

# Structure learning with Temporal Gaussian Mixture for model-based Reinforcement Learning

**Théophile Champion**

*University of Birmingham, School of Computer Science,  
Birmingham B15 2TT, United Kingdom*

TXC314@STUDENT.BHAM.AC.UK

**Marek Grześ**

*University of Kent, School of Computing  
Canterbury CT2 7NZ, United Kingdom*

M.GRZES@KENT.AC.UK

**Howard Bowman**

*University of Birmingham, School of Psychology and School of Computer Science,  
Birmingham B15 2TT, United Kingdom  
University College London, Wellcome Centre for Human Neuroimaging (honorary)  
London WC1N 3AR, United Kingdom*

H.BOWMAN@BHAM.AC.UK

**Editor: TO BE FILLED**

## Abstract

Model-based reinforcement learning refers to a set of approaches capable of sample-efficient decision making, which create an explicit model of the environment. This model can subsequently be used for learning optimal policies. In this paper, we propose a temporal Gaussian Mixture Model composed of a perception model and a transition model. The perception model extracts discrete (latent) states from continuous observations using a variational Gaussian mixture likelihood. Importantly, our model constantly monitors the collected data searching for new Gaussian components, i.e., the perception model performs a form of structure learning (Smith et al., 2020; Friston et al., 2018; Neacsu et al., 2022) as it learns the number of Gaussian components in the mixture. Additionally, the transition model learns the temporal transition between consecutive time steps by taking advantage of the Dirichlet-categorical conjugacy. Both the perception and transition models are able to forget part of the data points, while integrating the information they provide within the prior, which ensure fast variational inference. Finally, decision making is performed with a variant of Q-learning which is able to learn Q-values from beliefs over states. Empirically, we have demonstrated the model’s ability to learn the structure of several mazes: the model discovered the number of states and the transition probabilities between these states. Moreover, using its learned Q-values, the agent was able to successfully navigate from the starting position to the maze’s exit.

**Keywords:** Structure Learning, Q-Learning, Reinforcement Learning, Bayesian Modeling, Gaussian Mixture

## 1. Introduction

Model-based reinforcement learning is a theory describing how an agent should interact with its environment. More precisely, the agent maintains a model of its environment, which is composed of observations, states, and actions. When new observations become available, the agent needs to estimate the most likely states of the environment. This process is generally referred to as perception or inference, and can be implemented by minimizing the variational free energy, also known as the negative evidence lower bound in machine learning (Blei et al., 2017).

Variational inference is a form of approximate inference, where the true posterior is approximated by the variational distribution. Specifically, inference is generally rendered tractable by restricting the

arXiv:2411.11511v1 [cs.LG] 18 Nov 2024

approximate posterior to a class of distributions, where each distribution corresponds to a different set of parameter values. Inference then refers to the optimization of these parameters such that the variational free energy is minimized.

An important family of distributions frequently used in variational inference is the exponential family (Holland and Leinhardt, 1981), which contains most of the well-known distributions. For example, the Gaussian, Bernoulli, and Dirichlet distributions are all members of this family. Importantly, all the distributions within the exponential family can be mapped to the same functional form, which can be used to derive modular inference algorithms such as variational message passing (Winn and Bishop, 2005).

In these previous approaches, the generative model’s structure is known in advance, i.e., the number of latent states is known by the agent. In practice, this means that the model needs to be designed by a domain expert and is not learned by the agent. However, for some applications, the model may not be available, or experts may only have a partial understanding of the problem. In this case, learning the model becomes essential. Recent work has focused on problems where observations are discrete (Smith et al., 2020; Friston et al., 2018; Neacsu et al., 2022). In contrast, this paper addresses the case where observations are continuous.

Throughout this paper, we assume that the data is distributed according to a mixture of multivariate Gaussian distributions. Then, each component of the mixture is associated with a latent state, and we aim to learn how these states change over time. The key challenge is to identify the correct number of components. This requires the model to add and remove components when necessary. While the Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) is able to prune superfluous components, we also need a way to increase the number of components as new clusters of data points are discovered. To this end, our agent constantly monitors the data for new clusters of data points, and new Gaussian components are added to the mixtures when such clusters are identified.

While learning the model structure and inferring the current state using variational inference is useful, it does not prescribe which actions should be taken. Thus, the next step consists of comparing the quality of different policies, where in reinforcement learning, the quality of a policy is the discounted sum of rewards. Ideally, we would like to compare all possible policies, and select the policy with the highest quality. Unfortunately, the number of valid policies grows exponentially with the time horizon of planning. Specifically, if the agent can choose one of  $A$  actions, for  $T$  time steps, then the number of possible policies is:  $A^T$ .

This exponential explosion renders an exhaustive search intractable. Instead, algorithms such as Monte Carlo tree search (Browne et al., 2012) can be used to efficiently explore the space of valid policies (Champion et al., 2022a,b,c,d). An alternative approach is the Q-learning algorithm (Mnih et al., 2015), where instead of searching the space of policies using a search tree, the agent learns the value of performing each action in each state. However, Q-learning requires states to be observable. Therefore, we propose a variant of the Q-learning algorithm which can learn from beliefs over states.

In section 2, we present the variational Gaussian mixture model, which is used to learn the number of components and perform inference of the latent variables. Section 3 explains how the temporal transition can be learned by taking advantage of a categorical-Dirichlet model. Then, in Section 4, we describe an optimization which allows the agent to forget part of the data points by integrating the information they provided into the prior. By forgetting part of the data, the agent reduces the amount of memory required, while speeding up the inference process. Next, in Section 5, we describe how Q-learning can be adapted to work with beliefs over states. Finally, in Section 6 we empirically validate our approach, before summarizing and concluding the paper in Section 7.

## 2. Perception Model

In this section, we discuss the theory and implementation details of our perception model. Specifically, we describe how mean shift clustering can be used to initialize the parameters of a variational

Gaussian mixture (VGM) model. Then, we describe the VGM generative model, variational distribution and update equations.

## 2.1 Mean Shift Clustering

Given a dataset  $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N\}$ , the mean shift algorithm (Carreira-Perpinán, 2015) aims to find clusters of data points. While the mean shift algorithm does not require the number of clusters to be known, the user must specify the bandwidth parameter  $\theta_b$ , which defines the window's radius (see below). For each data point  $\mathbf{x}_n$ , the mean shift algorithm initializes a spherical window of radius  $\theta_b$  centred at  $\mathbf{x}_n$ , then the window's centroid  $\mathbf{m}_n$  is set to the mean of the data points within the window, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{m}_n = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_{\theta_b}|} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{W}_{\theta_b}} \mathbf{x}_n, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{W}_{\theta_b}$  is the set of data point indices within the window of radius  $\theta_b$ , and  $|\mathcal{W}_{\theta_b}|$  corresponds to the number of data points in this window. The above update equation is iterated until convergence of the window's centroid position, at which point the window is centred on a part of the space with high density. The points whose window's centroid land close to each other are then grouped within the same cluster. This procedure will output  $K$  clusters, we let  $\hat{r}_{nk}$  be one if the  $n$ -th data point is associated to the  $k$ -th cluster, and zero otherwise. Figure 1 illustrates the mean shift algorithm.




Figure 1: (a) shows how the centroids are initialized and updated, while (b) illustrates how the data points are clustered (different colors indicate different clusters).

## 2.2 Variational Gaussian mixture

While the mean-shift algorithm can identify clusters of data points, this algorithm does not scale well with the number of data points, i.e., for each additional data point Equation (1) must be iterated until convergence. Thus, we need to find a way to discard data points without losing the information they contain. As will become apparent later, this can be achieved using a variational Gaussian mixture (VGM) model (Bishop and Nasrabadi, 2006). In the following sub-sections, we discuss the generative model, variational distribution, variational free energy and update equations of the variational Gaussian mixture.

### 2.2.1 GENERATIVE MODEL

The generative model assumes that each data point  $\mathbf{x}_n$  is sampled from one of  $K$  Gaussian components. For each data point,  $z_{nk}$  is a binary random variable equal to one if the  $k$ -th component is responsible for the  $n$ -th data point, and zero otherwise. We denote by  $\mathbf{z}_n$  the one-of- $K$  (binary) random vector (i.e., a vector containing binary random variables) describing which component is responsible for the  $n$ -th data point, and let  $\mathbf{Z} = \{\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_N\}$  be the set of random vectors associated with all the data points.

Additionally, each Gaussian component is parameterized by its mean vector  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k$  and precision matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k$ . For conciseness, the set of all mean vectors and precision matrices are denoted by  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ , respectively. Using the aforementioned notation, the probability of the data (i.e.,  $\mathbf{X}$ ), given the latent variables (i.e.,  $\mathbf{Z}$ ) and the component parameters (i.e.,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ ) is:

$$P(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \prod_{n=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_n; \boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1})^{z_{nk}}. \quad (2)$$

Moreover, the prior over latent variables is defined as a categorical distribution parameterized by the mixing coefficients  $\mathbf{D}$ , where  $D_k$  is the fraction of the data for which the  $k$ -th component is responsible, i.e., the larger  $D_k$  is, the more prevalent the  $k$ -th component will be. More formally:

$$P(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{D}) = \prod_{n=1}^N \text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n; \mathbf{D}). \quad (3)$$

Finally, the VGM model takes advantage of conjugate priors by defining the prior over  $\mathbf{D}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$  as a Dirichlet, Gaussian and Wishart distributions, respectively. More precisely:

$$P(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k; \mathbf{m}_k, (\beta_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)^{-1}), \quad (4)$$

$$P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k; \mathbf{W}_k, v_k), \quad (5)$$

$$P(\mathbf{D}) = \text{Dir}(\mathbf{D}; d), \quad (6)$$

where  $d$  is a vector containing concentration parameters of the prior over  $\mathbf{D}$ ,  $\mathbf{W}_k$  and  $v_k$  are the scale matrix and degrees of freedom of the Wishart distribution over  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k$ ,  $\mathbf{m}_k$  is the mean vector of the prior over  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k$ , and finally,  $\beta_k$  is a parameter scaling the values of the precision matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k$ . Putting together all the factors defined in Equations (2) to (6), we see that the generative model factorizes as follows:

$$P(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \mathbf{D}) = P(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{D})P(\mathbf{D})P(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda})P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})P(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}), \quad (7)$$

which corresponds to the graphical model of Figure 2. Note, the VGM is parameterized by:  $d$ ,  $\mathbf{W}_k$ ,  $v_k$ ,  $\beta_k$ , and  $\mathbf{m}_k$ , but *how should we choose these parameters?* Experimentally, we set the parameters  $d_k$  and  $\beta_k$  to two times the number of states, i.e.,  $2K$ . Additionally, we initialized  $v_k$  to  $2K + O - 0.99$ , where  $O$  is the dimensionality of the observations, i.e.,  $\mathbf{x}_n \in \mathbb{R}^O$ . Moreover,  $\mathbf{m}_k$  was set to the mean of the data points associated to the  $k$ -th component by the mean shift algorithm. Finally, according to Appendix B of (Bishop and Nasrabadi, 2006), the expected precision matrix under a Wishart distribution  $P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})$  is  $\mathbf{W}_k v_k$ , thus we let:

$$\mathbf{W}_k = \frac{\bar{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_k}{v_k}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\bar{\Lambda}_k$  is the empirical precision matrix of the  $k$ -th Gaussian component. The empirical precision matrix was computed by taking the inverse of the (empirical) covariance matrix. Figure 3 illustrates the VGM obtained when its parameters are initialized based on the mean shift clusters using the aforementioned procedure.




Figure 2: This figure illustrates the graphical model of the variational Gaussian mixture. The latent variables are represented by a white circle with the variable’s name at the center, and the observed variables are depicted similarly but with a gray background. Finally, arrows connect the predictor variables to their target variable.




Figure 3: This figure illustrates the variational Gaussian mixture prior, when its parameters are initialized using the mean shift algorithm.

### 2.2.2 EMPIRICAL PRIOR AND VARIATIONAL DISTRIBUTION

Now that the generative model has been laid out, we would like to take into account the information provided by the available data points. As mentioned previously, we want to forget part of the data points as time passes, thus, we assume that the dataset  $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N\}$  has been split into the data points to forget  $\mathbf{X}' = \{\mathbf{x}_i | i \in N'\}$  and data points to keep  $\mathbf{X}'' = \{\mathbf{x}_j | j \in N''\}$ , where  $N'$  and  $N''$  are the indices of the data points to forget and keep, respectively.

For now, we assume that  $N'$  and  $N''$  are given, and the process of constructing  $N'$  and  $N''$  will be detailed in Section 4. Since we want to forget the data points indexed by  $\mathbf{X}'$ , we compute an empirical prior based on these data points alone. The empirical prior is a posterior distribution conditioned on the data points indexed by  $\mathbf{X}'$ . Critically, because of conjugacy, the empirical prior has the same functional form as the prior, and it can be used as a prior when additional data points will become available.

As computing the exact posterior is intractable, we turn to the variational inference framework (Fox and Roberts, 2012). More precisely, we approximate the true posterior using a structured

mean-field approximation:

$$P(\mathbf{Z}', \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \mathbf{D} | \mathbf{X}') \approx E(\mathbf{Z}', \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \mathbf{D}) \triangleq E(\mathbf{Z}')E(\mathbf{D}) \prod_{k=1}^K E(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k | \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)E(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k), \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{Z}'$  are the latent variables corresponding to the data points to forget, and to ensure conjugacy, the individual factors are defined as follows:

$$E(\boldsymbol{\mu} | \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k; \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k, (\bar{\beta}_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)^{-1}), \quad (10)$$

$$E(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k; \bar{\mathbf{W}}_k, \bar{v}_k), \quad (11)$$

$$E(\mathbf{Z}') = \prod_{n \in N'} \text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n; \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{n \cdot}), \quad (12)$$

$$E(\mathbf{D}) = \text{Dir}(\mathbf{D}; \bar{d}). \quad (13)$$

Note, the empirical prior is parameterized by:  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}$ ,  $\bar{d}$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{W}}_k$ ,  $\bar{v}_k$ ,  $\bar{\beta}_k$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{m}}_k$ . Similarly, we want to compute posterior beliefs using all the available data  $\mathbf{X}$ . Once again, we approximate the true posterior using a structured mean-field approximation:

$$P(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}, \mathbf{D} | \mathbf{X}) \approx Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) \triangleq Q(\mathbf{Z})Q(\mathbf{D}) \prod_{k=1}^K Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k | \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k) \quad (14)$$

where to ensure conjugacy, the individual factors are defined as follows:

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\mu} | \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k; \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k, (\hat{\beta}_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)^{-1}), \quad (15)$$

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k; \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k, \hat{v}_k), \quad (16)$$

$$Q(\mathbf{Z}) = \prod_{n=1}^N \text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n; \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{n \cdot}), \quad (17)$$

$$Q(\mathbf{D}) = \text{Dir}(\mathbf{D}; \hat{d}). \quad (18)$$

Note, the variational distribution is parameterized by:  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}$ ,  $\hat{d}$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k$ ,  $\hat{v}_k$ ,  $\hat{\beta}_k$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k$ . Note, the posterior parameters can be identified by the hat over each symbol, while the empirical prior parameters have a bar on top of each symbol. Also, the responsibilities  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}$  are identical in the empirical prior and posterior distribution, because they cannot be used in the generative model. Instead,  $\bar{d}$  will replace  $d$ , which will update the prior over  $\mathbf{D}$  and indirectly the prior over states  $P(\mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{D})$ . Importantly, the inference process will rely on iteratively updating the parameters of the empirical prior and variational distribution until convergence of the variational free energy.

### 2.2.3 VARIATIONAL FREE ENERGY

The goal of variational inference is to make the variational distribution as close as possible to the true posterior. Mathematically speaking, we want:

$$Q^*(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \arg \min_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})} D_{\text{KL}} [Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) || P(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda} | \mathbf{X})]. \quad (19)$$

However, we do not know the true posterior, therefore, Bayes theorem is used to re-arrange the above expression as follows:

$$Q^*(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \arg \min_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})} D_{\text{KL}} [Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) || P(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})] + \ln P(\mathbf{X}) \quad (20)$$

$$= \arg \min_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})} \underbrace{D_{\text{KL}} [Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) || P(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})]}_{\text{Variational Free Energy}}, \quad (21)$$

where the  $\ln P(\mathbf{X})$  term can be dropped, since it is a constant w.r.t.  $Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})$ . The variational free energy is defined as the KL-divergence between the variational distribution and the generative model, and can be re-arranged as follow using Equation (7) and (14):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F} &= D_{\text{KL}} [Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) || P(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln Q(\mathbf{D})] + \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln Q(\boldsymbol{\mu} | \boldsymbol{\Lambda})] + \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})] + \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\ln Q(\mathbf{Z})] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln P(\mathbf{D})] - \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\boldsymbol{\mu} | \boldsymbol{\Lambda})] - \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})] - \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D})}[\ln P(\mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{D})] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})], \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where the expectations are computed as described in Appendix B.

#### 2.2.4 UPDATE EQUATIONS

Let  $\mathbf{Y} = \{\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\}$  be the set of all latent variables, and  $\mathbf{Y}_j$  be an arbitrary random variable. As explained by Winn and Bishop (2005) and Champion et al. (2021), the variational free energy can be minimized by iteratively applying the following update equation for each latent variable  $\mathbf{Y}_j$ :

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{Y}_j) = \mathbb{E}_{i \neq j}[\ln P(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})] + c, \quad (23)$$

where  $c$  is a constant, and the expectation is over all factors of  $Q(\cdot)$  but  $Q(\mathbf{Y}_j)$ . As shown in Appendix C, the update equations for the variational posterior of the VGM can be obtained from (23). Additionally, as explained in Appendix D, these equations can be re-arranged to provide update equations for both the empirical prior and variational distribution parameters. Interestingly, the final set of equations suggest that the empirical prior parameters should be updated as if we wanted to compute the posterior distribution given the data points to forget  $\mathbf{X}'$ , and the prior parameters. Similarly, the variational posterior parameters need to be updated as if we wanted to compute the posterior distribution given the data points to keep  $\mathbf{X}''$ , and the empirical prior parameters. More precisely, the empirical prior parameters  $\bar{d}_k$ ,  $\bar{v}_k$ , and  $\bar{\beta}_k$  should be updated as follows:

$$\bar{v}_k = v_k + N'_k, \quad (24)$$

$$\bar{\beta}_k = \beta_k + N'_k, \quad (25)$$

$$\bar{d}_k = d_k + N'_k, \quad (26)$$

where  $N'_k$  is the number of data points to forget attributed to the  $k$ -th component:

$$N'_k = \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}. \quad (27)$$

Similarly, the posterior parameters  $\hat{d}_k$ ,  $\hat{v}_k$ , and  $\hat{\beta}_k$  are obtained by simply adding  $N''_k$  to the associated empirical prior parameters  $\bar{d}_k$ ,  $\bar{v}_k$ , and  $\bar{\beta}_k$ :

$$\hat{v}_k = \bar{v}_k + N''_k, \quad (28)$$

$$\hat{\beta}_k = \bar{\beta}_k + N''_k, \quad (29)$$

$$\hat{d}_k = \bar{d}_k + N''_k, \quad (30)$$

where  $N_k''$  is the number of data points to keep attributed to the  $k$ -th component:

$$N_k'' = \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}. \quad (31)$$

Moreover, Appendix D derives the following update equations for the scale matrix  $\bar{\mathbf{W}}_k$  and mean vector  $\bar{\mathbf{m}}_k$  of the empirical prior:

$$\bar{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} = \mathbf{W}_k^{-1} + N_k' \mathbf{S}'_k + \frac{\beta_k N_k'}{\beta_k + N_k'} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' - \mathbf{m}_k) (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' - \mathbf{m}_k)^\top, \quad (32)$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{m}}_k = \frac{\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N_k' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'}{\beta_k + N_k'}, \quad (33)$$

where the empirical mean  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$  and covariance  $\mathbf{S}_k$  of the data points in the  $k$ -th component are given by:

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' = \frac{1}{N_k'} \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n, \quad (34)$$

$$\mathbf{S}'_k = \frac{1}{N_k'} \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k') (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k')^\top. \quad (35)$$

Appendix D provides a derivation of the following update equations for the scale matrix  $\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k$  and mean vector  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k$  of the variational distribution:

$$\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} = \bar{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} + N_k'' \mathbf{S}''_k + \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N_k''}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k) (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top, \quad (36)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k = \frac{\bar{\beta}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k + N_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''}, \quad (37)$$

where the empirical mean  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$  and covariance  $\mathbf{S}_k$  of the data points in the  $k$ -th component are given by:

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' = \frac{1}{N_k''} \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n, \quad (38)$$

$$\mathbf{S}''_k = \frac{1}{N_k''} \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'') (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'')^\top. \quad (39)$$

Finally, the responsibilities  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}$  are updated as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} = \frac{\rho_{nk}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \rho_{nk}}, \quad (40)$$

where the logarithm of  $\rho_{nk}$  is given by:

$$\ln \rho_{nk} = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathcal{D})}[\ln \mathbf{D}_k] - \frac{K}{2} \ln 2\pi + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda_k)}[\ln |\Lambda_k|] - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mu_k, \Lambda_k)}[(\mathbf{x}_n - \mu_k)^\top \Lambda_k (\mathbf{x}_n - \mu_k)], \quad (41)$$

and the expectations can be evaluated using (85), (86), and (87). Importantly, as shown in Figure 4, iterating over the above update equations gives rise to a competition between the Gaussian components, which, in this example, ultimately leads to a Gaussian mixture with only three active components. Note that practically, the number of Gaussian components  $K$  remains unchanged, but the responsibilities of the  $k$ -th component  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}$  can become zero for all  $n$ , i.e., the  $k$ -th component is



not responsible for any data points and can be ignored. When this happens, the posterior parameters of this component revert to their prior counterparts.




Figure 4: The variational Gaussian mixture: (a) before the optimization process, (b) after 5 steps of optimization, (c) after 7 steps of optimization, and (d) after 10 steps of optimization.

### 3. Transition Model

In this section, we explain how to learn the transition mapping between consecutive time steps using a categorical-Dirichlet model. When combined with the perception model from the last section, the resulting model is a temporal Gaussian mixture (TGM) that is able to learn the environment’s structure. That is, a model which can learn the number of states and the transition probabilities between states given the action taken.

#### 3.1 Temporal Gaussian mixture

While the variational Gaussian mixture (from Section 2.2) is able to learn a static model of data, it cannot model time series. A potential solution would be to duplicate the Gaussian mixture likelihood at each time step, and to define the transition probability between any two consecutive time steps, c.f., Figure 5(a). Unfortunately, as depicted in Figure 6(a), adding such transition mapping interferes with the VGM’s ability to learn one component for each cluster of data points. Put simply, we empirically found that learning the likelihood first, and using the posterior over latent variables to learn the transition mapping, works better than learning the likelihood and transition mappings jointly.

Therefore, we use a second generative model for the transition mapping. See Figure 5(b) for an illustration of the model’s structure. Note, the parameters of the variational distribution over  $\mathbf{Z}_0$  and  $\mathbf{Z}_1$  are computed by iterating over the update equations presented in Section 2.2.4, and these parameters remain fixed during the inference process of the transition model.

More precisely, when the agent acts in the environment, it records the observations made  $\mathbf{X}$ , and the actions performed  $\mathbf{A}$ . Then, for each observation<sup>1</sup>  $\mathbf{x}_n \in \mathbf{X}$ , the VGM is used to compute the optimal variational distribution over the corresponding latent variable  $\mathbf{z}_n$ . However, the transition model relies on two observed variables  $\mathbf{X}_0$  and  $\mathbf{X}_1$ , i.e., it does not depend on  $\mathbf{X}$ . The trick is to consider any two consecutive observations  $\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_{n+1} \in \mathbf{X}$ , as observations for  $\mathbf{X}_0$  and  $\mathbf{X}_1$ , respectively. Consequently, the parameters of the variational distribution over  $\mathbf{z}_n, \mathbf{z}_{n+1} \in \mathbf{Z}$  can be used to define

1. Note,  $\mathbf{x}_n$  is the  $n$ -th observation in the dataset, which corresponds to the observation received by the agent at time step  $n$ .

the variational posterior over  $\mathbf{Z}_0$  and  $\mathbf{Z}_1$ , respectively. Similarly, each time  $\mathbf{x}_n$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{n+1}$  are used as observations for  $\mathbf{X}_0$  and  $\mathbf{X}_1$ , the action  $\mathbf{a}_n$  becomes an observed value for  $\mathbf{A}_0$ .

Additionally, since  $(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_{n+1}, \mathbf{a}_n, \mathbf{z}_n, \mathbf{z}_{n+1})$  are related to the variables  $(\mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{A}_0, \mathbf{Z}_0, \mathbf{Z}_1)$ , respectively, they will be denoted by  $(\mathbf{x}_n^0, \mathbf{x}_n^1, \mathbf{a}_n^0, \mathbf{z}_n^0, \mathbf{z}_n^1)$ . This simplifies the notation, for example, if we let  $M$  be the number of data points available to train the transition model, then:  $\mathbf{X}_0 = \{\mathbf{x}_1^0, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M^0\}$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_1 = \{\mathbf{x}_1^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M^1\}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_0 = \{\mathbf{a}_1^0, \dots, \mathbf{a}_M^0\}$ ,  $\mathbf{Z}_0 = \{\mathbf{z}_1^0, \dots, \mathbf{z}_M^0\}$ , and  $\mathbf{Z}_1 = \{\mathbf{z}_1^1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_M^1\}$ .

Finally, since we want to forget part of the data points as time passes, we assume that for all  $\mathbf{Y}_t \in \{\mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{A}_0, \mathbf{Z}_0, \mathbf{Z}_1\}$ , the  $M$  data points have been split into a set of data points to forget  $\mathbf{Y}'_t = \{\mathbf{y}_i^t | i \in M'\}$  and data points to keep  $\mathbf{Y}''_t = \{\mathbf{y}_j^t | j \in M''\}$ , where  $M'$  and  $M''$  are the indices of the data points to forget and keep, respectively. For example, if  $\mathbf{Y}_t = \mathbf{X}_1$ , then we have  $\mathbf{X}'_1 = \{\mathbf{x}_i^1 | i \in M'\}$  and  $\mathbf{X}''_1 = \{\mathbf{x}_j^1 | j \in M''\}$ .

### 3.1.1 GENERATIVE MODEL

We now focus on the transition model definition. Like in Section 2.2.1, the prior over  $\mathbf{D}$  is a Dirichlet distribution, and the prior over  $\mathbf{Z}_0$  is a Categorical distribution parameterized by  $\mathbf{D}$ :

$$P(\mathbf{D}) = \text{Dir}(\mathbf{D}; d), \quad (42)$$

$$P(\mathbf{Z}_0 | \mathbf{D}) = \prod_{n=1}^M \text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n^0 | \mathbf{D}), \quad (43)$$

where  $M$  is the number of data points available to train the transition model. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the transition mapping is modelled as a Categorical distribution parameterized by a 3d-tensor  $\mathbf{B}$ , where the prior over  $\mathbf{B}$  is a Dirichlet distribution:

$$P(\mathbf{B}) = \text{Dir}(\mathbf{B}; b), \quad (44)$$

$$P(\mathbf{Z}_1 | \mathbf{Z}_0, \mathbf{A}_0, \mathbf{B}) = \prod_{n=1}^M \text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n^1 | \mathbf{z}_n^0, \mathbf{a}_n^0, \mathbf{B}). \quad (45)$$

Finally, merging the above four equations, leads to the full generative model for the transition model:

$$P(\mathbf{Z}_{0:1}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{D} | \mathbf{A}_0) = P(\mathbf{Z}_0 | \mathbf{D}) P(\mathbf{D}) P(\mathbf{Z}_1 | \mathbf{Z}_0, \mathbf{A}_0, \mathbf{B}) P(\mathbf{B}), \quad (46)$$

which corresponds to the Bayesian network depicted in Figure 5(b).




Figure 5: This figure illustrates the graphical model of (a) a partially observable Markov decision process with variational Gaussian mixture likelihood, and (b) a temporal model based on a categorical-Dirichlet model.




Figure 6: This figure illustrates: (a) the partially observable Markov decision process from Figure 5(a), (b) the categorical-Dirichlet model from Figure 5(b) when provided with 100 data points, and (c) the categorical-Dirichlet model from Figure 5(b) when provided with 500 data points.

### 3.1.2 EMPIRICAL PRIOR, VARIATIONAL DISTRIBUTION AND UPDATE EQUATIONS

Since we want to forget the data points indexed by  $M'$  and keep the data points indexed by  $M''$ , we introduced an empirical prior like in Section 2.2.2. Once inference has been performed, the parameters of the empirical prior will be used as prior parameters, effectively integrating the information provided by the data points to forget into the prior distribution. After this replacement occurs, the data points indexed by  $M'$  can be safely discarded. More precisely, the empirical prior is defined as follows:

$$P(\mathbf{Z}'_{0:1}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{D} | \mathbf{A}'_0) \approx E(\mathbf{Z}'_{0:1}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{D}) \triangleq E(\mathbf{B})E(\mathbf{D})E(\mathbf{Z}'_0)E(\mathbf{Z}'_1), \quad (47)$$

where the individual factors are defined as follows:

$$E(\mathbf{Z}'_\tau) = \prod_{n \in M'} \text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n^\tau; \hat{\mathbf{r}}_n^\tau) \quad (48)$$

$$E(\mathbf{B}) = \text{Dir}(\mathbf{B}; \bar{\mathbf{b}}), \quad (49)$$

$$E(\mathbf{D}) = \text{Dir}(\mathbf{D}; \bar{\mathbf{d}}). \quad (50)$$

Additionally, we approximate the full posterior by a variational distribution as follows:

$$P(\mathbf{Z}_{0:1}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{D} | \mathbf{A}_0) \approx Q(\mathbf{Z}_{0:1}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{D}) \triangleq Q(\mathbf{B})Q(\mathbf{D})Q(\mathbf{Z}_0)Q(\mathbf{Z}_1), \quad (51)$$




Figure 7: This figure depicts the transition matrices learnt from 5.000 data points, i.e., each matrix corresponds to a different action. Note, the “eat” action allows the mouse to eat the cheese; if the mouse is not on the maze’s terminal cell, this action is equivalent to idle. The bottom-right figure illustrates the Gaussian components learned by the model and the state index associated to each component. Note, state seven is above state six, but it is not displayed because the agent did not visit this state in the last 100 steps.

where the individual factors are defined as follows:

$$Q(\mathbf{Z}_\tau) = \prod_{n=1}^M \text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n^\tau; \hat{\mathbf{r}}_n^\tau) \quad (52)$$

$$Q(\mathbf{B}) = \text{Dir}(\mathbf{B}; \hat{\mathbf{b}}), \quad (53)$$

$$Q(\mathbf{D}) = \text{Dir}(\mathbf{D}; \hat{\mathbf{d}}). \quad (54)$$

Normally, we would derive the update equations for  $\mathbf{Z}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{Z}_1$ ,  $\mathbf{B}$ , and  $\mathbf{D}$ . However, we are only interested in learning the transition mapping. Thus, only the update equation for  $\mathbf{B}$  has been derived. Additionally, as discussed at the beginning of Section 3.1, the parameters of  $Q(\mathbf{Z}_0)$  and  $Q(\mathbf{Z}_1)$  are initialized using the responsibilities obtained by performing inference in the perception model. As shown in Appendix E, the parameters of  $E(\mathbf{B})$  should be computed as follows:

$$\bar{b}[a]_{kj} = b[a]_{kj} + \sum_{n \in M'} [a = a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nj}^1, \quad (55)$$

where the parameter  $b$  was initialized as a 3d-tensor filled with ones. Similarly, the parameters of  $Q(\mathbf{B})$  should be computed as follows:

$$\hat{b}[a]_{kj} = \bar{b}[a]_{kj} + \sum_{n \in M''} [a = a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nj}^1. \quad (56)$$

Note, as the perception model learns the number of hidden states, the size of  $\bar{b}$  and  $\hat{b}$  change. Additionally, the probability of transitioning from the  $k$ -th component, to the  $j$ -th component, under

action  $a$ , is proportional to the (probabilistic) number of times such transition  $a$  was observed in the data. Indeed, since latent variables are not directly observable,  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^t$  does not have to be zero or one, instead, if  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 = 0.5$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nj}^1 = 0.5$ , then the corresponding element in the sum will add 0.25 to the (probabilistic) number of times such a transition was observed. Figure 7 illustrates the learned  $\mathbf{B}$  matrices. Note, the environment was a maze composed of eight states, seven of which are illustrated in the bottom-right image. The starting position was state zero, and the exit cell was state 5. Finally, in this environment, performing an action leading the agent to bump into a wall (e.g., go up in state two) results in the agent not moving.

## 4. To forget or not to forget

In the previous sections, we described the perception and transition models. Importantly, we explained that each model is provided with two sets of data points, i.e., the data points that can be forgotten and the data points that need to be kept in memory. The forgettable data points are used to compute empirical priors, i.e., posterior distributions taking into account only the data points to forget. Importantly, empirical priors have the same functional form as the prior distributions and can therefore be used as prior beliefs when the inference process is over, effectively integrating the information provided by the forgettable data points into the prior. We now focus on how to decide which data points to forget and keep.

### 4.1 Plasticity vs stability dilemma

When learning, the brain needs to be plastic by allowing changes in synaptic connectivity, as well as in the strength of existing synaptic connections. However, these changes should ideally preserve the previously learned concepts to ensure some form of stability over time, and avoid forgetting useful information. This is the plasticity versus stability dilemma (Mermillod et al., 2013).

Our model is faced with a similar challenge, as in general, new components are progressively discovered as the agent explores the environment. These new components need to be learned without forgetting older components. For example, imagine a mouse moving through a maze and observing a noisy estimate of its position. As new maze cells are explored, new positions are sampled and new components will become visible. However, if the number of samples for a new component is too small, this component may be confused with nearby cells, until enough data points are available to differentiate between the cells.

### 4.2 Flexible and fixed components

In this section, we discuss how our model addresses the plasticity vs stability dilemma. More precisely, we assume that the Gaussian components can be either flexible (plastic) or fixed (stable). All components are initialized flexibly, and they become fixed if they persist over long periods of time. Figure 8 illustrates how components transform into fixed components.

Mathematically, every 100 training iterations, the variational Gaussian mixture identifies a set of Gaussian components  $\mathcal{G}_t$ , where  $t \in \{100, 200, \dots\}$ . Given two Gaussian components with distributions  $\mathcal{N}(X; \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_1) \in \mathcal{G}_t$  and  $\mathcal{N}(X; \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_2) \in \mathcal{G}_{t+100}$ , we say that  $\mathcal{N}(X; \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_1)$  at time  $t$  becomes  $\mathcal{N}(X; \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_2)$  at time  $t + 100$ , if:

$$D_{\text{KL}} [\mathcal{N}(X; \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_1) || \mathcal{N}(X; \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_2)] < \theta_{\text{kl}}, \quad (57)$$

where  $\theta_{\text{kl}}$  is the threshold under which two Gaussian components are considered identical, and in our simulation  $\theta_{\text{kl}}$  was set to 0.5. In other words, a Gaussian component  $\mathcal{N}(X; \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_1) \in \mathcal{G}_t$  persists over time if there exists another component  $\mathcal{N}(X; \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_2) \in \mathcal{G}_{t+100}$  for which the KL-divergence is smaller than a predetermined threshold. If a Gaussian component persists more than  $\theta_{\text{counts}}$  times in a row, the component becomes fixed. In our simulation, we chose  $\theta_{\text{counts}} = 4$ .




Figure 8: This figure depicts the Gaussian components discovered every 100 training steps. The number associated to each component counts how many times a component has been observed. When a component has been observed five times in a row or more, this component becomes fixed and is therefore depicted in black. In contrast, red components are flexible components.

### 4.3 Which data points should be forgotten?

Figure 9 illustrates the data available for a trial composed of seven actions and eight observations. For each observation, the variational Gaussian mixture can be used to compute the associated responsibilities. An observation  $x_t$  can be forgotten if the previous  $x_{t-1}$ , current  $x_t$ , and next  $x_{t+1}$  observations are all associated to a fixed component. Of course, if the observation is at the beginning of a trial, then the previous observation can be ignored. Similarly, if the observation is at the end of a trial, then the next observation can be ignored.




Figure 9: This figure illustrates the three kind of data points that can be forgotten. Note,  $x_t$  corresponds to the observation at time  $t$ ,  $r_t$  corresponds to the responsibilities at time  $t$ , and  $a_t$  corresponds to the action at time  $t$ . If  $r_t$  has a black background it means that the corresponding observation  $x_t$  is likely to come from a fixed Gaussian component. In contrast, if  $r_t$  has a red background, then it likely comes from a flexible components. Observations that can be forgotten are depicted using a blue background, while observation to keep have a white background. Finally, small blue nodes connecting a triplet  $(a_t, r_t, r_{t+1})$  correspond to transitions to forget, while small white nodes correspond to transition to keep.

Following these rules in Figure 9, the observations  $x_0$ ,  $x_4$  and  $x_8$  can be forgotten. Therefore, in this case  $N' = \{0, 4, 8\}$  and  $N'' = \{1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7\}$ . If we forget these data points, we obtain the dataset illustrated in Figure 10. This sheds some light on the triplets  $(a_t, r_t, r_{t+1})$  that will become unavailable, and that must therefore be added to the forgetting set of the transition model. Specifically, in this case  $M' = \{0, 3, 4, 7\}$  and  $M'' = \{1, 2, 5, 6\}$ . Thus, for example, the triplet  $(a_7, r_7, r_8)$  can be forgotten, which reflects the fact that  $7 \in M'$ .




Figure 10: This figure shows the dataset after removing the forgettable data points in Figure 9.

## 5. Planning and decision making

In this section, we explain how Q-learning (Sutton and Barto, 2018) can be adapted to work with a problem where there is uncertainty about the current states. First, we introduce the standard Q-learning algorithm, then we adapt this algorithm to work with beliefs over states.

### 5.1 Q-learning

The Q-learning algorithm aims to solve the reinforcement learning problem, where at each time step, an agent takes an action  $a_t$  based on the current state  $s_t$ . Then, the environment produces a next state  $s_{t+1}$  and the reward  $r_{t+1}$  obtained by taking action  $a_t$  in state  $s_t$ . The agent's goal is to maximize the discounted sum of future rewards:

$$G_t = \sum_{\tau=t+1}^T \gamma^{\tau-t-1} r_{\tau}, \quad (58)$$

where  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$  is the discount factor, and the time horizon  $T$  must be larger than  $t + 1$ . In reinforcement learning, a policy  $\pi$  defines the probability of taking each action in each state, i.e.,  $\pi(a|s)$ . The expected value of a state  $s$  under a policy  $\pi$  is denoted  $v_{\pi}(s)$ , i.e.,

$$v_{\pi}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[G_t | s_t = s] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[ \sum_{\tau=t+1}^T \gamma^{\tau-t-1} r_{\tau} \mid s_t = s \right], \quad (59)$$

where  $v_{\pi}(s)$  are sometimes called the state values. Importantly, different policies  $\pi$  lead to different state values, and there exists at least one policy  $\pi^*$  with the highest state values:

$$v_*(s) = \max_{\pi} v_{\pi}(s), \quad (60)$$

where  $v_*(s)$  are the optimal state values obtained by following one of the optimal policies  $\pi^*$ . Similarly, the expected value of taking action  $a$  in state  $s$ , and then follow policy  $\pi$  is denoted  $q_{\pi}(a, s)$ , i.e.,

$$q_{\pi}(a, s) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[G_t | a_t = a, s_t = s] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[ \sum_{\tau=t+1}^T \gamma^{\tau-t-1} r_{\tau} \mid a_t = a, s_t = s \right], \quad (61)$$

where  $q_\pi(a, s)$  are sometime called the Q-values. Importantly, different policies  $\pi$  lead to different Q-values, and there exists at least one policy  $\pi^*$  with the highest Q-values:

$$q_*(a, s) = \max_{\pi} q_\pi(a, s), \quad (62)$$

where  $q_*(a, s)$  are the optimal Q-values obtained by following one of the optimal policies  $\pi^*$ . As shown in Appendix F, the following relationship holds:

$$q_*(a_t, s_t) = \sum_{s_{t+1}, r_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1}, r_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) [r_{t+1} + \gamma v_*(s_{t+1})] \quad (63)$$

$$= \sum_{s_{t+1}, r_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1}, r_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) [r_{t+1} + \gamma \max_{a_{t+1}} q_*(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1})], \quad (64)$$

where intuitively Equation (63) says that the optimal Q-values is equal to the expected immediate reward, plus the discounted value of the future state. Additionally, by comparing Equations (63) and (64), we see that the optimal value of a state is only as good as the value of the best action in that state, i.e.,

$$v_*(s_{t+1}) = \max_{a_{t+1}} q_*(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1}). \quad (65)$$

The goal of the Q-learning algorithm is to estimate the Q-values as given in Equation (64). The expectation over  $P(r_{t+1} | s_{t+1}, s_t, a_t)$  is approximated using Monte-Carlo sampling:

$$q_*(a_t, s_t) = \sum_{s_{t+1}, r_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1}, r_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) [r_{t+1} + \gamma \max_{a_{t+1}} q_*(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1})] \quad (66)$$

$$\approx r_{t+1} + \gamma \sum_{s_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) [\max_{a_{t+1}} q_*(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1})]. \quad (67)$$

The Q-learning works by storing the Q-values in a table denoted  $q(a_t, s_t)$ , then ideally, the following update equation would be iterated:

$$q(a_t, s_t) \leftarrow q(a_t, s_t) + \alpha \left[ \underbrace{r_{t+1} + \gamma \sum_{s_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) [\max_{a_{t+1}} q_*(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1})]}_{\text{Q-values target}} - q(a_t, s_t) \right], \quad (68)$$

where  $\alpha$  is the learning rate. However, the  $q_*(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1})$  is the quantity that Q-learning aims to learn and is therefore unknown. Thus, we approximate  $q_*(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1})$  by our current best guess  $q(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1})$ , leading to the following update equation:

$$q(a_t, s_t) \leftarrow q(a_t, s_t) + \alpha \left[ r_{t+1} + \gamma \sum_{s_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) [\max_{a_{t+1}} q(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1})] - q(a_t, s_t) \right]. \quad (69)$$

Importantly, when no model of the environment is available, the expectation w.r.t.  $P(s_{t+1} | s_t, a_t)$  can be approximated using a Monte-Carlo estimate.

## 5.2 Beliefs based Q-learning

While Q-learning assumes that states are observable, the discrete states available to our planner are the latent variables  $\mathbf{Z}_\tau$  over which the agent has posterior beliefs. The question then becomes:



how should we adapt Q-learning to work with stochastic states? We propose to scale the temporal difference in Equation (69) by the posterior probability of the state, more precisely:

$$q(a_t, s_t) \leftarrow q(a_t, s_t) + \alpha Q(s_t) \underbrace{\left[ r_{t+1} + \gamma \sum_{s_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \left[ \max_{a_{t+1}} q(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1}) \right] - q(a_t, s_t) \right]}_{\text{Temporal difference}}, \quad (70)$$

where  $q(a_t, s_t)$  are the estimated Q-values of taking action  $a_t$  in state  $s_t$ , while  $Q(s_t)$  is the posterior probability of state  $s_t$ . Intuitively, the temporal difference can be understood as the error between the estimated Q-values and the target Q-values. Given an action, we can compute the temporal difference for each state, and by multiplying the temporal difference by the state probability, we effectively perform a form of credit assignment. Note, if all of the probability mass is concentrated in one state, then the above equation reduces to the standard Q-learning. Importantly, the above equation needs to be applied for all states  $s_t$ , Figure 11 illustrates the computation of the updated Q-values. Finally, while Equation (70) used the notation from reinforcement learning, we can re-write this equation using our paper’s notation:

$$q(a_t, z_t) \leftarrow q(a_t, z_t) + \alpha Q(z_t) \left[ r_{t+1} + \gamma \sum_{z_{t+1}} P(z_{t+1}|z_t, a_t) \left[ \max_{a_{t+1}} q(a_{t+1}, z_{t+1}) \right] - q(a_t, z_t) \right], \quad (71)$$

where  $s_\tau$  is now  $z_\tau$ ,  $Q(z_t)$  is the posterior distribution obtained using the perception model from the current observation, and  $P(z_{t+1}|z_t, a_t)$  are the transition probabilities obtained from the transition model.




Figure 11: This figure illustrates the computation of the updated Q-values. More precisely, the row of temporal difference corresponding to the action selected is multiplied element-wise with the posterior beliefs. The resulting product is multiplied with the learning rate and added to the old-Q-values.

## 6. Experiments

In this section, we validate our approach on a maze solving task. The agent is able to move “up”, “down”, “left” and “right”, but if the action selected would lead the agent to bump into a wall, then

the agent does not move. As illustrated in Figure 12, the agent needs to navigate from the initial position (represented by the mouse) to the goal state (represented by the cheese). Then, when the goal state has been reached, the agent must perform the action “eat”. We study the performance of our agent based on two criteria: (i) its ability to learn the structure of various mazes, and (ii) its ability to solve the mazes by getting to the goal state and eating the cheese.

First, we focus on the model’s ability to learn the maze structure. By manual inspection of the learned components and transition matrices, we identified the cells which have been learnt properly (see green and orange cells in Figure 12), and the cells that were not learned (see red cells in Figure 12). Importantly, as the number of states increase, some components became unstable, effectively taking over the data points corresponding to neighbouring cells, the impacted cells are drawn in orange.

Second, we looked at which mazes can be solved by our approach. We found that mazes in Figure 12(a), 12(c), 12(d), and 12(e), can be solved by our approach. However, the agent was unable to solve the maze in Figure 12(b), because of a lack of exploration, leading to an inability to learn the entire maze structure. Similarly, the maze of Figure 12(f) remained unsolved as the large number of states rendered the Gaussian components unstable, leading to some components being unlearned as time passes.




Figure 12: This figure illustrates the mazes used throughout the experiment section. The starting position is represented by a mouse, while the goal state is represented by the cheese. Red cells correspond to positions for which no Gaussian components were learnt. In contrast, the model properly learnt Gaussian components for cells with green and orange backgrounds. However, components corresponding to orange cells became unstable as the number of states increased, and the model was unlearned by the end of the simulation, i.e., orange cells are green cells that turned red. Finally, a line connects the starting position to the goal state if the agent successfully learnt to solve the task.

Another interesting question is how fast can the TGM agent learn to solve each maze. To answer this question, we rely on an empirical comparison between TGM and two reinforcement learning algorithms, i.e., Deep Q-network (DQN) and Advantage Actor Critic (A2C). Put simply, the DQN agent (Mnih et al., 2015) learns the value of taking each action in each state, while A2C (Mnih et al., 2016) is a policy-based approach equipped with a critic network. Note, DQN, A2C and PPO, all learn a mapping from states to actions (or values) without creating a model of the environment, i.e., they are model-free approaches.

Figure 13 illustrates the average episodic reward gathered by the TGM, DQN and A2C agents on the corresponding mazes of Figure 12. Figure 13 shows that TGM performs better than DQN and A2C in the maze of Figure 12(a). Interestingly, all three agents (i.e., TGM, DQN, and A2C) fail to solve the maze of Figure 12(b). This suggests that despite a rather simple topology (i.e., a long corridor), this environment is challenging and would require a special exploration strategy. In other

words, random selection of actions is extremely unlikely to enable the agent to reach the goal state, thus, the agent should actively seek to explore rarely visited parts of the environment.




Figure 13: This figure illustrates the average episodic reward gathered by the TGM, DQN and A2C agents on the corresponding mazes in Figure 12. For example, the graph of Figure 13(a) corresponds to the maze in Figure 12(a). Similarly, the graph of Figure 13(x) corresponds to the maze in Figure 12(x). Note, in Figure 13(b), all three models performed the same, and therefore only DQN is visible. Finally, the shaded areas correspond to the standard deviation of each model.

Additionally, DQN seems to be learning faster than TGM on the maze of Figure 12(c), however, both agents reach a similar asymptotic mean reward. The opposite is true for the maze of Figure

12(d), where TGM learns faster than DQN but both agents reach a similar asymptotic mean reward. Note, on mazes 12(c) and 12(d), A2C performs worse than both DQN and TGM.

Finally, DQN outperforms TGM and A2C on both mazes 12(e) and 12(f). Importantly, TGM has a the small variance in Figure 13(f), because the TGM agent always fails to solve maze 12(f). In contrast, the large variance in Figure 13(e) indicates that the TGM agent alternates between successfully solving the maze and failing to do so.

To conclude, we showed that the TGM agent is competitive with reinforcement learning benchmark such as DQN and A2C. More precisely, TGM outperforms A2C on all the tested mazes, except one where all agents failed to solve the task. This may be because TGM is more stable than A2C as illustrated in Figure 13(c) to 13(e). Similarly, TGM performed better than DQN on one maze, similarly to DQN on three mazes, and worse than DQN on two mazes. However, while TGM sometimes performs worse than DQN, it learns an interpretable model of the environment, which can be desirable for some applications. Additionally, this model of the environment is composed of hidden states that may be useful to develop more advanced exploration strategies, which aim to explore rarely visited states.

## 7. Conclusion

In this paper, we tackled the problem of learning the model structure from data, when the observations are continuous. More specifically, we aimed at identifying the number of clusters present in the data, and each cluster was associated to a latent state. As more data is gathered by the agent, new clusters are discovered, and the model needs to increase its number of states. In contrast, if the agent currently believes that there are more states, than the actual number of clusters in the data, then the number of states needs to decrease.

We proposed a variational Gaussian mixture model, in which the Gaussian mixture model is able to remove clusters not supported by the data, and the agent is constantly monitoring the data searching for new clusters. When new clusters are identified, the corresponding components are added to the mixture. These two mechanics allow the model to learn the number of components. While this is happening, the agent also learns the parameters of the individual components through variational inference.

However, inferring the current state is only part of the story, and the agent also needs to learn how different actions impact the temporal transition between states. This is done by taking advantage of a categorical-Dirichlet model, which effectively keeps track of the number of times the agent moved from a state to another when performing a specific action.

Once the agent can perform inference and predict the consequences of its action, the last requirement is to perform decision making and planning. We proposed a variant of the Q-learning algorithm, which accommodates stochastic states, i.e., having beliefs over states instead of observable states. This new algorithm enabled the agent to solve several mazes, by reaching the exit position and eating the cheese.

Experimentally, our approach was able to solve several mazes, but still has limitations. For example, the approach is susceptible to unlearning existing components, where several components fuse together into a single component. Additionally, since  $\epsilon$ -greedy is used to trade-off exploration and exploitation, the agent tends to struggle to explore remote parts of the maze. These limitations suggest that more research is required to increase the stability of the Gaussian components. Additionally, the agent would benefit from improving the exploration strategy, for example, the agent should probably focus on discovering rarely explored parts of the maze instead of randomly selecting action. Also, the environments being modelled were somewhat idealised, e.g., the organism follows a rather stereotyped trajectory, passing from one cluster to another.

Furthermore, one could investigate alternative approaches for learning the number of components such as the infinite Gaussian mixture model (Rasmussen, 1999). Another interesting direction of

research would be to apply the temporal Gaussian mixture to study the latent representation learned in deep active inference (Fountas et al., 2020; Çatal et al., 2020; Champion et al., 2023; Millidge, 2020; Sancaktar et al., 2020; Lanillos et al., 2020; Oliver et al., 2019; van der Himst and Lanillos, 2020), or similarly to use the variational Gaussian mixture to study the representation learned by variational auto-encoders (Doersch, 2016; Higgins et al., 2017; Kingma and Welling, 2014; Rezende et al., 2014; Bai et al., 2022; Dilokthanakul et al., 2016).

## References

- Junwen Bai, Shufeng Kong, and Carla P Gomes. Gaussian mixture variational autoencoder with contrastive learning for multi-label classification. In *international conference on machine learning*, pages 1383–1398. PMLR, 2022.
- Christopher M Bishop and Nasser M Nasrabadi. *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, volume 4. Springer, 2006.
- David M Blei, Alp Kucukelbir, and Jon D McAuliffe. Variational inference: A review for statisticians. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 112(518):859–877, 2017.
- Cameron B Browne, Edward Powley, Daniel Whitehouse, Simon M Lucas, Peter I Cowling, Philipp Rohlfshagen, Stephen Tavener, Diego Perez, Spyridon Samothrakis, and Simon Colton. A survey of Monte Carlo tree search methods. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Intelligence and AI in games*, 4(1):1–43, 2012.
- Miguel A Carreira-Perpinán. A review of mean-shift algorithms for clustering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.00687*, 2015.
- Ozan Çatal, Tim Verbelen, Johannes Nauta, Cedric De Boom, and Bart Dhoedt. Learning perception and planning with deep active inference. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, ICASSP 2020, Barcelona, Spain, May 4-8, 2020*, pages 3952–3956. IEEE, 2020. doi: 10.1109/ICASSP40776.2020.9054364. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP40776.2020.9054364>.
- Théophile Champion, Marek Grześ, and Howard Bowman. Realizing Active Inference in Variational Message Passing: The Outcome-Blind Certainty Seeker. *Neural Computation*, 33(10):2762–2826, 09 2021. ISSN 0899-7667. doi: 10.1162/neco\_a.01422. URL [https://doi.org/10.1162/neco\\_a\\_01422](https://doi.org/10.1162/neco_a_01422).
- Théophile Champion, Howard Bowman, and Marek Grześ. Branching time active inference: Empirical study and complexity class analysis. *Neural Networks*, 152:450–466, 2022a. ISSN 0893-6080. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2022.05.010>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0893608022001824>.
- Théophile Champion, Lancelot Da Costa, Howard Bowman, and Marek Grześ. Branching time active inference: The theory and its generality. *Neural Networks*, 151:295–316, 2022b. ISSN 0893-6080. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2022.03.036>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0893608022001149>.
- Théophile Champion, Marek Grześ, and Howard Bowman. Multi-modal and multi-factor branching time active inference, 2022c. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.12503>.
- Théophile Champion, Marek Grześ, and Howard Bowman. Branching Time Active Inference with Bayesian Filtering. *Neural Computation*, 34(10):2132–2144, 09 2022d. ISSN 0899-7667. doi: 10.1162/neco\_a.01529. URL [https://doi.org/10.1162/neco\\_a\\_01529](https://doi.org/10.1162/neco_a_01529).

- Théophile Champion, Marek Grześ, Lisa Bonheme, and Howard Bowman. Deconstructing deep active inference, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.01618>.
- Nat Dilokthanakul, Pedro AM Mediano, Marta Garnelo, Matthew CH Lee, Hugh Salimbeni, Kai Arulkumaran, and Murray Shanahan. Deep unsupervised clustering with gaussian mixture variational autoencoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.02648*, 2016.
- Carl Doersch. Tutorial on variational autoencoders, 2016. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.05908>.
- Zafeirios Fountas, Noor Sajid, Pedro A. M. Mediano, and Karl J. Friston. Deep active inference agents using Monte-Carlo methods. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/865dfbde8a344b44095495f3591f7407-Abstract.html>.
- Charles W. Fox and Stephen J. Roberts. A tutorial on variational Bayesian inference. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 38(2):85–95, Aug 2012. ISSN 1573-7462. doi: 10.1007/s10462-011-9236-8. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-011-9236-8>.
- Karl Friston, Thomas Parr, and Peter Zeidman. Bayesian model reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.07092*, 2018.
- Irina Higgins, Loïc Matthey, Arka Pal, Christopher Burgess, Xavier Glorot, Matthew Botvinick, Shakir Mohamed, and Alexander Lerchner. beta-VAE: Learning basic visual concepts with a constrained variational framework. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net, 2017. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Sy2fzU9gl>.
- Paul W Holland and Samuel Leinhardt. An exponential family of probability distributions for directed graphs. *Journal of the american Statistical association*, 76(373):33–50, 1981.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2, Banff, Canada, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6114>.
- Solomon Kullback and Richard A Leibler. On information and sufficiency. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, 22(1):79–86, 1951.
- Pablo Lanillos, Gordon Cheng, et al. Robot self/other distinction: active inference meets neural networks learning in a mirror. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05473*, 2020.
- Martial Mermillod, Aurélia Bugaiska, and Patrick BONIN. The stability-plasticity dilemma: investigating the continuum from catastrophic forgetting to age-limited learning effects. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4, 2013. ISSN 1664-1078. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00504. URL <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00504>.
- Beren Millidge. Deep active inference as variational policy gradients. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 96:102348, 2020. ISSN 0022-2496. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmp.2020.102348>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022249620300298>.

- Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A. Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G. Belle-  
mare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K. Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, Stig Petersen,  
Charles Beattie, Amir Sadik, Ioannis Antonoglou, Helen King, Dharmashan Kumaran, Daan Wier-  
stra, Shane Legg, and Demis Hassabis. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learn-  
ing. *Nature*, 518(7540):529–533, Feb 2015. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/nature14236. URL  
<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14236>.
- Volodymyr Mnih, Adrià Puigdomènech Badia, Mehdi Mirza, Alex Graves, Timothy P. Lillicrap, Tim  
Harley, David Silver, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. Asynchronous methods for deep reinforcement  
learning, 2016.
- Victorita Neacsu, M Berk Mirza, Rick A Adams, and Karl J Friston. Structure learning enhances  
concept formation in synthetic active inference agents. *Plos one*, 17(11):e0277199, 2022.
- Guillermo Oliver, Pablo Lanillos, and Gordon Cheng. Active inference body perception and action  
for humanoid robots. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03022*, 2019.
- Carl Rasmussen. The infinite Gaussian mixture model. *Advances in neural information processing  
systems*, 12, 1999.
- Danilo Jimenez Rezende, Shakir Mohamed, and Daan Wierstra. Stochastic Backpropagation and  
Approximate Inference in Deep Generative Models. In Eric P Xing and Tony Jebara, editors,  
*Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 32 of *Proceedings  
of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1278–1286, Beijing, China, 2014. PMLR. URL [http://  
proceedings.mlr.press/v32/rezende14.html](http://proceedings.mlr.press/v32/rezende14.html).
- Cansu Sancaktar, Marcel A. J. van Gerven, and Pablo Lanillos. End-to-end pixel-based deep ac-  
tive inference for body perception and action. In *Joint IEEE 10th International Conference on  
Development and Learning and Epigenetic Robotics, ICDL-EpiRob 2020, Valparaiso, Chile, Oc-  
tober 26-30, 2020*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2020. doi: 10.1109/ICDL-EpiRob48136.2020.9278105. URL  
<https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDL-EpiRob48136.2020.9278105>.
- Ryan Smith, Philipp Schwartenbeck, Thomas Parr, and Karl J. Friston. An active inference approach  
to modeling structure learning: Concept learning as an example case. *Frontiers in Computational  
Neuroscience*, 14, 2020. ISSN 1662-5188. doi: 10.3389/fncom.2020.00041. URL [https://www.  
frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fncom.2020.00041](https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fncom.2020.00041).
- Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- Otto van der Himst and Pablo Lanillos. Deep active inference for partially observable MDPs. *CoRR*,  
abs/2009.03622, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.03622>.
- John Winn and Christopher Bishop. Variational message passing. *Journal of Machine Learning  
Research*, 6:661–694, 2005.

## Appendix A: notation and important properties

In this paper, we made extensive use of several definitions and properties, which are summarized in this appendix. Appendix A.1 provides the definition of various probability distributions, Appendix A.2 presents properties related to probability theory, and Appendix A.3 highlights properties from linear algebra.

### A.1: probability distributions

The probability density function (PDF) of a multivariate Gaussian distribution with mean  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and precision matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$  is given by:

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{-1}) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{K}{2}} |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{-1}|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\right). \quad (72)$$

The PDF of a Wishart distribution with  $v$  degrees of freedom and scale matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  is:

$$\mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}; \mathbf{W}, v) = 2^{-\frac{vK}{2}} |\mathbf{W}|^{-\frac{v}{2}} \Gamma_K\left(\frac{v}{2}\right)^{-1} |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}|^{\frac{(v-K-1)}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(\mathbf{W}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Lambda})\right). \quad (73)$$

The PDF of a Dirichlet distribution with concentration parameters  $d$  is defined as follows:

$$\text{Dir}(\mathbf{D}; d) = \frac{1}{B(d)} \prod_{k=1}^K D_k^{d_k-1}. \quad (74)$$

In the above equation,  $\mathbf{D}$  was a vector. We define a Dirichlet distribution over a 3d-tensor  $\mathbf{B}$ , as a product of Dirichlet distributions over the columns of the matrices  $\mathbf{B}[a]$ . More precisely, the PDF of a Dirichlet distribution with concentration parameters  $b$  is defined as:

$$\text{Dir}(\mathbf{B}; b) = \prod_{a=1}^A \prod_{j=1}^K \text{Dir}(\mathbf{B}[a]_{\cdot j}; b[a]_{\cdot j}) = \prod_{a=1}^A \prod_{j=1}^K \frac{1}{B(b[a]_{\cdot j})} \prod_{k=1}^K B[a]_{kj}^{b[a]_{kj}-1}. \quad (75)$$

The probability mass function (PMF) of a categorical distribution with parameters  $\mathbf{D}$  is given by:

$$\text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n | \mathbf{D}) = \prod_{k=1}^K D_k^{z_{nk}}. \quad (76)$$

In the above equation,  $\mathbf{D}$  is a vector, and the categorical distribution is a distribution over a single random variable. We extend the definition of categorical distributions to conditional distributions, by using 3d-tensor of parameters  $\mathbf{B}$ . More precisely, the PMF of a conditional categorical distribution with parameters  $\mathbf{B}$  is:

$$\text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n^{\tau+1} | \mathbf{z}_n^\tau, \mathbf{a}_n^\tau, \mathbf{B}) = \prod_{j=1}^K \prod_{k=1}^K B[\mathbf{a}_n^\tau]_{jk}^{z_{nk}^\tau z_{nj}^{\tau+1}}. \quad (77)$$

### A.2: important properties of probability theory

Given two sets of continuous random variables  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$ , the sum-rule of probability states that:

$$P(\mathbf{Y}) = \int_{\mathbf{X}} P(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) d\mathbf{X}, \quad (78)$$

and for discrete variables, the integral becomes a summation. The sum-rule can then be used to sum out random variables from a joint distribution. The second property is called the product-rule



of probability, and can be used to split a joint distribution into conditional distributions. Given two sets of random variables  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$ , the product-rule of probability states that:

$$P(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = P(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y})P(\mathbf{Y}). \quad (79)$$

A corollary of the product-rule of probability is called Bayes theorem:

$$P(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}) = \frac{P(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y})P(\mathbf{Y})}{P(\mathbf{X})}, \quad (80)$$

which states that the posterior  $P(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X})$  is equal to the likelihood  $P(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y})$  times the prior  $P(\mathbf{Y})$  divided by the evidence  $P(\mathbf{X})$ . Next, if  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$  are two real numbers, then a relevant property of logarithm is the following:

$$\ln(\mathbf{ab}) = \ln(\mathbf{a}) + \ln(\mathbf{b}). \quad (81)$$

Put simply, this allows us to turn the logarithm of a product into a sum of logarithms, and we will refer to the above equation as the “log-property”. Another property is called the linearity of expectation. Given a random variable  $\mathbf{X}$ , and two real numbers  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$ , the linearity of expectation states that:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{aX} + \mathbf{b}] = \mathbf{a}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}] + \mathbf{b}, \quad (82)$$

where the expectation is w.r.t. the marginal distribution over  $\mathbf{X}$ , i.e.,  $P(\mathbf{X})$ . Additionally, given two distributions  $Q(X)$  and  $P(X)$  over the same domain, the KL-divergence is an asymmetric distance that quantifies how different two distributions are from each other. The KL-divergence (Kullback and Leibler, 1951) is defined as:

$$D_{\text{KL}} [Q(X)|| P(X)] = \mathbb{E}_{Q(X)}[\ln Q(X) - \ln P(X)]. \quad (83)$$

Additionally, for discrete variables, the entropy of a conditional distribution decreases as more variables are given:

$$H[X|Y, Z] = - \sum_{x,y,z} P(x, y, z) \ln \frac{P(x, y, z)}{P(y, z)} \leq - \sum_{x,z} P(x, z) \ln \frac{P(x, z)}{P(z)} = H[X|Z]. \quad (84)$$

Moreover, according to Section of 10.2 of (Bishop and Nasrabadi, 2006), if  $\mathbf{\Lambda} \sim Q(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{\Lambda}; \hat{\mathbf{W}}, \hat{\nu})$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \sim Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}; \hat{\mathbf{m}}, (\hat{\beta}\mathbf{\Lambda})^{-1})$ , then the following two properties holds:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{\Lambda})}[\ln |\mathbf{\Lambda}|] = K \ln 2 + \ln |\hat{\mathbf{W}}| + \sum_{i=1}^K \psi\left(\frac{\hat{\nu}+1-i}{2}\right), \quad (85)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{\Lambda})}[(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \mathbf{\Lambda} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})] = K\hat{\beta}^{-1} + \hat{\nu}(\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{m}})^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}} (\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{m}}), \quad (86)$$

where  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{W}}$  are  $K \times K$  matrices, and  $\psi(\cdot)$  is the digamma function. Also, if  $\mathbf{D}$  is a random vector of size  $K$  distributed according to a Dirichlet distribution, i.e.,  $\mathbf{D} \sim Q(\mathbf{D}) = \text{Dir}(\mathbf{D}; \hat{\mathbf{d}})$ , then:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln \mathbf{D}_k] = \psi(\hat{d}_k) - \psi(\sum_{i=1}^K \hat{d}_i). \quad (87)$$

### A.3: important properties of linear algebra

Given a symmetric matrix  $X$ , and two vectors  $a$  and  $b$ , the following two properties hold:

$$(a - b)^\top X(a - b) = a^\top Xa - 2a^\top Xb + b^\top Xb \quad (88)$$

$$a^\top Xb = b^\top Xa \quad (89)$$

Given a symmetric matrix  $X$ ,  $N$  vectors  $a_i$ , and a vector  $b$ , the following three properties hold:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N a_i^\top X b = N \bar{a}^\top X b, \quad (90)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N a_i b^\top = N \bar{a} b^\top, \quad (91)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N b a_i^\top = N b \bar{a}^\top, \quad (92)$$

where  $\bar{a} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N a_i$ . Given a matrix  $X$ , and two vectors  $a$  and  $b$ :

$$a^\top X b = \text{tr}(b a^\top X), \quad (93)$$

where  $\text{tr}(X) = \sum_i X_{ii}$  is the trace  $X$ . Given two matrices  $A$  and  $B$ :

$$\text{tr}(A) + \text{tr}(B) = \text{tr}(A + B). \quad (94)$$

Given two vectors  $a$  and  $b$ :

$$(a - b)(a - b)^\top = a a^\top + b b^\top - a b^\top - b a^\top, \quad (95)$$

$$(a + b)(a + b)^\top = a a^\top + b b^\top + a b^\top + b a^\top. \quad (96)$$

Given two vectors  $a$  and  $b$ , and two constants  $c$  and  $d$ :

$$(ca)(db)^\top = cdab^\top. \quad (97)$$

Additionally, given a matrix  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  the following property holds:

$$|\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1}| = |\mathbf{\Lambda}|^{-1}, \quad (98)$$

where  $|\mathbf{\Lambda}|$  is the determinant of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ .

## Appendix B: Variational free energy proofs

In this appendix, we explain how to compute the expectations of the variational free energy presented in Section 2.2.3. More precisely, we derive the following analytical solutions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln Q(\mathbf{D})] &= -\ln B(\hat{d}) + \sum_{k=1}^K (\hat{d}_k - 1) \ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k, \\
\mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln Q(\boldsymbol{\mu} | \boldsymbol{\Lambda})] &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K K \ln \frac{\hat{\beta}_k}{2\pi} + \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_k - K, \\
\mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})] &= \sum_{k=1}^K -\frac{\hat{v}_k K}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} \ln |\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k| - \ln \Gamma_K\left(\frac{\hat{v}_k}{2}\right) + \frac{\hat{v}_k - K - 1}{2} \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_k - \frac{\hat{v}_k K}{2}, \\
\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\ln Q(\mathbf{Z})] &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \ln \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}, \\
\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln P(\mathbf{D})] &= -\ln B(d) + \sum_{k=1}^K (d_k - 1) \ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k, \\
\mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\boldsymbol{\mu} | \boldsymbol{\Lambda})] &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K K \ln \frac{\beta_k}{2\pi} + \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_k - \frac{\beta_k K}{\hat{\beta}_k} - \beta_k \hat{v}_k (\mathbf{m}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k (\mathbf{m}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k), \\
\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D})}[\ln P(\mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{D})] &= \sum_{k=1}^K N_k \ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k, \\
\mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})] &= \sum_{k=1}^K -\frac{v_k K}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{v_k}{2} \ln |\mathbf{W}_k| - \ln \Gamma_K\left(\frac{v_k}{2}\right) + \frac{v_k - K - 1}{2} \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_k - \frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k), \\
\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})] &= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{N_k}{2} \left[ \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_k - K \hat{\beta}_k^{-1} - \hat{v}_k \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_k \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k) - \hat{v}_k (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k) - K \ln 2\pi \right].
\end{aligned}$$

## B.1 Derivation for $\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln Q(\mathbf{D})]$

Let's first show that if  $Q(\mathbf{D}) = \text{Dir}(\mathbf{D}; \hat{\mathbf{d}})$ , then:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln Q(\mathbf{D})] = -\ln B(\hat{\mathbf{d}}) + \sum_{k=1}^K (\hat{d}_k - 1) \ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k,$$

where  $\ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln \mathbf{D}_k] = \psi(\hat{d}_k) - \psi(\sum_{i=1}^K \hat{d}_i)$ .

Using the definition of the Dirichlet distribution as given in Equation (74), the log-property, and the linearity of expectation, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln Q(\mathbf{D})] &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})} \left[ \ln \left( \frac{1}{B(\hat{\mathbf{d}})} \prod_{k=1}^K \mathbf{D}_k^{\hat{d}_k - 1} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})} \left[ -\ln B(\hat{\mathbf{d}}) + \sum_{k=1}^K (\hat{d}_k - 1) \ln \mathbf{D}_k \right] \\ &= -\ln B(\hat{\mathbf{d}}) + \sum_{k=1}^K (\hat{d}_k - 1) \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln \mathbf{D}_k]. \end{aligned}$$

P

Then, using (87), we get the final result:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln Q(\mathbf{D})] = -\ln B(\hat{\mathbf{d}}) + \sum_{k=1}^K (\hat{d}_k - 1) \ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k,$$

where  $\ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln \mathbf{D}_k] = \psi(\hat{d}_k) - \psi(\sum_{i=1}^K \hat{d}_i)$ .

## B.2 Derivation for $\mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda})]$

Next, we prove that if  $Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k; \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k, \hat{v}_k)$  and  $Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k; \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k, (\hat{\beta}_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)^{-1})$ , then:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda})] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K K \ln \frac{\hat{\beta}_k}{2\pi} + \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_k - K,$$

where  $\ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_k = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)}[\ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k|] = K \ln 2 + \ln |\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k| + \sum_{i=1}^K \psi(\frac{\hat{v}_k+1-i}{2})$ .

Using the definition of the Gaussian distribution as given in Equation (72), the log-property, and Equation (98):

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})} \left[ \ln \prod_{k=1}^K \left( \frac{2\pi}{\hat{\beta}_k} \right)^{-\frac{K}{2}} |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1}|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left( -\frac{\hat{\beta}_k}{2} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^K K \ln \frac{\hat{\beta}_k}{2\pi} - \frac{1}{2} \ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1}| - \frac{\hat{\beta}_k}{2} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K K \ln \frac{\hat{\beta}_k}{2\pi} + \ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k| - \hat{\beta}_k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

**P**

Then, using the linearity of expectation, as well as Equations (85) and (86):

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda})] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left( K \ln \frac{\hat{\beta}_k}{2\pi} + \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k|] - \hat{\beta}_k \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)] \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left( K \ln \frac{\hat{\beta}_k}{2\pi} + \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} - \hat{\beta}_k [K \hat{\beta}_k^{-1} + \hat{v}_k (\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k (\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)] \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K K \ln \frac{\hat{\beta}_k}{2\pi} + \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} - K, \end{aligned}$$

where according to (85), we have  $\ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)}[\ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}|] = K \ln 2 + \ln |\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k| + \sum_{i=1}^K \psi(\frac{\hat{v}_k+1-i}{2})$ .

### B.3 Derivation for $\mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda)}[\ln Q(\Lambda)]$

Let us now demonstrate that if  $Q(\Lambda) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{W}(\Lambda_k; \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k, \hat{v}_k)$ , then:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda)}[\ln Q(\Lambda)] = \sum_{k=1}^K -\frac{\hat{v}_k K}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} \ln |\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k| - \ln \Gamma_K\left(\frac{\hat{v}_k}{2}\right) + \frac{\hat{v}_k - K - 1}{2} \ln \tilde{\Lambda}_k - \frac{\hat{v}_k K}{2},$$

where  $\ln \tilde{\Lambda}_k = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda_k)}[\ln |\Lambda_k|] = K \ln 2 + \ln |\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k| + \sum_{i=1}^K \psi\left(\frac{\hat{v}_k+1-i}{2}\right)$ .

Using the definition of the Wishart distribution as given in Equation (73), the log-property, and the linearity of expectation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda)}[\ln Q(\Lambda)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda)} \left[ \ln \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{W}(\Lambda_k; \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k, \hat{v}_k) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda)} \left[ \ln \prod_{k=1}^K 2^{-\frac{\hat{v}_k K}{2}} |\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k|^{-\frac{\hat{v}_k}{2}} \Gamma_K\left(\frac{\hat{v}_k}{2}\right)^{-1} |\Lambda_k|^{\frac{\hat{v}_k - K - 1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} \Lambda_k)\right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda)} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^K -\frac{\hat{v}_k K}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} \ln |\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k| - \ln \Gamma_K\left(\frac{\hat{v}_k}{2}\right) + \frac{\hat{v}_k - K - 1}{2} \ln |\Lambda_k| - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} \Lambda_k) \right] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K -\frac{\hat{v}_k K}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} \ln |\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k| - \ln \Gamma_K\left(\frac{\hat{v}_k}{2}\right) + \frac{\hat{v}_k - K - 1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda_k)}[\ln |\Lambda_k|] - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda_k)}[\text{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} \Lambda_k)], \end{aligned}$$

P

where according to (85), we have  $\ln \tilde{\Lambda}_k = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda_k)}[\ln |\Lambda_k|] = K \ln 2 + \ln |\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k| + \sum_{i=1}^K \psi\left(\frac{\hat{v}_k+1-i}{2}\right)$ . Then, focusing on the last term:

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda_k)}[\text{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} \Lambda_k)] &= -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda_k)}[\Lambda_k]) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} \hat{v}_k \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k) \\ &= -\frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} \text{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k) \\ &= -\frac{\hat{v}_k K}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

which can be substituted back to get the final result:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda)}[\ln Q(\Lambda)] = \sum_{k=1}^K -\frac{\hat{v}_k K}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} \ln |\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k| - \ln \Gamma_K\left(\frac{\hat{v}_k}{2}\right) + \frac{\hat{v}_k - K - 1}{2} \ln \tilde{\Lambda}_k - \frac{\hat{v}_k K}{2}.$$

#### B.4 Derivation for $\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\ln Q(\mathbf{Z})]$

In this section, we show that if  $Q(\mathbf{Z}) = \prod_{n=1}^N \text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n; \hat{\mathbf{r}}_n)$ , then:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\ln Q(\mathbf{Z})] = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{r}_{nk} \ln \hat{r}_{nk}.$$

Using the definition of the Categorical distribution as given in Equation (76), the log-property, and the linearity of expectation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\ln Q(\mathbf{Z})] &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\ln \prod_{n=1}^N \text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n | \hat{\mathbf{r}}_n)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\ln \prod_{n=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^K \hat{r}_{nk}^{z_{nk}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K z_{nk} \ln \hat{r}_{nk}] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[z_{nk}] \ln \hat{r}_{nk}, \end{aligned}$$

where the final result is recovered by realizing that  $\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[z_{nk}] = \hat{r}_{nk}$ .

P

### B.5 Derivation for $\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln P(\mathbf{D})]$

Next, we prove that if  $Q(\mathbf{D}) = \text{Dir}(\mathbf{D}; \hat{d})$  and  $P(\mathbf{D}) = \text{Dir}(\mathbf{D}; d)$ , then:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln P(\mathbf{D})] = -\ln B(d) + \sum_{k=1}^K (d_k - 1) \ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k,$$

where  $\ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln \mathbf{D}_k] = \psi(\hat{d}_k) - \psi(\sum_{i=1}^K \hat{d}_i)$ .

Using the definition of the Dirichlet distribution as given in Equation (74), the log-property and the linearity of expectation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln P(\mathbf{D})] &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})} \left[ \ln \left( \frac{1}{B(d)} \prod_{k=1}^K \mathbf{D}_k^{d_k-1} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})} \left[ -\ln B(d) + \sum_{k=1}^K (d_k - 1) \ln \mathbf{D}_k \right] \\ &= -\ln B(d) + \sum_{k=1}^K (d_k - 1) \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln \mathbf{D}_k]. \end{aligned}$$

P

Then, using (87), we get the final result:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln Q(\mathbf{D})] = -\ln B(d) + \sum_{k=1}^K (d_k - 1) \ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k,$$

where  $\ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln \mathbf{D}_k] = \psi(\hat{d}_k) - \psi(\sum_{i=1}^K \hat{d}_i)$ .



## B.6 Derivation for $\mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda})]$

Next, we demonstrate that if  $Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k; \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k, \hat{v}_k)$ ,  $Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k; \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k, (\hat{\beta}_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)^{-1})$ , and  $P(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k; \mathbf{m}_k, (\beta_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)^{-1})$ , then:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda})] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K K \ln \frac{\beta_k}{2\pi} + \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_k - \frac{\beta_k K}{\hat{\beta}_k} - \beta_k \hat{v}_k (\mathbf{m}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k (\mathbf{m}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k),$$

where  $\ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_k = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)}[\ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k|] = K \ln 2 + \ln |\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k| + \sum_{i=1}^K \psi(\frac{\hat{v}_k + 1 - i}{2})$ .

Using the definition of the Gaussian distribution as given in Equation (73), the log-property and Equation (98):

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})} \left[ \ln \prod_{k=1}^K \left( \frac{2\pi}{\beta_k} \right)^{-\frac{K}{2}} |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1}|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left( -\frac{\beta_k}{2} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \mathbf{m}_k)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \mathbf{m}_k) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{K}{2} \ln \frac{\beta_k}{2\pi} - \frac{1}{2} \ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1}| - \frac{\beta_k}{2} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \mathbf{m}_k)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \mathbf{m}_k) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K K \ln \frac{\beta_k}{2\pi} + \ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k| - \beta_k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \mathbf{m}_k)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \mathbf{m}_k) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

P

Then, using the linearity of expectation, as well as Equations (85) and (86):

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda})] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K K \ln \frac{\beta_k}{2\pi} + \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k|] - \beta_k \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \mathbf{m}_k)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \mathbf{m}_k)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K K \ln \frac{\beta_k}{2\pi} + \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} - \beta_k [K \hat{\beta}_k^{-1} + \hat{v}_k (\mathbf{m}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k (\mathbf{m}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K K \ln \frac{\beta_k}{2\pi} + \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} - \frac{\beta_k K}{\hat{\beta}_k} - \beta_k \hat{v}_k (\mathbf{m}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k (\mathbf{m}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k), \end{aligned}$$

where according to (85), we have  $\ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)}[\ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}|] = K \ln 2 + \ln |\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k| + \sum_{i=1}^K \psi(\frac{\hat{v}_k + 1 - i}{2})$ .

### B.7 Derivation for $\mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda)}[\ln P(\Lambda)]$

Let us now demonstrate that if  $Q(\Lambda) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{W}(\Lambda_k; \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k, \hat{v}_k)$  and  $P(\Lambda) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{W}(\Lambda_k; \mathbf{W}_k, v_k)$ , then:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda)}[\ln P(\Lambda)] = \sum_{k=1}^K -\frac{v_k K}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{v_k}{2} \ln |\mathbf{W}_k| - \ln \Gamma_K\left(\frac{v_k}{2}\right) + \frac{(v_k - K - 1)}{2} \ln \tilde{\Lambda} - \frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k),$$

where  $\ln \tilde{\Lambda}_k = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda_k)}[\ln |\Lambda_k|] = K \ln 2 + \ln |\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k| + \sum_{i=1}^K \psi\left(\frac{\hat{v}_k + 1 - i}{2}\right)$ .

Using the definition of the Wishart distribution as given in (73), and using the log-property as well as the linearity of expectation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda)}[\ln P(\Lambda)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda)} \left[ \ln \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{W}(\Lambda_k; \mathbf{W}_k, v_k) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda)} \left[ \ln \prod_{k=1}^K 2^{-\frac{v_k K}{2}} |\mathbf{W}_k|^{-\frac{v_k}{2}} \Gamma_K\left(\frac{v_k}{2}\right)^{-1} |\Lambda_k|^{\frac{v_k - K - 1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \Lambda_k)\right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda)} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^K -\frac{v_k K}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{v_k}{2} \ln |\mathbf{W}_k| - \ln \Gamma_K\left(\frac{v_k}{2}\right) + \frac{v_k - K - 1}{2} \ln |\Lambda_k| - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \Lambda_k) \right] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K -\frac{v_k K}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{v_k}{2} \ln |\mathbf{W}_k| - \ln \Gamma_K\left(\frac{v_k}{2}\right) + \frac{v_k - K - 1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda_k)}[\ln |\Lambda_k|] - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda_k)}[\text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \Lambda_k)]. \end{aligned}$$

P

where according to (85), we have  $\ln \tilde{\Lambda} = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda_k)}[\ln |\Lambda|] = K \ln 2 + \ln |\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k| + \sum_{i=1}^K \psi\left(\frac{\hat{v}_k + 1 - i}{2}\right)$ . Then, focusing on the last term:

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda_k)}[\text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \Lambda_k)] &= -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda_k)}[\Lambda_k]) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \hat{v}_k \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k) \\ &= -\frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k), \end{aligned}$$

which can be substituted back to get the final result:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda)}[\ln P(\Lambda)] = \sum_{k=1}^K -\frac{v_k K}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{v_k}{2} \ln |\mathbf{W}_k| - \ln \Gamma_K\left(\frac{v_k}{2}\right) + \frac{(v_k - K - 1)}{2} \ln \tilde{\Lambda} - \frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k).$$

### B.8 Derivation for $\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D})}[\ln P(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{D})]$

Let us now prove that if  $Q(\mathbf{Z}) = \prod_{n=1}^N \text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n; \hat{\mathbf{r}}_n)$ ,  $P(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{D}) = \prod_{n=1}^N \text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n|\mathbf{D})$ , and  $Q(\mathbf{D}) = \text{Dir}(\mathbf{D}; \hat{\mathbf{d}})$ , then:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D})}[\ln P(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{D})] = \sum_{k=1}^K N_k \ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k,$$

where  $N_k = \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}$  and  $\ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln \mathbf{D}_k] = \psi(\hat{d}_k) - \psi(\sum_{i=1}^K \hat{d}_i)$ .

Using the definition of the Categorical distribution as given in (76), and using the log-property as well as the linearity of expectation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D})}[\ln P(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{D})] &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D})}[\ln \prod_{n=1}^N \text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n|\mathbf{D})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D})}[\ln \prod_{n=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^K \mathbf{D}_k^{z_{nk}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D})}[\sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K z_{nk} \ln \mathbf{D}_k] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[z_{nk}] \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln \mathbf{D}_k]. \end{aligned}$$

P

Then, realizing that  $\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[z_{nk}] = \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}$  and recalling that  $\ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln \mathbf{D}_k]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{D})}[\ln P(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{D})] &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K N_k \ln \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_k, \end{aligned}$$

where we defined  $N_k = \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}$ .

### B.9 Derivation for $\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})]$

Finally, we demonstrate that if  $Q(\mathbf{Z}) = \prod_{n=1}^N \text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n; \hat{\mathbf{r}}_n)$ ,  $Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k; \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k, \hat{v}_k)$ ,  $P(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \prod_{n=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_n; \boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1})^{z_{nk}}$  and  $Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k; \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k, (\hat{\beta}_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)^{-1})$ , then:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})] = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{N_k}{2} \left[ \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_k - K \hat{\beta}_k^{-1} - \hat{v}_k \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_k \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k) - \hat{v}_k (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k) - K \ln 2\pi \right].$$

Using the definition of the Gaussian distribution as given in (72), the log-property, and the linearity of expectation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})} \left[ \ln \prod_{n=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_n; \boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1})^{z_{nk}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})} \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K z_{nk} \ln \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_n; \boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})} \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K z_{nk} \ln \left( (2\pi)^{-\frac{K}{2}} |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1}|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\mathbf{x}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k) \right) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})} \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K z_{nk} \left( -\frac{K}{2} \ln 2\pi - \frac{1}{2} \ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1}| - \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\mathbf{x}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, realizing that  $\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[z_{nk}] = \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}$ , and using (86) and (85), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[z_{nk}] \left[ -\frac{K}{2} \ln 2\pi - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1}|] - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[(\mathbf{x}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\mathbf{x}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k)] \right] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}}{2} \left[ -K \ln 2\pi + \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k|] - K \hat{\beta}_k^{-1} - \hat{v}_k (\mathbf{x}_n - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k (\mathbf{x}_n - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k) \right] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}}{2} \left[ -K \ln 2\pi + \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} - K \hat{\beta}_k^{-1} - \hat{v}_k (\mathbf{x}_n - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k (\mathbf{x}_n - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k) \right] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{N_k}{2} \left[ -K \ln 2\pi + \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} - K \hat{\beta}_k^{-1} \right] - \underbrace{\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}}{2} \left[ \hat{v}_k (\mathbf{x}_n - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k (\mathbf{x}_n - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k) \right]}_{Y_{1k}}, \end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

where we used  $\ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1}| = -\ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k|$ , and defined  $\ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)}[\ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}|] = K \ln 2 + \ln |\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k| + \sum_{i=1}^K \psi(\frac{\hat{v}_k + 1 - i}{2})$  as well as  $N_k = \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}$ . Next, we focus on the second term in the above

equation, for all  $k$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{1k} &= \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\hat{r}_{nk}}{2} \hat{v}_k \left[ \mathbf{x}_n^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \mathbf{x}_n - \mathbf{x}_n^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \mathbf{x}_n + \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \right] \\
&= \frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{r}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \mathbf{x}_n - \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{r}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k - \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{r}_{nk} \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \mathbf{x}_n + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{r}_{nk} \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \right] \\
&= \frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{r}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \mathbf{x}_n - N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k - N_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k + N_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k = \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{r}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n$ . By adding and subtracting  $N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$ , we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{1k} &= \frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \left[ \hat{r}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \mathbf{x}_n - N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k - N_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k + N_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \right] \\
&= \frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{r}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \mathbf{x}_n - N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k + N_k (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k) \right] \\
&= \frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} \underbrace{\sum_{n=1}^N \hat{r}_{nk} (\mathbf{x}_n^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)}_{Y_2} + \frac{N_k \hat{v}_k}{2} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k).
\end{aligned}$$

P

Focusing on the first term, we used (93) and (94) to get:

$$Y_2 = \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{r}_{nk} \text{tr}(\mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{x}_n^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k),$$

we then add and subtract  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k$ , and use (95) to obtain:

$$Y_2 = \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{r}_{nk} \text{tr}((\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)(\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k + \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k + \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k).$$

Moreover, by using (94), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_2 &= \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{r}_{nk} \text{tr}((\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)(\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k) + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{r}_{nk} \text{tr}(\mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k + \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k - 2\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k) \\
&= N_k \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_k \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k) + \underbrace{\sum_{n=1}^N \hat{r}_{nk} \text{tr}(\mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k + \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k - 2\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k)}_{Y_3} \\
&= N_k \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_k \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k).
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{S}_k = \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)(\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)^\top$  and  $Y_3 = 0$  because:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_3 &= \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \text{tr}(\mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k + \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k - 2\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k) \\ &= \text{tr}\left(\sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k - \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} 2\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k\right) \\ &= \text{tr}(N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k - N_k 2\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

P

By substituting  $Y_2$  into  $Y_{1k}$ , and  $Y_{1k}$  into (99), we get the final result:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{N_k}{2} \left[ -K \ln 2\pi + \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} - K \hat{\beta}_k^{-1} \right] - \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ \frac{\hat{v}_k}{2} N_k \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_k \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k) + \frac{N_k \hat{v}_k}{2} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k) \right] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{N_k}{2} \left[ -K \ln 2\pi + \ln \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} - K \hat{\beta}_k^{-1} - \hat{v}_k \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_k \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k) - \hat{v}_k (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k) \right] \end{aligned}$$

## Appendix C: Perception model, update equation of variational distribution

In this appendix, we start with the general update equation of variational inference, i.e., Equation (23), and derive the specific update equations for  $\mathbf{Z}$ ,  $\mathbf{D}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ . Importantly, the update equations for  $\mathbf{Z}$ ,  $\mathbf{D}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$  rely on the generative model and variational distribution presented in Section 2.

### C.1 Update equation for $\mathbf{Z}$

Applying the general update equation given in (23) to the random variable  $\mathbf{Z}$ , we get:

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{Z}) = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln P(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{D})] + \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})] + c,$$

where  $c$  is a constant w.r.t.  $\mathbf{Z}$ . From the above equation, we can show that:

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K z_{nk} \ln \rho_{nk} + c \quad (100)$$

where:

$$\ln \rho_{nk} = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln \mathbf{D}_k] - \frac{K}{2} \ln 2\pi + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)}[\ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k|] - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)}[(\mathbf{x}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\mathbf{x}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k)].$$

Importantly, the expectations in the above equation can be evaluated using (85), (86), and (87).

Using (23), we get the update equation for  $\mathbf{Z}$ :

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{Z}) = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln P(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{D})] + \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})] + c.$$

Focusing on the first term, and using the log-property, the linearity of expectation, and the fact that  $P(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{D})$  is a product of categorical distributions, we get:

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln P(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{D})] = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})} \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K z_{nk} \ln \mathbf{D}_k \right] = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K z_{nk} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln \mathbf{D}_k],$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln \mathbf{D}_k]$  can be evaluated using (87). Finally, using the log-property, the linearity of expectation and the definition of the Gaussian distribution, the second term can be re-arranged as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})}[\ln P(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)} \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K z_{nk} \ln \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_n | \boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k) \right] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K z_{nk} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)} \left[ -\frac{K}{2} \ln 2\pi - \frac{1}{2} \ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1}| - \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\mathbf{x}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k) \right] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K z_{nk} \left[ -\frac{K}{2} \ln 2\pi + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)}[\ln |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k|] - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)}[(\mathbf{x}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\mathbf{x}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k)] \right], \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

where the expectations can be evaluated using (85) and (86). Substituting the two results above back into the update equation for  $\mathbf{Z}$  and re-arranging, we get:

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K z_{nk} \ln \rho_{nk} + c,$$

P

where:

$$\ln \rho_{nk} = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{D})}[\ln \mathbf{D}_k] - \frac{K}{2} \ln 2\pi + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\Lambda_k)}[\ln |\Lambda_k|] - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mu_k, \Lambda_k)}[(\mathbf{x}_n - \mu_k)^\top \Lambda_k (\mathbf{x}_n - \mu_k)].$$

Taking the exponential of both sides in (100), we obtain:

$$Q^*(\mathbf{Z}) \propto \prod_{n=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^K \rho_{nk}^{z_{nk}}.$$

Note, for every value of  $n$ ,  $z_{nk}$  are binary variables that sum to one, and  $Q^*(\mathbf{Z})$  must be normalized, thus:

$$Q^*(\mathbf{Z}) = \prod_{n=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^K \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^{z_{nk}} \quad \text{where:} \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} = \frac{\rho_{nk}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \rho_{nk}}.$$

Importantly, we recognize that  $Q^*(\mathbf{Z})$  is a product of categorical distributions parameterized by  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}$ :

$$Q^*(\mathbf{Z}) = \prod_{n=1}^N \text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_n; \hat{\mathbf{r}}_n).$$

## C.2 Update equation for $\mathbf{D}$

Using (23), we can obtain the following update equation for  $\mathbf{D}$ :

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{D}) = \ln P(\mathbf{D}) + \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\ln P(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{D})] + c,$$

from which it is possible to show that:

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{D}) = \ln \prod_{k=1}^K \mathbf{D}_k^{(d_k - 1 + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk})} + c,$$

where  $c$  is a constant w.r.t.  $\mathbf{D}$ .

Using (23), we get:

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{D}) = \ln P(\mathbf{D}) + \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\ln P(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{D})] + c.$$

P

Using the definition of the Dirichlet and categorical distributions, and the log-property:

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{D}) = \sum_{k=1}^K (d_k - 1) \ln \mathbf{D}_k + \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})} \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K z_{nk} \ln \mathbf{D}_k \right] + c.$$



Using the linearity of the expectation, and re-arranging:

$$\begin{aligned}\ln Q^*(\mathbf{D}) &= \sum_{k=1}^K (d_k - 1) \ln \mathbf{D}_k + \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\mathbf{z}_{nk}] \ln \mathbf{D}_k + c \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \left( d_k - 1 + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \right) \ln \mathbf{D}_k + c,\end{aligned}$$

P

where  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\mathbf{z}_{nk}]$ . Finally, using the log-property, we get:

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{D}) = \ln \prod_{k=1}^K \mathbf{D}_k^{(d_k - 1 + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk})} + c,$$

which is a Dirichlet distribution with parameters:  $\hat{d}_k = d_k + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}$ .

### C.3 Update equation for $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$

Using the general update equation given in (23), we get:

$$\ln Q^*(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \ln P(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) + \ln P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}) + \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\ln P(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})] + c,$$

where  $c$  is a constant w.r.t.  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ . Recalling that  $P(\boldsymbol{\mu}|\boldsymbol{\Lambda})$  is a product of Gaussian distributions,  $P(\boldsymbol{\Lambda})$  is a product of Wishart distributions, and  $P(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda})$  is a mixture of Gaussian distributions, we can rearrange the above equation as follows:

$$\ln Q^*(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ \ln \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k; \mathbf{m}_k, (\beta_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)^{-1}) + \ln \mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k; \mathbf{W}_k, v_k) + \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\ln \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_n; \boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1})^{\mathbf{z}_{nk}}] \right] + c,$$

thus:

$$\ln Q^*(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k) = \ln \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k; \mathbf{m}_k, (\beta_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)^{-1}) + \ln \mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k; \mathbf{W}_k, v_k) + \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\mathbf{z}_{nk}] \ln \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_n; \boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1}) + c.$$

Using that  $\mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z})}[\mathbf{z}_{nk}] = \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}$ , taking the exponential of both sides, and using the definition of Gaussian and Wishart distributions, as well as (98), we can rearrange as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}Q^*(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k) &\propto \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k; \mathbf{m}_k, (\beta_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)^{-1}) \mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k; \mathbf{W}_k, v_k) \prod_{n=1}^N \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_n; \boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1})^{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}} \\ &\propto |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1}|^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k|^{\frac{(v_k + N_k) - D - 1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} Y_1\right),\end{aligned}\tag{102}$$

where  $N_k = \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}$ , we identify  $\hat{v}_k = v_k + N_k$  from  $|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k|^{\frac{(v_k + N_k) - D - 1}{2}}$ , and:

$$Y_1 = \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k) + (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \mathbf{m}_k)^\top \beta_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \mathbf{m}_k) + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} (\mathbf{x}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k (\mathbf{x}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k).$$

Using (88) to rearrange  $Y_1$ , we get:

$$Y_1 = \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k) + \boldsymbol{\mu}_k^\top \beta_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k \boldsymbol{\mu}_k - 2 \boldsymbol{\mu}_k^\top \beta_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{m}_k + \mathbf{m}_k^\top \beta_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{m}_k + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} [\mathbf{x}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{x}_n - 2 \mathbf{x}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k \boldsymbol{\mu}_k + \boldsymbol{\mu}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k \boldsymbol{\mu}_k].$$

Using (90), we can simplify the second and third terms in the summation:

$$Y_1 = \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_k) + \boldsymbol{\mu}_k^\top \beta_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \boldsymbol{\mu}_k - 2\boldsymbol{\mu}_k^\top \beta_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{m}_k + \mathbf{m}_k^\top \beta_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{m}_k + \sum_{n=1}^N [\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{x}_n] - 2N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \boldsymbol{\mu}_k + N_k \boldsymbol{\mu}_k^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{m}_k$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k = \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n$ . Then, the second and last terms can be merged together. Similarly, using (89) the third and before last terms can be combined, leading to:

$$Y_1 = \boldsymbol{\mu}_k^\top (\beta_k + N_k) \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \boldsymbol{\mu}_k - 2\boldsymbol{\mu}_k^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_k (\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) + \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_k) + \mathbf{m}_k^\top \beta_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{m}_k + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{x}_n,$$

where we identify  $\hat{\beta}_k = \beta_k + N_k$  from  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k^\top (\beta_k + N_k) \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \boldsymbol{\mu}_k$ . Note, we want  $(\beta_k + N_k) \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k = \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$ , for the quadratic form of a Gaussian distribution to emerge (see below), which implies that  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k = \frac{\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k}{\beta_k + N_k}$ . Adding and subtracting  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top (\beta_k + N_k) \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k$ :

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1 &= \boldsymbol{\mu}_k^\top (\beta_k + N_k) \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \boldsymbol{\mu}_k - 2\boldsymbol{\mu}_k^\top (\beta_k + N_k) \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k + \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top (\beta_k + N_k) \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \\ &\quad + \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_k) + \mathbf{m}_k^\top \beta_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{m}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top (\beta_k + N_k) \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{x}_n. \end{aligned}$$

Using (88) backward, we obtain a Gaussian quadratic form, by combining the first three terms in the above equation:

$$Y_1 = (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\beta}_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k) + \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_k) + \mathbf{m}_k^\top \beta_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{m}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top (\beta_k + N_k) \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{x}_n.$$

Substituting  $Y_1$  back into the Equation (102), and re-arranging:

$$\begin{aligned} Q^*(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \mathbf{\Lambda}_k) &\propto |\mathbf{\Lambda}_k^{-1}|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \hat{\beta}_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k (\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k)\right) \\ &\quad |\mathbf{\Lambda}_k|^{\frac{\hat{v}_k - D - 1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} [\text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_k) + \mathbf{m}_k^\top \beta_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{m}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top (\beta_k + N_k) \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{x}_n]\right). \end{aligned}$$

Recognizing the definition of a Gaussian distribution:

$$Q^*(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \mathbf{\Lambda}_k) \propto \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k | \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k, (\hat{\beta}_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k)^{-1}) |\mathbf{\Lambda}_k|^{\frac{\hat{v}_k - D - 1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} Y_2\right) \quad (103)$$

where:

$$Y_2 = \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_k) + \mathbf{m}_k^\top \beta_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{m}_k - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top (\beta_k + N_k) \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \mathbf{x}_n.$$

Using (93), we turn all the quadratic forms into expressions containing traces:

$$Y_2 = \text{tr}(\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_k) + \text{tr}(\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_k) - \text{tr}((\beta_k + N_k) \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_k) + \sum_{n=1}^N \text{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{x}_n^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_k).$$

Then, using (94), we merge all the traces as follows:

$$Y_2 = \text{tr}([\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} + \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - (\beta_k + N_k) \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{x}_n^\top] \mathbf{\Lambda}_k), \quad (104)$$

where we factored out  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_k$ . Adding and subtracting  $\sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top]$ , we get:

$$Y_2 = \text{tr}([\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}[\mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{x}_n^\top + \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top] + Y_3] \mathbf{\Lambda}_k), \quad (105)$$

where:

$$Y_3 = \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - (\beta_k + N_k) \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top - \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top]. \quad (106)$$

Using (95) backward in (105), we obtain:

$$Y_2 = \text{tr}([\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}(\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)(\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)^\top + Y_3] \mathbf{\Lambda}_k).$$

Using (91) and (92), we simplify the summation in (106), leading to:

$$Y_3 = \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - \underbrace{(\beta_k + N_k) \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top}_{Y_4} + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top.$$

Using the definition of  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k$  and (97), we can re-write  $Y_4$  as:

$$Y_4 = (\beta_k + N_k) \left( \frac{\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k}{\beta_k + N_k} \right) \left( \frac{\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k}{\beta_k + N_k} \right)^\top = \frac{1}{\beta_k + N_k} \left( \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \right) \left( \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \right)^\top.$$

Using (96), the outer product can be substituted by a sum of four terms, by re-arranging, we then get:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_4 &= \frac{1}{\beta_k + N_k} \left( \beta_k^2 \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top + \beta_k N_k \mathbf{m}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top + \beta_k N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top + N_k^2 \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \right) \\ &= \frac{\beta_k^2}{\beta_k + N_k} \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top + \frac{\beta_k N_k}{\beta_k + N_k} \mathbf{m}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top + \frac{\beta_k N_k}{\beta_k + N_k} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top + \frac{N_k^2}{\beta_k + N_k} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting  $Y_4$  in  $Y_3$ , and rearranging:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_3 &= \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - \frac{\beta_k^2}{\beta_k + N_k} \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - \frac{\beta_k N_k}{\beta_k + N_k} \mathbf{m}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top - \frac{\beta_k N_k}{\beta_k + N_k} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - \frac{N_k^2}{\beta_k + N_k} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \\ &= \frac{\beta_k(\beta_k + N_k) - \beta_k^2}{\beta_k + N_k} \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - \frac{\beta_k N_k}{\beta_k + N_k} \mathbf{m}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top - \frac{\beta_k N_k}{\beta_k + N_k} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top + \frac{N_k(\beta_k + N_k) - N_k^2}{\beta_k + N_k} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \\ &= \frac{\beta_k N_k}{\beta_k + N_k} \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - \frac{\beta_k N_k}{\beta_k + N_k} \mathbf{m}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top - \frac{\beta_k N_k}{\beta_k + N_k} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top + \frac{\beta_k N_k}{\beta_k + N_k} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top \\ &= \frac{\beta_k N_k}{\beta_k + N_k} [\mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - \mathbf{m}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top + \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^\top]. \end{aligned}$$

Using (95) backward, we turn the four terms between the brackets into an outer product:

$$Y_3 = \frac{\beta_k N_k}{\beta_k + N_k} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{m}_k)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{m}_k)^\top.$$

Substituting  $Y_3$  back into  $Y_2$ , and  $Y_2$  back into (103):

$$Q^*(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \mathbf{\Lambda}_k) \propto \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k | \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k, (\hat{\beta}_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k)^{-1}) |\mathbf{\Lambda}_k|^{\frac{\hat{v}_k - D - 1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_k)\right)$$

where we identified:

$$\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} = \mathbf{W}_k^{-1} + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{r}_{nk} (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)(\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)^\top + \frac{\beta_k N_k}{\beta_k + N_k} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{m}_k)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{m}_k)^\top.$$

Recognizing the definition of a Wishart distribution, we obtain the final result:

$$Q^*(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k) \propto \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k | \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k, (\hat{\beta}_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)^{-1}) \mathcal{W}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k; \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k, \hat{v}_k)$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} &= \mathbf{W}_k^{-1} + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{r}_{nk} (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)(\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)^\top + \frac{\beta_k N_k}{\beta_k + N_k} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{m}_k)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{m}_k)^\top, \\ \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k &= \frac{\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k}{\beta_k + N_k}, \\ \hat{v}_k &= v_k + N_k, \\ \hat{\beta}_k &= \beta_k + N_k. \end{aligned}$$

## Appendix D: Perception model, update equation of empirical prior

In the previous section, we showed that the optimal variational posterior parameters can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{d}_k &= d_k + N_k, \\ \hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} &= \mathbf{W}_k^{-1} + \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)^\top + \frac{\beta_k N_k}{\beta_k + N_k} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{m}_k) (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k - \mathbf{m}_k)^\top, \\ \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k &= \frac{\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k}{\beta_k + N_k}, \\ \hat{v}_k &= v_k + N_k, \\ \hat{\beta}_k &= \beta_k + N_k.\end{aligned}$$

We now derive update equations for the empirical prior's parameters, and a new set of update equations for the variational posterior that relies only on the empirical prior's parameters. More precisely, we show that:

$$\bar{v}_k = v_k + N'_k, \quad \hat{v}_k = \bar{v}_k + N''_k, \quad (107)$$

$$\bar{\beta}_k = \beta_k + N'_k, \quad \hat{\beta}_k = \bar{\beta}_k + N''_k, \quad (108)$$

$$\bar{d}_k = d_k + N'_k, \quad \hat{d}_k = \bar{d}_k + N''_k, \quad (109)$$

where  $N'_k$  is the number of data points to forget attributed to the  $k$ -th component, and  $N''_k$  is the number of data points to keep attributed to the  $k$ -th component:

$$N'_k = \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}, \quad N''_k = \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}. \quad (110)$$

Additionally, we demonstrate that:

$$\bar{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} = \mathbf{W}_k^{-1} + N'_k \mathbf{S}'_k + \frac{\beta_k N'_k}{\beta_k + N'_k} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k - \mathbf{m}_k) (\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k - \mathbf{m}_k)^\top, \quad \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k = \frac{\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k}{\beta_k + N'_k}, \quad (111)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} = \bar{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} + N''_k \mathbf{S}''_k + \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N''_k}{\bar{\beta}_k + N''_k} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k) (\bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top, \quad \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k = \frac{\bar{\beta}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k + N''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k}{\bar{\beta}_k + N''_k}, \quad (112)$$

where the empirical mean  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k$  and covariance  $\mathbf{S}'_k$  of the forgettable data points in the  $k$ -th, and the empirical mean  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k$  and covariance  $\mathbf{S}''_k$  of the data points to keep in the  $k$ -th component are given by:

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k = \frac{1}{N'_k} \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n, \quad \mathbf{S}'_k = \frac{1}{N'_k} \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k) (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k)^\top, \quad (113)$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k = \frac{1}{N''_k} \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n, \quad \mathbf{S}''_k = \frac{1}{N''_k} \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k) (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k)^\top. \quad (114)$$

### D.1 Update equation for $\bar{v}_k$ , $\hat{v}_k$ , $\bar{\beta}_k$ , $\hat{\beta}_k$ , $\bar{d}_k$ , and $\hat{d}_k$

First, note that since  $N' \cup N'' = \{1, \dots, N\}$ , we have:

$$N_k = \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} = \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} + \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} = N'_k + N''_k. \quad (115)$$

Remembering that:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{d}_k &= d_k + N_k \\ \hat{v}_k &= v_k + N_k, \\ \hat{\beta}_k &= \beta_k + N_k,\end{aligned}$$

and using (115), we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{d}_k &= \underbrace{d_k + N'_k}_{\bar{d}_k} + N''_k \\ \hat{v}_k &= \underbrace{v_k + N'_k}_{\bar{v}_k} + N''_k, \\ \hat{\beta}_k &= \underbrace{\beta_k + N'_k}_{\bar{\beta}_k} + N''_k,\end{aligned}$$

which leads to the expected result:

$$\bar{v}_k = v_k + N'_k, \quad \hat{v}_k = \bar{v}_k + N''_k, \quad (116)$$

$$\bar{\beta}_k = \beta_k + N'_k, \quad \hat{\beta}_k = \bar{\beta}_k + N''_k, \quad (117)$$

$$\bar{d}_k = d_k + N'_k, \quad \hat{d}_k = \bar{d}_k + N''_k. \quad (118)$$

## D.2 Update equation for $\bar{\mathbf{m}}_k$ , and $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k$

We first note that:

$$N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k = N'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k + N''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k. \quad (119)$$

Indeed:

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k = \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n, \quad (120)$$

thus, remembering that  $N' \cup N'' = \{1, \dots, N\}$ , we have:

$$N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k = \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n, \quad (121)$$

$$= \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n + \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n. \quad (122)$$

Then, dividing and multiplying the first and second term by  $N'_k$  and  $N''_k$ , respectively, we get:

$$N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k = \frac{N'_k}{N'_k} \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n + \frac{N''_k}{N''_k} \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n \quad (123)$$

$$= N'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k + N''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k. \quad (124)$$

Now, remember that the optimal  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k$  is:

$$\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k = \frac{\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k}{\beta_k + N_k}, \quad (125)$$

and using  $N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k = N'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k + N''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k$  and  $N_k = N'_k + N''_k$ , we obtain:

$$\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k = \frac{\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k + N''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k}{\beta_k + N'_k + N''_k}, \quad (126)$$

where we recognize  $\bar{\beta}_k = \beta_k + N'_k$ , and let  $\bar{\beta}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k = \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k$ . Thus, the above equation can be re-written as:

$$\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k = \frac{\bar{\beta}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k + N''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k}{\bar{\beta}_k + N''_k}, \quad (127)$$

moreover, since  $\bar{\beta}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k = \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k$ , we have:

$$\bar{\mathbf{m}}_k = \frac{\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k}{\bar{\beta}_k} = \frac{\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k}{\beta_k + N'_k}. \quad (128)$$

Note, (127) and (128) are the update equations of  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_k$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{m}}_k$ , respectively.

### D.3 Update equation for $\bar{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1}$ , and $\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1}$

In this section, we show that the optimal updates for  $\bar{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1}$ , and  $\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1}$  are:

$$\bar{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} = \mathbf{W}_k^{-1} + N'_k \mathbf{S}'_k + \frac{\beta_k N'_k}{\beta_k + N'_k} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k - \mathbf{m}_k)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k - \mathbf{m}_k)^\top, \quad (129)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} = \bar{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1} + N''_k \mathbf{S}''_k + \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N''_k}{\bar{\beta}_k + N''_k} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top, \quad (130)$$

where:

$$\mathbf{S}'_k = \frac{1}{N'_k} \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k)(\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k)^\top, \quad (131)$$

$$\mathbf{S}''_k = \frac{1}{N''_k} \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k)(\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k)^\top. \quad (132)$$

From equation (104), by remembering that  $N' \cup N'' = \{1, \dots, N\}$ :

$$Y_2 = \text{tr}([\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} + \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - (\beta_k + N_k) \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top + \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{x}_n^\top + \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} \mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{x}_n^\top] \mathbf{\Lambda}_k). \quad (133)$$

Adding and subtracting  $\sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} [\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top]$  and  $\sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} [\bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top]$ :

**P**  $Y_2 = \text{tr}([$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{W}_k^{-1} + \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - (\beta_k + N_k) \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top \\ & + \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} [\mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{x}_n^\top + \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top] + \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} [\mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{x}_n^\top + \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top] \\ & - \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} [\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top] - \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} [\bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top] \\ & ] \mathbf{\Lambda}_k). \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

Using (95):

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_2 = \text{tr}([ & \\ & \mathbf{W}_k^{-1} + \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - (\beta_k + N_k) \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top \\ & + \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k) (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k)^\top + \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k) (\mathbf{x}_n - \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k)^\top \\ & - \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} [\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top] - \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} [\bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top] \\ & ] \mathbf{\Lambda}_k), \tag{135}
\end{aligned}$$

and the definition of  $S'_k$  and  $S''_k$ , we get:

$$Y_2 = \text{tr}([\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} + N'_k S'_k + N''_k S''_k + Y_3] \mathbf{\Lambda}_k), \tag{136}$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_3 = & \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - (\beta_k + N_k) \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top \\ & - \sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} [\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top] - \sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} [\bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top]. \tag{137}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\sum_{n \in N'} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} [\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top] = -N'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top$  and  $\sum_{n \in N''} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk} [\bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k \mathbf{x}_n^\top - \mathbf{x}_n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top] = -N''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top$ , thus:

$$Y_3 = \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - \underbrace{(\beta_k + N_k) \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top}_{Y_4} + N'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top + N''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top. \tag{138}$$

Focusing on  $Y_4$ , we have:

$$Y_4 = (\beta_k + N_k) \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k \hat{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top \tag{139}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\beta_k + N_k} (\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) (\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)^\top \tag{140}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\beta_k + N_k} (\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k + N''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k) (\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k + N''_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k)^\top \tag{141}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\bar{\beta}_k + N''_k} (\bar{\beta}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k + N'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k) (\bar{\beta}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k + N'_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k)^\top \tag{142}$$

$$= \frac{\bar{\beta}_k^2}{\bar{\beta}_k + N''_k} \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top + \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N''_k}{\bar{\beta}_k + N''_k} \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top + \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N''_k}{\bar{\beta}_k + N''_k} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top + \frac{N''_k^2}{\bar{\beta}_k + N''_k} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top. \tag{143}$$



Adding and subtracting  $\bar{\beta}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top + N_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top$ , we obtain:

$$Y_4 = \frac{\bar{\beta}_k^2}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top + \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N_k''}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top + \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N_k''}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top + \frac{N_k''^2}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top - \bar{\beta}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top - N_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top + \bar{\beta}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top + N_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top \quad (144)$$

$$= \frac{\bar{\beta}_k^2 - \bar{\beta}_k(\bar{\beta}_k + N_k'')}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top + \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N_k''}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top + \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N_k''}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top + \frac{N_k''^2 - N_k''(\bar{\beta}_k + N_k'')}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top + \bar{\beta}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top + N_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top \quad (145)$$

$$= \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N_k''}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} [-\bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top + \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top + \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top] + \bar{\beta}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top + N_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top. \quad (146)$$

Substituting  $Y_4$  into  $Y_3$ , we get:

$$Y_3 = \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top + \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N_k''}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} [\bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top + \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top] - \bar{\beta}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top + N_k' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top - N_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top + N_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k''^\top \quad (147)$$

$$= \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N_k''}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k) (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top + \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - \underbrace{\bar{\beta}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top}_{Y_5} + N_k' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top. \quad (148)$$

Focusing on  $Y_5$ , and following a similar logic as for  $Y_4$ :

$$Y_5 = (\beta_k + N_k') \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k^\top \quad (149)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\beta_k + N_k'} (\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N_k' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k') (\beta_k \mathbf{m}_k + N_k' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k')^\top \quad (150)$$

$$= \frac{\beta_k^2}{\beta_k + N_k'} \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top + \frac{\beta_k N_k'}{\beta_k + N_k'} \mathbf{m}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top + \frac{\beta_k N_k'}{\beta_k + N_k'} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' \mathbf{m}_k^\top + \frac{N_k'^2}{\beta_k + N_k'} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top. \quad (151)$$

Substituting  $Y_5$  into  $Y_3$ , we get:

$$Y_3 = \beta_k \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - \frac{\beta_k^2}{\beta_k + N_k'} \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - \frac{\beta_k N_k'}{\beta_k + N_k'} \mathbf{m}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top - \frac{\beta_k N_k'}{\beta_k + N_k'} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' \mathbf{m}_k^\top - \frac{N_k'^2}{\beta_k + N_k'} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top + N_k' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top + \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N_k''}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k) (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \quad (152)$$

$$= \frac{\beta_k(\beta_k + N_k') - \beta_k^2}{\beta_k + N_k'} \mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - \frac{\beta_k N_k'}{\beta_k + N_k'} \mathbf{m}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top - \frac{\beta_k N_k'}{\beta_k + N_k'} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' \mathbf{m}_k^\top + \frac{N_k'(\beta_k + N_k') - N_k'^2}{\beta_k + N_k'} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top$$

$$+ \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N_k''}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k) (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \quad (153)$$

$$= \frac{\beta_k N_k'}{\beta_k + N_k'} [\mathbf{m}_k \mathbf{m}_k^\top - \mathbf{m}_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' \mathbf{m}_k^\top + \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'^\top] + \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N_k''}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k) (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top \quad (154)$$

$$= \frac{\beta_k N_k'}{\beta_k + N_k'} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' - \mathbf{m}_k) (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k' - \mathbf{m}_k)^\top + \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N_k''}{\bar{\beta}_k + N_k''} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k) (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k'' - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top. \quad (155)$$

P

Finally, substituting  $Y_3$  into  $Y_2$ , we get:

$$Y_2 = \text{tr}([$$

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{W}_k^{-1} + N'_k S'_k + \frac{\beta_k N'_k}{\beta_k + N'_k} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k - \mathbf{m}_k)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k - \mathbf{m}_k)^\top + N''_k S''_k + \frac{\bar{\beta}_k N''_k}{\bar{\beta}_k + N''_k} (\bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}''_k - \bar{\mathbf{m}}_k)^\top}_{\hat{\mathbf{W}}_k^{-1}}$$

$$]\mathbf{\Lambda}_k).$$

(156)

## Appendix E: Transition Model

In this appendix, we start with the general update equation of variational inference, i.e., Equation (23), and derive the specific update equation for  $\mathbf{B}$ . Then, we re-arranged the resulting equation to obtain the update equation of the empirical prior. Importantly, the update equation for  $\mathbf{B}$  depends on the generative model and variational distribution of Section 3.

### E.1 Variational distribution, update equation for $\mathbf{B}$

Once again, by using (23), we get the following update equation for  $\mathbf{B}$ :

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{B}) = \ln P(\mathbf{B}) + \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_0)}[\ln P(\mathbf{Z}_1 | \mathbf{Z}_0, \mathbf{A}_0, \mathbf{B})] + c, \quad (157)$$

from which we can show that:

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{B}) = \ln \prod_{a=1}^A \prod_{j=1}^K \prod_{k=1}^K \mathbf{B}[a]_{kj}^{(b[a]_{kj}-1 + \sum_{n=1}^M [a=a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^\tau \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^{\tau+1})} + c, \quad (158)$$

where  $c$  is a constant w.r.t.  $\mathbf{B}$ .

Using (23), we get:

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{B}) = \ln P(\mathbf{B}) + \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_0)}[\ln P(\mathbf{Z}_1 | \mathbf{Z}_0, \mathbf{A}_0, \mathbf{B})] + c. \quad (159)$$

Using the definition of the Dirichlet and categorical distributions, and the log-property:

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{B}) = \sum_{a=1}^A \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{k=1}^K (b[a]_{kj} - 1) \ln \mathbf{B}[a]_{kj} + \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_0)} \left[ \sum_{n=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{z}_{nk}^0 \mathbf{z}_{nj}^1 \ln \mathbf{B}[a_n^0]_{kj} \right] + c. \quad (160)$$

Using the linearity of the expectation, and re-arranging:

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{B}) = \sum_{a=1}^A \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{k=1}^K (b[a]_{kj} - 1) \ln \mathbf{B}[a]_{kj} + \sum_{n=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}_0)}[\mathbf{z}_{nk}^0] \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}_1)}[\mathbf{z}_{nj}^1] \ln \mathbf{B}[a_n^0]_{kj} + c \quad (161)$$

$$= \sum_{a=1}^A \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{k=1}^K (b[a]_{kj} - 1) \ln \mathbf{B}[a]_{kj} + \sum_{a=1}^A \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{n=1}^M [a = a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^1 \ln \mathbf{B}[a_n^0]_{kj} + c \quad (162)$$

$$= \sum_{a=1}^A \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{k=1}^K \left( b[a]_{kj} - 1 + \sum_{n=1}^M [a = a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^1 \right) \ln \mathbf{B}[a]_{kj} + c, \quad (163)$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}_0)}[\mathbf{z}_{nk}^0]$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^1 = \mathbb{E}_{Q(\mathbf{Z}_1)}[\mathbf{z}_{nj}^1]$ , and  $[\cdot]$  is an indicator function equals to one if the condition is satisfied and zero otherwise. Finally, using the log-property:

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{B}) = \ln \prod_{a=1}^A \prod_{j=1}^K \prod_{k=1}^K \mathbf{B}[a]_{kj}^{(b[a]_{kj}-1 + \sum_{n=1}^M [a=a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^1)} + c, \quad (164)$$

which is a Dirichlet distribution with parameters:  $\hat{b}[a]_{kj} = b[a]_{kj} + \sum_{n=1}^M [a = a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^1$ .

## E.2 Empirical prior, update equation for $\mathbf{B}$

In the previous section, we showed that the optimal variational posterior can be written as:

$$\ln Q^*(\mathbf{B}) = \ln \prod_{a=1}^A \prod_{j=1}^K \prod_{k=1}^K \mathbf{B}[a]_{kj}^{(b[a]_{kj}-1+\sum_{n=1}^M [a=a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^1)} + c, \quad (165)$$

which is a Dirichlet distribution with parameters:  $\hat{b}[a]_{kj} = b[a]_{kj} + \sum_{n=1}^M [a = a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^1$ . In this section, we re-arrange this result to obtain an update equation for the empirical prior parameters, and another update equation that expresses the variational posterior parameters as a function of the empirical prior parameters. More precisely, we show that the parameters of  $E^*(\mathbf{B})$  should be computed as follows:

$$\bar{b}[a]_{kj} = b[a]_{kj} + \sum_{n \in M'} [a = a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nj}^1. \quad (166)$$

Similarly, the parameters of  $Q^*(\mathbf{B})$  should be computed as follows:

$$\hat{b}[a]_{kj} = \bar{b}[a]_{kj} + \sum_{n \in M''} [a = a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nj}^1. \quad (167)$$

Remember that we want to forget the data points indexed by  $M'$  and keep the data points indexed by  $M''$ . Importantly, since  $M' \cup M'' = \{1, \dots, M\}$ , we can re-arrange the update equation for the variational parameters as follows:

$$\hat{b}[a]_{kj} = b[a]_{kj} + \sum_{n=1}^M [a = a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nj}^1 \quad (168)$$

$$= b[a]_{kj} + \underbrace{\sum_{n \in M'} [a = a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nj}^1}_{\bar{b}[a]_{kj}} + \sum_{n \in M''} [a = a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nj}^1, \quad (169)$$

P

where because the parameters of the empirical prior should take into account the information of the data points indexed by  $M'$ , we have:

$$\bar{b}[a]_{kj} = b[a]_{kj} + \sum_{n \in M'} [a = a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nj}^1, \quad (170)$$

and the parameters of the variational posterior can be written as:

$$\hat{b}[a]_{kj} = \bar{b}[a]_{kj} + \sum_{n \in M''} [a = a_n^0] \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nk}^0 \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{nj}^1. \quad (171)$$

## Appendix F: Q-learning

In this appendix, we prove the following relationships:

$$q_*(a, s) = \sum_{s_{t+1}, r_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1}, r_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) [r_{t+1} + \gamma v_*(s_{t+1})] \quad (172)$$

$$= \sum_{s_{t+1}, r_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1}, r_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) [r_{t+1} + \gamma \max_{a_{t+1}} q_*(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1})]. \quad (173)$$

Let us begin with the definition of  $q_*(a, s)$  and  $q_\pi(a, s)$ :

$$q_*(a, s) = \max_{\pi} q_\pi(a, s) \quad (174)$$

$$= \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_\pi [G_t | a_t = a, s_t = s], \quad (175)$$

then using the definition of the return  $G_t$  from Equation (58), we obtain:

$$q_*(a, s) = \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \sum_{\tau=t+1}^T \gamma^{\tau-t-1} r_\tau \mid a_t = a, s_t = s \right]. \quad (176)$$

Re-arranging the elements in the summation, we get:

$$q_*(a, s) = \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ r_{t+1} + \gamma \sum_{\tau=t+2}^T \gamma^{\tau-t-2} r_\tau \mid a_t = a, s_t = s \right] \quad (177)$$

$$= \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_\pi [r_{t+1} + \gamma G_{t+1} | a_t = a, s_t = s], \quad (178)$$

where we used the return  $G_{t+1}$  definition backward. Next, we extract a factor from the expectation to obtain:

$$q_*(a, s) = \max_{\pi} \sum_{s_{t+1}, r_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1}, r_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \left[ \mathbb{E}_\pi [r_{t+1} + \gamma G_{t+1} | s_{t+1}] \right], \quad (179)$$

which can be re-arranged as follow, by realizing that  $r_{t+1}$  is a constant w.r.t. the  $\mathbb{E}_\pi[\cdot | s_{t+1}]$  and does not depend on  $\pi$ :

$$q_*(a, s) = \sum_{s_{t+1}, r_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1}, r_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \left[ r_{t+1} + \gamma \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_\pi [G_{t+1} | s_{t+1}] \right]. \quad (180)$$

Importantly, recognizing the definition of  $v_*(s_{t+1})$ , we get our first relationship:

$$q_*(a, s) = \sum_{s_{t+1}, r_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1}, r_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) [r_{t+1} + \gamma v_*(s_{t+1})]. \quad (181)$$

$$(182)$$

Restarting from (180), we extract another factor from the expectation leading to:

$$q_*(a, s) = \sum_{s_{t+1}, r_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1}, r_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \left[ r_{t+1} + \gamma \max_{\pi} \sum_{a_{t+1}} \pi(a_{t+1} | s_{t+1}) \left[ \mathbb{E}_\pi [G_{t+1} | a_{t+1}, s_{t+1}] \right] \right], \quad (183)$$

where we recognize the definition of  $q_\pi(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1})$ :

$$q_*(a, s) = \sum_{s_{t+1}, r_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1}, r_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \left[ r_{t+1} + \gamma \underbrace{\max_{\pi} \sum_{a_{t+1}} \pi(a_{t+1} | s_{t+1}) q_\pi(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1})}_{f(\pi)} \right]. \quad (184)$$

Focusing on the expression within the maximum operator, we see that  $f(\pi)$  can only be maximized if:

$$\forall a_{t+1}, \left( q_\pi(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1}) \neq \max_a q_\pi(a, s_{t+1}) \right) \Rightarrow \pi(a_{t+1} | s_{t+1}) = 0. \quad (185)$$

Indeed, if there exists an action  $a_{t+1}$  such that  $q_\pi(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1}) \neq \max_a q_\pi(a, s_{t+1})$  and  $\pi(a_{t+1} | s_{t+1}) \neq 0$ , then  $f(\pi)$  can be increased by reducing  $\pi(a_{t+1} | s_{t+1})$  to zero and increasing  $\pi(a'_{t+1} | s_{t+1})$  for an action  $a'_{t+1}$  where  $q_\pi(a'_{t+1}, s_{t+1}) = \max_a q_\pi(a, s_{t+1})$ . The condition describes in (185) together with (184), implies that:

P

$$q_*(a, s) = \sum_{s_{t+1}, r_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1}, r_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \left[ r_{t+1} + \gamma \max_{\pi} \max_{a_{t+1}} q_\pi(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1}) \right], \quad (186)$$

where by swapping the maximum operators, we get:

$$q_*(a, s) = \sum_{s_{t+1}, r_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1}, r_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \left[ r_{t+1} + \gamma \max_{a_{t+1}} \max_{\pi} q_\pi(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1}) \right], \quad (187)$$

and by recognizing the definition of  $q_*(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1})$ , we get the second relationship:

$$q_*(a, s) = \sum_{s_{t+1}, r_{t+1}} P(s_{t+1}, r_{t+1} | s_t, a_t) \left[ r_{t+1} + \gamma \max_{a_{t+1}} q_*(a_{t+1}, s_{t+1}) \right]. \quad (188)$$