

---

# Mutual Information Estimation via Normalizing Flows

---

Ivan Butakov<sup>1 2 3 4</sup> Alexander Tolmachev<sup>1 2</sup> Sofia Malanchuk<sup>1 2</sup> Anna Neopryatnaya<sup>1 2</sup> Alexey Frolov<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

We propose a novel approach to the problem of *mutual information* (MI) estimation via introducing normalizing flows-based estimator. The estimator maps original data to the target distribution with known closed-form expression for MI. We demonstrate that our approach yields MI estimates for the original data. Experiments with high-dimensional data are provided to show the advantages of the proposed estimator.

## 1. Introduction

Information-theoretic analysis of deep neural networks (DNN) has attracted recent interest due to intriguing fundamental results and new hypothesis. Applying information theory to DNNs may provide novel tools for explainable AI via estimation of information flows (Tishby & Zaslavsky, 2015; Xu & Raginsky, 2017; Goldfeld et al., 2019; Steinke & Zakyntinou, 2020; Amjad et al., 2022), as well as new ways to encourage models to extract and generalize information (Tishby & Zaslavsky, 2015; Chen et al., 2016; Belghazi et al., 2018; Ardizzone et al., 2020). Useful applications of information theory to the classical problem of independence testing are also worth noting (Berrett & Samworth, 2017; Sen et al., 2017; Duong & Nguyen, 2023).

Most of the information theory applications to the field of machine learning are based on the two central information-theoretic quantities: *differential entropy* and *mutual information* (MI). The latter quantity is widely used as an invariant measure of the non-linear dependence between random variables, while differential entropy is usually viewed as a measure of randomness. However, as it has been shown in the works of (Goldfeld et al., 2020; McAllester & Stratos, 2020), MI and differential entropy are extremely hard to

estimate in the case of high-dimensional data. In the work of (Czyż et al., 2023), it is argued that such estimation is also challenging for long-tailed distributions and large values of MI. These problems considerably limit the applications of information theory to real-scale machine learning problems. However, recent advances in the neural estimation methods show that complex parametric estimators achieve relative practical success in the cases where classical MI estimation techniques fail (Belghazi et al., 2018; van den Oord et al., 2019; Song & Ermon, 2020; Rhodes et al., 2020; Ao & Li, 2022; Butakov et al., 2024; Franzese et al., 2024).

This paper addresses the mentioned problem of the mutual information estimation in high dimensions via using normalizing flows (Dinh et al., 2015; Rezende & Mohamed, 2015). Some recent works also utilize generative models to estimate MI. According to a general generative approach proposed by Song & Ermon (2020), generative models can be used to reconstruct probability density functions (PDFs) of marginal and joint distributions to estimate differential entropy and MI via a Monte Carlo (MC) integration. However, as it is mentioned in the original work, when flow-based generative models are used, this approach yields poor estimates even when the data is of simple structure. The estimator proposed in Franzese et al. (2024) uses score-based diffusion models to estimate differential entropy and MI without explicit reconstruction of the PDFs. Increased accuracy of this estimator comes at a cost of training complementary score networks and using them to compute MC estimate of Kullback–Leibler divergence (KLD). Finally, in the work of Duong & Nguyen (2023) normalizing flows are used to transform marginal distributions into Gaussian, then a zero-correlation criterion is employed to test the zero-MI hypothesis. The latter method does not require MC integration, but also does not yield a numerical MI estimate. We also note the work of Ao & Li (2022), where normalizing flows are combined with a  $k$ -NN entropy estimator.

In contrast, our method allows for direct (i.e., without MC integration, nearest neighbors search or other similar data manipulations) and the accurate MI estimation. Our contributions in this work are the following:

1. We propose a MI-preserving technique for concurrent binormalization of two random vectors (RVs).

---

<sup>1</sup>Skolkovo Institute of Science and Technology, Moscow, Russia <sup>2</sup>Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Dolgoprudny, Moscow Oblast, Russia <sup>3</sup>Sirius University of Science and Technology, Sirius, Krasnodar Krai, Russia <sup>4</sup>Marchuk Institute of Numerical Mathematics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia. Correspondence to: Ivan Butakov <butakov.id@phystech.edu>.

2. We suggest a method to directly measure the MI of the concurrently binormalized RVs via a simple closed-form formula. We further simplify our approach to require only  $O(d)$  or even  $O(1)$  additional learnable parameters to estimate the MI (here  $d$  denotes the dimension of the data). We prove that our estimate is at least a lower bound on MI.
3. We validate and evaluate our method via experiments with high-dimensional synthetic data with known ground truth MI. We show that the proposed MI estimator performs well in comparison to the ground truth and some other advanced estimators during the tests with high-dimensional compressible and incompressible data of various complexity.

This article is organized as follows. In Section 2, the necessary background is provided and the key concepts of information theory are introduced. Section 3 describes the general method, as well as contains results, useful for practical implementation. In Section 4, a series of experiments is performed to evaluate the proposed method and compare it to several other key MI estimators. Finally, the results are discussed in Section 5. We provide all the proofs in Appendix A, technical details in Appendix C.

## 2. Preliminaries

Consider random vectors, denoted as  $X: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $Y: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ , where  $\Omega$  represents the sample space. Let us assume that these random vectors have absolutely continuous probability density functions (PDF) denoted as  $\rho(x)$ ,  $\rho(y)$ , and  $\rho(x, y)$ , respectively, where the latter refers to the joint PDF. The differential entropy of  $X$  is defined as follows:

$$h(X) = -\mathbb{E} \log \rho(x) = -\int_{\text{supp } X} \rho(x) \log \rho(x) dx,$$

where  $\text{supp } X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  represents the *support* of  $X$ , and  $\log(\cdot)$  denotes the natural logarithm. Similarly, we define the joint differential entropy as  $h(X, Y) = -\mathbb{E} \log \rho(x, y)$  and conditional differential entropy as  $h(X | Y) = -\mathbb{E} \log \rho(X|Y) = -\mathbb{E}_Y (\mathbb{E}_{X|Y=y} \log \rho(X | Y = y))$ . Finally, the mutual information (MI) is given by  $I(X; Y) = h(X) - h(X | Y)$ , and the following equivalences hold

$$I(X; Y) = h(X) - h(X | Y) = h(Y) - h(Y | X), \quad (1)$$

$$I(X; Y) = h(X) + h(Y) - h(X, Y), \quad (2)$$

$$I(X; Y) = \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\rho_{X,Y} \| \rho_X \otimes \rho_Y) \quad (3)$$

The above definitions can be generalized via Radon-Nikodym derivatives and induced densities in case of distributions supports being manifolds, see Spivak (1965).

The differential entropy estimation is a separate classical statistical problem. Recent works have proposed several novel ways to acquire the estimate in the high-dimensional case (Berrett et al., 2019; Goldfeld et al., 2020; Butakov et al., 2021; Ao & Li, 2022; Greenewald et al., 2023; Adilova et al., 2023; Franzese et al., 2024). Due to Equation (2), mutual information can be found by estimating entropy values separately. In contrast, this paper suggests an approach that estimates MI values directly.

In our work, we rely on the well-known fundamental property of MI, which is invariance under smooth injective mappings.

**Theorem 2.1** (Czyż et al. (2023); Butakov et al. (2024)). *Let  $\xi: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n'}$  be an absolutely continuous random vector, and let  $g: \mathbb{R}^{n'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be an injective piecewise-smooth mapping with Jacobian  $J$ , satisfying  $n \geq n'$  and  $\det(J^T J) \neq 0$  almost everywhere. Let either  $\eta$  be a discrete random variable, or  $(\xi, \eta)$  be an absolutely continuous random vector. Then*

$$I(\xi; \eta) = I(g(\xi); \eta) \quad (4)$$

We stress the importance of Theorem 2.1, as  $g$  can be interpreted as an inverse (from data space to latent space) flow transformation.

## 3. Method description

Our task is to estimate  $I(X; Y)$ , where  $X, Y$  are random vectors. Here we focus on the absolutely continuous  $(X, Y)$ , as it is the most common case in practice. Note that Theorem 2.1 allows us to train normalizing flows  $f_X, f_Y$  and estimate MI between latent representations, as  $I(f_X(X); f_Y(Y)) = I(X; Y)$  due to smoothness and bijectivity of flow models.

The following results considerably facilitate MI estimation in the latent space:

**Theorem 3.1** (Theorem 8.6.5 in Cover & Thomas (2006)). *Let  $Z$  be a  $d$ -dimensional absolutely continuous random vector with probability density function  $\rho_Z$  mean  $m$  and covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} h(Z) &= h(\mathcal{N}(m, \Sigma)) - \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\rho_Z \| \mathcal{N}(m, \Sigma)) = \\ &= \frac{d}{2} \log(2\pi e) + \frac{1}{2} \log \det \Sigma - \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\rho_Z \| \mathcal{N}(m, \Sigma)) \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 3.2.* Note that  $h(Z) \neq h(Z') - \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\rho_Z \| \rho_{Z'})$  in general.

**Corollary 3.3.** *Let  $(\xi, \eta)$  be an absolutely continuous pair of random vectors with joint and marginal probability density functions  $\rho_{\xi, \eta}$ ,  $\rho_\xi$  and  $\rho_\eta$  correspondingly, and mean and covariance matrix being*

$$m = \begin{bmatrix} m_\xi \\ m_\eta \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{\xi, \xi} & \Sigma_{\xi, \eta} \\ \Sigma_{\eta, \xi} & \Sigma_{\eta, \eta} \end{bmatrix}$$

Then

$$I(\xi; \eta) = \frac{1}{2} [\log \det \Sigma_{\xi, \xi} + \log \det \Sigma_{\eta, \eta} - \log \det \Sigma] + \\ + D_{\text{KL}}(\rho_{\xi, \eta} \| \mathcal{N}(m, \Sigma)) - \\ - D_{\text{KL}}(\rho_{\xi} \otimes \rho_{\eta} \| \mathcal{N}(m, \text{diag}(\Sigma_{\xi, \xi}, \Sigma_{\eta, \eta}))),$$

which implies the following in the case of marginally Gaussian  $\xi$  and  $\eta$ :

$$I(\xi; \eta) \geq \\ \geq \frac{1}{2} [\log \det \Sigma_{\xi, \xi} + \log \det \Sigma_{\eta, \eta} - \log \det \Sigma], \quad (5)$$

with the equality holding if and only if  $(\xi, \eta)$  are jointly Gaussian.

From now on we denote  $f_X(X)$  and  $f_Y(Y)$  as  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  correspondingly. The provided closed-form expression allows for calculating MI for jointly Gaussian  $(\xi, \eta)$ , and serves as a lower bound on MI in a more general case of  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  being marginally Gaussian. It is important to note that the conditions of Theorem 2.1 may be violated by Gaussianizing  $(X, Y)$  as a whole due to potential intermixing of components and corresponding information leaks between random vectors. In conclusion, to fully leverage the convenient and robust closed-form expression for MI, random vectors have to be Gaussianized via separate flows (to preserve the MI), but the resulting joint distribution also have to be Gaussian (to achieve equality in Equation (5)).

### 3.1. General binormalization approach

Due to the aforementioned nuances, we propose applying flows  $f_X$  and  $f_Y$  to  $X$  and  $Y$  separately. But instead of maximizing the log-likelihood using two separate and fixed base (latent) distributions, we maximize the log-likelihood of the joint sampling  $\{(x_k, y_k)\}_{k=1}^N$  using the whole set of Gaussian distributions as possible base distributions.

**Definition 3.4.** We denote a set of  $d$ -dimensional Gaussian distributions as  $S_{\mathcal{N}}^d \triangleq \{\mathcal{N}(m, \Sigma) \mid m \in \mathbb{R}^d, \Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}\}$ .<sup>1</sup>

**Definition 3.5.** The log-likelihood of a sampling  $\{z_k\}_{k=1}^N$  with respect to a set of absolutely continuous probability distributions is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_S(\{z_k\}) \triangleq \sup_{\mu \in S} \mathcal{L}_{\mu}(\{z_k\}) = \sup_{\mu \in S} \sum_{k=1}^N \log \left[ \left( \frac{d\mu}{dz} \right) (z_k) \right]$$

Let us define  $f \triangleq f_X \times f_Y$  (Cartesian product of functions) and  $S \circ f = \{\mu \circ f \mid \mu \in S\}$  (set of pushforward measures). In our case,  $\mathcal{L}_{S_{\mathcal{N}} \circ f}(\{(x_k, y_k)\})$  can be expressed in a closed-form via the change of variables formula (identically to a classical normalizing flows setup) and maximum-likelihood estimates for  $m$  and  $\Sigma$ .

<sup>1</sup>We omit  $d$  whenever it can be deduced from the context.

### Statement 3.6.

$$\mathcal{L}_{S_{\mathcal{N}} \circ (f_X \times f_Y)}(\{(x_k, y_k)\}) = \\ = \log \left| \det \frac{\partial f(x, y)}{\partial (x, y)} \right| + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}(\hat{m}, \hat{\Sigma})}(\{f(x_k, y_k)\}),$$

where

$$\log \left| \det \frac{\partial f(x, y)}{\partial (x, y)} \right| = \\ = \log \left| \det \frac{\partial f_X(x)}{\partial x} \right| + \log \left| \det \frac{\partial f_Y(y)}{\partial y} \right|,$$

$$\hat{m} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N f(x_k, y_k)$$

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N (f(x_k, y_k) - \hat{m})(f(x_k, y_k) - \hat{m})^T$$

Maximization of  $\mathcal{L}_{S_{\mathcal{N}} \circ (f_X \times f_Y)}(\{(x_k, y_k)\})$  with respect to parameters of  $f_X$  and  $f_Y$  yields a pair of *binormalizing* flows, making it possible to apply Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 3.3 to acquire a MI estimate:

$$\hat{I}_{\text{g.MIENF}}(X; Y) \triangleq \\ \triangleq \frac{1}{2} [\log \det \hat{\Sigma}_{\xi, \xi} + \log \det \hat{\Sigma}_{\eta, \eta} - \log \det \hat{\Sigma}] \quad (6)$$

Note that if only marginal Gaussianization is achieved, Equation (6) serves as a lower bound estimate.

### 3.2. Refined approach

Although the proposed general method is compelling, as it requires only the slightest modifications to the conventional normalizing flows setup to make the application of the closed-form expressions for MI possible, we have to mention several drawbacks.

Firstly, the log-likelihood maximum is ambiguous, as  $\mathcal{L}_{S_{\mathcal{N}}}$  is invariant under invertible affine mappings:

*Remark 3.7.* Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be a non-singular matrix,  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\{z_k\}_{k=1}^N \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then

$$\mathcal{L}_{S_{\mathcal{N}} \circ (Az+b)}(\{z_k\}) = \mathcal{L}_{S_{\mathcal{N}}}(\{z_k\})$$

This makes the proposed log-likelihood maximization an ill-posed problem.

Secondly, this method requires a regular (ideally, after every gradient descend step) updating of  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}$  for the whole dataset, which is expensive. In practice, these estimates can be replaced with batchwise maximum likelihood estimates, which are used to update  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}$  via exponential moving

average (EMA). This approach, however, requires tuning EMA multiplication coefficient in accordance with the learning rate to make the training fast yet stable. We also note that  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}$  can be made learnable via the gradient ascend, but the benefits of the closed-form expressions for  $\mathcal{L}_{S_{\mathcal{N}}}$  in Statement 3.6 are thus lost.

Finally, each loss function evaluation requires inversion of  $\hat{\Sigma}$ , and each MI estimation requires evaluation of  $\det \hat{\Sigma}$  and determinants of two diagonal blocks of  $\hat{\Sigma}$ . This might be resource-consuming in high-dimensional cases, as matrices may not be sparse. Numerical instabilities might also occur if  $\hat{\Sigma}$  happens to be ill-posed (which might happen in the case of data lying on a manifold or due to high MI).

That is why we propose an elegant and simple way to eliminate all the mentioned problems by narrowing down  $S_{\mathcal{N}}$  to a subclass of Gaussian distributions with simple and bounded covariance matrices and fixed means. For simplicity, we assume  $d_{\xi} \leq d_{\eta}$  from now on.

**Definition 3.8.**

$$S_{\text{tridiag}\mathcal{N}}^{d_{\xi}, d_{\eta}} \triangleq \{ \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma) \mid \Sigma_{\xi, \xi} = I_{d_{\xi}}, \Sigma_{\eta, \eta} = I_{d_{\eta}}, \Sigma_{\xi, \eta} (\equiv \Sigma_{\eta, \xi}^T) = \text{diag}(\{\rho_j\}), \rho_j \in [0; 1) \}$$

This approach solves all the aforementioned problems without any loss in generalization ability, as it is shown by the following results:

**Corollary 3.9.** *If  $(\xi, \eta) \sim \mu \in S_{\text{tridiag}\mathcal{N}}$ , then*

$$I(\xi; \eta) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_j \log(1 - \rho_j^2) \quad (7)$$

*In case of  $\rho_j \equiv \rho$ , this expression can be further simplified:*

$$I(\xi; \eta) = -\frac{d'}{2} \log(1 - \rho^2), \quad d' \triangleq \min\{d_{\xi}, d_{\eta}\} \quad (8)$$

**Statement 3.10.** *Let  $(\xi, \eta) \sim \mathcal{N}(m, \Sigma)$ , where  $\Sigma$  is non-singular. There exist invertible affine mappings  $\varphi_{\xi}, \varphi_{\eta}$  such that  $(\varphi_{\xi}(\xi), \varphi_{\eta}(\eta)) \sim \mu \in S_{\text{tridiag}\mathcal{N}}$ . Due to Theorem 2.1, the following also holds:  $I(\xi; \eta) = I(\varphi_{\xi}(\xi); \varphi_{\eta}(\eta))$ .*

**Statement 3.11.** *Let  $(\xi, \eta) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma) \in S_{\text{tridiag}\mathcal{N}}$ ,  $\{z_k\}_{k=1}^N \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_{\xi} + d_{\eta}}$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)}(\{z_k\}) = I(\xi; \eta) + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}(0, I)}(\{\Sigma^{-1/2} z_k\}),$$

where

$$\Sigma^{-1/2} = \left[ \begin{array}{cc|cc} \alpha_j + \beta_j & & \alpha_j - \beta_j & \\ & \ddots & & \ddots \\ \hline \alpha_j - \beta_j & & \alpha_j + \beta_j & \\ & \ddots & & \ddots \end{array} \right],$$

$\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{d_{\xi}}$ 
 $\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{d_{\eta}}$

$$\alpha_j = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1 + \rho_j}}, \quad \beta_j = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1 - \rho_j}}$$

and  $I(\xi; \eta)$  is calculated via (7).

Maximization of  $\mathcal{L}_{S_{\text{tridiag}\mathcal{N}} \circ (f_X \times f_Y)}(\{(x_k, y_k)\})$  with respect to the parameters of  $f_X$  and  $f_Y$  yields the following MI estimate:

$$\hat{I}_{\text{MIENF}}(X; Y) \triangleq -\frac{1}{2} \sum_j \log(1 - \hat{\rho}_j^2), \quad (9)$$

where  $\hat{\rho}_j$  are the maximum-likelihood estimates of  $\rho_j$ .

### 3.3. Implementation details

In this section, we would like to emphasize the computational simplicity of the proposed amendments to the conventional normalizing flows setup.

Firstly, Statement 3.11 allows for cheap log-likelihood computation and sample generation, as  $\Sigma, \Sigma^{-1/2}$  and  $\Sigma^{-1}$  are easily calculated from the  $\{\rho_j\}$  and are sparse (tridiagonal, block-diagonalizable with  $2 \times 2$  blocks).

Secondly, the method requires only  $d' = \min\{d_{\xi}, d_{\eta}\}$  additional parameters: the estimates for  $\{\rho_j\}$ . As  $\rho_j \in [0; 1)$ , an appropriate parametrization should be chosen to allow for the stable learning of the estimates via the gradient ascend. We propose to use the *logarithm of cross-component MI*:  $w_j \triangleq \log I(\xi_j; \eta_j) = \log[-\frac{1}{2} \log(1 - \rho_j^2)]$ . In this parametrization  $w_j \in \mathbb{R}$  and

$$\hat{I}_{\text{MIENF}}(X; Y) = \sum_j e^{\hat{w}_j}$$

$$\rho_j = \sqrt{1 - \exp(-2 \cdot e^{w_j})} \in (0; 1)$$

Although  $\rho_j = 0$  is not achievable in the proposed parametrization, it can be made arbitrary close to 0 with  $w_j \rightarrow -\infty$ .

### 3.4. Extension to non-Gaussian base distributions

The proposed method can be easily generalized to account for any base distribution with closed-form expression for MI, or even a combination of such distributions. For example, a smoothed uniform distribution can be considered, with the learnable parameter being the smoothing constant  $\varepsilon$ , see Appendix B.2, Equation (10).

However, due to Remark 3.2, in case of non-Gaussian base distributions acquired estimates may be neither upper nor lower bounds on MI.

### 3.5. Extension to non-bijective flows

As Theorem 2.1 does not require  $g$  to be bijective, our method is naturally extended to injective normalizing

**Algorithm 1** MI estimator evaluation

- 1: Generate two datasets of samples from jointly Gaussian vectors  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  with given mutual information (see Corollary 3.3 and Corollary 3.9 for covariance matrix selection):  $\{(a_k, b_k)\}_{k=1}^N$ .
- 2: Choose functions  $g_\xi$  and  $g_\eta$  satisfying conditions of Theorem 2.1, so  $I(\xi; \eta) = I(g_\xi(\xi); g_\eta(\eta))$ .
- 3: Estimate  $I(g_\xi(\xi); g_\eta(\eta))$  via  $\{(g_\xi(a_k), g_\eta(b_k))\}_{k=1}^N$  and compare the estimated value with the ground truth.

flows (Teng & Choromanska, 2019; Brehmer & Cranmer, 2020). Moreover, according to Butakov et al. (2024), such approach may actually facilitate the estimation of MI.

## 4. Experiments

To evaluate our estimator, we utilize synthetic datasets with known mutual information. Czyż et al. (2023) and Butakov et al. (2024) propose extensive frameworks for evaluation of MI estimators. Although Czyż et al. (2023) provide a much richer framework with checks for many corner cases and properties, we focus on the tests proposed in Butakov et al. (2024), as they are of much higher dimension, satisfy the *manifold hypothesis* (Fefferman et al., 2013) and are closer in properties to real data. We, of course, plan to evaluate our method to full extent in the near future, which includes running tests from Czyż et al. (2023).

The formal description of the dataset generation and estimator evaluation is provided in Algorithm 1. Essentially similar setups are widely used to test the MI estimators (Belghazi et al., 2018; Poole et al., 2019; McAllester & Stratos, 2020; Butakov et al., 2024; Franzese et al., 2024). Note that any absolutely continuous random vector can be *separately* modeled via the proposed way; the theoretical construction for invertible Gaussianization is provided in the work of Chen & Gopinath (2000). However, Czyż et al. (2023) have suggested that not every *pair* of random vectors can be modeled via the described algorithm, as the base distribution may be non-Gaussian.

Unfortunately, little is known about multidimensional non-Gaussian distributions with closed-form expression for mutual information and easy sampling procedure. To our knowledge, we can only mention the multivariate Student distribution (Arellano-Valle et al., 2013) and the smoothed uniform distribution (Czyż et al., 2023), see Appendix B for more details. That is why we also evaluate our method via the aforementioned distributions, see Figure 1.

In our work, Algorithm 1 is used to generate datasets of synthetic images with known ground truth mutual information. During the experiments with synthetic images, we compare our method with the Mutual Information Neural




Figure 1: Tests with incompressible multidimensional data. “Uniform” denotes the uniformly distributed samples acquired from the correlated Gaussians via the Gaussian CDF. “Smoothed uniform” and “Student” denote the non-Gaussian-based distributions described in Appendix B. “arcsinh(Student)” denotes the arcsinh function applied to the “Student” example (this is done to avoid numerical instabilities in the case of long-tailed distributions).

Estimator (MINE) (Belghazi et al., 2018) and 5-nearest neighbors weighted Kozachenko-Leonenko (WKL) estimator (Kozachenko & Leonenko, 1987; Berrett et al., 2019); the latter is fed with the data compressed via a convolutional autoencoder (CNN AE) in accordance to the pipeline proposed in Butakov et al. (2024).

We choose MINE as a suitable and well-performing representative of advanced NN-based MI estimators; see the overviews provided by Poole et al. (2019); McAllester & Stratos (2020); Song & Ermon (2020); Czyż et al. (2023). We choose AE+WKL, as this pipeline has performed the best in Butakov et al. (2024) during the same tests we utilize here.

For the tests with synthetic images, we use GLOW (Kingma & Dhariwal, 2018) normalizing flow architecture with  $\log_2(\text{image size})$  splits, 2 blocks between splits and 16 hidden channels in each block, appended with a learnable orthogonal linear layer and a small 4-layer Real NVP flow (Dinh et al., 2017). For the other tests, we use 16-layer Real NVP architecture. For further details (including the architecture of MINE critic network and CNN autoencoder), we refer the reader to Appendix C.

The results of the experiments performed with the high-dimensional synthetic images are provided in Figure 2. We attribute the good performance of AE+WKL to the fact that the proposed synthetic datasets are easily and almost losslessly compressed via the CNN AE. We run additional experiments with much simpler, but incompressible data to show that the estimation error of WKL rapidly increases with the dimension. The results are provided in Table 1. In




Figure 2: Comparison of the selected NN-based estimators: MINE, AE + WKL 5-NN and MIENF (ours). For WKL we use 99.9% asymptotic confidence intervals acquired from the integration standard deviation. Along  $x$  axes is  $I(X; Y)$ , along  $y$  axes is  $\hat{I}(X; Y)$ .

contrast, our method yields reasonable estimates in the same or similar cases presented in Figure 1.

Overall, the proposed estimator performs well during all the experiments, including the incompressible high-dimensional data, large MI values and non-Gaussian-based tests.

Table 1: Evaluation of 5-nearest neighbors weighted Kozachenko-Leonenko estimator on multidimensional uniformly distributed data. For each dimension  $d_X = d_Y$ , 11 estimates of MI are acquired with the ground truth ranging from 0 to 10 with a fixed step size 1. The RMSE is calculated for each set of estimates.

$d_{X,Y}$	2	4	8	16	32	64
RMSE	2.2	1.0	127.9	227.5	522.4	336.2

## 5. Discussion

Information-theoretic analysis of deep neural networks is a novel and developing approach. As it relies on a well-established theory of information, it potentially can provide fundamental, robust and intuitive results (Shwartz-Ziv & Tishby, 2017). Currently, this analysis is complicated due to main information-theoretic qualities — *differential entropy* and *mutual information* — being hard to measure in the case of high-dimensional data.

We have shown that it is possible to modify the conventional normalizing flows setup to harness all the benefits of simple, robust closed-form expressions for mutual information. We provide useful theoretical and practical insights on using the proposed method effectively. We have demonstrated the effectiveness of our estimator in various settings, including compressible and incompressible high-dimensional data, high values of mutual information and the data not acquired from the Gaussian distribution via invertible mappings.

Although convergence of the proposed estimator follows

from the convergence analysis of conventional normalizing flows if  $(X, Y)$  can be jointly Gaussianized via separate mappings, convergence of the proposed method in the general case is still an open question. We consider this to be the major limitation of our estimator. However, conducted experiments show good performance of our method even in the case of data, which appear in the literature as non-Gaussian-based examples (Czyż et al., 2023).

Finally, it is worth noting that despite normalizing flows and Gaussian base distributions being used throughout our work, the proposed method can be extended to any type of base distribution with closed-form expression for mutual information and to any injective generative model with tractable Jacobians. For example, a subclass of diffusion models can be considered (Zhang & Chen, 2021; Kingma et al., 2021). Injective normalizing flows (Teng & Choromanska, 2019; Brehmer & Cranmer, 2020) are also compatible with the proposed pipeline.

**Future work.** As further research, we consider deriving convergence rates of our estimator, or other related theoretical results. We also would like to evaluate the performance of our approach in application to different base distributions and generative models. Another important question we would like to address in the nearest future is the construction of non-Gaussian-based tests for evaluation of MI estimators. Finally, we plan using our method to estimate the information flows in deep neural networks and explore the hypotheses related to the Information Bottleneck principle (Tishby et al., 1999; Shwartz-Ziv & Tishby, 2017; Geiger, 2022).

## 6. Reproducibility Statement

In order to facilitate the reproduction of our results, we provide proofs to all theoretical results in Appendix A, the most essential information about the experiments in Section 4 and Appendix C, and the complete source code in the supplementary materials.

## 7. Impact Statement

This paper presents work whose goal is to advance the field of interpretable Machine Learning. As our work touches general questions of information theory in application to deep learning, all potential societal consequences of our work which are worth mentioning here are connected to the possible advances of explainable Artificial Intelligence. It is argued that new means to interpret large neural networks might promote them in the areas critical to human well-being, such as healthcare, education, and finances.

## References

- Adilova, L., Geiger, B. C., and Fischer, A. Information plane analysis for dropout neural networks, 2023.
- Amjad, R. A., Liu, K., and Geiger, B. C. Understanding neural networks and individual neuron importance via information-ordered cumulative ablation. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 33(12): 7842–7852, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TNNLS.2021.3088685.
- Ao, Z. and Li, J. Entropy estimation via normalizing flow. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 36(9):9990–9998, Jun. 2022. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v36i9.21237. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/21237>.
- Ardizzone, L., Mackowiak, R., Rother, C., and Köthe, U. Training normalizing flows with the information bottleneck for competitive generative classification. In Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M., and Lin, H. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 7828–7840. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2020/file/593906af0d138e69f49d251d3e7cbcd0-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/593906af0d138e69f49d251d3e7cbcd0-Paper.pdf).
- Arellano-Valle, R., Contreras-Reyes, J., and Genton, M. Shannon entropy and mutual information for multivariate skew-elliptical distributions. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 40:42–62, 03 2013. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9469.2011.
- Belghazi, M. I., Baratin, A., Rajeshwar, S., Ozair, S., Bengio, Y., Courville, A., and Hjelm, D. Mutual information neural estimation. In Dy, J. and Krause, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 531–540. PMLR, 07 2018. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/belghazi18a.html>.
- Berrett, T. and Samworth, R. Nonparametric independence testing via mutual information. *Biometrika*, 106, 11 2017. doi: 10.1093/biomet/asz024.
- Berrett, T. B., Samworth, R. J., and Yuan, M. Efficient multivariate entropy estimation via  $k$ -nearest neighbour distances. *Ann. Statist.*, 47(1):288–318, 02 2019. doi: 10.1214/18-AOS1688. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-AOS1688>.
- Brehmer, J. and Cranmer, K. Flows for simultaneous manifold learning and density estimation. In Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M., and Lin, H.

- (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 442–453. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2020/file/051928341be67dcba03f0e04104d9047-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/051928341be67dcba03f0e04104d9047-Paper.pdf).
- Butakov, I., Tolmachev, A., Malanchuk, S., Neopryatnaya, A., Frolov, A., and Andreev, K. Information bottleneck analysis of deep neural networks via lossy compression. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=huGECz8dPp>.
- Butakov, I. D., Malanchuk, S. V., Neopryatnaya, A. M., Tolmachev, A. D., Andreev, K. V., Kruglik, S. A., Marshakov, E. A., and Frolov, A. A. High-dimensional dataset entropy estimation via lossy compression. *Journal of Communications Technology and Electronics*, 66(6):764–768, 7 2021. ISSN 1555-6557. doi: 10.1134/S1064226921060061. URL <https://doi.org/10.1134/S1064226921060061>.
- Chen, S. and Gopinath, R. Gaussianization. In Leen, T., Dietterich, T., and Tresp, V. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 13. MIT Press, 2000. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2000/file/3c947bc2f7ff007b86a9428b74654de5-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2000/file/3c947bc2f7ff007b86a9428b74654de5-Paper.pdf).
- Chen, X., Duan, Y., Houthoofd, R., Schulman, J., Sutskever, I., and Abbeel, P. Infogan: Interpretable representation learning by information maximizing generative adversarial nets. In Lee, D. D., Sugiyama, M., von Luxburg, U., Guyon, I., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2016, December 5-10, 2016, Barcelona, Spain*, pp. 2172–2180, 2016. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2016/hash/7c9d0b1f96aebd7b5eca8c3edaa19ebb-Abstract.html>.
- Cover, T. M. and Thomas, J. A. *Elements of Information Theory (Wiley Series in Telecommunications and Signal Processing)*. Wiley-Interscience, USA, 2006.
- Czyż, P., Grabowski, F., Vogt, J. E., Beerenwinkel, N., and Marx, A. Beyond normal: On the evaluation of mutual information estimators. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=25vRtG56YH>.
- Dinh, L., Krueger, D., and Bengio, Y. NICE: non-linear independent components estimation. In Bengio, Y. and LeCun, Y. (eds.), *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Workshop Track Proceedings*, 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1410.8516>.
- Dinh, L., Sohl-Dickstein, J., and Bengio, S. Density estimation using real NVP. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=HkpbhH91x>.
- Duong, B. and Nguyen, T. Normalizing flows for conditional independence testing. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 66, 08 2023. doi: 10.1007/s10115-023-01964-w.
- Fefferman, C., Mitter, S., and Narayanan, H. Testing the manifold hypothesis. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 29, 10 2013. doi: 10.1090/jams/852.
- Franzese, G., BOUNOUA, M., and Michiardi, P. MINDE: Mutual information neural diffusion estimation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=0kWd8SJq8d>.
- Geiger, B. C. On information plane analyses of neural network classifiers—a review. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 33(12):7039–7051, 12 2022. doi: 10.1109/tnnls.2021.3089037. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/2Ftnnls.2021.3089037>.
- Goldfeld, Z., van den Berg, E., Greenewald, K. H., Melnyk, I. V., Nguyen, N. H., Kingsbury, B., and Polyanskiy, Y. Estimating information flow in deep neural networks. In *ICML*, 2019.
- Goldfeld, Z., Greenewald, K., Niles-Weed, J., and Polyanskiy, Y. Convergence of smoothed empirical measures with applications to entropy estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(7):4368–4391, 2020. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2020.2975480.
- Greenewald, K. H., Kingsbury, B., and Yu, Y. High-dimensional smoothed entropy estimation via dimensionality reduction. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, ISIT 2023, Taipei, Taiwan, June 25-30, 2023*, pp. 2613–2618. IEEE, 2023. doi: 10.1109/ISIT54713.2023.10206641. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISIT54713.2023.10206641>.
- Kingma, D. P. and Ba, J. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization, 2017.
- Kingma, D. P. and Dhariwal, P. Glow: Generative flow with invertible 1x1 convolutions. In Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Grauman, K., Cesa-Bianchi, N., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information*

- Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2018/file/d139db6a236200b21cc7f752979132d0-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2018/file/d139db6a236200b21cc7f752979132d0-Paper.pdf).
- Kingma, D. P., Salimans, T., Poole, B., and Ho, J. On density estimation with diffusion models. In Beygelzimer, A., Dauphin, Y., Liang, P., and Vaughan, J. W. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=2LdBqxcl1Yv>.
- Kozachenko, L. F. and Leonenko, N. N. Sample estimate of the entropy of a random vector. *Problems Inform. Transmission*, 23:95–101, 1987.
- McAllester, D. and Stratos, K. Formal limitations on the measurement of mutual information. In Chiappa, S. and Calandra, R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Twenty Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 108 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 875–884. PMLR, 08 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v108/mcallester20a.html>.
- Poole, B., Ozair, S., Van Den Oord, A., Alemi, A., and Tucker, G. On variational bounds of mutual information. In Chaudhuri, K. and Salakhutdinov, R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 5171–5180. PMLR, 06 2019. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/poole19a.html>.
- Rezende, D. J. and Mohamed, S. Variational inference with normalizing flows. In Bach, F. R. and Blei, D. M. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2015, Lille, France, 6-11 July 2015*, volume 37 of *JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, pp. 1530–1538. JMLR.org, 2015. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v37/rezende15.html>.
- Rhodes, B., Xu, K., and Gutmann, M. U. Telescoping density-ratio estimation. In Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M., and Lin, H. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 4905–4916. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2020/file/33d3b157ddc0896addfb22fa2a519097-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/33d3b157ddc0896addfb22fa2a519097-Paper.pdf).
- Sen, R., Suresh, A. T., Shanmugam, K., Dimakis, A. G., and Shakkottai, S. Model-powered conditional independence test. In Guyon, I., Luxburg, U. V., Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2017/file/02f039058bd48307e6f653a2005c9dd2-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/02f039058bd48307e6f653a2005c9dd2-Paper.pdf).
- Shwartz-Ziv, R. and Tishby, N. Opening the black box of deep neural networks via information, 2017.
- Song, J. and Ermon, S. Understanding the limitations of variational mutual information estimators. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=B1x62TntDS>.
- Spivak, M. *Calculus On Manifolds: A Modern Approach To Classical Theorems Of Advanced Calculus*. Avalon Publishing, 1965. ISBN 9780805390216.
- Steinke, T. and Zakyntinou, L. Reasoning About Generalization via Conditional Mutual Information. In Abernethy, J. and Agarwal, S. (eds.), *Proceedings of Thirty Third Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 125 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 3437–3452. PMLR, 09–12 Jul 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v125/steinke20a.html>.
- Teng, Y. and Choromanska, A. Invertible autoencoder for domain adaptation. *Computation*, 7(2), 2019. ISSN 2079-3197. doi: 10.3390/computation7020020. URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2079-3197/7/2/20>.
- Tishby, N. and Zaslavsky, N. Deep learning and the information bottleneck principle. *2015 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, pp. 1–5, 2015.
- Tishby, N., Pereira, F. C., and Bialek, W. The information bottleneck method. In *Proc. of the 37-th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control and Computing*, pp. 368–377, 1999. URL [/brokenurl#citeseeer.nj.nec.com/tishby99information.html](http://brokenurl#citeseeer.nj.nec.com/tishby99information.html).
- van den Oord, A., Li, Y., and Vinyals, O. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding, 2019.
- Xu, A. and Raginsky, M. Information-theoretic analysis of generalization capability of learning algorithms. In Guyon, I., Luxburg, U. V., Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2017/file/ad71c82b22f4f65b9398f76d8be4c615-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/ad71c82b22f4f65b9398f76d8be4c615-Paper.pdf).

Zhang, Q. and Chen, Y. Diffusion normalizing flow. In Ranzato, M., Beygelzimer, A., Dauphin, Y., Liang, P., and Vaughan, J. W. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pp. 16280–16291. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2021/file/876f1f9954de0aa402d91bb988d12cd4-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2021/file/876f1f9954de0aa402d91bb988d12cd4-Paper.pdf).

## A. Complete proofs

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* For any function  $g$ , let us denote  $\sqrt{\det(J^T(x)J(x))}$  (area transformation coefficient) by  $\alpha(x)$  where it exists.

Foremost, let us note that in both cases,  $\rho_\xi(x | \eta)$  and  $\rho_{g(\xi)}(x' | \eta) = \rho_\xi(x | \eta)/\alpha(x)$  exist. Hereinafter, we integrate over  $\text{supp } \xi \cap \{x | \alpha(x) \neq 0\}$  instead of  $\text{supp } \xi$ ; as  $\alpha \neq 0$  almost everywhere by the assumption, the values of the integrals are not altered.

According to the definition of the differential entropy,

$$\begin{aligned} h(g(\xi)) &= - \int \frac{\rho_\xi(x)}{\alpha(x)} \log \left( \frac{\rho_\xi(x)}{\alpha(x)} \right) \alpha(x) dx = \\ &= - \int \rho_\xi(x) \log(\rho_\xi(x)) dx + \int \rho_\xi(x) \log(\alpha(x)) dx = \\ &= h(\xi) + \mathbb{E} \log \alpha(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} h(g(\xi) | \eta) &= \mathbb{E}_\eta \left( - \int \frac{\rho_\xi(x | \eta)}{\alpha(x)} \log \left( \frac{\rho_\xi(x | \eta)}{\alpha(x)} \right) \alpha(x) dx \right) = \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\eta \left( - \int \rho_\xi(x | \eta) \log(\rho_\xi(x | \eta)) dx + \int \rho_\xi(x | \eta) \log(\alpha(x)) dx \right) = \\ &= h(\xi | \eta) + \mathbb{E} \log \alpha(\xi) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by the MI definition,

$$I(g(\xi); \eta) = h(g(\xi)) - h(g(\xi) | \eta) = h(\xi) - h(\xi | \eta) = I(\xi; \eta).$$

□

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* As  $h(Z - m) = h(Z)$ , let us consider a centered random vector  $Z$ . We denote probability density function of  $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$  as  $\phi_\Sigma$ .

$$\text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\rho_Z || \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_Z(z) \log \frac{\rho_Z(z)}{\phi_\Sigma(z)} dz = -h(Z) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_Z(z) \log \phi_\Sigma(z) dz$$

Note that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_Z(z) \log \phi_\Sigma(z) dz = \text{const} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_Z z^T \Sigma^{-1} z = \text{const} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)} z^T \Sigma^{-1} z = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_Z(z) \log \phi_\Sigma(z) dz,$$

from which we arrive to the final result:

$$\text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\rho_Z || \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)) = -h(Z) + h(\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma))$$

□

*Proof of Corollary 3.3.* By applying Theorem 3.1 to Equation (2), we derive the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned} I(\xi; \eta) &= \frac{1}{2} [\log \det \Sigma_{\xi, \xi} + \log \det \Sigma_{\eta, \eta} - \log \det \Sigma] + \\ &\quad + \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\rho_{\xi, \eta} || \mathcal{N}(m, \Sigma)) - \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\rho_\xi || \mathcal{N}(m_\xi, \Sigma_{\xi, \xi})) - \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\rho_\eta || \mathcal{N}(m_\eta, \Sigma_{\eta, \eta})) \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\rho_\xi || \mathcal{N}(m_\xi, \Sigma_{\xi, \xi})) + \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\rho_\eta || \mathcal{N}(m_\eta, \Sigma_{\eta, \eta})) = \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\rho_\xi \otimes \rho_\eta || \mathcal{N}(m, \text{diag}(\Sigma_{\xi, \xi}, \Sigma_{\eta, \eta}))),$$

which results in

$$I(\xi; \eta) = \frac{1}{2} [\log \det \Sigma_{\xi, \xi} + \log \det \Sigma_{\eta, \eta} - \log \det \Sigma] + \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\rho_{\xi, \eta} \| \mathcal{N}(m, \Sigma)) - \text{D}_{\text{KL}}(\rho_{\xi} \otimes \rho_{\eta} \| \mathcal{N}(m, \text{diag}(\Sigma_{\xi, \xi}, \Sigma_{\eta, \eta})))$$

□

*Proof of Statement 3.6.* Due to the change of variables formula,

$$\mathcal{L}_{S_{\mathcal{N}} \circ (f_X \times f_Y)}(\{(x_k, y_k)\}) = \log \left| \det \frac{\partial f(x, y)}{\partial(x, y)} \right| + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}}(\{f(x_k, y_k)\})$$

As  $f = f_X \times f_Y$ , the Jacobian matrix  $\frac{\partial f(x, y)}{\partial(x, y)}$  is block-diagonal, so

$$\log \left| \det \frac{\partial f(x, y)}{\partial(x, y)} \right| = \log \left| \det \frac{\partial f_X(x)}{\partial x} \right| + \log \left| \det \frac{\partial f_Y(y)}{\partial y} \right|$$

Finally, we use the maximum-likelihood estimates for  $m$  and  $\Sigma$  to drop the supremum in  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}}(\{f(x_k, y_k)\})$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{m} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N f(x_k, y_k), \quad \hat{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N (f(x_k, y_k) - \hat{m})(f(x_k, y_k) - \hat{m})^T \implies \\ &\implies \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}}(\{f(x_k, y_k)\}) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}(\hat{m}, \hat{\Sigma})}(\{f(x_k, y_k)\}) \end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Remark 3.7.*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{S_{\mathcal{N}} \circ (Az+b)}(\{z_k\}) &= \log |\det A| + \mathcal{L}_{S_{\mathcal{N}}}(\{Az_k + b\}) = \log |\det A| + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}(\hat{m}+b, A\hat{\Sigma}A^T)}(\{Az_k + b\}) = \\ &= \log |\det A| + \log |\det A^{-1}| + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}(\hat{m}, \hat{\Sigma})}(\{z_k\}) = \mathcal{L}_{S_{\mathcal{N}}}(\{z_k\}) \end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Corollary 3.9.* Under the proposed assumptions,  $\log \det \Sigma_{\xi, \xi} = \log \det \Sigma_{\eta, \eta} = 0$ , so  $I(\xi; \eta) = -\frac{1}{2} \log \det \Sigma$ . The matrix  $\Sigma$  is block-diagonalizable via the following permutation:

$$(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{d_{\xi}}, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_{d_{\eta}}) \mapsto (\xi_1, \eta_1, \xi_2, \eta_2, \dots),$$

with the blocks being

$$\text{cov}(\xi_i, \eta_i) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho_j \\ \rho_j & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

The determinant of block-diagonal matrix is a product of the block determinants, so  $I(\xi; \eta) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_k \log(1 - \rho_j^2)$ . □

*Proof of Statement 3.10.* Let us consider centered  $\xi$  and  $\eta$ , as shifting is an invertible affine mapping. Note that  $\Sigma_{\xi, \xi}$  and  $\Sigma_{\eta, \eta}$  are positive definite and symmetric, so the following symmetric matrix square roots are defined:  $A = \Sigma_{\xi, \xi}^{-1/2}$ ,  $B = \Sigma_{\eta, \eta}^{-1/2}$ . By applying these invertible linear transformation to  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  we get

$$\text{cov}(A\xi, B\eta) = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{\xi, \xi}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{\xi, \xi} (\Sigma_{\xi, \xi}^{-1/2})^T & \Sigma_{\xi, \xi}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{\xi, \eta} (\Sigma_{\eta, \eta}^{-1/2})^T \\ \Sigma_{\eta, \eta}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{\eta, \xi} (\Sigma_{\xi, \xi}^{-1/2})^T & \Sigma_{\eta, \eta}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{\eta, \eta} (\Sigma_{\eta, \eta}^{-1/2})^T \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & C \\ C^T & I \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $C = \Sigma_{\xi, \xi}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{\xi, \eta} (\Sigma_{\eta, \eta}^{-1/2})^T$ .

Then, the singular value decomposition is performed:  $C = URV^T$ , where  $U$  and  $V$  are orthogonal,  $R = \text{diag}(\{\rho_j\})$ . Finally, we apply  $U^T$  to  $A\xi$  and  $V^T$  to  $B\eta$ :

$$\text{cov}(U^T A\xi, V^T B\eta) = \begin{bmatrix} U^T U & U^T C V \\ (U^T C V)^T & V^T V \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & R \\ R^T & I \end{bmatrix},$$

Note that  $U^T A$  and  $V^T B$  are invertible. □

*Proof of Statement 3.11.* Note that  $\Sigma$  is positive definite and symmetric, so the following symmetric matrix square root is defined:  $\Sigma^{-1/2}$ . This matrix is a normalization matrix:  $\text{cov}(\Sigma^{-1/2}(\xi, \eta)) = \Sigma^{-1/2} \Sigma (\Sigma^{-1/2})^T = I$ .

According to the change of variable formula,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)}(\{z_k\}) = \log \det \Sigma^{-1/2} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}(0, I)}(\{\Sigma^{-1/2} z_k\})$$

As  $\Sigma_{\xi, \xi} = I_{d_\xi}$  and  $\Sigma_{\eta, \eta} = I_{d_\eta}$ , from the equation (5) we derive

$$I(\xi; \eta) = -\frac{1}{2} \log \det \Sigma = \log \det \Sigma^{-1/2}$$

Finally, it is sufficient to validate the proposed closed-form expression for  $\Sigma^{1/2}$  in the case of  $2 \times 2$  matrices, as  $\Sigma$  is block-diagonalizable (with  $2 \times 2$  blocks) via the following permutation:

$$M: (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{d_\xi}, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_{d_\eta}) \mapsto (\xi_1, \eta_1, \xi_2, \eta_2, \dots),$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha + \beta & \alpha - \beta \\ \alpha - \beta & \alpha + \beta \end{bmatrix}^2 &= 2 \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^2 + \beta^2 & \alpha^2 - \beta^2 \\ \alpha^2 - \beta^2 & \alpha^2 + \beta^2 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{1 - \rho^2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\rho \\ -\rho & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &\frac{1}{1 - \rho^2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\rho \\ -\rho & 1 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

□

## B. Non-Gaussian-based tests

As our estimator is based on Gaussianization, it seems natural that we observe good performance in the experiments with synthetic data acquired from the correlated Gaussian vectors via invertible transformations. Possible bias towards such data can not be discriminated via the *independency* and *self-consistency* tests, and hard to discriminate via the *data-processing* test proposed in Czyż et al. (2023); Franzese et al. (2024) for the following reasons:

1. *Independency* test requires  $\hat{I}(X; Y) \approx 0$  for independent  $X$  and  $Y$ . In such case, as  $\text{cov}(f_X(X), f_Y(Y)) = 0$  for any measurable  $f_X$  and  $f_Y$ ,  $\hat{I}_{\text{MIENF}}(X; Y) \approx 0$  in any meaningful scenario (no overfitting, no ill-posed transformations), regardless of the marginal distributions of  $X$  and  $Y$ .
2. *Self-consistency* test requires  $\hat{I}(X; Y) \approx \hat{I}(g(X); Y)$  for  $X, Y$  and  $g$  satisfying Theorem 2.1. In our setup, this test only measures the ability of normalizing flows to invert  $g$ , and provides no information about the quality of  $\hat{I}(X; Y)$  and  $\hat{I}(g(X); Y)$ .
3. *Data-processing* test leverages the *data processing inequality* (Cover & Thomas, 2006) via requiring  $\hat{I}(X; Y) \geq \hat{I}(g(X); Y)$  for any  $X, Y$  and measurable  $g$ . Theoretically, this test may highlight the bias of our estimator towards binormalizable data. However, this requires constructing  $X, Y$  and  $g$ , so  $X$  and  $Y$  are not binormalizable,  $g(X)$  and  $Y$  are and  $\hat{I}(X; Y) < \hat{I}(g(X); Y)$ , which seems challenging to achieve.

That is why we use two additional, non-Gaussian-based families of distributions with known closed-form expressions for MI and easy sampling procedures: *multivariate Student distribution* (Arellano-Valle et al., 2013) and *smoothed uniform distribution* (Czyż et al., 2023).

In the following subsections, we provide additional information about the distributions, closed-form expressions for MI and sampling procedures.

### B.1. Multivariate Student distribution

Consider  $(n + m)$ -dimensional  $(\tilde{X}; \tilde{Y}) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ , where  $\Sigma$  is selected to achieve  $I(\tilde{X}; \tilde{Y}) = \varkappa > 0$ . Firstly, a correction term is calculated in accordance to the following formula:

$$c(k, n, m) = f(k) + f(k + n + m) - f(k + n) - f(k + m), \quad f(x) = \log \Gamma\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) - \frac{x}{2} \psi\left(\frac{x}{2}\right),$$

where  $k$  is the number of degrees of freedom,  $\psi$  is the digamma function. Secondly,  $X = \tilde{X} / \sqrt{k/U}$  and  $Y = \tilde{Y} / \sqrt{k/U}$  are defined, where  $U \sim \chi_k^2$ . The resulting vectors are distributed according to the multivariate Student distribution with  $k$  degrees of freedom. According to [Arellano-Valle et al. \(2013\)](#),  $I(X; Y) = \varkappa + c(k, n, m)$ . During the generation,  $\varkappa$  is set to  $I(X; Y) - c(k, n, m)$  to achieve the desired value of  $I(X; Y)$ .

Note that  $I(X; Y) \neq 0$  even in the case of independent  $\tilde{X}$  and  $\tilde{Y}$ , as some information between  $X$  and  $Y$  is shared via the magnitude.

### B.2. Smoothed uniform distribution

**Lemma B.1.** Consider independent  $X \sim \text{U}[0; 1]$ ,  $Z \sim \text{U}[-\varepsilon; \varepsilon]$  and  $Y = X + Z$ . Then

$$I(X; Y) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon - \log(2\varepsilon), & \varepsilon < 1/2 \\ (4\varepsilon)^{-1} & \varepsilon \geq 1/2 \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

*Proof.* Probability density function of  $Y$  (two cases):

$$(\varepsilon < 1/2): \quad \rho_Y(y) = (\rho_X * \rho_Z)(y) = \begin{cases} 0, & y < -\varepsilon \vee y \geq 1 + \varepsilon \\ \frac{y+\varepsilon}{2\varepsilon}, & -\varepsilon \leq y < \varepsilon \\ 1, & \varepsilon \leq y < 1 - \varepsilon \\ \frac{1+\varepsilon-y}{2\varepsilon}, & 1 - \varepsilon \leq y < 1 + \varepsilon \end{cases}$$

$$(\varepsilon \geq 1/2): \quad \rho_Y(y) = (\rho_X * \rho_Z)(y) = \begin{cases} 0, & y < -\varepsilon \vee y \geq 1 + \varepsilon \\ \frac{y+\varepsilon}{2\varepsilon}, & -\varepsilon \leq y < 1 - \varepsilon \\ \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}, & 1 - \varepsilon \leq y < \varepsilon \\ \frac{1+\varepsilon-y}{2\varepsilon}, & \varepsilon \leq y < 1 + \varepsilon \end{cases}$$

Differential entropy of a uniformly distributed random variable:

$$h(U[a; b]) = \log(b - a)$$

Conditional differential entropy of  $Y$  with respect to  $X$ :

$$h(Y | X) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim X} h(Y | X = x) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim X} h(Z + x | X = x)$$

As  $X$  and  $Z$  are independent,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim X} h(Z + x | X = x) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim X} h(Z + x) = \int_0^1 \log(2\varepsilon) dx = \log(2\varepsilon) \quad (11)$$

Differential entropy of  $Y$ :

$$h(Y) = - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \rho_Y(y) dy = \begin{cases} \varepsilon, & \varepsilon < 1/2 \\ (4\varepsilon)^{-1} + \log(2\varepsilon), & \varepsilon \geq 1/2 \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

The final result is acquired via substituting (11) and (12) into (1).  $\square$

Equation (10) can be inverted:

$$\varepsilon = \begin{cases} -W\left[-\frac{1}{2} \exp(-I(X; Y))\right], & I(X; Y) < 1/2 \\ (4 \cdot I(X; Y))^{-1}, & I(X; Y) \geq 1/2 \end{cases}, \quad (13)$$

where  $W$  is the product logarithm function.

## C. Technical details

In this section, we describe the technical details of our experimental setup: architecture of the neural networks, hyperparameters, etc.

For the tests described in Section 4, we use architectures listed in Table 2. The autoencoders are trained via Adam (Kingma & Ba, 2017) optimizer on  $5 \cdot 10^3$  images with a batch size  $5 \cdot 10^3$ , a learning rate  $10^{-3}$  and MAE loss for  $2 \cdot 10^3$  epochs. The MINE critic network is trained via Adam optimizer on  $5 \cdot 10^3$  pairs of images with a batch size 512, a learning rate  $10^{-3}$  for  $5 \cdot 10^3$  epochs. The GLOW normalizing flow is trained via Adam optimizer on  $10 \cdot 10^3$  images with a batch size 256, a learning rate decaying from  $3 \cdot 10^{-4}$  to  $2 \cdot 10^{-5}$  for  $2 \cdot 10^3$  epochs.

Table 2: The NN architectures used to conduct the tests in Section 4.

NN	Architecture
AEs, $16 \times 16$ ( $32 \times 32$ ) images	$\times 1$ : Conv2d(1, 4, ks=3), BatchNorm2d, LeakyReLU(0.2), MaxPool2d(2)
	$\times 1$ : Conv2d(4, 8, ks=3), BatchNorm2d, LeakyReLU(0.2), MaxPool2d(2)
	$\times 2(3)$ : Conv2d(8, 8, ks=3), BatchNorm2d, LeakyReLU(0.2), MaxPool2d(2)
	$\times 1$ : Dense(8, dim), Tanh, Dense(dim, 8), LeakyReLU(0.2)
	$\times 2(3)$ : Upsample(2), Conv2d(8, 8, ks=3), BatchNorm2d, LeakyReLU(0.2)
	$\times 1$ : Upsample(2), Conv2d(8, 4, ks=3), BatchNorm2d, LeakyReLU(0.2)
	$\times 1$ : Conv2d(4, 1, ks=3), BatchNorm2d, LeakyReLU(0.2)
MINE, critic NN, $16 \times 16$ ( $32 \times 32$ ) images	$\times 1$ : [Conv2d(1, 8, ks=3), MaxPool2d(2), LeakyReLU(0.01)] $\times 2$ in parallel
	$\times 1(2)$ : [Conv2d(8, 8, ks=3), MaxPool2d(2), LeakyReLU(0.01)] $\times 2$ in parallel
	$\times 1$ : Dense(128, 100), LeakyReLU(0.01)
	$\times 1$ : Dense(100, 100), LeakyReLU(0.01)
	$\times 1$ : Dense(100, 1)
GLOW, $16 \times 16$ ( $32 \times 32$ ) images	$\times 1$ : 4 (5) splits, 2 GLOW blocks between splits, 32 hidden channels in each block, leaky constant = 0.01
	$\times 1$ : Orthogonal linear layer
	$\times 4$ : RealNVP(AffineCouplingBlock(MLP( $d/2$ , 32, 32, $d$ )), Permute)
RealNVP, $d$ -dimensional data	$\times 16$ : RealNVP(AffineCouplingBlock(MLP( $d/2$ , 32, 32, 32, $d$ )), Permute)

Here we do not explicitly define  $g_\xi$  and  $g_\eta$  used in the tests with synthetic data, as these functions smoothly map low-dimensional vectors to high-dimensional images and, thus, are very complex. A Python implementation of the functions in question is available in the supplementary material, see the file `source/python/mutinfo/utis/synthetic.py`.