

Neural Operator Variational Inference based on Regularized Stein Discrepancy for Deep Gaussian Processes

Jian Xu*, Shian Du*, Junmei Yang, Qianli Ma, Delu Zeng

Abstract—Deep Gaussian Process (DGP) models offer a powerful nonparametric approach for Bayesian inference, but exact inference is typically intractable, motivating the use of various approximations. However, existing approaches, such as mean-field Gaussian assumptions, limit the expressiveness and efficacy of DGP models, while stochastic approximation can be computationally expensive. To tackle these challenges, we introduce Neural Operator Variational Inference (NOVI) for Deep Gaussian Processes. NOVI uses a neural generator to obtain a sampler and minimizes the Regularized Stein Discrepancy in \mathcal{L}_2 space between the generated distribution and true posterior. We solve the minimax problem using Monte Carlo estimation and subsampling stochastic optimization techniques. We demonstrate that the bias introduced by our method can be controlled by multiplying the Fisher divergence with a constant, which leads to robust error control and ensures the stability and precision of the algorithm. Our experiments on datasets ranging from hundreds to tens of thousands demonstrate the effectiveness and the faster convergence rate of the proposed method. We achieve a classification accuracy of 93.56 on the CIFAR10 dataset, outperforming SOTA Gaussian process methods. Furthermore, our method guarantees theoretically controlled prediction error for DGP models and demonstrates remarkable performance on various datasets. We are optimistic that NOVI has the potential to enhance the performance of deep Bayesian nonparametric models and could have significant implications for various practical applications.

Index Terms—Deep Gaussian Processes, Operator Variational Inference, Neural Network Generator

I. INTRODUCTION

GAUSSIAN processes (GPs) [1] are widely used in statistical inference and machine learning due to their effectiveness in modeling the relationship between inputs and outputs. For example, they have been successfully applied to modeling the dynamics of complex systems, such as robots or autonomous vehicles, for tasks such as trajectory planning [2], adaptive control [3], and anomaly detection [4]. The assumption that the latent function values follow a joint Gaussian distribution may not always hold, and in some scenarios,

it can be overly restrictive. [5]. For example, when dealing with non-Gaussian and non-stationary processes [6], [7], such as those found in financial time series or climate modeling, the Gaussian assumption may not be appropriate. Therefore, Deep Gaussian processes (DGPs) have been proposed as an alternative approach to address these limitations in GP models.

A Deep Gaussian Process (DGP) model is a hierarchical composition of GP models that offers a probabilistic nonparametric approach with robust uncertainty quantification [8]. The non-Gaussian distribution over composition functions provides expressive capacity but also presents challenges for inference [9]. Previous research on DGP models has used variational inference with a combination of sparse Gaussian processes [10], [11], [12], [13] and mean-field Gaussian assumptions [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20], [21] to approximate the posterior distribution. Stochastic optimization techniques have been used to scale up DGPs to handle large datasets, such as Doubly Stochastic Variational Inference (DSVI) [22]. These strategies often incorporate a collection of inducing points ($M \ll N$) whose position is learned alongside the other model hyperparameters, reducing the training cost to $\mathcal{O}(NM^2)$.

The mean-field Gaussian assumptions in approximate posterior distributions simplify computations, but can impose overly stringent constraints on DGP models, potentially limiting their expressiveness and effectiveness. Stochastic approximation approaches, such as SGHMC [23], draw unbiased samples from the posterior distribution, but their sequential sampling method can be computationally expensive for both training and prediction. Additionally, evaluating their convergence in finite time can be challenging [24].

While previous literature has explored various methods to approximate the non-mean-field Gaussian posterior, to the best of our knowledge, none has fully addressed the important problem of inducing point distribution in DGP inference. For instance, previous approaches, such as those proposed in [25], [26], [27], attempted to design grids, orthogonal structures, or other special structures among inducing points. However, such structures may be handcrafted and may introduce bias by not fully capturing the information of the inducing points from the data. Other approaches, such as those based on normalizing flows [28], [29], face invertibility constraints that limit the flexibility of the transformation form of neural networks [30]. In addition, implicit distributions variational inference [31], [32], [33], [34], [35] attempts to estimate the difficult-to-handle non-Gaussian posterior variational lower bound through adversarial networks. However, controlling the bias and variance of the

Jian Xu is with School of Mathematics, South China University of Technology in Guangdong Province, China (e-mail: 2713091379@qq.com). Shian Du is with the Shenzhen International Graduate School, Tsinghua University, Shenzhen, China (e-mail: dsa1458470007@gmail.com). * represents joint contribution.

Junmei Yang, Delu Zeng are affiliated with School of Electronic and Information Engineering at South China University of Technology in Guangdong Province, China. Qianli Ma is affiliated with School of Computer Science and Engineering at South China University of Technology in Guangdong Province, China.

Qianli Ma, Delu Zeng are the corresponding authors (e-mail: qianlima@scut.edu.cn and dlzeng@scut.edu.cn).

density ratio in high-dimensional space becomes exceedingly difficult, hindering the scalability and effectiveness of this approach [36], [37].

Therefore, in the context of high-dimensional non-mean-field scenarios, we propose a new variational inference framework for DGP based on Stein discrepancy (SD)[38], [39]. This is because SD provides accurate and efficient measures of distance between probability distributions, alleviating various computational issues in computing KL divergence. Unlike KL divergence, SD does not require computing the normalization constant of the distribution, and its gradient form often contains high-order information and geometric properties such as the curvature of the distribution, making it more effective for optimizing DGP high-dimensional non-mean-field posterior distributions and providing advantages in terms of error control and convergence rate[40], [41].

In this work, we introduce a novel inference framework for DGP models called Neural Operator Variational Inference (NOVI), which utilizes operators to optimize a regularized Stein Discrepancy with data subsampling. Specifically, we use Gaussian noise to transform a simple low-dimensional distribution into a high-dimensional complex distribution through a neural network generator, and then minimize the regularized Stein discrepancy between the generated distribution and the true posterior distribution using a SGD-based approach to obtain the gradients of the generator. The NOVI approach solves a minimax problem by Monte Carlo estimation, and offers a black-box algorithmic solution that can handle complex posterior distributions for DGP models.

The main contributions are as follows:

- We propose NOVI for DGPs, a novel variational framework based on Stein discrepancy and operator variational inference with a neural generator. It minimizes Regularized Stein Discrepancy in \mathcal{L}_2 space between the generated distribution and true posterior to construct a more flexible and wider class of posterior approximations overcoming previous limitations caused by mean-field Gaussian posterior assumptions and the issues of non-mean-field minimization of KL divergence in the context of high-dimensional inducing points scenarios.
- We provide theoretical evidence that our training schedule is essentially optimizing the Fisher divergence between the generated distribution and the true posterior distribution. Additionally, the bias introduced by our method can be effectively controlled by multiplying the Fisher divergence with a constant. This feature of our approach enables us to achieve robust error control, ensuring the stability and precision of the algorithm.
- We have conducted experimental demonstrations on eight UCI regression datasets and image classification datasets, which include MNIST, Fashion-MNIST, and CIFAR-10. The results demonstrate remarkable performance and faster convergence speeds than state-of-the-art methods, validating the effectiveness of the proposed model. By employing a convolutional architecture, we have achieved a classification accuracy of 93.56% on the CIFAR-10 dataset, surpassing the performance of state-of-the-art Gaussian process methods.

Our code is publicly available at <https://github.com/studying910/NOVI-DGP>.

II. PRELIMINARY

In this section, we present necessary notations and settings on single-layer Gaussian Processes (GPs) and Deep Gaussian Processes (DGPs), then we point out the flaws of current model and introduce our motivation.

A. Gaussian Processes

Let a random function $f : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ map N training inputs $\mathbf{X} \triangleq \{\mathbf{x}_n\}_{n=1}^N$ to a collection of noisy observed outputs $\mathbf{y} \triangleq \{y_n\}_{n=1}^N$. In general, a zero mean GP prior is imposed on the function f , i.e., $f \sim \mathcal{GP}(0, k)$ where k represents a covariance function $k : \mathbb{R}^D \times \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathbf{f} \triangleq \{f(\mathbf{x}_n)\}_{n=1}^N$ represent the latent function values at the inputs \mathbf{X} . This assumption yields a multivariate Gaussian prior over the function values $p(\mathbf{f}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}})$ where $[\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}}]_{ij} = k(x_i, x_j)$. In this work, we suppose \mathbf{y} is contaminated by an i.i.d noise, thus $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{f}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{f}, \sigma^2\mathbf{I})$ where σ^2 is the noise variance. The GP posterior of the latent output $p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})$ has a closed-form solution [1] but suffers from $\mathcal{O}(N^3)$ computational cost and $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$ storage requirement, thus limiting its scalability to big data.

Advanced sparse methods have been developed to set so-called *inducing points* $\mathbf{z} = \{\mathbf{z}_m\}_{m=1}^M$ from the input space and the associated inducing outputs known as *inducing variables*: $\mathbf{u} = \{u_m = f(\mathbf{z}_m)\}_{m=1}^M$ [42], [10], [11], with a time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(NM^2)$. In this *Sparse GPs* (SGPs) paradigm, *inducing variables* \mathbf{u} share a joint multivariate Gaussian distribution with \mathbf{f} : $p(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{u}) = p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{u})p(\mathbf{u})$ where the condition is specified as:

$$p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{u}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{Z}}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}}^{-1}\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{Z}}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}}^{-1}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{X}}) \quad (1)$$

and $p(\mathbf{u}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}})$ is the prior over the inducing outputs.

To solve the intractable posterior distribution of inducing variables $p(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{y})$, *Sparse variational GPs* (SVGPs) [42], [14] reformulate the posterior inference problem as variational inference (VI) and confine the variational distribution to be $q(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{u}) = p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{u})q(\mathbf{u})$ [17], [42], [16], [22]. This method approximates $q(\mathbf{u}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{S})$ [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20], then a Gaussian marginal¹ is obtained by maximizing the evidence lower bound (ELBO) [43].

B. Deep Gaussian Processes

A multi-layer DGP model is a hierarchical composition of GP models constructed by stacking the multi-output SGPs together [44]. Consider a model with L layers and D_ℓ independent random functions in layer $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ such that output of the $\ell-1$ -th layer $\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}$ is used as an input to the ℓ -th layer, i.e., $\mathbf{F}_\ell \triangleq \{\mathbf{F}_{\ell,1} = f_{\ell,1}(\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}), \dots, \mathbf{F}_{\ell,D_\ell} = f_{\ell,D_\ell}(\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1})\}$, where $f_{\ell,d} \sim \mathcal{GP}(0, k_\ell)$ for $d = 1, \dots, D_\ell$ and $\mathbf{F}_0 \triangleq \mathbf{X}$. The inducing points and corresponding

¹The solution is given in App. A

inducing variables for each layer are denoted by $\mathcal{Z} \triangleq \{\mathbf{Z}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^L$ and $\mathcal{U} \triangleq \{\mathbf{U}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^L$ respectively where $\mathbf{U}_\ell \triangleq \{\mathbf{U}_{\ell,1} = f_{\ell,1}(\mathbf{Z}_\ell), \dots, \mathbf{U}_{\ell,D_\ell} = f_{\ell,D_\ell}(\mathbf{Z}_\ell)\}$. Let $\mathcal{F} \triangleq \{\mathbf{F}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^L$, the DGP model design yields the following joint model density:

$$p(\mathbf{y}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U}) = p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{F}_L) \prod_{\ell=1}^L p(\mathbf{F}_\ell|\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}, \mathbf{U}_\ell) p(\mathcal{U}). \quad (2)$$

Here we place independent GP priors within and across layers on \mathcal{U} : $p(\mathcal{U}) = \prod_{l=1}^L p(\mathbf{U}_l) = \prod_{l=1}^L \prod_{d=1}^{D_\ell} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}|0, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{Z}_\ell \mathbf{Z}_\ell})$ and the condition similar to Equation (1) is defined as follows:

$$p(\mathbf{F}_\ell | \mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}, \mathbf{U}_\ell) = \prod_{d=1}^{D_\ell} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{F}_{\ell,d} | \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1} \mathbf{Z}_\ell} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{Z}_\ell \mathbf{Z}_\ell}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1} \mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}} - \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1} \mathbf{Z}_\ell} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{Z}_\ell \mathbf{Z}_\ell}^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{Z}_\ell \mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}}) \quad (3)$$

As an extension of Variational Inference with DGPs, DSVI [22] approximates the posterior by requiring the distribution across the inducing outputs to be a-posteriori Gaussian and independent amongst distinct GPs to obtain an analytical ELBO (known as the mean-field assumption [45], [43], $q(\mathbf{U}_{\ell,1:D_\ell}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{m}_{\ell,1:D_\ell}, \mathbf{S}_{\ell,1:D_\ell})$, where $\mathbf{m}_{\ell,1:D_\ell}$ and $\mathbf{S}_{\ell,1:D_\ell}$ are variational parameters. By iteratively sampling the layer outputs and utilizing the reparameterisation trick [46], DSVI enables scalability to big datasets.

The variational posterior distribution $q(\mathcal{U})$ in traditional approximation approaches for Deep Gaussian Process (DGP) models assumes that the distribution follows a mean-field Gaussian, which simplifies the analytical marginalization of the inducing outputs. However, this assumption is overly strict and may limit the effectiveness and expressiveness of the model. By Bayes' Rule, the true posterior distribution can be expressed in a more complex form that is not necessarily Gaussian,

$$p(\mathcal{U}|\mathbf{y}) = \frac{p(\mathcal{U}) p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})}{p(\mathbf{y})} = \frac{\int p(\mathbf{y}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U}) d\mathcal{F}}{p(\mathbf{y})} \quad (4)$$

In Deep Gaussian Process (DGP) models, the likelihood term $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})$ in the posterior equation (Equation (4)) is difficult to compute because the latent functions $\mathbf{F}_1, \dots, \mathbf{F}_{L-1}$ are inputs to a non-linear kernel function. Additionally, empirical evidence suggests that the true posterior distribution $p(\mathcal{U}|\mathbf{y})$ is often non-Gaussian, which makes it even more challenging to compute. Furthermore, in high-dimensional contexts, optimizing the model via variational lower bounds often leads to suboptimal results, as we discussed in Section I.

To address this issue, we introduce a novel variational family that balances computational efficiency and improved expressiveness, while also ensuring accurate error control, based on the concept of Operator Variational Inference (OVI) [47]. Furthermore, our approach includes the learning of preservable transformations and the generation of approximate posterior samples through neural networks, as detailed in Section III and Section IV.

III. OVI AND STEIN DISCREPANCY

Before using OVI and Stein Discrepancy to develop a unique inference strategy for DGP model, we provide a quick

introduction to these concepts that form the foundation of our method.

Definition 1 Let $p(\mathbf{x})$ be a probability density supported on $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a differentiable function, we define Langevin-Stein Operator as:

$$\mathcal{A}_p \phi(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x})^T \phi(\mathbf{x}) + \text{Tr}(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi(\mathbf{x})). \quad (5)$$

Lemma 1 Let $p(\mathbf{x})$ be a probability density function supported on $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a differentiable function. Suppose that $\int_{\partial \mathcal{X}} p(\mathbf{x}) \phi(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$, where $\partial \mathcal{X}$ represents the boundary of \mathcal{X} . Under these conditions, Stein's identity can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p} [\mathcal{A}_p \phi(\mathbf{x})] = 0. \quad (6)$$

When considering the expectation of $\mathcal{A}_p \phi(\mathbf{x})$ under $\mathbf{x} \sim q$, where $q(\mathbf{x})$ is another probability density supported on $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, the implication of Lemma 1 is that for arbitrary ϕ , the expectation will not be necessarily equal to zero. Instead, the magnitude of $\mathcal{A}_p \phi(\mathbf{x})$ under $\mathbf{x} \sim q$ reflects the difference between probability distributions p and q . Thus, we can define a discrepancy measure, referred to as Stein discrepancy, to capture the difference between the target distribution and its approximation.

Definition 2 (Stein's Discrepancy) [38] Let $p(\mathbf{x})$, $q(\mathbf{x})$ be probability densities supported on $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Stein discrepancy is defined as the maximum violation of Stein's identity in a proper function set \mathcal{F} for any differentiable function $\phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$.

$$S(q, p) \triangleq \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\mathcal{A}_p \phi(\mathbf{x})]. \quad (7)$$

Similar to prior approaches [48], we adopt the \mathcal{L}_2 space as the function space \mathcal{F} in the Stein discrepancy (7) and represent ϕ with a neural network ϕ_η as a discriminator

$$\text{LSD}(q, p; \eta) \triangleq \max_{\eta} \{ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x})^T \phi_\eta(\mathbf{x}) + \text{Tr}(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi_\eta(\mathbf{x}))] \}. \quad (8)$$

The approach, known as the Learned Stein Discrepancy (LSD) [48], uses neural networks as discriminators to parameterize ϕ in the Stein discrepancy equation (7). However, neural networks are not inherently square integrable and do not vanish at infinity. In order to satisfy the conditions of Stein's identity [38], an \mathcal{L}_2 regularizer is applied to the LSD with a regularization strength $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$, resulting in a Regularized Stein Discrepancy (RSD)

$$\text{RSD}(q, p; \eta) \triangleq \max_{\eta} \{ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x})^T \phi_\eta(\mathbf{x}) + \text{Tr}(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi_\eta(\mathbf{x}))] - \lambda \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\phi_\eta(\mathbf{x})^T \phi_\eta(\mathbf{x})] \}. \quad (9)$$

In Bayesian posterior inference, we aim to approximate the true posterior p using an approximate posterior q_θ , parameterized by variational parameters $\theta \in \Theta$, where Θ is a set of possible parameterizations. Stein divergence, as defined in Equation (7), is often used as the objective function for the Operator Variational Inference (OVI) algorithm [47]. OVI is a

black-box algorithm that leverages operators to optimize any operator-based objective, with the benefits of data subsampling and the capability to operate with a wider class of posterior approximations that do not require tractable densities. By combining the parameterizations of the variational family Θ and the discriminator ϕ_η , OVI can solve a minimax problem to find the optimal variational parameters θ and discriminator parameters η .

$$\theta^* = \arg \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\eta} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q_\theta} [\mathcal{A}_p \phi_\eta(\mathbf{x})]. \quad (10)$$

IV. DEEP GAUSSIAN PROCESSES WITH NEURAL OPERATOR VARIATIONAL INFERENCE

In this section, we present the algorithmic design for performing Bayesian inference on the posterior $p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D})$ of DGPs. We adopt the notation introduced in Section II-B, where $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{x}_n, y_n\}_{n=1}^N$ denotes the training dataset, $\mathcal{U} \triangleq \{\mathbf{U}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^L$ represents the inducing variables, and ν denotes the hyperparameters of the DGP model, including the inducing point locations, kernel hyperparameters, and noise variance.

A. Neural network as Generators

Consider a reference distribution $q_0(\epsilon)$ that generates noise $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{d_0}$. We represent the neural network that generates the posterior distribution, along with its parameters, as g_θ . If a noise vector is passed through this network, the resulting distribution of generated samples can be expressed as $\mathcal{U} = g_\theta(\epsilon)$. In summary, our setup is as follows,

$$\epsilon \sim q_0(\epsilon), \quad g_\theta(\epsilon) = \mathcal{U} \sim q_\theta(\mathcal{U})$$

Compared to traditional machine learning methods, such as grid-based or orthogonal designs, neural networks are recognized for their superior capability to model distributions, enabling them to learn implicit posterior distributions from data. As generators, neural networks can transform simple distributions such as Gaussian or uniform distributions, making them highly versatile and widely used in deep generative models [49], [31], [37], [50], [51], [52], [53], [54], [55]. As mentioned earlier, the high-dimensional and non-mean-field nature of the posterior distribution in deep generative models makes KL divergence unsuitable as a measure for the fit between the generative distribution $q_\theta(\mathcal{U})$ and the true posterior $p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D})$. Therefore, using OVI and RSD to construct a better objective is a reasonable approach.

B. Training Schedule

In Section III, we provided a review of OVI, a method that uses Langevin-Stein operator to enable a more flexible representation of the posterior geometry beyond the commonly used Gaussian distribution in vanilla VI. We extend this technique to the context of inducing points posterior inference for DGP models by iteratively training the discriminator and generator parameters to optimize the fit of the posterior to the data. Using the definition of RSD, we can construct an objective whose expectation value² is zero if and only if the

true posterior $p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D})$ and the approximate distribution $q(\mathcal{U})$ are equivalent. During training, our goal is to minimize this objective

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \nu) = \text{RSD}(q_\theta(\mathcal{U}), p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu); \phi_\eta) \quad (11)$$

Based on equation (9), we observe that equation (11) is a minmax problem. To solve it, we need to find the supremum on the right-hand side of the equation while jointly optimizing the inducing points posterior distribution and other model parameters ν such as the Gaussian process kernel parameters. To achieve this, we separate the optimization of the discriminator ϕ_η and generator g_θ to enable optimal estimation of these parameters. Since the other model parameters ν are point estimates, we utilize Monte Carlo sampling and maximum likelihood estimation to optimize them after optimizing the discriminator and generator. We present the main idea of our algorithm and its pseudocode in Algorithm 1 and refer to as *Neural Operator Variational Inference* (NOVI) for DGP.

Algorithm 1 NOVI for DGP

Input: training data $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{x}_n, y_n\}_{n=1}^N$, penalty parameter λ , n_c number of iterations for training the discriminator, learning rate α, β, γ , M batch size, sample number K
Initialize discriminator η , generator θ , DGP hyperparameters ν
repeat
 for $j = 1$ **to** n_c **do**
 Sample a minibatch $\{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^M \sim \mathcal{D}$
 Generate i.i.d. standard normal distribution noise $\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_K$ from q_0
 Generate sample $g_\theta(\epsilon_1) \dots g_\theta(\epsilon_K)$ from the generator

 Compute empirical loss $\widehat{\text{RSD}}(q_\theta, p; \phi_\eta)$
 $\eta \leftarrow \eta - \alpha \nabla_\eta \widehat{\text{RSD}}(q_\theta, p; \phi_\eta)$
 end for
 Compute empirical loss $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\theta, \nu)$
 $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \beta \nabla_\theta \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\theta, \nu)$
 $\nu \leftarrow \nu - \gamma \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \nabla_\nu \log p(y, \mathcal{U}^k | \nu)$
until θ, ν converge

In our implementation, we utilize Monte Carlo method to estimate the objective (11) and RSD(9):

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{RSD}}(p, q_\theta; \phi_\eta) &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K (\nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log p(\mathcal{U} | \mathcal{D}, \nu)^T |_{\mathcal{U}=\mathcal{U}^k} \phi_\eta(\mathcal{U}^k) \\ &+ \mathbb{E}_{\omega \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})} (\omega^T \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \phi_\eta(\mathcal{U}) |_{\mathcal{U}=\mathcal{U}^k} \omega)) \\ &- \lambda \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K (\phi_\eta(\mathcal{U}^k)^T \phi_\eta(\mathcal{U}^k)) \\ \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\theta, \nu) &= \widehat{\text{RSD}}(p, q_\theta; \phi_{\eta^*}), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where ϕ_{η^*} is the supremum of RSD estimate and the gradient with θ and ν is computed via automatic differentiation. To compute the expensive divergence of ϕ_η in Equation (12), we use the Hutchinson estimator [56], which provides a stochastic estimate of the trace of a matrix and reduces the time complexity from $\mathcal{O}(D^2)$ to $\mathcal{O}(D)$, where D is the dimensionality of the matrix. In Theorem 1, we prove that the score function $\nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu)$ can be evaluated by Monte

²The expectation doesn't include the regularization term.

Carlo method, which demonstrates that RSD is a suitable objective for updating the parameters of the generator network.

Theorem 1 *Assuming that $\mathcal{U} \in \Omega$, $\nu \in \Upsilon$ where Ω and Υ are both compact spaces. We can obtain an asymptotically unbiased estimator for the score function $\nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu)$ in Equation 12, which converges in probability to the true value. (detailed proof can be seen in App. B):*

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu) &\approx -(\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_{\ell}, \dots, \Delta_L) \\ &+ \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log \sum_{s=1}^S p(\mathbf{y}|\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_L^{(s)}) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\Delta_{\ell} = (\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_{\ell}\mathbf{z}_{\ell}}^{-1}\mathbf{U}_{\ell,1}, \dots, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_{\ell}\mathbf{z}_{\ell}}^{-1}\mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}, \dots, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_{\ell}\mathbf{z}_{\ell}}^{-1}\mathbf{U}_{\ell,D_{\ell}})$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell,d}^{(s)} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K}_{\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}\mathbf{z}_{\ell}}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_{\ell}\mathbf{z}_{\ell}}^{-1}\mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}, \mathbf{K}_{\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}} - \mathbf{K}_{\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}\mathbf{z}_{\ell}}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_{\ell}\mathbf{z}_{\ell}}^{-1}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_{\ell}\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}})$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, S is the number of samples involved in estimation.

In Monte Carlo estimation of the log likelihood function, bias can arise due to the logarithmic transformation on the likelihood function, which is not explicitly defined in the DGP model. This bias can affect other DGP inference objectives, such as DSVI[22].

However, in our method based on the score function, the gradient operator cancels out the bias introduced by the logarithmic transformation. The fact that our model is asymptotically unbiased, as proven by theorem 1, is beneficial for mini-batch methods that rely on random sub-sampling of data. This property enhances both the scalability and accuracy of our method.

To ensure the convergence of this estimate, we propose to introduce a constraint function $c(\cdot)$ to restrict the parameter space of the objective function, which, to our knowledge, has not been considered in previous work. This constraint function $c(\cdot)$ is designed to confine \mathcal{U} and ν within a compact space. For instance, if we adopt a squared exponential kernel function $k_{SE}(x, x') = \sigma_f^2 \exp\left(-\frac{(x-x')^2}{2l^2}\right)$ with length scale l , we can apply a clip function as a constraint for an appropriate closed interval $[M, N]$, namely:

$$\text{clip}(l) = \begin{cases} M & \text{if } l < M \\ l & \text{if } M \leq l \leq N \\ N & \text{if } l > N \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

As for the generated \mathcal{U} by the neural network generator, we can also apply such a constraint in the last layer to ensure the convergence of the score function estimate.

C. Prediction

To obtain the final layer density for predicting the value of the test data $\mathcal{D}^* = \{\mathbf{x}_n^*, y_n^*\}_{n=1}^T$, we first sample from the optimized generator and transform the input locations \mathbf{x} to the test locations \mathbf{x}^* using a specified formula. We subsequently compute the function values at the test locations, which are represented as \mathbf{F}_{ℓ}^* . Finally, we use a suitable method

to estimate the density of the final layer, which enables us to make predictions for the test data

$$\begin{aligned} q(\mathbf{F}_L^*) &= \\ &\int \prod_{\ell=1}^L \prod_{d=1}^{D_{\ell}} p(\mathbf{F}_{\ell,d}^*|\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}^*, \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}) q_{\theta^*}(\mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}) d\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}^* d\mathbf{U}_{\ell,d} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where θ^* is the optimal of the generator and the first term of the integral $p(\mathbf{F}_{\ell,d}^*|\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}^*, \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d})$ is conditional Gaussian. We leverage this consequence to draw samples from $q(\mathbf{F}_L^*)$, and further perform the sampling using re-parameterization trick [22], [57], [58]. Specifically, we first sample $\epsilon^{\ell} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_{D_{\ell}})$ and $\mathbf{U} \sim q_{\theta^*}(\mathcal{U})$, then recursively draw the sampled variables $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell,d}^* \sim p(\mathbf{F}_{\ell,d}^*|\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}^*, \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d})$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell,d}^* &= \mathbf{K}_{\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}\mathbf{z}_{\ell}}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_{\ell}\mathbf{z}_{\ell}}^{-1}\mathbf{U}_{\ell,d} \\ &+ \epsilon_{\ell} \odot \sqrt{\text{diag}(\mathbf{K}_{\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}} - \mathbf{K}_{\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}\mathbf{z}_{\ell}}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_{\ell}\mathbf{z}_{\ell}}^{-1}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_{\ell}\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}})}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where the square root is element-wise. We define $\mathbf{F}_0^* \triangleq \mathbf{X}^*$ for the first layer and use $\text{diag}(\cdot)$ to denote the vector of diagonal elements of a matrix. The diagonal approximation in Equation (16) holds since in DGP model, the i -th marginal of approximate posterior $q(\mathbf{F}_{(\ell,d)[i]})$ depends only on the corresponding inputs \mathbf{x}_i [11].

V. CONVERGENCE GUARANTEES AND BIAS CONTROL

In this section, we provide convergence guarantees and error control for NOVI DGP, detailed proof can be seen in App. C.

Definition 3 *The Fisher divergence [59] between two suitably smooth density functions is defined as*

$$F(q, p) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\nabla \log q(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla \log p(\mathbf{x})\|_2^2 q(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}.$$

Theorem 2 *Training the generator with the optimal discriminator corresponds to minimizing the Fisher divergence between p_{θ} and q . The corresponding optimal loss is*

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \nu) = \frac{1}{4\lambda} F(q_{\theta}(\mathcal{U}), p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu))$$

Theorem 3 *Assuming that $\mathcal{U} \in \Omega$, $\nu \in \Upsilon$ where Ω and Υ are both compact spaces. The bias of the estimation for prediction $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_L^*$ in Equation (16) from the DGPs exact evaluation can be bounded by the square root of the Fisher divergence between $q_{\theta}(\mathcal{U})$ and $p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu)$ up to multiplying a constant.*

Theorem 2 demonstrates that our algorithm is equivalent to minimizing Fisher divergence, while Theorem 3 guarantees a bounded bias for prediction estimation. Fisher divergence has proven to be a valuable tool in various statistics and machine learning applications, as demonstrated by its use in practical contexts such as generative models [60], Bayesian inference [59], and others [41].

Moreover, Fisher divergence has strong connections to other distance metrics such as total variation [61], Hellinger distance [62], and Wasserstein distance [63]. In fact, it is




Fig. 1. Regression mean test RMSE results by our NOVI method (blue), SGHMC (orange), IPVI (pink) and DSVI (cyan) for DGPs on UCI benchmark datasets. Lower is better. The mean is shown with error bars of one standard error.

often a stronger distance metric than these alternatives [64]. Researchers have shown that Fisher divergence can be used to upper-bound Wasserstein distance, which is especially useful in high-dimensional distribution estimation, as it leads to improved moment estimates [41].

Additionally, the connection between Fisher divergence and KL divergence can be demonstrated through de Bruijn’s identity [65], [66] and Stein’s identity [38], [67]. Therefore, by minimizing Fisher divergence, we can achieve more accurate and efficient estimation of the underlying distribution, which has important implications for various statistical and machine learning tasks.

VI. RELATED WORKS

Our method for inference is inspired by two previous works, namely OVI [47] and Stein Discrepancy [38]. However, our approach is distinct in that it specifically focuses on the DGP posterior and develops tailored algorithms to address it. One key challenge in calculating the score function for DGPs is that the likelihood function is not explicit, and thus we propose a stochastic gradient and Monte Carlo sampling method to address this issue (see Theorem 1). While OVI [47] introduces a similar objective for inference to RSD, it utilizes a different class of discriminator, and does not employ many of the

state-of-the-art techniques we use for scalability, such as the Hutchinson estimator [56].

The computation of the term $\text{Tr}(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\phi_{\eta}(\mathbf{x}))$ in Equation (8) is computationally expensive as it requires $\mathcal{O}(d)$ vector-Jacobian products. To address this issue, we can use the Hutchinson estimator, which only requires one vector-Jacobian product to compute. This estimator can be obtained by multiplying the matrix $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\phi_{\eta}(\mathbf{x})$ by a noise vector twice, as shown in the following identity [56]:

$$\text{Tr}(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\phi_{\eta}(\mathbf{x})) = \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)} [\epsilon^T \nabla_{\mathbf{x}}\phi_{\eta}(\mathbf{x}) \epsilon]. \quad (17)$$

This single-sample Monte-Carlo estimator has been widely used in recent years in the machine learning community due to its efficiency and unbiasedness [68], [69], [70].

VII. EXPERIMENTS

In order to evaluate the performance of our proposed method, we conducted empirical evaluations on real-world datasets for both regression and classification tasks, with both small and large datasets. Our method was compared against several other models, including Doubly Stochastic VI (DSVI) [22], which was used as our baseline model, Implicit Posterior VI (IPVI) [33], which constructs a variational lower bound using density ratio estimates, and the state-of-the-art SGHMC

Data Set	Model	Time (L=3)	Iter(L=3)	Acc (L=3)	Time (L=4)	Iter (L=4)	Acc (L=4)
MNIST	DSVI	0.34s/iter	20K	-	0.54s/iter	20K	97.41
	IPVI	0.49s/iter	20K	-	0.62s/iter	20K	97.80
	SGHMC	1.14s/iter	20K	-	1.22s/iter	20K	97.55
	NOVI (ours)	0.38s/iter	10K	98.04	0.50s/iter	10K	98.21
Fashion-MNIST	DSVI	0.34s/iter	20K	-	0.50s/iter	20K	87.99
	IPVI	0.48s/iter	20K	-	0.61s/iter	20K	88.90
	SGHMC	1.21s/iter	20K	-	1.25s/iter	20K	87.08
	NOVI (ours)	0.40s/iter	10K	89.36	0.55s/iter	10K	89.65
CIFAR-10	DSVI	0.43s/iter	20K	-	0.66s/iter	20K	51.79
	IPVI	0.62s/iter	20K	-	0.78s/iter	20K	53.27
	SGHMC	8.04s/iter	20K	-	8.61s/iter	20K	52.81
	NOVI (ours)	0.43s/iter	10K	53.42	0.52s/iter	10K	53.62

TABLE I

MEAN TEST ACCURACY (%) AND TRAINING DETAILS ACHIEVED BY DSVI, SGHMC AND NOVI (OURS) DGP MODEL FOR THREE IMAGE CLASSIFICATION DATASETS. BATCH SIZE IS SET TO 256 FOR ALL METHODS. L DENOTES THE NUMBER OF HIDDEN LAYERS. OUR PROPOSED METHOD CAN ALSO BE COMBINED WITH CONVOLUTION KERNELS [71] TO OBTAIN A BETTER RESULT, FOR A FAIR COMPARISON, WE HAVE NOT IMPLEMENTED HERE BUT IN NEXT PART.

model [23]. All experiments were conducted with the same hyper-parameters and initializations, and we provide detailed training information in Appendix E.

A. UCI Regression Benchmark

In our experiments, we evaluated the performance of the NOVI model on eight UCI regression datasets, which varied in size from 308 to 45,730 data points. We used the average RMSE of the test data as the performance metric, and the results are presented in Figure 1. The tabular version of the results can be found in Appendix D.C.

Our findings suggest that on three out of the eight datasets, namely 'Boston', 'Energy', and 'Concrete', using a simple 2-layer NOVI model produced the best results with a significant performance gap compared to other methods. However, for larger datasets such as 'Power', 'Kin8nm', and 'Protein', deeper NOVI models outperformed other methods. We attribute this phenomenon to the common issue of overfitting that occurs when adding more layers to the model, particularly on small datasets. This phenomenon has been observed in many other DGP studies, such as DSVI and SGHMC, which have also reported similar findings.

We have also included additional results for real-world regression datasets in Appendix D.E, further demonstrating the effectiveness of the NOVI model. Overall, our experiments highlight the importance of carefully selecting model architecture and hyperparameters to achieve optimal performance, particularly when working with small datasets.

B. Image Classification

We evaluate our method on multiclass classification tasks using the MNIST [72], Fashion-MNIST [73], and CIFAR-10 [74] datasets. The first two datasets consist of grayscale images of size 28×28 pixels, while CIFAR-10 comprises colored images of size 32×32 pixels. The results are presented in Table I³. We note that our method outperforms the other three

³For 3-layer DSVI and SGHMC models, since they have not yet released the corresponding code to reproduce it, we only test the training time and report its iterations according to the original paper.

Models	Accuracy (%)
CNF [29]	76.8
BDCGP [77]	74.6
DCGP [78]	75.9
DKL[76]	77.0
Resnet-20	91.3
Resnet-56	93.03
NOVI-DGP	93.56

TABLE II

CONVOLUTIONAL RESULTS OF CIFAR10 DATASET COMPARED WITH BASELINE DEEP LEARNING AND DGP METHODS. OUR RESULTS INDICATE THAT OUR MODEL OUTPERFORMS RESNET WHEN COMPARED, WITH ONLY AN ADDITION OF LESS THAN ONE-TENTH OF THE PARAMETER COUNT.

methods on all three datasets, with significantly less training time and iterations. Additionally, we evaluate our approach using three UCI classification datasets, and the results are presented in Appendix D.A.

Furthermore, we conduct supplementary experiments to achieve superior performance on the CIFAR-10 dataset. We utilize the convolutional layers of ResNet-20 [75] as our feature extractor and achieve a remarkable accuracy of 93.56 on the test set under pre-training[76], surpassing the performance of all baseline methods, as detailed in Table IV and Appendix D.F.

C. Computational complexity

We compared the training efficiency of our model with three other methods on a single Tesla V100 GPU using the Energy dataset, and the results are presented in Table III. It can be observed that our model achieves faster iteration times and requires less time to converge compared to DSVI and SGHMC. Furthermore, our method achieves convergence in less than one-tenth of the number of iterations required by the other three methods. Additionally, Table I shows that NOVI requires significantly less training time and iterations to converge on high-dimensional image datasets, demonstrating the scalability of our proposed method to larger datasets. Details regarding the number of inducing points used in each method can be found in Appendix D.D.




Fig. 2. The mean RMSE comparison of NOVI (test: orange, train: red) with Monte Carlo log-likelihood maximization method (test: blue, train: cyan) using 2-layer DGP model on four UCI regression datasets.

Type	DSVI 2	DSVI 3	DSVI 4	DSVI 5
Time (s)	0.835	0.903	0.965	1.339
Iteration	20K	20K	20K	20K
Type	IPVI 2	IPVI 3	IPVI 4	IPVI 5
Time (s)	0.117	0.162	0.211	0.260
Iteration	20K	20K	20K	20K
Type	SGHMC 2	SGHMC 3	SGHMC 4	SGHMC 5
Time (s)	0.630	1.000	1.490	1.870
Iteration	20K	20K	20K	20K
Type	NOVI 2	NOVI 3	NOVI 4	NOVI 5
Time (s)	0.391	0.613	0.863	1.123
Iteration	500	500	500	500

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF TRAINING TIME (S) OF A SINGLE ITERATION AND TOTAL TRAINING ITERATIONS ON ENERGY DATASET. BATCH SIZE IS SET TO 1000 FOR ALL THREE METHODS. * INDICATES THAT ALTHOUGH IPVI TAKES LESS TIME PER ITERATION, IT REQUIRES A LARGER TRAINING ITERATION TO CONVERGE, WHICH IS MORE TIME-CONSUMING THAN OUR METHOD.

D. Ablation study

To demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed NOVI method, we compare it with a 2-layer DGP model by directly maximizing the log-likelihood with randomly initialized \mathcal{U} and hyperparameters ν . The results are presented in Figure 2. It can be observed that NOVI achieves lower test RMSE and higher train RMSE for all datasets, which indicates that our optimization method reduces overfitting. Although there is some loss fluctuation during the training of our method, it is caused by the unique adversarial training and converges to a stable value after only several hundred iterations. Additional results for ablation study on classification datasets can be found in Appendix D.B.

VIII. CONCLUSION

This paper introduces a novel framework called NOVI, which integrates the Stein Discrepancy with Deep Gaussian Processes (DGPs) to model non-Gaussian and hierarchical-related posteriors, thereby enhancing the flexibility of DGP models. The approach involves generating inducing variables from a neural generator and optimizing them jointly with variational parameters through adversarial training. Theoretical

analysis shows that the bias introduced by our method can be bounded by Fisher divergence, enabling efficient optimization of the neural generator. Empirical evaluation indicates that NOVI outperforms state-of-the-art approximation methods for both regression and classification tasks, while requiring significantly less training time and iterations to converge. Adversarial training introduces fluctuations in loss during training, which can pose challenges for optimization, but these fluctuations are greatly reduced at the convergence point.

Future work could focus on incorporating convolutional structures to better extract features from images and utilizing Neural Architecture Search (NAS)[79] methods to obtain more suitable network architectures for practical applications. Overall, the proposed NOVI framework represents a significant advancement in the field of deep learning, and holds promise for a wide range of applications in both academia and industry.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

THE SOLUTION TO SVGP AND DSVI

Due to the Gaussian mean-field assumptions, the solution to SVGP has an analytical solution

$$\begin{aligned}
 q(\mathbf{f}) &= \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{f}|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \\
 \text{where } \boldsymbol{\mu} &= \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{XZ}}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{ZZ}}^{-1}\mathbf{m} \\
 \boldsymbol{\Sigma} &= \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{XX}} - \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{XZ}}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{ZZ}}^{-1}(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{ZZ}} - \mathbf{S})\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{ZZ}}^{-1}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{ZX}}
 \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

While performing similarly in DSVI, they have an analytical form for $q(\mathbf{F})$

$$\begin{aligned}
 q(\{\mathbf{F}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^L) &= \\
 \prod_{\ell=1}^L \prod_{d=1}^{D_\ell} \int q(\mathbf{F}_{\ell,d}|\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}, \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}) q(\mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}) d\mathbf{U}_{\ell,d} & \tag{19} \\
 = \prod_{\ell=1}^L \prod_{d=1}^{D_\ell} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{F}_{\ell,d}|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\ell,d}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\ell,d}), &
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\ell,d}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\ell,d}$ is defined as Equation (18).

APPENDIX B

PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Theorem 4 Assuming that $\mathcal{U} \in \Omega$, $\nu \in \mathcal{T}$ where Ω and \mathcal{T} are both compact spaces. We can obtain an asymptotically unbiased estimator for the score function $\nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu)$

in Equation (18), which converges in probability to the true value.

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu) &\approx -(\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_\ell, \dots, \Delta_L) \\ &+ \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log \sum_{s=1}^S p(\mathbf{y}|\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_L^{(s)}) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $\Delta_\ell = (\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_\ell \mathbf{z}_\ell}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{\ell,1}, \dots, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_\ell \mathbf{z}_\ell}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}, \dots, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_\ell \mathbf{z}_\ell}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{\ell,D_\ell})$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell,d}^{(s)} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K}_{\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1} \mathbf{z}_\ell} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_\ell \mathbf{z}_\ell}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}, \mathbf{K}_{\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1} \widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}} - \mathbf{K}_{\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1} \mathbf{z}_\ell} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_\ell \mathbf{z}_\ell}^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_\ell \widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}})$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, S is the number of samples involved in estimation.

Proof 1 From Bayes Formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \log p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu) &= \log \frac{p(\mathcal{U})p(\mathcal{D}|\mathcal{U}, \nu)}{p(\mathcal{D})} \\ &= \log p(\mathcal{U}) + \log p(\mathcal{D}|\mathcal{U}, \nu) - \log p(\mathcal{D}), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

since the prior term $p(\mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}) = \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_\ell \mathbf{z}_\ell})$, the gradient with \mathcal{U} is a long vector and is tractable:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log p(\mathcal{U}) &= \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log \prod_{\ell=1}^L \prod_{d=1}^{D_\ell} p(\mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{d=1}^{D_\ell} \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}^T \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_\ell \mathbf{z}_\ell}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d} \\ &= -(\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_\ell, \dots, \Delta_L) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $\Delta_\ell = (\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_\ell \mathbf{z}_\ell}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{\ell,1}, \dots, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_\ell \mathbf{z}_\ell}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}, \dots, \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_\ell \mathbf{z}_\ell}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{\ell,D_\ell})$. The third term of Equation (21) is a constant w.r.t \mathcal{U} . We compute the second data likelihood term $\log p(\mathcal{D}|\mathcal{U}, \nu)$ using re-parameterization trick and Monte Carlo method over each layer:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log p(\mathcal{D}|\mathcal{U}, \nu) &= \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log \int p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{F}_L) \prod_{\ell=1}^L p(\mathbf{F}_\ell|\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}, \mathbf{U}_\ell) d\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1} \\ &= \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbf{F}_L|\mathcal{U})} p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{F}_L) \approx \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log \sum_{s=1}^S p(\mathbf{y}|\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_L^{(s)}) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The last equation in the above expression can be derived from the following conditions: We denote Monte Carlo estimation $\frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S p(\mathbf{y}|\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_L^{(s)})$ as $\tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})$ and the true value as $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})$, respectively. By the Central Limit Theorem, $\frac{\tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) - p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{S} \text{Var}(p(\mathbf{y}|\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_L^{(s)})}} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, i.e., $\tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})$ and $\nabla \tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} \nabla p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})$, since $\nabla \tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) - \nabla p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) = \nabla \sqrt{\frac{\text{Var}(p(\mathbf{y}|\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_L^{(s)}))}{S}} \epsilon \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} 0$ as S increases, where $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The likelihood function $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}, \nu)$ is a continuous bounded function defined on a compact domain Ω and Υ , then uniform continuity guarantees the boundedness of its derivative, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla \log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) - \nabla \log \tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})\| \\ &= \left\| \frac{\nabla p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})}{p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})} - \frac{\nabla \tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})}{\tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \frac{\tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) \nabla p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) - p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) \nabla \tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})}{p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) \tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \frac{\tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) \nabla p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) - p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) \nabla p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) + p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) \nabla p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) - p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) \nabla \tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})}{p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) \tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \frac{(\tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) - p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})) \nabla p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) + p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) (\nabla p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) - \nabla \tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}))}{p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) \tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})} \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) \tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})} \cdot \left(\|\nabla p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})\| \cdot \|\tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) - p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})\| + p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) \|\nabla p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) - \nabla \tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})\| \right) \\ &\xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} 0 \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

It is easy to derive from the above equation that $\nabla \log \tilde{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} \nabla \log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{U})$, the approximately equal sign means that the right-hand side converges to the left-hand side in probability. From the above expression, we can also conclude that this estimator is asymptotically unbiased.

we draw S samples $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell,d}^{(s)}$ from $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell,d} \sim p(\mathbf{F}_{\ell,d}|\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}, \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d})$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell,d} &= \mathbf{K}_{\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1} \mathbf{z}_\ell} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_\ell \mathbf{z}_\ell}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d} \\ &+ \epsilon_\ell \odot \sqrt{\text{diag}(\mathbf{K}_{\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1} \widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}} - \mathbf{K}_{\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1} \mathbf{z}_\ell} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_\ell \mathbf{z}_\ell}^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}_\ell \widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{\ell-1}})} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $\epsilon_\ell \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_{D_\ell})$. As a result, we obtain the score function via automatic differentiation:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu) &\approx -(\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_\ell, \dots, \Delta_L) \\ &+ \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log \sum_{s=1}^S p(\mathbf{y}|\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_L^{(s)}) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

APPENDIX C

PROOF OF THEOREM 2 AND THEOREM 3

Definition 4 Let $p(\mathbf{x})$ be a probability density supported on $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\phi: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a differentiable function, we define Langevin-Stein Operator (LSO) [47]

$$\mathcal{A}_p \phi(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x})^T \phi(\mathbf{x}) + \text{Tr}(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi(\mathbf{x})). \quad (27)$$

Lemma 2 Let $p(\mathbf{x})$ be a probability density function supported on $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\phi: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a differentiable function. Suppose that $\int_{\partial \mathcal{X}} p(\mathbf{x}) \phi(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$, where $\partial \mathcal{X}$ represents the boundary of \mathcal{X} . Under these conditions, Stein's identity can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p} [\mathcal{A}_p \phi(\mathbf{x})] = 0. \quad (28)$$

Proof 2

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p} [\mathcal{A}_p \phi(\mathbf{x})] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p} [\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x})^T \phi(\mathbf{x}) + \text{Tr}(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi(\mathbf{x}))] \\ &= \text{Tr}(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p} [\phi(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x})^T + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi(\mathbf{x})]) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p} [\phi(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x})^T + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi(\mathbf{x})] \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} p(\mathbf{x}) \phi(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x})^T + p(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} (p(\mathbf{x}) \phi(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x} \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

From Divergence Theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Tr} \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} (p(\mathbf{x}) \phi(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x} \right) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \text{div}(p(\mathbf{x}) \phi(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{\partial \mathcal{X}} p(\mathbf{x}) \phi(\mathbf{x})^T \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where $\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})$ is the outward-pointing unit vector on the boundary of \mathcal{X} .

Lemma 3 Suppose $p(\mathbf{x})$, $q(\mathbf{x})$ are probability densities supported on $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a differentiable function satisfying $\int_{\partial\mathcal{X}} p(\mathbf{x})\phi(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\int_{\partial\mathcal{X}} q(\mathbf{x})\phi(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\mathcal{A}_p \phi(\mathbf{x})] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log q(\mathbf{x}))^T \phi(\mathbf{x})] \quad (32)$$

Proof 3 By Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log q(\mathbf{x})^T \phi(\mathbf{x}) + \text{Tr}(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi(\mathbf{x}))] &= 0 \\ \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\text{Tr}(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi(\mathbf{x}))] &= -\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log q(\mathbf{x})^T \phi(\mathbf{x})] \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\mathcal{A}_p \phi(\mathbf{x})] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x})^T \phi(\mathbf{x}) + \text{Tr}(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi(\mathbf{x}))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log q(\mathbf{x}))^T \phi(\mathbf{x})] \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Lemma 4 For any $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\lambda > 0$, the function $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{y} - \lambda \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y}$ achieves its maximum $\frac{1}{4\lambda} \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{a}$ if and only if $\mathbf{y} = \frac{1}{2\lambda} \mathbf{a}$.

Proof 4 From Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{y} - \lambda \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} &\leq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2 \|\mathbf{y}\|_2 - \lambda \|\mathbf{y}\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{4\lambda} \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 - \lambda (\|\mathbf{y}\|_2 - \frac{1}{2\lambda} \|\mathbf{a}\|_2)^2 \leq \frac{1}{4\lambda} \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The equality holds iff $\mathbf{y} = \frac{1}{2\lambda} \mathbf{a}$.

Definition 5 The Fisher divergence [59] between two suitably smooth density functions is defined as

$$F(q, p) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|\nabla \log q(\theta) - \nabla \log p(\theta)\|_2^2 q(\theta) d\theta. \quad (36)$$

Theorem 5 Supposed that the discriminator and the generator network has enough capacity. Training the generator with the optimal discriminator corresponds to minimizing the fisher divergence between p_θ and q . The corresponding optimal loss is

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \nu) = \frac{1}{4\lambda} F(q_\theta(\mathcal{U}), p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu)) \quad (37)$$

Proof 5 Let our loss function be $\mathcal{L}(\theta, \nu)$, by Lemma 3,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \nu) &= \sup_{\eta} \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta(\mathcal{U})} [\mathcal{A}_p \phi_\eta(\mathcal{U}) - \lambda \phi_\eta(\mathcal{U})^T \phi_\eta(\mathcal{U})] \\ &= \sup_{\eta} \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta(\mathcal{U})} [(\nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log p(\mathcal{U} | \mathcal{D}, \nu) \\ &\quad - \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} q_\theta(\mathcal{U}))^T \phi_\eta(\mathcal{U}) - \lambda \phi_\eta(\mathcal{U})^T \phi_\eta(\mathcal{U})] \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

According to Lemma 4, the above equation attains its maximum value when the function $\phi_\eta(\mathcal{U}) = \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu) - \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} q_\theta(\mathcal{U})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \nu) &= \frac{1}{4\lambda} \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta(\mathcal{U})} [\|\nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu) - \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} q_\theta(\mathcal{U})\|_2^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{4\lambda} F(q_\theta(\mathcal{U}), p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu)) \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

The optimal discriminator is:

$$\phi_{\eta^*}(\mathcal{U}) = \frac{1}{2\lambda} (\nabla_{\mathcal{U}} \log p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu) - \nabla_{\mathcal{U}} q_\theta(\mathcal{U})) \quad (40)$$

Lemma 5 Suppose $p(\mathbf{x})$, $q(\mathbf{x})$ are probability densities on \mathbb{R}^d and $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a differentiable function that satisfies $\lim_{\|\mathbf{x}\| \rightarrow \infty} q(\mathbf{x})\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$, we have

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\mathcal{A}_p \phi(\mathbf{x})]| \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} \|\phi(\mathbf{x})\|_2^2} \sqrt{F(q, p)} \quad (41)$$

Proof 6 By Lemma 3, we have:

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\mathcal{A}_p \phi(\mathbf{x})]| = |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log q(\mathbf{x}))^T \phi(\mathbf{x})]|. \quad (42)$$

From Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Hölder's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log q(\mathbf{x}))^T \phi(\mathbf{x})]| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log q(\mathbf{x})\|_2 \|\phi(\mathbf{x})\|_2] \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log p(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \log q(\mathbf{x})\|_2^2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} \|\phi(\mathbf{x})\|_2^2} \\ &= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} \|\phi(\mathbf{x})\|_2^2} \sqrt{F(q, p)} \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Definition 6 Suppose $p(\mathbf{x})$ is probability densities on \mathbb{R}^d and $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function, we define $\phi_\psi^p(\mathbf{x})$ as a solution of the Stein equation $\mathcal{A}_p \phi(\mathbf{x}) = \psi(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p}[\psi(\mathbf{x})]$.

Lemma 6 Suppose $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded function, there exists a bounded solution of the Stein equation.

Proof 7 Let $h(\mathbf{x}) = \psi(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p}[\psi(\mathbf{x})]$, $h(\mathbf{x})$ is obviously bounded, then

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{p(\mathbf{x})} \int_{-\infty}^{x_1} p(t, x_2, \dots, x_d) h(t, x_2, \dots, x_d) dt, \\ \phi_2(\mathbf{x}) &= \dots = \phi_d(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

is a bounded solution.

Lemma 7 Suppose $p(\mathbf{x})$, $q(\mathbf{x})$ are probability densities on \mathbb{R}^d and $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded function. $\forall i \in (1, \dots, n)$, let $\phi_{\psi_i}^p(\mathbf{x})$ be a solution of the Stein equation, then we have

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\psi(\mathbf{x})] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p} [\psi(\mathbf{x})]\|_2 \leq c_{\psi}^{p, q} \sqrt{F(q, p)} \quad (45)$$

where $c_{\psi}^{p, q} \triangleq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} \|\phi_{\psi_i}^p(\mathbf{x})\|_2^2}$ is bounded.

Proof 8 By Lemma 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\psi_i(\mathbf{x})] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p} [\psi_i(\mathbf{x})]| \\ &= |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\psi_i(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p} [\psi_i(\mathbf{x})]]| \\ &= |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} [\mathcal{A}_p \phi_{\psi_i}^p(\mathbf{x})]| \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim q} \|\phi_{\psi_i}^p(\mathbf{x})\|_2^2} \sqrt{F(q, p)}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}\sim q}[\psi(\mathbf{x})] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}\sim p}[\psi(\mathbf{x})]\|_2 \\
&= \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}\sim q}[\psi_i(\mathbf{x})] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}\sim p}[\psi_i(\mathbf{x})]\|_2^2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}\sim q} \|\phi_{\psi_i}^p(\mathbf{x})\|_2^2} F(q, p) = c_{\psi}^{p,q} \sqrt{F(q, p)},
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

where

$$c_{\psi}^{p,q} \triangleq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}\sim q} \|\phi_{\psi_i}^p(\mathbf{x})\|_2^2} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \|\phi_{\psi_i}^p(\mathbf{x})\|_{\infty}^2} \tag{48}$$

is bounded by Lemma 6.

Theorem 6 *The bias of the estimate of the prediction $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_L^*$ in Equation (21) from the DGPs exact evaluation can be bounded by the square root of the Fisher divergence between $q_{\theta}(\mathcal{U})$ and $p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu)$ up to multiplying a constant.*

Proof 9 *From Law of Large Numbers, we have*

$$\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_L^* = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \widehat{\mathbf{F}}_L^{*(s)} \approx \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{F}_L^*)}[\mathbf{F}_L^*] \tag{49}$$

, where S denotes the number of samples involved in the estimation and $q(\mathbf{F}_L^*)$ is represented as:

$$q(\mathbf{F}_L^*) = \int \prod_{\ell=1}^L \prod_{d=1}^{D_{\ell}} p(\mathbf{F}_{\ell,d}^* | \mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}^*, \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}) q_{\theta^*}(\mathbf{U}_{\ell}) d\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}^* d\mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}. \tag{50}$$

The DGPs exact evaluation can be written as:

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{F}}_L^* = \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbf{F}_L^*|\mathcal{D}, \nu)}[\mathbf{F}_L^*]. \tag{51}$$

Similarly:

$$\begin{aligned}
& p(\mathbf{F}_L^*|\mathcal{D}, \nu) \\
&= \int \prod_{\ell=1}^L \prod_{d=1}^{D_{\ell}} p(\mathbf{F}_{\ell,d}^* | \mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}^*, \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}) p(\mathbf{U}_{\ell}|\mathcal{D}, \nu) d\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}^* d\mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}.
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

By Lemma 7:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_L^* - \widetilde{\mathbf{F}}_L^*\|_2 \\
&= \|\mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{F}_L^*)}[\mathbf{F}_L^*] - \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbf{F}_L^*|\mathcal{D}, \nu)}[\mathbf{F}_L^*]\|_2 \\
&= \|\mathbb{E}_{q(\mathcal{U})} \left[\int \mathbf{F}_L^* \prod_{\ell=1}^L \prod_{d=1}^{D_{\ell}} p(\mathbf{F}_{\ell,d}^* | \mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}^*, \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}) d\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}^* d\mathbf{F}_L^* \right] \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu)} \left[\int \mathbf{F}_L^* \prod_{\ell=1}^L \prod_{d=1}^{D_{\ell}} p(\mathbf{F}_{\ell,d}^* | \mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}^*, \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}) d\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}^* d\mathbf{F}_L^* \right]\|_2 \\
&= \|\mathbb{E}_{q(\mathcal{U})}[\psi(\mathcal{U})] - \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu)}[\psi(\mathcal{U})]\|_2 \\
&\leq c_{\psi}^{p,q} \sqrt{F(q(\mathcal{U}), p(\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{D}, \nu))},
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Since Ω and \mathcal{Y} are both compact, $\psi(\mathcal{U}) = \int \mathbf{F}_L^* \prod_{\ell=1}^L \prod_{d=1}^{D_{\ell}} p(\mathbf{F}_{\ell,d}^* | \mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}^*, \mathbf{U}_{\ell,d}) d\mathbf{F}_{\ell-1}^* d\mathbf{F}_L^*$ is obviously bounded.

APPENDIX D ADDITIONAL RESULTS

A. UCI Classification Benchmark

We performed classification task on three UCI benchmark datasets, with size ranging from 1000 to 7400. Results are

Models	Accuracy (%)
CNF [29]	76.8
BDCGP [77]	74.6
DCGP [78]	75.9
DKL[76]	77.0
Resnet-20	91.3
Resnet-56	93.03
NOVI-DGP	93.56

TABLE IV

CONVOLUTIONAL RESULTS OF CIFAR10 DATASET COMPARED WITH BASELINE DEEP LEARNING AND DGP METHODS. OUR RESULTS INDICATE THAT OUR MODEL OUTPERFORMS RESNET WHEN COMPARED, WITH ONLY AN ADDITION OF LESS THAN ONE-TENTH OF THE PARAMETER COUNT.

reported in Figure 3 compared through test accuracy as performance metric. It can be observed that NOVI achieves the best results in different sizes of datasets and shows competitive performance within different layers.

B. Ablation study on Classification datasets

We also performed ablation study on classification datasets and reported its results by test accuracy in Figure 4. From which it can be seen that NOVI not only achieves better results on large scale datasets, which demonstrates its scalability, but also the results on the test set have far exceeded the performance of the Monte Carlo log-likelihood maximization method on the training set, suggesting the feasibility of adversarial training.

C. Tabular version of Figure 2 in the main text

Tabular version of Figure 2 in the main text can be seen in Table V.

D. Comparison about inducing points

In order to investigate the robustness of NOVI at different numbers of induced points, we have performed ablation study to compare accuracy and training time on 4 UCI regression datasets using 2-layer DGP model. For each dataset, number of iteration is set to be the same for fair comparison. Results are shown in Table VII. From which it can be seen that the performance increases gradually with the number of induction points, while the time fluctuates only slightly, which shows the robustness of NOVI to the number of inducing points.

E. Additional experiments

We have also performed additional regression experiments for two real-world datasets: Estate and Elevators. Results are shown in Table VI. From these two datasets, it can be seen that NOVI has achieved better RMSE value than other two methods (which demonstrates its robustness to complex real-world problems).

F. Convolutional experiments for CIFAR10 dataset

To better clarify the expressiveness of NOVI-DGP on image classification experiment, we have adopted the convolutional structure to better extract features for DGP. The results are shown in Table IV. It can be seen that NOVI-DGP outperforms




Fig. 3. Classification mean test accuracy (%) by our NOVI method (blue), SGHMC (pink) and DSVI (orange) for DGPs on three UCI benchmark datasets. Higher is better.




Fig. 4. The mean accuracy comparison of NOVI (blue) with Monte Carlo log-likelihood maximization method (pink) using 3-layer DGP model on three image classification datasets. The results of the training and test sets are shown by dashed and solid lines, respectively.

all the baseline methods by a large gap and obtains satisfactory 93.56% classification accuracy (Since IPVI, SGHMC and IPVI have not implemented the convolutional results, we compare with some classic methods in deep learning and DGP community). We follow prior work [78] to utilize pre-training method (Resnet-20) to extract semantic meaningful features from input images and also outperform it (77.0%) by a large gap, which further demonstrates the effectiveness of our method.

APPENDIX E TRAINING DETAILS

A. UCI datasets

a) Training: We conducted a random 0.9/0.1 train/test split and normalized the features to the range $[-1, 1]$. The depth L of DGP models varied from 2 to 5, with 100 inducing points per layer, which are initialized by sampling from isotropic Gaussian distribution. The output dimension for

each hidden layer is set to 1 for final layer and 10 for others. We have utilized RQ kernel for all tasks. For all datasets, we have optimized hyper-parameters and network parameters jointly and utilized different learning rate, 0.02 for hyper-parameters and 0.001 for network parameters using Adam optimizer [80]. The dimension of noise ϵ used to generate \mathcal{U} is set to 200 for all datasets. We train for almost 500 iterations for all datasets. DSVI and SGHMC methods are initialized the same as NOVI to obtain a fair comparison.

b) Network Settings: The generator and discriminator network are all constructed by fully-connected layer, activated by Sigmoid and PReLU function respectively. The schematic diagram is shown in Figure 5.

B. Image datasets

a) Training: We have followed the division of the original dataset and normalized pixel values to $[-1, 1]$. The depth L of DGP models are varied from 3 to 4 with 100 inducing points

Data	DSVI 2	DSVI 3	DSVI 4	DSVI 5	SGHMC 2	SGHMC 3	SGHMC 4	SGHMC 5	IPVI 2	IPVI 3	IPVI 4	IPVI 5	NOVI 2	NOVI 3	NOVI 4	NOVI 5
Boston	0.32 (0.02)	0.32 (0.02)	0.32 (0.02)	0.32 (0.02)	0.37 (0.07)	0.38 (0.08)	0.35 (0.09)	0.39 (0.07)	0.35 (0.06)	0.34 (0.05)	0.33 (0.06)	0.32 (0.04)	0.20 (0.01)	0.34 (0.02)	0.40 (0.03)	0.38 (0.02)
Energy	0.05 (0.00)	0.05 (0.00)	0.05 (0.00)	0.05 (0.00)	0.13 (0.01)	0.13 (0.01)	0.09 (0.04)	0.13 (0.01)	0.13 (0.01)	0.13 (0.01)	0.12 (0.03)	0.11 (0.04)	0.04 (0.00)	0.05 (0.00)	0.06 (0.00)	0.06 (0.00)
Power	0.22 (0.00)	0.22 (0.00)	0.22 (0.00)	0.22 (0.00)	0.23 (0.00)	0.22 (0.00)	0.22 (0.00)	0.22 (0.00)	0.22 (0.01)	0.22 (0.01)	0.22 (0.01)	0.21 (0.01)	0.22 (0.00)	0.21 (0.00)	0.21 (0.00)	0.21 (0.00)
Concrete	0.34 (0.01)	0.34 (0.01)	0.34 (0.01)	0.34 (0.01)	0.35 (0.03)	0.33 (0.03)	0.31 (0.02)	0.31 (0.02)	0.32 (0.02)	0.30 (0.03)	0.31 (0.03)	0.30 (0.04)	0.24 (0.00)	0.25 (0.00)	0.24 (0.00)	0.23 (0.00)
Yacht	0.07 (0.00)	0.07 (0.00)	0.07 (0.00)	0.07 (0.00)	0.03 (0.01)	0.03 (0.01)	0.02 (0.01)	0.03 (0.01)	0.03 (0.02)	0.03 (0.02)	0.04 (0.03)	0.03 (0.01)	0.02 (0.00)	0.09 (0.01)	0.08 (0.00)	0.06 (0.00)
Power	0.22 (0.00)	0.22 (0.00)	0.22 (0.00)	0.22 (0.00)	0.23 (0.00)	0.22 (0.00)	0.22 (0.00)	0.22 (0.00)	0.22 (0.01)	0.22 (0.01)	0.22 (0.01)	0.21 (0.01)	0.22 (0.00)	0.21 (0.00)	0.21 (0.00)	0.21 (0.00)
Qsar	0.57 (0.00)	0.50 (0.00)	0.47 (0.00)	0.42 (0.00)	0.56 (0.00)	0.56 (0.00)	0.56 (0.00)	0.56 (0.00)	0.56 (0.01)	0.54 (0.01)	0.54 (0.01)	0.54 (0.01)	0.51 (0.00)	0.46 (0.01)	0.45 (0.01)	0.44 (0.01)
Protein	0.81 (0.00)	0.77 (0.00)	0.79 (0.00)	0.73 (0.00)	0.72 (0.01)	0.71 (0.01)	0.70 (0.01)	0.69 (0.00)	0.68 (0.01)	0.65 (0.01)	0.65 (0.01)	0.65 (0.01)	0.67 (0.00)	0.65 (0.00)	0.66 (0.00)	0.66 (0.00)
Kin8nm	0.39 (0.00)	0.37 (0.00)	0.34 (0.00)	0.30 (0.00)	0.26 (0.01)	0.25 (0.01)	0.25 (0.01)	0.24 (0.01)	0.25 (0.01)	0.25 (0.01)	0.25 (0.00)	0.26 (0.01)	0.24 (0.00)	0.28 (0.00)	0.26 (0.00)	0.27 (0.00)

TABLE V
TABULAR VERSION OF FIGURE 2 IN THE MAIN TEXT.

Method	Estate				Elevators			
	L=2	L=3	L=4	L=5	L=2	L=3	L=4	L=5
DSVI	0.65 (0.02)	0.66 (0.02)	0.50 (0.02)	0.64 (0.02)	0.37 (0.00)	0.36 (0.00)	0.37 (0.00)	0.36 (0.00)
SGHMC	0.54 (0.01)	0.50 (0.01)	0.53 (0.01)	0.61 (0.01)	0.36 (0.00)	0.36 (0.00)	0.35 (0.00)	0.35 (0.00)
NOVI	0.56 (0.02)	0.40 (0.02)	0.40 (0.01)	0.39 (0.02)	0.36 (0.00)	0.35 (0.00)	0.35 (0.00)	0.35 (0.00)

TABLE VI
ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTS FOR REAL-WORLD DATASETS. IT SHOWS REGRESSION MEAN TEST RMSE VALUES WITH ITS STANDARD DEVIATION ON THE ROUND BRACKET. L DENOTES THE NUMBER OF LAYERS IN DGP MODELS.

	Concrete	Energy	Boston	Kin8nm
Iteration	500	600	300	500
RMSE (M=50)	0.28 (0.00)	0.04 (0.00)	0.23 (0.00)	0.26 (0.00)
Time (M=50)	0.397s	0.404s	0.380s	0.600s
RMSE (M=100)	0.24 (0.00)	0.04 (0.00)	0.20 (0.01)	0.24 (0.00)
Time (M=100)	0.403s	0.420s	0.400s	0.613s
RMSE (M=200)	0.20 (0.00)	0.03 (0.00)	0.20 (0.00)	0.24 (0.00)
Time (M=200)	0.408s	0.450s	0.410s	0.646s
RMSE (M=400)	0.19 (0.00)	0.03 (0.00)	0.18 (0.01)	0.23 (0.00)
Time (M=400)	0.408s	0.450s	0.420s	0.658s

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF INDUCING POINTS (50, 100, 200 AND 400) USING 2-LAYER DGP MODEL ON 4 UCI REGRESSION DATASETS. M DENOTES THE NUMBER OF INDUCING POINTS PER LAYER.




Fig. 5. Semantic diagram of generator and discriminator network. The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of input and output neurons respectively.

per layer, which are initialized by sampling from isotropic Gaussian distribution. The output dimension for each hidden layer is set to be 10 for final layer (which is the exact number of class to predict), and 60 for others. We have utilized RQ kernel for all tasks. For all datasets, we have optimized hyper-parameters and network parameters jointly and utilized different learning rate, 0.02 for hyper-parameters and 0.001 for network parameters using Adam optimizer [80]. The dimension of noise ϵ used to generate \mathcal{U} is set to 200 for all datasets. We train for almost $10k$ iterations for all datasets. DSVI and SGHMC methods are initialized the same as NOVI to obtain a fair comparison.

b) *Network Settings*: The network is constructed in the same way when applied to the UCI dataset, which also can be seen in Figure 5.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. E. Rasmussen and C. K. I. Williams, *Gaussian processes for machine learning*. MIT Press, 2006.
- [2] J. Cheng, Y. Chen, Q. Zhang, L. Gan, C. Liu, and M. Liu, “Real-time trajectory planning for autonomous driving with gaussian process and incremental refinement,” in *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 8999–9005.
- [3] G. Chowdhary, H. A. Kingravi, J. P. How, and P. A. Vela, “Bayesian nonparametric adaptive control using gaussian processes,” *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 537–550, 2014.
- [4] W. Cho, Y. Kim, and J. Park, “Hierarchical anomaly detection using a multioutput gaussian process,” *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 261–272, 2019.
- [5] V. Dutoir, J. Hensman, M. van der Wilk, C. H. Ek, Z. Ghahramani, and N. Durrande, “Deep neural networks as point estimates for deep gaussian processes,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 9443–9455, 2021.
- [6] A. Hebbal, L. Brevault, M. Balesdent, E.-G. Taibi, and N. Melab, “Efficient global optimization using deep gaussian processes,” in *2018 IEEE Congress on evolutionary computation (CEC)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–8.
- [7] C.-K. Lu, S. C.-H. Yang, X. Hao, and P. Shafto, “Interpretable deep gaussian processes with moments,” in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 613–623.
- [8] S. W. Ober and L. Aitchison, “Global inducing point variational posteriors for bayesian neural networks and deep gaussian processes,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 8248–8259.
- [9] M. M. Dunlop, M. A. Girolami, A. M. Stuart, and A. L. Teckentrup, “How deep are deep gaussian processes?” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 19, no. 54, pp. 1–46, 2018.
- [10] E. L. Snelson and Z. Ghahramani, “Sparse Gaussian processes using pseudo-inputs,” in *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2005, pp. 1257–1264.
- [11] J. Quiñero-Candela and C. E. Rasmussen, “A unifying view of sparse approximate Gaussian process regression,” *JMLR*, vol. 6, pp. 1939–1959, 2005.
- [12] M. N. Gibbs and D. J. MacKay, “Variational gaussian process classifiers,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 1458–1464, 2000.
- [13] L. Mao and S. Sun, “Multiview variational sparse gaussian processes,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 32, no. 7, pp. 2875–2885, 2020.
- [14] J. Hensman, A. Matthews, and Z. Ghahramani, “Scalable Variational Gaussian Process Classification,” in *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, G. Lebanon and S. V. N. Vishwanathan, Eds., vol. 38. San Diego, California, USA: PMLR, 09–12 May 2015, pp. 351–360. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v38/hensman15.html>
- [15] M. P. Deisenroth and J. W. Ng, “Distributed Gaussian processes,” in *Proc. ICML*, 2015, pp. 1481–1490.

- [16] Y. Gal, M. van der Wilk, and C. E. Rasmussen, “Distributed variational inference in sparse Gaussian process regression and latent variable models,” in *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2014, pp. 3257–3265.
- [17] J. Hensman, N. Fusi, and N. Lawrence, “Gaussian processes for big data,” in *Proc. UAI*, 2013, pp. 282–290.
- [18] T. N. Hoang, Q. M. Hoang, and K. H. Low, “A unifying framework of anytime sparse Gaussian process regression models with stochastic variational inference for big data,” in *Proc. ICML*, 2015, pp. 569–578.
- [19] —, “A distributed variational inference framework for unifying parallel sparse Gaussian process regression models,” in *Proc. ICML*, 2016, pp. 382–391.
- [20] M. K. Titsias, “Variational model selection for sparse Gaussian process regression,” School of Computer Science, University of Manchester, Tech. Rep., 2009.
- [21] H. Liu, Y.-S. Ong, X. Shen, and J. Cai, “When gaussian process meets big data: A review of scalable gps,” *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. 31, no. 11, pp. 4405–4423, 2020.
- [22] H. Salimbeni and M. Deisenroth, “Doubly stochastic variational inference for deep Gaussian processes,” in *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2017, pp. 4588–4599.
- [23] M. Havasi, J. M. Hernández-Lobato, and J. J. Murillo-Fuentes, “Inference in deep Gaussian processes using stochastic gradient Hamiltonian Monte Carlo,” in *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2018, pp. 7517–7527.
- [24] X. Gao, M. Gürbüzbalaban, and L. Zhu, “Global convergence of stochastic gradient hamiltonian monte carlo for nonconvex stochastic optimization: Nonasymptotic performance bounds and momentum-based acceleration,” *Operations Research*, 2021.
- [25] L. Wu, A. Miller, L. Anderson, G. Pleiss, D. Blei, and J. Cunningham, “Hierarchical inducing point gaussian process for inter-domain observations,” in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 2926–2934.
- [26] J. Lindinger, D. Reeb, C. Lippert, and B. Rakitsch, “Beyond the mean-field: Structured deep gaussian processes improve the predictive uncertainties,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 8498–8509, 2020.
- [27] J. Shi, M. Titsias, and A. Mnih, “Sparse orthogonal variational inference for gaussian processes,” in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 1932–1942.
- [28] D. Rezende and S. Mohamed, “Variational inference with normalizing flows,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2015, pp. 1530–1538.
- [29] H. Yu, D. Liu, B. K. H. Low, and P. Jaillet, “Convolutional normalizing flows for deep gaussian processes,” in *2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [30] L. Dinh, J. Sohl-Dickstein, and S. Bengio, “Density estimation using real nvp,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.08803*, 2016.
- [31] L. Mescheder, S. Nowozin, and A. Geiger, “Adversarial variational Bayes: Unifying variational autoencoders and generative adversarial networks,” in *Proc. ICML*, 2017, pp. 2391–2400.
- [32] C. Ma, Y. Li, and J. M. Hernández-Lobato, “Variational implicit processes,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 4222–4233.
- [33] H. Yu, Y. Chen, B. K. H. Low, P. Jaillet, and Z. Dai, “Implicit posterior variational inference for deep gaussian processes,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [34] S. Sun, G. Zhang, J. Shi, and R. Grosse, “Functional variational bayesian neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.05779*, 2019.
- [35] S. Rodríguez-Santana and D. Hernández-Lobato, “Adversarial α -divergence minimization for bayesian approximate inference,” *Neurocomputing*, vol. 471, pp. 260–274, 2022.
- [36] M. Sugiyama, T. Suzuki, and T. Kanamori, *Density ratio estimation in machine learning*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [37] M. K. Titsias and F. J. R. Ruiz, “Unbiased implicit variational inference,” in *Proc. AISTATS*, 2019, pp. 167–176.
- [38] Q. Liu and D. Wang, “Stein variational gradient descent: A general purpose bayesian inference algorithm,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 29, 2016.
- [39] D. Wang, X. Qin, F. Song, and L. Cheng, “Stabilizing training of generative adversarial nets via langevin stein variational gradient descent,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 33, no. 7, pp. 2768–2780, 2020.
- [40] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville, *Deep learning*. MIT press, 2016.
- [41] J. H. Huggins, T. Campbell, M. Kasprzak, and T. Broderick, “Practical bounds on the error of bayesian posterior approximations: A nonasymptotic approach,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.09505*, 2018.
- [42] M. K. Titsias, “Variational learning of inducing variables in sparse Gaussian processes,” in *Proc. AISTATS*, 2009, pp. 567–574.
- [43] M. D. Hoffman, D. M. Blei, C. Wang, and J. Paisley, “Stochastic variational inference,” *JMLR*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1303–1347, 2013.
- [44] A. Damianou and N. Lawrence, “Deep Gaussian processes,” in *Proc. AISTATS*, 2013, pp. 207–215.
- [45] M. Opper and D. Saad, *Advanced mean field methods: Theory and practice*. MIT press, 2001.
- [46] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling, “Auto-encoding variational Bayes,” in *Proc. ICLR*, 2013.
- [47] R. Ranganath, D. Tran, J. Altsaar, and D. Blei, “Operator variational inference,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 29, 2016.
- [48] W. Grathwohl, K.-C. Wang, J.-H. Jacobsen, D. Duvenaud, and R. Zemel, “Learning the stein discrepancy for training and evaluating energy-based models without sampling,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 3732–3747.
- [49] F. Huszár, “Variational inference using implicit distributions,” *arXiv:1702.08235*, 2017.
- [50] G. Cybenko, “Approximation by superpositions of a sigmoidal function,” *Mathematics of control, signals and systems*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 303–314, 1989.
- [51] Y. Lu and J. Lu, “A universal approximation theorem of deep neural networks for expressing probability distributions,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 3094–3105, 2020.
- [52] D. Perekrestenko, S. Müller, and H. Bölcskei, “Constructive universal high-dimensional distribution generation through deep relu networks,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 7610–7619.
- [53] Y. Yang, Z. Li, and Y. Wang, “On the capacity of deep generative networks for approximating distributions,” *Neural Networks*, vol. 145, pp. 144–154, 2022.
- [54] L. Yang and G. E. Karniadakis, “Potential flow generator with 12 optimal transport regularity for generative models,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 528–538, 2020.
- [55] Q. Xie, P. Zhang, B. Yu, and J. Choi, “Semisupervised training of deep generative models for high-dimensional anomaly detection,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 2444–2453, 2021.
- [56] M. F. Hutchinson, “A stochastic estimator of the trace of the influence matrix for laplacian smoothing splines,” *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 1059–1076, 1989.
- [57] D. J. Rezende, S. Mohamed, and D. Wierstra, “Stochastic backpropagation and approximate inference in deep generative models,” in *Proc. ICML*, 2014, pp. 1278–1286.
- [58] D. P. Kingma, T. Salimans, and M. Welling, “Variational dropout and the local reparameterization trick,” in *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2015, pp. 2575–2583.
- [59] B. Sriperumbudur, K. Fukumizu, A. Gretton, A. Hyvärinen, and R. Kumar, “Density estimation in infinite dimensional exponential families,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 18, 2017.
- [60] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel, “Denoising diffusion probabilistic models,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 6840–6851, 2020.
- [61] A. Chambolle, “An algorithm for total variation minimization and applications,” *Journal of Mathematical imaging and vision*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 89–97, 2004.
- [62] R. Beran, “Minimum hellinger distance estimates for parametric models,” *The annals of Statistics*, pp. 445–463, 1977.
- [63] S. Vallender, “Calculation of the wasserstein distance between probability distributions on the line,” *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 784–786, 1974.
- [64] C. Ley and Y. Swan, “Stein’s density approach and information inequalities,” *Electronic Communications in Probability*, vol. 18, pp. 1–14, 2013.
- [65] A. R. Barron, “Entropy and the central limit theorem,” *The Annals of probability*, pp. 336–342, 1986.
- [66] A. J. Stam, “Some inequalities satisfied by the quantities of information of fisher and shannon,” *Information and Control*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 101–112, 1959.
- [67] S. Park, E. Serpedin, and K. Qaraqe, “On the equivalence between stein and de bruijn identities,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 12, pp. 7045–7067, 2012.
- [68] W. Grathwohl, R. T. Chen, J. Bettencourt, I. Sutskever, and D. Duvenaud, “Ffjord: Free-form continuous dynamics for scalable reversible generative models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.01367*, 2018.
- [69] A. Tsitsulin, M. Munkhoeva, D. Mottin, P. Karras, A. Bronstein, I. Oseledets, and E. Müller, “The shape of data: Intrinsic distance for data distributions,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.11141*, 2019.

- [70] I. Han, D. Malioutov, H. Avron, and J. Shin, "Approximating spectral sums of large-scale matrices using stochastic chebyshev approximations," *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. A1558–A1585, 2017.
- [71] V. Kumar, V. Singh, P. Srijith, and A. Damianou, "Deep gaussian processes with convolutional kernels," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.01655*, 2018.
- [72] Y. LeCun, C. Cortes, and C. Burges, "Mnist handwritten digit database, 1998," URL <http://www.research.att.com/~yann/ocr/mnist>, 1998.
- [73] H. Xiao, K. Rasul, and R. Vollgraf, "Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747*, 2017.
- [74] A. Krizhevsky, G. Hinton *et al.*, "Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images.(2009)," 2009.
- [75] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proc. CVPR*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [76] A. G. Wilson, Z. Hu, R. R. Salakhutdinov, and E. P. Xing, "Stochastic variational deep kernel learning," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 29, 2016.
- [77] V. Dutoit, M. Wilk, A. Artemev, and J. Hensman, "Bayesian image classification with deep convolutional gaussian processes," in *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 1529–1539.
- [78] K. Blomqvist, S. Kaski, and M. Heinonen, "Deep convolutional gaussian processes," in *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2019, Würzburg, Germany, September 16–20, 2019, Proceedings, Part II*. Springer, 2020, pp. 582–597.
- [79] T. Elsken, J. H. Metzen, and F. Hutter, "Neural architecture search: A survey," *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 1997–2017, 2019.
- [80] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, "Adam: A method for stochastic optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.