

Free Energy Evaluation Using Marginalized Annealed Importance Sampling

Muneki Yasuda* and Chako Takahashi

Graduate School of Science and Engineering, Yamagata University, Japan.

The evaluation of the free energy of a stochastic model is considered to be a significant issue in various fields of physics and machine learning. However, the exact free energy evaluation is computationally infeasible because it includes an intractable partition function. Annealed importance sampling (AIS) is a type of importance sampling based on the Markov chain Monte Carlo method, which is similar to a simulated annealing, and can effectively approximate the free energy. This study proposes a new AIS-based approach, referred to as marginalized AIS (mAIS). The statistical efficiency of mAIS is investigated in detail based on a theoretical and numerical perspectives. Based on the investigation, it has been proved that mAIS is more effective than AIS under a certain condition.

Keywords: free energy evaluation, annealed importance sampling, marginalized annealed importance sampling, Ising model, restricted Boltzmann machine

I. INTRODUCTION

The evaluation of the free energy (i.e., the negative log of the partition function) of a stochastic model is considered to be an important issue in various fields of physics. Moreover, the free energy plays an important role in machine learning models, e.g., Boltzmann machine [1]. Boltzmann machine and its variants, e.g., restricted Boltzmann machine (RBM) [2, 3] and deep Boltzmann machine (DBM) [4], have been actively investigated in the fields of machine learning and physics [5–11]. However, the exact free energy evaluation is computationally infeasible, because it includes an intractable partition function.

Annealed importance sampling (AIS) [12] is a type of importance sampling based on the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method, which is similar to simulated annealing, and can effectively approximate the free energy [12, 13]. In AIS, from a tractable initial distribution to the target distribution, a sequential sampling (or ancestral sampling) is executed, in which the transitions between the distributions are performed using, for example, Gibbs sampling [14]. The AIS-based free energy evaluation is essentially the same as the method proposed by Jarzynski (the so-called Jarzynski equality) [15]. Several researchers have addressed the improvement of AIS [16–21]. In AIS, the free energy is estimated as follows: first, we obtain the estimator of the partition function based on the sample average of *the importance weights*, which are obtained during the sequential sampling process, and subsequently, the free energy estimator is obtained as the negative log of the obtained partition function estimator. It is known that the partition function estimator is unbiased, whereas the free energy estimator is biased [16].

To evaluate the free energy, we propose a new AIS-based approach, referred to as *marginalized AIS* (mAIS). The concept of mAIS is simple; mAIS corresponds to AIS in a marginalized model. Therefore, the basic principle

of mAIS is similar to AIS. Suppose that our target model represents a distribution in n dimensional space. With regard to AIS, we perform a sampling procedure in the n dimensional space to evaluate the free energy. However, in mAIS, the dimensional space, where the sampling procedure is performed, is smaller because the dimension of the model is reduced through marginalization. Intuitively, mAIS seems to be more effective than AIS considering the aforementioned statement. This intuition is valid under a certain condition. Under the condition, the following two statements can be proved (see section III B): (1) the partition function estimator obtained from mAIS is more accurate than that obtained from AIS, and (2) the bias of the free energy estimator obtained from mAIS is lower than that of the estimator obtained from AIS. However, as discussed in section III B, the condition assumed in the aforementioned statements limits the range in which the effectiveness of mAIS is assured. As discussed in section III C, this condition can be satisfied with regard to the use AIS and mAIS on Markov random fields (MRFs) defined on bipartite graphs. Moreover, a layer-wised marginal operation can be performed in bipartite-type MRFs. Bipartite-type MRFs include important applications, e.g., RBM and DBM.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section II explains the AIS-based free energy evaluation. Section III introduces mAIS Section III A details mAIS. Section III B describes the theoretical analysis of mAIS, and section III C discusses the application of mAIS to bipartite-type MRFs Section IV numerically demonstrates the validity of mAIS. Section V summarizes the study, along with discussions.

II. FREE ENERGY EVALUATION USING ANNEALED IMPORTANCE SAMPLING

Consider a distribution with n random variables, $\mathbf{x} := \{x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i \mid i \in U := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}\}$, as

$$P_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{Z} \exp(-E(\mathbf{x})), \quad (1)$$

* muneki@yz.yamagata-u.ac.jp

where \mathcal{X}_i is the continuous or discrete sample space of x_i and $E(\mathbf{x})$ is the energy function (or the Hamiltonian); Z is the partition function defined as

$$Z := \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \exp(-E(\mathbf{x})), \quad (2)$$

where $\sum_{\mathbf{x}} := \sum_{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1} \sum_{x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2} \cdots \sum_{x_n \in \mathcal{X}_n}$ denotes the multiple summation over all realizations of \mathbf{x} . When \mathcal{X}_i exhibits a continuous space, \sum_{x_i} is replaced by the integration over \mathcal{X}_i .

This study evaluates free energy $F := -\ln Z$. The evaluation of the free energy is infeasible because it requires the evaluation of the intractable partition function. AIS is a type of importance sampling based on the MCMC method, which is similar to simulated annealing, and can evaluate the free energy [12, 13]. This free energy evaluation method is essentially the same as the method proposed by Jarzynski [15]. The AIS-based free energy evaluation is briefly explained in the following.

First, we design a sequence of distributions as

$$\{P_k(\mathbf{x}) \mid k = 0, 1, \dots, K\}, \quad (3)$$

where $P_K(\mathbf{x}) = P_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{x})$, and each $P_k(\mathbf{x})$ is expressed as

$$P_k(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{Z_k} \exp(-E_k(\mathbf{x})), \quad (4)$$

where Z_k is the partition function of the k th distribution. Because $P_K(\mathbf{x}) = P_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{x})$, $E_k(\mathbf{x}) = E(\mathbf{x})$ and $Z_k = Z$ are assumed. In this sequence, the initial distribution $P_0(\mathbf{x})$ is set to a tractable distribution (e.g., a uniform distribution). For example, the sequence expressed as

$$P_k(\mathbf{x}) \propto P_0(\mathbf{x})^{1-\beta_k} P_{\text{model}}(\mathbf{x})^{\beta_k}, \quad (5)$$

for $0 = \beta_0 < \beta_1 < \cdots < \beta_K = 1$, is frequently used, where β_k corresponds to the annealing temperature. The k th distribution expressed by equation (5) corresponds to equation (4) with $E_k(\mathbf{x}) = (1 - \beta_k) \ln P_0(\mathbf{x}) + \beta_k E(\mathbf{x})$. However, we pursue the following arguments without specifying the form of $E_k(\mathbf{x})$.

On the k th distribution, a transition probability $T_k(\mathbf{x}' \mid \mathbf{x})$, which satisfies the condition

$$P_k(\mathbf{x}') = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} T_k(\mathbf{x}' \mid \mathbf{x}) P_k(\mathbf{x}), \quad (6)$$

is defined. Using the transition probability, the annealing process from the initial state $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}$ to the final state $\mathbf{x}^{(K)}$ is defined as

$$T(\mathbf{X}) := \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} T_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k+1)} \mid \mathbf{x}^{(k)}) \right) P_0(\mathbf{x}^{(1)}), \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{X} := \{\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \mid k = 0, 1, \dots, K\}$. $T(\mathbf{X})$ denotes the joint distribution over \mathbf{X} . For $T(\mathbf{X})$, the corresponding ‘‘reverse’’ process,

$$\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}) := \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} \tilde{T}_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \mid \mathbf{x}^{(k+1)}) \right) P_K(\mathbf{x}^{(K)}), \quad (8)$$

is defined, where

$$\tilde{T}_k(\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x}') := \frac{T_k(\mathbf{x}' \mid \mathbf{x}) P_k(\mathbf{x})}{P_k(\mathbf{x}')} \quad (9)$$

is the reverse transition. Because the normalization condition, $\sum_{\mathbf{x}} \tilde{T}_k(\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x}') = 1$, is ensured from the condition in equation (6), $\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X})$ can be considered as the joint distribution over \mathbf{X} ; it satisfies

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}^{(1)}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}^{(2)}} \cdots \sum_{\mathbf{x}^{(K-1)}} \tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}) = P_K(\mathbf{x}^{(K)}).$$

AIS is regarded as the importance sampling, in which $\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X})$ and $T(\mathbf{X})$ are considered the target and corresponding proposal distributions, respectively. Using equations (7), (8), and (9), the ratio between the target and proposal distributions, i.e., the (normalized) importance weight, is obtained as

$$\frac{\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X})}{T(\mathbf{X})} = \frac{Z_0}{Z_K} W(\mathbf{X}), \quad (10)$$

where

$$W(\mathbf{X}) := \prod_{k=1}^K w_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \quad (11)$$

$$w_k(\mathbf{x}) := \exp(-E_k(\mathbf{x}) + E_{k-1}(\mathbf{x})). \quad (12)$$

Here, Z_0 is the partition function of $P_0(\mathbf{x})$ (i.e., a tractable distribution) and $Z_K = Z$ is the true partition function of the objective distribution. From the normalization condition of $\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X})$, the relation,

$$1 = \sum_{\mathbf{X}} \frac{\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X})}{T(\mathbf{X})} T(\mathbf{X}),$$

is obtained. Substituting equation (10) into this relation yields

$$Z_K = Z_0 \sum_{\mathbf{X}} W(\mathbf{X}) T(\mathbf{X}), \quad (13)$$

where $\sum_{\mathbf{X}} := \sum_{\mathbf{x}^{(1)}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}^{(2)}} \cdots \sum_{\mathbf{x}^{(K)}}$ denotes the multiple summation over all realizations of \mathbf{X} .

Sampling from the proposal distribution can be performed using ancestral sampling, from $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}$ to $\mathbf{x}^{(K)}$, on $T(\mathbf{X})$, i.e., the sequence of the sample points, $\mathbf{X} := \{\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(K)}\}$, is generated by the following sampling process:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^{(1)} &\leftarrow P_0(\mathbf{x}), \\ \mathbf{x}^{(k)} &\leftarrow T_{k-1}(\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x}^{(k-1)}) \quad (k = 2, 3, \dots, K). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Using N independent sample sequences $S_T := \{\mathbf{X}_\mu \mid \mu = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$ obtained from this ancestral sampling process conducted N times, equation (13) is approximated as

$$Z \approx Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T) := \frac{Z_0}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^N W(\mathbf{X}_\mu). \quad (15)$$

Using equation (15), the free energy is approximated as

$$\begin{aligned} F &\approx F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T) := -\ln Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T) \\ &= -\ln Z_0 - \ln \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^N W(\mathbf{X}_\mu) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

$Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)$ is an unbiased estimator for the true partition function because its expectation converges to Z : $\mathbb{E}_T[Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)] = Z$, where $\mathbb{E}_T[\dots]$ denotes the expectation of the distribution over $S_T = \{\mathbf{X}_\mu\}$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}_T[\dots] := \left(\prod_{\mu=1}^N \sum_{\mathbf{X}_\mu} T(\mathbf{X}_\mu) \right) (\dots). \quad (17)$$

However, $F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)$ is not an unbiased estimator for the true free energy [16]. Using Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_T[F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)] &= -\mathbb{E}_T[\ln Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)] \\ &\geq -\ln \mathbb{E}_T[Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)] = F \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

is obtained, which implies that the expectation of $F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)$ provides an upper bound on the true free energy.

III. PROPOSED METHOD

Suppose that \mathbf{x} is divided into two mutually disjoint sets: $\mathbf{v} := \{v_i \mid i \in V\}$ and $\mathbf{h} := \{h_j \mid j \in H\}$, i.e., $U = V \cup H$ and $V \cap H = \emptyset$; therefore, $P_k(\mathbf{x})$ can be considered as the joint distribution over \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{h} : $P_k(\mathbf{x}) = P_k(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h})$. The method discussed in Section II is regarded as AIS based on this joint distribution. In contrast, mAIS proposed in this section is regarded as AIS based on a *marginal* distribution of $P_k(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h})$.

A. Marginalized annealed importance sampling

For the sequence of the distributions in equation (3), we introduce the sequence of their marginal distributions as

$$\{P_k(\mathbf{v}) \mid k = 0, 1, \dots, K\}, \quad (19)$$

where $P_k(\mathbf{v})$ is the marginal distribution of $P_k(\mathbf{x})$, i.e.,

$$P_k(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{\mathbf{h}} P_k(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z_k} \exp(-E_V(\mathbf{v}, k)), \quad (20)$$

where

$$E_V(\mathbf{v}, k) := -\ln \sum_{\mathbf{h}} \exp(-E_k(\mathbf{x})) \quad (21)$$

is the energy function of the marginal distribution. From the definition, the partition functions of $P_k(\mathbf{x})$ and $P_k(\mathbf{v})$ are the same.

Based on the sequence of the marginal distributions in equation (19), in a similar manner to equation (7), the annealing process from the initial state $\mathbf{v}^{(1)}$ to the final state $\mathbf{v}^{(K)}$ can be defined as

$$\tau(\mathbf{V}) := \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} \tau_k(\mathbf{v}^{(k+1)} \mid \mathbf{v}^{(k)}) \right) P_0(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}), \quad (22)$$

where $\mathbf{V} := \{\mathbf{v}^{(k)} \mid k = 0, 1, \dots, K\}$ and $\tau_k(\mathbf{v}' \mid \mathbf{v})$ is the transition probability on the marginal distribution in equation (20). The transition probability satisfies the following condition:

$$P_k(\mathbf{v}') = \sum_{\mathbf{v}} \tau_k(\mathbf{v}' \mid \mathbf{v}) P_k(\mathbf{v}). \quad (23)$$

Using almost the same derivation to obtain equation (13), we derive

$$Z_K = Z_0 \sum_{\mathbf{V}} \Lambda(\mathbf{V}) \tau(\mathbf{V}), \quad (24)$$

where $\Lambda(\mathbf{V})$ is the importance weight of mAIS defined as

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{V}) := \prod_{k=1}^K \lambda_k(\mathbf{v}^{(k)}), \quad (25)$$

where

$$\lambda_k(\mathbf{v}) := \exp(-E_V(\mathbf{v}, k) + E_V(\mathbf{v}, k-1)). \quad (26)$$

In mAIS, the free energy can be evaluated using a technique similar to the derivation of equation (16). The sequence of the sample points, $\mathbf{V} := \{\mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \mathbf{v}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{v}^{(K)}\}$, is generated based on the ancestral sampling on $\tau(\mathbf{V})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}^{(1)} &\leftarrow P_0(\mathbf{v}), \\ \mathbf{v}^{(k)} &\leftarrow \tau_{k-1}(\mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{v}^{(k-1)}) \quad (k = 2, 3, \dots, K). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

By conducting this ancestral sampling process N times, N independent sample sequences $S_\tau := \{\mathbf{V}_\mu \mid \mu = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$ are obtained, and subsequently, using the N sample sequences, equation (24) is approximated as

$$Z \approx Z_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau) := \frac{Z_0}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^N \Lambda(\mathbf{V}_\mu). \quad (28)$$

Therefore, the free energy is evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} F &\approx F_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau) := -\ln Z_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau) \\ &= -\ln Z_0 - \ln \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^N \Lambda(\mathbf{V}_\mu) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Similar to $Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)$, $Z_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)$ acts as an unbiased estimator for the true partition function because $\mathbb{E}_\tau[Z_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)] = Z$, where $\mathbb{E}_\tau[\dots]$ denotes the expectation of the distribution over $S_\tau = \{\mathbf{V}_\mu\}$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}_\tau[\dots] := \left(\prod_{\mu=1}^N \sum_{\mathbf{V}_\mu} \tau(\mathbf{V}_\mu) \right) (\dots). \quad (30)$$

Similar to equation (18), based on Jensen's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}_\tau[F_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)] \geq F \quad (31)$$

can be obtained; therefore, $F_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)$ is not an unbiased estimator for the true free energy as is the case with $F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)$.

In the aforementioned discussions, we have considered mAIS based on the sequence of $P_k(\mathbf{v})$ (we refer to this mAIS as ‘‘mAIS-V’’). An opposite mAIS (referred to as ‘‘mAIS-H’’), which is based on the sequence of

$$P_k(\mathbf{h}) = \sum_{\mathbf{v}} P_k(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z_k} \exp(-E_H(\mathbf{h}, k)), \quad (32)$$

where

$$E_H(\mathbf{h}, k) := -\ln \sum_{\mathbf{v}} \exp(-E_k(\mathbf{x})), \quad (33)$$

can be constructed in the same manner. However, we do not need to consider mAIS-H separately because the difference between the methods is the way of labeling variables, i.e., mAIS-V is identified with mAIS-H by exchanging the labels of variable sets. Therefore, we consider mAIS-V as mAIS in this paper.

Theoretically, mAIS can be applied to any models. However, whether it is practical or not strongly depend on the structures of $\{P_k(\mathbf{x})\}$ because mAIS requires the marginal operation, as expressed in equation (20). mAIS can be efficiently applied to a bipartite-type MRF (i.e., an MRF defined on a bipartite undirected graph), which will be discussed in Section III C.

Suppose that we have a model that mAIS can be efficiently applied to. Therefore, the free energy of the model can be evaluated based on the two methods, i.e., $F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)$ and $F_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)$. Now, our question is ‘‘which method is more efficient?’’ Intuitively, mAIS seems to be better because the entire sample space of the variables is reduced through marginalization (it is similar to the concept of *Rao-Blackwellization* [22]). This intuition is true under a certain condition, which is discussed in the next section.

B. Statistical efficiency of mAIS

First, we compare the statistical efficiencies of the two estimators for the partition function, i.e., $Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)$ and $Z_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)$. The variance of $Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)$ is

$$\mathbb{V}_T[Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)] = \frac{1}{N} \left(Z_0^2 \sum_{\mathbf{X}} W(\mathbf{X})^2 T(\mathbf{X}) - Z^2 \right), \quad (34)$$

where $\mathbb{V}_T[A] := \mathbb{E}_T[A^2] - \mathbb{E}_T[A]^2$. The variance of $Z_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)$ is

$$\mathbb{V}_\tau[Z_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)] = \frac{1}{N} \left(Z_0^2 \sum_{\mathbf{V}} \Lambda(\mathbf{V})^2 \tau(\mathbf{V}) - Z^2 \right), \quad (35)$$




FIG. 1. State transition, from the previous to next states, according to equation (36).

where $\mathbb{V}_\tau[A] := \mathbb{E}_\tau[A^2] - \mathbb{E}_\tau[A]^2$. As discussed in Sections II and III A, both estimators are unbiased; therefore, the estimator with smaller variance is more effective.

Assume that the transition probability of AIS is expressed as

$$T_k(\mathbf{x}' | \mathbf{x}) = P_k(\mathbf{h}' | \mathbf{v}') \tau_k(\mathbf{v}' | \mathbf{v}), \quad (36)$$

where $\tau_k(\mathbf{v}' | \mathbf{v})$ is the transition probability of mAIS satisfying equation (23), and

$$P_k(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v}) = \frac{P_k(\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{\mathbf{h}} P_k(\mathbf{x})} = \frac{\exp(-E_k(\mathbf{x}))}{\exp(-E_V(\mathbf{v}, k))} \quad (37)$$

is the conditional distribution on $P_k(\mathbf{x})$. According to equation (36), the state transition from \mathbf{x} to \mathbf{x}' is performed as follows: first, the state of \mathbf{v} is updated to \mathbf{v}' according to $\tau_k(\mathbf{v}' | \mathbf{v})$; subsequently, the state of \mathbf{h} is updated to \mathbf{h}' according to $P_k(\mathbf{h}' | \mathbf{v}')$ (see figure 1). The use of the transition probability of equation (36) is accepted in AIS because it satisfies the condition of equation (6) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{x}} P_k(\mathbf{h}' | \mathbf{v}') \tau_k(\mathbf{v}' | \mathbf{v}) P_k(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= P_k(\mathbf{h}' | \mathbf{v}') \underbrace{\sum_{\mathbf{v}} \tau_k(\mathbf{v}' | \mathbf{v}) P_k(\mathbf{v})}_{P_k(\mathbf{v}')} = P_k(\mathbf{x}'). \end{aligned}$$

Based on this assumption, the following theorem can be obtained.

Theorem 1 $Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)$ and $Z_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)$ are unbiased estimators for Z defined in equations (13) and (24), respectively. For the two estimators, the inequality

$$\mathbb{V}_T[Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)] \geq \mathbb{V}_\tau[Z_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)]$$

always holds, if the transition probabilities of AIS and mAIS satisfy the condition expressed in equation (36).

Based on this theorem, it is ensured that $Z_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)$ is statistically more efficient. The proof of this theorem is presented in Appendix A 1.

Next, the statistical efficiencies of the two estimators for the free energy, i.e., $F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)$ and $F_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)$, are compared. As expressed in equations (18) and (31), $\mathbb{E}_T[F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)]$ and $\mathbb{E}_\tau[F_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)]$ are upper bounds on the true free energy. Based on the assumption of equation (36), the following theorem can be obtained.




FIG. 2. Square-grid graph can be regarded as a bipartite graph.

Theorem 2 $F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)$ and $F_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)$ are biased estimators for F defined in equations (16) and (29), respectively. For the two estimators, the inequality

$$\mathbb{E}_T[F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)] \geq \mathbb{E}_\tau[F_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)] \geq F$$

always holds, if the transition probabilities of AIS and mAIS satisfy the condition expressed in equation (36).

Based on this theorem, although $F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)$ and $F_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)$ are biased, the bias of $F_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)$ is ensured to be smaller. The proof of this theorem is presented in Appendix A 2. The aforementioned do not depend on the details of the setting: the design of $E_k(\mathbf{x})$ and the values of N and K ; only the condition in equation (36) is required.

We have proved that mAIS is statistically more efficient than AIS with regard to the partition function and free energy. The remaining issue is that whether this condition is satisfied in practical situations. This condition significantly limits the modeling of $T_k(\mathbf{x}' | \mathbf{x})$; e.g., the standard (synchronous or asynchronous) Gibbs sampling on $P_k(\mathbf{x})$ does not satisfy the condition because it uses the states of \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{h} to obtain the subsequent states. As explained in Section III C, the state transition according to equation (36) can be natural and practical when $P_k(\mathbf{x})$ is a bipartite-type MRF.

In Theorems 1 and 2, the condition of equation (36) is not a necessary condition but a sufficient condition. This implies the possibility of the relaxation of the condition. However, it is an open problem.

C. Application to bipartite-type MRFs

The proposed mAIS is applicable when the marginal operation in equation (20) is feasible. Owing to this restriction, the range of application of mAIS is limited. As discussed below, mAIS is practical on bipartite-type MRFs, which include important applications such as RBM and DBM (a DBM can be observed as a bipartite-type MRF [11]). Moreover, a square-grid-type MRF is regarded as a bipartite-type MRF (see Fig. 2).

Suppose that $P_k(\mathbf{x})$ is a bipartite-type MRF and that \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{h} are the variables of each layers. In this case, the energy function $E_k(\mathbf{x})$ can be expressed as

$$E_k(\mathbf{x}) = - \sum_{i \in V} \phi_i^{(k)}(v_i) - \sum_{j \in H} \phi_j^{(k)}(h_j)$$

$$- \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{j \in H} \psi_{i,j}^{(k)}(v_i, h_j), \quad (38)$$

where $\phi_i^{(k)}$ and $\psi_{i,j}^{(k)}$ are one- and two-variable functions determined based on the design of $\{P_k(\mathbf{x})\}$; the marginal operation in equation (20) is feasible and leads to

$$E_V(\mathbf{v}, k) = - \sum_{i \in V} \phi_i^{(k)}(v_i) - \sum_{j \in H} \ln \sum_{h_j} \exp(\phi_j^{(k)}(h_j) + \sum_{i \in V} \psi_{i,j}^{(k)}(v_i, h_j)). \quad (39)$$

On the bipartite-type MRF, the layer-wise blocked Gibbs sampling based on the conditional distributions $P_k(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v})$ and $P_k(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{h})$ can be easily implemented, where $P_k(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v})$ is the conditional distribution presented in equation (37) and

$$P_k(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{h}) = \frac{P_k(\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{\mathbf{v}} P_k(\mathbf{x})} = \frac{\exp(-E_k(\mathbf{x}))}{\exp(-E_H(\mathbf{h}, k))}, \quad (40)$$

because \mathbf{v} are conditional independent from each other in $P_k(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{h})$ and \mathbf{h} are also conditional independent from each other in $P_k(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v})$, i.e.,

$$P_k(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{h}) \propto \prod_{i \in V} \exp\left(\phi_i^{(k)}(v_i) + \sum_{j \in H} \psi_{i,j}^{(k)}(v_i, h_j)\right),$$

$$P_k(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v}) \propto \prod_{j \in H} \exp\left(\phi_j^{(k)}(h_j) + \sum_{i \in V} \psi_{i,j}^{(k)}(v_i, h_j)\right).$$

Based on the layer-wise blocked Gibbs sampling, the transition probability of mAIS can be modeled as

$$\tau_k(\mathbf{v}' | \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{\mathbf{h}} P_k(\mathbf{v}' | \mathbf{h}) P_k(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v}), \quad (41)$$

which satisfies the condition in equation (23) as follows:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}} \sum_{\mathbf{h}} P_k(\mathbf{v}' | \mathbf{h}) P_k(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v}) P_k(\mathbf{v}) = P_k(\mathbf{v}').$$

This transition probability can be considered as a collapsed Gibbs sampling [23]. From equations (36) and (41), when the transition probability of AIS is modeled by

$$T_k(\mathbf{x}' | \mathbf{x}) = P_k(\mathbf{h}' | \mathbf{v}') \sum_{\mathbf{h}} P_k(\mathbf{v}' | \mathbf{h}) P_k(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v}), \quad (42)$$

the theoretical results mentioned in Section III B (Theorems 1 and 2) are applicable. Approximating the expectations in equations (41) and (42) using the sampling approximation with one sample point leads to the widely used sampling procedures on bipartite-type MRFs (see figure 3).




FIG. 3. State transitions on a bipartite-type MRF based on the one-sample approximation of equations (41) and (42): the transitions of (a) mAIS and (b) AIS. The transitions between the layers (illustrated by the arrows) are the blocked Gibbs sampling based on $P_k(\mathbf{h} | \mathbf{v})$ and $P_k(\mathbf{v} | \mathbf{h})$.

IV. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

The performance of mAIS (i.e., mAIS-V) is examined using numerical experiments on an RBM whose energy function is defined as

$$E(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{T} \left(\sum_{i \in V} b_i v_i + \sum_{j \in H} c_j h_j + \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{j \in H} w_{i,j} v_i h_j \right), \quad (43)$$

where $v_i, h_j \in \{-1, +1\}$ and $T > 0$ is the temperature of the RBM. On the RBM, the distribution sequence, $\{P_k(\mathbf{x})\}$, is designed according to equation (5), where $\beta_{k+1} = \beta_k + 1/K$ and the initial distribution $P_0(\mathbf{x})$ is fixed to a uniform distribution; therefore, in this case, $E_k(\mathbf{x})$ and $E_V(\mathbf{v}, k)$ in equations (38) and (39) are

$$E_k(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{\beta_k}{T} \left(\sum_{i \in V} b_i v_i + \sum_{j \in H} c_j h_j + \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{j \in H} w_{i,j} v_i h_j \right)$$

and

$$E_V(\mathbf{v}, k) = -\frac{\beta_k}{T} \sum_{i \in V} b_i v_i - \sum_{j \in H} \ln 2 \cosh \frac{\beta_k}{T} \left(c_j + \sum_{i \in V} w_{i,j} v_i \right),$$

respectively. In the following experiments, b_i s and c_j s were independently drawn from a uniform distribution in $[-0.001, +0.001]$, and $w_{i,j}$ s are independently drawn from a normal distribution whose mean is zero and variance is $1/n$; the sizes of the sample set and \mathbf{v} were fixed to $N = 1000$ and $|V| = 20$. In this section, the blocked Gibbs sampling shown in figure 3 was used for the state transitions of AIS and mAIS.

Figure 4 shows the absolute percentage error (APE) between the true free energy, $f := F/n$, and its approximation, $f_{\text{app}} := F_{\text{app}}/n$, obtained using AIS or mAIS, against the inverse temperature $1/T$, where the APE is defined as

$$\text{APE} := 100 \times \frac{|f - f_{\text{app}}|}{|f|} [\%]. \quad (44)$$

In this experiment, the size of \mathbf{h} is fixed to $|H| = 40$. We observe that the APEs obtained using mAIS are always




FIG. 4. APEs versus $1/T$ for $K = 10, 30$ and 60 . These plots represent the average values over 1000 experiments.

lower than those obtained using AIS, as supported by Theorem 1. mAIS is particularly effective in the high-temperature region.

Next, we compare the true free energy f with the trial averages of its approximations, $\mathbb{E}_{\text{trial}}[f_{\text{app}}]$, where $\mathbb{E}_{\text{trial}}[\dots]$ was estimated based on the average of 30 trials. The trial average can be regarded as the approximation of $\mathbb{E}_S[\dots]$ in AIS or $\mathbb{E}_{S_r}[\dots]$ in mAIS. The results are listed in table I. In this experiment, the size of \mathbf{h} was fixed to $|H| = 40$. The estimates of AIS and mAIS are higher than the true free energy and the estimates of mAIS are lower than those of AIS, as supported by Theorem 2.

Finally, we investigate the relative accuracy of mAIS compared with AIS for fraction $\alpha := |H|/|V|$. The aforementioned two experiments correspond to the cases of $\alpha = 2$. Intuitively, mAIS is more efficient for a larger α because as α increases, the fraction of the size of remaining variables through marginalization to n reduces (in other words, the dimension of space evaluated by the sampling approximation relatively shrinks). However, the theoretical results obtained in section III B do not directly support this assumption. Thus, we check the relative accuracy for several α values using numerical experiments. In the experiments, the relative accuracy is measured by the ratio of the APEs obtained using AIS and mAIS, i.e.,

$$r := \frac{\text{APE of AIS}}{\text{APE of mAIS}} = \frac{|f - f_{\text{AIS}}|}{|f - f_{\text{mAIS}}|}.$$

The relative accuracy increases as r increases. The distributions of $\ln r$ for $1/T = 0.5, 1$, and 2 are shown in figures 5–7, respectively. Each distribution in these figures was created based on the kernel density estimation [24] using the results obtained from 40000 experiments, in which the Gaussian kernel with a bandwidth (or smoothing parameter) of 0.25 was used. In all cases, the distributions transit to the positive direction with an increase in α ; it implies that the relative accuracy monotonically improves as α increases. This result implies that we should use mAIS-V when $\alpha > 1$ and mAIS-H when $\alpha < 1$.

TABLE I. Comparison of the true free energy f with the trial averages of its approximations, $\mathbb{E}_{\text{trial}}[f_{\text{app}}]$, obtained using AIS and mAIS, for several T and K values. The values are the average values obtained over 1000 experiments.

$1/T$	true	AIS			mAIS		
		K			K		
		10	30	60	10	30	60
0.2	-0.69759	-0.69759	-0.69759	-0.69759	-0.69759	-0.69759	-0.69759
0.4	-0.71084	-0.71083	-0.71084	-0.71084	-0.71084	-0.71084	-0.71084
0.8	-0.76376	-0.76373	-0.76375	-0.76375	-0.76375	-0.76376	-0.76376
1	-0.80306	-0.80300	-0.80305	-0.80305	-0.80305	-0.80306	-0.80306
2	-1.10992	-1.10782	-1.10977	-1.10987	-1.10963	-1.10987	-1.10990
4	-1.95593	-1.93328	-1.95345	-1.95545	-1.95143	-1.95535	-1.95575
8	-3.80281	-3.70846	-3.78813	-3.79920	-3.78087	-3.79925	-3.80186




FIG. 5. Distributions of $\ln r$ for several α values when $1/T = 0.5$: (a) $K = 10$, (b) $K = 30$, and (c) $K = 60$.

V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In this study, we have proposed mAIS, which is identified as AIS on a marginalized model. The proposed method is regarded as a new way to use AIS and not an extension of AIS; this implies that the proposed method does not compete with several related studies listed in section I but help contribute to those studies. Two important theorems for mAIS (i.e., Theorems 1 and 2) have been obtained: when the transition probabilities of AIS and mAIS satisfy the condition in equation (36), (a) the partition-unction estimator of mAIS is more accurate than that of AIS and (b) the bias of the free energy estimator of mAIS is lower than that of AIS. These results theoretically support the effectiveness of mAIS.

mAIS has two disadvantages: (i) mAIS is not practical in a model in which the marginalizing operation is not easily executed, and (ii) the effectiveness of mAIS in comparison with AIS cannot be guaranteed when the transition probabilities of AIS and mAIS do not satisfy equation (36). The disadvantages do not have any impact in bipartite-type MRFs; however, for other models, we cannot ensure whether mAIS is still effective or not. To expand the range of application of mAIS, a resolution or relaxation of these disadvantages needs to be considered.

The first disadvantage is a fundamental problem of

mAIS and cannot be resolved. The second one (i.e., the condition in equation (36)) might be partially resolved. As mentioned in section III B, the condition in equation (36) is sufficient for Theorems 1 and 2 and has been not identified whether it is a necessary condition. If not, the condition can be relaxed. This point needs to be investigated in our future studies.

Appendix A: Proofs

This appendix demonstrates the proofs of the two theorems presented in Section III B.

1. Proof of Theorem 1

As discussed in Sections II and III A, $Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)$ and $Z_{\text{mAIS}}(S_T)$ are the unbiased estimators of Z because

$$\mathbb{E}_T[Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)] = \mathbb{E}_T[Z_{\text{mAIS}}(S_T)] = Z.$$

The relationship between the annealing processes in equations (7) and (22) is considered. Based on the assumption of equation (36), the marginal distribution of $T(\mathbf{X})$ can be expressed as




FIG. 6. Distributions of $\ln r$ for several α values when $1/T = 1$: (a) $K = 10$, (b) $K = 30$, and (c) $K = 60$.




FIG. 7. Distributions of $\ln r$ for several α values when $1/T = 2$: (a) $K = 10$, (b) $K = 30$, and (c) $K = 60$.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{H}} T(\mathbf{X}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{H}} \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} P_k(\mathbf{h}^{(k+1)} | \mathbf{v}^{(k+1)}) \tau_k(\mathbf{v}^{(k+1)} | \mathbf{v}^{(k)}) \right) P_0(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \mathbf{h}^{(1)}) \\ &= \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{\mathbf{h}^{(k+1)}} P_k(\mathbf{h}^{(k+1)} | \mathbf{v}^{(k+1)}) \tau_k(\mathbf{v}^{(k+1)} | \mathbf{v}^{(k)}) \right) \sum_{\mathbf{h}^{(1)}} P_0(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \mathbf{h}^{(1)}) = \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} \tau_k(\mathbf{v}^{(k+1)} | \mathbf{v}^{(k)}) \right) P_0(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\tau(\mathbf{V}) = \sum_{\mathbf{H}} T(\mathbf{X}) \quad (\text{A1})$$

is obtained. Moreover, the assumption of equation (36) leads to

$$\frac{T(\mathbf{X})}{\tau(\mathbf{V})} = \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} \frac{P_k(\mathbf{h}^{(k+1)} | \mathbf{v}^{(k+1)}) \tau_k(\mathbf{v}^{(k+1)} | \mathbf{v}^{(k)})}{\tau_k(\mathbf{v}^{(k+1)} | \mathbf{v}^{(k)})} \right) \frac{P_0(\mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \mathbf{h}^{(1)})}{P_0(\mathbf{v}^{(1)})} = \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} P_{k-1}(\mathbf{h}^{(k)} | \mathbf{v}^{(k)}). \quad (\text{A2})$$

From equations (A1) and (A2), the annealing process of

AIS can be factorizable as

$$T(\mathbf{X}) = T(\mathbf{H} | \mathbf{V}) \tau(\mathbf{V}), \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $T(\mathbf{H} | \mathbf{V}) := \prod_{k=1}^K P_{k-1}(\mathbf{h}^{(k)} | \mathbf{v}^{(k)})$ is the conditional distribution over \mathbf{H} . Using equation (A3), the difference in the variances can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{V}_T[Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)] - \mathbb{V}_\tau[Z_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)] \\ &= \frac{Z_0^2}{N} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{X}} W(\mathbf{X})^2 T(\mathbf{X}) - \sum_{\mathbf{V}} \Lambda(\mathbf{V})^2 \tau(\mathbf{V}) \right) \\ &= \frac{Z_0^2}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{V}} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{H}} W(\mathbf{X})^2 T(\mathbf{H} | \mathbf{V}) - \Lambda(\mathbf{V})^2 \right) \tau(\mathbf{V}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

From equations (12) and (26),

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k(\mathbf{v}^{(k)}) &= \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{h}^{(k)}} \exp(-E_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}))}{\sum_{\mathbf{h}^{(k)}} \exp(-E_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}))} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{h}^{(k)}} \frac{\exp(-E_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}))}{\exp(-E_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}))} \frac{\exp(-E_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}))}{\sum_{\mathbf{h}^{(k)}} \exp(-E_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}))} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{h}^{(k)}} w_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) P_{k-1}(\mathbf{h}^{(k)} | \mathbf{v}^{(k)}) \end{aligned}$$

is obtained, which leads to

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{V}) = \sum_{\mathbf{H}} W(\mathbf{X}) T(\mathbf{H} | \mathbf{V}). \quad (\text{A5})$$

Substituting equation (A5) into (A4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{V}_T[Z_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)] - \mathbb{V}_\tau[Z_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)] \\ &= \frac{Z_0^2}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{X}} (W(\mathbf{X}) - \Lambda(\mathbf{V}))^2 T(\mathbf{X}) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

2. Proof of Theorem 2

As shown in equations (18) and (31), $\mathbb{E}_T[F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)]$ and $\mathbb{E}_\tau[F_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)]$ are upper bounds on the true free energy F , i.e., $\mathbb{E}_T[F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)] \geq F$ and $\mathbb{E}_\tau[F_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)] \geq$

F . Using equation (A3), $\mathbb{E}_T[F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)]$ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_T[F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)] \\ &= -\ln Z_0 - \left(\prod_{\mu=1}^N \sum_{\mathbf{X}_\mu} T(\mathbf{X}_\mu) \right) \ln \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^N W(\mathbf{X}_\mu) \right) \\ &= -\ln Z_0 \\ &\quad - \left(\prod_{\mu=1}^N \sum_{\mathbf{V}_\mu} \sum_{\mathbf{H}_\mu} T(\mathbf{H}_\mu | \mathbf{V}_\mu) \tau(\mathbf{V}_\mu) \right) \ln \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^N W(\mathbf{X}_\mu) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

Using Jensen's inequality, the following inequality is obtained:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\prod_{\mu=1}^N \sum_{\mathbf{V}_\mu} \sum_{\mathbf{H}_\mu} T(\mathbf{H}_\mu | \mathbf{V}_\mu) \tau(\mathbf{V}_\mu) \right) \ln \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^N W(\mathbf{X}_\mu) \right) \\ &\leq \left(\prod_{\mu=1}^N \sum_{\mathbf{V}_\mu} \tau(\mathbf{V}_\mu) \right) \ln \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^N \sum_{\mathbf{H}_\mu} T(\mathbf{H}_\mu | \mathbf{V}_\mu) W(\mathbf{X}_\mu) \right) \\ &= \left(\prod_{\mu=1}^N \sum_{\mathbf{V}_\mu} \tau(\mathbf{V}_\mu) \right) \ln \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^N \Lambda(\mathbf{V}_\mu) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

Equation (A5) is used in the derivation of the last line of equation (A7). From equations (A6) and (A7),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_T[F_{\text{AIS}}(S_T)] \\ &\geq -\ln Z_0 - \left(\prod_{\mu=1}^N \sum_{\mathbf{V}_\mu} \tau(\mathbf{V}_\mu) \right) \ln \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mu=1}^N \Lambda(\mathbf{V}_\mu) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\tau[F_{\text{mAIS}}(S_\tau)] \geq F \end{aligned}$$

is ensured; here, the final inequality is obtained from equation (31).

Acknowledgment

This work was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI (grant numbers 18K11459, 18H03303, 20K23342, 21K11778, and 21K17804).

-
- [1] D. H. Ackley, G. E. Hinton, and T. J. Sejnowski, *Cognitive Science* **9**, 147 (1985).
 - [2] P. Smolensky, *Parallel distributed processing: Explorations in the microstructure of cognition* **1**, 194 (1986).
 - [3] G. E. Hinton, *Neural Computation* **14**, 1771 (2002).
 - [4] R. Salakhutdinov and G. E. Hinton, In *Proc. of the 12th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 448 (2009).
 - [5] Y. Roudi, E. Aurell, and J. Hertz, *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience* **3**, 1 (2009).
 - [6] A. Decelle and C. Furtlehner, *Chinese Physics B* **30**, 040202 (2021).
 - [7] J. Chen, S. Cheng, H. Xie, L. Wang, and T. Xiang, *Physical Review B* **97**, 085104 (2018).
 - [8] Y. Nomura and M. Imada, *Physical Review X* **11**, 031034 (2021).
 - [9] G. Torlai, G. Mazzola, J. Carrasquilla, M. Troyer, R. Melko, and G. Carleo, *Nature Physics* **14**, 447 (2018).
 - [10] G. Carleo and M. Troyer, *Science* **355**, 602 (2017).
 - [11] X. Gao and L. Duan, *Nature Communications* **8**, 1 (2017).

- [12] R. M. Neal, *Statistics and Computing* **11**, 125 (2001).
- [13] R. Salakhutdinov and I. Murray, In Proc. of the 25th International Conference on Machine Learning **25**, 872 (2008).
- [14] S. Geman and D. Geman, *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **6**, 721 (1984).
- [15] C. Jarzynski, *Phys. Rev. E* **56**, 5018 (1997).
- [16] Y. Burda, R. B. Grosse, and R. Salakhutdinov, In Proc. of the 18th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics , 102 (2015).
- [17] Q. Liu, A. Ihler, J. Peng, and J. Fisher, In Proc. of the 31st Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence , 514 (2015).
- [18] D. E. Carlson, P. Stinson, A. Pakman, and L. Paninski, In proc. of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning **6**, 4248 (2016).
- [19] F. Mazzanti and E. Romero, arXiv:2007.11926 (2020).
- [20] O. Krause, A. Fischer, and C. Igel, *Artificial Intelligence* **278**, 103195 (2020).
- [21] M. Yasuda and K. Sekimoto, *Physical Review E* **103**, 052118 (2021).
- [22] J. S. Liu, *Monte Carlo strategies in scientific computing* (Springer, 2001).
- [23] J. S. Liu, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **89**, 958 (1994).
- [24] C. M. Bishop, *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning* (Springer, 2006).