_i^* are analogous to the variables x_i and x_i^* of Section 4.2, respectively. We will then use MFVB to fit this model where the parameters to be estimated are $\theta = (Y^T, \beta^T)^T$ and we have a uniform improper prior on β . Since the posterior is multivariate normal, in this case the LRVB covariance matrices will be exact in light of Appendix B.

The terms in Eq. (6) are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{q_Y^*} &= \text{Var}(Y|\beta) = \epsilon I_z \\ \Sigma_{q_\beta^*} &= \text{Var}(\beta|Y) = (X^T X)^{-1} \sigma^2 \\ \frac{\partial \eta_\beta}{\partial m_Y^T} &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} X^T \\ \frac{\partial \eta_Y}{\partial m_\beta^T} &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} X \Rightarrow \\ I - \Sigma_{q^*} H &= \begin{pmatrix} I_\beta & -\sigma^2 (X^T X)^{-1} X^T \\ -\frac{\epsilon}{\sigma^2} X & I_Y \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The upper-left (β) component of $(I - \Sigma_{q^*} H)^{-1}$ can be calculated with the Schur complement:

$$\begin{aligned} (I - \Sigma_{q^*} H)_{\beta\beta}^{-1} &= \left(I_\beta - \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma^2} (X^T X)^{-1} X^T X \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma^2} \right)^{-1} I_\beta \\ &\equiv \alpha I_\beta, \end{aligned}$$

where we have defined $\alpha = \sigma^2 (\sigma^2 - \epsilon)^{-1}$. Note that $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \alpha = 1$. This gives the rest of the inverse and the covariance between Y and β :

$$\begin{aligned} (I - \Sigma_{q^*} H)^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha I_\beta & \alpha (X^T X)^{-1} X^T \\ \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma^2} X & (I_Y - \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma^2} P_X)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ \Sigma_p &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha I_\beta & \alpha (X^T X)^{-1} X^T \\ \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma^2} X & (I_Y - \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma^2} P_X)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^2 (X^T X)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon I_Y \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \sigma^2 (X^T X)^{-1} & \epsilon \alpha (X^T X)^{-1} X^T \\ \epsilon \alpha X (X^T X)^{-1} & \epsilon (I_Y - \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma^2} P_X)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where $P_X = X (X^T X)^{-1} X^T$ is the projection matrix onto X . This says that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\beta, Y) &= \epsilon \alpha (X^T X)^{-1} X^T \Rightarrow \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{Y}, Y) &= \text{Cov}(X\beta, Y) = X \text{Cov}(\beta, Y) \\ &= \epsilon \alpha P_X. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\epsilon \rightarrow 0 \Rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow 1$, the covariance between \hat{y}_i and z_i is proportional to the diagonal of P_X , which is exactly the classical leverage score.

C.2 Normal mixture leverage scores

We now consider leverage scores in the setting of Section 4.2, The new posterior with perturbed x observations is the original posterior plus a term for x^* :

$$\begin{aligned} \log p(\mu, \sigma, a, z, x|x^*) &= \log p(\mu, \sigma, a, z|x) + \log p(x|x^*) + \text{constant} \\ &= \log p(\mu, \sigma, a, z|x) - \frac{1}{2} \sigma_x^{-2} \sum_i (x_i - x_i^*)^2 + \text{constant} \end{aligned}$$

Considering infinitesimal noise in x will not change the point estimates of θ . Similarly, since $\sigma_x^2 \approx 0$, uncertainty in the parameters do not affect our inference about x , and its variational distribution is given by

$$\begin{aligned} E_{q^*}(x) &= x^* \\ \text{var}_{q^*}(x) &= I_n \sigma_x^2. \end{aligned}$$

To get the LRVB covariance, we need only to calculate the quantities in equation 6. In particular, we are interested in the sub-matrix $\Sigma_{m, \theta x}$, the estimated covariance between θ and x . To aid our computation, we will use Schur compliments and the fact that $\sigma_x^2 \approx 0$. In order to make the notation tidier, we will use some shorthand notation relative to the main body of the text

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma &:= \Sigma_m \\ V &:= \Sigma_{q^*} \\ R &:= \Sigma_{q^*} H. \end{aligned}$$

We partition each matrix into θ , x , and z blocks:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma &= \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{\theta\theta} & \Sigma_{\theta X} & \Sigma_{\theta Z} \\ \Sigma_{X\theta} & \Sigma_{XX} & \Sigma_{XZ} \\ \Sigma_{Z\theta} & \Sigma_{ZX} & \Sigma_{ZZ} \end{pmatrix} \\ R &= \begin{pmatrix} R_\theta & R_{\theta X} & R_{\theta Z} \\ R_{X\theta} & 0 & R_{XZ} \\ R_{Z\theta} & R_{ZX} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ V &= \begin{pmatrix} V_\theta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_x^2 I_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & V_Z \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We are interested in using equation 6, i.e. $\Sigma = (I - R)^{-1}V$, to find the sub-matrix in $\Sigma_{x\theta}$. (We could just as well find $\Sigma_{\theta x}$.) First, note that one can eliminate z immediately with a Schur complement. In general, if the matrices partition into two groups A and B , then

$$\Sigma_A = \left[I - R_{AA} - R_{AB}(I - R_{BB})^{-1}R_{BA} \right]^{-1} V_A. \quad (12)$$

In this case, let B refer to the z variables and a to everything else. Noting that $R_{ZZ} = 0$ and applying formula 12 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{\theta\theta} & \Sigma_{\theta X} \\ \Sigma_{X\theta} & \Sigma_{XX} \end{pmatrix} &= \left[\begin{pmatrix} I_\theta & 0 \\ 0 & I_X \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} R_\theta & R_{\theta X} \\ R_{X\theta} & 0 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} R_{\theta Z} \\ R_{XZ} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} R_{Z\theta} & R_{ZX} \end{pmatrix} \right]^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} V_\theta & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_X^2 I_n \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \left[\begin{pmatrix} I_\theta - R_\theta & -R_{\theta X} \\ -R_{X\theta} & I_X \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} R_{\theta Z}R_{Z\theta} & R_{\theta Z}R_{ZX} \\ R_{XZ}R_{Z\theta} & R_{XZ}R_{ZX} \end{pmatrix} \right]^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} V_\theta & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_X^2 I_n \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (I_\theta - R_\theta - R_{\theta Z}R_{Z\theta}) & (-R_{\theta X} - R_{\theta Z}R_{ZX}) \\ (-R_{X\theta} - R_{XZ}R_{Z\theta}) & (I_X - R_{XZ}R_{ZX}) \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} V_\theta & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_X^2 I_n \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

It will be enough to get the first row, $(\Sigma_{\theta\theta}, \Sigma_{\theta X})$, and for that we can use the Schur inverse.

$$\begin{aligned} BD^{-1}C &= (R_{\theta X} + R_{\theta Z}R_{ZX})(I_X - R_{XZ}R_{ZX})^{-1}(R_{X\theta} + R_{XZ}R_{Z\theta}) \\ A - BD^{-1}C &= I_\theta - R_\theta - R_{\theta Z}R_{Z\theta} - (R_{\theta X} + R_{\theta Z}R_{ZX})(I_X - R_{XZ}R_{ZX})^{-1}(R_{X\theta} + R_{XZ}R_{Z\theta}) \\ BD^{-1} &= -(R_{\theta X} + R_{\theta Z}R_{ZX})(I_X - R_{XZ}R_{ZX})^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Given these quantities, since the V matrix is block diagonal,

$$\Sigma_{\theta X} = -(A - BD^{-1}C)^{-1}BD^{-1}\sigma_X^2.$$

It will be helpful to simplify this by taking $\sigma_X^2 \rightarrow 0$. To aid in this, write:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{XZ} &= \sigma_X^2 Q_{XZ} \\ R_{X\theta} &= \sigma_X^2 Q_{X\theta} \\ D^{-1} &= (I_X - R_{XZ}R_{ZX})^{-1} = (I_X - \sigma_X^2 Q_{XZ}R_{ZX})^{-1} \\ &\approx I_X + \sigma_X^2 Q_{XZ}R_{ZX}. \end{aligned}$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned} A - BD^{-1}C &\approx I_\theta - R_\theta - R_{\theta Z}R_{Z\theta} - \sigma_X^2 (R_{\theta X} + R_{\theta Z}R_{ZX})(I_X + \sigma_X^2 Q_{XZ}R_{ZX})(Q_{X\theta} + Q_{XZ}R_{Z\theta}) \\ &\approx I_\theta - R_\theta - R_{\theta Z}R_{Z\theta} - \sigma_X^2 (R_{\theta X} + R_{\theta Z}R_{ZX})(Q_{X\theta} + Q_{XZ}R_{Z\theta}) \\ (A - BD^{-1}C)^{-1} &\approx (I_\theta - R_\theta - R_{\theta Z}R_{Z\theta} - \sigma_X^2 (R_{\theta X} + R_{\theta Z}R_{ZX})(Q_{X\theta} + Q_{XZ}R_{Z\theta}))^{-1} \\ &\approx (I_\theta - R_\theta - R_{\theta Z}R_{Z\theta})^{-1} \times \\ &\quad \left(I_\theta + \sigma_X^2 (I_\theta - R_\theta - R_{\theta Z}R_{Z\theta})^{-1} (R_{\theta X} + R_{\theta Z}R_{ZX})(Q_{X\theta} + Q_{XZ}R_{Z\theta}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} BD^{-1} &= -(R_{\theta X} + R_{\theta Z}R_{ZX})(I_X - \sigma_X^2 Q_{XZ}R_{ZX})^{-1} \\ &\approx -(R_{\theta X} + R_{\theta Z}R_{ZX})(I_X + \sigma_X^2 Q_{XZ}R_{ZX}). \end{aligned}$$

This uses the matrix version of this Taylor expansion:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1-r} &\approx 1+r \\ \frac{1}{x-r} &= \frac{x^{-1}}{1-x^{-1}r} \approx x^{-1}(1+x^{-1}r). \end{aligned}$$

as well as eliminating any term that exhibits terms that have second or higher powers of σ_X^2 . Observe that if $\sigma_X^2 = 0$, then this gives:

$$\Sigma_{\theta\theta}^0 V_\theta^{-1} = (I_\theta - R_\theta - R_{\theta Z}R_{Z\theta})^{-1}.$$

This is the covariance of θ before performing the sensitivity analysis. Substitute this in:

$$(A - BD^{-1}C)^{-1} \approx \Sigma_{\theta\theta}^0 V_\theta^{-1} (I_\theta + \sigma_X^2 \Sigma_{\theta\theta}^0 V_\theta^{-1} (R_{\theta X} + R_{\theta Z} R_{ZX}) (Q_{X\theta} + Q_{XZ} R_{Z\theta})).$$

Now things are tidy enough to plug in for $\Sigma_{\theta X}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{\theta X} &= -(A - BD^{-1}C)^{-1} BD^{-1} (\sigma_X^2 I_X) \\ &\approx \Sigma_{\theta\theta}^0 V_\theta^{-1} (I_\theta + \sigma_X^2 \Sigma_{\theta\theta}^0 V_\theta^{-1} (R_{\theta X} + R_{\theta Z} R_{ZX}) (Q_{X\theta} + Q_{XZ} R_{Z\theta})) \times \\ &\quad (R_{\theta X} + R_{\theta Z} R_{ZX}) (I_X + \sigma_X^2 Q_{XZ} R_{ZX}) \sigma_X^2 I_X \\ &\approx \sigma_X^2 \Sigma_{\theta\theta}^0 V_\theta^{-1} (R_{\theta X} + R_{\theta Z} R_{ZX}) (I_X + \sigma_X^2 Q_{XZ} R_{ZX}) \\ &\approx \sigma_X^2 \Sigma_{\theta\theta}^0 V_\theta^{-1} (R_{\theta X} + R_{\theta Z} R_{ZX}). \end{aligned}$$

The final result is appealingly simple.

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{\theta x} &= \sigma_x^2 L_{\theta X} \\ L_{\theta x} &:= \Sigma_{m,\theta} \Sigma_{q^*,\theta}^{-1} (R_{\theta X} + R_{\theta Z} R_{ZX}). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The quantities $L_{\theta x}$ are the leverage scores that are plotted in figure 2.