Disentangled Representation Learning

2020.5.21

Seung-Hoon Na
Jeonbuk National University

Contents

- Generative models
- Supervised disentangled representation
- Unsupervised disentangled representation
- Adversarial disentangled representation
- Methods
  - DC-IGN (Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network)
  - DisBM
  - β-VAE
  - Independently Controllable Factors
  - InfoGAN

Reference

- Transforming Auto-encoders [Hinton et al ‘11]
- Learning to Disentangle Factors of Variation with Manifold Interaction [Reed et al ’14]
- Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al ‘15]
- Bayesian representation learning with oracle constraints [Karaletsos et al ‘16]
- InfoGAN: Interpretable Representation Learning by Information Maximizing Generative Adversarial Nets [Chen et al ‘16]
- Independently Controllable Factors [Thomas et al ’17]
- β-VAE: Learning Basic Visual Concepts with a Constrained Variational Framework [Higgins et al ‘17]
- SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al ‘18]
- Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al ‘18]
- Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih ‘18]
- Understanding disentangling in β-VAE [Burgess et al ‘18]
- Emergence of Invariance and Disentanglement in Deep Representations [Achille & Soatto ’18]
- Towards a Definition of Disentangled Representations [Higgins et al ’18]
- Variational Autoencoders Pursue PCA Directions (by Accident) [Rolinek et al ’19]
- Challenging Common Assumptions in the Unsupervised Learning of Disentangled Representations [Locatello et al ‘19]
- Unsupervised Model Selection for Variational Disentangled Representation Learning [Duan et al’ 20]

Representation Learning

- Deep learning approach
  - Learn multiple layers of representation of data
  - Issue: Characterizing the optimal representation of data ➔ what characterizes a good representation?
    - [Cohen et al ’14] propose a theoretical framework to learn irreducible representations having both invariances and equivariances, from the perspective of Lie group theory
  - Desiderata for good representations
    - Invariance, meaningfulness of representations, abstraction, and disentanglement

https://arxiv.org/pdf/1503.03167.pdf

Disentangled Representation Learning

- Disentangled Representation [Bengio ‘13]
  - One for which changes in the encoded data are sparse over real-world transformations
  - Changes in only a few latents at a time should be able to represent sequences which are likely to happen in the real world

https://arxiv.org/pdf/1503.03167.pdf

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- The "vision as inverse graphics" for disentangled representation learning
  - Computer graphics consists of a function to go from compact descriptions of scenes (the graphics code) to images
  - Graphics codes conveniently align with the properties of an ideal representation
    - The graphics code is typically disentangled
      - To allow for rendering scenes with fine-grained control over transformations such as object location, pose, lighting, texture, and shape
    - This encoding is designed to easily and interpretably represent sequences of real data so that common transformations may be compactly represented in software code

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Present an approach for learning interpretable graphics codes
  - for complex transformations such as out-of-plane rotations and lighting variations.
  - Given a set of images, use a hybrid encoder-decoder model to learn a representation that is disentangled with respect to various transformations such as object out-of-plane rotations and lighting variations
  - Use variational auto-encoder, based on a deep directed graphical model with many layers of convolution and de-convolution operators

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Propose a training procedure to encourage each group of neurons in the graphics code layer to distinctly represent a specific transformation
  - To learn a disentangled representation, train using data where each mini-batch has a set of active and inactive transformations, but we do not provide target values as in supervised learning; the objective function remains reconstruction quality.
    - E.g.) a nodding face would have the 3D elevation transformation active but its shape, texture and other affine transformations would be inactive
  - Exploit this type of training data to force chosen neurons in the graphics code layer to specifically represent **active transformations**, thereby automatically creating a disentangled representation

➔ Given a single face image, the model can regenerate the input image with a different pose and lighting

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]



- In order to learn parameters in DC-IGN, gradients are back-propagated using stochastic gradient descent using the following variational object function

$$-log(P(x|z_i)) + KL(Q(z_i|x)||P(z_i))$$

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Encoder network
  - Captures distribution over graphics codes Z given data x
  - Z: a disentangled representation containing a factored set of latent variables $z_i \in Z$ such as pose, light and shape

$$Z = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{z}_1 & \mathbf{z}_2 & \mathbf{z}_3 & \mathbf{z}_{[4,n]} \\ \hline \end{array}$$

corresponds to ϕ α $\phi_{\mathbf{L}}$ intrinsic properties (shape, texture, etc)

- Decoder network
  - Learns a conditional distribution to produce an approximation $\hat{x}$ given Z

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Encoder
  - Encoder output: $y_e = encoder(x)$
  - Variational approximation: $Q(z_i|y_e)$
    - chosen to be a multivariate normal distribution
  - Model parameters: W that connects y_e & z_i
  - The distribution parameters $\theta = (\mu_{z_i}, \Sigma_{z_i})$ and latents Z can then be expressed as:



$$\mu_{z_i} = W_e * y_e$$
$$\Sigma_{z_i} = \text{diag}(\exp(W_e * y_e))$$
$$\forall i, z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{z_i}, \Sigma_{z_i})$$

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Training with Specific Transformations
  - Goal: Learn a representation of the data which consists of disentangled and semantically interpretable latent variables
  - Keep only a small subset of the latent variables to change for sequences of inputs corresponding to real-world events
  - **Structure of the target representation vector**
    - Deconstruct a face image by splitting it into variables for pose, light, and shape as in graphics engines
      - Based on the target representation that is already designed for use in graphics engines

$$Z = \boxed{z_1 \mid z_2 \mid z_3 \mid z_{[4,n]}}$$

corresponds to ϕ α ϕ_L intrinsic properties (shape, texture, etc)

φ is the azimuth of the face, α is the elevation of the face with respect to the camera, and φ_L is the azimuth of the light source

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Training with Specific Transformations
  - Perform a training procedure which directly targets this definition of disentanglement
  - Data for Extrinsic variables; $z_{1,2,3}$
    - Organize our data into mini-batches corresponding to changes in only a single scene variable
      - E.g.) azimuth angle, elevation angle, azimuth angle of the light source
    - These are transformations which might occur in the real world
  - Data for Intrinsic variables; $z_{[4,200]}$
    - Generate mini-batches in which the three extrinsic scene variables are held fixed but all other properties of the face change
    - These batches consist of many different faces under the same viewing conditions and pose
    - These intrinsic properties of the model describe identity, shape, expression, etc.

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Training procedure based on VAE
  - 1. Select at random a latent variable z_{train} which we wish to correspond to one of {azimuth angle, elevation angle, azimuth of light source, intrinsic properties}.
  - 2. Select at random a mini-batch in which that only that variable changes.
  - 3. Show the network each example in the minibatch and capture its latent representation for that example z_k
  - 4. Calculate the average of those representation vectors over the entire batch.

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Training procedure based on VAE
  - 5. Before putting the encoder's output into the decoder, replace the values $z_i \neq z_{train}$ with their averages over the entire batch. These outputs are "clamped"
  - 6. Calculate reconstruction error and backpropagate as per VAE in the decoder
  - 7. Replace the gradients for the latents $z_i \neq z_{train}$ (the clamped neurons) with their difference from the mean. The gradient at z_{train} is passed through unchanged.
  - 8. Continue backpropagation through the encoder using the modified gradient

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Training on a minibatch in which only , the azimuth angle of the face, changes



During the forward step, the output from each component$z_1 \neq z_i$ of the encoder is altered to be the same for each sample in the batch. This reflects the fact that the generating variables of the image (e.g. the identity of the face) which correspond to the desired values of these latents are unchanged throughout the batch. By holding these outputs constant throughout the batch, the single neuron z1 is forced to explain all the variance within the batch, i.e. the full range of changes to the image caused by changing . During the backward step z1 is the only neuron which receives a gradient signal from the attempted reconstruction, and all $z_1 \neq z_i$ receive a signal which nudges them to be closer to their respective averages over the batch. During the complete training process, after this batch, another batch is selected at random; it likewise contains variations of only one of ϕ, α, ϕ_L; all neurons which do not correspond to the selected latent are clamped; and the training proceeds.

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Training procedure based on VAE
  - Ratio for batch types
    - Select the type of batch to use a ratio of about *1:1:1:10, azmuth:elevation:lighting:intrinsic*
  - Train both the encoder and decoder to represent certain properties of the data in a specific neuron
    - Decoder part: By clamping the output of all but one of the neurons, force the decoder to recreate all the variation in that batch using only the changes in that one neuron's value.
    - Encoder part: By clamping the gradients, train the encoder to put all the information about the variations in the batch into one output neuron.
  - So leads to networks whose latent variables have a strong equivariance with the corresponding generating parameters
    - allows the value of the true generating parameter (e.g. the true angle of the face) to be trivially extracted from the encoder.

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Invariance Targeting
  - By training with only one transformation at a time, we are encouraging certain neurons to contain specific information; this is equivariance
  - But, we also wish to explicitly discourage them from having other information; that is, we want them to be invariant to other transformations
    - This goal corresponds to having all but one of the output neurons of the encoder give the same output for every image in the batch.
  - To encourage this invariance, train all the neurons which correspond to the inactive transformations with an error gradient equal to their difference from the mean
    - This error gradient is seen as acting on the set of subvectors $z_{inactive}$ from the encoder for each input in the batch
    - Each of these $z_{inactive}$'s will be pointing to a close-together but not identical point in a high-dimensional space; the invariance training signal will push them all closer together

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Experiment results

  Manipulating pose variables: Qualitative results showing the generalization capability of the learned DC-IGN decoder to rerender a single input image with different pose direction

change $z_{elevation}$ smoothly from -15 to 15,



change $z_{arimuth}$ smoothly from -15 to 15,



Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

Manipulating light variables: Qualitative results showing the generalization capability of the learnt DC-IGN decoder to render original static image with different light directions

Entangled versus disentangled representations.



using a normally-trained network



DC-IGN

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

Generalization of decoder to render images in novel viewpoints and lighting conditions:







All DC-IGN encoder networks reasonably predicts transformations from static test images

Sometimes, the encoder network seems to have learnt a switch node to separately process azimuth on left and right profile side of the face.

Deep Convolutional Inverse Graphics Network [Kullkarni et al '15]

- Chair Dataset

Manipulating rotation: Each row was generated by encoding the input image (leftmost) with the encoder, then changing the value of a single latent and putting this modified encoding through the decoder. The network has never seen these chairs before at any orientation.



InfoGAN: Interpretable Representation Learning by Information Maximizing Generative Adversarial Nets [Chen et al '16]

- DC-IGN: supervised disentangled representation learning
- InfoGAN: unsupervised disentangled representation learning
  - an information-theoretic extension to the Generative Adversarial Network
  - Learn disentangled representations in a completely unsupervised manner
  - Maximize the mutual information between a fixed small subset of the GAN's noise variables and the observations, which turns out to be relatively straightforward

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Generative adversarial networks (GAN)
  - Train deep generative models using a minimax game.
  - Learn a generator distribution $P_G(x)$ that matches the real data distribution $P_{data}(x)$
  - Learns a generator network G, such that G generates samples from the generator distribution P_G by transforming a noise variable $z \sim P_{noise}(z)$ into a sample $G(z)$
  - Minimax game
    - G is trained by playing against an adversarial discriminator network D that aims to distinguish between samples from the true data distribution P_{data} and the generator's distribution P_G.

$$\min_G \max_D V(D,G) = \mathbb{E}_{x\sim P_{\text{data}}}[\log D(x)] + \mathbb{E}_{z\sim \text{noise}}[\log(1 - D(G(z)))]$$

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Inducing Latent Codes
  - GAN uses a simple factored continuous input noise vector z, while imposing no restrictions on the manner in which the generator may use this noise
  - InfoGAN decompose the input noise vector into two parts
    - (i) z: Treated as source of incompressible noise;
    - (ii) c: the latent code and will target the salient structured semantic features of the data distribution
    - $c = [c_1, c_2, \cdots., c_L]$: the set of structured latent variables
      - In its simplest form, we may assume a factored distribution:

$$P(c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_L) = \prod_{i=1}^{L} P(c_i)$$

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Mutual Information for Inducing Latent Codes
  - $G(z, c)$: the generator network with both the incompressible noise z and the latent code c
  - However, in standard GAN, the generator is free to ignore the additional latent code c by finding a solution satisfying $P_G(x|c) = P_G(x)$
  - To cope with the problem of trivial codes, propose an information-theoretic regularization

    ➔ Make $I(c; G(z, c))$ high
    - There should be high mutual information between latent codes c and generator distribution $G(z, c)$

$$I(X;Y) = H(X) - H(X|Y) = H(Y) - H(Y|X)$$

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Variational Mutual Information Maximization
  - Hard to maximize directly as it requires access to the posterior $I\big(c; G(z,c)\big)$
  - Instead consider a lower bound of it by defining an auxiliary distribution $Q(c|x)$ to approximate $P(c|x)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
I(c; G(z,c)) &= H(c) - H(c|G(z,c)) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x\sim G(z,c)}[\mathbb{E}_{c'\sim P(c|x)}[\log P(c'|x)]] + H(c) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x\sim G(z,c)}[\underbrace{D_{\mathrm{KL}}(P(\cdot|x) \parallel Q(\cdot|x))}_{\geq 0} + \mathbb{E}_{c'\sim P(c|x)}[\log Q(c'|x)]] + H(c) \\
&\geq \mathbb{E}_{x\sim G(z,c)}[\mathbb{E}_{c'\sim P(c|x)}[\log Q(c'|x)]] + H(c)
\end{aligned}
$$

Variational Information Maximization

fixing the latent code distribution
➔treat H(c) as a constant

But we still need to be able to sample from the posterior in the inner expectation.

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Variational Mutual Information Maximization

Lemma 5.1 *For random variables X, Y and function $f(x, y)$ under suitable regularity conditions:* $\mathbb{E}_{x\sim X, y\sim Y|x}[f(x,y)] = \mathbb{E}_{x\sim X, y\sim Y|x, x'\sim X|y}[f(x',y)]$.

Proof.

$$\mathbb{E}_{x\sim X, y\sim Y|x}[f(x,y)] = \quad \text{make expectations explicit...}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{x\sim P(X)}\left[\mathbb{E}_{y\sim P(Y|X=x)}[f(x,y)]\right] = \quad \text{by definition of } P(Y|X=x)...$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,y\sim P(X,Y)}[f(x,y)] = \quad \text{by definition of } P(X|Y=y)... \ ...$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{y\sim P(Y)}\left[\mathbb{E}_{x\sim P(X|Y=y)}[f(x,y)]\right] = \quad \text{rename } x \text{ to } x'...$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{y\sim P(Y)}\left[\mathbb{E}_{x'\sim P(X|Y=y)}[f(x',y)]\right] = \quad \text{by the law of total expectation...}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{x\sim P(X)}\left[\mathbb{E}_{y\sim P(Y|X=x)}\left[\mathbb{E}_{x'\sim P(X|Y=y)}[f(x',y)]\right]\right] = \quad \text{make expectations implicit...}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{x\sim X, y\sim Y|x, x'\sim X|y}[f(x',y)]$$

http://aoliver.org/assets/correct-proof-of-infogan-lemma.pdf

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Variational Mutual Information Maximization
  - By using Lemma 5.1, we can define a variational lower bound, $L_I(G, Q)$, of the mutual information, $I(c;\ G(z, c))$

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_I(G, Q) &= E_{c\sim P(c), x\sim G(z,c)}[\log Q(c|x)] + H(c) \\
&= E_{x\sim G(z,c)}[\mathbb{E}_{c'\sim P(c|x)}[\log Q(c'|x)]] + H(c) \\
&\leq I(c; G(z, c))
\end{aligned}
$$

  - $L_I(G, Q)$ is easy to approximate with Monte Carlo simulation. In particular, L_I can be maximized w.r.t. Q directly and w.r.t. G via the reparametrization trick
    - $L_I(G, Q)$ can be added to GAN's objectives with no change to GAN's training procedure ➔ InfoGAN

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Variational Mutual Information Maximization
  - when the variational lower bound attains its maximum $L_I(G, Q)=H(c)$ for discrete latent codes, the bound becomes tight and the maximal mutual information is achieved
  - InfoGAN is defined as the following minimax game with a variational regularization of mutual information and a hyperparameter:

$$\min_{G,Q} \max_{D} V_{\mathrm{InfoGAN}}(D, G, Q) = V(D, G) - \lambda L_I(G, Q)$$

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Experiments: Mutual Information Maximization
  - Train InfoGAN on MNIST dataset with a uniform categorical distribution on latent codes $c \sim \mathrm{Cat}(K = 10, p = 0.1)$



the lower bound $L_I\ (G, Q)$ is quickly maximized to $H(c) \approx 2.30$

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - Model the latent codes with
    - 1) one categorical code: $c_1 \sim \mathrm{Cat}(K = 10, p = 0.1)$
    - 2) two continuous codes: $c_2, c_3 \sim \mathrm{Unif}(-1, 1)$

(a) Varying c_1 on InfoGAN (Digit type)

(b) Varying c_1 on regular GAN (No clear meaning)

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - Model the latent codes with
    - 1) one categorical code: $c_1 \sim \text{Cat}(K = 10, p = 0.1)$
    - 2) two continuous codes: $c_2, c_3 \sim \text{Unif}(-1, 1)$

(c) Varying c_2 from -2 to 2 on InfoGAN (Rotation)

(d) Varying c_3 from -2 to 2 on InfoGAN (Width)

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - On the face datasets, InfoGAN is trained with:
    - five continuous codes: $c_i \sim \text{Unif}(-1, 1)$ with $1 \leq i \leq 5$

(a) Azimuth (pose)

(b) Elevation

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - On the face datasets, InfoGAN is trained with:
    - five continuous codes: $c_i \sim \text{Unif}(-1, 1)$ with $1 \leq i \leq 5$

(c) Lighting

(d) Wide or Narrow

InfoGAN [Chen et al ‘16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - On the chairs dataset, InfoGAN is trained with:
    - Four categorical codes: $c_{1,2,3,4} \sim \mathrm{Cat}(K = 20, p = 0.05)$
    - One continuous code: $c_5 \sim \mathrm{Unif}(-1, 1)$

(a) Rotation

(b) Width

InfoGAN [Chen et al ‘16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - InfoGAN on the Street View House Number (SVHN):
    - Four 10−dimensional categorical variables and two uniform continuous variables as latent codes.

(a) Continuous variation: Lighting

(b) Discrete variation: Plate Context

InfoGAN [Chen et al ‘16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - InfoGAN on CelebA
    - the latent variation as 10 uniform categorical variables, each of dimension 10

(a) Azimuth (pose)

a categorical code can capture the azimuth of face by discretizing this variation of continuous nature

(b) Presence or absence of glasses

a subset of the categorical code is devoted to signal the presence of glasses

InfoGAN [Chen et al '16]

- Experiments: Disentangled representation learning
  - InfoGAN on CelebA
    - the latent variation as 10 uniform categorical variables, each of dimension 10

(c) Hair style

(d) Emotion

shows variation in hair style, roughly ordered from less hair to more hair

shows change in emotion, roughly ordered from stern to happy

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- InfoGAN for disentangled representation learning
  - Based on maximising the mutual information between a subset of latent variables and observations within GAN
  - Limitation
    - The reliance of InfoGAN on the GAN framework comes at the cost of training instability and reduced sample diversity
    - Requires some a priori knowledge of the data, since its performance is sensitive to the choice of the prior distribution and the number of the regularised noise latents
    - Lacks a principled inference network (although the implementation of the information maximisation objective can be implicitly used as one)
      - The ability to infer the posterior latent distribution from sensory input is important when using the unsupervised model in transfer learning or zero-shot inference scenarios

➔ Requires a principled way of using unsupervised learning for developing more human-like learning and reasoning in algorithms

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Necessity for disentanglement metric
  - No method for quantifying the degree of learnt disentanglement currently exists
  - No way to quantitatively compare the degree of disentanglement achieved by different models or when optimising the hyperparameters of a single model.

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- β-VAE
  - A deep unsupervised generative approach for disentangled factor learning
    - Can automatically discover the independent latent factors of variation in unsupervised data
  - Based on the variational autoencoder (VAE) framework
  - Augment the original VAE framework with a single hyperparameter β that controls the extent of learning constraints applied to the model.
    - β-VAE with β = 1 corresponds to the original VAE framework

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- $\mathcal{D} = \{X, V, W\}$ the set of images $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$
  - Two sets of ground truth data generative factors
    - $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^K$: conditionally independent factors

$$log\, p(\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{x}) = \sum_k log\, p(v_k|\mathbf{x})$$

    - $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^H$: conditionally dependent factors

  - Assume that the images $\boldsymbol{x}$ are generated by the true world simulator using the corresponding ground truth data generative factors:

$$p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{Sim}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$$

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- The β-VAE objective function for an unsupervised deep generative model
  - Using samples from $\boldsymbol{X}$ only, can learn the joint distribution of the data $\boldsymbol{x}$ and a set of generative latent factors $\boldsymbol{z}$ such that $\boldsymbol{z}$ can generate the observed data $\boldsymbol{x}$

$$p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}) \approx p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{Sim}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})$$

  - The objective: Maximize the marginal (log-)likelihood of the observed data $\boldsymbol{x}$ in expectation over the whole distribution of latent factors $\boldsymbol{z}$

$$\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{p_\theta(\mathbf{z})}\left[p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})\right]$$

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- For a given observation $\boldsymbol{x}$, $q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$: a probability distribution for the inferred posterior configurations of the latent factors $\boldsymbol{z}$

- The formulation for β-VAE
  - Ensure that the inferred latent factors $q_\phi(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x})$ capture the generative factors $\boldsymbol{v}$ in a disentangled manner
  - Here, the conditionally dependent data generative factors $\boldsymbol{w}$ can remain entangled in a separate subset of $\boldsymbol{z}$ that is not used for representing $\boldsymbol{v}$

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- The formulation for β-VAE
  - The constraint for $q_\phi(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x})$
    - Match $q_\phi(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x})$ to a prior $p(\boldsymbol{z})$ that can both control the capacity of the latent information bottleneck, and embodies the desiderata of statistical independence mentioned above
    - So set the prior to be an isotropic unit Gaussian

$$p(\mathbf{z}) = \mathcal{N}(0, I)$$

$$\max_{\phi,\theta} \mathbb{E}_{x\sim\mathbf{D}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})]\right]$$

$$\text{subject to } D_{KL}(q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})||p(\mathbf{z})) < \epsilon$$

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- The formulation for β-VAE
  - Re-written as a Lagrangian under the KKT conditions:

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta, \phi, \beta; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})] - \beta \left(D_{KL}(q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})||p(\mathbf{z})) - \epsilon\right)$$

The regularisation coefficient that constrains the capacity of the latent information channel z and puts implicit independence pressure on the learnt posterior due to the isotropic nature of the Gaussian prior p(z).

  - Now, the β -VAE formulation:

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta, \phi, \beta; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \geq \mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \beta) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})] - \beta\, D_{KL}(q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})||p(\mathbf{z}))$$

Varying β changes the degree of applied learning pressure during training, thus encouraging different learnt representations

β = 1 corresponds to the original VAE formulation

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta, \phi, \beta; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \geq \mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \beta) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})] - \beta\, D_{KL}(q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})||p(\mathbf{z}))$$

- The β-VAE hypothesis: Higher values of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ should encourage learning a disentangled representation of $\boldsymbol{v}$
  - The D_{KL} term encourages conditional independence in $q_\varphi(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x})$
    - The data $\boldsymbol{x}$ is generated using at least some conditionally independent ground truth factors $\boldsymbol{v}$
- Tradeoff b/w reconstruction and disentanglement
  - Under β values, there is a trade-off between reconstruction fidelity and the quality of disentanglement within the learnt latent representations
  - Disentangled representations emerge when the right balance is found between information preservation (reconstruction cost as regularisation) and latent channel capacity restriction (β > 1).
  - The latent channel capacity restriction can lead to poorer reconstructions due to the loss of high frequency details when passing through a constrained latent bottleneck

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

$$\mathcal{F}(\theta, \phi, \beta; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \geq \mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \beta) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})] - \beta \, D_{KL}(q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})||p(\mathbf{z}))$$

- Given this tradeoff, the log likelihood of the data under the learnt model: a poor metric for evaluating disentangling in β-VAEs
- So, we need a quantitative metric that directly measures the degree of learnt disentanglement in the latent representation
- Additional advantage of using disentanglement metric
  - We can not learn the optimal value of β directly, but instead estimate it using either the proposed disentanglement metric or through visual inspection heuristics

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Assumption for disentanglement metric
  - The data generation process uses a number of data generative factors, some of which are conditionally independent, and we also assume that they are interpretable
- There may be a tradeoff b/w independence and interpretability
  - A representation consisting of independent latents is not necessarily disentangled
    - Independence can readily be achieved by a variety of approaches (such as PCA or ICA) that learn to project the data onto independent bases
    - Representations learnt by such approaches do not in general align with the data generative factors and hence may lack interpretability
  - A simple cross-correlation calculation between the inferred latents would not suffice as a disentanglement metric.

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Disentangling metric
  - The goal is to measure both the independence and interpretability (due to the use of a simple classifier) of the inferred latents
  - Based on Fix-generate-encode
    - (Fix) Fix the value of one data generative factor while randomly sampling all others
    - (Generate) Generate a number of images using those generative factor
    - (Encode) Run inference on generated images
    - (Check variance) Assumption on variance: there will be less variance in the inferred latents that correspond to the fixed generative factor.
    - (Disentanglement metric score)
      - Use a low capacity linear classifier to identify this factor and report the accuracy value as the final disentanglement metric score
      - Smaller variance in the latents corresponding to the target factor will make the job of this classifier easier, resulting in a higher score under the metric

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Disentanglement metric



Over a batch of L samples, each pair of images has a fixed value for one target generative factor y (here y = scale) and differs on all others

A linear classifier is then trained to identify the target factor using the average pairwise difference z^b_{diff} in the latent space over L samples.

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Disentangling metric
  - Given $\mathcal{D} = \{X, V, W\}$, assumed to contain a balanced distribution of ground truth factors $(\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w})$
  - Images data points are obtained using a ground truth simulator process $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbf{Sim}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$
  - Assume we are given labels identifying a subset of the independent data generative factors $\boldsymbol{v} \in V$ for at least some instances
  - Then construct a batch of B vectors $\mathbf{z}_{\text{diff}}^{b}$, to be fed as inputs to a linear classifier

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Disentangling metric

1. Choose a factor $y \sim Unif[1...K]$ (e.g. $y = scale$ in Fig. 5)

2. For a batch of L samples:

(a) Sample two sets of latent representations, $\mathbf{v}_{1,l}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{2,l}$, enforcing $[\mathbf{v}_{1,l}]_k = [\mathbf{v}_{2,l}]_k$ if $k = y$ (so that the value of factor $k = y$ is kept *fixed*).

(b) Simulate image $\mathbf{x}_{1,l} \sim \mathbf{Sim}(\mathbf{v_{1,l}})$, then infer $\mathbf{z}_{1,l} = \mu(\mathbf{x}_{1,l})$, using the encoder $q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}) \sim N(\mu(\mathbf{x}), \sigma(\mathbf{x}))$.
Repeat the process for $\mathbf{v}_{2,l}$.

For ensuring $[\mathbf{z}^b_{\text{diff}}]_y < [\mathbf{z}^b_{\text{diff}}]_{\{\setminus y\}}$

(c) Compute the difference $\mathbf{z}^l_{\text{diff}} = |\mathbf{z}_{1,l} - \mathbf{z}_{2,l}|$, the absolute linear difference between the inferred latent representations.

3. Use the average $\mathbf{z}^b_{\text{diff}} = \frac{1}{L}\sum_{l=1}^{L} \mathbf{z}^l_{\text{diff}}$ to predict $p(y|\mathbf{z}^b_{\text{diff}})$ (again, $y = scale$ in Fig. 5) and report the accuracy of this predictor as **disentangement metric score**.

The classifier's goal is to predict the index y of the generative factor that was kept fixed for a given $\boldsymbol{z}^l_{diff}$.

choose a linear classifier with low VC-dimension in order to ensure it has no capacity to perform nonlinear disentangling by itself

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

Manipulating latent variables on celebA: Qualitative results comparing disentanglin
performance of β-VAE (β = 250), VAE, InfoGAN

Latent code traversal: The traversal of a single latent variable while keeping others fixed to either their inferred



β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Manipulating latent variables on 3D chairs: Qualitative results comparing disentangling performance of β-VAE (β = 5), VAE(β = 1), InfoGAN, DC-GAN



Only β-VAE learnt about the unlabelled factor of chair leg style

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Manipulating latent variables on 3D faces: Qualitative results comparing disentangling performance of β-VAE (β = 20), VAE(β = 1), InfoGAN, DC-GAN



β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Latent factors learnt by β-VAE on celebA

  Traversal of individual latents demonstrates that β-VAE discovered in an unsupervised manner factors that encode skin colour, transition from an elderly male to younger female, and image saturation

(a) Skin colour

(b) Age/gender



(c) Image saturation



β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Disentanglement metric classification accuracy for 2D shapes dataset: Accuracy for different models and training regimes

Model	Disentanglement metric score
Ground truth	*100%*
Raw pixels	$45.75 \pm 0.8\%$
PCA	$84.9 \pm 0.4\%$
ICA	$42.03 \pm 10.6\%$
DC-IGN	$\mathbf{99.3 \pm 0.1\%}$
InfoGAN	$73.5 \pm 0.9\%$
VAE untrained	$44.14 \pm 2.5\%$
VAE	$61.58 \pm 0.5\%$
β-VAE	$\mathbf{99.23 \pm 0.1\%}$

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Disentanglement metric classification accuracy for 2D shapes dataset: Positive correlation is present between the size of z and the optimal normalised values of β for disentangled factor learning for a fixed β-VAE architecture

β values are normalised by latent z size M and input x size N





Good reconstructions are associated with entangled representations (lower disentanglement scores). Disentangled representations (high disentanglement scores) often result in blurry reconstructions

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

- Disentanglement metric classification accuracy for 2D shapes dataset: Positive correlation is present between the size of z and the optimal normalised values of β for disentangled factor learning for a fixed β-VAE architecture



Some of the observations from the results

When β is too low or too high the model learns an entangled latent representation due to either too much or too little capacity in the latent z bottleneck

in general β > 1 is necessary to achieve good disentanglement, However if β is too high and the resulting capacity of the latent channel is lower than the number of data generative factors, then the learnt representation necessarily has to be entangled

VAE reconstruction quality is a poor indicator of learnt disentanglement

Good disentangled representations often lead to blurry reconstructions due to the restricted capacity of the latent information channel z, while entangled representations often result in the sharpest reconstructions

β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]

Representations learnt by a β-VAE (β = 4)



β-VAE [Higgins et al '17]



Understanding disentangling in β-VAE [Burgess et al '18]

- Information bottleneck
  - The β-VAE objective is closely related to the information bottleneck principle

a Lagrange multiplie

$$\max[I(Z;Y) - \beta I(X;Z)]$$

  - Maximise the mutual information between the latent bottleneck Z and the task Y
    - While discarding all the irrelevant information about Y that might be present in the input X
  - Y would typically stand for a classification task

Understanding disentangling in β-VAE [Burgess et al '18]

- β-VAE through the information bottleneck perspective
  - The learning of the latent representation z in β-VAE: The posterior distribution $q(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x})$ as an information bottleneck for the reconstruction task $\max E_{q(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x})}\left[\log p(\boldsymbol{x}|\boldsymbol{z})\right]$
  - $D_{KL}\left(q_{\phi}(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x})||\, p(\boldsymbol{z})\right)$ of the β-VAE objective
    - Can be seen as an upper bound on the amount of information that can be transmitted through the latent channels per data sample
    - $D_{KL}\left(q_{\phi}(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x})||\, p(\boldsymbol{z})\right) = 0$ when $q(z_i|\boldsymbol{x}) = p(\boldsymbol{z})$; the latent channels z_i have zero capacity (μ_i is always zero, and σ_i always 1)
    - The capacity of the latent channels can only be increased (i.e., increase the KL divergence term) by
      - 1) dispersing the posterior means across the data points, or 2) decreasing the posterior variances

Understanding disentangling in β-VAE [Burgess et al '18]

- β-VAE through the IB perspective
  - Reconstructing under Information bottleneck ➔ embedding reflects locality in data space
    - Reconstructing under this bottleneck encourages embedding the data points on a set of representational axes where nearby points on the axes are also close in data space
    - The KL can be minimised by reducing the spread of the posterior means, or broadening the posterior variances, i.e.

      by squeezing the posterior distributions into a shared coding space

Understanding disentangling in β-VAE [Burgess et al '18]

- Reconstructing under IB ➔ embedding reflects locality in data space

Connecting posterior overlap with minimizing the KL divergence and reconstruction error.



Broadening the posterior distributions and/or bringing their means closer together will tend to reduce the KL divergence with the prior, which both increase the overlap between them

But, a datapoint $\tilde{x}$ sampled from the distribution $q(z_2|x_2)$ is more likely to be confused with a sample from $q(z_1|x_1)$ as the overlap between them increases.

Hence, ensuring neighbouring points in data space are also represented close together in latent space will tend to reduce the log likelihood cost of this confusion

Understanding disentangling in β-VAE [Burgess et al '18]

- Comparing disentangling in β-VAE and VAE

  β-VAE represention exhibits the locality property since small steps in each of the two learnt directions in the latent space result in small changes in the reconstructions

  The VAE represention, however, exhibits fragmentation in this locality property



Understanding disentangling in β-VAE [Burgess et al '18]

- β-VAE aligns latent dimensions with components that make different contributions to reconstruction
  - β-VAE finds latent components which make different contributions to the log-likelihood term of the cost function
    - These latent components tend to correspond to features in the data that are intuitively qualitatively different, and therefore may align with the generative factors in the data
  - E.g.) The dSprites dataset
    - Position makes the most gain at first:
      - Intuitively, when optimising a pixel-wise decoder log likelihood, information about position will result in the most gains compared to information about any of the other factors of variation in the data
    - Other factors such as sprite scale make further improvement in log likelihood if the more capacity is available:
      - If the capacity of the information bottleneck were gradually increased, the model would continue to utilise those extra bits for an increasingly precise encoding of position, until some point of diminishing returns is reached for position information, where a larger improvement can be obtained by encoding and reconstructing another factor of variation in the dataset, such as sprite scale.

Understanding disentangling in ß-VAE [Burgess et al '18]

- β-VAE aligns latent dimensions with components that make different contributions to reconstruction
  - Simple test: generate dSprites conditioned on the ground-truth factors, **f**, with a controllable information bottleneck
    - To evaluate how much information the model would choose to retain about each factor in order to best reconstruct the corresponding images given a total capacity constraint
    - The factors are each independently scaled by a learnable parameter, and are subject to independently scaled additive noise (also learned): $\sigma f_i + \mu$
    - The training objective combined maximising the log likelihood and minimising the absolute deviation from C

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{f}), \mathbf{z}, C) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{f})}[\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})] - \gamma \left| D_{KL}\left(q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{f}) \parallel p(\mathbf{z})\right) - C \right|$$

    - A single model was trained across of range of C's by linearly increasing it from a low value (0.5 nats) to a high value (25.0 nats) over the course of training

Understanding disentangling in ß-VAE [Burgess et al ‘18]

Utilisation of data generative factors as a function of coding capacity

the early capacity is allocated to positional latents only (x and y), followed by a scale latent, then shape and orientation latents



Understanding disentangling in ß-VAE [Burgess et al ‘18]

Utilisation of data generative factors as a function of coding capacity

at 3.1 nats only location of the sprite is reconstructed. At 7.3 nats the scale is also added reconstructed, then shape identity (15.4 nats) and finally rotation (23.8 nats), at which point reconstruction quality is high



Understanding disentangling in ß-VAE [Burgess et al '18]

- Improving disentangling in β-VAE with controlled capacity increase
  - Extend β-VAE: by gradually adding more latent encoding capacity, enabling progressively more factors of variation to be represented whilst retaining disentangling in previously learned factors
  - Apply the capacity control objective from the ground-truth generator in the previous section to β-VAE,
    - Allowing control of the encoding capacity (again, via a target KL, C) of the VAE's latent bottleneck:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, C) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})] - \gamma \left| D_{KL}\left(q_\phi(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}) \parallel p(\mathbf{z})\right) - C \right|$$

    - Similar to the generator model, C is gradually increased from zero to a value large enough to produce good quality reconstruction

Understanding disentangling in β-VAE [Burgess et al '18]

- Disentangling and reconstructions from β-VAE with controlled capacity increase





SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al '18]

- Motivation
  - An important step towards bridging the gap between human and artificial intelligence is endowing algorithms with compositional concepts
  - Compositionality
    - Allows for reuse of a finite set of primitives (addressing the data efficiency and human supervision issues) across many scenarios
      - By recombining them to produce an exponentially large number of novel yet coherent and potentially useful concepts (addressing the overfitting problem).
    - At the core of such human abilities as creativity, imagination and language-based communication
- SCAN (Symbol-Concept Association Network)
  - View concepts as abstractions over a set of primitives.
  - A new framework for learning such abstractions in the visual domain.
  - Learns concepts through fast symbol association, grounding them in disentangled visual primitives that are discovered in an unsupervised manner

SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al '18]

- Schematic of an implicit concept hierarchy built upon a subset of four visual primitives: object identity (I), object colour (O), floor colour (F) and wall colour (W) (other visual primitives necessary to generate the scene are ignored in this example)



Each node in this hierarchy is defined as a subset of visual primitives that make up the scene in the input image

Each parent concept is abstraction (i.e. a subset) over its children and over the original set of visual primitives

SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al '18]

- Formalising concepts
  - Concepts are abstractions over visual representational primitives
  - $(Z_1, \cdots, Z_K) \in R^K$: the visual representations (a K-dimensional visual representation space)
  - Z_k: a random variable
  - $\{1, \cdots, K\}$: the set of indices of the independent latent factors sufficient to generate the visual input
  - a concept C_i: a set of assignments of probability distributions to the random variables Z_k

$$C_i = \{(k, p_k^i(Z_k)) \mid k \in S_i\}$$

  - $S_i \subseteq \{1, ..., K\}$: the set of visual latent primitives that are relevant to concept C_i
  - $p_k^i(Z_k)$: a probability distribution specified for the visual latent factor represented by the random variable Z_k

SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al '18]

- Formalising concepts
  - $\{p_k(Z_k)|k \in \overline{S_i}\}$: Assignments to visual latent primitives that are irrelevant to the concept C_i
    - $\overline{S_i} = \{1, ..., K\} \setminus S_i$: the set of visual latent primitives that are irrelevant to the concept C_i .

$$p_k(Z_k) = \mathcal{N}(0, 1),\ \forall k \in \overline{S_i}$$

  - Simplified notations

$$\{\ (size,\ p(Z_{size} = \text{small})),\ (colour,\ p(Z_{colour} = \text{blue}))\ \}$$

{small, blue} or {small, blue, _, _}

SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al '18]

- Formalising concepts
  - $C_1 \subset C_2$: C_1 is superordinate to C_2
    - C_2 is subordinate to C_1
  - $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$: Two concepts C_1 and C_2 are orthogonal
  - $C_1 \cup C_2$: The conjunction of two orthogonal concepts

    {small, _, _} AND {_, round, _}
    = {small,round, _}
  - $C_1 \cap C_2$: The overlap of two non-orthogonal concepts C_1 and C_2

    {small, round, _} IN COMMON {_, round, red}
    = {_, round, _})
  - $C_2 \backslash C_1$: The difference between two concepts C_1 and C_2

    {small,round, _} IGNORE {_, round, _}
    = {small, _, _}

SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al '18]

- Model architecture
  - **Learning visual representational primitives**
    - β-VAE ➔ however, the balance is often tipped too far away from reconstruction accuracy

$$\mathcal{L}_x(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_x, \beta) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{z}_x|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}_x)] - \beta\, D_{KL}\big(q_\phi(\mathbf{z}_x|\mathbf{x}) \parallel p(\mathbf{z}_x)\big)$$

Well chosen values of β (usually β > 1) result in more disentangled latent representations $\boldsymbol{z}_x$ by setting the right balance between reconstruction accuracy, latent channel capacity and independence constraints to encourage disentangling

- β-VAE$_{DAE}$

$$\mathcal{L}_x(\theta, \phi; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_x, \beta) = -\mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{z}_x|\mathbf{x})} \|J(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - J(\mathbf{x})\|_2^2 - \beta\, D_{KL}\big(q_\phi(\mathbf{z}_x|\mathbf{x}) \parallel p(\mathbf{z}_x)\big)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} \sim p_\theta(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}_x) \qquad J : \mathbb{R}^{W \times H \times C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$$

J: the function that maps images from pixel space with dimensionality Width × Height × Channels to a high-level feature space with dimensionality N given by a stack of DAE layers up to a certain layer depth (a hyperparameter)

SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al '18]

β-VAE$_{\text{DAE}}$ model architecture



SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al '18]

- Model architecture
  - **Learning visual concepts**



SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al '18]

- **Learning visual concepts**
  - The latent space $\boldsymbol{z}_y$ of SCAN : The space of concepts
  - The latent space $\boldsymbol{z}_x$ of β-VAE: the space of visual primitives
  - Learn visually grounded abstractions
    - The grounding is performed by minimizing the KL divergence between the two distributions
    - Both spaces are parametrised as multivariate Gaussian distributions with diagonal covariance matrices: $\dim(\boldsymbol{z}_y)= \dim(\boldsymbol{z}_x)$=K
  - Choose the forward KL divergence $D_{KL}\left(q(\mathbf{z}_x) \parallel q(\mathbf{z}_y)\right)$
    - The abstraction step corresponds to setting SCAN latents z_y^k corresponding to the relevant factors to narrow distributions,
    - While defaulting those corresponding to the irrelevant factors to the wider unit Gaussian prior

SCAN [Higgins et al '18]

- **Learning visual concepts**



Mode coverage of the extra KL term of the SCAN loss function.

- Forward KL divergence $D_{KL}(\boldsymbol{z_x}|\boldsymbol{z_y})$: Allows SCAN to learn abstractions (wide yellow distribution $\boldsymbol{z_y}$) over the visual primitives that are irrelevant to the meaning of a concept
- Blue modes corresponds to the inferred values of $\boldsymbol{z_x}$ for different visual examples matching symbol **y**

When presented with visual examples that have high variability for a particular generative factor, (e.g. various lighting conditions when viewing examples of apples), the forward KL allows SCAN to learn a broad distribution for the corresponding conceptual latent $q(z_y^k)$ that is close to the prior $p(z_y^k) = N(0,1)$

SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al '18]

- **Learning visual concepts**

$$\mathcal{L}_y(\theta_y, \phi_y; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_y, \beta, \lambda) = \mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi_y}(\mathbf{z}_y|\mathbf{y})}[\log p_{\theta_y}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{z}_y)]$$
$$- \beta\, D_{KL}\left(q_{\phi_y}(\mathbf{z}_y|\mathbf{y}) \parallel p(\mathbf{z}_y)\right)$$
$$- \lambda\, D_{KL}\left(q_{\phi_x}(\mathbf{z}_x|\mathbf{x}) \parallel q_{\phi_y}(\mathbf{z}_y|\mathbf{y})\right)$$

$\boldsymbol{y}$: symbol inputs

$\boldsymbol{z_y}$: the latent space of concepts

$\boldsymbol{z_x}$: the latent space of the pre-trained β-VAE containing the visual primitives which ground the abstract concepts $\boldsymbol{z_y}$

$\boldsymbol{x}$: example images that correspond to the concepts $\boldsymbol{z_y}$ activated by symbols $\boldsymbol{y}$

- Use k-hot encoding for the symbols $\boldsymbol{y}$
- Each concept is described in terms of the k ≤ K visual attributes it refers to
  - e.g.) an apple could be referred to by a 3-hot symbol "round, small, red"

SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al '18]

- **Learning visual concepts**
  - Once trained, SCAN allows for bi-directional inference and generation: **img2sym** and **sym2img**
  - Sym2img
    - Generate visual samples that correspond to a particular concept
    - 1) infer the concept $\boldsymbol{z}_y$ by presenting an appropriate symbol y to the inference network of SCAN
    - 2) Sample from the inferred concept $q_{\phi_y}(\mathbf{z}_y|\mathbf{y})$ and use the generative part of β-VAE to visualise the corresponding image samples $p_{\theta_x}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}_y)$

SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al '18]

- **Learning visual concepts**
  - Once trained, SCAN allows for bi-directional inference and generation: **img2sym** and **sym2img**
  - Img2sym
    - Infer a description of an image in terms of the different learnt concepts via their respective symbols
    - 1) An image x is presented to the inference network of the β-VAE to obtain its description in terms of the visual primitives $\boldsymbol{z}_x$
    - 2) Uses the generative part of the SCAN to sample descriptions $p_{\theta_y}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{z}_x)$ in terms of symbols that correspond to the previously inferred visual building $q_{\phi_x}(\mathbf{z}_x|\mathbf{x})$

SCAN [Higgins et al '18]

- **Learning concept recombination operators**
  - Logical concept manipulation operators AND, IN COMMON and IGNORE Seen as style transfer ops
    - implemented within a conditional convolutional module parametrized by ψ: $(\boldsymbol{z}_{y_1}, \boldsymbol{z}_{y_2}, \boldsymbol{r}) \rightarrow \boldsymbol{z}_r$
    - The convolutional module ψ
      - Accepts 1) two multivariate Gaussian distributions $\boldsymbol{z}_{y_1}$ and $\boldsymbol{z}_{y_2}$ corresponding to the two concepts that are to be recombined
        - » The input distributions $\boldsymbol{z}_{y_1}$ and $\boldsymbol{z}_{y_2}$ are inferred from the two corresponding input symbols y_1 and y_2, respectively, using a pre-trained SCAN
      - 2) a conditioning vector $\boldsymbol{r}$ specifying the recombination operator
        - » Use 1-hot encoding for the conditioning vector $\boldsymbol{r}$
        - » [1 0 0], [0 1 0] and [0 0 1] for AND, IN COMMON and IGNORE, respectively
      - Outputs $\boldsymbol{z}_r$
        - » The convolutional module strides over the parameters of each matching component z_{y1}^k and z_{y2}^k one at a time and outputs the corresponding parametrised component z_r^k of a recombined multivariate Gaussian distribution $\boldsymbol{z}_r$ with a diagonal covariance matrix

$\boldsymbol{r}$ effectively selects the appropriate trainable transformation matrix parametrised by ψ

SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al '18]

- **Learning concept recombination operators**
  - Trained by minimising:

$$\mathcal{L}_r(\psi; \mathbf{z}_x, \mathbf{z}_r) = D_{KL}\left[q_{\phi_x}(\mathbf{z}_x|\mathbf{x}_i) \,||\, q_\psi\left(\mathbf{z}_r \mid q_{\phi_y}(\mathbf{z}_{y_1}|\mathbf{y}_1), q_{\phi_y}(\mathbf{z}_{y_2}|\mathbf{y}_2), \mathbf{r}\right)\right]$$

The inferred latent distribution of the β-VAE given a seed image $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ that matches the specified symbolic description

The resulting $\boldsymbol{z}_r$ lives in the same space as $\boldsymbol{z}_y$ and corresponds to a node within the implicit hierarchy of visual concept

SCAN [Higgins et al '18]

- **Learning concept recombination operators**

The convolutional recombination operator that takes in $\{\mu^k_{y_1}, \sigma^k_{y_1}; \mu^k_{y_2}, \sigma^k_{y_2}\}$ and outputs $\{\mu^k_r, \sigma^k_r\}$



SCAN [Higgins et al ‘18]

- **Learning concept recombination operators**



Visual samples produced by SCAN and JMVAE when instructed with a novel concept recombination

Recombination instructions are used to imagine concepts that have never been seen during model training

SCAN samples consistently match the expected ground truth recombined concept, while maintaining high variability in the irrelevant visual primitives.

JMVAE samples lack accuracy

SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al '18]

- DeepMind Lab experiments
  - The generative process was specified by four factors of variation:
    - wall colour, floor colour, object colour with 16 possible values each, and
    - object identity with 3 possible values: hat, ice lolly and suitcase
    - Other factors of variation were also added to the dataset by the DeepMind Lab engine
      - such as the spawn animation, horizontal camera rotation and the rotation of objects around the vertical axis
  - Dataset is split to a training set and a held out set
    - The held out set: from 300 four-gram concepts that were never seen during training, either visually or symbolically

SCAN: Learning Hierarchical Compositional Visual Concepts [Higgins et al '18]

- A: sym2img inferences
- B: img2sym inferences: when presented with an image, SCAN is able to describe it in terms of all concepts it has learnt, including synonyms (e.g. "dub", which corresponds to {ice lolly, white wall})



SCAN [Higgins et al '18]

- Evolution of understanding of the meaning of concept {cyan wall} as SCAN is exposed to progressively more diverse visual examples

Teach SCAN the meaning of the concept {cyan wall} using a curriculum of fifteen progressively more diverse visual examples

6/32 latents z_y^k and labelled according to their corresponding visual primitives in z_x





Top row contains three sets of visual samples (sym2img) generated by SCAN after seeing each set of five visual examples presented in the bottom row

Average inferred specificity of concept latents z_y^k during training. Vertical dashed lines correspond to the vertical dashed lines in the left plot and indicate a switch to the next set of five more diverse visual examples

SCAN [Higgins et al '18]

- Quantitative results comparing the accuracy and diversity of visual samples produced through sym2img inference by SCAN and three baselines
  - High accuracy means that the models understand the meaning of a symbol
  - High diversity means that the models were able to learn an abstraction. It quantifies the variety of samples in terms of the unspecified visual attributes

$$D_{KL}\left(u(\mathbf{y}_i) \parallel p(\mathbf{y}_i)\right)$$

The KL divergence of the inferred (irrelevant) factor distribution with the flat prior

	Accuracy			Diversity		
Model	Train	Test (symbols)	Test (operators)	Train	Test (symbols)	Test (operators)
TrELBO	0.81	0.69	0.37	9.41	6.86	**0.63**
JMVAE	0.75	0.68	0.61	4.32	2.87	0.86
SCAN_R	**0.86**	**0.81**	0.67	13.17	9.2	9.94
SCAN_U ($\beta = 0.1$)	0.27	0.26	0.25	5.51	1.23	1.66
SCAN_U ($\beta = 1$)	0.58	0.36	0.33	2.07	1.22	1.34
SCAN_U ($\beta = 20$)	0.65	0.42	0.32	**1.41**	3.98	4.57
SCAN ($\beta = 53$)	0.82	0.79	**0.79**	1.46	**1.08**	1.05

All models were trained on a random subset of 133 out of 18,883 possible concepts sampled from all levels of the implicit hierarchy with ten visual examples each

SCAN_U: a SCAN with unstructured vision (lower β means more visual entanglement),

SCAN_R: a SCAN with a reverse grounding KL term for both the model itself and its recombination operator

Test symbols: Test values can be computed either by directly feeding the ground truth symbols

Test operators: Applying trained recombination operators to make the model recombine in the latent space

SCAN [Higgins et al '18]

- Comparison of sym2img samples of SCAN, JMVAE and TrELBO trained on CelebA



SCAN [Higgins et al ‘18]

- Example sym2img samples of SCAN trained on CelebA

Run inference using four different values for each attribute. We found that the model was more sensitive to changes in values in the positive rather than negative direction, hence we use the following values: $\{-6, -3, 1, 2\}$





Despite being trained on binary k-hot attribute vectors (where k varies for each sample), SCAN learnt meaningful directions of continuous variability in its conceptual latent space $\boldsymbol{z}_y$.

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Contributions of this work
  - Show a decomposition of the variational lower bound that can be used to explain the success of the β-VAE in learning disentangled representations.
  - propose a simple method based on weighted minibatches to stochastically train with arbitrary weights on the terms of our decomposition without any additional hyperparameters.
  - Propose β-TCVAE
    - used as a plug-in replacement for the β-VAE with no extra hyperparameters
  - Propose a new information-theoretic disentanglement metric
    - Classifier-free and generalizable to arbitrarily-distributed and non-scalar latent variables

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- VAE and β-VAE

$$\mathcal{L}_\beta = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\left(\mathbb{E}_q[\log p(x_n|z)] - \beta\,\mathrm{KL}\left(q(z|x_n)||p(z)\right)\right)$$

- [Higgins et al '17]'s metric for evaluating Disentangled Representations
  - The accuracy that a low VC-dimension linear classifier can achieve at identifying a fixed ground truth factor
  - For a set of ground truth factors, $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^{K}$, each training data point is an aggregation over L samples:

$$\frac{1}{L}\sum_{l=1}^{L}|z_l^{(1)} - z_l^{(2)}|$$

    - Random vectors $z_l^{(1)}$, $z_l^{(2)}$ are drawn i.i.d. from $q(z|v_k)$ for any fixed value of v_k, and a classification target k

$q(z|v_k)$ is sampled by using an intermediate data sa $z \sim q(z|x), x \sim p(x|v_k)$

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Sources of Disentanglement in the ELBO
  - Notations $\{1, 2, ..., N\}$ ← Training examples

$$q(z|n) = q(z|x_n)$$

$$q(z, n) = q(z|n)p(n) = q(z|n)\frac{1}{N}$$

$$q(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} q(z|n)p(n)$$ ← the aggregated posterior

$$\mathbb{E}_{p(n)}\Big[\mathrm{KL}\big(q(z|n)||p(z)\big)\Big] =$$

$$: \underbrace{\mathrm{KL}\left(q(z,n)||q(z)p(n)\right)}_{\text{(i) Index-Code MI}} + \underbrace{\mathrm{KL}\big(q(z)||\prod_j q(z_j)\big)}_{\text{(ii) Total Correlation}} + \underbrace{\sum_j \mathrm{KL}\left(q(z_j)||p(z_j)\right)}_{\text{(iii) Dimension-wise KL}}$$

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- ELBO TC-Decomposition

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\mathrm{KL}\big(q(z|x_n)||p(z)\big) = \mathbb{E}_{p(n)}\Big[\mathrm{KL}\big(q(z|n)||p(z)\big)\Big]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{p(n)}\Big[\mathbb{E}_{q(z|n)}\big[\log q(z|n) - \log p(z) + \log q(z) - \log q(z) + \log\prod_j q(z_j) - \log\prod_j q(z_j)\big]\Big]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{q(z,n)}\Big[\log\frac{q(z|n)}{q(z)}\Big] + \mathbb{E}_{q(z)}\Big[\log\frac{q(z)}{\prod_j q(z_j)}\Big] + \mathbb{E}_{q(z)}\left[\sum_j \log\frac{q(z_j)}{p(z_j)}\right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{q(z,n)}\Big[\log\frac{q(z|n)p(n)}{q(z)p(n)}\Big] + \mathbb{E}_{q(z)}\Big[\log\frac{q(z)}{\prod_j q(z_j)}\Big] + \sum_j \mathbb{E}_{q(z)}\Big[\log\frac{q(z_j)}{p(z_j)}\Big]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{q(z,n)}\Big[\log\frac{q(z|n)p(n)}{q(z)p(n)}\Big] + \mathbb{E}_{q(z)}\Big[\log\frac{q(z)}{\prod_j q(z_j)}\Big] + \sum_j \mathbb{E}_{q(z_j)q(z_{\setminus j}|z_j)}\Big[\log\frac{q(z_j)}{p(z_j)}\Big]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{q(z,n)}\Big[\log\frac{q(z|n)p(n)}{q(z)p(n)}\Big] + \mathbb{E}_{q(z)}\Big[\log\frac{q(z)}{\prod_j q(z_j)}\Big] + \sum_j \mathbb{E}_{q(z_j)}\Big[\log\frac{q(z_j)}{p(z_j)}\Big]$$

$$= \underbrace{\mathrm{KL}\left(q(z,n)||q(z)p(n)\right)}_{\text{(i) Index-Code MI}} + \underbrace{\mathrm{KL}\big(q(z)||\prod_j q(z_j)\big)}_{\text{(ii) Total Correlation}} + \underbrace{\sum_j \mathrm{KL}\big(q(z_j)||p(z_j)\big)}_{\text{(iii) Dimension-wise KL}}$$

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Index-code mutual information (MI)

$$\mathrm{KL}\left(q(z,n)||q(z)p(n)\right)$$

  - The mutual information $I_q(z;\ n)$ between the data variable and latent variable based on the empirical data distribution $q(z,n)$
    - MI is controversial on its effect on disentangled representation learning
      - a higher mutual information can lead to better disentanglement [Chen '16]
      - a penalized mutual information through the information bottleneck encourages compact and disentangled representations [Achille & Soatto '17 & Burgess '17]

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Total correlation (TC) $\mathrm{KL}\left(q(z)||\prod_j q(z_j)\right)$
  - One of many generalizations of mutual information to more than two random variables
  - The penalty on TC forces the model to find statistically independent factors in the data distribution
  - The main claim of this work on TC:
    - A heavier penalty on the TC induces a more disentangled representation, and that the existence of this term is the reason β-VAE has been successful.

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Dimension-wise KL $\sum_j \mathrm{KL}\left(q(z_j)||p(z_j)\right)$
  - Prevents individual latent dimensions from deviating too far from their corresponding priors
  - It acts as a complexity penalty on the aggregate posterior which reasonably follows from the minimum description length [Hinton '94] formulation of the ELBO.

This work claims that TC is the most important term in this decomposition for learning disentangled representations by penalizing only this term.

Now, how to estimate the three terms in the TC decomposition?

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Training with Minibatch-Weighted Sampling
  - The decomposition requires the evaluation of $q(z)$

$$q(z) = \mathbb{E}_{p(n)}[q(z|n)]$$ depends on the entire dataset

  - Issue
    - A naïve Monte Carlo approximation based on a minibatch of samples from $p(n)$ is likely to underestimate $q(z)$.
    - This can be intuitively seen by viewing $q(z)$ as a mixture distribution where the data index n indicates the mixture component
    - With a randomly sampled component, $q(z|n)$ is close to 0, whereas $q(z|n)$ would be large if n is the component that z came from.
    - So it is much better to sample this component and weight the probability appropriately

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Training with Minibatch-Weighted Sampling
  - Propose using a weighted version for estimating the function $\log q(z)$ during training, inspired by importance sampling

$$\mathbb{E}_{q(z)}[\log q(z)] \approx \frac{1}{M}\sum_{i=1}^{M}\left[\log \frac{1}{NM}\sum_{j=1}^{M} q(z(n_i)|n_j)\right]$$

$\{n_1, \ldots, n_M\}$ ← a minibatch of samples

$z(n_i)$ is a sample from $q(z|n_i)$

Computing this minibatch estimator does not require any additional hyperparameters

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Special case: β-TCVAE
  - Assign different weights (α, β, γ) to the terms of TC-decomposition

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta-\mathrm{TC}} := \mathbb{E}_{q(z|n)p(n)}[\log p(n|z)]$$

$$- \alpha I_q(z;n) - \beta\, \mathrm{KL}\big(q(z)||\prod_j q(z_j)\big) - \gamma \sum_j \mathrm{KL}\left(q(z_j)||p(z_j)\right)$$

The proposed β-TCVAE uses $\alpha = \gamma = 1$ and only modifies the hyperparameter β

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Measuring Disentanglement with the Mutual Information Gap
  - Estimate the **empirical mutual information** between a latent variable z_j and a ground truth factor v_k using the joint distribution:

$$q(z_j, v_k) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} p(v_k)p(n|v_k)q(z_j|n)$$

$$I_n(z_j; v_k) = \mathbb{E}_{q(z_j,v_k)}\left[\log \sum_{n \in \mathcal{X}_{v_k}} q(z_j|n)p(n|v_k)\right] + H(z_j)$$

$\mathcal{X}_{v_k}$ is the support of $p(n|v_k)$

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I(z_j; v_k) \\
=& \mathbb{E}_{q(z_j, v_k)} \left[\log q(z_j, v_k) - \log q(z_j) - \log p(v_k) \right] \\
=& \mathbb{E}_{q(z_j, v_k)} \left[\log \sum_{n=1}^{N} q(z_j, v_k, n) - \log q(z_j) - \log p(v_k) \right] \\
=& \mathbb{E}_{p(v_k)p(n'|v_k)q(z_j|n')} \left[\log \sum_{n=1}^{N} p(v_k)p(n|v_k)q(z_j|n) - \log q(z_j) - \log p(v_k) \right] \\
=& \mathbb{E}_{p(v_k)p(n'|v_k)q(z_j|n')} \left[\log \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}[n \in \mathcal{X}_{v_k}] p(n|v_k)q(z_j|n) \right] + \mathbb{E}_{q(z_j)} \left[-\log q(z_j) \right] \\
=& \mathbb{E}_{p(v_k)p(n'|v_k)q(z_j|n')} \left[\log \sum_{n \in \mathcal{X}_{v_k}} q(z_j|n)p(n|v_k) \right] + H(z_j)
\end{aligned}
$$

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Mutual Information Gap (MIG)

$$I_n(z_j; v_k) = \mathbb{E}_{q(z_j, v_k)}\left[\log \sum_{n \in \mathcal{X}_{v_k}} q(z_j|n)p(n|v_k)\right] + H(z_j)$$

  - A higher mutual information implies that z_j contains a lot of information about v_k
t the average maximal M
and the mutual information is maximal if there exists a deterministic, invertible relationship between z_j and v_j
  - For discrete v_k $\quad 0 \leq I(z_j; v_k) \leq H(v_k)$

$$H(v_k) = \mathbb{E}_{p(v_k)}[-\log p(v_k)]$$

  - The normalized mutual information: $I(z_j; v_k)/H(v_k)$

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Mutual Information Gap (MIG)
  - Note that a single factor can have high mutual information with multiple latent variables
  - So enforce axis-alignment by measuring the difference between the top two latent variables with highest mutual information
  - Then the mutual information gap (MIG) is:

$$\frac{1}{K}\sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{1}{H(v_k)}\left(I_n(z_{j^{(k)}};v_k)-\max_{j\neq j^{(k)}}I_n(z_j;v_k)\right)$$

$$j^{(k)}=\operatorname{argmax}_j I_n(z_j;v_k)$$

K: the number of known factors

MIG is bounded by 0 and 1.

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Mutual Information Gap (MIG)
  - The average maximal MI: $\frac{1}{K}\sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{I_n(z_{k*};v_k)}{H(v_k)}$
  - MIG defends against two important cases:
  - 1) Related to rotation of the factors.
    - When a set of latent variables are not axis-aligned, each variable can contain a decent amount of information regarding two or more factors.
    - The gap heavily penalizes unaligned variables, which is an indication of entanglement.
  - 2) Related to compactness of the representation.
    - If one latent variable reliably models a ground truth factor, then it is unnecessary for other latent variables to also be informative about this factor

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Mutual Information Gap (MIG)

In comparison to prior metrics, the MIG detects axis-alignment, is unbiased for all hyperparameter settings, and can be generally applied to any latent distributions provided efficient estimation exists

Metric	Axis	Unbiased	General
Higgins *et al.* [7]	No	No	No
Kim & Mnih [8]	Yes	No	No
MIG (Ours)	Yes	Yes	Yes

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Experiments

Dataset	Ground truth factors
dSprites	scale (6), rotation (40), posX (32), posY (32)
3D Faces	azimuth (21), elevation (11), lighting (11)

– ELBO vs. Disentanglement Trade-off (dSprites)

Compared to β-VAE, β-TCVAE creates more disentangled representations while preserving a better generative model of the data with increasing β



Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Experiments
  - ELBO vs. Disentanglement Trade-off (3D Faces)

Compared to β-VAE, β-TCVAE creates more disentangled representations while preserving a better generative model of the data with increasing β



Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Experiments
  - Distribution of disentanglement score (MIG) for different modeling algorithms





Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Experiments
  - Scatter plots of the average MIG and TC per value of β. Larger circles indicate a higher β.

dSprites



3D Faces



Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Experiments

The β-TCVAE has a higher chance of obtaining a disentangled representation than βVAE, even in the presence of sampling bias.

Distribution of disentanglement scores (MIG).

Different joint distributions of factors.





All samples have non-zero probability in all joint distributions; the most likely sample is 4 times as likely as the least likely sample.

Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Experiments
  - Learned latent variables using β-VAE and β-TCVAE



Isolating Sources of Disentanglement in VAEs [Chen et al '18]

- Experiments
  - CelebA Latent Traversals: β-TCVAE Model One (β=15)



Baldness | Dramatic masculinity | Azimuth

https://arxiv.org/pdf/1802.04942.pdf

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- β-VAE's drawback
  - Reconstruction quality (compared to VAE) must be sacrificed in order to obtain better disentangling
- FactorVAE
  - Aims at obtaining a better trade-off between disentanglement and reconstruction, allowing to achieve better disentanglement without degrading reconstruction quality
  - Augments the VAE objective with a penalty that encourages the marginal distribution of representations to be factorial without substantially affecting the quality of reconstructions
  - This penalty is expressed as a KL divergence between this marginal distribution and the product of its marginals, and is optimised using a discriminator network following the divergence minimisation view of GANs

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Architecture of FactorVAE, a Variational Autoencoder (VAE) that encourages the code distribution to be factorial



$(z'^{(i)})_{i=1}^{B}, (z^{(i)})_{i=1}^{B} \overset{iid}{\sim} q(z) = \int p_{data}(x)q(z|x)dx$

randomly permute each dimension across batch

$(z'^{(i)}_{perm})_{i=1}^{B}$

+

-

Input

Discriminator

Cross-entropy loss for classifying samples from each class
- encouraging $q(z)$ to be factorised

FactorVAE objective = VAE objective - $\gamma \times$ cross-entropy loss

distinguishes whether the input was drawn from the marginal code distribution or the product of its marginals

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Trade-off between Disentanglement and Reconstruction in β-VAE
  - Observations $x^{(i)} \in X$, $i = 1, \ldots, N$ are generated by combining K underlying factors $f = (f_1, \cdots, f_K)$
    - Modelled using a real-valued latent/code vector $z \in R^d$, interpreted as the representation of the data
  - The generative model:
    - The prior: defined by the standard Gaussian prior $p(z) = \mathcal{N}(0, I)$
      - intentionally chosen to be a factorised distribution
    - The decoder: parameterised by a neural net $p_\theta(x|z)$
  - The variational posterior for an observation:

$$q_\theta(z|x) = \prod_{j=1}^{d} \mathcal{N}(z_j|\mu_j(x), \sigma_j^2(x))$$

    - with the mean and variance produced by the encoder, parameterised by a neural net

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Trade-off between Disentanglement and Reconstruction in β-VAE
  - The variational posterior: Seen as the distribution of the representation corresponding to the data point x
  - The distribution of representations for the entire data set:

$$q(z) = \mathbb{E}_{p_{data}(x)}[q(z|x)] = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} q(z|x^{(i)})$$

the empirical data distribution

    - known as the marginal posterior or aggregate posterior
  - A disentangled representation would have each z_j correspond to precisely one underlying factor f_k. Assume that these factors vary independently
  - Thus, our desire for a factorial distribution:

$$q(z) = \prod_{j=1}^{d} q(z_j)$$

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Trade-off between Disentanglement and Reconstruction in β-VAE
  - β-VAE objective

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[\mathbb{E}_{q(z|x^{(i)})}[\log p(x^{(i)}|z)] - \beta KL(q(z|x^{(i)})||p(z))\right]$$

    - is a variational lower bound on $\mathbb{E}_{p_{data}(x)}[\log p(x^{(i)})]$
  - KL Decomposition:

$$\mathbb{E}_{p_{data}(x)}[KL(q(z|x)||p(z))] = I(x;z) + KL(q(z)||p(z))$$

$I(x;z)$: The mutual information between x and z under the joint distribution $p_{data}(x)q(z|x)$

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- The KL term in the VAE objective decomposes as follows (Makhzani & Frey, 2017):

Lemma 1. $\mathbb{E}_{p_{data}(x)}[KL(q(z|x)||p(z))] = I_q(x;z) + KL(q(z)||p(z))$ *where* $q(x,z) = p_{data}(x)q(z|x)$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{p_{data}(x)}[KL(q(z|x)||p(z))] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{p_{data}(x)}\mathbb{E}_{q(z|x)}\left[\log \frac{q(z|x)}{p(z)}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{p_{data}(x)}\mathbb{E}_{q(z|x)}\left[\log \frac{q(z|x)}{q(z)}\frac{q(z)}{p(z)}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{p_{data}(x)}\mathbb{E}_{q(z|x)}\left[\log \frac{q(z|x)}{q(z)} + \log \frac{q(z)}{p(z)}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{p_{data}(x)}[KL(q(z|x)||q(z))] + \mathbb{E}_{q(x,z)}\left[\log \frac{q(z)}{p(z)}\right] \\
&= I_q(x;z) + \mathbb{E}_{q(z)}\left[\log \frac{q(z)}{p(z)}\right] \\
&= I_q(x;z) + KL(q(z)||p(z))
\end{aligned}
$$

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Trade-off between Disentanglement and Reconstruction in β-VAE
  - KL Decomposition:

$$\mathbb{E}_{p_{data}(x)}[KL(q(z|x)||p(z))] = I(x;z) + KL(q(z)||p(z))$$

$I(x;z)$: The mutual information between x and z under the joint distribution $p_{data}(x)q(z|x)$

  - 1) Penalising the $KL(q(z)||p(z))$ term:
    - Pushes $q(z)$ towards the factorial prior $p(z)$, encouraging independence in the dimensions of z and thus disentangling.
  - 2) Penalising $I(x;\ z)$:
    - Reduces the amount of information about x stored in z, which can lead to poor reconstructions for high values of β
  - Thus, making β larger than 1, penalising both terms more, leads to better disentanglement but reduces reconstruction quality
  - Therefore there exists a value of β > 1 that gives highest disentanglement, but results in a higher reconstruction error than a VAE

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Total correlation penalty & FactorVAE
  - Penalising $I(x;\ z)$ more than a VAE does might be neither necessary nor desirable for disentangling.
    - For example, InfoGAN disentangles by encouraging $I(x;\ c)$ to be high where c is a subset of the latent variables z
  - FactorVAE
    - Augment the VAE objective with a term that directly encourages independence in the code distribution:

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[\mathbb{E}_{q(z|x^{(i)})}[\log p(x^{(i)}|z)] - KL(q(z|x^{(i)})||p(z))\right] - \gamma KL(q(z)||\bar{q}(z))$$

$$\bar{q}(z) := \prod_{j=1}^{d} q(z_j)$$

This is a lower bound on the marginal log likelihood $\mathbb{E}_{p_{data}(x)}[\log p(x)]$

Total correlation

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Estimation of Total Correlation
  - Total Correlation
    - Intractable since both $q(z)$ and $\bar{q}(z)$ involve mixtures with a large number of components
    - The direct Monte Carlo estimate requires a pass through the entire data set for each $q(z)$ evaluation
  - An alternative approach for optimizing total correlation
    - We can sample from $q(z)$ efficiently by
      - First choosing a datapoint $x^{(i)}$ uniformly at random
      - Then sampling from $q\left(z\middle|x^{(i)}\right)$
    - We can also sample from $\bar{q}(z)$ by
      - Generating d samples from $q(z)$
      - Then ignoring all but one dimension for each sample
  - A more efficient alternative for optimizing total correlation
    - Involves sampling a batch from q(z) and then randomly permuting across the batch for each latent dimension

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Estimation of Total Correlation
  - This is a standard trick used in the independence testing literature (Arcones & Gine, 1992)
  - As long as the batch is large enough, the distribution of these samples samples will closely approximate $\bar{q}(z)$.

Algorithm 1 `permute_dims`

Input: $\{z^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^d : i = 1, \ldots, B\}$
for $j = 1$ **to** d **do**
  $\pi \leftarrow$ random permutation on $\{1, \ldots, B\}$
  $(z_j^{(i)})_{i=1}^B \leftarrow (z_j^{(\pi(i))})_{i=1}^B$
end for
Output: $\{z^{(i)} : i = 1, \ldots, B\}$

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Discriminator-based approximation of Total Correlation
  - Having access to samples from both distributions allows us to minimise their KL divergence using **the density-ratio trick** (Nguyen et al., 2010; Sugiyama et al., 2012)
    - which involves training a classifier/discriminator to approximate the density ratio that arises in the KL term
  - Suppose we have a discriminator D (in our case an MLP):
    - Outputs an estimate of the probability $D(z)$ that its input is a sample from $q(z)$ rather than from $\bar{q}(z)$

$$TC(z) = KL(q(z)||\bar{q}(z)) = \mathbb{E}_{q(z)}\left[\log \frac{q(z)}{\bar{q}(z)}\right]$$

$$\approx \mathbb{E}_{q(z)}\left[\log \frac{D(z)}{1-D(z)}\right].$$

  - Train the discriminator and the VAE jointly

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Discriminator-based approximation of Total Correlation
  - Train the discriminator and the VAE jointly

VAE

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[\mathbb{E}_{q(z|x^{(i)})}[\log p(x^{(i)}|z)] - KL(q(z|x^{(i)})||p(z))\right]$$

$$- \gamma KL(q(z)||\bar{q}(z))$$

The TC term is replaced with the discriminator-based approximation

$$TC(z) = KL(q(z)||\bar{q}(z)) = \mathbb{E}_{q(z)}\left[\log \frac{q(z)}{\bar{q}(z)}\right]$$

$$\approx \mathbb{E}_{q(z)}\left[\log \frac{D(z)}{1-D(z)}\right].$$

  - The discriminator is trained to classify between samples from $q(z)$ and $\bar{q}(z)$, thus learning to approximate the density ratio needed for estimating TC

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- FactorVAE

Algorithm 2 FactorVAE

Input: observations $(x^{(i)})_{i=1}^{N}$, batch size m, latent dimension d, γ, VAE/Discriminator optimisers: g, g_D
Initialize VAE and discriminator parameters θ, ψ.
repeat
Randomly select batch $(x^{(i)})_{i\in\mathcal{B}}$ of size m
Sample $z_\theta^{(i)} \sim q_\theta(z|x^{(i)})\ \forall i \in \mathcal{B}$

$$\theta \leftarrow g(\nabla_\theta \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{B}} [\log \frac{p_\theta(x^{(i)}, z_\theta^{(i)})}{q_\theta(z_\theta^{(i)}|x^{(i)})} - \gamma \log \frac{D_\psi(z_\theta^{(i)})}{1-D_\psi(z_\theta^{(i)})}])$$

Randomly select batch $(x^{(i)})_{i\in\mathcal{B}'}$ of size m
Sample $z_\theta'^{(i)} \sim q_\theta(z|x^{(i)})$ for $i \in \mathcal{B}'$

$$(z_{perm}'^{(i)})_{i\in\mathcal{B}'} \leftarrow \texttt{permute\_dims}((z_\theta'^{(i)})_{i\in\mathcal{B}'})$$

$$\psi \leftarrow g_D(\nabla_\psi \frac{1}{2m} [\sum_{i\in\mathcal{B}} \log(D_\psi(z_\theta^{(i)})) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{B}'} \log(1 - D_\psi(z_{perm}'^{(i)}))])$$

until convergence of objective.

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- FactorVAE
  - Note that low TC is necessary but not sufficient for meaningful disentangling.
    - E.g.) when $q(z|x) = p(z)$, TC=0 but z carries no information about the data
    - Thus having low TC is only meaningful when we can preserve information in the latents, which is why controlling for reconstruction error is important.
  - GAN: the data space is often very high dimensional
    - Divergence minimisation is usually done between two distributions over the data space, which is often very high dimensional (e.g. images).
    - As a result, the two distributions often have disjoint support, making training unstable, especially when the discriminator is strong.
    - Hence it is necessary to use tricks to weaken the discriminator such as instance noise (Sønderby et al., 2016) or to replace the discriminator with a critic, as in Wasserstein GANs (Arjovsky et al., 2017).
  - FactorVAE: the latent space is typically much lower dimensional
    - Minimise divergence between two distributions over the latent space (as in e.g. (Mescheder et al., 2017)), which is typically much lower dimensional and the two distributions have overlapping support.
    - Observe that training is stable for sufficiently large batch sizes (e.g. 64 worked well for d = 10), allowing us to use a strong discriminator.

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- A New Metric for Disentanglement



Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Higgins et al. (2016)'s supervised metric
  - Quantify disentanglement when the ground truth factors of a data set are given.
  - The metric is the error rate of a linear classifier that is trained:



  - 1) Choose a factor k; generate data with this factor fixed but all other factors varying randomly;
  - 2) Obtain their representations (defined to be the mean of $q(z|x)$);
  - 3) Take the absolute value of the pairwise differences of these representations.
  - 4) Then the mean of these statistics across the pairs gives one training input for the classifier, and the fixed factor index k is the corresponding training output

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Higgins et al. (2016)'s metric: Limitations
  - 1) it could be sensitive to hyperparameters of the linear classifier optimisation, such as the choice of the optimiser and its hyperparameters, weight initialisation, and the number of training iterations
  - 2) Having a linear classifier is not so intuitive – we could get representations where each factor corresponds to a linear combination of dimensions instead of a single dimension
  - 3) Finally and most importantly, the metric has a failure mode: it gives 100% accuracy even when only K − 1 factors out of K have been disentangled; to predict the remaining factor, the classifier simply learns to detect when all the values corresponding to the K − 1 factors are non-zero

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Higgins et al. (2016)'s metric: Limitations
  - β-VAE model trained on the 2D Shapes data that scores 100% on metric in Higgins et al. (2016) (ignoring the shape factor).



The model only uses three latent units to capture x-position, y-position, scale and ignores orientation, yet achieves a perfect score on the metric.

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- A New Metric for Disentanglement



- 1) Choose a factor k; generate data with this factor fixed but all other factors varying randomly;
- 2) obtain their representations; normalise each dimension by its empirical standard deviation over the full data (or a large enough random subset);
- 3) Take the empirical variance in each dimension of these normalised representations.
- 4) Then the index of the dimension with the lowest variance and the target index k provide one training input/output example for the classifier

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- A New Metric for Disentanglement

  - Thus if the representation is perfectly disentangled, the empirical variance in the dimension corresponding to the fixed factor will be 0
  - We normalise the representations so that the arg min is invariant to rescaling of the representations in each dimension.
  - The resulting classifier is a deterministic function of the training data, hence there are no optimisation hyperparameters to tune
  - Most importantly, it circumvents the failure mode of the earlier metric, since the classifier needs to see the lowest variance in a latent dimension for a given factor to classify it correctly

Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

FactorVAE gives much better disentanglement scores than VAEs (β = 1), while barely sacrificing reconstruction error, highlighting the disentangling effect of adding the Total Correlation penalty to the VAE objective



Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

Reconstruction error plotted against our disentanglement metric, both averaged over 10 random seeds at the end of training.



Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

First row: originals. Second row: reconstructions. Remaining rows: reconstructions of latent traversals across each latent dimension sorted by KL(q(zj |x)||p(zj)), for the best scoring models on our disentanglement metric

both models are capable of finding x-position, y-position, and scale, but struggle to disentangle orientation and shape, β-VAE especially

score: 0.814, β = 4

β-VAE



score: 0.889, γ = 35

FactorVAE



Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Total Correlation values for FactorVAE on 2D Shapes

The discriminator is consistently underestimating the true TC, also confirmed in (Rosca et al., 2018). However the true TC decreases throughout training, and a higher γ leads to lower TC, so the gradients obtained using the discriminator are sufficient for encouraging independence in the code distribution.





Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Disentanglement scores for InfoWGAN-GP on 2D Shapes for 10 random seeds per hyperparameter setting





Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Latent traversals for InfoWGAN-GP on 2D Shapes across four continuous codes (first four rows) and categorical code (last row) for run with best disentanglement score (λ = 0.2).

the model learns only the scale factor, and tries to put positional information in the discrete latent code, which is one reason for the low disentanglement score



Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Reconstruction error plotted against our disentanglement metric, both averaged over 10 random seeds at the end of training for 3D Shapes data



Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

First row: originals. Second row: reconstructions. Remaining rows: reconstructions of latent traversals across each latent dimension sorted by $KL(q(z_j|x)||p(z_j))$, for the best scoring models on our disentanglement metric (for 3D shapes data)

β-VAE, score: 1.00, β = 32



FactorVAE, score: 1.00, γ = 7



Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- Plots of reconstruction error of β-VAE (left) and FactorVAE (right) for different values of β and γ on **3D Faces** data over 5 random seeds.

β-VAE



FactorVAE



Disentangling by Factorising [Kim & Mnih'18]

- β-VAE and FactorVAE latent traversals across each latent dimension sorted by KL on **3D Chairs**, with annotations of the factor of variation corresponding to each latent unit



» β-VAE and FactorVAE latent traversals across each latent dimension sorted by KL on **3D Faces**, with annotations of the factor of variation corresponding to each latent unit



» β-VAE and FactorVAE latent traversals across each latent dimension sorted by KL on **CelebA**, with annotations of the factor of variation corresponding to each latent unit



DARLA: Improving Zero-Shot Transfer in Reinforcement Learning [Higgins et al '18]

DARLA (DisentAngled Representation Learning Agent)



DARLA [Higgins et al '18]

- 1) Learn to see (unsupervised learning of F_U)
  - The task of inferring a factorised set of generative factors $\mathcal{S}^z_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}} = \hat{S}$ from observations $\mathcal{S}^o$ is the goal of the extensive disentangled factor learning literature
- 2) Learn to act (reinforcement learning of π_S in the source domain D_S utilising previously learned F_U)
  - An agent that has learnt to see the world in stage one in terms of the natural data generative factors is now exposed to a source domain $D_S \in M$
- 3) Transfer (to a target domain D_T)
  - we test how well the policy πS learnt on the source domain generalises to the target domain DT ∈ M in a zero-shot domain adaptation setting
    - the agent is evaluated on the target domain without retraining

Unsupervised Model Selection for Variational Disentangled Representation Learning [Duan et al' 20]

Unsupervised Disentanglement Ranking Our proposed UDR method consists of four steps (illustrated in Fig. 4 in Supplementary Material):

1. Train $M = H \times S$ models, where H is the number of different hyperparameter settings, and S is the number of different initial model weight configurations (seeds).
2. For each trained model $i \in \{1,...,M\}$, sample without replacement $P \leq S$ other trained models with the same hyperparameters but different seeds.
3. Perform P pairwise comparisons per trained model and calculate the respective UDR_{ij} scores, where $i \in \{1,...,M\}$ is the model index, and $j \in \{1,...,P\}$ is its unique pairwise match from Step 2.
4. Aggregate UDR_{ij} scores for each model i to report the final $\text{UDR}_i = \text{avg}_j(\text{UDR}_{ij})$ scores, where $\text{avg}_j(\cdot)$ is the median over P scores.

$$\frac{1}{d_a + d_b}\left[\sum_b \frac{r_a^2 \cdot I_{KL}(b)}{\sum_a R(a,b)} + \sum_a \frac{r_b^2 \cdot I_{KL}(a)}{\sum_b R(a,b)}\right]$$

$$I_{KL}(a) = \begin{cases} 1 & KL(q_\phi(z_a|\boldsymbol{x}) \,||\, p(z_a)) > 0.01 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Independently Controllable Factors [Thomas et al ’17]