Generative Modeling: A Review

Nick Polson* Booth School of Business University of Chicago Vadim Sokolov⁺ Department of Industrial Engineering George Mason University

First Draft: September10, 2024 This Draft: January 13, 2025

Abstract

Generative methods (Gen-AI) are reviewed with a particular goal to solving tasks in Machine Learning and Bayesian inference. Generative models require one to simulate a large training dataset and to use deep neural networks to solve a supervised learning problem. To do this, we require high dimensional regression methods and tools for dimensionality reduction (a.k.a feature selection). The main advantage of Gen-AI methods is their ability to be model-free and to use deep neural networks to estimate conditional densities or posterior quantiles of interest. To illustrate generative methods , we analyze the well-known Ebola data-set. Finally, we conclude with directions for future research.

Key Words: Generative AI, Neural Networks, Deep Learning, ABC, INN, Normalizing Flows, Diffusion Models, Quantile Bayes, Fiducial Inference, Ebola

^{*}Nick Polson is Professor of Econometrics and Statistics at ChicagoBooth, email: ngp@chicagobooth.edu. [†]Vadim Sokolov is an Assistant Professor in Operations Research at George Mason University, email: vsokolov@anl.gov

1 Introduction

An important task in machine learning is the following: Given input-output pairs where the input is high dimensional construct a "look-up" table (a.k.a. dictionary) for the inputoutput examples. This is an encoding (a.k.a. data compression problem) for fast search and retrieval. Another common problem is to find a simple prediction rule (a.k.a. algorithm), namely, *can we find a good predictor* f(x) *to evaluate on x to predict output y*? Given a training dataset $(y_i, x_i)_{i=1}^N$ of input-output pairs can we train a model i.e. find f. Computationally, we have a high dimensional multivariate function f(x) where $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d)$. Given (y, x)-input-output pairs we have a pattern matching (a.k.a. supervised learning) nonparametric regression of the form

$$y = f(x)$$
 where $x = (x_1, ..., x_d)$

To achieve good generalisability we need to be able to perform nonlinear dimension reduction and to find a suitable set of features/factors. The key question is *How do we represent a multivariate function so as to make training efficient?* Many high dimensional statistical models require data dimension reduction methods. Following Breiman (2001) we represent data as being generated by a black box with an input vector *x*. The black box generates output *y*, or a predictive distribution over the output p(Y | X) that describes uncertainty in predicting *y* from *x*. Fisher (1922) and Cook (2007) describe clearly the issue of dimension reduction. Although it was typical to find predictors via screening and plotting them against the output variable

A central problem in statistical inference is to calculate a posterior distribution of interest. Given a likelihood function, $p(y | \theta)$ or a forward model $y = f(\theta)$, and a prior distribution $\pi(\theta)$ the goal is an inverse probability calculation is to compute the posterior distribution $p(\theta | y)$. This is notoriously hard for high-dimensional models. MCMC methods solve this by generating samples from the posterior using density evaluation. Generative AI techniques, on the other hand, directly learn the mapping from the a uniform to the distribution of the interest. The main advantage of generative AI is that it is model free and doesn't require the use of iterative density methods. The inverse Bayesian map is replaced by pattern recognition of an input-output map using deep learning. Deep Quantile NNs provide a general framework for inference decision making. Quantile NN provide an alternative to invertible NN approaches, such as normalizing flows.

Generative methods solve both of these problems as follows. Let $Z \sim P_Z$ be a base measure for a latent variable, Z, typically a standard multivariate normal or vector of uniforms. The goal of generative methods is to characterize the posterior measure $P_{X|Y}$ from the training data $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^N \sim P_{X,Y}$ where N is chosen to be suitably large. A deep learner is used to estimate \hat{f} via the non-parametric regression X = f(Y, Z). The deep learner is estimated via a NN from the triples $(X_i, Y_i, Z_i)_{i=1}^N \sim P_{X,Y} \times P_Z$. The ensuing estimator \hat{H}_N can be thought of as a transport map from the based distribution to the posterior as required. In the case, where Z is a uniform, this amounts to inverse cdf sampling, namely $X = F_{X|Y}^{-1}(U)$.

Let $(X, Y) \sim P_{X,Y}$ be input-output pairs and $P_{X,Y}$ a joint measure from which we can simulate a training dataset $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^N \sim P_{X,Y}$. Standard prediction techniques for the con-

ditional posterior mean $\hat{X}(Y) = E(X|Y) = f(Y)$ of the input given the output. To do this, consider the multivariate non-parametric regression $X = f(Y) + \epsilon$ and provide methods for estimating the conditional mean. Typically estimators, \hat{f} , include KNN and Kernel methods. Recently, deep learners have been proposed and the theoretical properties of superpositions of affine functions (a.k.a. ridge functions) have been provided (see Montanelli and Yang (2020), Schmidt-Hieber (2020), Polson and Ročková (2018)). In general, we characterize the posterior map for *any* output *Y*. Simply evaluate the network at any *Y* via use the transport map

$$X = H(S(Y), \psi(Z))$$

from a new base draw, *Z*. Here ψ denotes the cosine embedding so that the architecture for the latent variable corresponds to a discrete Fourier approximation. Generative methods on the other hand make use of supervised learning problems by constructing a "look-up" table of training data to which a deep neural network is fitted. This provides a so-called transport map to a base distribution, given by the a latent variable *z* with known distribution p(z). As we can choose the sample size *N*, it is important to understand the Bayes risk properties of such deep learning estimators and their interpolation properties known as double descent.

The rest of the paper is outlined as follows. Section 1.1 describes dimensionality reduction techniques. Section 2 describes the many alternatives to architecture design. For example, auto-encoders Albert et al. (2022); Akesson et al. (2021) or implicit models, see Diggle and Gratton (1984); Baker et al. (2022); Schultz et al. (2022) There is also a link with indirect inference methods developed in Pastorello et al. (2003); Stroud et al. (2003); Drovandi et al. (2011, 2015) Commonly used generative methods include: Variational AutoEncoder (VAE), Independent Component Analysis (ICA), Nonlinear Independent Component Estimation (NICE), Normalizing Flows (NF), Invertible Neural Networks (INN), Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN), Conditional GAN, Approximate Bayesian Computation (ABC) and Deep Fiducial Inference (DFI). Section 3 reviews Generative Bayesian Computation to the classic Ebola dataset. Finally, Section 5 concludes with direction for future research.

Folklore of Deep Learning: *Shallow Deep Learners provide good representations of multi-variate functions and are good extrapolators.*

Hence we can evaluate the network at any new input and predict an output and we can still learn the posterior map of interest.

Double Descent There is still the question of approximation and the interpolation properties of a DNN. Recent research on interpolation properties of quantile neural networks were recently studied by Padilla et al. (2022) and Shen et al. (2021), Schmidt-Hieber (2020). See also Bach (2024); Belkin et al. (2019)

2 Generative Methods

Let *Z* ~ *p*(*Z*) be drawn from a base distribution. Suppose that we have a joint likelihood, $p_{\theta}(X, Z)$, defined by

$$p_{\theta}(x,z) = p(x,z|\theta) = p(x|\theta)p(z)$$

The parameters are drawn from $\theta \sim \pi(\theta)$. We will learn two maps via the use of deep learners so that we can generate a forward and reverse process, namely

$$x = f(z)$$
 and $z = g(x)$

where *f* and *g* are superpositions (a.k.a. compositions) of univariate semi affine functions

$$f = f_T \circ \ldots \circ f_1$$
 and $g = g_1 \circ \ldots \circ g_T$

The maps are chosen to be invertible with easy to handle Jacobians.

Flow-based generative models, with invertible transformations, to map x to a latent based distribution z are commonplace. See Papamakarios et al. (2017) for masked autoregressive flows for density estimation. Inference, on the other hand, is a conditional density estimation problem where we wish to estimate the conditional posterior of interest, namely $p(\theta|x)$. The generator leads to an imputed distribution for θ given by

$$\theta = G(x, z)$$
 where $z \sim p(z)$

The discriminator D(x) tests for the marginal of the data. The noise outsourcing theorem guarantees the existence of an oracle generator network which we denote by G^* . This is summarized as

Noise Outsourcing Theorem If (X, Θ) are random variables in a Borel space (\mathcal{X}, Θ) then there exists an r.v. *Z* which is independent of *X* and a function $G^* : [0, 1] \times \mathcal{X} \to \Theta$

$$(X, \Theta) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} (X, G^{\star}(Z, X))$$

Hence the existence of G^* follows from the noise outsourcing theorem Kallenberg (1997). Furthermore, if there is a statistic S(X) with $X \perp \Theta | S(X)$, then

$$\Theta|X \stackrel{a.s.}{=} G^{\star}(Z, S(X)))$$

The role of S(X) is to perform dimension reduction in n, the dimensionality of the signal. S(X) can be estimated optimally via a deep neural network as the conditional mean $\hat{S}(X) = E(\Theta|X)$ as shown in Jiang et al. (2017).

Dimensionality reduction This can be performed using auto-encoders and partial least-squares Polson et al. (2021) due to the result by Brillinger Brillinger (2012); Bhadra et al. (2021), see survey by Blum et al. (2013) and kernel embeddings approach discussed by Park et al. (2016). Generative AI circumvents the need for methods like MCMC that require the density evaluations. Dimensionality-reduced sufficient statistics, along with the

non-linear maps Jiang et al. (2017); Albert et al. (2022). A number of authors have discussed the choice of summary statistics S(X). In an ABC framework with a parametric exponential family, see Beaumont et al. (2002), optimal choice Nunes and Balding (2010) A local smoothing version of ABC is given in Jiang et al. (2018); Bernton et al. (2019) Fearnhead and Prangle (2012), Longstaff and Schwartz (2001) take a basis function approach. Pastorello et al. (2003) provide an estimation procedure when latent variables are present. Our work builds on Jiang et al. (2017) who were the first to propose deep learners for dimension reduction methods and to provide asymptotic theoretical results. Our approach also builds on the insight by Dabney et al. (2018); Ostrovski et al. (2018) that implicit quantile neural networks can be ued to approximated posterior distributions that arise in decision theory.

Sufficient Dimension Reduction: Let S(y) is sufficient summary statistic in the Bayes sense (Kolmogorov, 1942), if for every prior π

$$f_B(y) := \pi_{\theta \mid y}(\theta \in B \mid y) = \pi_{\theta \mid s(y)}(\theta \in B \mid s(y)).$$

Then we need to use our pattern matching datatest $(y^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)})$ which is simulated from the prior and forward model to "train" the set of functions $f_B(y)$ where we pick the sets $B = (-\infty, q]$ for a quantile q. Hence, we can then interpolate in between.

Estimating the full sequence of functions is then done by interpolating for all Borel sets *B* and all new data points *y* using a NN architecture and conditional density NN estimation.

Summary Statistic: The notion of a summary statistic is prevalent in the ABC literature and is tightly related to the notion of a Bayesian sufficient statistic S^* for θ , then Kolmogorov (1942) in the Bayesian context for almost every y

$$\pi(\theta \mid Y = y) = \pi(\theta \mid S^*(Y) = S^*(y))$$

Furthermore, $S(y) = E(\theta | Y = y) = E_{\pi}(\theta | S^*(Y) = S^*(y))$ is a function of $S^*(y)$. In the case of exponential family, we have $S(Y) = E_{\pi}(\theta | Y)$ is a one-to-one function of $S^*(Y)$, and thus is a minimal sufficient statistic.

Sufficient statistics are generally kept for parametric exponential families where $S(\cdot)$ is given by the specification of the probabilistic model. However, many forward models have an implicit likelihood and no such structures. The generalisation of sufficiency is a summary statistics (a.k.a. feature extraction/selection in a neural network). Hence, we make the assumption that there exists a set of features such that the dimensionality of the problem is reduced

Learning Summary Statistics A deep NN can effectively learn a good approximation to the posterior mean $E_{\pi}(\theta \mid y)$ by using a large data set $(y^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)})_{i=1}^N \sim \pi \times \mathcal{M}$ and solving the ℓ_2 - minimisation problem

$$\arg\min_{\psi} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|S_{\psi}(y^{(i)}) - \theta^{(i)}\|^2.$$

The resulting estimator $\hat{\theta}(y) = S_{\hat{\psi}}(y)$ approaches S(y). This still leaves the problem of simulating a training data set tto learn the ABC posterior, which requires the rejection sampling. Our approach, on the other hand, rectifies this issue. Our approach directly evaluates the network on y_{obs} and relies on good generalization error, a.k.a. interpolation.

Bayes Risk Consider the non-parametric condition regression, $y_i = f(x_i) + \epsilon_i$ where $x_i = (x_{1i}, \ldots, x_{di})$. We wish to estimate a *d*-dimensional multivariate function $f(x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ where $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in [0, 1]^d$. From a classical risk perspective, with $\|.\|$ denoting $L^2(P_X)$ -norm, define

$$R(f, \hat{f}_N) = E_{X,Y} \left(\|f - \hat{f}_N\|^2 \right).$$

A key asymptotic result comes from a posterior concentration property. Here \hat{f}_N is constructed as a regularised MAP (maximum a posteriori) estimator which solves the optimisation problem

$$\hat{f}_N = \arg\min_{\hat{f}_N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \hat{f}_N(x_i)^2 + \lambda \phi(\hat{f}_N))$$

where λ is a regularisation parameter.

The ensuing posterior distribution $\Pi(f|x, y)$ concentrates on the minimax rate (up to a log *N* factors). For example, Barron (1993) shows rates of convergence given by $O(N^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ for Fourier networks. Under standard assumptions, we have an optimal minimax rate, for β -Hólder smooth functions *f*,

$$\inf_{\hat{f}} \sup_{f} R(f, \hat{f}_N) = O_p\left(N^{-2\beta/(2\beta+d)}\right)$$

Typically, this space is too large as the bound still depends on d. By restricting the class of functions better rates can be obtained including ones that do no depend on d and in this sense we avoid the curse of dimensionality. For example, it is common to consider the class of linear superpositions (a.k.a. ridge functions) and projection pursuit.

A key result in the deep learning literature is the following rate. Given a training dataset of input-output pairs $(x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^N$ from the model $y = f(x) + \epsilon$ where f is a deep learner (a.k.a. superposition of functions $f = g_L \circ \ldots g_1 \circ g_0$ where g_l are β_l -smooth Hólder functions with d_l variables, that is $|g_l(x) - g_l(y)| < |x - y|^{\beta_l}$.

Then the deep learning estimator has optimal rate, given by

$$O\left(\max_{1\leq i\leq L} N^{-2\beta^*/(2\beta^*+d_i)}\right) \text{ where } \beta_i^* = \beta_i \prod_{l=i+1}^L \min(\beta_l, 1)$$

For example, for generalised additive models with $f_0(x) = h\left(\sum_{p=1}^d f_{0,p}(x_p)\right)$ where $g_0(z) = h(z)$ and $g_1(x_1, \ldots, x_d) = (f_{01}(x_1), \ldots, f_{0d}(x_d))$ and $g_2(y_1, \ldots, y_d) = \sum_{i=1}^d y_i$. So $d_1 = 1, d_2 = 1$ and $t_3 = 1$ as h is Lipschitz. Hence the optimal rate is $O(N^{-1/3})$ and is independent of d! Schmidt-Hieber shows that deep ReLU networks also achieve the optimal rate of $O(N^{-1/3})$. Coppejans (2004) finds a rate of $O(N^{-3/7}) = O(N^{-3/(2 \times 3+1)})$ for 3-times differentiable (cubic B-splines) functions and Igelnik and Parikh (2003) finds a rate $O(N^{-1})$ for Kolmogorov Spline Networks.

2.1 Generative Architectures

We now turn to specific generative methods, namely, Variational Auto-Encoders (VAE), Independent Component Analysis (ICA), Nonlinear Independent Component Estimation (NICE), Normalizing Flows (NF), Invertible Neural Networks (INN), Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN), Conditional GAN, Approximate Bayesian Computation (ABC) and Deep Fiducial Inference (DFI).

Variational Auto-Encoder (VAE) The VAE is a generative model used in machine learning to find an approximate posterior distribution and a forward propagation map (Kingma and Welling, 2022) in the form of a variation of input data or denoising.

The latent space, $z \sim p(z)$, is typically assumes to be a mutivariate mixture of Gaussians. We have a structure of the form

$$p_{\theta}(x) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p_{\theta}(x, z) dz$$
 with $p_{\theta}(x, z) = p_{\theta}(x|z) p_{\theta}(z)$

Here $p_{\theta}(x|z)$ denotes the forward map which we learn with a deep neural network and $p_{\theta}(z)$ is a mixture of Gaussians base distribution. Simultaneously, we learn an approximation, $q_{\phi}(z|x)$ the decoder via its own neural network. This is sometimes called amortised inference. As we are learning density NNs the objective function is

$$\inf_{\theta,\phi} KL(q_{\phi}(z|x), p_{\theta}(z|x))$$

Then we learn both $p_{\theta}(x|z)$ and $q_{\phi}(z|x)$.

Independent Component Analysis (ICA) There is a strong connection with independent component analysis. MacKay (1999) shows that ICA can be viewed as a latent variable model. Specifically, a hierarchical model with a degenerate first stage. Let z_i , $1 \le i \le K$ denote a set of sources. We observe data x_j , $1 \le j \le K$ which are linear mixtures of sources where *A* is the mixing matrix

$$x = Az$$
 with $p(z) = \prod_{i=1}^{K} p_i(z_i)$

We wish to estimate $W = A^{-1}$.

The joint likelihood on observables and hidden states is given by

$$p(x, z|A) = \delta(x - Az)p(z)$$

Inference can be performed in one of two ways. Either as a latent variable model which we will analyze in the next section or via MAP algorithms directly on the marginal likelihood

$$p(x|A) = \int p(x|A,z)p(z)dz = \int \delta(x-Az)p(z)dz$$
$$p(x|A) = \frac{1}{det(A)} \prod_{i=1}^{K} p_i(A_{ij}^{-1}x_j)$$

where we have used the fact that $\int \delta(x - Az) f(z) dz = |A|^{-1} f(x/A)$.

One usually assumes a super-Gaussian source distribution for $z \sim p(z)$ in order to ensure identifiability of W which is unidentified if we simply assume z is multivariate Gaussian.

NICE (Non-linear independent component estimation) Dinh et al. (2015) provide a deep learning framework called the for high-dimensional density estimation, followed by the real NVP (Dinh et al., 2017) transformations for unsupervised learning. The real NVP method learns a stable and invertible bijective function or map between samples $x \sim p_X$ and latent space $s \sim p_S$ or, $\theta \sim p_{\theta}$. For example, Trippe and Turner (2018) utilize normalizing flows as likelihoods for conditional density estimation for complex densities. Rezende and Mohamed (2015a) provide an approximation framework using a series of parametric transformations for complex posteriors. A new method for Monte Carlo integration called Neural Importance Sampler was provided by Müller et al. (2019) based on the NICE framework by parametrize the proposal density by a collection of neural networks.

Normalizing Flows (Density Deep NN) In many cases we can model $G : \Re^n \to \Re^n$ and

$$x = G(z)$$
 where $z \sim p(z)$

In many cases, *G* can be chosen to be an invertible neural networks with a structured diagonal Jacobian that is easy to compute. This makes the mapping *g* far easier to learn. Our objective function can then be standard log-likelihood, with $z = G^{-1}(x)$,

$$p(x) = p(z) |\det J_z|^{-1}$$
 where $J_z = \frac{\partial G(z)}{\partial z}$

A typical procedure for estimating the map *G* relies on maximizing the log-likelihood

$$\log p(z) + \log \left| \det \frac{\partial G^{-1}}{\partial z} \right| \tag{1}$$

The normalizing flow model requires constructing map G that have tractable inverse and Jacobian determinant. It is achieved by representing G as a composite map

$$G = T_k \circ \cdots \circ T_1, \tag{2}$$

We then use simple building block transformations T_i that have tractable inverse and Jacobian determinant.

The likelihood for such a composite map is easily computable. If we put $z_0 = z$ and $z_K = \theta$, the forward evaluation is then

$$z_k = T_k z_{k-1}$$
, for $k = 1, \dots, K$, (3)

with inverse evaluation i

$$z_{k-1} = T_k^{-1}(z_k), \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, K.$$
 (4)

Furthermore, the Jacobian is calculated as the product of Jacobians

$$\left|\det\frac{\partial G^{-1}}{\partial z}\right| = \prod_{k=1}^{K} \left|\det\frac{\partial T_k}{\partial z_{k-1}}\right|^{-1}.$$
(5)

Invertible Neural Network: An important concept in the context of generative models is an invertible neural network or INNs (Dinh et al., 2017). Loosely speaking, an INN is a one-to-one function with a forward mapping $f : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$, and its inverse $g = f^{-1}$. Song et al. (2019) provides the 'MintNet' algorithm to construct INNs by using simple building blocks of triangular matrices, leading to efficient and exact Jacobian calculation. On the other hand, Behrmann et al. (2021) show that common INN method suffer from exploding inverses and provide conditions for stability of INNs. For image representation, Jacobsen et al. (2018) introduce a deep invertible network, called the i-revnet, that retains all information from input data up until the final layer.

HINT (Hierarchical Invertible Neural Transport) networks are discussed in (Kruse et al., 2021) who provide the algorithm for posterior sampling. In this formulation, the function *T* moves in the normalizing direction: a complicated and irregular data distribution $p_w(w)$ towards the simpler, more regular or 'normal' form, of the base measure $p_z(z)$.

Flow transformation models: Here y = h(x) where $h(\cdot)$ is a flow. Typically *h* is modeled as an invertible neural network (INN), with both p_y and p_F as Gaussian densities,

$$p(y, x|s) = p(y|x, s)p(x|s)$$

= $p_y(y|h^{-1}(x), s)p_F(h^{-1}(x)) \left| \frac{\partial h^{-1}}{\partial x} \right|$ where $J_z = \frac{\partial h^{-1}(z)}{\partial z}$

where the determinant of Jacobian is easy to compute. These models can be thought of as latent factor models. Flow-based methods have been used to construct a nonlinear ICA where the dimensionality of the latent space is equal to the data as in an auto-encoder approach, see Camuto et al. (2021).

Latent Factor Model: A special case of flow models contain latent factors that are driven with INNs. These models take the form where (y, X) are observed data and ϵ is the mean zero Gaussian noise

$$y = F^T s + \epsilon \tag{6}$$

$$X = h(F) \tag{7}$$

$$F \sim N(0, I_p), \ s \sim N(0, I_s) \tag{8}$$

Here $h(\cdot)$ is an invertible neural network (INN) and *F* are the latent factors. This is essentially a flow transformation model. We can estimate *h* and *s* using the loss function:

$$L(h,s) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\{ \lambda \|y_i - h^{-1}(x_i)^T s\|^2 + \|h^{-1}(x_i)\|^2 - \log \left|\frac{\partial h^{-1}}{\partial x}\right|(x_i) \right\} - \log p(s)$$

An iterative two-step minimization procedure to learn *h* and *s* is given by: For t = 1, 2, ...

1.
$$\hat{h}^{(t)} = \hat{h}^{(t-1)} - \eta \nabla L(h, \hat{s}^{(t-1)})$$

2. $\hat{s}^{(t)} = \arg\min_s L(\hat{h}^{(t)}, s)$, or draw samples from the posterior $\propto \exp\left(-L(\hat{h}^{(t)}, s)\right)$.

Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN) The third class of methods uses Generative Adversarial Networks. Here we learn the implicit probability distribution over θ by defining a deterministic map $\theta = G_{\theta_g}(z, x)$, called generator. The basic idea of GAN is to introduce a nuisance neural network $D_{\theta_d}(x)$, called discriminator and parameterised by θ_d and then jointly estimate the parameters θ_g of the generator function $G_{\theta_g}(z, x)$ and the discriminator. The discriminator network is a binary classifier which is trained to discriminate generated and real samples θ . The network parameters are found by minimizing standard binomial log-likelihood (a.k.a cross-entropy)

$$J(\theta_d, \theta_g) = -\frac{1}{2} E_x[\log D_{\theta_d}(x)] - \frac{1}{2} E_z[\log(1 - D_{\theta_d}(G_{\theta_g}(z, x)))].$$
(9)

To calculate the first term, the expectation with respect to θ , we just use empirical expectation calculated using observed training samples. Next, we need to specify the cost function for the generator function. Assuming a zero-sum scenario in which the sum of the cost for generator and discriminator is zero, we use the mini-max estimator, which jointly estimates the parameters θ_d (and θ_g as a by-product) and is defined as follows:

$$\min_{\theta_g} \max_{\theta_d} J(\theta_d, \theta_g) \tag{10}$$

The term adversarial, which is misleading, was used due to the analogy with game theory. In GANs the generator networks tries to "trick" the discriminator network by generating samples that cannot be distinguished from real samples available from the training data set.

Conditional GAN cGAN architectures again we generate a reference table from $p(x, \theta)$ but we have to be able to decide when the marginals for the data match up. To do this, we use the Jensen-Shannon Kullback-Leibler divergence io compare the distributions $p(x_{obs})$ and p(x). This can be expressed as

$$JS(p_{\theta}^{(n)}, p_{\theta_0}^{(n)}) = \ln 2 + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{D: \mathcal{X} \to \{0,1\}} \left(E_{x \sim p_{\theta_0}^{(n)}}(\ln D(x)) + E_{x \sim p_{\theta_0}^{(n)}}(\ln(1 - D(x))) \right)$$

This leads to a minimax game interpretation and the need to find two neural networks, a generator *G* and a discriminator *D*. The discriminator plays the same role as the ϵ -nbd in ABC simulation as a way of deciding. whether $p(x_{obs})$ is close to p(x).

Diffusion Models Diffusion models fall into this class as they consist of a forward simulation process, a reverse process and a sampling procedure. They are designed to transport samples to a base distribution typically Gaussian. Here $x_0 \sim q(x)$ leads to a forward

diffusion process $q(x_t|x_{t-1})$. Similar to stochastic gradient Langevin diffusion MCMC (and bridge sampling).

Diffusion Model consists of a forward process (or diffusion process), in which a datum (generally an image) is progressively noised, and a reverse process (or reverse diffusion process), in which noise is transformed back into a sample from the target distribution.

The sampling chain transitions in the forward process can be set to conditional Gaussians when the noise level is sufficiently low. Combining this fact with the Markov assumption leads to a simple parameterization of the forward process:

$$q(x_T|x_0) = \prod_{t=0}^T q(x_t|x_{t-1}) = \prod_{t=0}^T N(\sqrt{1-\beta_t}x_{t-1},\sqrt{\beta_t})$$

where β_t is a variance schedule (either learned or fixed).

Approximate Bayesian Computation Approximate Bayesian Computation (ABC) is a generative method for obtaining samples from the posterior distribution. Both ABC and GANs compare aspects of the data generating mechanism of the observed data (a.k.a. marginal $p(Y^{(n)})$) and data from a generator $p_G(Y^{(n)})$ which is defined by a neural mapping. Once the mapping has been trained. This is accomplished by forward simulation of the so-called reference table $\{(\theta_j, Y_j^{(n)})\}_{j=1}^N$ where $Y^{(n)} = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$.

Usually a summary statistic $s_j = s(Y_j^{(n)})$ is used to reduce the dimensionality of the signal $Y^{(n)} = (Y_1, ..., Y_n)$. This makes the simulation process far more efficient.

ABC is a generative method for obtaining samples from the posterior distribution. It is a common approach in cases when likelihood is not available, but samples can be generated from some model.. The ABC rely on comparing summary statistic calculated from data s_{obs} and of from observed output . We will denote a training sample by input-output pairs ($\theta^{(i)}, Y^{(i)}$). The ABC posterior requires a kernel, a dimensionality reducing summary statistic S(y) and a tolerance level ϵ with a tilted-posterior defined by

$$\pi_{ABC}^{\epsilon}(\theta|Y=y_{obs}) = \frac{1}{m_{\epsilon}(y_{obs})} \int K_{\epsilon}(S(y)-y_{obs})\lambda_{\theta}(dy)\pi(d\theta).$$

Here $y = (y_1, ..., y_n)$ is high dimensional. Hence the need for a *k*-dimensional summary statistic $S : \Re^n \to \Re^k$ where *k* is fixed.

This ensures that the mean of the ABC posterior matches that of the posterior of interest. Furthermore, under a uniform kernel $K = I(|S(y) - s_{obs}| < \epsilon)$ they show convergence

$$\pi^{\epsilon}_{ABC}(\theta \mid Y = y_{obs}) \to \pi(\theta \mid Y = y_{obs})$$

as required. Specifically,

$$\pi_{ABC}^{\epsilon}.(\theta|Y = y_{obs}) = \frac{1}{m_{\epsilon}(y_{obs})} \int_{\Theta} I(|S(y) - s_{obs}| < \epsilon) \delta(y - f(\theta)) \pi(\theta) dy d\theta$$

= $\pi(\theta \mid |S(y) - s_{obs}| < \epsilon) \rightarrow \pi(\theta \mid Y = y_{obs})$
where $S(y) = \hat{\theta}(y) = E_{\pi}(\theta \mid y)$.

Jiang et al. (2017) show the optimality of using the posterior mean as a summary statistic. They also propose the use of deep learning to estimate *S*.

Conventional ABC methods suffers from the main drawback that the samples do not come from the true posterior, but an approximate one, based on the ϵ -ball approximation of the likelihood, which is a non-parametric local smoother. Theoretically, as ϵ goes to zero, you can guarantee samples from the true posterior. However, the number of sample required is prohibitive. Our method circumvents this by replacing the ball with a deep learning generator and directly model the relationship between the posterior and a baseline uniform Gaussian distribution. Our method is also not a density approximation, as many authors have proposed. Rather, we directly use L_2 methods and Stochastic Gradient Descent to find transport map from θ to a uniform or a Gaussian random variable. The equivalent to the mixture of Gaussian approximation is to assume that our baseline distribution is high-dimensional Gaussian. Such models are called the diffusion models in literature. Full Bayesian computations can then be reduced to high-dimensional L_2 optimization problems with a carefully chosen neural network.

Deep Fiducial Inference Deep fiducial inference as follows. Given the relationship between data *Y* and parameter θ as $Y = g(\theta)$, where *g* is a known and deterministic function, and *U* is a random variate whose distribution is known. It is also assumed that *g* is invertible and $g^{-1}(u) = Q_y(u) = \theta$ exists for any observed *y*. Fisher argues that distribution over θ can be obtained by propagating the distribution of *U* through the inverse of *g*. Given sample $U \sim F_0$, then $\theta = Q_y(U)$ is a sample from the fiducial distribution of θ . A more general case is when the inverse is not unique or does not exist.

Fisher would also invert confidence intervals (a.k.a. quantiles!) to get posterior inverse cumulative distribution functions (cdf), see Efron (1993). One caveat is the need for exponential family models with well defined fiducial inverses. To see this, define $\theta_Y(\alpha)$ such that

$$P_Y(\theta \leq \theta_Y(\alpha)) = \alpha$$

Let $\alpha_Y(\theta) = \theta_Y^{-1}(\alpha)$ be the inverse cumulative distribution function. The fiducial posterior is the transport map defined by

$$\pi(\theta|Y) := \frac{d}{d\theta} \alpha_Y(\theta).$$

There appears to be no prior distribution $\pi(\theta)$ that has been specified. However, when we go from the transport map to densities, the Jacobian will naturally induce a prior. It is related to the observer Fisher information matrix and hence Jeffrys non-informative prior.

To see this, we write $y = G(u, \theta)$ as the Fiducial map. The inverse posterior map is $u = G^{-1}(y, \theta)$ where *U* is uniform. This follows from the implicit function $y - G(u, \theta) = 0$ in a neighborhood of (y, u) in which the inverse u(y) is uniquely defined is continuously differentiable with

$$\frac{d}{dy}u(y) = \left(\frac{d}{d\theta}G(y,\theta)\right)^{-1}\Big|_{u=G^{-1}(y,\theta)}$$

Hence, we have a likelihood function

$$f_Y(y|\theta) = F_U(G^{-1}(y,\theta)) |\det J_y|$$
 where $J_y = \frac{d}{dy}u(y)$

In this sense we get the empirical Jeffreys prior. We wish to calculate the posterior $\pi(\theta|y)$ at the observed output *y*.

Algorithm Define $y^* = G(u^*, \theta^*)$ where $\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} ||y - G(u^*, \theta^*)||$. Simulate U^* , compute θ^* , let $y^* = G(U^*, \theta^*)$ and accept θ^* only if $||y - y^*|| \le \epsilon$.

In a similar manner to Jiang et al we can proof that

$$\pi_{y^{\star}}(\theta|\|y - y^{\star}\| < \epsilon) \to \pi(\theta|y)$$

By using a dimension reducing summary statistic, *S*, we can also use the conditioning set $||S(y) - S(y^*)|| < \epsilon$ which will increase the efficiency of the rejection sampling.

For example, given $Y = \theta + U$, $U \sim N(0,1)$, the inverse is $Q_y(u) = u - \theta$. The fiducial distribution of θ is N(y,1). If we add variance and consider sample of *n* observations from Normal distribution $Y \sim N(v, \sigma^2)$, then the summary statistics, which are sample average \bar{y} and sample variance s^2 are given by

$$\bar{y} = \mu + \sigma U_1, \, s^2 = \sigma^2 U_2, \, U_1 \sim N(0, n^{-1}), \, U_2 \sim Gamma(n/2, n/2).$$

The inverse is $Q_y(u_1, u_2) = \bar{y} - su_1 / \sqrt{u_2, s^2 u_2}$. The fiducial distribution of θ is $N(y, \sqrt{u_2})$.

PLS Another architecture for finding summary statistics is to use PLS. Given the parameters and data, the map is

$$\theta^{(i)} = H(S(y^{(i)}), \epsilon)$$

We can find a set of linear maps S(y) = By. This rule also provide dimension reduction. Moreover, due to orthogonality of y, ϵ , we can simply consistently estimate $\hat{S}(y) = \hat{B}y$ via $\theta^{(i)} = H(\hat{B}y)$. A key result of Brillinger (2012) shows that we can use linear SGD methods and partial least squares to find \hat{B} . Section 4 provides an application to Ebola data.

3 Generative Bayesian Computation (GBC)

To fix notation, let \mathcal{Y} denote a locally compact metric space of signals, denoted by y, and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y})$ the Borel σ -algebra of \mathcal{Y} . Let λ be a measure on the measurable space of signals $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Y}))$. Let $P(dy|\theta)$ denote the conditional distribution of signals given the parameters. Let Θ denote a locally compact metric space of admissible parameters (a.k.a. hidden states and latent variables $z \in \mathcal{Z}$) and $\mathcal{B}(\Theta)$ the Borel σ -algebra of Θ . Let μ be a measure on the measurable space of parameters ($\Theta, \mathcal{B}(\Theta)$). Let $\Pi(d\theta|y)$ denote the conditional distribution of the parameters given the observed signal y (a.k.a., the posterior distribution). In many cases, Π is absolutely continuous with density π such that

$$\Pi(d\theta|y) = \pi(\theta|y)\mu(d\theta).$$

Moreover, we will write $\Pi(d\theta) = \pi(\theta)\mu(d\theta)$ for prior density π when available.

Our framework allows for likelihood and density free models. In the case of likelihoodfree models, the output is simply specified by a map (a.k.a. forward equation)

$$y = f(\theta)$$

When a likelihood $p(y|\theta)$ is available w.r.t. the measure λ , we write

$$P(dy|\theta) = p(y|\theta)\lambda(dy).$$

There are a number of advantages of such an approach, primarily the fact that they are density free. They use simulation methods and deep neural networks to invert the prior to posterior map. We build on this framework and show how to incorporate utilities into the generative procedure.

Here we use noise outsourcing theorem iin the following form. If (Y, Θ) are random variables in a Borel space (\mathcal{Y}, Θ) then there exists an r.v. $\tau \sim U(0, 1)$ which is independent of Y and a function $H : \mathcal{Y} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \Theta$ such that

$$(Y,\Theta) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} (Y,H(Y,\tau))$$

Hence the existence of *H* follows from the noise outsourcing theorem Kallenberg (1997). Moreover, if there is a statistic S(Y) with $Y \perp \Theta | S(Y)$, then

$$\Theta|Y \stackrel{a.s.}{=} H(S(Y),\tau).$$

The role of S(Y) is equivalent to the ABC literature. It performs dimension reduction in n, the dimensionality of the signal. Our approach then is to use deep neural network first to calculate the inverse probability map (a.k.a posterior) $\theta \stackrel{D}{=} F_{\theta|y}^{-1}(\tau)$ where τ is a vector of uniforms. In the multi-parameter case, we use an RNN or autoregressive structure where we model a vector via a sequence $(F_{\theta_1}^{-1}(\tau_1), F_{\theta_2|\theta_1}^{-1}(\tau_2) \dots)$. A remarkable result due to Brillinger (2012), shows that we can learn *S* independent of *H* simply via OLS.

As a default choice of network architecture, we will use a ReLU network for the posterior quantile map. The first layer of the network is given by the utility function and hence this is what makes the method different from learning the posterior and then directly using naive Monte Carlo to estimate expected utility. This would be inefficient as quite often the utility function places high weight on region of low-posterior probability representing tail risk.

3.1 Bayes Rule for Quantiles

Parzen (2004) shows that quantile methods are direct alternatives to density computations. Specifically, given $F_{\theta|y}(u)$, a non-decreasing and continuous from right function, we define

$$Q_{\theta|y}(u) := F_{\theta|y}^{-1}(u) = \inf\left(\theta : F_{\theta|y}(\theta) \ge u\right)$$

which is non-decreasing, continuous from left. Parzen (2004) shows the important probabilistic property of quantiles

$$\theta \stackrel{P}{=} Q_{\theta}(F_{\theta}(\theta))$$

Hence, we can increase the efficiency by ordering the samples of θ and the baseline distribution and use monotonicity of the inverse CDF map.

Let g(y) be non-decreasing and continuous from left with $g^{-1}(z) = \sup (y : g(y) \le z)$. Then, the transformed quantile has a compositional nature, namely

$$Q_{g(Y)}(u) = g(Q(u))$$

Hence, quantiles act as superposition (a.k.a. deep Learner).

This is best illustrated in the Bayes learning model. We have the following result updating prior to posterior quantiles known as the conditional quantile representation

$$Q_{\theta|Y=y}(u) = Q_{\theta}(s)$$
 where $s = Q_{F(\theta)|Y=y}(u)$

To compute *s*, by definition

$$u = F_{F(\theta)|Y=y}(s) = P(F(\theta) \le s|Y=y) = P(\theta \le Q_{\theta}(s)|Y=y) = F_{\theta|Y=y}(Q_{\theta}(s))$$

Quantiles as Deep Learners Parzen (2004) showed that quantile models are direct alternatives to other Bayes computations. Specifically, given F(y), a non-decreasing and continuous from right function. We define $Q(u) := F^{-1}(u) = \inf(y : F(y) \ge u)$ non-decreasing, continuous from left, and g(y) to be a non-decreasing and continuous from left with

$$g^{-1}(z) = \sup \left(y : g(y) \le z \right)$$

Then, the transformed quantile has a compositional nature, namely

$$Q_{g(Y)}(u) = g(Q(u))$$

Hence Quantiles act as superpositions (a.k.a. Deep Learner).

Quantile Re-ordering Dabney et al. (2017) use quantile neural networks for decisionmaking and apply quantile neural networks to the problem of reinforcement learning. Specifically, they rely on the fact that expectations are quantile integrals. Let $F_U(u)$ be the CDF of the distributed utility. The key identity follows from the Lorenz curve

$$E_{U\sim U(d,\theta)}(U) = \int_0^1 F_U^{-1}(\tau)d\tau.$$

This key identity follows from the identity

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} u dF_U(u) = \int_0^1 F_U^{-1}(\tau) d\tau$$

which holds true under the simple transformation $\tau = F_U(u)$, with Jacobian $d\tau = f_U(u)du$.

Quantile Deep NNs By construction, the posterior distribution can be characterized by the von Neumann inverse CDF map

$$\theta = F_{\theta|y}^{-1}(\tau)$$
 where $\tau \sim U(0,1)$.

This falls into our general inverse-map framework $\theta = H(S(y), \tau)$ where $F_{\theta|y}^{-1} = H \circ S$. Hence, deep quantile NNs are the most natural set of deep learners to use. Other popular approach are ReLU/Tanh networks.

Kolmogorov-Arnold says any multivariate function can be expressed this way. So in principle if *N* is large enough we can learn the manifold structure in the parameters for any arbitrary nonlinearity. As the dimension of the data *y* is large, in practice, this requires providing an efficient architecture. The main question of interest. Section 2 provides our recommendation based on quantile neural networks.

Deep learners are good interpolators (one of the folklore theorems of machine learning). Hence the set of posteriors $\pi(\theta|y)$ is characterised by the distributional identity

$$\theta \stackrel{D}{=} H(S(y_N), \tau_K)$$
 where $y_N = (y_1, \dots, y_N)$ $\tau \sim U(0, 1)$.

Quantile Learners The second class of methods proposed on machine leaning literature involves using deep learners to approximate an inverse CDF function or a more general approach that represents the target distribution over θ as a marginalization over a nuance random variable z (Kingma and Welling, 2022). In the case of inverse CDF, the latent variable z is simply uniform on (0, 1) (Bond-Taylor et al., 2022). One of the approaches of this type is called Normalizing flows. Normalizing flows provide an alternative approach of defining a deterministic map $\theta \mid x, \theta_g = G(z, x, \theta_g)$ that transforms a univariate random variable $z \sim p(z)$ to a sample from the target distribution $G(z, x, \theta_g) = x \sim F(\theta)$. If transformation G is invertible (G^{-1} exists) and differentiable, then the relation between target density F and the latent density p(z) is given by Rezende and Mohamed (2015b):

3.2 Deep Quantile Bayes

Dabney et al. (2018) proposed a learning algorithm for estimating a quantile function capable of estimating any distribution over an observed variable. An IQN network approximates the quantile function $F^{-1}(\tau, x)$ for the random output variable y, and takes two inputs, the predictor x and the quantile $\tau \in (0,1)$. Then sample from the target distribution $p(y \mid x)$ can be generated by taking $\tau \sim U(0,1)$ and calculating $F^{-1}(\tau, x)$.

We use a different approach, to learn a single quantile function $F^{-1}(\tau, x) = f(\tau, x, \theta)$, and then use the quantile function to generate samples from the target distribution. We represent the quantile function is a function of superposition for two other functions $F^{-1}(\tau, x) = f(\tau, x, \theta) = g(\psi(x) \circ \phi(\tau))$, as proposed in Dabney et al. (2018), where \circ is the element-wise multiplication operator. Both functions *g* and ϕ are feed-forward neural networks, and *phi* is given by

$$\phi_j(\tau) = \operatorname{ReLU}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \cos(\pi i \tau) w_{ij} + b_j\right).$$

Cosine Embedding To learn an inverse CDF, we use the kernel embedding trick and augment the predictor space. We use a different approach, to learn a single quantile function $F^{-1}(\tau, x) = f(\tau, x, \theta)$, and then use the quantile function to generate samples from the target distribution. We represent the quantile function is a function of superposition for two other functions $F^{-1}(\tau, x) = f(\tau, x, \theta) = g(\psi(x) \circ \phi(\tau))$, as proposed in Dabney et al. (2018), where \circ is the element-wise multiplication operator. Both functions *g* and ϕ are feed-forward neural networks. To avoid over-fitting, we use a sufficiently large training dataset.

Normal-Normal Bayes Learning: Wang Distortion For example, consider the normalnormal learning model. We will develop the necessary quantile theory to show how to calculate posteriors and expected utility without resorting to densities. Also, we show a relationship with Wang's risk distortion measure as the deep learning that needs to be learned.

Specifically, we observe the data $y = (y_1, ..., y_n)$ from the following model

$$y_1, \ldots, y_n \mid \theta \sim N(\theta, \sigma^2)$$

 $\theta \sim N(\mu, \alpha^2)$

Hence, the summary (sufficient) statistic is $S(y) = \bar{y} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i$.

Given observed samples $y = (y_1, ..., y_n)$, the posterior is then $\theta \mid y \sim N(\mu_*, \sigma_*^2)$ with

$$\mu_* = (\sigma^2 \mu + \alpha^2 s)/t, \quad \sigma_*^2 = \alpha^2 \sigma^2/t,$$

where

$$t = \sigma^2 + n\alpha^2$$
 and $s(y) = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$

The posterior and prior CDFs are then related via the

$$1 - \Phi(\theta, \mu_*, \sigma_*) = g(1 - \Phi(\theta, \mu, \alpha^2)),$$

where Φ is the normal cdf. Here the Wang distortion function defined by

$$g(p) = \Phi\left(\lambda_1 \Phi^{-1}(p) + \lambda\right),$$

where

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{\alpha}{\sigma_*}$$
 and $\lambda = \alpha \lambda_1 (s - n\mu)/t$.

The proof is relatively simple and is as follows

$$g(1 - \Phi(\theta, \mu, \alpha^2)) = g(\Phi(-\theta, \mu, \alpha^2)) = g\left(\Phi\left(-\frac{\theta - \mu}{\alpha}\right)\right)$$
$$= \Phi\left(\lambda_1\left(-\frac{\theta - \mu}{\alpha}\right) + \lambda\right) = 1 - \Phi\left(\frac{\theta - (\mu + \alpha\lambda/\lambda_1)}{\alpha/\lambda_1}\right)$$

Thus, the corresponding posterior updated parameters are

$$\sigma_* = \alpha / \lambda_1, \quad \lambda_1 = \frac{\alpha}{\sigma_*}$$
$$\mu_* = \mu + \alpha \lambda / \lambda_1, \quad \lambda = \frac{\lambda_1 (\mu_* - \mu)}{\alpha} = \alpha \lambda_1 (s - n\mu) / t.$$

We now provide an empirical example.

Numerical Example Consider the normal-normal model with Prior $\theta \sim N(0,5)$ and likelihood $y \sim N(3,10)$. We generate n = 100 samples from the likelihood and calculate the posterior distribution.



Figure 1: Density for prior, likelihood and posterior, distortion function and 1 - Φ for the prior and posterior of the normal-normal model.

The posterior distribution calculated from the sample is then $\theta \mid y \sim N(3.28, 0.98)$.

Figure 1 shows the Wang distortion function for the normal-normal model. The left panel shows the model for the simulated data, while the middle panel shows the distortion function, the right panel shows the 1 - Φ for the prior and posterior of the normal-normal model.

4 Ebola Data

For illustration, we use the multi-output agent-based epidemic model problem documented in Fadikar et al. (2018). We predict the 56-week, simulated outputs for three holdout scenarios.

After the 2014-2015 West Africa Ebola outbreak, the Research and Policy for Infectious Disease Dynamics (RAPIDD) program at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) convened a workshop to compile and explore the various forecasting approaches used to help manage the outbreak. At its conclusion, a disease forecasting challenge was launched to provide 4 synthetic population datasets and scenarios as a baseline for cross-assessment. A stochastic, agent-based model (Ajelli et al., 2018) first generated each population using varying degrees of data accuracy, availability, and intervention measures; individuals were then assigned activities based on demographic and survey data to model realistic

disease propagation. Transmission by an infected individual is determined probabilistically based on the duration of contact with a susceptible individual and d = 5 static inputs $\Theta = \theta_1$, *cdots*, θ_5 to the model.

Parameter	Description	Range
θ_1	probability of disease transmission	$[3 \times 10^{-5}, 8 \times 10^{-5}]$
θ_2	initial number of infected individuals	[1,20]
$ heta_3$	delay in hospital intervention	[2, 10]
$ heta_4$	efficacy of hospital intervention	[0.1, 0.8]
$ heta_5$	intervention reduction of travel	$[3 \times 10^{-5}, 8 \times 10^{-5}]$

Figure 2: 5 static inputs used for defining disease propagation for the Ebola ABM

A single run outputs a cumulative count of infected individuals over a 56-week period. For more details on the model and challenge, see Viboud et al. (2018).

To maintain comparison, we use the same data set from Fadikar et al. (2018), which consists of a collection of m = 100 scenarios generated through a space-filling, symmetric Latin hypercube design. For each scenario, 100 replicates were run for a total of N = 10,000 simulated epidemic trajectories. A single run for each parameter set produced a 56-dimensional output, capturing the cumulative weekly number of infected individuals. The log results for every setting combination is captured in Figure 3.

Notably, different parameter settings produced strongly divergent behaviors in their replicates. Some followed a mean trajectory while others produced strong bimodal behavior, significant heteroskedasticity, or simply remained flat-lined. Fadikar et al. (2018) reasons that only a subset of replicates within each parameter settings may produce similar initial behaviors and that adding an additional variable α to index these replicates would produce more accurate predictions. Modifying the Quantile Kriging approach, the 100 replicates of each parameter setting are replaced with $n_{\alpha} = 5$ quantile-based trajectories. The quantiles are then indexed within each parameter set by the addition of a sixth latent variable $\alpha \in [0, 1]$:

$$\Theta = [\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_4, \theta_5, \alpha].$$
(11)

For testing the forecast models, 3 unique parameter settings, which we will refer to as A, B, and C, and their respective n = 100 simulated outputs were excluded from the training set. Figure 4 shows the 5 calculated quantiles of these three hold-out scenarios, labeled A, B, and C and highlighted in red, green, and blue respectively, that we wish to predict using our model.



Figure 3: For each scenario, the 100 simulated trajectories for the cumulative number of disease incidences across 56 weeks are shown as grey lines. The three holdout scenarios (A, B, and C) are highlighted in red, green, and blue respectively.



Figure 4: For each holdout scenario, labeled A, B, and C, the 100 simulated trajectories of the cumulative number of disease incidences over 56 weeks are shown as grey lines. The 5 colored lines represent the [0.05, 0.275, 0.5, 0.725, 0.95] quantiles, which are now indexed by the additional sixth parameter α .



Figure 5: The first column shows the 100 actual simulations and their empirical quantiles for each of the three holdout scenarios. The next 5 columns show the posterior prediction's 90% confidence intervals for each empirical quantile, denoted by different colors.

The model's predicted trajectories are shown in Figure 5. Each row of the figure corresponds to one of the holdout scenarios (A, B, and C), which were not used to train the GP emulator. The first column shows the 100 replicates generated by the ABM, along with the estimated quantiles. The remaining 5 columns compare the 90% confidence intervals our model predicts for each of the 5 quantile settings estimated from the ABM replicates.

Overall, our model's predictions among the lower quantiles provide more noticeable improvements, including the correction of several of Fadikar et al. (2018) cases, to maintain the quantile across the entire timeline's 90% CI. In contrast, some of our results underestimated the initial case loads when Fadikar et al. (2018)'s model did not; however, most of these cases incorporated the difference within the following weeks without missing the quantile's inflection points.



Figure 6: Prediction for 20 randomly selected *y*'s



Figure 7: Posterior histograms for $y^{(7080)}$

5 Discussion

Generative AI is a simulation-based methodology, that takes joint samples of observables and parameters as an input and then applies nonparametric regression in a form of deep neural network by regressing θ on a non-linear function h which is a function of dimensionality-reduced sufficient statistics of θ and a randomly generated stochastically uniform error. In its simplest form, h, can be identified with its inverse CDF.

There are many challenging future problems. The method can easily handle highdimensional latent variables. But designing the architecture for fixed high-dimensional parameters can be challenging. We leave it for the future research. Having learned the nonlinear map, when faced with the observed data y_{obs} , one simply evaluates the nonlinear map at newly generated uniform random values. Generative AI circumvents the need for methods like MCMC that require the density evaluations.

References

- Ajelli, M., Zhang, Q., Sun, K., Merler, S., Fumanelli, L., Chowell, G., Simonsen, L., Viboud, C., and Vespignani, A. (2018). The RAPIDD Ebola forecasting challenge: Model description and synthetic data generation. *Epidemics*, 22:3–12.
- Akesson, M., Singh, P., Wrede, F., and Hellander, A. (2021). Convolutional neural networks as summary statistics for approximate bayesian computation. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics*.
- Albert, C., Ulzega, S., Ozdemir, F., Perez-Cruz, F., and Mira, A. (2022). Learning summary statistics for bayesian inference with autoencoders. *SciPost Physics Core*, 5(3):043.
- Bach, F. (2024). High-dimensional analysis of double descent for linear regression with random projections. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 6(1):26–50.

- Baker, E., Barbillon, P., Fadikar, A., Gramacy, R. B., Herbei, R., Higdon, D., Huang, J., Johnson, L. R., Ma, P., Mondal, A., et al. (2022). Analyzing stochastic computer models: A review with opportunities. *Statistical Science*, 37(1):64–89.
- Barron, A. R. (1993). Universal approximation bounds for superpositions of a sigmoidal function. *IEEE Transactions on Information theory*, 39(3):930–945.
- Beaumont, M. A., Zhang, W., and Balding, D. J. (2002). Approximate Bayesian computation in population genetics. *Genetics*, 162(4):2025–2035.
- Behrmann, J., Vicol, P., Wang, K.-C., Grosse, R., and Jacobsen, J.-H. (2021). Understanding and Mitigating Exploding Inverses in Invertible Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1792–1800. PMLR.
- Belkin, M., Rakhlin, A., and Tsybakov, A. B. (2019). Does data interpolation contradict statistical optimality? In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1611–1619. PMLR.
- Bernton, E., Jacob, P. E., Gerber, M., and Robert, C. P. (2019). Approximate Bayesian computation with the Wasserstein distance. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 81(2):235–269.
- Bhadra, A., Datta, J., Polson, N., Sokolov, V., and Xu, J. (2021). Merging two cultures: Deep and statistical learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.11561*.
- Blum, M. G. B., Nunes, M. A., Prangle, D., and Sisson, S. A. (2013). A Comparative Review of Dimension Reduction Methods in Approximate Bayesian Computation. *Statistical Science*, 28(2):189–208.
- Bond-Taylor, S., Leach, A., Long, Y., and Willcocks, C. G. (2022). Deep Generative Modeling: A Comparative Review of VAEs, GANs, Normalizing Flows, Energy-Based and Autoregressive Models. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(11):7327–7347.
- Breiman, L. (2001). Statistical Modeling: The Two Cultures (with comments and a rejoinder by the author). *Statistical Science*, 16(3):199–231.
- Brillinger, D. R. (2012). A Generalized Linear Model With "Gaussian" Regressor Variables. In Guttorp, P. and Brillinger, D., editors, *Selected Works of David Brillinger*, Selected Works in Probability and Statistics, pages 589–606. Springer, New York, NY.
- Camuto, A., Willetts, M., Roberts, S., Holmes, C., and Rainforth, T. (2021). Towards a Theoretical Understanding of the Robustness of Variational Autoencoders. In *Proceedings of The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3565–3573. PMLR.
- Cook, R. D. (2007). Fisher lecture: Dimension reduction in regression. *Statistical Science*, pages 1–26.

- Coppejans, M. (2004). On Kolmogorov's representation of functions of several variables by functions of one variable. *Journal of Econometrics*, 123(1):1–31.
- Dabney, W., Ostrovski, G., Silver, D., and Munos, R. (2018). Implicit Quantile Networks for Distributional Reinforcement Learning.
- Dabney, W., Rowland, M., Bellemare, M. G., and Munos, R. (2017). Distributional Reinforcement Learning with Quantile Regression.
- Diggle, P. J. and Gratton, R. J. (1984). Monte Carlo Methods of Inference for Implicit Statistical Models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 46(2):193– 227.
- Dinh, L., Krueger, D., and Bengio, Y. (2015). NICE: Non-linear Independent Components Estimation.
- Dinh, L., Sohl-Dickstein, J., and Bengio, S. (2017). Density estimation using Real NVP.
- Drovandi, C. C., Pettitt, A. N., and Faddy, M. J. (2011). Approximate Bayesian computation using indirect inference. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 60(3):317–337.
- Drovandi, C. C., Pettitt, A. N., and Lee, A. (2015). Bayesian Indirect Inference Using a Parametric Auxiliary Model. *Statistical Science*, 30(1):72–95.
- Efron, B. (1993). Bayes and likelihood calculations from confidence intervals. *Biometrika*, 80(1):3–26.
- Fadikar, Arindam., Higdon, Dave., Chen, Jiangzhuo., Lewis, Bryan., Venkatramanan, Srinivasan., and Marathe, Madhav. (2018). Calibrating a Stochastic, Agent-Based Model Using Quantile-Based Emulation. SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification, 6(4):1685–1706.
- Fearnhead, P. and Prangle, D. (2012). Constructing summary statistics for approximate Bayesian computation: Semi-automatic approximate Bayesian computation. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 74(3):419–474.
- Fisher, R. A. (1922). On the mathematical foundations of theoretical statistics. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical or Physical Character*, 222(594-604):309–368.
- Igelnik, B. and Parikh, N. (2003). Kolmogorov's spline network. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 14(4):725–733.
- Jacobsen, J.-H., Smeulders, A., and Oyallon, E. (2018). I-revnet: Deep invertible networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.07088*.
- Jiang, B., Wu, T.-Y., Zheng, C., and Wong, W. H. (2017). Learning Summary Statistic For Approximate Bayesian Computation Via Deep Neural Network. *Statistica Sinica*, 27(4):1595–1618.

- Jiang, B., Wu, Tung-Yu, and Wing Hung Wong (2018). Approximate Bayesian Computation with Kullback-Leibler Divergence as Data Discrepancy. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1711– 1721. PMLR.
- Kallenberg, O. (1997). Foundations of Modern Probability. Springer, 2nd ed. edition edition.
- Kingma, D. P. and Welling, M. (2022). Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes.
- Kolmogorov, AN. (1942). Definition of center of dispersion and measure of accuracy from a finite number of observations (in Russian). *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 6:3–32.
- Kruse, J., Detommaso, G., Köthe, U., and Scheichl, R. (2021). HINT: Hierarchical Invertible Neural Transport for Density Estimation and Bayesian Inference. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(9):8191–8199.
- Longstaff, F. A. and Schwartz, E. S. (2001). Valuing American options by simulation: A simple least-squares approach. *The review of financial studies*, 14(1):113–147.
- MacKay, D. J. (1999). Maximum likelihood and covariant algorithms for independent component analysis.
- Montanelli, H. and Yang, H. (2020). Error bounds for deep ReLU networks using the Kolmogorov–Arnold superposition theorem.
- Müller, T., Mcwilliams, B., Rousselle, F., Gross, M., and Novák, J. (2019). Neural Importance Sampling. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 38(5):145:1–145:19.
- Nunes, M. A. and Balding, D. J. (2010). On Optimal Selection of Summary Statistics for Approximate Bayesian Computation. *Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology*, 9(1).
- Ostrovski, G., Dabney, W., and Munos, R. (2018). Autoregressive Quantile Networks for Generative Modeling.
- Padilla, O. H. M., Tansey, W., and Chen, Y. (2022). Quantile regression with ReLU networks: Estimators and minimax rates. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(1):247:11251–247:11292.
- Papamakarios, G., Pavlakou, T., and Murray, I. (2017). Masked Autoregressive Flow for Density Estimation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Park, M., Jitkrittum, W., and Sejdinovic, D. (2016). K2-ABC: Approximate Bayesian Computation with Kernel Embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 398–407. PMLR.
- Parzen, E. (2004). Quantile Probability and Statistical Data Modeling. *Statistical Science*, 19(4):652–662.

- Pastorello, S., Patilea, V., and Renault, E. (2003). Iterative and recursive estimation in structural nonadaptive models. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 21(4):449–509.
- Polson, N., Sokolov, V., and Xu, J. (2021). Deep Learning Partial Least Squares. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2106.14085.
- Polson, N. G. and Ročková, V. (2018). Posterior Concentration for Sparse Deep Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Rezende, D. and Mohamed, S. (2015a). Variational Inference with Normalizing Flows. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1530–1538. PMLR.
- Rezende, D. J. and Mohamed, S. (2015b). Variational inference with normalizing flows. *arXiv preprint arXiv:*1505.05770.
- Schmidt-Hieber, J. (2020). Nonparametric regression using deep neural networks with ReLU activation function. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(4):1875–1897.
- Schultz, L., Auld, J., and Sokolov, V. (2022). Bayesian Calibration for Activity Based Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.04414*.
- Shen, G., Jiao, Y., Lin, Y., Horowitz, J. L., and Huang, J. (2021). Deep Quantile Regression: Mitigating the Curse of Dimensionality Through Composition.
- Song, Y., Meng, C., and Ermon, S. (2019). MintNet: Building Invertible Neural Networks with Masked Convolutions. *arXiv*:1907.07945 [cs, stat].
- Stroud, J. R., Müller, P., and Polson, N. G. (2003). Nonlinear state-space models with statedependent variances. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 98(462):377–386.
- Trippe, B. L. and Turner, R. E. (2018). Conditional Density Estimation with Bayesian Normalising Flows. *arXiv:1802.04908 [stat]*.
- Viboud, C., Sun, K., Gaffey, R., Ajelli, M., Fumanelli, L., Merler, S., Zhang, Q., Chowell, G., Simonsen, L., and Vespignani, A. (2018). The RAPIDD ebola forecasting challenge: Synthesis and lessons learnt. *Epidemics*, 22:13–21.