

### Local Message Passing on Frustrated Systems

Luca Schmid, Joshua Brenk and Laurent Schmalen



# **Marginal Inference**



### **Probabilistic Inference**

Infer the state of a system  $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$  based on a noisy observation  $\boldsymbol{y}$  and prior knowledge  $p(\mathcal{X})$ .

Goal: Find the corresponding posterior distribution 
$$p(X|y) = \frac{p(y|X) \cdot p(X)}{p(y)}$$

**Marginal inference**: Infer the state of a local variable  $x_n$ 

Marginalization: 
$$P(x_n|\boldsymbol{y}) = \sum_{x_1} \cdots \sum_{x_{n-1}} \sum_{x_{n+1}} \cdots \sum_{x_N} P(\mathcal{X}|\boldsymbol{y}) =: \sum_{n \in \{x_n\}} P(\mathcal{X}|\boldsymbol{y})$$

- computationally complex for large systems  $\mathcal{X}$ 



# **Marginal Inference on Graphical Models**



Assume structure 
$$p(\mathcal{X}|\mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{n=1}^{N} \psi_n(x_n) \prod_{n>m} \psi_{nm}(x_m, x_n)$$
  
Can we use this structure to perform the marginalization more efficiently?

 $\rightarrow$  distributive law  $\hat{=}$  message passing on graphs

Example:

$$p(x_{1}|\boldsymbol{y}) = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{x_{2}} \sum_{x_{3}} \psi_{1}(x_{1})\psi_{2}(x_{2})\psi_{3}(x_{3})\psi_{21}(x_{2}, x_{1})\psi_{32}(x_{3}, x_{2})$$

$$= \frac{1}{Z}\psi_{1}(x_{1})\left(\sum_{x_{2}}\psi_{2}(x_{2})\psi_{21}(x_{2}, x_{1})\left(\sum_{x_{3}}\psi_{3}(x_{3})\psi_{32}(x_{3}, x_{2})\right)\right)$$

$$\psi_{1} \quad \psi_{21} \quad \psi_{22} \quad \psi_{21} \quad \psi_{22} \quad \psi_{21} \quad \psi_{21} \quad \psi_{22} \quad \psi_{21} \quad \psi_{22} \quad \psi_{21} \quad \psi_{21} \quad \psi_{21} \quad \psi_{22} \quad \psi_{21} \quad \psi_{22} \quad \psi_{21} \quad \psi_{21} \quad \psi_{22} \quad \psi_{21} \quad \psi_{21} \quad \psi_{21} \quad \psi_{22} \quad \psi_{21} \quad$$



# **Message Passing on Graphical Models**



Sum-product Algorithm (SPA) [KFL01]

$$m_{\psi \to x}(x) = \sum_{\sim \{x\}} \left( \psi(\mathcal{X}_n) \prod_{x' \in \mathcal{X}_n \setminus \{x\}} m_{x' \to \psi}(x') \right)$$

 $\mathcal{X}_n \subset \mathcal{X}$  : Adjacent variable nodes of factor node  $\psi(\mathcal{X}_n)$ 

### Advantages of message passing on graphs:

- Algorithm defined by simple update rule
- Efficient algorithms can be derived very intuitively
- Also applicable to graphs with cycles



[KFL01] F. R. Kschischang, B. J. Frey, and H.-A. Loeliger. "Factor graphs and the sum-product algorithm," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 2001.



# Message Passing on Graphs with Cycles



- SPA also applicable to cyclic graphs  $\rightarrow$  iterative algorithm
- But: SPA only yields approximation of marginals on graphs with cycles
  - Fixed points of SPA correspond to stationary points of the Bethe free energy [YFW00]



Alternative: Directly try to minimize the Bethe free energy, e.g., concave-convex procedure (CCCP) [Yui02]
 Many attemps to mitigate this suboptimality of the SPA on cyclic graphs: Momentum BP, Neural BP, ...

Instead of fixing a mismatched algorithm, we want to find a message update rule that is especially taylored to graphs with (many) cycles!

[YFW00] J. S. Yedidia, W. T. Freeman, and Y. Weiss. "Generalized belief propagation," Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2000.
 [Yui02] A. L. Yuille. "CCCP algorithms to minimize the Bethe and Kikuchi free energies," Neural Computation, 2002.



# Message Passing on Graphs with Cycles



#### Message Update Rule

Non-extrinsic:

A mapping from one or multiple incident messages to one outgoing message, which is applied **locally** at a (factor) node.

**Extrinsic:** 
$$\operatorname{FN}_{e}(\psi_{n,m}): m_{x_n \to \psi_{n,m}}(x_n) \mapsto m_{\psi_{n,m} \to x_m}(x_m)$$

Represent mapping by compact multilayer perceptron (1 hidden layer à 7 neurons)

 $\mathsf{FN}(\psi_{n,m}): \begin{pmatrix} m_{x_n \to \psi_{n,m}}(x_n) \\ m_{x_n \to \psi}(x_m) \end{pmatrix} \mapsto m_{\psi_{n,m} \to x_m}(x_m)$ 

### cycBP: Optimize local mapping towards good end-to-end inference performance

 $m_{x_m \to \psi_{nm}}(x_m) \uparrow \downarrow m_{\psi_{nm} \to x_m}(x_m)$ 



## **Marginal Inference: Objective Functions**



Supervised Training: Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{KL}} := D_{\mathsf{KL}} \left( b_n(x_n) \| p(x_n) \right)$$

■  $b_n(x_n), b_{n,m}(x_n, x_m)$ : Single, pairwise beliefs of message passing ■  $p(x_n) = \sum_{n < \{x_n\}} p(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ : Exact marginal distributions

Unsupervised Training: Regularized Bethe free energy

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{Bethe}} := F_{\mathsf{Bethe}} + \alpha \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}} \qquad , \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$$

Bethe free energy 
$$F_{\text{Bethe}} = \sum_{(n,m)\in\mathcal{E}} \sum_{x_n,x_m} b_{n,m}(x_n,x_m) \log\left(\frac{b_{n,m}(x_n,x_m)}{\psi_n(x_n)\psi_{n,m}(x_n,x_m)\psi_m(x_m)}\right)$$
  
$$-\sum_{n=1}^N (|\mathcal{X}_n|-1) \sum_{x_n} b_n(x_n) \log\left(\frac{b_n(x_n)}{\psi_n(x_n)}\right)$$

Bethe consistency distance (proposed)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}} := D_{\mathsf{KL}} \left( \sum_{x_m} b_{n,m}(x_n, x_m) \Big\| b_n(x_n) \right) + D_{\mathsf{KL}} \left( \sum_{x_n} b_{n,m}(x_n, x_m) \Big\| b_m(x_m) \right)$$



### Experiment: 2×2 Ising Model



$$N = 4 \text{ binary variables } x_n \in \{+1, -1\}$$

$$Use \log-likelihood ratios L_{\psi_{nm} \to x_n} := \log\left(\frac{m_{\psi_{nm} \to x_n}(x_n = +1)}{m_{\psi_{nm} \to x_n}(x_n = -1)}\right)$$

$$\psi_n(x_n) = \exp(\theta_n x_n) \text{ with local fields } \theta_n, \ n = 1, \dots, N$$

$$\psi_{n,m}(x_n, x_m) = \exp(E_{n,m} x_n x_m) \text{ with local couplings } E_{n,m}, \ n > m$$

Spin glass:  $\theta_n$  and  $E_{n,m}$  independenly sampled from  $\mathcal{U}[-2,+2]$ Frustrated system, e.g., for  $E_{n,m} \ll 0, \forall n,m$ 





### Experiment: 2×2 Ising Model



Training and evaluation (averaged over  $10^5$  graphs) on samples of the Ising spin glass model

Algo.	Loss	$\mathcal{L}_{KL}$	$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{L}}$
SPA	-	0.087	0.30
CCCP	-	0.044	$2\cdot 10^{-6}$
cycBP <sub>e</sub>	$\mathcal{L}_{KL}$	0.040	0.17
cycBP <sub>e</sub>	$\mathcal{L}_{Bethe}$	0.030	0.11
cycBP	$\mathcal{L}_{KL}$	0.014	0.48
cycBP	$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Bethe}}$	0.027	0.027





### Experiment: 2×2 Ising Model







10 Schmid, Brenk & Schmalen: Local Message Passing on Frustrated Systems

Communications Engineering Lab (CEL)



### **Conclusion & Outlook**



Alternative message update rules exist which perform especially well on cyclic graphs where the SPA fails

- Extrinsic principle loses its objective on graphs with many short cycles
- **Regularized Bethe free energy**  $\mathcal{L}_{Bethe}$  as novel objective function for unsupervised training
- Results for symbol detection as a practical application -> Poster session!

- Investigate optimal message update rules for larger graphs and different topologies
   Replace NN by simple parametric function
- Make update rules a function of the node degree, the iteration number, ...



This work has received funding in part from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 101001899) and in part from the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) within the project Open6GHub (grant agreement 16KISK010).

