

SCALABLE EXPECTATION ESTIMATION WITH SUBTRACTIVE MIXTURE MODELS

Lena Zellinger[△], Nicola Branchini[△], Víctor Elvira, Antonio Vergari
School of Informatics & School of Mathematics
University of Edinburgh

ABSTRACT

Many Monte Carlo (MC) and importance sampling (IS) methods use mixture models (MMs) for their simplicity and ability to capture multimodal distributions. Recently, *subtractive mixture models* (SMMs), i.e. MMs with negative coefficients, have shown greater expressiveness and success in generative modeling. However, their negative parameters complicate sampling, requiring costly auto-regressive techniques or accept-reject algorithms that do not scale in high dimensions. In this work, we use the difference representation of SMMs to construct an unbiased IS estimator (ΔEx) that removes the need to sample from the SMM, enabling high-dimensional expectation estimation with SMMs. In our experiments, we show that ΔEx can achieve comparable estimation quality to auto-regressive sampling while being considerably faster in MC estimation. Moreover, we conduct initial experiments with ΔEx using hand-crafted proposals, gaining first insights into how to construct safe proposals for ΔEx .

1 INTRODUCTION

Many tasks in probabilistic machine learning (ML) and statistics amount to approximating expectations under complex probability distributions, including computing average treatment effects (Hirano et al., 2003; Khan & Ugander, 2023), several fairness metrics (Zhang & Long, 2021), and predictions in Bayesian inference (Vehtari et al., 2017). Such intractable expectations are commonly estimated via *importance sampling* (IS), which is a generalization of standard Monte Carlo (MC) integration. IS allows to approximate expectations under a distribution p by sampling from a so-called *proposal distribution* q while preserving unbiasedness. This can be particularly beneficial when sampling from p directly is costly or results in high variance. To achieve low-variance estimators with IS, the chosen family of proposal distributions should be expressive enough to closely model the target of integration while also supporting efficient sampling.

Mixture models (MMs) are a natural choice of proposals in IS for their simplicity and ability to represent multimodal distributions (Owen & Zhou, 2000; Bugallo et al., 2017). Classical MMs are however fundamentally restricted to *add* probability densities. This implies that, in many scenarios, they require a large number of components to accurately represent the target distribution. Recently, *subtractive mixture models* (SMMs), which allow for negative mixture weights, have gained attention in probabilistic ML (Marteau-Ferey et al., 2020; Rudi & Ciliberto, 2021; Loconte et al., 2024; Cai et al., 2024). Due to their ability to subtract densities, SMMs can represent complex distributions while provably requiring exponentially less components than classical additive MMs (Loconte et al., 2024; 2025b). However, sampling techniques for SMMs, such as auto-regressive inverse transform sampling (ARITS) (Loconte et al., 2024; Cai et al., 2024) and accept-reject methods (Robert & Stoehr, 2025), can be computationally expensive and hence unsuitable for high dimensional expectation estimation.

In this preliminary work, we motivate the use of SMMs for IS, highlighting their expressiveness and theoretical connection to optimal IS proposals. Moreover, we discuss how to make expectation estimation with SMMs feasible in practice. To this end, we propose ΔEx - an unbiased IS estimator which avoids costly sampling from the SMM by writing an SMM as a *difference of additive MMs*

[△]: Shared first authorship.




Figure 1: A squared mixture can be split into its positive and negative parts as illustrated via its representation as a computational graph, also called circuit (Choi et al., 2020; Loconte et al., 2025a).

(Bignami & De Matteis, 1971; Robert & Stoehr, 2025). We show empirically that ΔEx can achieve similar estimation quality to costly ARITS sampling and discuss how to further reduce its variance. Moreover, we test ΔEx with hand-crafted proposals revealing that a low Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between the proposal and target of integration does not necessarily result in a low-variance estimator.

Contributions. (i) We study for the first time, to the best of our knowledge, the use of SMMs to estimate expectations with IS. (ii) We propose and analyze a new IS estimator, ΔEx , that avoids costly sampling from the proposal SMM, thereby lowering the computational complexity by a factor of d , the ambient dimension, and discuss how to further reduce its variance. (iii) We conduct experiments with ΔEx in a standard MC setting, demonstrating its computational efficiency compared to ARITS. We further test ΔEx with various synthetic proposals and propose initial directions for obtaining low-variance estimators with ΔEx .

2 SUBTRACTIVE MIXTURE MODELS

The recipe for classical additive MMs is simple: combine valid probability density functions (PDFs) in a convex combination (McLachlan et al., 2019). Popular choices of base distributions for a mixture component are exponential families, or more expressive probabilistic models such as normalizing flows (Pires & Figueiredo, 2020). As their formulation only allows to *add* PDFs, to recover one target PDF of interest they can require an exponential number of components.

Intuitively, SMMs increase the *expressive efficiency* (Choi et al., 2020) of classical additive MMs by dropping the convex constraint over the mixture coefficients. An SMM over \mathbf{x} is thus given by

$$q_{\text{SMM}}(\mathbf{x}) = Z_q^{-1} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k q_k(\mathbf{x}), \text{ where } \alpha_k \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (\text{SMM})$$

where $Z_q = \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k \int q_k(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$ is the normalizing constant and the mixture coefficients α_k are allowed to be negative. A challenge when *learning* SMMs is constraining $q(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ to retain a valid PDF. While it is possible to derive closed-form constraints for simple parametric q_k , such as Gaussians, Gammas and Weibulls (Jiang et al., 1999; Zhang & Zhang, 2005; Rabusseau & Denis, 2014), this is non-trivial in general. To this end, Loconte et al. (2024) developed squared SMMs, ensuring the non-negativity of q by squaring Eq. (SMM), i.e.,

$$q_{\text{SMM}^2}(\mathbf{x}) = Z_q^{-1} \cdot \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k q_k(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 = Z_q^{-1} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{k'=1}^{K'} \alpha_k \alpha_{k'} q_k(\mathbf{x}) q_{k'}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (1)$$

where $Z_q = \int \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{k'=1}^{K'} \alpha_k \alpha_{k'} q_k(\mathbf{x}) q_{k'}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$. Fig. 1 shows the computational graph of a squared SMM. Note that Eq. (1) is still an SMM, as some $\alpha_k \alpha_{k'}$ can be < 0 , but q is guaranteed to be ≥ 0 .¹ To exactly compute Z_q , the products $q_k q_{k'}$ need to be integrable, a condition verified for exponential families and other functions such as polynomials (Loconte et al., 2024). Squared SMMs can be further combined into a sum of squared (SOS) SMMs, which can be proven to be more expressive efficient than both additive MMs and squared SMMs (Loconte et al., 2025b). Analogously to squared SMMs, SOS SMMs can be easily rewritten in the form of Eq. (SMM). Therefore, from here on we will assume a valid SMM to be in such a form.

¹While a squared SMM has up to $\binom{K+1}{2}$ unique components due to the pairwise products, the number of learnable parameters remains the same as for its non-squared counterpart (Loconte et al., 2024).

3 IMPORTANCE SAMPLING WITH SMMs

IS is based on the idea that we can estimate expectations over p by drawing i.i.d. samples from a proposal PDF q of choice. The unnormalized IS (UIS) estimator of the integral $I = \int f(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}$ for a function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\int_{\mathcal{X}} |f(\mathbf{x})|p(\mathbf{x}) < \infty$ is given by

$$\hat{I}_{\text{UIS}} = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S w^{(s)} f(\mathbf{x}^{(s)}), \quad \text{where } w^{(s)} = \frac{p(\mathbf{x}^{(s)})}{q(\mathbf{x}^{(s)})}, \quad \text{and } \mathbf{x}^{(s)} \sim q(\mathbf{x}), \quad (2)$$

where $p \ll q$. When $q(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{x})$, \hat{I}_{UIS} reduces to simple MC. The optimal (variance-minimizing) proposal for Eq. (2) is $q_{\text{UIS}}^{\star}(\mathbf{x}) = Z_{q^{\star}}^{-1} \cdot |f(\mathbf{x})|p(\mathbf{x})$ (Robert et al., 1999; Owen, 2013), which can be very different from p . The interest in using SMMs for importance sampling is natural not only due to their expressiveness, but also because the IS optimal proposal often explicitly takes the form of an SMM. For instance, this is the case when one is interested in a difference of expectations, i.e., quantities in the form $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_0(\mathbf{x})}[f_0(\mathbf{x})] - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_1(\mathbf{x})}[f_1(\mathbf{x})]$, such as the average treatment effect in causal inference (Hirano et al., 2003). The optimal UIS proposal in this case is easily shown to be proportional to $|p_0(\mathbf{x})f_0(\mathbf{x}) - p_1(\mathbf{x})f_1(\mathbf{x})|$, and hence takes the form of an SMM.

SMMs and the SNIS estimator. If p is only known up to a normalizing constant one can resort to the self-normalized IS estimator (SNIS). Let $p(\mathbf{x}) = Z_p^{-1} \cdot \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x})$, then

$$\hat{I}_{\text{SNIS}} = \sum_{s=1}^S \bar{w}^{(s)} f(\mathbf{x}^{(s)}), \quad \bar{w}^{(s)} = \tilde{w}^{(s)} / \left(\sum_{i=1}^S \tilde{w}^{(i)} \right), \quad \tilde{w}^{(s)} = \frac{\tilde{p}(\mathbf{x}^{(s)})}{q(\mathbf{x}^{(s)})}. \quad (3)$$

For SNIS the proposal $q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ that minimizes the asymptotic variance is known to be

$$q_{\text{SNIS}}^{\star}(\mathbf{x}) = Z_{q_{\text{SNIS}}^{\star}}^{-1} \cdot |p(\mathbf{x})f(\mathbf{x}) - I \cdot p(\mathbf{x})|, \quad (4)$$

where commonly $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is the set of square integrable PDFs, i.e., $\int q(\mathbf{x})^2 d\mathbf{x} < \infty$ (Geweke, 1989; Rainforth et al., 2020; Branchini & Elvira, 2024). Interestingly, Eq. (4) takes the form of an SMM, where the first component is the optimal UIS proposal, while the second is just $p(\mathbf{x})$ scaled by I .

3.1 HOW TO SAMPLE AN SMM?

Although using SMMs as proposals is promising, sampling from them is known to be more challenging than sampling from MMs. This is because, for the latter, one can use the latent variable interpretation of MMs (Peharz et al., 2016) and perform ancestral mixture sampling (Bishop & Nasrabadi, 2006) (see also Appendix A.3), while for SMMs, the introduction of negative coefficients breaks such a latent variable interpretation. Nevertheless, it is possible to sample from SMMs, e.g., by performing auto-regressive inverse transform sampling (ARITS) (Loconte et al., 2024; Cai et al., 2024) or using accept-reject algorithms (Robert & Stoehr, 2025).

Unfortunately, neither of these approaches scales as gracefully as ancestral sampling for additive MMs. For instance, ARITS entails fixing a variable ordering and sampling *iteratively*, $x_1 \sim q_{\text{SMM}}(x_1)$ and $x_i \sim q_{\text{SMM}}(x_i | x_{<i})$ for $i \in \{2, \dots, d\}$, where each sampling step requires numerically inverting the corresponding conditional cumulative distribution function (CDF). As a result, ARITS has a cost that is d -times slower than classical ancestral sampling, assuming that computing the univariate marginals and inverting the CDFs costs equivalently to sampling one component in a MM. See Algorithm 1 in Appendix B.3 for the pseudocode of ARITS. In the following, we show how to make the use of SMMs as proposals in a computationally feasible way: we devise an estimator that recovers the cost of ancestral sampling while providing unbiased estimates.

4 AVOIDING SAMPLING FROM SMMs: THE ΔEX ESTIMATOR

Following Robert & Stoehr (2025), we rewrite an SMM as the *difference of two additive MMs*, i.e.,

$$q(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z_q} \left(Z_+ \cdot q_+(\mathbf{x}) - Z_- \cdot q_-(\mathbf{x}) \right), \quad (5)$$

where q_+ and q_- are composed of the positively and negatively weighted components of q respectively, Z_+ , Z_- are their normalizing constants, and $Z_q = Z_+ - Z_-$ is the normalizing constant of q .

Such a difference representation has been known in previous works (Bignami & De Matteis, 1971; Rabusseau & Denis, 2014; Robert & Stoehr, 2025), but to the best of our knowledge they did not evaluate the quality of practical MC estimators nor considered extending them to IS. Converting a sum of squared SMMs (Eq. (1)) into Eq. (5) is always possible and can be done in time linear in the number of components (after squaring). Fig. 1 shows an example. Such a representation allows us to split an expectation over the SMM into a difference of expectations, each of which is an expectation w.r.t. an additive MM. Therefore, I can be rewritten as

$$I = \int f(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} = \mathbb{E}_q [f(\mathbf{x})w(\mathbf{x})] = \frac{Z_+}{Z_q} \mathbb{E}_{q_+} [f(\mathbf{x})w(\mathbf{x})] - \frac{Z_-}{Z_q} \mathbb{E}_{q_-} [f(\mathbf{x})w(\mathbf{x})], \quad (6)$$

where $w(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{x})/q(\mathbf{x})$. This leads to our proposed **difference of expectations estimator** (ΔEx):

$$\hat{I}_{\Delta\text{Ex}} = \frac{Z_+}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_+} \sum_{s=1}^{S_+} f(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)})w(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)}) - \frac{Z_-}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_-} \sum_{s=1}^{S_-} f(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s)})w(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s)}), \quad \begin{matrix} \mathbf{x}_+^{(s)} \sim q_+(\mathbf{x}_+) \\ \mathbf{x}_-^{(s)} \sim q_-(\mathbf{x}_-) \end{matrix}, \quad (7)$$

where $S = S_+ + S_-$. Note that, interestingly, while we sample from q_+ and q_- , the weights have the full SMM q in the denominator. With ΔEx , we can sample both q_+ and q_- via classical ancestral sampling with no need to approximate inverse CDFs and iterate d times. Proposition 1 states the core properties of our proposed estimator. Fig. 3 in Appendix D illustrates samples used for expectation estimation with ΔEx as well as samples obtained by ARITS.

Proposition 1 (Properties of ΔEx) See Appendix A for proofs.

1. **Unbiasedness and strong consistency:** the ΔEx estimator is unbiased, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}_+ \sim q_+, \mathbf{x}_- \sim q_-} [\hat{I}_{\Delta\text{Ex}}] = I$,

and it is strongly consistent, $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}_+ \sim q_+, \mathbf{x}_- \sim q_-} \left(\lim_{\substack{S_+ \rightarrow +\infty \\ S_- \rightarrow +\infty}} \hat{I}_{\Delta\text{Ex}} = I \right) = 1$.

2. **Variance expression:** for simplicity, let $I = \int \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} = Z_p$; an analogue expression for generic $f(\mathbf{x})$ is in Appendix A. Let $\tilde{w}(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x})/q(\mathbf{x})$. The variance of $\hat{I}_{\Delta\text{Ex}}$ is given by

$$\frac{Z_+^2}{Z_q^2} \frac{1}{S_+} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q_+} [(\tilde{w}(\mathbf{x}))^2] - (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q_+} [\tilde{w}(\mathbf{x})])^2 \right) + \frac{Z_-^2}{Z_q^2} \frac{1}{S_-} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q_-} [(\tilde{w}(\mathbf{x}))^2] - (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q_-} [\tilde{w}(\mathbf{x})])^2 \right).$$

Necessary and sufficient conditions for finite variance are: (i) $q(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ almost-everywhere in the support of q_+ and q_- ; (ii) $\int (\tilde{w}(\mathbf{x}))^2 q_+(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} < \infty$ and $\int (\tilde{w}(\mathbf{x}))^2 q_-(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} < \infty$.

Note that for ΔEx , the variance is more complex than for the standard UIS estimator. First, more terms appear as ΔEx is a difference of two estimators that, individually, are biased for I - yet, unbiased when combined. Second, while the importance weight $\tilde{w}(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x})/q(\mathbf{x})$ evaluates the full SMM in the denominator, the expectations are under q_+ and q_- instead of q . This complicates interpreting the variance as a known divergence between q and p . However, it shares a basic property with divergences $D(p; q)$: if $p = q$, it is zero. Detailed intuitions about which properties a good proposal q should satisfy will require further work.

Variance reduction. Since ΔEx splits the SMM into two additive mixtures, it is straightforward to apply additional variance reduction techniques. For instance, we can use *stratified sampling* (Owen, 2013) to draw a deterministic number of samples from each component of q_+ and q_- respectively. Stratified sampling is known to reduce the variance of the standard UIS estimator compared to using ancestral sampling (Hesterberg, 1995).² We choose stratified sampling as a first, easy to implement variance reduction technique for our experiments (Section 5), and refer to the stratified variant of our method as ΔExS , while ΔExA uses ancestral sampling. A proof showing that $\text{Var}[\hat{I}_{\Delta\text{ExS}}] \leq \text{Var}[\hat{I}_{\Delta\text{ExA}}]$ can be found in Appendix A.3. However, we did not find strong evidence for this variance reduction in our experiments (see Appendix C.1).

Sampling budget. When computing $\hat{I}_{\Delta\text{Ex}}$ for a given budget S , we propose to fix the sample size for the two mixtures as $S_+ = \lfloor \frac{Z_+}{Z_+ + Z_-} S \rfloor$ and $S_- = \lfloor \frac{Z_-}{Z_+ + Z_-} S \rfloor$. Intuitively, we sample from the mixtures in proportion to their relative contribution to the estimator. This is the sample allocation we use in Section 5. For an empirical comparison with equal sample allocation, see Appendix C.2.

²This is also known as *deterministic mixture sampling* in the multiple IS (MIS) literature (Owen & Zhou, 2000; Elvira et al., 2019)

4.1 A SAFER Δ EX

As just discussed, our Δ Ex method provides more scalable computation than ARITS-based estimators while maintaining several nice statistical properties. At the same time, it can pose additional challenges that do not appear when sampling from the SMM directly. To see why, consider a scenario where some of the samples obtained by Δ Ex evaluate to very close, non-zero values for *both* $\frac{Z_+}{Z_q} q_+$ and $\frac{Z_-}{Z_q} q_-$. For such samples, the resulting density q would be close to zero, potentially leading to exploding importance weights, and with the crucial consequence of resulting in high-variance estimates. Fig. 2 shows a concrete example: The second target density and its proposals have deep, low-density valleys and result in high variance for Δ Ex. Note that this potential issue is dependent on the chosen proposal but it differs from the usual reason for high variance that can appear in IS estimators (Delyon & Portier, 2021). Typically in IS, one can have a large weight (hence, large variance) because the proposal has lighter tails than the target, so that for some samples, $q(\mathbf{x})$ is much smaller than $p(\mathbf{x})$. Our problem is specific to Δ Ex since it samples where q_+ and q_- individually have high density, even if the overall q there is close to 0. ARITS, on the other hand, is unlikely to sample in areas where q is close to 0 (see Fig. 3).

To improve the variance of our estimator in such scenarios, we take inspiration from safe adaptive IS (SAIS) (Delyon & Portier, 2021; Korba & Portier, 2022; Bianchi et al., 2024) and include a “safe” mixture component in our proposal. Given a SMM proposal q_{SMM} , we mix it with the safe component q_{safe} in a convex combination, resulting in $q(\mathbf{x}) = (1 - \alpha)q_{\text{SMM}}(\mathbf{x}) + \alpha q_{\text{safe}}(\mathbf{x})$, where α is a hyperparameter and the sampling budget can be allocated as $S_{q_{\text{SMM}}} = \lfloor (1 - \alpha)S \rfloor$ and $S_{q_{\text{safe}}} = \lfloor \alpha S \rfloor$. Differently from the SAIS literature, the “safe” component here does not necessarily need to be a heavy-tailed density, but rather a flat one that covers the low-density valleys of the SMM (see Fig. 2). In the next section, we show how this simple modification yields much better estimates for target densities and proposals that would otherwise be problematic with Δ Ex.

5 EXPERIMENTS

In this Section, we conduct preliminary experiments with Δ Ex in synthetic examples to investigate the following research questions: **(RQ1)**: “How does Δ Ex compare to ARITS in terms of error and runtime?”, and **(RQ2)**: “What is the intuition for a good proposal for Δ Ex?”. By doing so, we evaluate the potential of Δ Ex for large-scale expectation estimation in a controlled setting and motivate further investigation on diverse problems.

5.1 RQ1: RUNTIME AND ESTIMATION QUALITY OF Δ EX AND ARITS

We compare ARITS and Δ ExS in terms of runtime and estimation quality in a standard MC setting. We estimate $I = \mathbb{E}_p[f(\mathbf{x})]$, where p is a squared SMM with Gaussian inputs, and f is a standard GMM defined over the same set of variables as p , so we can compute the ground-truth value of I exactly. We vary the number of variables d (dimension) in $\{16, 32, 64\}$. Moreover, we let the number of components in p range in $\{2, 4, 6\}$ before squaring³, while keeping it fixed to 100 for f to encourage non-vanishing values of I in higher dimensions. The budget for ARITS estimators is fixed to 10000 samples while Δ ExS estimators are computed for $S \in \{10000, 100000, 300000\}$. The results are averaged over 30 different initializations of f and p . We measure the estimation error as $\log(|\hat{I} - I|)$ and the runtime is reported in seconds. Further details on the initialization of p and f , the used hardware, and the ARITS implementation can be found in Appendix B.

Table 1 shows that Δ ExS is consistently faster than ARITS, even when using a much larger sampling budget. At the same time, the estimation quality of Δ ExS is generally comparable to ARITS when a sufficiently large sample size is used. These results highlight the potential of Δ ExS for high-dimensional expectation estimation where ARITS is computationally infeasible.

5.2 RQ2: Δ EX FOR NORMALIZING CONSTANT ESTIMATION

To address our second research question, we test Δ ExS for normalizing constant estimation using hand-crafted proposals. In particular, given an unnormalized target distribution \tilde{p} , we aim to ap-

³Note that this results in up to 3, 10 and 21 unique components after squaring respectively.

Table 1: ΔExS is consistently faster than ARITS for expectation estimation while achieving comparable estimation quality. Results for MC comparing our method (ΔExS) with ARITS for a varying number of features (d) and components (K) as well as different sampling budgets (S) for ΔExS . The error is given as $\log(|\hat{I} - I|)$, hence lower is better, and time is in seconds. Results are averaged over 30 initializations of p and f (mean \pm stddev).

Method	d	S	Number of components (K)					
			2		4		6	
			$\log(\hat{I} - I)$	Time (s)	$\log(\hat{I} - I)$	Time (s)	$\log(\hat{I} - I)$	Time (s)
ΔExS	16	10000	-18.650 \pm 1.291	0.053 \pm 0.072	-18.240 \pm 1.314	0.102 \pm 0.007	-17.942 \pm 1.199	0.219 \pm 0.026
ΔExS	16	100000	-19.722 \pm 1.041	0.238 \pm 0.004	-19.231 \pm 1.228	0.659 \pm 0.039	-19.009 \pm 1.379	1.368 \pm 0.087
ΔExS	16	300000	-19.937 \pm 0.797	0.668 \pm 0.013	-19.743 \pm 1.070	1.862 \pm 0.112	-19.491 \pm 0.931	3.851 \pm 0.226
ARITS	16	10000	-19.111 \pm 1.103	7.579 \pm 0.120	-19.299 \pm 1.611	7.588 \pm 0.037	-18.739 \pm 1.024	7.869 \pm 0.034
ΔExS	32	10000	-48.024 \pm 1.344	0.042 \pm 0.003	-47.231 \pm 1.059	0.097 \pm 0.008	-47.273 \pm 1.015	0.185 \pm 0.017
ΔExS	32	100000	-48.395 \pm 1.068	0.268 \pm 0.009	-48.092 \pm 0.771	0.652 \pm 0.055	-48.426 \pm 1.734	1.313 \pm 0.091
ΔExS	32	300000	-48.729 \pm 0.835	0.762 \pm 0.030	-48.671 \pm 1.758	1.869 \pm 0.162	-48.791 \pm 1.007	3.756 \pm 0.259
ARITS	32	10000	-47.897 \pm 1.165	15.460 \pm 0.116	-47.349 \pm 0.839	15.730 \pm 0.058	-47.300 \pm 0.978	17.560 \pm 0.060
ΔExS	64	10000	-108.129 \pm 1.280	0.059 \pm 0.061	-107.338 \pm 0.854	0.085 \pm 0.008	-107.444 \pm 0.827	0.137 \pm 0.022
ΔExS	64	100000	-108.000 \pm 1.066	0.331 \pm 0.017	-107.431 \pm 0.692	0.621 \pm 0.070	-107.672 \pm 0.782	0.980 \pm 0.194
ΔExS	64	300000	-108.354 \pm 1.436	0.961 \pm 0.049	-107.569 \pm 1.215	1.801 \pm 0.207	-108.052 \pm 1.372	2.845 \pm 0.576
ARITS	64	10000	-107.898 \pm 1.129	31.036 \pm 0.115	-107.330 \pm 0.929	34.318 \pm 0.142	-107.374 \pm 1.138	52.490 \pm 0.095

proximate $I = \int \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} = \mathbb{E}_q[\tilde{p}(\mathbf{x})/q(\mathbf{x})]$. Note that the task of normalizing constant estimation requires the use of IS, as opposed standard MC, since the problem is not an expectation under p .

Remember that the optimal proposal in standard UIS is known to be $q_{\text{UIS}}^\star(\mathbf{x}) = Z_{q^\star}^{-1} \cdot |f(\mathbf{x})|p(\mathbf{x})$ (Robert et al., 1999; Owen, 2013), which reduces to $q_{\text{UIS}}^\star(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{x})$ for normalizing constant estimation. We therefore create proposals by slightly noising the standard deviations of the Gaussian components of p , which should result in proposals that are fairly close to the optimal UIS proposal. In particular, we set $\sigma_q := \sigma_p \cdot \exp(\epsilon \cdot Z)$, where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$, for each input standard deviation σ_p . We apply these perturbations before squaring the proposal. Moreover, we want to understand the the potential benefit of including a safe mixture component, as described in Section 4.1. We heuristically choose q_{safe} as a zero-mean, zero-covariance multivariate Gaussian with a large standard deviation compared to the other components of the proposal, namely $\sigma = 3$, and set $\alpha = 0.001$.

Fig. 2 shows two simple, two-dimensional targets and corresponding proposals. We compute estimates based on $S = 15000$ samples from the proposal. We repeat the estimation 100 times and report the estimated coefficient of variation (CoV), given as $I^{-1} \cdot \sqrt{\widehat{\text{V}}[\hat{I}_{\Delta\text{ExS}}]}$, as well as the average estimation error, measured as $\log(|\hat{I}_{\Delta\text{ExS}} - I|)$. We further report the the estimated KL divergence between the target and the proposal based on 200000 samples from p obtained by ARITS.

As can be seen from the results for the first target, ΔExS can exhibit a low estimated CoV even without a safe component when the proposal does not have a prominent low-density valley. For the second target, ΔExS does result in high variance initially but the inclusion of a safe component drastically improves the estimator’s variance and average estimation quality, even with a small mixing proportion α . Overall, it is an interesting observation that low KL divergence between the target and the proposal does not necessarily correspond to a low-variance estimator. This raises the question how to find good proposals for ΔEx estimators systematically.

6 DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we connected optimal IS proposals with SMMs and examined an unbiased IS estimator, which we term ΔEx , that allows us to use SMMs as proposals while avoiding costly auto-regressive inverse transform sampling. We further derived a variance expression that highlights qualitative differences of ΔEx with standard IS estimators, opening many new possibilities to do adaptive IS (Bugallo et al., 2017) with SMMs. ΔEx shows promising computational improvements over ARITS in our experiments. However, the scalability does not come for free. Our estimator can return negative values for a positive quantity, and the UIS estimator can sometimes have high variance when the proposal has low-density valleys. Yet, as a first step towards designing appropriate proposals for ΔEx , we found that mixing the SMM with a “safe” component can address this problem.




Figure 2: ΔEx can result in high variance when q has low-density valleys, but we can fix that with a “safe” component. We show here that (i) choosing a good proposal for ΔEx does not simply amount to having a small KL divergence, as coefficient of variation (CoV) can be very large even when KL is small and (ii) low-density valleys in q can cause high CoV, but we can fix that with the inclusion of a “safe” component. The integral of interest here is the normalizing constant of p , i.e., $I = \int \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$. Estimates are computed from $S = 15000$ samples, CoV and average error are based on 100 estimates, and the KL is estimated from 200000 samples.

In upcoming work, we will study adaptive IS strategies tailored to the proposed method. For instance, it is natural in the setting of latent variable models to consider a version of the evidence lower bound that exploits the difference representation of an SMM,

$$\mathbb{E}_q \left[\log \left(\frac{p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})}{q(\mathbf{z})} \right) \right] = \frac{Z_+}{Z_q} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{q_+} \left[\log \frac{p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})}{q(\mathbf{z})} \right] - \frac{Z_-}{Z_q} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{q_-} \left[\log \frac{p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})}{q(\mathbf{z})} \right] \quad (\Delta\text{ELBO})$$

and its several variants (Hotti et al., 2024) when using deterministic mixture sampling. Furthermore, we are investigating an extension of ΔEx to hierarchical mixture models that can be represented in the language of deep circuits (Vergari et al., 2019; Mari et al., 2023). Lastly, we will perform more experiments to evaluate ΔEx against several baselines and other approximate inference approaches.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LZ and AV were supported by the “UNREAL: Unified Reasoning Layer for Trustworthy ML” project (EP/Y023838/1) selected by the ERC and funded by UKRI EPSRC. The work of VE is supported by ARL/ARO under grant W911NF-22-1-0235. The authors are grateful to Lorenzo Locomonte for useful discussion about the implementation of ARITS and the cirkit library, and to Adrián Javaloy for early helpful discussions around SMMs.

CONTRIBUTIONS

NB and AV initially discussed a preliminary idea of using circuits for IS. NB suggested to use the difference representation of SMMs for IS and together with LZ then formalized ΔEx which was later discussed with AV and VE. LZ highlighted the instability of ΔEx , proposed the inclusion of a safe component to fix it, and suggested the stratified variant of ΔEx . NB and LZ jointly provided the proofs and derivations and designed experiments with the help of AV. LZ was responsible for implementing and carrying out experiments with help from NB. NB led the writing with LZ and help from AV and VE. AV supervised and provided feedback for all the steps of the project.

REFERENCES

- Pascal Bianchi, Bernard Delyon, Victor Priser, and François Portier. Stochastic mirror descent for nonparametric adaptive importance sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.13272*, 2024.
- Anna Bignami and A. De Matteis. A note on sampling from combinations of distributions. *IMA Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 8(1):80–81, 08 1971. ISSN 0272-4960. doi: 10.1093/imamat/8.1.80. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/imamat/8.1.80>.
- Christopher M Bishop and Nasser M Nasrabadi. *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, volume 4. Springer, 2006.
- Nicola Branchini and Víctor Elvira. Generalizing self-normalized importance sampling with couplings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.19974*, 2024.
- Monica F Bugallo, Victor Elvira, Luca Martino, David Luengo, Joaquin Miguez, and Petar M Djuric. Adaptive importance sampling: The past, the present, and the future. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 34(4):60–79, 2017.
- Diana Cai, Chirag Modi, Charles C Margossian, Robert M Gower, David M Blei, and Lawrence K Saul. Eigenvi: score-based variational inference with orthogonal function expansions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- Y Choi, Antonio Vergari, and Guy Van den Broeck. Probabilistic circuits: A unifying framework for tractable probabilistic models. *UCLA*. URL: <http://starai.cs.ucla.edu/papers/ProbCirc20.pdf>, pp. 6, 2020.
- Bernard Delyon and François Portier. Safe adaptive importance sampling. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(2):885–917, 2021.
- Víctor Elvira, Luca Martino, David Luengo, and Mónica F. Bugallo. Generalized Multiple Importance Sampling. *Statistical Science*, 34(1):129 – 155, 2019. doi: 10.1214/18-STS668.
- John Geweke. Bayesian inference in econometric models using monte carlo integration. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pp. 1317–1339, 1989.
- Tim Hesterberg. Weighted average importance sampling and defensive mixture distributions. *Technometrics*, 37(2):185–194, 1995.
- Keisuke Hirano, Guido W Imbens, and Geert Ridder. Efficient estimation of average treatment effects using the estimated propensity score. *Econometrica*, 71(4):1161–1189, 2003.
- Alexandra Hotti, Oskar Kviman, Ricky Molén, Víctor Elvira, and Jens Lagergren. Efficient mixture learning in black-box variational inference. In Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Zico Kolter, Katherine Heller, Adrian Weller, Nuria Oliver, Jonathan Scarlett, and Felix Berkenkamp (eds.), *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 18972–18991. PMLR, 21–27 Jul 2024. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v235/hotti24a.html>.
- Renyang Jiang, Ming J. Zuo, and Han-Xiong Li. Weibull and inverse weibull mixture models allowing negative weights. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 66(3):227–234, 1999.
- Samir Khan and Johan Ugander. Adaptive normalization for ipw estimation. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 11(1):20220019, 2023.
- Anna Korba and François Portier. Adaptive importance sampling meets mirror descent: a bias-variance tradeoff. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 11503–11527. PMLR, 2022.
- Lorenzo Loconte, M. Sladek Aleksanteri, Stefan Mengel, Martin Trapp, Arno Solin, Nicolas Gillis, and Antonio Vergari. Subtractive mixture models via squaring: Representation and learning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=xIHi5nxu9P>.

- Lorenzo Loconte, Antonio Mari, Gennaro Gala, Robert Peharz, Cassio de Campos, Erik Quaeghebeur, Gennaro Vessio, and Antonio Vergari. What is the relationship between tensor factorizations and circuits (and how can we exploit it)? *Transactions of Machine Learning Research*, 2025a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Y7dRmpGiHj>.
- Lorenzo Loconte, Stefan Mengel, and Antonio Vergari. Sum of squares circuits. In *The 39th Annual AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2025b.
- Antonio Mari, Gennaro Vessio, and Antonio Vergari. Unifying and understanding overparameterized circuit representations via low-rank tensor decompositions. In *The 6th Workshop on Tractable Probabilistic Modeling*, 2023.
- Ulysse Marteau-Ferey, Francis Bach, and Alessandro Rudi. Non-parametric models for non-negative functions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33 (NeurIPS)*, pp. 12816–12826, 2020.
- Geoffrey J McLachlan, Sharon X Lee, and Suren I Rathnayake. Finite mixture models. *Annual review of statistics and its application*, 6(1):355–378, 2019.
- Art Owen and Yi Zhou. Safe and effective importance sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 95(449):135–143, 2000.
- Art B. Owen. *Monte Carlo theory, methods and examples*. <https://artowen.su.domains/mc/>, 2013.
- Robert Peharz, Robert Gens, Franz Pernkopf, and Pedro Domingos. On the latent variable interpretation in sum-product networks. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 39(10):2030–2044, 2016.
- Guilherme G. P. Freitas Pires and Mário A. T. Figueiredo. Variational mixture of normalizing flows. In *28th European Symposium on Artificial Neural Networks, Computational Intelligence and Machine Learning, ESANN 2020, Bruges, Belgium, October 2-4, 2020*, pp. 205–210, 2020. URL <https://www.esann.org/sites/default/files/proceedings/2020/ES2020-188.pdf>.
- Guillaume Rabusseau and François Denis. Learning negative mixture models by tensor decompositions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.4224*, 2014.
- Tom Rainforth, Adam Golinski, Frank Wood, and Sheheryar Zaidi. Target-aware bayesian inference: how to beat optimal conventional estimators. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(88):1–54, 2020.
- Christian P Robert and Julien Stoehr. Simulating signed mixtures. *Statistics and Computing*, 35(1):1–21, 2025.
- Christian P Robert, George Casella, and George Casella. *Monte Carlo statistical methods*, volume 2. Springer, 1999.
- Alessandro Rudi and Carlo Ciliberto. PSD representations for effective probability models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34 (NeurIPS)*, pp. 19411–19422. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
- The april lab. *circuit*, October 2024. URL <https://github.com/april-tools/circuit>.
- Aki Vehtari, Andrew Gelman, and Jonah Gabry. Practical bayesian model evaluation using leave-one-out cross-validation and waic. *Statistics and computing*, 27:1413–1432, 2017.
- Antonio Vergari, Nicola Di Mauro, and Guy Van den Broeck. Tractable probabilistic models: Representations, algorithms, learning, and applications. *Tutorial at UAI*, 2019.
- Antonio Vergari, YooJung Choi, Anji Liu, Stefano Teso, and Guy Van den Broeck. A compositional atlas of tractable circuit operations for probabilistic inference. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:13189–13201, 2021.

Baibo Zhang and Changshui Zhang. Finite mixture models with negative components. In *4th International Conference on Machine Learning and Data Mining in Pattern Recognition (MLDM)*, pp. 31–41. Springer, 2005.

Yiliang Zhang and Qi Long. Assessing fairness in the presence of missing data. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:16007–16019, 2021.

A PROOFS

A.1 VARIANCE DERIVATION

Under the assumptions in Proposition 1, we have

$$\mathbb{V}_{\substack{\mathbf{x}_+ \sim q_+ \\ \mathbf{x}_- \sim q_-}}[\widehat{I}_{\Delta\text{Ex}}] = \mathbb{V}_{q_+} \left[\frac{Z_+}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_+} \sum_{s=1}^{S_+} f(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)}) w(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)}) \right] + \mathbb{V}_{q_-} \left[\frac{Z_-}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_-} \sum_{s=1}^{S_-} f(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s)}) w(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s)}) \right] \quad (8)$$

$$= \frac{Z_+^2}{Z_q^2} \frac{1}{S_+} \left(\mathbb{E}_{q_+} [(f(\mathbf{x}_+) w(\mathbf{x}_+))^2] - (\mathbb{E}_{q_+} [f(\mathbf{x}_+) w(\mathbf{x}_+)])^2 \right) + \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{Z_-^2}{Z_q^2} \frac{1}{S_-} \left(\mathbb{E}_{q_-} [(f(\mathbf{x}_-) w(\mathbf{x}_-))^2] - (\mathbb{E}_{q_-} [f(\mathbf{x}_-) w(\mathbf{x}_-)])^2 \right), \quad (10)$$

where we used the independence of \mathbf{x}_+ and \mathbf{x}_- as well as the fact that both $\{\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)}\} \sim q_+$ and $\{\mathbf{x}_-^{(s)}\} \sim q_-$ are sampled i.i.d. When $f(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ and we replace $p(\mathbf{x})$ with its unnormalized version $\tilde{p}(\mathbf{x})$, we obtain the expression in Proposition 1.

A.2 UNBIASEDNESS AND CONSISTENCY OF ΔEx FOR UIS

We show that our constructed ΔEx estimator is unbiased for UIS as stated in Proposition 1. Note that the standard MC setting, as benchmarked in Table 1, is the special case of $p = q$.

Recall that our estimator is given as

$$\widehat{I}_{\Delta\text{Ex}} = \frac{Z_+}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_+} \sum_{s=1}^{S_+} f(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)}) w(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)}) - \frac{Z_-}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_-} \sum_{s=1}^{S_-} f(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s)}) w(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s)}), \text{ where } \begin{matrix} \mathbf{x}_+^{(s)} \sim q_+(\mathbf{x}_+) \\ \mathbf{x}_-^{(s)} \sim q_-(\mathbf{x}_-) \end{matrix}.$$

Note that $q(\mathbf{x}) = Z_q^{-1} (Z_+ q_+(\mathbf{x}) - Z_- q_-(\mathbf{x}))$ and $\{\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)}\} \sim q_+$ and $\{\mathbf{x}_-^{(s)}\} \sim q_-$ are sampled i.i.d. Assuming that $\int |f(\mathbf{x})| p(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} < \infty$ and $q(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ almost-everywhere in the support of q_+ and q_- , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{x}_+ \sim q_+ \\ \mathbf{x}_- \sim q_-}}[\widehat{I}_{\Delta\text{Ex}}] = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{x}_+ \sim q_+ \\ \mathbf{x}_- \sim q_-}} \left[\frac{Z_+}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_+} \sum_{s=1}^{S_+} f(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)}) \frac{p(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)})}{q(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)})} - \frac{Z_-}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_-} \sum_{s'=1}^{S_-} f(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s')}) \frac{p(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s')})}{q(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s')})} \right] \quad (11)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{q_+} \left[\frac{Z_+}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_+} \sum_{s=1}^{S_+} f(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)}) \frac{p(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)})}{q(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)})} \right] - \mathbb{E}_{q_-} \left[\frac{Z_-}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_-} \sum_{s'=1}^{S_-} f(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s')}) \frac{p(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s')})}{q(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s')})} \right] \quad (12)$$

$$= \frac{Z_+}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_+} \mathbb{E}_{q_+} \left[\sum_{s=1}^{S_+} f(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)}) \frac{p(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)})}{q(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)})} \right] - \frac{Z_-}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_-} \mathbb{E}_{q_-} \left[\sum_{s'=1}^{S_-} f(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s')}) \frac{p(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s')})}{q(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s')})} \right] \quad (13)$$

$$= \frac{Z_+}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_+} \sum_{s=1}^{S_+} \mathbb{E}_{q_+} \left[f(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)}) \frac{p(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)})}{q(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)})} \right] - \frac{Z_-}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_-} \sum_{s'=1}^{S_-} \mathbb{E}_{q_-} \left[f(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s')}) \frac{p(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s')})}{q(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s')})} \right] \quad (14)$$

$$= \frac{Z_+}{Z_q} \mathbb{E}_{q_+} \left[f(\mathbf{x}_+) \frac{p(\mathbf{x}_+)}{q(\mathbf{x}_+)} \right] - \frac{Z_-}{Z_q} \mathbb{E}_{q_-} \left[f(\mathbf{x}_-) \frac{p(\mathbf{x}_-)}{q(\mathbf{x}_-)} \right] \quad (15)$$

$$= \frac{Z_+}{Z_q} \int f(\mathbf{x}) \frac{p(\mathbf{x})}{q(\mathbf{x})} q_+(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} - \frac{Z_-}{Z_q} \int f(\mathbf{x}) \frac{p(\mathbf{x})}{q(\mathbf{x})} q_-(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \quad (16)$$

$$= \int f(\mathbf{x}) \frac{p(\mathbf{x})}{q(\mathbf{x})} \frac{1}{Z_q} (Z_+ q_+(\mathbf{x}) - Z_- q_-(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x} \quad (17)$$

$$= \int f(\mathbf{x}) \frac{p(\mathbf{x})}{q(\mathbf{x})} q(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \quad (18)$$

$$= \int f(\mathbf{x}) p(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = I. \quad (19)$$

Under the same assumptions as above and by directly applying the strong law of large numbers, we have almost sure (a.s.) consistency, as

$$\mathbb{P}_{\substack{\mathbf{x}_+ \sim q_+ \\ \mathbf{x}_- \sim q_-}} \left(\lim_{\substack{S_+ \rightarrow +\infty \\ S_- \rightarrow +\infty}} \widehat{I}_{\Delta\text{Ex}} = I \right) = 1. \quad (20)$$

A.3 VARIANCE REDUCTION BY STRATIFIED SAMPLING

Given an overall sampling budget S and a (normalized) additive mixture $q(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k q_k(\mathbf{x})$, with $\alpha_k \geq 0$ and $\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k = 1$, **ancestral sampling** first selects a component for each of the S samples by drawing from a categorical distribution, i.e. $C^{(s)} \sim \text{Cat}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K)$ for $s \in \{1, \dots, S\}$, and then samples from the resulting component, $\mathbf{x}^{(s)} \sim q_{C^{(s)}}$.

On the other hand, **stratified sampling** deterministically assigns the number of samples drawn from each component in proportion to its assigned mixture weight. The k -th component receives a sampling budget of $S_k \approx \alpha_k S$.

Since our estimator is a difference of two independent estimators,

$$\widehat{I}_{\Delta\text{Ex}} = \frac{Z_+}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_+} \sum_{s=1}^{S_+} f(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)}) w(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)}) - \frac{Z_-}{Z_q} \frac{1}{S_-} \sum_{s=1}^{S_-} f(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s)}) w(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s)}), \text{ where } \begin{matrix} \mathbf{x}_+^{(s)} \sim q_+(\mathbf{x}_+) \\ \mathbf{x}_-^{(s)} \sim q_-(\mathbf{x}_-) \end{matrix},$$

the variance is a sum of two variances

$$\mathbb{V}_{\substack{\mathbf{x}_+ \sim q_+ \\ \mathbf{x}_- \sim q_-}} [\widehat{I}_{\Delta\text{Ex}}] = \frac{Z_+^2}{Z_q^2} \mathbb{V}_{q_+} \left[\frac{1}{S_+} \sum_{s=1}^{S_+} f(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)}) \frac{p(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)})}{q(\mathbf{x}_+^{(s)})} \right] + \frac{Z_-^2}{Z_q^2} \mathbb{V}_{q_-} \left[\frac{1}{S_-} \sum_{s=1}^{S_-} f(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s)}) \frac{p(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s)})}{q(\mathbf{x}_-^{(s)})} \right].$$

Since both q_+ and q_- are additive MMs, we can apply the known result that the variance under stratified sampling cannot be greater than that of ancestral sampling for both terms in the above (see, e.g., [Elvira et al. \(2019\)](#) comparing the S_1 and R_1 schemes). As a result, the variance for ΔExS cannot be greater than that for ΔExA .

B EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

We implement all of our experiments in Python using the `circuit` library ([The april lab, 2024](#)). Experiments reporting runtime are run on a single NVIDIA L40 (45GiB VRAM) GPU each and runtimes are measured using `time.perf_counter`.

B.1 EXPERIMENT 1: COMPARISON OF ΔExS AND ARITS

In our first set of experiments, depicted in [Table 1](#), our sampling distribution is a squared SMM with Gaussian inputs. The means are initialized with a standard normal distribution and standard deviations are drawn from a $\text{Unif}(2, 3)$ distribution. The mixture weights are initialized with a $\text{Unif}(-1, 1)$ distribution. We repeat the random initialization until the generated model has at least one negatively weighted component after squaring.

The target function f is initialized with 100 Gaussian components for all settings. The means are initialized using a standard normal distribution and the standard deviations are sampled from a $\text{Unif}(1, 2)$ distribution. The weights of the sum layer are sampled from a $\text{Unif}(10000, 100000)$ distribution to encourage a non-zero target expectation in high dimensions.

B.2 EXPERIMENT 2: ΔExS FOR UIS

In this experiment, we try to predict the normalizing constants of two target densities given by squared SMMs and denoted by p_1 and p_2 . The targets p_1 and p_2 are constructed by squaring and re-normalizing an (unnormalized) SMM with the components $\mathcal{N}([0, 0]^T, 0.6^2 \cdot \mathbf{1})$ and $\mathcal{N}([0, 0]^T, \mathbf{1})$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the two-dimensional identity, and mixture weights $\alpha_1 = 0.12$, $\alpha_2 = -0.36$ (for p_1) and $\alpha_1 = 0.16$, $\alpha_2 = -0.36$ (for p_2) respectively. Since in this experiment we are estimating the normalizing constant of the target distribution, $f(\mathbf{x}) = 1$.

B.3 ARITS SAMPLING

In our implementation of ARITS, we use a binary search for numerically inverting the conditional CDF. We choose the start and end points of the binary search as -100 and 100 respectively across all settings⁴. The search is stopped once the upper and lower bound for each sample differ by no more than 10^{-6} . Pseudocode for our ARITS implementation is given in Algorithm 1. Note that computing the conditional CDF in the algorithm is tractable (Vergari et al., 2021).

The runtime and performance reported for ARITS in Table 1 could likely be improved via a more efficient implementation of the algorithm, parallelization, or a different choice of hyperparameters (i.e., start and end point for binary search, stopping criterion, sampling batch size). Nevertheless, sampling with ARITS is inherently sequential in the number of features.

Further, note that while continuing the binary search until all samples in the batch reached the specified tolerance, as in our implementation, might seem inefficient, we found that generally all samples reached the desired tolerance in the same iteration.

Algorithm 1: Pseudocode for the ARITS implementation used in our experiments.

For Table 1, $L = -100$, $B = 100$, $T = 10^{-6}$.

Input : (normalized) sampling distribution q_{SMM} ,
 number of samples S ,
 number of features D ,
 initial upper bound B ,
 initial search lower bound L ,
 tolerance for stopping binary search T

Output: set of S samples from p_{SMM} \mathbf{X}_S

```

 $\mathbf{X}_S = ()$ ;
for  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  do
   $\mathbf{u} \leftarrow (u_1, \dots, u_S) \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)^S$ ;
   $\mathbf{L} \leftarrow (L, \dots, L)$ ,  $|\mathbf{L}| = S$ ;
   $\mathbf{B} \leftarrow (B, \dots, B)$ ,  $|\mathbf{B}| = S$ ;
  if  $i > 1$  then
    /* Pre-compute evidence of observations made so far */
     $\mathbf{e} \leftarrow q_{\text{SMM}}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i-1})$ ;
  else
     $\mathbf{e} \leftarrow (1, \dots, 1)$ ,  $|\mathbf{e}| = S$ 
  /* Perform binary search to numerically invert CDF */
  while Any  $|\mathbf{L} - \mathbf{B}| > T$  do
     $\mathbf{M} \leftarrow \mathbf{L} + (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{L})/2$ ;
    /* Compute conditional CDF at midpoint */
     $\mathbf{c} \leftarrow q_{\text{SMM}}(\mathbf{x}_i \leq \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i-1})/\mathbf{e}$ 
    /* Update upper and lower bounds for  $\mathbf{x}_i$  */
    for  $s \in \{1, \dots, S\}$  do
      if  $c_s > u_s$  then
         $B_s \leftarrow M_s$ 
      else
         $L_s \leftarrow M_s$ 
    /* Re-compute midpoint and append i-th dimension to sample */
     $\mathbf{M} \leftarrow \mathbf{L} + (\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{L})/2$ ;
     $\mathbf{X}_S \leftarrow (\mathbf{X}_S, \mathbf{M})$ 
return  $\mathbf{X}_S$ 

```

⁴To ensure the validity of the algorithm, we always check whether these bounds result in a (conditional) CDF of 0 and 1 respectively.

Table 2: **Stratified sampling does not provide noticeable variance reduction compared to ancestral sampling in our experiments.** Results for MC comparing ΔExS (stratified sampling) with ΔExA (ancestral sampling), for a varying number for features (d) and components (K). The variance estimators are computed based on 100 ΔEx estimators. Results are averaged over 30 initializations of p and f (mean \pm stddev). The experimental setup is as in Table 1.

d	S	$\widehat{\text{V}}[\Delta\text{ExS}] \cdot (\widehat{\text{V}}[\Delta\text{ExA}])^{-1}$	$\widehat{\text{V}}[\Delta\text{ExS}] \cdot (\widehat{\text{V}}[\Delta\text{ExA}])^{-1}$	$\widehat{\text{V}}[\Delta\text{ExS}] \cdot (\widehat{\text{V}}[\Delta\text{ExA}])^{-1}$
16	10000	1.133 \pm 0.346	1.033 \pm 0.183	1.000 \pm 0.000
32	10000	1.133 \pm 1.196	1.333 \pm 1.322	0.933 \pm 0.868
64	10000	49.267 \pm 200.313	8.733 \pm 17.875	75.467 \pm 191.528

C ADDITIONAL MONTE CARLO EXPERIMENTS

C.1 EMPIRICAL VARIANCE COMPARISON OF ΔExS AND ΔExA

As discussed in Section 4 and Appendix A.3, we expect ΔExS , which uses stratified mixture sampling, to have smaller or equal variance than ΔExA , which relies on ancestral sampling. Table 3 gives an empirical comparison of the variance of the two estimators for the same setup as in Section 5.1 and Table 1. Estimators of the variance are computed from 100 ΔEx estimators each and the table reports the variance ratio of ΔExS and ΔExA , i.e. $\widehat{\text{V}}[\Delta\text{ExS}] \cdot (\widehat{\text{V}}[\Delta\text{ExA}])^{-1}$. A ratio lower than 1 hence indicates a variance reduction by stratified sampling.

Interestingly, we do not observe any variance reduction by using stratified sampling empirically. The difference between the two techniques could be potentially more apparent in a different experimental setup. Note that for $d = 64$, the estimators of the variance are likely unreliable due to small values of the estimators. For instance, ground-truth values for $d = 64$, $K = 2$ can be in the order of 10^{-47} .

C.2 EFFECT OF SAMPLING BUDGET ALLOCATION ON ΔEx

In Table 3 we compare our proposed sample allocation for q_+ and q_- , i.e. $S_+ = \lfloor \frac{Z_+}{Z_+ + Z_-} S \rfloor$ and $S_- = \lfloor \frac{Z_-}{Z_+ + Z_-} S \rfloor$ (see Section 4), with equal sampling splitting, i.e. $S_+ = \lfloor \frac{S}{2} \rfloor$ and $S_- = \lfloor \frac{S}{2} \rfloor$. We denote the estimator using equal sample splitting as ΔExS (Eq.). We use the same experimental setup as in Section 5.1, hence the results for ΔExS coincide with Table 1. We find that the two sampling schemes achieve similar mean errors for this set of examples.

D COMPARISON OF ARITS AND ΔExS SAMPLES

Figure 3 compares 1500 samples obtained from a squared SMM by ARITS and ΔExS . We denote the full SMM by $q_{\text{SMM}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z_q} (Z_+ \cdot q_+(\mathbf{x}) - Z_- \cdot q_-(\mathbf{x}))$ as in Eq. (5). ARITS samples directly from q_{SMM} , while ΔExS samples from q_+ and q_- in isolation. Note that ΔExS does not sample from q_{SMM} but the samples from q_+ and q_- can be combined into an unbiased expectation estimator over q_{SMM} (see Section 4). The visualized SMM coincides with the second target in Fig. 2.

Table 3: **Δ ExS performs similarly with our proposed sample allocation and equal sample splitting.** Results for MC comparing Δ ExS with our proposed sample allocation and equal sample splitting (Eq.), for a varying number for features (d) and components (K) as well as different sampling budgets (S). The error is given as $\log(|\hat{I} - I|)$, hence lower is better. Results are averaged over 30 initializations of p and f (mean \pm stddev). The experimental setup is as in Table 1.

Method	d	S	Number of components (K)		
			2	4	6
			$\log(\hat{I} - I)$	$\log(\hat{I} - I)$	$\log(\hat{I} - I)$
Δ ExS	16	10000	-18.650 \pm 1.291	-18.240 \pm 1.314	-17.942 \pm 1.199
Δ ExS (Eq.)	16	10000	-18.070 \pm 0.900	-18.300 \pm 1.196	-18.047 \pm 1.488
Δ ExS	16	100000	-19.722 \pm 1.041	-19.231 \pm 1.228	-19.009 \pm 1.379
Δ ExS (Eq.)	16	100000	-19.325 \pm 1.016	-19.206 \pm 0.933	-18.874 \pm 1.219
Δ ExS	16	300000	-19.937 \pm 0.797	-19.743 \pm 1.070	-19.491 \pm 0.931
Δ ExS (Eq.)	16	300000	-20.003 \pm 0.920	-19.790 \pm 1.338	-19.196 \pm 1.175
Δ ExS	32	10000	-48.024 \pm 1.344	-47.231 \pm 1.059	-47.273 \pm 1.015
Δ ExS (Eq.)	32	10000	-47.377 \pm 0.964	-47.138 \pm 1.056	-46.845 \pm 0.702
Δ ExS	32	100000	-48.395 \pm 1.068	-48.092 \pm 0.771	-48.426 \pm 1.734
Δ ExS (Eq.)	32	100000	-47.908 \pm 1.022	-48.068 \pm 1.094	-48.501 \pm 1.337
Δ ExS	32	300000	-48.729 \pm 0.835	-48.671 \pm 1.758	-48.791 \pm 1.007
Δ ExS (Eq.)	32	300000	-48.250 \pm 0.909	-48.025 \pm 0.918	-48.561 \pm 0.833
Δ ExS	64	10000	-108.129 \pm 1.280	-107.338 \pm 0.854	-107.444 \pm 0.827
Δ ExS (Eq.)	64	10000	-107.973 \pm 0.989	-107.226 \pm 0.665	-107.518 \pm 1.371
Δ ExS	64	100000	-108.000 \pm 1.066	-107.431 \pm 0.692	-107.672 \pm 0.782
Δ ExS (Eq.)	64	100000	-108.187 \pm 1.281	-107.386 \pm 0.741	-107.644 \pm 0.967
Δ ExS	64	300000	-108.354 \pm 1.436	-107.569 \pm 1.215	-108.052 \pm 1.372
Δ ExS (Eq.)	64	300000	-108.044 \pm 1.399	-107.816 \pm 0.938	-107.858 \pm 0.885




Figure 3: **ARITS samples directly from the full SMM q_{SMM} while ΔExS samples from q_+ and q_- in isolation.** The figure shows 1500 samples obtained by ARITS (first row) and ΔExS (second row) respectively. *All depicted densities are normalized and visualized using the same color map.*