

Stochastic Variational Inference with Tuneable Stochastic Annealing

John Paisley
Columbia University
New York, NY, USA

Ghazal Fazelnia
Spotify Research
New York, NY, USA

Brian Barr
Capital One Labs
New York, NY, USA

Abstract—In this paper, we exploit the observation that stochastic variational inference (SVI) is a form of annealing and present a modified SVI approach — applicable to both large and small datasets — that allows the amount of annealing done by SVI to be tuned. We are motivated by the fact that, in SVI, the larger the batch size the more approximately Gaussian is the intrinsic noise, but the smaller its variance. This low variance reduces the amount of annealing which is needed to escape bad local optimal solutions. We propose a simple method for achieving both goals of having larger variance noise to escape bad local optimal solutions and more data information to obtain more accurate gradient directions. The idea is to set an actual batch size, which may be the size of the data set, and a smaller *effective* batch size that matches the larger level of variance at this smaller batch size. The result is an approximation to the maximum entropy stochastic gradient at this variance level. We theoretically motivate our approach for the framework of conjugate exponential family models and illustrate the method empirically on the probabilistic matrix factorization collaborative filter, the Latent Dirichlet Allocation topic model, and the Gaussian mixture model.

I. INTRODUCTION

Posterior inference of a model’s variables is one of the core problems of Bayesian modeling. There are two fundamental approaches to perform this posterior inference. One approach uses Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling techniques, which are asymptotically exact. However, MCMC tends to be slow compared to point-estimate techniques and not scalable to large datasets [1, 2]. Mean-field variational inference is another approach that approximates the posterior distribution by first defining a simpler family of factorized distribution and then finding a member that is closest to the desired posterior [3, 4, 5]. It uses the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence as a measure of closeness turning the inference problem into an optimization problem. This optimization, however, imposes new types of challenges, for example finding closed form expressions or scaling to large datasets.

To deal with non-convexity in variational inference optimization, methods such as selective marginalization [6] or convex relaxations have been proposed [7]. Annealing methods in particular have shown promising results at improving local optimal solutions. Annealing has been studied for variational inference in variety of contexts [8, 9, 10, 11]. These approaches mostly perform a deterministic inflation of the entropy term in the variational objective, which shrinks with each iteration to allow for more exploration of the variational objective in early iterations. Stochastic variational inference is another implicit,

less investigated annealing approach that we consider in this paper.

Stochastic variational inference (SVI) is a practical method that allows for efficient inference over large datasets [12]. It combines natural gradients [13] and stochastic optimization [14] ideas, and optimizes the global variational parameters of model’s posterior approximation over an entire dataset. SVI’s gradients are random because the subset of data they are calculated over is randomly sampled, and the variance of this gradient is inversely related to the number of subsamples that are selected in each iteration. This introduces an annealing effect [15], which has well-known benefits beyond inference for big data when the noise is Gaussian [16]. However, the desired Gaussianity of the stochastic gradients of SVI are also linked to the batch size: To achieve a more Gaussian noise, a larger batch size is required, but larger batch sizes reduce the effective variance of the added noise, thereby reducing the effective annealing. As a result of this reduced annealing, the algorithm may still not be able to escape bad local optimal solutions. The goal of our paper is to simultaneously increase the Gaussianity by increasing the batch size, while also increasing the effective variance of this batch size, using mathematical properties of the model itself rather than the simple but potentially less stable trick of directly adding Gaussian noise to the gradients.

We propose a simple, but mathematically motivated method to increase the Gaussianity of the stochastic gradients produced by SVI by simultaneously increasing the batch size, while reintroducing the variance that is naturally lost in the process. In the context of conjugate exponential family models, the result is the introduction of a one-dimensional noise term that can be added into the stochastic update of the natural parameter that is determined by the desired effective batch size. This desired sample size is less than the actual batch size used in the stochastic updates. We derive the general algorithm, and illustrate its ability to find better local optima on the probabilistic matrix factorization collaborative filter, the Latent Dirichlet Allocation topic model, and the Gaussian mixture model. We argue that this methodology can benefit both stochastic as well as batch inference, bringing the advantages of SVI to smaller data sets as well.

The paper is organized as follows. We begin in Section 2 with a discussion of the conjugate exponential family model structure and general variational inference for the mixed membership model setting. Then we derive and present our proposed method

in Section 3. Finally, in Section 4 we illustrate the approach with empirical results on the probabilistic matrix factorization collaborative filter, the Latent Dirichlet Allocation topic model, and the Gaussian mixture model.

II. MODEL STRUCTURE AND VARIATIONAL INFERENCE

Suppose we have a dataset $X = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$, where each x_n is a group of data making up a single observation, such as a document, image, or a feature vector. We assume a generative model with the following structure

$$x_n | \theta_n \stackrel{ind}{\sim} p(X | \theta_n, \beta), \quad \theta_n \stackrel{iid}{\sim} p(\theta), \quad \beta \sim p(\beta). \quad (1)$$

The local variables θ_n only impact data x_n , while the global variables β are used by all of the data. The joint likelihood of the model can be written

$$p(x, \theta, \beta) = p(\beta) \prod_{n=1}^N p(x_n | \theta_n, \beta) p(\theta_n). \quad (2)$$

We assume the full posterior $p(\theta, \beta | x)$ is intractable, so we approximate it with a factorized distribution $q(\beta, \theta) = q(\beta) \prod_n q(\theta_n)$ using variational inference. The variational objective function for this specific modeling framework takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \mathbb{E}_q[\ln p(x, \theta, \beta)] - \mathbb{E}_q[\ln q(\beta, \theta)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_q\left[\ln \frac{p(\beta)}{q(\beta)}\right] + \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}_q\left[\frac{\ln p(x_n, \theta_n | \beta)}{q(\theta_n)}\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

We assume that the model is in the conjugate exponential family. As a result, each q distribution is optimally chosen to be in the same exponential family as the prior, and has a natural parameter vector, which we will call λ_n for $q(\theta_n)$ and λ for $q(\beta)$.

Since optimizing $q(\theta_n)$ does not change from standard VI inference in the SVI setting, we focus on the stochastic update for $q(\beta)$, which requires updating λ . Let η be the natural parameter for the prior on β . In the standard batch variational inference approach, the natural parameter update of $q(\beta)$ can be shown to always equal

$$\lambda = \eta + \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)], \quad (4)$$

where the expectation is over the current setting of $q(\theta_n)$ and $t(\theta_n)$ is the sufficient statistic function of the conditional posterior distribution of β . The variational update therefore uses the expectation of these sufficient statistics. Next, we discuss how these updates are modified for stochastic inference, and note how there is an implied Gaussian annealing being done by SVI. That discussion will point towards a modified SVI algorithm presented later.

A. Stochastic variational inference

Stochastic variational inference (SVI) can be used when N is too large to update each $q(\theta_n)$ in a reasonable amount of time within one iteration. In this setting, each iteration samples a subset of x_n , indexed by set S_t at iteration t . It then constructs the iteration-dependent objective function

$$\mathcal{L}_t = \mathbb{E}_q\left[\ln \frac{p(\beta)}{q(\beta)}\right] + \frac{N}{|S_t|} \sum_{n \in S_t} \mathbb{E}_q\left[\frac{\ln p(x_n, \theta_n | \beta)}{q(\theta_n)}\right]. \quad (5)$$

The scaling by $\frac{N}{|S_t|}$ ensures that the stochastic gradient of \mathcal{L}_t with respect to λ is unbiased.

In this framework, the stochastic update for λ is

$$\lambda \leftarrow (1 - \rho_t)\lambda + \rho_t\left(\eta + \frac{N}{|S_t|} \sum_{n \in S_t} \mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)]\right). \quad (6)$$

The step size $\rho_t > 0$ satisfies $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \rho_t = \infty$ and $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \rho_t^2 < \infty$. The expectation of this gradient over the randomness of the subset S_t at iteration t is equal to the ground truth gradient of the entire dataset, meaning the stochastic gradient is unbiased. Combined with the conditions on step size ρ_t , this guarantees convergence to a local optimal solution of the true underlying \mathcal{L} containing all of the data.

From the annealing perspective, we can think of the stochastic update as

$$\lambda \leftarrow (1 - \rho_t)\lambda + \rho_t\left(\eta + \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)] + \epsilon_t\right), \quad (7)$$

where $\epsilon_t \sim p_t(\epsilon)$ is generated from a noise process with an implied but undefined distribution. Therefore, SVI can also be viewed as an annealing method in addition to a scalable inference approach. That is, by subsampling the data SVI implicitly adds noise to the true gradients, which is known in other optimization contexts to have the potential advantage of escaping bad local optimal solutions. As an aside, this helps explain why SVI can be empirically observed to find better local solutions than batch VI according to their shared variational objective function.

B. SVI and annealing

Theoretical analysis of ideal annealing approaches using Langevin dynamics assume the added noise is Gaussian [16], and so infusing Gaussianity in SVI can help improve the annealing process for variational inference. Therefore, it is important to understand how Gaussian is the implied random ϵ_t introduced by SVI in Equation 7. To this end, we observe that we can write the actual stochastic update of λ in Equation 6 as

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &\leftarrow (1 - \rho_t)\lambda + \rho_t(\eta + N\lambda'_t), \\ \lambda'_t &\equiv \frac{1}{|S_t|} \sum_{n \in S_t} \mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)]. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The vector λ'_t is the average of the expected sufficient statistics over the random subsample S_t of iteration t . Since the terms in this subsample are chosen uniformly at random with

replacement, they are *iid* from the empirical data distribution. (Often they are chosen without replacement in practice, in which case the CLT is approximate and depends on N and $|S_t|$.) By the central limit theorem this vector is asymptotically Gaussian

$$\lambda'_t \overset{\text{approx}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma_t), \quad (9)$$

where the mean and covariance are

$$\mu = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)], \quad \Sigma_t = \frac{1}{|S_t|} \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta)]). \quad (10)$$

The expected value of λ'_t is the true gradient because the stochastic gradients of SVI are unbiased. The randomness of $\mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta)]$ in the above equation characterized by the covariance matrix is due to evaluating the expectation at a single, randomly selected θ_n . Therefore, the noise of SVI is approximately Gaussian, and the larger the batch size S_t , the more accurate this is by the central limit theorem.

While Gaussian noise is good for annealing, we observe that turning the noise more Gaussian by increasing $|S_t|$ also takes SVI further away from its stochastic update. That is, increasing $|S_t|$ allows us to more accurately use the following approximation,

$$\lambda \leftarrow (1 - \rho_t)\lambda + \rho_t \left(\eta + \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)] + N\epsilon_t \right), \quad (11)$$

$$\epsilon_t \overset{\text{approx}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, |S_t|^{-1} \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta)])),$$

but the noise being added has smaller variance in this case, and so a closer Gaussian approximation also leads to less annealing. We next discuss one possible method for achieving both aims of having Gaussian noise, but sufficient stochasticity in the gradients to escape bad local optimal solutions.

III. SVI+ : MORE ANNEALING AND LARGER BATCH SIZES

In this section we propose a modification of SVI that we refer to as SVI+ in this paper (“plus” additional annealing). We first discuss the proposed method in the general mathematical setting. While the general method could technically be performed directly, we also propose a slight approximation that produces a straightforward and very fast update requiring little modification to any existing SVI algorithm. The resulting algorithm is given in Algorithm 1.

A. Proposed method

We propose adding back the variance to the stochastic gradients that we lose when we increase $|S_t|$ as follows,

$$\lambda \leftarrow (1 - \rho_t)\lambda + \rho_t \left(\eta + N \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)] + \epsilon_t + \xi_t \right) \right), \quad (12)$$

where we now have two noise vectors, ϵ_t and ξ_t , added to the true underlying gradient calculated over the entire dataset. The distributions of these vectors are

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_t &\overset{\text{approx}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, |S_t|^{-1} \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta)])), \\ \xi_t &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, a \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta)])). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The first random vector ϵ_t is the implicit noise from SVI discussed previously, while the second ξ_t is a proposed addition. Since both are (approximately) Gaussian, the vector $\epsilon_t + \xi_t$ also has the following approximate multivariate Gaussian distribution,

$$\epsilon_t + \xi_t \overset{\text{approx}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, (a + |S_t|^{-1}) \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta)])). \quad (14)$$

As $|S_t|$ increases, this approximation becomes more accurate, but the *effective* variance of the noise remains $(a + \frac{1}{|S_t|}) \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta)])$, and so the actual variance can be controlled by a lower bound a . We emphasize that the difference between this noise variance and the variance corresponding to $|S_t| = M$ is entirely in its closer Gaussian approximation due to the central limit theorem – the distribution of ϵ_t in the small $|S_t|$ setting is unknown and likely far from Gaussian. We will empirically demonstrate the advantage of this Gaussianity by comparing SVI+ for a particular M setting with SVI when $|S_t| = M$.

We define this effective variance in terms of a desired smaller batch size, which is the actual variance of the stochastic gradient of SVI using this smaller batch size. Note that $|S_t|$ is the *actual* batch size, let M be the *effective* batch size whose variance we seek to mimic. We can do this by tuning a in the following way,

$$\frac{1}{M} = a + \frac{1}{|S_t|} \Rightarrow a = \frac{|S_t| - M}{M|S_t|}. \quad (15)$$

The LHS of the first equation is the desired variance of Equation 14 corresponding to batch sizes of size M and the RHS of the first equation is the actual variance of Equation 14 accounting for both the actual batch size $|S_t|$ and the variance a of the new Gaussian vector ξ_t . Setting a in this way requires that $M < |S_t|$, but since we want to increase variance we equivalently want the variance corresponding to a smaller batch size, and so this assumption is valid.

We therefore propose the following procedure, which we then greatly simplify for practical implementations. Given a desired effective batch size M and true batch size $|S_t|$, we construct the update at iteration t as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &\leftarrow (1 - \rho_t)\lambda + \rho_t \left(\eta + \frac{N}{|S_t|} \sum_{n \in S_t} \mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)] + N\xi_t \right), \quad (16) \\ \xi_t &\sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{|S_t| - M}{M|S_t|} \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta)])\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta)])$ is unknown and λ may be too high dimensional to approximate it directly, we next discuss an alternative approach for implementing this approximation.

B. Approximation and simplification

The value of $\text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta)])$ is unknown. We propose an approximation that has the advantage of greatly simplifying the final algorithm, making the proposed method very easy to implement.

We suggest using the data in batch S_t to approximate the true $\text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta)])$ calculated over the entire dataset,

$$\text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta)]) \approx \Sigma_t \quad (17)$$

Algorithm 1 SVI+ for tuneable annealing

Require: Data $\{x_i\}_{n=1:N}$, batch size $|S_t|$, effective size M

1: **function** AT ITERATION t

2: **Sample** data indices $S_t \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$

3: **Sample** $\varepsilon_n \sim_{iid} \mathcal{N}(0, |S_t|/M - 1)$ for $n \in S_t$

4: **Define** sample average $\bar{\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{|S_t|} \sum_{n \in S_t} \varepsilon_n$ (≈ 0)

5: **Construct** noise-added sample vector

$$\lambda'_t = \frac{1}{|S_t|} \sum_{n \in S_t} (1 + \varepsilon_n - \bar{\varepsilon}) \mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)]$$

6: **Calculate** M -level annealed stochastic update

$$\lambda \leftarrow (1 - \rho_t)\lambda + \rho_t(\eta + N\lambda'_t)$$

return λ – Note: SVI special case when $M = |S_t|$

7: **end function**

where we define

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_t &= \frac{1}{|S_t|} \sum_{n \in S_t} (\mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)] - \bar{\mu}_t)(\mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)] - \bar{\mu}_t)^T, \\ \bar{\mu}_t &= \frac{1}{|S_t|} \sum_{n \in S_t} \mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)]. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Using this approximation, we observe that we can generate the random target vector having the desired covariance,

$$\xi_t \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{|S_t| - M}{M|S_t|} \Sigma_t\right), \quad (19)$$

as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_t &= \frac{\sqrt{|S_t| - M}}{|S_t|\sqrt{M}} \sum_{n \in S_t} (\mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)] - \bar{\mu}_t) \varepsilon_n, \\ \varepsilon_n &\stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

To see the equivalence of Eqs. 19 and 20, we note that ξ_t in Equation 20 must be Gaussian by construction, and also that the mean and variance of this Gaussian vector is easily shown to be $\mathbb{E}[\xi_t] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\xi_t \xi_t^T] = \frac{|S_t| - M}{M|S_t|} \Sigma_t$. For notational convenience, we will let the indexing of the random variable ε_n match the indices contained in S_t .

We finally observe that, from the process above and the definition of $\bar{\mu}_t$ in Equation 18, we can rewrite the term involving $\bar{\mu}_t$ in Equation 20 as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \in S_t} \bar{\mu}_t \varepsilon_n &= \sum_{n \in S_t} \mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)] \bar{\varepsilon}, \\ \bar{\varepsilon} &= \frac{1}{|S_t|} \sum_{n \in S_t} \varepsilon_n \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

This finally allows us to write the vector in Equation 20 in the following equivalent way,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_t &= \frac{\sqrt{|S_t| - M}}{|S_t|\sqrt{M}} \sum_{n \in S_t} \mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)] (\varepsilon_n - \bar{\varepsilon}), \\ \varepsilon_n &\stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \\ \bar{\varepsilon} &= \frac{1}{|S_t|} \sum_{n \in S_t} \varepsilon_n. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

When we plug this back into Equation 16 and simplify, we obtain the stochastic update that defines the SVI+ algorithm. We present this as a definition below.

Definition 1 (SVI+). Let $S_t \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ be the index set of the batch used at iteration t for SVI. Let $M < |S_t|$ be the desired effective batch size whose stochastic gradient is to be approximately noise-matched with a Gaussian distribution. For an exponential family q distribution in a conjugate exponential family model, the SVI+ update for the natural parameters in iteration t is $\lambda \leftarrow (1 - \rho_t)\lambda + \rho_t(\eta + \lambda'_t)$, where the stochastic gradient λ'_t is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda'_t &= \frac{N}{|S_t|} \sum_{n \in S_t} (1 + \varepsilon_n - \bar{\varepsilon}) \mathbb{E}_q[t(\theta_n)], \\ \varepsilon_n &\stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{|S_t|}{M} - 1\right), \\ \bar{\varepsilon} &= \frac{1}{|S_t|} \sum_{n \in S_t} \varepsilon_n. \end{aligned}$$

This is also summarized in Algorithm 1. The difference between this algorithm and the original SVI update in Equation 6 is the addition of a random variable $(\varepsilon_n - \bar{\varepsilon})$ to be multiplied with the expected sufficient statistic of each observation. We notice that, when $M = |S_t|$, $\varepsilon_n = 0$ with probability one and we recover SVI. We also observe that we can use this for small-scale problems. In that case, we let $S_t = \{1, \dots, N\}$ for every iteration. We then form the batch update, but add randomness according to the effective batch size M desired for annealing.

C. Discussion: SVI+ as maximum entropy stochastic gradient

Let $x \sim \mathcal{P}$ be an arbitrary distribution on x with $\mathbb{E}[x] = \mu$ and $\text{Cov}(x) = \Sigma$. Then it is well-known that the entropy of \mathcal{P} is upper-bounded by a Gaussian distribution \mathcal{N} having the same mean and variance — since the Kullback-Leibler divergence $\text{KL}(\mathcal{P} \parallel \mathcal{N}) \geq 0$, it immediately follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(x \sim \mathcal{P}) &\leq - \int \mathcal{P}(x) \ln \mathcal{N}(x) dx \\ &= \mathcal{H}(x \sim \mathcal{N}), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where \mathcal{H} is entropy. If $\lambda'_{t,M}$ is a stochastic gradient of batch size M at iteration t , then the distribution $\lambda'_{t,M} \sim \mathcal{P}_M$ is likely far from Gaussian when M is small — recall that \mathcal{P}_M approaches the empirical distribution of the gradients as $M \rightarrow 1$ and converges to a Gaussian when $M \rightarrow \infty$ due to the CLT.

The previous discussion shows that, for effective batch size M , SVI+ replaces the true distribution on stochastic gradient $\lambda'_{t,M} \sim \mathcal{P}_M$ with a distribution $\lambda'_{t,M} \sim \mathcal{N}_M$, where \mathcal{N}_M is approximately Gaussian with the same covariance as \mathcal{P}_M . Therefore, SVI+ is a maximum entropy method that seeks to take stochastic gradient steps using the maximum entropy distribution corresponding to batches of size M . That is, if $\lambda'_{t,M}$ follows SVI in Equation 8 with $|S_t| = M$ and $\lambda'_{t,S_t,M}$ follows SVI+ in Definition 1 with $|S_t| > M$, then $\mathbb{E}[\lambda'_{t,M}] = \mathbb{E}[\lambda'_{t,S_t,M}] = \mathbb{E}[\lambda'_{t,N}]$ (i.e., unbiased), $\text{Cov}[\lambda'_{t,M}] = \text{Cov}[\lambda'_{t,S_t,M}]$ and $\mathcal{H}(\lambda'_{t,M}) < \mathcal{H}(\lambda'_{t,S_t,M})$.




Fig. 1: Variational objective as a function of iteration for the probabilistic matrix factorization collaborative filter model. We use both the 1M and 10M MovieLens data sets and average over 20 random initializations. In all experiments, the batch size $|S_t|$ equals the data size, with the difference of SVI+ being the effective batch size used for stochastically annealing the gradients. (See text for details.) As is evident, SVI+ consistently finds a much better local optimal solution, with the improvement increasing with larger data size. It also converges significantly faster. The left two figures show the relative performance of variational PMF for rank 5 and 10 factorizations on the same data, which are directly comparable for model selection. They indicate that rank 5 provides a better model according to the marginal likelihood VI approximation.

IV. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

In this section, we present some empirical results to evaluate the ability of SVI+ to outperform both batch and stochastic variational inference in terms of finding better local optimal solutions. We demonstrate this on three models: probabilistic matrix factorization, latent Dirichlet allocation, and the Gaussian mixture model. Each model focuses on a different aspect of the annealing performance of SVI+.

A. Example 1: Probabilistic matrix factorization

We first consider variational inference for the probabilistic matrix factorization (PMF) model used for collaborative filtering [17]. PMF models the rating y given by user i to item j as

$$y_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(u_i^T v_j, \sigma^2), \quad (i, j) \in \Omega \quad (24)$$

where Ω is the pairwise index set of ratings in a data set. The vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ parameterize the user and item locations, respectively, and d is the chosen rank of the factorization. As conjugate priors, PMF uses

$$u_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, cI_d), \quad v_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, cI_d) \quad (25)$$

and we define $q(u, v) = \prod_i q(u_i) \prod_j q(v_j)$ where each q is a multivariate Gaussian distributions whose parameters are to be learned using variational inference. For the Gaussian $q(u_i)$, the sufficient statistics over the entire data set restricted to user i can be shown to equal

$$\lambda'_{u_i} = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{j:(i,j) \in \Omega} [\mathbb{E}_q[v_j v_j^T], y_{ij} \mathbb{E}_q[v_j]], \quad (26)$$

and a similar pattern holds for each v_j .

In this experiment, we evaluate the annealing performance of SVI+ when a batch VI algorithm is modified. That is, in Algorithm 1 we take the index set $S_t = \Omega$ for each iteration, but either use or don't use annealing by tuning M . We evaluate

results on the benchmark 1 million and 10 million MovieLens data sets.¹ We set parameters $c = 1$, $\sigma^2 = 1/2$ and note that y is a star ranking between 1 and 5. We consider both $d = 5, 10$.

Our results are shown in Figure 1, where we plot the variational objective functions from 20 randomly initialized runs. For batch inference, we use the standard VI algorithm to learn q . For SVI+, we use Algorithm 1 with $S_t = \Omega$, $\rho = 0.85$ and an increasing $M_t = 50t$, which transitions from SVI+ to batch over iterations. We observed much freedom in setting these parameters. As is evident, SVI+ consistently converges to a better local optimal solution for both data sets and different factorization rank settings, which can be entirely attributed to the annealing performed by SVI that allows for better distributions to be learned on the embeddings u and v . It converges faster as well.

We note that batch variational inference is a natural choice for this data since each iteration of the larger 10 million set required only 8.9 seconds on average using a standard personal desktop computer. However, as Figure 1 shows, incorporating the implied annealing from SVI+ can produce a significantly better model fit with virtually no additional computation time.

B. Example 2: Latent Dirichlet allocation

We show a second illustrative example on a topic modeling problem using Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) [18]. Where the previous example motivated the use of SVI+ in batch settings, in this example we compare how SVI+ performs against SVI when the batch size $|S_t|$ of SVI is equal to either the batch size of SVI+ or the smaller M setting of SVI+. We learn LDA with 50 topics on a data set of 250,000 articles from *The New York Times*. We omit a mathematical characterization of this model since it's batch VI algorithm is well known from Blei et al. [18], but mention that the sufficient statistic

¹<https://grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/>




Fig. 2: SVI+ compared with SVI for the LDA model averaged over 20 random initializations. For SVI+, $|S_t| = 1000$ and $M = 500$. As is evident, SVI+ using batch size 1000 but effective batch size of 500 finds a better local optimal solution than SVI using either of these batch sizes. This indicates that the annealing done by SVI+ at effective level of $M = 500$ is better than that of SVI when the actual batch size is 500. We believe this is due to the increase Gaussianity of the noise in SVI+ at this batch size than the implicit noise of SVI at the same size. Also of interest is that increasing the batch size of SVI alone slightly degrades performance because of the reduced annealing performed by less stochasticity in the gradients.

constructing λ' in SVI is the vector of counts of expected number of times each word appears from each topic within a subsampled batch of data (see Hoffman et al. [12]).

We experiment using SVI with batch sizes of $|S_t| = 500, 1000$ and SVI+ with $|S_t| = 1000$ and $M = 500$. As mentioned, in this way we can see the different between SVI and SVI+ according to both the actual and effective batch sizes. In Figure 2, we show the variational objective as a function of batches seen averaged over 20 random initializations. We note that the size of this problem meant that the error bars were significantly small and could be ignored.

As is clear from this figure, SVI+ outperforms SVI with batch size $|S_t| = 1000$ as a result of the increased annealing afforded by SVI+ when $M = 500$. However, we also observe that SVI+ in this original setting outperforms SVI when $|S_t| = 500$ for SVI. This indicates that the annealing done by SVI+ at the equivalent effective batch size $M = 500$ when $|S_t| = 1000$ is better than the annealing done by SVI when $|S_t| = 500$. This give support to our conjecture that the increased *Gaussianity* of the noise in SVI+ improves local optimal convergence compared with the unknown noise distribution of SVI at this same batch size. Note that the improvement of SVI 500 over SVI 1000 also provides separate evidence of the advantage of annealing introduced by SVI itself. Though less pronounced than PMF the results in Figure 2 are statistically significant as an empirical proof of concept of the previous analysis.

C. Example 3: Gaussian mixture model

Finally, we focus on the Gaussian mixture model (GMM) as a simple working example. The GMM assumes a probability density on the data that is a weighted sum of K Gaussian

distributions. For each data point $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the generative model is,

$$x_i | c_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{c_i}, \Lambda_{c_i}), \quad c_i \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\pi), \quad (27)$$

where $c \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ is the index of the Gaussian used by observation x_i , defined by its mean and precision (μ, Λ) , and π is the mixing distribution on these Gaussians. Conjugate prior distributions on model parameters are

$$\pi \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha), \quad \mu_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, cI), \quad \Lambda_j \sim \text{Wishart}(a, B). \quad (28)$$

We define the approximate posterior distributions as follows

$$\begin{aligned} q(\pi) &= \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_K), \quad q(\mu_j) = \mathcal{N}(m'_j, \Sigma'_j), \\ q(\Lambda_j) &= \text{Wishart}(a'_j, B'_j), \quad q(c_i) = \text{Multinomial}(\phi_i). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

As with PMF and LDA, since the model is in the conjugate exponential family, we can derive closed form solution of these distributions, which we omit for space.² Therefore, SVI for the GMM stochastically updates the natural parameters of the approximate posterior distributions for global variables μ, Λ , and π using the general framework of Hoffman et al. [12] described previously.

D. Variational objective value comparison

We first show how our proposed method again outperforms regular SVI as well as batch inference in terms of local optimal value of the variational inference objective. We use a small, synthetic 2-dimensional dataset with 250 samples, as well as the Pima Indian Diabetes from the UCI repository, which is an 8-dimensional dataset having 768 samples.³ We note that these

²Please see, e.g., Bishop [19] for more details about the model and algorithm.

³<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/>




Fig. 3: Objective function values as a function of iterations for a typical run. Left: Comparison on synthetic data. Right: Comparison on Pima dataset with four different effective batch sizes M . Both results show that SVI and batch perform roughly equally, with SVI slightly better on Pima because of its implicit annealing. However, SVI+ noticeably finds better local optima than SVI when the effective batch size M is smaller than $|S_t|$.

data sizes are very small relative to the previous two examples, which allows us to show how SVI+ can benefit this regime.

The parameters settings for the GMM in our experiments are $a = D, \alpha = (0.5, 0.5), B = I, c = 10$. For the synthetic data, we set $|S_t| = 50$ and $M = 10$. For Pima, we set $|S_t| = 200$ and vary $M \in \{50, 100, 150\}$. In both cases, we are able to show batch results on the entire data set as well.

Figure 3 shows plots of the objective functions for the two datasets. The left figure shows the result of the objective function for batch, SVI and SVI+. As can be seen, SVI+ is able to achieve better local optimal values compared to regular SVI and batch inference. This confirms that even for small datasets, SVI+ can find better local optimal values than these methods. The right figure shows the objective value for the Pima dataset as a function of iteration. As can be seen, SVI+ with smaller M results in better objective values in this case as well.




Fig. 4: The size-sorted empirical distribution of data over 50 clusters averaged over multiple runs. The ground truth number of clusters in the data was 4. Batch inference (L), SVI (M) and SVI+ (R). Batch inference consistently over estimates this number, while SVI oversimplifies the model by underestimating it. (Best viewed zoomed in.)

E. Nonparametric approximation of cluster number

We also consider a nonparametric extension of the GMM in which the underlying number of clusters in the data is determined by an approximation to the Dirichlet process.⁴ One well-known way to approximate the Dirichlet process is through a finite mixture [22],

$$G_K = \sum_{i=1}^K \pi_i \delta_{\theta_i}, \quad \pi \sim \text{Dirichlet}\left(\frac{\alpha}{K}, \dots, \frac{\alpha}{K}\right), \quad \theta_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} G_0.$$

In the limit as $\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} G_K = G \sim \text{DP}(\alpha G_0)$. Here, the atoms $\theta_i = \{\mu_i, \Sigma_i\}$, which are used in the GMM as before.

In this experiment, we use synthetic data containing 4 underlying clusters and approximate the Dirichlet process prior by setting $K = 50$. We ran inference for this model for $|S_t| = \{10, 20, 30, 40, 50\}$. For each $|S_t|$ we set $M = \{0.2|S_t|, 0.4|S_t|, 0.6|S_t|\}$. This gives a total of 15 combinations and for each we ran 10 times with random initializations. We first show the probability distribution over clusters averaged over 15 random initializations for batch inference, SVI and SVI+ in Figure 4. We see that batch inference consistently learned 5 clusters while SVI learned 3 clusters. SVI+ is more accurate in the number of clusters learned and the distribution of the data across these clusters because it converges more consistently to a better local optima.

We show one of the clustering results in Figure 5. This also shows the data used in our experiments. In this example, $|S_t| = 40$ and $M = 16$. Batch, SVI and SVI+ are ordered from left to right. This is one typical example from the 150 runs where batch inference picked out one extra cluster, and

⁴We omit a technical discussion for space. Please see, e.g., Ferguson [20] and Neal [21] for discussions.




Fig. 5: A typical clustering result from Fig 4 on a 2D toy dataset for Batch (L), SVI (M) and SVI+ (R).




Fig. 6: Box plots over multiple random initializations of the fraction of data points contained in the size-ranked largest clusters. Blue = regular SVI, Red = SVI+. Higher is not necessarily better. Accuracy can be deduced from the distribution of raw data in Fig 5.

SVI learns only two clusters. As Figure 4 shows, SVI almost always converged to two clusters as shown here, while batch inference frequently chose five clusters in this way. In Figure 6 we show box plots of the cumulative sums of each of 150 runs summarized in the averages of Figure 4. As can be seen, most of the data are contained in the first two clusters in SVI, while SVI+ has a more accurate representation in terms of the distribution of data displayed in Figure 5.

V. CONCLUSION

We presented a new annealing method for variational inference in conjugate exponential family models that can be applied to large or small data sets in both the stochastic and batch inference settings. By using a larger actual batch size in combination with a tuneable smaller effective batch

size parameter, we are able to take annealed stochastic gradient steps that are more Gaussian in their distribution. We mathematically derived the method, called SVI+ in this paper, for general exponential family q distributions. The resulting algorithm introduced virtually no computational overhead and can be applied with slight modification to existing SVI code. Empirically, we demonstrated that both stochastic updates and batch updates can benefit from the proposed method by finding better local optimal solutions. We demonstrated performance on standard machine learning models to emphasize its advantages in different regimes, for big and small data and for stochastic and batch variational inference.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Hastings, “Monte carlo sampling methods using markov chains and their applications,” *Biometrika*, vol. 23, no. 57, pp. 97–109, 1970.
- [2] A. Gelfand and A. Smith, “Sampling based approaches to calculating marginal densities,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 23, no. 85, pp. 398–409, 1990.
- [3] M. I. Jordan, Z. Ghahramani, T. S. Jaakkola, and L. K. Saul, “An introduction to variational methods for graphical models,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 183–233, 1999.
- [4] D. M. Blei, A. Kucukelbir, and J. D. McAuliffe, “Variational inference: A review for statisticians,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 23, no. 85, pp. 398–409, 2017.
- [5] M. W. Seeger and D. P. Wipf, “Variational bayesian inference techniques,” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 81–91, 2010.
- [6] G. Fazelnia and J. Paisley, “Probabilistic orthogonal matching pursuit,” in *IEEE International Conference on Big Data*, 2022.
- [7] —, “CRVI: Convex relaxation for variational inference,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2018.
- [8] K. Katahira, K. Watanabe, and M. Okada, “Deterministic annealing variant of variational bayes method,” in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, vol. 95, no. 1. IOP Publishing, 2008, p. 012015.
- [9] R. Yoshida and M. West, “Bayesian learning in sparse graphical factor models via variational mean-field annealing,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 11, no. May, pp. 1771–1798, 2010.
- [10] S. Gultekin, A. Zhang, and J. Paisley, “Asymptotic simulated annealing for variational inference,” in *IEEE Global Communications Conference*, 2018.
- [11] S. Mandt, J. McInerney, F. Abrol, R. Ranganath, and D. Blei, “Variational tempering,” in *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2016.
- [12] M. D. Hoffman, D. M. Blei, C. Wang, and J. Paisley, “Stochastic variational inference,” *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1303–1347, 2013.
- [13] S.-I. Amari, “Natural gradient works efficiently in learning,” *Neural Computation*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 251–276, 1998.

- [14] H. Robbins and S. Monro, "A stochastic approximation method," *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pp. 400–407, 1951.
- [15] S. Mandt, M. Hoffman, and D. Blei, "A variational analysis of stochastic gradient algorithms," in *International Conference on machine learning*, 2016.
- [16] M. Welling and Y. W. Teh, "Bayesian learning via stochastic gradient langevin dynamics," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2011.
- [17] A. Mnih and R. R. Salakhutdinov, "Probabilistic matrix factorization," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2007.
- [18] D. M. Blei, A. Y. Ng, and M. I. Jordan, "Latent dirichlet allocation," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 993–1022, 2003.
- [19] C. Bishop, "Pattern recognition and machine learning," *Springer*, vol. 51, no. 7, pp. 2282–2312, 2006.
- [20] T. S. Ferguson, "A bayesian analysis of some nonparametric problems," *The Annals of Statistics*, pp. 209–230, 1973.
- [21] R. M. Neal, "Markov chain sampling methods for dirichlet process mixture models," *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 249–265, 2000.
- [22] H. Ishwaran and M. Zarepour, "Dirichlet prior sieves in finite normal mixtures," *Statistica Sinica*, pp. 941–963, 2002.