

# Learning minimal representations of stochastic processes with variational autoencoders

Gabriel Fernández-Fernández,<sup>1</sup> Carlo Manzo,<sup>2,3</sup> Maciej Lewenstein,<sup>1,4</sup> Alexandre Dauphin,<sup>1</sup> and Gorka Muñoz-Gil<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*ICFO – Institut de Ciències Fotòniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, Av. Carl Friedrich Gauss 3, 08860 Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain*

<sup>2</sup>*Facultat de Ciències, Tecnologia i Enginyeries, Universitat de Vic – Universitat Central de Catalunya (UVic-UCC), C. de la Laura, 13, 08500 Vic, Spain*

<sup>3</sup>*Institut de Recerca i Innovació en Ciències de la Vida i de la Salut a la Catalunya Central (IRIS-CC), 08500 Vic, Barcelona, Spain*

<sup>4</sup>*ICREA, Pg. Lluís Companys 23, 08010 Barcelona, Spain*

<sup>5</sup>*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Innsbruck, Technikerstr. 21a, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria*

Stochastic processes have found numerous applications in science, as they are broadly used to model a variety of natural phenomena. Due to their intrinsic randomness and uncertainty, they are however difficult to characterize. Here, we introduce an unsupervised machine learning approach to determine the minimal set of parameters required to effectively describe the dynamics of a stochastic process. Our method builds upon an extended  $\beta$ -variational autoencoder architecture. By means of simulated datasets corresponding to paradigmatic diffusion models, we showcase its effectiveness in extracting the minimal relevant parameters that accurately describe these dynamics. Furthermore, the method enables the generation of new trajectories that faithfully replicate the expected stochastic behavior. Overall, our approach enables for the autonomous discovery of unknown parameters describing stochastic processes, hence enhancing our comprehension of complex phenomena across various fields.

The recent advances in machine learning (ML) have not only impacted everyday life but also the development of science. In physics, the predictive power of ML has been used to get insights from theoretical and experimental physical systems with unprecedented accuracy [1, 2]. Indeed, ML can easily extract knowledge from a plethora of data types with no prior information about its source.

It has broadly been argued that, if a machine can make predictions over a given physical process, the properties of the latter must be encoded in the internal representation of the machine [3]. Therefore, beyond its predictive nature, ML can also be helpful for scientific discovery. Several examples in biology [4], quantum matter [5, 6], quantum information [7], lattice field theory [8], mathematics [9], or experiment design [10, 11] show that deep neural networks (NN), despite being often considered as black boxes, can guide scientists to understand complex phenomena or to design involved experiments.

There exist various techniques that exploit the information encoded in the trained model, e.g., by defining a notion of similarity between the different training examples and the test examples [12, 13]. Alternatively, one can study the internal representation of the NN, which allows for mapping the statistics of the training and test examples onto a vectorial space. An example of such embedding is the encoding produced at the lower dimensional hidden layer of an autoencoder, called the bottleneck. Autoencoders [14] are NN architectures trained to compress and decompress data to and from a given vectorial space. The abstract representation obtained at this level is very useful for unsupervised applications and machine interpretability. For example, it has been shown that an autoencoder can learn abstract concepts such as the color and the position of a given object [15, 16]. Such

architectures have also been used in physics to discover the relevant physical parameters that govern deterministic trajectories [17], the time-independent local dynamics of partial differential equations [18], or the order parameter of probabilistic spin configurations [19].

In this work, we explore the capability of ML to characterize time series of stochastic processes. In particular, we aim at determining whether a machine can learn, in an unsupervised way, the minimal parametric representation of a stochastic process from trajectories and correctly quantify these parameters. Extending previous works on unsupervised learning approaches to diffusion [20, 21], we train a  $\beta$ -variational autoencoder ( $\beta$ -VAE) [15] to generate trajectories with the same properties as the ones used as inputs. The architecture presents an information bottleneck constructed to represent conditionally independent factors of variation. Using an adaption of the original  $\beta$ -VAE [22], we successfully train the architecture with various sets of data corresponding to diffusion processes with different characteristics. Our results show that only the minimal necessary properties describing the motion of the particles arise in the bottleneck and can be directly related to the known theories describing these models. Moreover, the training provides a generative model that can produce new trajectories with the same properties as the training dataset, thus allowing for an in-depth study of their statistical properties. Besides its fundamental value, this work offers a valuable tool for the study of molecular diffusion from individual trajectories, such as those obtained with single-molecule imaging techniques [23, 24], for which extensive ML methods have been developed [25]. In contrast to the latter, rather than predicting known parameters with increasing accuracy, we aim here at solving a more fundamental ques-




FIG. 1. **Interpretable autoregressive  $\beta$ -VAE.** Given the displacements  $\Delta\mathbf{x}(t)$  of a diffusion trajectory, the encoder (orange) compresses them into an interpretable latent space (blue), in which few neurons (dark blue) represent physical features of the input data while others are noised out (light blue). An autoregressive decoder (green) generates from this latent representation the displacements  $\Delta\mathbf{x}'(t)$  of a new trajectory recursively, considering a certain receptive field RF (light green cone).

tion: learning the most efficient description of a given stochastic process.

*Interpretable generative model* — We aim to construct a machine learning (ML) architecture capable of (i) extracting interpretable physical variables from stochastic time series, and (ii) modeling the probability distribution function of the input data. To this end, we consider a  $\beta$ -variational autoencoder ( $\beta$ -VAE) architecture [15], schematically depicted in Fig. 1 (see Appendix and Ref. [26] for further details). In this architecture, an encoder (depicted in orange in Fig. 1) compresses displacements from an input trajectory  $\mathbf{x}$  into a latent space  $\mathbf{z}$  (shown in blue), for which each neuron is parameterized via a normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu_{z_i}, \sigma_{z_i})$ . Throughout this work, we consider  $|\mathbf{z}| = 6$  latent neurons. A sample is then drawn from the latent space and fed into the decoder (depicted in green), which generates a distribution function from which the displacements of new trajectories  $\mathbf{x}'$  can be sampled. The training of this architecture is based on a loss function that consists of two terms: a reconstruction loss that compares the model’s inputs and outputs, and a second loss term that measures the dissimilarity between the distribution of the latent variables and their prior. For the prior, a standardized normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  is typically considered. A parameter  $\beta$  is used to control the relative weight of the two loss components and, through an *ad hoc* annealing schedule, can be tuned in such a way that only the minimum number of latent neurons remains informative (i.e.,  $\sigma_{z_i} \ll 1$ ). In a physical context, only the pertinent properties governing the process will manifest in the latent space and serve to reproduce the input [17].

Traditional approaches for representation learning typically focus on deterministic decoders and use a reconstruction error to directly compare the input and output of the autoencoder [17, 19]. However, when dealing with stochastic signals, any form of compression inevitably leads to significant information loss in the reconstructed trajectory. Therefore, we adopt a distinct approach based on a probabilistic decoder to model the distribution of displacements  $p(\Delta\mathbf{x})$  through  $p_\theta(\Delta\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})$ ,

where  $\theta$  represents the trainable parameters from which the individual displacements  $\Delta x_i$  of the trajectories are sampled. We thus use the maximum likelihood estimation to compare the resulting  $p_\theta$  with the samples of the training dataset, assumed to be representative of the distribution  $p$ . Notably, the stochastic signal that corresponds to the input may exhibit various types of correlations, which play a crucial role in modeling important physical processes. To ensure that these properties are preserved at the autoencoder output, we follow the architecture proposed in Ref. [22] and construct the decoder using an autoregressive (AR) convolutional network known as WaveNet [27]. WaveNet models the output distribution according to the following recursive conditional probability

$$p_\theta(\Delta\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}) = \prod_{t=1}^T p_\theta(\Delta x_t | \Delta x_{t-1}, \dots, \Delta x_{t-\text{RF}}; \mathbf{z}), \quad (1)$$

where  $T$  is the length of the trajectory and RF is the receptive field, i.e., the number of past displacements used to predict the forthcoming one (light green cone in Fig. 1).

*Extracting physical variables from stochastic data* — To test the ability of the architecture to extract relevant physical variables from stochastic data, we train it on three datasets, constructed with three paradigmatic models of diffusion. First, we consider Brownian motion (BM) [28, 29], used to describe the stochastic motion of a particle suspended in a fluid. The diffusion of a Brownian particle is characterized by a single parameter, the diffusion coefficient  $D$ , hence serving as an initial benchmark for our study. More precisely, BM can be expressed as a Langevin equation of the form  $\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \xi(t)$ , where  $\xi(t)$  is a Gaussian noise with autocorrelation function

$$\langle \xi(t)\xi(t') \rangle = 2D\delta(t - t'). \quad (2)$$

To train the autoencoder, we generate a dataset of trajectories with  $D \in [10^{-5}, 10^{-2}]$  using the `andi_datasets` library [30]. All training details can be found in the Appendix. As commented earlier, as training proceeds, the model improves its generative capabilities while minimizing the KL divergence of the latent neurons with respect to their prior  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . After training, a single neuron of the six available *survives*, i.e., differs drastically from its purely noisy prior. In Fig. 2(a), we show the value of such neuron when inputting BM trajectories of different diffusion coefficients  $D$ . The plot shows a direct relation between  $D$  and the neuron value, highlighting that the autoencoder has learned that the only information needed by the decoder to generate a new trajectory is its diffusion coefficient. Moreover, the relation between  $z_1$  and  $D$  extends beyond the range of  $D$  considered in the training set (gray shaded area), showing the generalization capabilities of the network.

To further understand the power of the model, we consider two extensions of BM, namely fractional Brownian motion (FBM), and scaled Brownian motion (SBM).

These are paradigmatic models of anomalous diffusion, i.e., diffusion that deviates from the typical Brownian behavior. These models have found extensive application in describing motion in different biological scenarios at various scales [31–34] and thus constitute a valuable benchmark to demonstrate the method’s utility in experimental settings. Both models are characterized by only two parameters: the diffusion coefficient and the anomalous diffusion exponent  $\alpha$ . However, the source of anomalous diffusion is different in each model.

FBM can be derived from the Langevin equation and expressed as  $\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \xi_{fGn}(t)$ , where  $\xi_{fGn}(t)$  represents fractional Gaussian noise with the autocorrelation function

$$\langle \xi_{fGn}(t) \xi_{fGn}(t') \rangle = \alpha(\alpha - 1)D |t - t'|^{\alpha-2}, \quad (3)$$

where  $D$  is here referred to as a generalized diffusion coefficient with dimensions  $[l]^2[t]^{-\alpha}$ . Importantly, Eq. (3) implies that FBM displacements are correlated. This feature provides an interesting benchmark for the autoregressive properties of the decoder, as we will discuss in the following section. We train an autoencoder with a dataset consisting of FBM trajectories with  $\alpha \in [0.2, 1.8]$  and  $D \in [10^{-5}, 10^{-2}]$ . In Fig. 2(b,c), we show the only two surviving neurons: one ( $z_1$ ) shows a nearly linear relation with the anomalous diffusion exponent  $\alpha$ , whereas the other ( $z_2$ ) has a monotonic dependence on the  $\log(D)$ . These results prove the model’s ability to only retain minimal information to correctly reproduce FBM trajectories through the probabilistic decoder.

SBM extends Brownian diffusion by considering an aging diffusion coefficient  $D(t)$ , which is usually considered to scale as  $D_\alpha(t) = \alpha D_0 t^{\alpha-1}$ , where  $\alpha$  is the anomalous diffusion exponent and  $D_0$  is a constant with dimensions  $[l]^2[t]^{-\alpha}$ . In contrast to the previous cases, the two neurons that survive after training with SBM display a more complex relationship with  $\alpha$  and  $D_0$ , as depicted in Fig. 2(d,e). It must be pointed out that the only constraint imposed by the  $\beta$ -VAE loss in order to obtain these results is that the representation in the latent space is minimal, while still achieving good reconstruction loss. Hence, nothing prevents the network to learn a minimal representation based on combinations of the independent factors (meaningful physical variables in this case) [35, 36]. Nonetheless, the number of surviving neurons should never exceed the number of independent factors (or degrees of freedom), a situation that would not correspond to a minimal representation.

*Generating trajectories from meaningful representations* — An essential feature of the presented architecture is its ability to generate trajectories with the same physical properties as the training samples. Moreover, the representational power of the latent space allows one to set the properties of the output trajectories by tuning the value of the latent neurons. Inference is then done directly from the latent space, without any need of the encoder.




FIG. 2. **Interpretation of the latent space.** Distribution of latent neuron activations  $z_i$  for three datasets: BM (upper row), FBM (middle row), and SBM (lower row). Only surviving neurons are shown (i.e.,  $\sigma_{z_i} \ll 1$ ). For all datasets, the number of surviving neurons agrees with their respective number of degrees of freedom.

As expressed in Eq. (1), the decoder predicts the probability of each displacement  $\Delta x_t$  by means of a conditional probability related to previous displacements and, most importantly, the latent vector  $\mathbf{z}$ . In practice, by means of the reparameterization trick [37], the decoder outputs the mean  $\mu_t$  and variance  $\sigma_t^2$  of a normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu_t, \sigma_t^2)$ , and we then use the latter to sample each displacement  $\Delta x_t$ . In the case of BM trajectories, the autoencoder correctly learns to set  $\mu_t = 0$  and  $\sigma_t^2 = 2D \forall t$ , as the displacements of such trajectories are independent and stationary. Hence, the decoder only needs to properly learn the exact transformation from  $z_1$  in Fig. 2(a) to  $\sigma_t^2$ .

To further understand the power of the method, we analyze the more complex cases of FBM and SBM. In this sense, a fundamental feature of FBM trajectories is the correlation of displacements, which has a characteristic power-law behavior directly connected to Eq. (3). As commented, the architecture includes an autoregressive decoder to preserve this feature in generated trajectories.


In fact, in Fig. 3(a), we show that when generating trajectories for a given  $\alpha$ , the power-law correlation is preserved in a range defined by the architecture’s receptive field (RF) and then lost, as expected from Eq. (1). Since power-law correlations produce anomalous diffusion in FBM, their loss affects the anomalous diffusion exponent of the generated trajectories, as shown in Fig. 3(b) (see Appendix for details). While the exponent is correct for  $\Delta t < RF$ , it rapidly converges to one at longer times. In our experiments, increasing the RF hindered training substantially. A possible solution is to consider a transformer-based decoder [38], where extensive efforts to enlarge context length are currently being pursued [39].

With respect to the SBM dataset, the  $\beta$ -VAE must encode into the latent space the time-dependent diffusion coefficient  $D_\alpha(t)$  in order to generate trajectories with anomalous diffusion exponent  $\alpha$ . We have shown that the latent space obtained for the model trained on SBM trajectories has a complex relationship with the input parameters  $\alpha$  and  $D_0$ . To simplify the analysis, instead of generating trajectories directly from the latent space as we did with FBM, we feed trajectories with a given ground-truth  $\alpha$  and  $D_0$  to the decoder, extract their latent representation  $\mathbf{z}$ , and use it to generate new trajectories. As shown in Fig. 3(c), the generator is able to correctly reproduce trajectories with the correct exponent for various  $D_0$  and a wide range of  $\alpha$ . In Fig. 3(d), we show  $D_\alpha(t)$  calculated as the variance of the displacements for different  $t$ . The  $\beta$ -VAE perfectly reproduces the expected behavior over all generated times, confirming the generative capabilities of the architecture.

**Conclusions** — In this work, we have explored the application of machine learning (ML) techniques to provide interpretable representations of stochastic processes from time series. We have shown that a method based on a  $\beta$ -variational autoencoder with an autoregressive decoder can retrieve the minimal parametric representation of trajectories corresponding to different processes describing diffusion.

The architecture has been specially developed to account for common features present in stochastic data. First, the output of the network is probabilistic. Due to the stochastic nature of diffusion trajectories, trajectory reconstruction after compression is effectively unfeasible. Hence, instead of reconstructing, as done typically in AE, we aim at generating new trajectories via a parameterized distribution optimized to match the input data distribution. Second, the decoder is autoregressive, a feature introduced in order to model distributions with correlations, as for the case of FBM trajectories.

Through in-silico experiments, we showed that a  $\beta$ -VAE trained on this data correctly extracts its main features. For Brownian motion (BM), the latent space correctly extracts the single parameter needed for its description, namely the diffusion coefficient  $D$ . In the case of fractional Brownian motion, the latent neurons are proportional to the anomalous diffusion exponent  $\alpha$  and generalized diffusion coefficient  $D$ . Last, for scaled Brow-



**FIG. 3. Statistical properties of generated anomalous diffusion.** Top (bottom) row corresponds to the FBM (SBM) dataset. **(a)** Displacements correlations  $C = |\langle \Delta x_t \Delta x_{t+\Delta t} \rangle| / \Delta x_0^2$  for the input (dotted) and generated data (solid) with  $\alpha = 0.6, 1.8$  (blue and green, respectively). **(b)** Anomalous exponent  $\alpha_g$  of the generated FBM data fitted from the time-averaged mean squared displacement at different  $\Delta t$  for different input  $\alpha$ . Insets show the 2D histograms of the input vs. generated anomalous exponent at the highlighted  $\Delta t$ , before (blue) and after (orange) the receptive field RF. **(c)** Anomalous exponent  $\alpha_g$  of the generated SBM data vs. the input exponent  $\alpha$  for various  $D_0$ . **(d)** Evolution of the diffusion coefficient for generated SBM trajectories at various  $\alpha$ . Dotted lines show the expected scalings.

nian motion, the autoencoder finds a minimal representation with only two parameters, which are however a non-linear combination of  $\alpha$  and  $D_0$ . Such a drawback is a known feature of  $\beta$ -VAE [15], and efforts are being put into solving it [36].

Last, we leveraged the model to generate trajectories from different latent vectors, each representing distinct physical properties. Notably, the generated trajectories for FBM display the expected power-law displacement correlation, although these vanish beyond the receptive field, i.e., the number of previous displacements used by the decoder in order to predict the forthcoming one. As for SBM, the trajectories exhibit the characteristic aging effect, i.e., the power-law scaling of the diffusion coefficient over time. Consequently, the anomalous diffusion exponent is also correctly reproduced.

In contrast to the predominantly employed supervised methods, our study showcases the potential of unsupervised machine learning techniques to uncover the intrinsic structure of stochastic processes and determine the minimal parameterization required for accurate characterization. As such, it offers a promising avenue for uncovering previously unknown physical degrees of freedom

inherent in stochastic physical processes. A significant advantage of this approach is its ability to operate without prior information about the data or the underlying physical process. This makes it particularly well-suited for experimental settings where the impact of changes in experimental conditions on the system is not fully understood. By leveraging the proposed method to analyze the data, researchers can extract the minimal representation of trajectories and establish connections with existing knowledge. The results of our study also offer practical implications for model simplification and computational efficiency. In phenomenological models, characterized by multiple input parameters, the reduction of the dimensionality of the parameter space can significantly decrease the computational cost associated with the modeling and simulation of stochastic processes, thus enabling more efficient analysis and prediction of their behavior. Thus, the proposed approach offers a promising avenue for advancing the modeling and analysis of stochastic systems, enabling researchers to gain deeper insights into physical processes.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

GM-G acknowledges funding from the European Union. CM acknowledges support through grant RYC-2015-17896 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and “ESF Investing in your future”, grants BFU2017-85693-R and PID2021-125386NB-I00 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033/ and FEDER “ERDF A way of making Europe”, and grant AGAUR 2017SGR940 funded by the Generalitat de Catalunya. GF-F, AD, and ML acknowledge support from: ERC AdG NOQIA; MICIN/AEI

(PGC2018-0910.13039/501100011033, CEX2019-000910-S/10.13039/501100011033, Plan National FIDEUA PID2019-106901GB-I00, FPI; MICIN with funding from European Union NextGenerationEU (PRTR-C17.I1): QUANTERA MAQS PCI2019-111828-2); MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by the “European Union NextGeneration EU/PRTR” QUANTERA DYNAMITE PCI2022-132919 within the QuantERA II Programme that has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 101017733Proyectos de I+D+I “Retos Colaboración” QUSPIN RTC2019-007196-7); Fundació Cellex; Fundació Mir-Puig; Generalitat de Catalunya (European Social Fund FEDER and CERCA program, AGAUR Grant No. 2021 SGR 01452, QuantumCAT U16-011424, co-funded by ERDF Operational Program of Catalonia 2014-2020); Barcelona Supercomputing Center MareNostrum (FI-2023-1-0013); EU (PASQuans2.1, 101113690); EU Horizon 2020 FET-OPEN OPTologic (Grant No 899794); EU Horizon Europe Program (Grant Agreement 101080086 — NeQST), National Science Centre, Poland (Symfonia Grant No. 2016/20/W/ST4/00314); ICFO Internal “QuantumGaudi” project; European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie-Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement No 101029393 (STREDCH) and No 847648 (“La Caixa” Junior Leaders fellowships ID100010434: LCF/BQ/PI19/11690013, LCF/BQ/PI20/11760031, LCF/BQ/PR20/11770012, LCF/BQ/PR21/11840013). Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union, European Commission, European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency (CINEA), the European Research Executive Agency nor any other granting authority. Neither the European Union nor any granting authority can be held responsible for them.

- 
- [1] G. Carleo, I. Cirac, K. Cranmer, L. Daudet, M. Schuld, N. Tishby, L. Vogt-Maranto, and L. Zdeborová, Machine learning and the physical sciences, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **91**, 045002 (2019), [arxiv:1903.10563](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.10563).
  - [2] A. Dawid, J. Arnold, B. Requena, A. Gresch, M. Płodzień, K. Donatella, K. Nicoli, P. Stornati, R. Koch, M. Büttner, R. Okuła, G. Muñoz-Gil, R. A. Vargas-Hernández, A. Cervera-Lierta, J. Carrasquilla, V. Dunjko, M. Gabrié, P. Huembeli, E. van Nieuwenburg, F. Vicentini, L. Wang, S. J. Wetzels, G. Carleo, E. Greplová, R. Krems, F. Marquardt, M. Tomza, M. Lewenstein, and A. Dauphin, *Modern applications of machine learning in quantum sciences* (2022), [arxiv:2204.04198](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.04198).
  - [3] C. Molnar, *Interpretable Machine Learning: A Guide for Making Black Box Models Explainable* (Leanpub, 2018).
  - [4] C. J. Soelistyo, G. Vallardi, G. Charras, and A. R. Lowe, Learning biophysical determinants of cell fate with deep neural networks, *Nature Machine Intelligence* **4**, 636 (2022).
  - [5] C. Miles, A. Bohrdt, R. Wu, C. Chiu, M. Xu, G. Ji, M. Greiner, K. Q. Weinberger, E. Demler, and E.-A. Kim, Correlator convolutional neural networks as an interpretable architecture for image-like quantum matter data, *Nature Communications* **12**, 3905 (2021).
  - [6] N. Käming, A. Dawid, K. Kottmann, M. Lewenstein, K. Sengstock, A. Dauphin, and C. Weitenberg, Unsupervised machine learning of topological phase transitions from experimental data, *Machine Learning: Science and Technology* **2**, 035037 (2021), [arxiv:2101.05712](https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.05712).
  - [7] A. Pozas-Kerstjens, N. Gisin, and M.-O. Renou, Proofs of network quantum nonlocality in continuous families of distributions, *Physical Review Letters* **130**, 090201 (2023), [arxiv:2203.16543](https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.16543).
  - [8] S. Blücher, L. Kades, J. M. Pawłowski, N. Strodthoff, and J. M. Urban, Towards novel insights in lattice field theory with explainable machine learning, *Physical Review D* **101**, 094507 (2020), [arxiv:2003.01504](https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.01504).
  - [9] A. Davies, P. Veličković, L. Buesing, S. Blackwell,

- D. Zheng, N. Tomašev, R. Tanburn, P. Battaglia, C. Blundell, A. Juhász, M. Lackenby, G. Williamson, D. Hassabis, and P. Kohli, Advancing mathematics by guiding human intuition with AI, *Nature* **600**, 70 (2021).
- [10] A. A. Melnikov, H. Poulsen Nautrup, M. Krenn, V. Dunjko, M. Tiersch, A. Zeilinger, and H. J. Briegel, Active learning machine learns to create new quantum experiments, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115**, 1221 (2018).
- [11] M. Krenn, M. Erhard, and A. Zeilinger, Computer-inspired quantum experiments, *Nature Reviews Physics* **2**, 649 (2020), [arxiv:2002.09970](#).
- [12] P. W. Koh and P. Liang, [Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions](#) (2020), [arxiv:1703.04730](#).
- [13] A. Dawid, P. Huembeli, M. Tomza, M. Lewenstein, and A. Dauphin, Hessian-based toolbox for reliable and interpretable machine learning in physics, *Machine Learning: Science and Technology* **3**, 015002 (2021).
- [14] G. E. Hinton and R. R. Salakhutdinov, Reducing the dimensionality of data with neural networks, *Science* **313**, 504 (2006).
- [15] I. Higgins, L. Matthey, A. Pal, C. Burgess, X. Glorot, M. Botvinick, S. Mohamed, and A. Lerchner,  $\beta$ -VAE: Learning basic visual concepts with a constrained variational framework, in *International Conference on Learning Representations* (2016) p. 22.
- [16] C. P. Burgess, I. Higgins, A. Pal, L. Matthey, N. Watters, G. Desjardins, and A. Lerchner, [Understanding disentangling in  \$\beta\$ -VAE](#) (2018), [arxiv:1804.03599](#).
- [17] R. Iten, T. Metger, H. Wilming, L. del Rio, and R. Renner, Discovering physical concepts with neural networks, *Physical Review Letters* **124**, 010508 (2020), [arxiv:1807.10300](#).
- [18] P. Y. Lu, S. Kim, and M. Soljačić, Extracting interpretable physical parameters from spatiotemporal systems using unsupervised learning, *Physical Review X* **10**, 031056 (2020).
- [19] S. J. Wetzel, Unsupervised learning of phase transitions: From principal component analysis to variational autoencoders, *Physical Review E* **96**, 022140 (2017), [arxiv:1703.02435](#).
- [20] H. Kabbech and I. Smal, Identification of diffusive states in tracking applications using unsupervised deep learning methods, in *2022 IEEE 19th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI)* (IEEE, Kolkata, India, 2022) pp. 1–4.
- [21] G. Muñoz-Gil, G. Guigó i Corominas, and M. Lewenstein, Unsupervised learning of anomalous diffusion data: An anomaly detection approach, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **54**, 504001 (2021).
- [22] J. Chorowski, R. J. Weiss, S. Bengio, and A. van den Oord, Unsupervised speech representation learning using WaveNet autoencoders, *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* **27**, 2041 (2019), [arxiv:1901.08810](#).
- [23] C. Manzo and M. F. Garcia-Parajo, A review of progress in single particle tracking: From methods to biophysical insights, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **78**, 124601 (2015).
- [24] E. Barkai, Y. Garini, and R. Metzler, Strange kinetics of single molecules in living cells, *Physics Today* **65**, 29 (2012).
- [25] G. Muñoz-Gil, G. Volpe, M. A. Garcia-March, E. Aghion, A. Argun, C. B. Hong, T. Bland, S. Bo, J. A. Conejero, N. Firbas, Ò. Garibo i Orts, A. Gentili, Z. Huang, J.-H. Jeon, H. Kabbech, Y. Kim, P. Kowalek, D. Krapf, H. Loch-Olszewska, M. A. Lomholt, J.-B. Masson, P. G. Meyer, S. Park, B. Requena, I. Smal, T. Song, J. Szwabiński, S. Thapa, H. Verdier, G. Volpe, A. Widera, M. Lewenstein, R. Metzler, and C. Manzo, Objective comparison of methods to decode anomalous diffusion, *Nature Communications* **12**, 6253 (2021).
- [26] G. Fernández-Fernández, *SPIVAE* (2023).
- [27] A. van den Oord, S. Dieleman, H. Zen, K. Simonyan, O. Vinyals, A. Graves, N. Kalchbrenner, A. Senior, and K. Kavukcuoglu, [WaveNet: A generative model for raw audio](#) (2016), [arxiv:1609.03499](#).
- [28] A. Einstein, Über die von der molekularkinetischen Theorie der Wärme geforderte Bewegung von in ruhenden Flüssigkeiten suspendierten Teilchen, *Annalen der Physik* **322**, 549 (1905).
- [29] M. von Smoluchowski, Zur Kinetischen Theorie der Brownschen Molekularbewegung und der Suspensionen, *Annalen der Physik* **326**, 756 (1906).
- [30] G. Muñoz-Gil, B. Requena, G. Volpe, M. A. Garcia-March, and C. Manzo, [AnDiChallenge/ANDI\\_datasets: Challenge 2020 release](#), Zenodo (2021).
- [31] A. Sabri, X. Xu, D. Krapf, and M. Weiss, Elucidating the origin of heterogeneous anomalous diffusion in the cytoplasm of mammalian cells, *Physical Review Letters* **125**, 058101 (2020), [arxiv:1910.00102](#).
- [32] S. C. Lim and S. V. Muniandy, Self-similar Gaussian processes for modeling anomalous diffusion, *Physical Review E* **66**, 021114 (2002).
- [33] G. Muñoz-Gil, C. Romero-Aristizabal, N. Mateos, F. Campelo, L. I. de Llobet Cucalon, M. Beato, M. Lewenstein, M. F. Garcia-Parajo, and J. A. Torrenopina, Stochastic particle unbinding modulates growth dynamics and size of transcription factor condensates in living cells, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **119**, e2200667119 (2022).
- [34] W. Wang, R. Metzler, and A. G. Cherstvy, Anomalous diffusion, aging, and nonergodicity of scaled Brownian motion with fractional Gaussian noise: Overview of related experimental observations and models, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **24**, 18482 (2022).
- [35] B. Schölkopf, F. Locatello, S. Bauer, N. R. Ke, N. Kalchbrenner, A. Goyal, and Y. Bengio, Toward causal representation learning, *Proceedings of the IEEE* **109**, 612 (2021).
- [36] H. P. Nautrup, T. Metger, R. Iten, S. Jerbi, L. M. Trenkwalder, H. Wilming, H. J. Briegel, and R. Renner, Operationally meaningful representations of physical systems in neural networks, *Machine Learning: Science and Technology* **3**, 045025 (2022).
- [37] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling, [Auto-encoding variational bayes](#) (2013), [arxiv:1312.6114](#).
- [38] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, [Attention is all you need](#) (2017), [arxiv:1706.03762](#).
- [39] A. Bulatov, Y. Kuratov, and M. S. Burtsev, [Recurrent memory transformer](#) (2022), [arxiv:2207.06881](#).
- [40] A. Paszke, S. Gross, F. Massa, A. Lerer, J. Bradbury, G. Chanan, T. Killeen, Z. Lin, N. Gimelshein, L. Antiga, A. Desmaison, A. Köpf, E. Yang, Z. DeVito, M. Raison, A. Tejani, S. Chilamkurthy, B. Steiner, L. Fang, J. Bai, and S. Chintala, [PyTorch: An impera-](#)

tive style, high-performance deep learning library (2019), arxiv:1912.01703.

- [41] J. Howard and S. Gugger, *fastai: A layered API for deep learning* (2020), arxiv:2002.04688.
- [42] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, *Adam: A method for stochastic optimization* (2014), arxiv:1412.6980.
- [43] L. N. Smith, *A disciplined approach to neural network hyper-parameters: Part 1 – learning rate, batch size, momentum, and weight decay* (2018), arxiv:1803.09820.
- [44] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, *Delving deep into rectifiers: Surpassing human-level performance on ImageNet classification* (2015), arxiv:1502.01852.
- [45] S. R. Bowman, L. Vilnis, O. Vinyals, A. M. Dai, R. Jozefowicz, and S. Bengio, *Generating sentences from a continuous space* (2015), arxiv:1511.06349.

## Appendix A: Machine learning pipeline

In this section, we provide an overview of the machine learning architecture used in the main text, along with further explanations on the loss function, datasets, and training. A Python implementation of the developed software, mainly based on the PyTorch [40] and fastai [41] libraries, is provided in [26].

### 1. Architecture

The machine learning model used throughout our work is schematically represented in Fig. 1, and its layers’ parameters are specified in Table I. The inputs to the model are the displacements of a  $d$ -dimensional trajectory of length  $T$ , represented as a tensor of size  $d \times (T - 1)$ . The model is able to produce the displacements of a new trajectory with arbitrary length  $T'$ , as we extend below. This work considers a generative model whose output is not directly the trajectory’s displacements but rather their probability distribution. To model these distributions, we use a Gaussian distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu_t, \sigma_t)$  for each displacement  $\Delta x_t$ . Hence, the network here predicts  $n = 2$  parameters,  $\mu_t$  and  $\sigma_t$ , and then  $\Delta x_t$  is sampled from the associated distribution. In the present work, we focus on one-dimensional trajectories ( $d = 1$ ) and consider a fixed trajectory length of  $T = 400$  for all trainings. Nonetheless, the model is length independent, as shown in Fig. 3, where we generate trajectories of 6000 time steps from a pre-trained model with  $T = 400$ .

The core of the model is inspired by [22] and consists of a convolutional variational autoencoder (VAE) with an autoregressive (AR) decoder. The architecture, as any VAE-like structure, has three main components: i) a convolutional encoder that compresses the input into the latent neurons; ii) a set of *probabilistic* latent neurons; iii) a decoder that up-samples the latent representation to control the generation of new outputs.

*i) Encoder* – As presented in Table I, the encoder consists of a stack of four convolutional layers, followed by an adaptive (average and maximum) pooling layer, and

Layer type	Output size
Input	$B \times d \times (T - 1)$
Encoder	
4 × 1D Conv. ( $N_c = 16$ )	$B \times 16 \times (T - 9)$
1D adaptive (avg + max) pooling	$B \times 16 \times (16 + 16)$
Flatten	$B \times 512$
MLP (200 and 100 neurons)	$B \times 100$
Latent distribution	$B \times 12$
Latent layer ( $ \mathbf{z}  = 6$ )	$B \times 6$
Decoder	
MLP (100, 200, and 512 neurons)	$B \times 512$
Reshape	$B \times 16 \times 32$
Interpolation	$B \times 16 \times (T - 9)$
3 × 1D transposed Conv. ( $N_c = 16$ )	$B \times 16 \times (T - 1)$
1D transposed Conv. ( $N_c =  \mathbf{z} $ )	$B \times 6 \times (T - 1)$
WaveNet ( $d_c = [1, 2, 4, 8]$ , RF = 32)	$B \times nd \times (T - 1 - \text{RF})$
Sampled output	$B \times d \times T'$

TABLE I. **Architecture layers’ details.** We use ReLU as non-linear activation function in all layers, kernel of size three and stride one on the convolutional (Conv.) layers, and no padding. We abbreviate the terms: batch size  $B$ , dilation  $d_c$ , number of convolutional channels  $N_c$ , and receptive field RF.

a two layered multilayer perceptron (MLP) that transforms the data into the appropriate latent dimension.

*ii) Latent space* – Following the typical VAE construction [37], the latent space consists of a set of probabilistic neurons of size  $|\mathbf{z}|$ . Throughout this work, we consider  $|\mathbf{z}| = 6$ . To facilitate training, we consider the widely known *reparameterization trick* [37]: instead of considering a probabilistic neuron, we sample it from two, each representing the mean and variance of a Gaussian, while externalizing the noise. This way, one can properly backpropagate the error through this layer.

*iii) Decoder* – The decoder consists of two distinct parts. First, a convolutional module upsamples the latent vector to a higher dimensional space. As presented in Table I, this is done by reversing the encoder modules. That is, stacking various layers MLP, interpolation, and transposed convolution layers. Second, an autoregressive module, based on the WaveNet architecture [27], generates the model’s output. This kind of networks uses a finite number of previous data points, defined as the receptive field (RF), to predict the forthcoming one. In the current work, RF = 32. During training, as shown in Fig. 1, the AR module receives as input the trajectory’s displacements. The model uses an amount of initial displacements corresponding to the RF to make the first prediction. Thus, the prediction length is fixed to  $T - 1 - \text{RF}$ . Our experiments show that padding the input with zeros inevitably creates artifacts, as the padding lacks the tra-

jectory features. When performing inference (i.e., generating new trajectories), WaveNet generates new outputs (i.e., the displacement  $\Delta x_t$ ) by recursively feeding its own previous outputs as input (i.e., the displacements  $\Delta x_{t-1}, \Delta x_{t-2}, \dots$ ). By means of this recursive sampling, the generated trajectories can have an arbitrary length  $T'$ . Importantly, in all cases, the upsampled latent vector generated by the convolutional module is fed as a conditioning to each layer of the WaveNet.

## 2. Loss function

Below, we discuss some key aspects of the loss function of the model which are relevant to understanding the loss distribution of the datasets used in our study. As a  $\beta$ -VAE model, the proposed model has a loss consisting of two components, which can be expressed as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\log p_{\theta}(\Delta \mathbf{x}) - \beta D_{KL}(p_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}) \parallel g(\mathbf{z})). \quad (\text{A1})$$

The first term is a reconstruction loss that evaluates the similarity between the inputs and the model's outputs. Here, we employ for that the negative log-likelihood (NLL), which is asymptotically equivalent to the Kullback-Leibler divergence ( $D_{KL}$ ) of the predicted distribution from the data's true probability distribution. The second term measures the similarity between the distribution of the latent neurons  $p_{\phi}(\mathbf{z})$  and their prior  $g(\mathbf{z})$ . In the following, we focus on the reconstruction term in the AR framework and refer the reader to [15] for a study on the role of  $\beta$  weighting the second term.

The AR formalism considers that the input data distribution can be described as the product of conditional probabilities  $p(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_t p(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t})$ , where each conditional probability is a function of the previous values in the data with some ordering  $< t$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{x}_{<t} = x_1, \dots, x_{t-1}$ . In practice, one introduces a receptive field (RF), such that  $p(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t}) \rightarrow p(x_t | x_{t-\text{RF}}, \dots, x_{t-1})$ . This term is of high importance, as it defines the amount of previous information considered when recursively predicting next steps. In AR models, each of these conditional probabilities is modeled as a parameterized probability distribution  $p(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t}) \approx p_{\theta}(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{<t})$  whose parameters  $\theta$  can be found by maximizing a likelihood function w.r.t. the input data. As commented above, we consider here that  $p_{\theta}(\Delta x_t | \Delta \mathbf{x}_{<t}) = \log \mathcal{N}(\mu_t, \sigma_t^2)$ , where  $\mu_t$  and  $\sigma_t$  are calculated by the AR model considering all  $\Delta \mathbf{x}_{<t}$  as defined by the recursive scheme mentioned above. Then, the parameters  $\theta$  of the network are optimized by minimizing the NLL, namely

$$-\log p_{\theta}(\Delta \mathbf{x}) = -\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \log \mathcal{N}(\mu_t^{(i)}, \sigma_t^{2(i)}), \quad (\text{A2})$$

where  $N$  is the total number of samples in the training dataset and  $T - 1$  is the total number of considered displacements. The NLL for a single displacement and time

step reads

$$-\log \mathcal{N}(\mu_t, \sigma_t^2) = \log(\sigma_t \sqrt{2\pi}) + \frac{(\Delta x_t - \mu_t)^2}{2\sigma_t^2}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where the minimum loss is achieved when the input displacement  $\Delta x_t$  coincides with the predicted  $\mu_t$ . Once this is achieved, decreasing  $\sigma_t^2$  effectively lowers the NLL.

In this work, we consider data generated via Gaussian processes. Taking Brownian motion (BM) as an example, it can be seen that, in a properly trained model, the variance  $\sigma_t^2$  defined above must be related to the variance of the input's displacements, which are directly connected to the diffusion coefficient via  $\sigma^2 = 2D\Delta t$ , where  $\Delta t = 1$  for all cases considered in this work. This means that, in the perfect training scenario, for BM,  $\mu_t = 0$  and  $\sigma_t^2 = 2D \forall t$ . As a lower variance  $\sigma_t^2$  implies a lower NLL, trajectories with lower diffusion coefficient will have lower NLLs. This not only affects BM trajectories, but also FBM and SBM ones. In those cases, we expect that  $\mu_t \neq 0$  for most  $t$ , but still lower diffusion coefficients will imply lower variances  $\sigma_t^2$ . We observe this behavior in both FBM and SBM datasets, as shown in Fig. 4. Moreover, the aging effect, present in SBM, implies that the diffusion coefficient scales as  $D_{\alpha}(t) = \alpha D_0 t^{\alpha-1}$ . Hence, a larger  $\alpha$  implies a larger  $D(t > 1)$  for a given  $D_0$ . Such effect is also seen in Fig. 4, where the NLL increases for larger  $\alpha$ . Oppositely, for FBM, the NLL remains almost constant in the whole  $\alpha$  range.




FIG. 4. **Relation between the loss and the diffusion parameters.** Negative log-likelihood (NLL) of two models, trained with: (a) FBM and (b) SBM trajectories as a function of the trajectories' anomalous exponent  $\alpha$ . Colors encode the diffusion coefficient  $D$  and  $D_0$  for FBM and SBM respectively.

## 3. Datasets

BM, FBM, and SBM trajectories are generated via the `andi_datasets` package [30]. Each dataset consists of about 100000 trajectories of total time length  $T = 400$ , with 21 anomalous exponents equally spaced in the range  $\alpha \in [0.2, 1.8]$ , and 10 diffusion coefficients  $D \in [10^{-5}, 10^{-2}]$ . The same range is considered for  $D_0$  for the SBM trajectories. We then consider 476 trajectories for each of the parameters' combination. We split the training and validation datasets following the standard 80% and 20% proportion, respectively. In most of



our analysis, the range of the test data was within the training range. However, for Fig. 2(b) and Fig. 3(c), we used an extended test dataset with 49 equally spaced values of  $\alpha \in [0.04, 1.96]$ . Similarly, for Fig. 2(a,c), we used an extended test dataset that spanned 49  $D \in [3.16 \cdot 10^{-6}, 3.16 \cdot 10^{-2}]$ .

*Anomalous exponent estimation* — In order to estimate the anomalous exponent of trajectories generated by the model, we use different averages to the mean squared displacement (MSD). For the trajectories generated with the model trained on FBM trajectories, we estimate  $\alpha_g$  by fitting the time average mean squared displacement (TA-MSD). Considering that the trajectory is sampled at  $T$  discrete times  $t_i = i\Delta t$ ,

$$\text{TA-MSD}(\Delta t) = \frac{1}{T - \Delta t} \sum_{i=1}^{T-\Delta t} [x(t_i) - x(t_i + \Delta t)]^2, \quad (\text{A4})$$

where  $\Delta t$  is the time lag. In Fig. 3(b), we fit the TA-MSD with a sliding window of three time lags, ranging from the smallest time lag up to  $\Delta t = 420$ . For the insets, we perform a linear fit of the TA-MSD on the highlighted range of time lags, respectively from  $\Delta t = 1$  to 20, and from  $\Delta t = 380$  to 400. The same method would not work for SBM due to its weakly non-ergodic nature. Hence,  $\alpha_g$  shown in Fig. 3(c) is estimated by fitting the time and ensemble-average mean squared displacement (TEA-MSD). The TEA-MSD for a fixed time lag can be defined in terms of the TA-MSD for the  $i$ -th trajectory as:

$$\text{TEA-MSD}(\Delta t) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{TA-MSD}(\Delta t)_i, \quad (\text{A5})$$

where  $N$  is the total number of generated trajectories. We take the last 55% of the trajectory length and  $\Delta t = 2$  to assure statistical significance.

#### 4. Training

In this section, we specify the setup used for training our model, including the initialization of the model's parameters and the set of hyperparameters used during the training process.

To minimize the loss, we updated the model's parameters using the Adam optimizer [42] with a maximum learning rate selected using the learning rate finder tool from the fastai library [41], usually found around  $10^{-4}$ . Additionally, we scheduled both the learning rate and the optimizer's momentum using the one cycle policy from [43]. The batch size was set to 256 trajectories.

We found that a proper initialization was crucial to obtain good results. We used Kaiming He's initialization [44] with fan out mode, except for the latent neurons representing the logarithm of the variance, which

were initially set to zero to prevent overflow in the initial stages.

To ensure proper learning when using an autoregressive model, it is important to use an annealing schedule of  $\beta$  [45]. In this study, we first train until convergence with  $\beta = 0$ , and then, we follow a monotonically increasing annealing schedule for  $\beta$  to minimize the number of informative neurons while having a good reconstruction loss. We found a good compromise of  $\beta$  on the order of  $5 \cdot 10^{-3}$ .

#### Appendix B: Latent neurons encode stochastic parameters

Figure 5 shows a more detailed representation of the learned latent space. The 2D projections of these figures are shown in the main text (Fig. 2). As shown, the model learns a combination of both relevant parameters in the latent neurons. For FBM, Fig. 5(a,b), the latent neurons  $z_1, z_2$  encode both the anomalous exponent  $\alpha$  and the diffusion coefficient  $D$ . This encoding is smooth, continuous, and generally independent except for big  $\alpha$  that shows how the same neuron is encoding a non-linear relationship of the parameters. In contrast, as illustrated in the main text, for SBM the model learns two distinct combinations of the parameters,  $\log \alpha D_0 T^{\alpha-1}$  and  $\log \alpha D_0 T^{-(\alpha-1)}$ . These combinations can be considered as complementary non-linear transformations of  $\alpha$  and  $D_0$ . These relationships are depicted in Fig. 5 (c, d), where the latent neurons directly represent the combination of both  $\alpha$  and  $D_0$ .




FIG. 5. **3D representation of the latent space.** Distribution of latent neurons activations  $z_i$  w.r.t. the anomalous exponent  $\alpha$  and the diffusion coefficient,  $D$  for FBM (upper row) and  $D_0$  for SBM (lower row).