
Multi-Level Variational Autoencoder: Learning Disentangled Representations from Grouped Observations Supplementary Material

Diane Bouchacourt
 OVAL Group
 University of Oxford*
 diane@robots.ox.ac.uk

Ryota Tomioka, Sebastian Nowozin
 Machine Intelligence and Perception Group
 Microsoft Research
 Cambridge, UK
 {ryoto, Sebastian.Nowozin}@microsoft.com

1 Mixture of Normals Method

We discuss here a method to construct the variational approximation $q(C_G = c | \mathbf{X}_G = \mathbf{x}_G, \phi_c)$ as a mixture of $|G|$ density functions, each of them evaluating the probability of $C_G = c$ given $X_i = x_i$. This is an alternative to the Product of Normals method.

$$q(C_G = c | \mathbf{X}_G = \mathbf{x}_G, \phi_c) = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{i=1}^{|G|} q(C_G = c | X_i = x_i, \phi_c) \quad (1)$$

We assume $q(C_G | X_i = x_i, \phi_c)$ to be a Normal distribution $N(\mu_i, \Sigma_i)$. However, the term $\text{KL}(q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_G; \phi_c) || p(C_G))$ can not be computed in closed form

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_G; \phi_c) || p(C_G)) &= \mathbb{E}_{q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_G, \phi_c)} [\log q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_G, \phi_c) - \log p(C_G)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_G, \phi_c)} [\log q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_G, \phi_c)] - \mathbb{E}_{q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_G, \phi_c)} [\log p(C_G)] \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

We estimate this term by sampling L samples $c_l \sim q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_G; \phi_c)$ and computing the estimate:

$$\frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \log \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{i=1}^{|G|} q(C_G = c_l | X_i = x_i, \phi_c) - \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \log p(C_G = c_l) \quad (3)$$

In our experiments we used $L = |G|$ as we used the samples we draw to compute the first term of the objective function, that is $\sum_{i \in G} \mathbb{E}_{q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_G; \phi_c)} [\mathbb{E}_{q(S_i | X_i; \phi_s)} [\log p(X_i | C_G, S_i; \theta)]]$.

Figure 1 shows the qualitative results of the Mixture of Normal method. Qualitative evaluation indicate a better disentanglement with the Product of Normal method therefore we focused on the Product. On MS-Celeb-1M, the Mixture of Normal densities seems to store information about the grouping into the style: when style gets transferred, the facial features along the columns (which should remain constant as it is the same identity) tend to change². Nevertheless, we present it as it might be better suited to other datasets and other tasks.

2 Experimental Details

In all experiments we use the Adam optimiser presented in Kingma and Ba [2015] with $\alpha = 0.001, \beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.999, \epsilon = 1e - 8$. We use diagonal covariances for the Normal variational

*The work was performed as part of an internship at Microsoft Research.

²The previous version of the supplementary material had the wrong figure on MS-Celeb-1M (computed with another model). This updated figure shows the actual results and emphasize the conclusion that information about content is stored in the style.




Figure 1: *ML-VAE with Mixture of Normal densities.* We intentionally show the same images as the *ML-VAE with Product of Normal* for comparison purposes. Swapping, first row and first column are test data samples (green boxes), second row and column are reconstructed samples (blue boxes) and the rest are swapped reconstructed samples (red boxes). Each row is fixed style and each column is a fixed content. Best viewed in color on screen. As we mention, compared to *ML-VAE with Product of Normal*, the *Mixture of Normal* seems to store information about the grouping into the style.

approximations $q(\mathbf{S}_G|\mathbf{X}_G; \phi_s), q(C_G|\mathbf{X}_G; \phi_c)$. in both experiments we use a Normal distribution with diagonal covariances for the posterior $p(X_i|C_G, S_i; \theta)$. We train the model for 2000 epochs on MNIST and 250 epochs on MS-Celeb-1M. When we compare the original VAE and the ML-VAE we use early stopping on the validation set for MS-Celeb-1M as the architecture is larger and prone to over-fitting. In the specific case of Stochastic Variational Inference (SVI) Hoffman et al. [2013], for MNIST we train the model for 2000 epochs and proceed to 40000 epochs of inference at test-time, and for MS-Celeb-1M we use 500 training epochs and proceed to 200 epochs of inference at test-time.

2.1 Networks Architectures

MNIST Lecun et al. [1998]. We use an encoder network composed of a first linear layer e_0 that takes as input a 1×784 -dimensional MNIST image x_i , x_i is a realisation of X_i . Layer e_0 has 500 hidden units and the hyperbolic tangent activation function. After layer e_0 we separate the network into 4 linear layers, $e_{m,s}, e_{v,s}$ and $e_{m,c}, e_{v,c}$ each of size $500 \times d$ where d is the dimension of both latent representations S and C . The layers $e_{m,s}, e_{v,s}$ take as input the output of e_0 and output respectively the mean and log-variance of the Normal distribution $q(S_i|X_i = x_i; \phi_s)$. The layers $e_{m,c}, e_{v,c}$ take as input the output of l_0 and output respectively the mean and variance of the Normal distribution $q(C_G|X_i = x_i; \phi_c)$.

We then construct $q(C_G|\mathbf{X}_G; \phi_c)$ from $q(C_G|X_i = x_i; \phi_c), i \in G$. Let us denote G the group in which x_i belongs. As explained in step 9 of Algorithm 1 in the main paper, for each input x_i we draw a sample $c_{G,i} \sim q(C_G|\mathbf{X}_G = \mathbf{x}_G; \phi_c)$ for the content of the group G , and a sample $s_i \sim q(S_i|X_i = x_i; \phi_s)$ of the style latent representation. We concatenate $(c_{G,i}, s_i)$ into a $2 \times d$ -dimensional vector that is fed to the decoder.

The decoder network is composed of a first linear layer d_0 that takes as input the $2 \times d$ -dimensional vector $(c_{G,i}, s_i)$. Layer d_0 has 500 hidden units and the hyperbolic tangent activation function. A second linear layer d_2 takes as input the output of d_0 and outputs a 784-dimensional vector representing the parameters of the Normal distribution $p(X_i|C_G, S_i; \theta)$. We use in our experiments $d = 10$ for a total latent representation size of respectively 20.

MS-Celeb-1M Guo et al. [2016]. We use an encoder network composed of a four convolutional layers e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4 all of stride 2 and kernel size 4. They are composed of respectively 64, 128, 256 and 512 filters. All four layers are followed by Batch Normalisation and Rectified Linear Units (ReLU) activation functions. The fifth and sixth layers e_5, e_6 are linear layers with 256 hidden units, followed by Batch Normalisation and Concatenated Rectified Linear Unit (CReLU) activation functions. Similarly to the MNIST architecture, after layer e_6 we separate the network

into 4 linear layers, $e_{m,s}, e_{v,s}$ and $e_{m,c}, e_{v,c}$ each of size $256 \times 2 \times d$ where d is the dimension of both latent representations S and C . The layers for the log-variances are followed by the tangent hyperbolic activation function and multiplied by 5.

Similarly as the MNIST experiment we construct the latent representation and sample it as explained in Algorithm 1 in the main paper.

The decoder network is composed of 3 deconvolutional layers d_1, d_2, d_3 all of stride 2 and kernel size 4. They are composed of respectively 256, 128, 64 filters. All four layers are followed by Batch Normalisation and Rectified Linear Units (ReLU) activation functions. The seventh and eight layers are deconvolutional layers composed of 3 filters, of stride 1 and kernel size 3 and output respectively the mean and log-variance of the Normal distribution $p(X_i|C_G, S_i; \theta)$. The layer for the log-variances are followed by the tangent hyperbolic activation function and multiplied by 5. We use in our experiments $d = 50$ for a total latent representation size 100. We use padding in the convolutional and deconvolutional layers to match the data size.

Specific case for Stochastic Variational Inference (SVI) Hoffman et al. [2013]. We compare in our experiments with Stochastic Variational Inference (SVI), from Hoffman et al. [2013]. In the case of SVI, the encoder is an embedding layer mapping each sample x_i in a group G to the non-shared parameters $\phi_{s,i}$ of its style latent representation $q(S_i|\phi_{s,i})$ and to the non-shared parameters $\phi_{c,G}$ of its group content latent representation $q(C_G|\phi_{c,G})$. The decoder is the same as the ML-VAE.

3 Quantitative Evaluation details

We explain in Section 4 of the main paper how we quantitatively evaluate the disentanglement performance of our model. We give details here for the interested reader. Figure 2 show the quantitative evaluation for k up to $k = K = 100$ on MNIST.




Figure 2: *Quantitative Evaluation.*

3.1 Classifier architecture

The classifier is a neural network composed of two linear layers of 256 hidden units each. The first layer is followed by a tangent hyperbolic activation function. The second layer is followed by a softmax activation function. We use the cross-entropy loss. We use the Adam optimiser presented in Kingma and Ba [2015] with $\alpha = 0.001, \beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.999, \epsilon = 1e - 8$. Note that the training, validation and testing sets for the classifier are all composed of test images, and each set is composed of K times the number of classes; hence our choice of K and number of classes for MS-Celeb-1M. In the case of MNIST, there are only 10 classes, therefore when k is small we would take only a small number of images to test the classifier. Therefore we perform 5 trials of test procedures of the classifier, each trial using different test images, and report the mean performance.

3.2 Conditional entropy computation.

We show here that training the neural network classifier with the cross-entropy loss is a proxy for minimising the conditional entropy of the class given the latent code features C or S .

Let us take the example of the latent code C used as features. We denote a class Y and we train the neural network classifier to model the distribution $r(Y|C)$ by minimising the cross-entropy loss, which corresponds to maximising $\mathbb{E}_{p(Y,C)}[\log r(Y|C)]$ where $p(Y, C)$ is estimated using samples

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Sample a class } y \sim p(Y), \\ &\text{Sample grouped observations for this class } \mathbf{x}_{G_Y} \sim p(\mathbf{X}_{G_Y}), \\ &\text{Sample the latent code to use as features } c_{G_Y} \sim q(C_{G_Y} | \mathbf{X}_{G_Y}, \phi_c) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The conditional entropy of the class Y given the latent code C is expressed as

$$\mathbb{H}(Y|C) = -\mathbb{E}_{p(Y,C)}[\log p(Y|C)] \quad (5)$$

We can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}(Y|C) &= -\mathbb{E}_{p(Y,C)}[\log p(Y|C)] = -\mathbb{E}_{p(Y,C)}[\log \frac{p(Y|C)}{r(Y|C)} r(Y|C)] \\ &= -\mathbb{E}_{p(Y,C)}[\log r(Y|C)] - \mathbb{E}_{p(Y,C)}[\log \frac{p(Y|C)}{r(Y|C)}] \\ &= -\mathbb{E}_{p(Y,C)}[\log r(Y|C)] - \mathbb{E}_{p(Y,C)}[\log \frac{p(Y, C)}{r(Y, C)}] \\ &= -\mathbb{E}_{p(Y,C)}[\log r(Y|C)] - \text{KL}(p(Y, C) || r(Y, C)) \leq -\mathbb{E}_{p(Y,C)}[\log r(Y|C)] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

since the Kullback-Leibler is always positive. Therefore, training the neural network classifier to minimise the cross-entropy loss is equivalent to minimising an upper bound on the conditional entropy of the class given the latent code features C . We report the value of $\mathbb{E}_{p(Y,C)}[\log r(Y|C)]$ on the classifier test set in the paper as the reported Conditional entropy in bits. Similarly we report the performances with the style latent code or the latent code of the original VAE model.

4 ML-VAE with Product of Normal Without Accumulating Evidence

We show in Figure 3 and 4 the results of swapping and interpolation of the ML-VAE with Product of Normal without accumulating evidence (strategy 1 in the main paper). We intentionally show the same images for comparison purposes.




Figure 3: ML-VAE with Product of Normal without accumulating evidence. Swapping, first row and first column are test data samples (green boxes), second row and column are reconstructed samples (blue boxes) and the rest are swapped reconstructed samples (red boxes). Each row is fixed style and each column is a fixed content. Best viewed in color on screen.




Figure 4: *ML-VAE without accumulating evidence. Interpolation, from top left to bottom right rows correspond to a fixed style and interpolating on the content, columns correspond to a fixed content and interpolating on the style.*

5 Accumulating Group Evidence using a Product of Normal densities: Detailed derivations

We construct the probability density function of the random variable C_G by multiplying $|G|$ normal density functions, each of them evaluating the probability of C_G under the realisation $X_i = x_i$, where $i \in G$.

$$q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_G = \mathbf{x}_G; \phi_c) \propto \prod_{i \in G} q(C_G | X_i = x_i; \phi_c) \quad (7)$$

We assume $q(C_G | X_i = x_i; \phi_c)$ to be a Normal distribution $N(\mu_i, \Sigma_i)$. The normalisation constant is the resulting product marginalised over all possible values of C_G .

The result of the product of $|G|$ normal density functions is proportional to the density function of a Normal distribution of mean μ_G and variance Σ_G .

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_G^{-1} &= \sum_{i \in G} \Sigma_i^{-1} \\ \mu_G^T \Sigma_G^{-1} &= \sum_{i \in G} \mu_i^T \Sigma_i^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

We show below how we derive the expressions of mean μ_G and variance Σ_G .

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{i \in G} q(C_G = c | X_i = x_i; \phi_c) &= \prod_{i \in G} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d |\Sigma_i|}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(c - \mu_i)^T \Sigma_i^{-1} (c - \mu_i)\right) \\
&= K_1 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in G} (c - \mu_i)^T \Sigma_i^{-1} (c - \mu_i)\right) \\
&= K_1 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{i \in G} c^T \Sigma_i^{-1} c + \mu_i^T \Sigma_i \mu_i - 2\mu_i^T \Sigma_i^{-1} c\right)\right) \\
&= K_1 K_2 \exp\left(\sum_{i \in G} \mu_i^T \Sigma_i^{-1} c - \frac{1}{2} c^T \Sigma_i^{-1} c\right) \\
&= K_1 K_2 \exp\left(\sum_{i \in G} \mu_i^T \Sigma_i^{-1} c - \frac{1}{2} c^T \sum_{i \in G} \Sigma_i^{-1} c\right) \\
&= K_1 K_2 \exp\left(\mu_G^T \Sigma_G^{-1} c - \frac{1}{2} c^T \Sigma_G^{-1} c\right) \\
&= K_1 K_2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} (c^T \Sigma_G^{-1} c - 2\mu_G^T \Sigma_G^{-1} c)\right) \\
&= K_1 K_2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} (c^T \Sigma_G^{-1} c - 2\mu_G^T \Sigma_G^{-1} c + \mu_G^T \Sigma_G^{-1} \mu_G - \mu_G^T \Sigma_G^{-1} \mu_G)\right) \\
&= K_1 K_2 \exp(-\mu_G^T \Sigma_G^{-1} \mu_G) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} (c^T \Sigma_G^{-1} c - 2\mu_G^T \Sigma_G^{-1} c + \mu_G^T \Sigma_G^{-1} \mu_G)\right) \\
&= K_1 K_2 K_3 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} (c^T \Sigma_G^{-1} c - 2\mu_G^T \Sigma_G^{-1} c + \mu_G^T \Sigma_G^{-1} \mu_G)\right) \\
&= K_1 K_2 K_3 K_4 \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d |\Sigma_G|}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} (c - \mu_G)^T \Sigma_G^{-1} (c - \mu_G)\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where d is the dimensionality of c and

$$\begin{aligned}
K_1 &= \prod_{i \in G} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d |\Sigma_i|}} \\
K_2 &= \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in G} \mu_i^T \Sigma_i^{-1} \mu_i\right) \\
K_3 &= \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \mu_G^T \Sigma_G^{-1} \mu_G\right) \\
K_4 &= \sqrt{(2\pi)^d |\Sigma_G|}
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

This is a normal distribution, scaled by $K_1 K_2 K_3 K_4$, of mean μ_G and variance Σ_G

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_G^{-1} &= \sum_{i \in G} \Sigma_i^{-1}, \\
\mu_G^T \Sigma_G^{-1} &= \sum_{i \in G} \mu_i^T \Sigma_i^{-1}
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

However, the constant of normalisation disappears when we rescale the resulting product in order for the resulting product to integrate to 1.

$$\begin{aligned}
q(C_G = c | X_G = x_G; \phi_c) &= \frac{K_1 K_2 K_3 K_4 \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d |\Sigma_G|}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(c - \mu_G)^T \Sigma_G^{-1} (c - \mu_G)\right)}{\int_c K_1 K_2 K_3 K_4 \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d |\Sigma_G|}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(c - \mu_G)^T \Sigma_G^{-1} (c - \mu_G)\right) dc} \\
&= \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(c - \mu_G)^T \Sigma_G^{-1} (c - \mu_G)\right)}{\int_c \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(c - \mu_G)^T \Sigma_G^{-1} (c - \mu_G)\right) dc} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d |\Sigma_G|}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(c - \mu_G)^T \Sigma_G^{-1} (c - \mu_G)\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

6 Bias of the Objective

We detail the bias induced by taking a subset of the samples in a group as mentioned in Section 3 of the main paper. We build an estimate of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G}, \theta, \phi_c, \phi_s)$ using mini-batches of grouped observations.

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G}_b, \theta, \phi_c, \phi_s) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}_b|} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_b} \text{ELBO}(G; \theta, \phi_s, \phi_c) \tag{13}$$

If we take all observations in each group $G \in \mathcal{G}_b$, it is an unbiased estimate. However when the groups sizes are too large and we subsample G , this estimate is biased. The $\text{ELBO}(G; \theta, \phi_s, \phi_c)$ for a group is

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{ELBO}(G; \theta, \phi_s, \phi_c) &= \sum_{i \in G} \mathbb{E}_{q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_G; \phi_c)} [\mathbb{E}_{q(S_i | X_i; \phi_s)} [\log p(X_i | C_G, S_i; \theta)]] \\
&\quad - \sum_{i \in G} \text{KL}(q(S_i | X_i; \phi_s) || p(S_i)) - \text{KL}(q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_G; \phi_c) || p(C_G)).
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Let us take a subsample H of G and consider the estimate $\text{ELBO}(G; \theta, \phi_s, \phi_c)_H$. The superscript H denotes the fact that we use a subsample of G to estimate $\text{ELBO}(G; \theta, \phi_s, \phi_c)_H$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{ELBO}(G; \theta, \phi_s, \phi_c)_H &= \sum_{i \in H \subseteq G} \mathbb{E}_{q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_H; \phi_c)} [\mathbb{E}_{q(S_i | X_i; \phi_s)} [\log p(X_i | C_G, S_i; \theta)]] \\
&\quad - \sum_{i \in H \subseteq G} \text{KL}(q(S_i | X_i; \phi_s) || p(S_i)) - \text{KL}(q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_H; \phi_c) || p(C_G)).
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_H; \phi_c)$ is computed using \mathbf{X}_H .

The gradient with respect to the parameters θ, ϕ_s, ϕ_c is

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_\theta \text{ELBO}(G; \theta, \phi_s, \phi_c)_H &= \sum_{i \in H \subseteq G} \mathbb{E}_{q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_H; \phi_c)} [\mathbb{E}_{q(S_i | X_i; \phi_s)} [\nabla_\theta \log p(X_i | C_G, S_i; \theta)]], \\
\nabla_{\phi_s} \text{ELBO}(G; \theta, \phi_s, \phi_c)_H &= \sum_{i \in H \subseteq G} \mathbb{E}_{q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_H; \phi_c)} [\nabla_{\phi_s} \mathbb{E}_{q(S_i | X_i; \phi_s)} [\log p(X_i | C_G, S_i; \theta)]], \\
&\quad - \sum_{i \in H \subseteq G} \nabla_{\phi_s} \text{KL}(q(S_i | X_i; \phi_s) || p(S_i)) \\
\nabla_{\phi_c} \text{ELBO}(G; \theta, \phi_s, \phi_c)_H &= \sum_{i \in H \subseteq G} \nabla_{\phi_c} \mathbb{E}_{q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_H; \phi_c)} [\mathbb{E}_{q(S_i | X_i; \phi_s)} [\log p(X_i | C_G, S_i; \theta)]] \\
&\quad - \nabla_{\phi_c} \text{KL}(q(C_G | \mathbf{X}_H; \phi_c) || p(C_G)).
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Since we build the content variational approximation in a non-linear manner with the Product of Normals or the Mixture of Normals methods, the gradients $\nabla_\theta \text{ELBO}(G; \theta, \phi_s, \phi_c)_H$ and $\nabla_{\phi_c} \text{ELBO}(G; \theta, \phi_s, \phi_c)_H$ do not decompose in an unbiased manner, i.e. by summing the gradient of subsampled groups we do not retrieve the gradient computed using the entire group. The resulting bias will depend on the method employed. For future work, we plan on analysing the effect of the bias. In detail we want to derive a manner to correct the bias and verify that the biased estimator do not over-estimate the true objective function, that is the sum of the groups Evidence Lower Bound.

7 Stochastic Variational Inference (SVI) Results

We show in Figure 5 the qualitative results of Stochastic Variational Inference (SVI) Hoffman et al. [2013] on the swapping evaluation. We see that while SVI disentangles the style and the content, but the resulting image quality is poor. In the case of MS-Celeb-1M, we trained SVI for twice the number of epochs of the other models, that is in total 500 epochs, the training objective to maximise, that is the average group Evidence Lower Bound, remains lower than the ML-VAE model at the end of the training. This is because SVI does not share the parameters ϕ_c, ϕ_s among observations at training, hence take a longer time to train. It is the first disadvantage of SVI compared to VAE-based model. At test-time, the SVI model requires expensive iterative inference. In the case of MS-Celeb-1M we used 200 epochs of test inference, it is possible that more epochs of test-time inference would have lead to better quality images but this already shows the limits of non-amortised variational inference and the advantages of the ML-VAE. We see that while SVI disentangles the style and the content, but the resulting image quality is poor.




Figure 5: Stochastic Variational Inference (SVI) Hoffman et al. [2013] qualitative results. Swapping, first row and first column are test data samples (green boxes), second row and column are reconstructed samples (blue boxes) and the rest are swapped reconstructed samples (red boxes). Each row is fixed style and each column is a fixed content. Best viewed in color on screen.

8 Other Formulations Explored

We explored other possible formulations and we detail them here for the interested reader, along with the reasons for which we did not pursue them.

SVI-Encode. We explained the disadvantages of Stochastic Variational Inference (SVI), see Hoffman et al. [2013]. In order to remove the need for costly inference at test-time, we tried training an encoder to model the variational approximation of the latent representation C, S corresponding to the generative model of the trained SVI model. We do not use training data but generated observations, sampling the latent representation from the prior. The encoder does not have any group information, and each sample has a separate content and style latent representation C_i, S_i . The model maximises the log-likelihood of the generative model under the latent code representation.

$$\sum_{i \in N} \mathbb{E}_{q(C_i, S_i | X_i; \phi)} [\log p(X_i | C_i, S_i, \theta)] \quad (17)$$

where $p(X_i | C_i, S_i, \theta)$ is the distribution corresponding to the generative model and $q(C_i, S_i | X_i; \phi)$ is the variational approximation. We refer to this method as SVI-Encode. The qualitative quality of this model on test samples is highly dependent on the quality of the generative model. Therefore it gives satisfactory qualitative results on MNIST, but poor qualitative results on MS-Celeb-1M where the qualitative results of SVI are not satisfactory. However, we think that a model trained alternatively between SVI and this SVI-Encode could benefit from the disentanglement power of SVI and amortised inference at test-time. We leave this for possible future work.

Regularising the objective. A possible formulation of the problem is to employ a regular VAE with an additional term to enforce observations within a group to have similar variational approximations of the content. This model separates the latent representation of the style, S and the latent representation of the content C but each observation X_i within a group has its own latent variables S_i and C_i . The sharing of the content within a group is enforced by adding a penalisation term based on a symmetrised Kullback-Leibler divergence between the content latent representation of the observations belonging to the same group. The resulting model maximises the objective³

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}_{q(C_i, S_i | X_i; \phi)} [\log p(X_i | C_i, S_i, \theta)] \\
& - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}|} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{KL}(q(S_i | X_i; \phi_s) || p(S_i)) - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}|} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{KL}(q(C_i | X_i; \phi_c) || p(C_i)) \\
& - \frac{\lambda}{|\mathcal{G}|} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{|G|/2} \sum_{\substack{i \in [1, |G|/2], \\ \text{s.t. } X_{2i} \in G, X_{2i+1} \in G}} \frac{1}{2} \left[\text{KL}(q(C_{2i} | X_{2i}, \phi_c) || q(C_{2i+1} | X_{2i+1}, \phi_c)) \right. \\
& \left. + \text{KL}(q(C_{2i+1} | X_{2i+1}, \phi_c) || q(C_{2i} | X_{2i}, \phi_c)) \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where λ is an hyper-parameter to cross-validate. In our experiment, the drawback of this model is that if the latent representation size is too large (in detail, with the size 100 used in our experiments for MS-Celeb-1M), the model sets the content latent representation to the prior $p(C)$ in order to encounter a null penalty. The observations are encoded in the style latent representation only. This is a known problem of VAE, see Chen et al. [2017]. On the opposite, the ML-VAE model is more robust to this problem.

³The equation was corrected compared to the submitted version.

References

- Xi Chen, Diederik P. Kingma, Tim Salimans, Yan Duan, Prafulla Dhariwal, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Pieter Abbeel. Variational lossy autoencoder. *ICLR*, 2017.
- Yandong Guo, Lei Zhang, Yuxiao Hu, Xiaodong He, and Jianfeng Gao. MS-Celeb-1M: A dataset and benchmark for large scale face recognition. *ECCV*, 2016.
- Matthew D. Hoffman, David M. Blei, Chong Wang, and John Paisley. Stochastic variational inference. *JMLR*, 2013.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *ICLR*, 2015.
- Yann Lecun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, pages 2278–2324, 1998.