CS639 Deep Learning for NLP

Latent Variable Models

Junjie Hu

WISCONSIN
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MADISON

Slides adapted from Graham

https://junjiehu.github.io/cs639-spring26/

Goal for Today

- **Variational Auto-encoder (VAE)**
  1. Maximize Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO)
  2. Reparamertizction trick
- **Discrete Latent Variable Models (LVM) in NLP**

Discriminative vs. Generative Models

- **Discriminative model:** calculate the probability of output given input $p(Y \mid X)$

- **Generative model:** calculate the probability of a variable $p(X)$, or multiple variables $p(X, Y)$

- Which of the following models are discriminative vs. generative?

  - Standard BiLSTM POS tagger

  - Language model

Types of Variables

- Observed vs. Latent:
  - **Observed:** something that we can observe and measure from our data, e.g. X **or** Y
  - **Latent:** a variable z that we assume exists, but we aren't given the value, namely something we don't have data for
- In graphical models, observed variables are typically shaded nodes, and latent variables are typically unshaded nodes.



Marginal over latent variables is usually intractable (not computable in a reason time).

$$p(X) = \int_z p(X, z)dz$$

Latent Variable Models

- A vector of latent variables $\mathbf{z}$ in a high-dim space $\mathcal{Z}$ which we can sample from some PDF $p(\mathbf{z})$ over $\mathcal{Z}$
- For every observed $\mathbf{x}$ in our dataset, there is a $\mathbf{z}$ that causes the model to generate $\mathbf{x}$
- A latent variable model (LVM) is a probability distribution over two sets of variables $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{z}$:

$$p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z};\theta)$$

Maximum Likelihood Framework

- Maximize the probability of each x in the training set under the generative process according to:

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \int p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z};\theta)p(\mathbf{z})d\mathbf{z}$$

Why LVM?

- Intuitively, latent variable **z** enables the model to first decide which property to generate before it assigns values to the output **x**

- Example:
  - Sample a LV z from the set [0,…9] before generating an image for the digit

z=2 -> x= 

- Sample a sentiment from {positive, negative} before generating a positive/negative movie review.

z=“negative" -> x= “This is a bad movie.”

What Types of Latent Variables?

- Latent continuous vector (e.g. variational auto-encoder)

- Latent discrete vector (e.g. topic model)

- Latent structure (e.g. HMM or tree-structured model)





Variational Auto-encoders

(Kingma and Welling 2014)

VAE as a Graphical Model

- We have a random variable ***X*** for our dataset
- We have a latent variable **z** sampled from a Gaussian
- We have a deterministic function $f(\mathbf{z}; \theta)$ that maps $\mathbf{z}$ to the data space $\mathcal{X}$. If $\mathbf{z}$ is a random variable (r.v.) in $\mathcal{Z}$, then $f(\mathbf{z}; \theta)$ is also a r.v. in $\mathcal{X}$
- If we repeat this sampling *N* times, we hope to approximate X by $f(\mathbf{z}; \theta)$



$$X \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,I)} f(\mathbf{z}; \theta)$$

An Example (Goersch 2016)



$\mathbf{z}$ $\mathbf{x} = f(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{z}/10 + \mathbf{z}/\|\mathbf{z}\|$ $\mathbf{x}$

A probabilistic perspective on Variational Auto-Encoder



$$X \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,I)} f(\mathbf{z}; \theta)$$

- For each datapoint i :
  - Draw latent variables $z_i \sim p(z)$ (prior)
  - Draw data point $x_i \sim p_\theta(x|z)$
- Joint probability distribution over data and latent variables:

$$p(x, z) = p(z)p_\theta(x|z)$$

- Similar to Naive Bayes, HMM: only the prior differs

What is Our Loss Function?

- We would like to maximize the corpus log likelihood

$$\log P(\mathcal{X}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \log P(\boldsymbol{x}; \theta)$$

- For a single example, the marginal likelihood is

$$P(\boldsymbol{x}; \theta) = \int P(\boldsymbol{x} \mid \boldsymbol{z}; \theta) P(\boldsymbol{z}) d\boldsymbol{z}$$

- We can approximate this by sampling **z**s then summing

$$P(\boldsymbol{x}; \theta) \approx \sum_{\boldsymbol{z} \in S(\boldsymbol{x})} P(\boldsymbol{x} | \boldsymbol{z}; \theta) \quad \text{where} \quad S(\boldsymbol{x}) := \{\boldsymbol{z}'; \boldsymbol{z}' \sim P(\boldsymbol{z})\}$$

Variational Inference

Two tasks of interest:

- Learn the parameters θ of $p_\theta(x|z)$
- **Inference** over z with the *posterior* distribution: $p_\theta(z|x)$ given input x, what are its latent factors?

$$p_\theta(z|x) = \frac{p_\theta(x|z)p(z)}{p(x)}$$

$$p(x) = \int p(z)p_\theta(x|z)dz \quad \text{<- intractable}$$

- However, as $p(x)$ is intractable $p_\theta(z|x)$ is also intractable.
- Solution: **Variational inference** approximates the posterior $p_\theta(z|x)$ with a family of distributions $q_\phi(z|x)$

Variational Inference

- Variational inference approximates the true posterior $p_\theta(z|x)$ with a family of distributions $q_\phi(z|x)$

$$\text{minimize}: \ \mathrm{KL}(q_\phi(z|x)||p_\theta(z|x))$$

- One other target is to maximize the log-data likelihood which can be rewritten as:

$$\log p(x) = \mathrm{ELBO} + \mathrm{KL}(q_\phi(z|x)||p_\theta(z|x))$$

- Combining the above two, this is equivalent to maximize the **Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO)**

$$\mathrm{ELBO} = \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(z|x)}[\log p_\theta(x|z)] - \mathrm{KL}(q_\phi(z|x)||p(z))$$

$$\mathrm{KL}(q||p) \geq 0 => \log p(x) \geq \mathrm{ELBO}$$

Variational Inference

- Variational inference approximates the true posterior $p_\theta(z|x)$ with a family of distributions $q_\phi(z|x)$

$$\text{minimize}: \ \mathrm{KL}(q_\phi(z|x)||p_\theta(z|x))$$

- One other target is to maximize the log-data likelihood which can be rewritten as:

$$\log p(x) = \mathrm{ELBO} + \mathrm{KL}(q_\phi(z|x)||p_\theta(z|x))$$

- **Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO)**

$$\mathrm{ELBO} = \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(z|x)}[\log p_\theta(x|z)] - \mathrm{KL}(q_\phi(z|x)||p(z))$$

$$\mathrm{KL}(q||p) \geq 0 => \log p(x) \geq \mathrm{ELBO}$$

Variational Inference

- Variational inference approximates the true posterior $p_\theta(z|x)$ with a family of distributions $q_\phi(z|x)$

$$\text{minimize}: \ \mathrm{KL}(q_\phi(z|x)||p_\theta(z|x))$$

$$\text{maximize:} \log p(x) = \mathrm{ELBO} + \mathrm{KL}(q_\phi(z|x)||p_\theta(z|x))$$

- Combining the above two objectives, it is equivalent to maximize ELBO

$$\text{maximize}: \mathrm{ELBO}$$

Variational Auto-Encoders

$$\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) \geq \text{ELBO}$$

$$\underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}\sim q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})]}_{\text{Reconstruction Loss}} - \underbrace{D_{\text{KL}}(q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})\|p(\mathbf{z}))}_{\text{KL Regularizer}}$$

The inequality holds for any $q_\phi(z|x)$, but the lower bound is tight only if $p_\theta(z|x) = q_\phi(z|x)$

$p_\theta(z|x)$ is intractable

Variational Autoencoders

$$\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) \;>= \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}\sim q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})]}_{\text{Reconstruction Loss}} - \underbrace{D_{\mathrm{KL}}(q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})\|p(\mathbf{z}))}_{\text{KL Regularizer}}$$



Variational Autoencoders

$$\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) \;>= \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}\sim q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})]}_{\text{Reconstruction Loss}} - \underbrace{D_{\mathrm{KL}}(q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})\|p(\mathbf{z}))}_{\text{KL Regularizer}}$$



Regularized Autoencoder

Why prior ?

$$\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) \;>=\; \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}\sim q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})]}_{\text{Reconstruction Loss}} - \underbrace{D_{\mathrm{KL}}(q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})\|p(\mathbf{z}))}_{\text{KL Regularizer}}$$



Why prior ?

$$\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) \;>=\; \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}\sim q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})]}_{\text{Reconstruction Loss}} - \underbrace{D_{\mathrm{KL}}(q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})\|p(\mathbf{z}))}_{\text{KL Regularizer}}$$



VAE vs. AE

VAE


$\mathbf{x}$
$q_{\phi}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})$
$\mathbf{z}$
$p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})$
$\mathbf{x}$

VAE vs. AE

VAE



inductive bias !

VAE vs. AE

VAE



inductive bias !

AE



VAE vs. AE

VAE



inductive bias !

AE



VAE vs. AE

VAE



inductive bias !

AE



AE is not generative model:

(1) Can't sample new data from AE
(2) Can't compute the log likelihood of data x

Training of VAE

$$\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) \;>=\; \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}\sim q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}[\log p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z})]}_{\text{Reconstruction Loss}} - \underbrace{D_{\mathrm{KL}}(q_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})\|p(\mathbf{z}))}_{\text{KL Regularizer}}$$



Problem!
Sampling Breaks Backprop



Figure Credit: Doersch (2016)

Solution: Re-parameterization Trick



Figure Credit: Doersch (2016)

An Example: Generating Sentences w/ Variational Autoencoders

Generating from Language Models

- **Remember:** using ancestral sampling, we can generate from a normal language model

while x_{j-1} != “</s>”:
  $x_j \sim P(x_j \mid x_1, \ldots, x_{j-1})$

- We can also generate conditioned on something P(**y**|**x**) (e.g. translation, image captioning)

while y_{j-1} != “</s>”:
  $y_j \sim P(y_j \mid X, y_1, \ldots, y_{j-1})$

Generating Sentences from a Continuous Space (Bowman et al. 2015)

- The VAE-based approach is conditional language model that conditions on a latent variable **z**
- Like an encoder-decoder, but latent representation is latent variable, input and output are identical



Motivation for Latent Variables

- Allows for a **consistent latent space** of sentences?
  - e.g. interpolation between two sentences

Standard encoder-decoder

i went to the store to buy some groceries .
i store to buy some groceries .
i were to buy any groceries .
horses are to buy any groceries .
horses are to buy any animal .
horses the favorite any animal .
horses the favorite favorite animal .
horses are my favorite animal .

VAE

“ i want to talk to you . ”
“i want to be with you . ”
“i do n’t want to be with you . ”
i do n’t want to be with you .
she did n’t want to be with him .
he was silent for a long moment .
he was silent for a moment .
it was quiet for a moment .
it was dark and cold .
there was a pause .
it was my turn .

- **More robust to noise?** VAE can be viewed as standard model + regularization.

Handling Discrete Latent Variables in NLP

Types of Variables

- Continuous vs. Discrete Variables:
  - **Continuous** variables taking numerical values from a range, e.g., $z \in [0,1]$. For example, when z is closer to 0, it indicates a negative sentiment. When z is closer to 1, it indicates a positive sentiment.
  - **Discrete** variables taking a categorical values from a set of classes, e.g., $z \in \{\text{positive}, \text{negative}, \text{neutral}\}$

Latent variable $z \rightarrow$ Observed variable x

$$p(x) = \int_z p(x \mid z; \theta) p(z) dz$$

Discrete Latent Variables?

- Many variables are better treated as discrete in NLP
  - Part-of-speech of a word
  - Class of a question
  - Writer traits (left-handed or right-handed, etc.)

Unsupervised Recurrent Neural Network Grammars

(Kim et al., 2019)



Inference Network $q_\phi(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{x})$ Generative Model $p_\theta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$

STRUCTVAE: Tree-structured Latent Variable Models for Semi-supervised Semantic Parsing (Yin et al. 2018)



Latent Diffusion LM

[Lovelace et al. NeurIPS 2023]

- Forward Diffusion Process: adding noise util the data becomes indistinguishable from Gaussian noise
- Backward Diffusion Process: learning to remove noise back to a sentence



Figure 1: Overview of our proposed latent language diffusion framework.

Questions?