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Abstract
Probabilistic circuits (PCs) are a promising avenue for probabilistic modeling, as they permit a wide range of exact and efficient inference routines. Recent “deep-learning-style” implementations of PCs strive for a better scalability, but are still difficult to train on real-world data, due to their sparsely connected computational graphs. In this paper, we propose Einsum Networks (EinNets), a novel implementation design for PCs, improving prior art in several regards. At their core, EinNets combine a large number of arithmetic operations in a single monolithic einsum-operation, leading to speedups and memory savings of up to two orders of magnitude, in comparison to previous implementations. As an algorithmic contribution, we show that the implementation of Expectation-Maximization (EM) can be simplified for PCs, by leveraging automatic differentiation. Furthermore, we demonstrate that EinNets scale well to datasets which were previously out of reach, such as SVHN and CelebA, and that they can be used as faithful generative image models.

1. Introduction
The central goal of probabilistic modeling is to approximate the data-generating distribution, in order to answer statistical queries by means of probabilistic inference. In recent years many novel probabilistic models based on deep neural networks have been proposed, such as Variational Autoencoders (VAEs) (Kingma & Welling, 2014) (formerly known as Density Networks (MacKay, 1995)), Normalizing Flows (Rezende & Mohamed, 2015; Papamakarios et al., 2019), Autoregressive Models (ARMs) (Larochelle & Murray, 2011; Uria et al., 2016), and Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) (Goodfellow et al., 2014). While all these models have achieved impressive results on large-scale datasets, i.e. they have been successful in terms of representational power and learning, they unfortunately fall short in terms of inference, a main aspect of probabilistic modeling and reasoning (Pearl, 1988; Koller & Friedman, 2009). All of the mentioned models allow to draw unbiased samples, enabling inference via Monte Carlo estimation. This strategy, however, becomes quickly unreliable and computationally expensive for all but the simplest inference queries. Also other approximate inference techniques, e.g. variational inference, are often biased and their inference quality might be hard to analyse. Besides sampling, only ARMs and Flows support efficient evaluation of the probability density for a given sample, which can be used, e.g., for model comparison and outlier detection.

However, even for ARMs and Flows the following inference task is computationally hard: Consider a density \( p(X_1, \ldots, X_N) \) over \( N \) random variables, where \( N \) might be just in the order of a few dozens. For example, \( X_1, \ldots, X_N \) might represent medical measurements of a particular person drawn from the general population modeled by \( p(X_1, \ldots, X_N) \). Now assume that we split the variables into three disjoint sets \( X_q, X_m, \) and \( X_e \) of roughly the same size, and that we wish to compute

\[
p(x_q | x_e) = \frac{\int p(x_q, x'_m, x_e)dx'_m}{\int \int p(x'_q, x'_m, x_e)dx'_q dx'_m}, \tag{1}
\]

for arbitrary values \( x_q \) and \( x_e \). In words, we wish to predict query variables \( X_q \), based on evidence \( X_e = x_e \), while accounting for all possible values of missing variables \( X_m \), by marginalizing them. Conditional densities like (1) highlight the role of generative models as “multi-purpose predictors”, since the choice of \( X_q, X_m, \) and \( X_e \) can be arbitrary. However, evaluating conditional densities of this form is notoriously hard for any of the models above, which represents a principal drawback of these methods.

These shortcomings in terms of inference have motivated a growing stream of research on tractable probabilistic models, where inference queries like (1) can be computed ex-
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actively and efficiently (in polynomial time). One of the most prominent families of tractable models are probabilistic circuits (PCs), which represent probability densities via computational graphs of i) mixtures (convex sum nodes), ii) factorizations (product nodes), and iii) tractable distributions (leaves, input nodes). Key structural properties of PCs are smoothness and decomposability (Darwiche, 2003), which ensure that any integral, like those appearing in (1), can be computed in linear time of the circuit size. These structural constraints, however, make it hard to work with PCs in practice, as they lead to highly sparse and cluttered computational graphs, which are inapt for current machine learning frameworks. Furthermore, PCs are typically implemented in the log-domain, which slows down learning and inference even further.

In this paper, we propose a novel implementation design for PCs, which ameliorates these practical difficulties, and allows to evaluate and train PCs of up to two orders of magnitude faster than previous “deep-learning-style” implementations (Pronobis et al., 2017; Peharz et al., 2019). The central idea is to compute all product and sum operations on the same topological layer using a single monolithic einsum operation. In that way, the main computational work is lifted by a parallel operation for which efficient implementations, both for CPU and GPU, are readily available in most numerical frameworks. In order to ensure numerical stability, we extend the well-known log-sum-exp-trick to our setting, leading to the “log-einsum-exp” trick. Since our model implements PCs via a hierarchy of large einsum layers, we call our model Einsum Network (EiNet).

As further contributions, we present two algorithmic improvements for training PCs. First, we show that Expectation-Maximization (EM), the canonical maximum-likelihood learning algorithm for PCs (Peharz, 2015; Desana & Schnörr, 2016; Peharz et al., 2017), can be easily implemented via automatic differentiation, readily provided by most machine learning frameworks. Second, we leverage stochastic online EM (Sato, 1999) in order to further improve the learning speed of EiNets, or, enable EM for large datasets at all. In experiments we demonstrate that EiNets can rapidly learn generative models for street view house numbers (SVHN) and CelebA. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that PCs have been successfully trained on datasets of this size. EiNets are capable of producing high-quality image samples, while maintaining tractable inference, e.g. for conditional densities (1).

We adopt the name probabilistic circuits, as suggested by (Vergari et al., 2019), which serves as an umbrella term for many structurally related models, like arithmetic circuits, sum-product networks, cutset networks, etc. See Section 2 for details.

2 The einsum operation implements the Einstein notation of tensor-product contraction, and unifies standard linear algebra operations like dot product, outer product, and matrix multiplication.

2. Probabilistic Circuits

Probabilistic circuits (PCs) are a family of probabilistic models which allow a wide range of exact and efficient inference routines. The earliest representatives of PCs are arithmetic circuits (ACs) (Darwiche, 2002; 2003), which are based on decomposable negation normal forms (DNNFs) (Darwiche, 1999; 2001), a tractable representation for propositional logic formulas. Further members of the PC family are sum-product networks (SPNs) (Poon & Domingos, 2011), cutset networks (CNs) (Rahman et al., 2014), and probabilistic sentential decision diagrams (PSDDs) (Kisa et al., 2014). The main differences between different types of PCs are i) the set of structural constraints assumed and corresponding tractable inference routines, ii) syntax and representation, and iii) application scenarios. In order to treat these models in a unified fashion, we adopt the umbrella term probabilistic circuits suggested by (Vergari et al., 2019), and distinguish various instantiates of PCs mainly via their structural properties.

Definition 1 (Probabilistic Circuit). Given a set of random variables \( X \), a probabilistic circuit (PC) \( \mathcal{P} \) is a tuple \((\mathcal{G}, \psi)\), where \( \mathcal{G} \) denotes as computational graph, is an acyclic directed graph \((V, E)\), and \( \psi: V \rightarrow 2^{X} \), denoted as scope function, is a function assigning some scope (i.e., a sub-set of \( X \)) to each node in \( V \). For internal nodes of \( \mathcal{G} \), i.e. any node \( N \in V \) which has children, the scope function satisfies \( \psi(N) = \cup_{N' \in \text{ch}(N)} \psi(N') \), where \( \text{ch}(N) \) denotes the set of children of \( N \). A leaf of \( \mathcal{G} \) computes a probability density over its scope \( \psi(L) \). All internal nodes of \( \mathcal{G} \) are either sum nodes (S) or product nodes (P). A sum node \( S \) computes a convex combination of its children, i.e. \( S = \sum_{N \in \text{ch}(S)} w_{S,N} N \), where \( \sum_{N \in \text{ch}(S)} w_{S,N} = 1 \), and \( \forall N \in \text{ch}(S): w_{S,N} \geq 0 \). A product node \( P \) computes a product of its children, i.e. \( P = \prod_{N \in \text{ch}(P)} N \).

PCs can be seen as a special kind of neural network, where the first layer computes non-linear functions (probability densities) over sub-sets of \( X \), and all internal nodes compute either weighted sums (linear functions) or products (multiplicative interactions). Each node \( N \) in a PC sees only a sub-set of the inputs, namely variables in its scope \( \psi(N) \). The output of a PC is typically a single root node \( N_{\text{root}} \) (i.e., a node without parents), for which we assume full scope \( \psi(N_{\text{root}}) = X \). We define a density \( P(x) \) proportional to the output: \( P(x) := \frac{1}{\prod_{N \in \text{root}(\mathcal{P})} \psi(N)} \). PCs as defined here encode a density, but do not permit tractable inference yet. In particular, the normalization constant is hard to compute. Various tractable inference routines “can be bought” by imposing structural constraints, which we review next.

This subsumes probability mass functions by assuming an adequate underlying counting measure, and also hybrid discrete-continuous densities by assuming an adequate underlying product measure of counting and Lebesgue measures.
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Decomposability. A PC is decomposable, if for each product node \( P \in V \) it holds that \( \psi(N) \cap \psi(N') = \emptyset \), for \( N, N' \in \text{ch}(P), N \neq N' \), i.e. a PC is decomposable if children of product nodes have pairwise disjoint scope.

Smoothness. A PC is smooth, if for each sum node \( S \in V \) it holds that \( \psi(N) = \psi(N') \), for \( N, N' \in \text{ch}(S) \), i.e. a PC is smooth if children of sum nodes have identical scope.

In smooth and decomposable PCs, any node is by induction a properly normalized density (over its scope), since i) leaves are densities by assumption, ii) sum nodes are mixture densities, and iii) product nodes are factorized densities. The most important consequence of decomposability and smoothness is that integrals which can be written as nested single-dimensional integrals—in particular the normalization constant—can be computed in linear time of the circuit size (Peharz et al., 2015). This follows from the fact that any single-dimensional integral i) commutes with a sum-node and ii) affects only a single child of a product-node. Consequently, all integrals can be distributed to the PC’s leaves, i.e. we simply need to perform integration at the leaves (which is assumed to be tractable), and evaluate the internal nodes in a single feedforward pass. Smooth and decomposable PCs admit a natural interpretation as latent variable models (Zhao et al., 2015; Peharz et al., 2017), which admits a natural sampling procedure via ancestral sampling and maximum-likelihood learning via EM (Peharz, 2015; Desana & Schnörr, 2016; Peharz et al., 2017). Smooth and decomposable PCs are often referred to as sum-product networks (SPNs) (Poon & Domingos, 2011).

In this paper, we consider only smooth and decomposable PCs (aka SPNs), which allow efficient marginalization and conditioning. A further structural property, not considered in this paper, is determinism (Darwiche, 2003) which allows for exact probability maximization (most-probable-explanation), which is NP-hard in non-deterministic PCs (de Campos, 2011; Peharz et al., 2017). Moreover, PCs can be equipped with structured decomposability (Pipatsrisawat & Darwiche, 2008; Khosravi et al., 2019a), which allows circuit multiplication and structured expectations (Shen et al., 2016; Khosravi et al., 2019b).

3. Einsum Networks

3.1. Vectorizing Probabilistic Circuits

An immediate way to yield a denser and thus more efficient layout for PCs is to vectorize them. To this end, we re-define a leaf \( L \) to be a vector of \( K \) densities over \( \psi(L) \), rather than a single density. For example, a leaf computing a Gaussian density is replaced by a vector \( [N(\cdot|\theta_1), \ldots, N(\cdot|\theta_K)]^T \), each \( N(\cdot|\theta_k) \) being a Gaussian over \( \psi(L) \), equipped with private parameters \( \theta_k \). A product node is re-defined to be an outer product \( \otimes_{N \in \text{ch}(P)} N \), containing the products of all possible combinations of densities coming from the child vectors. Since the number of elements in outer products grows exponentially, we restrict the number of children to two (this constraint is frequently imposed on PCs for simplicity). Finally, we re-define sum nodes to be a vector of \( K \) weighted sums, where each individual sum operation has its private weights and computes a convex combination over all the densities computed by its children. The vectorized version of PCs is frequently called a region graph (Dennis & Ventura, 2012; Trapp et al., 2019a) and has been used in previous GPU-supporting implementations (Pronobis et al., 2017; Peharz et al., 2019). It is easily verified, that our desired structural properties—smoothness and decomposability—carry over to vectorized PCs.

For the remainder of the paper, we use symbols \( S, P, L \) for the vectorized versions, and refer to them as sum nodes, product nodes, and leaf nodes, respectively, or also simply as sums, products and leaves. To any single entry in these vectors we explicitly refer to as \( \text{entry} \), or \( \text{operation} \). In principle, the number of entries \( K \) could be different for each leaf or sum, which would, however, lead to a less homogeneous PC design. Therefore, in this paper, we assume for simplicity the same \( K \) for all leaves and sums. Furthermore, we make some simplifying assumptions about the structure of \( G \). First, we assume a structure alternating between sums/leaves and products, i.e. children of sums can only be products, and children of products can only be sums or leaves. Second, we also assume the root of the PC is a sum node. These assumptions are commonly made in the PC literature and are no restriction of generality. Furthermore, we also assume that each product node has at most one parent (which must be a sum due to alternating structure). This is also not a severe structural assumption: If a product has two or more sum nodes as parents, then, by smoothness, these sum nodes have all the same scope. Consequently, they could be simply concatenated to a single sum vector. Of course, since in this paper we assume a constant length \( K \) for all sum and leaf vectors, this assumption requires a large enough \( K \).

3.2. The Basic Einsum Operation

The core computational unit in EiNets is the vectorized PC excerpt in Fig. 1, showing a sum node \( S \) with a single product node \( P \), which itself has two children \( N \) and \( N' \) (shown here as sum nodes, but they could also be leaves). Nodes \( N \) and \( N' \) compute each a vector of \( K \) densities, the product node \( P \) computes the outer product of \( N \) and \( N' \), and the sum node \( S \) computes a matrix-vector product \( W \cdot \text{vec}(P) \). Here, \( W \) is an element-wise non-negative \( K \times K^2 \) matrix, whose rows sum to one, and \( \text{vec}(P) \) unrolls \( P \) to a vector of \( K^2 \) elements. Previous PC implementations (Pronobis et al., 2017; Peharz et al., 2019), are also based on this core computational unit. For numerical stability, however,
they use a computational workaround in the log-domain: The outer product is transformed into an “outer sum” of log-densities (realized with broadcasting), the matrix multiplication is implemented using a broadcasted sum of log values in vectors \( \exp(\log a) \) and \( \text{vec}(\log P) \), to which then a log-sum-exp operation is applied, yielding \( \log S \). This workaround introduces significant overhead and needs to allocate the products explicitly.

Mathematically, the PC excerpt in Fig. 1 is a simple multilinear form, naturally expressed in Einstein notation:

\[
S_k = W_{kij}N_iN_j'. \tag{2}
\]

Here we have re-shaped \( W \) into a \( K \times K \times K \) tensor, normalized over its last two dimensions, i.e. \( W_{kij} \geq 0 \), \( \sum_{i,j} W_{kij} = 1 \). The signature in (2) mentions three indices \( i, j \) and \( k \) labeling the axes of \( N, N', \) and \( W \). Axes with the same index get multiplied. Furthermore, any indices not mentioned on the left hand side get summed out. General-purpose Einstein summations are readily implemented in most numerical frameworks, and usually denoted as einsum operation.

However, applying (2) in a naive way would quickly lead to numerical underflow and unstable training. In order to ensure numerical stability, we develop a technique similar to the classical “log-sum-exp”-trick. We keep all probabilistic values in the log-domain, but the weight-tensor \( W \) is kept in the linear domain. Consequently, we need a numerically stable computation for

\[
\log S_k = \log \sum_{i,j} W_{kij} \exp(\log N_i) \exp(\log N_j'). \tag{3}
\]

Let us define \( a = \max_i \log N_i \) and \( a' = \max_j \log N_j' \). Then, it is easy to see that (3) can also be computed as

\[
a + a' + \log \sum_{i,j} W_{kij} \exp(\log N_i - a) \exp(\log N_j' - a'). \tag{4}
\]

A sufficient condition for numerical stability of (4) is that all sum-weights \( W_{kij} > 0 \), since in this case the maximal values in vectors \( \exp(\log N - a) \) and \( \exp(\log N' - a') \) are guaranteed to be 1, leading to a positive argument for the log. This is not a severe requirement, as positive sum-weights are commonly enforced in PCs, e.g. by using Laplace smoothing or imposing a positive lower bound on the weights.

Given two \( K \)-dimensional vectors \( N, N' \) and the \( K \times K \times K \) weight-tensor \( W \), our basic einsum operation (4) requires \( 2K \) exp-operations, \( K \log \)-operations, \( O(K^3) \) multiplications and \( O(K^3) \) additions. We need to store \( 3K \) values for \( N, N', S \), while the product operations are not stored explicitly. In contrast, the indirect implementations of the same operation in (Pronobis et al., 2017; Peharz et al., 2019) need \( O(K^3) \) additions, \( K^3 \) exp-operations and \( K \log \)-operations. These implementations also store \( 3K \) values for \( N, N', S \), and additional \( K^2 \) values for the explicitly computed products. While our implementation is cubic in the number of multiplications, the previous implementations need a cubic number of exp-operations. This partially explains the speedup of EinNets in our experiments in Section 4. However, the main reasons for the observed speedup are i) an optimized implementation of the einsum operation, ii) avoiding the overhead of allocating product nodes, and iii) a higher degree of parallelism, as discussed in the next section.

### 3.3. The Einsum Layer

Rather than computing single vectorized sums, we can do better by computing whole layers in parallel. To this end, we organize the PC graph \( G \) in layers using Algorithm 1, which is essentially a top-down breadth-first search. We first partition the set of nodes \( V \) into the sets \( L, S, \) and \( P \), containing all leaves, all sums and all products, respectively. We initialize an empty set \( M \), which stores the “marked” nodes during the execution of the algorithm. We also initialize an empty list layers which will contain the result of the algorithm, a topologically ordered list of sets of nodes.

![Figure 1: Basic einsum operation in EinNets](image)

**Algorithm 1** Topological Layers

1: **Input:** PC graph \( G = (V, E) \)
2: Let \( L, S, P \) be the set of all leaves, sum nodes, product nodes in \( V \), respectively
3: \( M \leftarrow \{\} \)
4: \( \text{layers} \leftarrow [\]
5: while \( M \neq S \cup P \) do
6: \( l_S = \{S \in S : S \notin M \land \forall P \in \text{pa}(S) : P \in M\} \)
7: \( \text{layers} \leftarrow \text{concatenate}(l_S, \text{layers}) \)
8: \( M \leftarrow M \cup l_S \)
9: \( l_P = \{P \in P : P \notin M \land \forall S \in \text{pa}(P) : S \in M\} \)
10: \( \text{layers} \leftarrow \text{concatenate}(l_P, \text{layers}) \)
11: \( M \leftarrow M \cup l_P \)
12: end while
13: \( \text{layers} \leftarrow \text{concatenate}([L], \text{layers}) \)
14: **Return** layers
In line 6, we construct the set \( l_5 \) of unmarked sum nodes (i.e. \( S \notin M \)), but whose parents (denoted as \( \text{pa}(S) \)), have already been marked. Note that in the first iteration of the while-loop, \( l_5 \) will only contain the root of the EinNet. The set \( l_5 \) is then inserted as head of the list \( \text{layers} \) and all nodes in \( l_5 \) are marked as visited. A similar procedure, but for product nodes, is performed in lines 9–11, yielding node set \( l_6 \). Note that, since we assume that each product node has only one parent (cf. Section 3.1), \( l_6 \) will be exactly the set of children of the sum nodes in \( l_5 \) (constructed in line 6 within the same while-iteration). If we assume for the moment that all sum nodes in \( l_5 \) have exactly one child, then \( l_6 \) and \( l_5 \) form a consecutive pair of product and sum layers, as illustrated in Fig. 2. The central technique in this paper is an efficient and parallel computation of these two layers. The last step of Algorithm 1, line 13, is to insert the set of all leaf nodes as head of the list \( \text{layers} \). It is easy to check that \( \text{layers} \) will be a topologically ordered list of layers, ordered from leaves to root.

Let us now consider an excerpt as in Fig. 2, consisting of \( L \) sum nodes, where each of the sum nodes has a single child. We first collect all the vectors of the “left” product children in an \( L \times K \) matrix \( \mathbf{N} \) and similarly all the “right” product children in an \( L \times K \) matrix \( \mathbf{N}' \), where “left” and “right” are arbitrary but fixed assignments. We further extend the 3-dimensional weight-tensor \( \mathbf{W} \) from (2) to a 4-dimensional \( L \times K \times K \times K \) tensor, where the slice \( \mathbf{W}_{l,:,:,:} \) contains the weights for the \( l \)-th vectorized sum node. The result of all \( L \) sums—i.e. in total \( L \times K \) sum operations—can be performed with a single einsum operation: \( \mathbf{S}_{ik} = \mathbf{W}_{lklj} \mathbf{N}_{li} \mathbf{N}'_{lj} \). Note the similarity to (2), and the additional parallelism by simply introducing an additional index \( l \). It is straight-forward to extend the log-einsum-exp trick (see Section (3.2)) to this operation, in order to ensure numerical stability. Constructing the two matrices \( \mathbf{N} \) and \( \mathbf{N}' \) requires some book-keeping and introduces some computational overhead stemming from extracting and concatenating slices from the log-probability tensors below. This overhead is essentially the symptom of the sparse and cluttered layout of PCs. The main computational work, however, is then performed by a highly parallel einsum operation. In order to allow sum nodes with multiple children we use a simple technique explained next.

3.4. The Mixing Layer

In order to compute sum nodes with multiple children, we express any sum node with several children as a cascade of 2 vectorized sum operations. In particular, for a sum node \( S \) with \( C \) children, we introduce \( C \) new sum nodes \( S_1, \ldots, S_C \), each adopting one of the children as a single child. Subsequently, the results of \( S_c, c \in \{1, \ldots, C\} \), get mixed in an element-wise manner, i.e. \( S_k = \sum_{c=1}^{C} w^c S_c \).

This decomposition is essentially an over-parameterization (Trapp et al., 2019b) of the original sum nodes, and represents the same functions. This principle is illustrated in Fig. 3, where a sum node \( S_1 \) with 3 children and a sum node \( S_2 \) with 2 children, are expressed using 5 sum nodes, each with a single child, followed by element-wise mixtures (drawn as sum nodes in boxes).

These element-wise mixtures can also be implemented with a single einsum operation, which we denote as mixing layer. To this end, let \( M \) be the number of sum nodes having more than one child, and \( D \) the maximal number of children (e.g. \( D = 3 \) in Fig. 3). We collect the \( K \)-dimensional probability vectors computed by the first sum layer in a \( D \times M \times K \) tensor, where the first axis is zero-padded for sum nodes with less than \( D \) children. The mixing layer computes then a convex combination over the first dimension of this tensor. Constructing this tensor unfortunately involves some copy overhead, and wastes also some computation due to zero padding. However, allowing for sum nodes with multiple children lets us express a much wider range of structures than e.g. random binary trees, which is the only structure considered in (Peharz et al., 2019).

3.5. Exponential Families as Input Layer

For the leaves of EinNets we use log-densities of exponential families (EFs), which have the form

\[
\log p = \log h(x) + T(x)^T \theta - A(\theta),
\]

where \( \theta \) are the natural parameters, \( h \) is the so-called base measure, \( T \) is the sufficient statistic and \( A \) is the log-normalizer. Many parametric distributions can be expressed as EFs, e.g. Gaussian, Binomial, Categorical, Beta, etc. In order to facilitate learning using EM, we keep the parame-
3.6. Expectation-Maximization (EM)

A natural way to learn PCs is the EM algorithm, which is known to rapidly increase the likelihood, especially in early iterations (Salakhutdinov et al., 2003). EM for PCs was derived in (Peharz et al., 2017; Desana & Schnörr, 2016; Peharz et al., 2017), leading to the following update rules for sum-weights and leaves:

\[ n_{S,N}(x) = \frac{1}{P(x)} \frac{\partial P}{\partial S} N(x), \quad p_L(x) = \frac{1}{P(x)} \frac{\partial P}{\partial L}(x), \]

\[ w_{S,N} \leftarrow \frac{w_{S,N} \sum_x n_{S,N}(x)}{\sum_x n_{S,N}(x)}, \quad \phi_L \leftarrow \frac{\sum_x p_L(x) T(x)}{\sum_x p_L(x)}, \]

where the sums in (7) range over all training examples \( x \). In (Peharz et al., 2017) and (Peharz et al., 2019), the derivatives \( \frac{\partial P}{\partial S} \) and \( \frac{\partial P}{\partial L} \) are required for the expected statistics \( n_{S,N} \) and \( p_L \), which were computed with an explicitly implemented backpass, performed in the log-domain for robustness. Here we show that this implementation overhead can be avoided by leveraging automatic differentiation.

Recall that EiNets represent all probability values in the log-domain, thus the PC output is actually \( \log P(x) \), rather than \( P(x) \). Calling auto-diff on \( \log P(x) \) yields the following derivative for each sum-weight \( w_{S,N} \) (omitting argument \( x \)):

\[ \frac{\partial \log P}{\partial S} = \frac{\partial P}{\partial S} \frac{\partial S}{\partial n_{S,N}} = \frac{\partial P}{\partial S} N, \]

which is exactly \( n_{S,N} \) in (6), i.e. auto-diff readily provides the required expected statistics for sum nodes. In many frameworks, auto-diff readily accumulates the gradient by default, as required in (7), leading to an embarrassingly simple implementation for the E-step. For the M-step, we simply multiply the result of the accumulator with the current weights, and renormalize.

Furthermore, recall that the leaves are implemented as log-densities of an EF. Taking the gradient yields:

\[ \frac{\partial \log P}{\partial \log L} = \frac{1}{\frac{\partial P}{\partial \log L}} = \frac{1}{\frac{\partial P}{\partial L}}, \]

which is \( p_L \) in (6). Thus, auto-diff also implements most of the EM update for the leaves. We simply need to accumulate both \( p_L \) and \( L \) over the whole dataset, and use (7) to update the expectation parameters \( \phi \).

The classical EM algorithm uses a whole pass over the training set for a single update, which is computationally wasteful due to redundancies in the training data (Bottou, 1998). Similar to stochastic gradient descent (SGD), it is possible to define a stochastic version for EM (Sato, 1999).

To this end, one replaces the sums over the entire dataset in (7) with sums over mini-batches, yielding \( w_{S,N}^{\text{mini}} \) and \( \phi_L^{\text{mini}} \). The full EM update is then replaced with gliding averages

\[ w_{S,N} \leftarrow (1 - \lambda) w_{S,N} + \lambda w_{S,N}^{\text{mini}}, \]

\[ \phi_L \leftarrow (1 - \lambda) \phi_L + \lambda \phi_L^{\text{mini}}, \]

where \( \lambda \in [0, 1] \) is a step-size parameter. This stochastic version of EM introduces two hyper-parameters, step-size \( \lambda \) and the batch-size, which need to be set appropriately. Furthermore, unlike full-batch EM, stochastic EM does not guarantee that the training likelihood increases in each iteration. However, stochastic EM updates the parameters after each mini-batch and typically leads to faster learning.

Sato (1999) shows an interesting connection between stochastic EM and natural gradients (Amari, 1998). In particular, for any EF model \( P(X, Z) \), where \( X \) are observed and \( Z \) latent variables, performing (8) and (9) is equivalent to SGD, where the gradient is pre-multiplied by the inverse Fisher information matrix of the complete model \( P(X, Z) \).

The difference to standard natural gradient is, that the natural gradient is defined via the inverse Fisher of the marginal \( P(X) \) (Amari, 1998), rather than \( P(X, Z) \). Sato’s analysis also applies to EiNets, since smooth and decomposable PCs are EFs of the form \( P(X, Z) \) (Peharz et al., 2017), where the latent variables are associated with sum nodes. Thus, (8) and (9) are in fact performing SGD with (a variant of) natural gradient.

4. Experiments

We implemented EiNets in PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019). Code accompanying this paper can be found in a standalone repository;\(^3\) moreover, the code will be incorporated and further developed in SPFlow (Molina et al., 2019), a general-purpose PC library.\(^4\)

4.1. Efficiency Comparison

In order to demonstrate the efficiency of EiNets we compare with the two most prominent deep-learning implementations of PCs, namely LibSPN (Pronobis et al., 2017) and Einsum Networks
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As a sanity check, we first reproduce the density estimation results of RAT-SPNs (Peharz et al., 2019) on 20 binary datasets (Lowd & Davis, 2010; Van Haaren & Davis, 2012; Gens & Domingos, 2013), see Table 1. We see that EiNets largely achieve the same performance as RAT-SPNs, except on ‘ad’ where EiNets even outperform RAT-SPNs with a large margin. We conjecture that this difference stems from stochastic EM which might help EiNets to escape from local optima of the training likelihood. In Table 1, we also report several baselines, namely online Bayesian moment matching (oBMM) (Rashwan et al., 2016), concave-convex procedure (CCCP) (Zhao et al., 2016), LearnSPN (Gens & Domingos, 2013), and ID-SPN (Rooshenas & Lowd, 2014). Note that these baseline methods are PCs learned with custom code and are not easily scalable to bigger datasets. Also, note that Learn-SPN, CCCP and ID-SPN learn the PC structure from data, while the other methods use randomized structures.

We compare EiNets with two other deep-learning PC implementations 6 LibSPN and SPFlow in terms of i) training time, ii) memory consumption, and iii) inference time. To this end, we trained and tested them on synthetic data (Gaussian noise) with \( N = 2000 \) samples and \( D = 512 \) dimensions. As leaves we used single-dimensional Gaussians. We varied each structural hyper-parameter in the following ranges: depth \( D \in \{1, \ldots, 9\} \), replica \( R \in \{1, \ldots, 40\} \), and vector length of sums/leaves \( K \in \{1, \ldots, 40\} \); please see (Peharz et al., 2019) for the precise meaning of these hyper-parameters. When varying one hyper-parameter, we left the others to default values \( D = 4 \), \( R = 10 \), and \( K = 10 \). We ran this set of experiments on a GeForce RTX 2080 Ti, using a batch size of 100 samples.

In Figure 4 we see a comparison of the three implementations in terms of train time and GPU-memory peak consumption, where the circle radii represent the magnitude of the varied hyper-parameter. We see that EiNets tend to be one or two orders of magnitude faster (note the log-scale).

Figure 4. Illustration of training time and peak memory consumption of EiNets, SPFlow and LibSPN when training randomized binary PC trees, and varying hyper-parameters \( K \) (number of densities per sum/leaf), depth \( D \), and number of replica \( R \), respectively. The blob size directly corresponds to the respective hyper-parameter under change. The total number of parameters ranged within \( 10k - 9.4M \) (for varying \( K \)), \( 100k - 5.2M \) (for varying \( D \)), and \( 24k - 973k \) (for varying \( R \)). For LibSPN, some settings exhausted GPU memory and are therefore missing.

Table 1. Test log-likelihoods of various baselines and EiNets, on 20 binarized datasets. For each dataset, the best performing method is underlined. Results which are not statistically different from the best method (using a one sided t-test, \( p = 0.05 \)) are in boldface. For oBMM and CCCP, no detailed results were available, so no significance testing was done with these methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dataset</th>
<th>oBMM</th>
<th>CCCP</th>
<th>Learn-SPN</th>
<th>ID-SPN</th>
<th>RAT-SPN</th>
<th>EiNet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>msnbc</td>
<td>-6.030</td>
<td>-6.045</td>
<td>-6.113</td>
<td>-6.040</td>
<td>-6.039</td>
<td>-6.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jester</td>
<td>-53.860</td>
<td>-52.880</td>
<td>-53.480</td>
<td>-52.858</td>
<td>-52.970</td>
<td>-52.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>netflix</td>
<td>-57.990</td>
<td>-56.782</td>
<td>-57.328</td>
<td>-56.355</td>
<td>-56.850</td>
<td>-56.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retail</td>
<td>-11.420</td>
<td>-10.919</td>
<td>-11.043</td>
<td>-10.847</td>
<td>-10.911</td>
<td>-10.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dna</td>
<td>-99.610</td>
<td>-84.921</td>
<td>-82.523</td>
<td>-81.211</td>
<td>-97.232</td>
<td>-96.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book</td>
<td>-35.550</td>
<td>-35.009</td>
<td>-35.886</td>
<td>-34.137</td>
<td>-34.684</td>
<td>-34.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>web-lb</td>
<td>-165.570</td>
<td>-157.492</td>
<td>-158.204</td>
<td>-151.838</td>
<td>-157.530</td>
<td>-157.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reuters-52</td>
<td>-108.010</td>
<td>-84.628</td>
<td>-85.067</td>
<td>-83.346</td>
<td>-87.367</td>
<td>-87.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20mg</td>
<td>-158.010</td>
<td>-153.205</td>
<td>-155.925</td>
<td>-151.468</td>
<td>-152.062</td>
<td>-153.938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPFlow (Molina et al., 2019). LibSPN is natively based on Tensorflow (Abadi M. et al., 2015), while SPFlow supports multiple backends. For our experiment, we used SPFlow with Tensorflow backend. We used randomized binary trees (RAT-SPNs) (Peharz et al., 2019) as a common benchmark: These PC structures are governed by two structural parameters, the split-depth \( D \) and number of replica \( R \): Starting from the root sum node, they split the whole scope \( X \) into two randomized balanced parts, recursively until depth \( D \), yielding a binary tree with \( 2^D \) leaves. This construction is repeated \( R \) times, yielding \( R \) random binary trees, which are mixed at the root.

As a sanity check, we first reproduce the density estimation results of RAT-SPNs (Peharz et al., 2019) on 20 binary datasets (Lowd & Davis, 2010; Van Haaren & Davis, 2012; Rashwan et al., 2019, 2020).
than the competitors, especially for large models. Also in terms of memory consumption EiNets scale gracefully. In particular, for large $K$, memory consumption is an order of magnitude lower than for LibSPN or SPFlow. This can be easily explained by the fact that our einsum operations do not generate product nodes explicitly in memory, while the other frameworks do. Moreover, EiNets also perform superior in terms of inference time. In particular for large models, they run again one or two orders of magnitude faster than the other implementations. For space reasons, these results are deferred to the supplementary.

4.2. EiNets as Generative Image Models

While PCs are an actively researched topic, their scalability issues have restricted them so far to rather small datasets like MNIST (LeCun et al., 1998). In this paper, we use PCs as generative model for street-view house numbers (SVHN) (Netzer et al., 2011), containing $32 \times 32$ RGB images of digits, and center-cropped CelebA (Liu et al., 2015), containing $128 \times 128$ RGB face images. For SVHN, we used the first $50k$ train images and concatenated it with the extra set, yielding a train set $581k$ images. We reserved the rest of the core train set, $23k$ images, as validation set. The test set comprises $26k$ images. For CelebA, we used the standard train, validation and test splits, containing $183k$, $10k$, and $10k$ images, respectively. The data was normalized before training (division by 255), but otherwise no preprocessing was applied. To the best or our knowledge, PCs have not been successfully trained on datasets of this size before.

We first clustered both datasets into 100 clusters using the sklearn implementation of k-means, and learned an EiNet for each of these clusters. We then used these 100 EiNets as mixture components of a mixture model, using the cluster proportions as mixture coefficients. Note that a mixture of PCs yields again a PC, and that this step is essentially the first step of LearnSPN (Gens & Domingos, 2013), one of the most prominent PC structure learners.

We trained EiNets using the image-tailored structure proposed in (Poon & Domingos, 2011), to which we refer as PD structure. The PD structure recursively decomposes the image into sub-rectangles using axis-aligned splits, displaced by a certain step-size $\Delta$. Here, $\Delta$ serves as a structural hyperparameter, which governs the number of sum nodes according to $O\left(\frac{1}{\Delta^2}\right)$ (Peharz, 2015). $\Delta$ can also be a vector of step-sizes; in this case the largest value in $\Delta$ which fits in the longer side of a sub-rectangle is applied. The recursive splitting process stops, when a rectangle cannot be split by any value in $\Delta$.

For the PD structure of each EiNet component, we used a step-size $\Delta = 8$ for SVHN and $\Delta = 32$ for CelebA, i.e. we applied 4 axis-aligned splits. We only applied vertical splits, in order to reduce artifacts stemming from the PD structure. As leaves, we used factorized Gaussians, i.e. Gaussians with diagonal covariance matrix, which were further factorized over the RGB channels. The vector length for sums and leaves was set to $K = 40$. After each EM update, we projected the Gaussian variances to the interval $[10^{-6}, 10^{-2}]$, corresponding to a maximal standard deviation of 0.1. Each component was trained for 25 epochs, using a batch size of 500 and EM stepsize of 0.5. In total, training lasted 5 hours for SVHN and 3 hours for CelebA, on an NVidia P100.

Original samples and samples from the EiNet mixture are shown in Figure 5, (a,b) for SVHN and (d,e) for CelebA, respectively. The SVHN samples are rather compelling, and some samples could be mistaken for real data samples. The CelebA samples are somewhat over-smoothed, which is a typical effect for likelihood-based approaches, but capture the main quality of faces well. In both cases, some “stripy” artifacts, typical for the PD architecture (Poon & Domingos, 2011), can be seen.

We computed two common measures to evaluate image quality, namely the Fréchet Inception Score (FID) (Heusel et al., 2017) and the log-likelihood of the test set. For the FID, we sampled artificial sample sets of the same size as the respective test sets. For SVHN, EiNets achieved a FID of 86.51 and a test log-likelihood of $-4.248 \text{nats}$, normalized over samples, pixels and channels. For CelebA, EiNets achieved a FID of 105.44 (71.47 when re-scaling images to $64 \times 64$ using Lanczos resampling) and a normalized test log-likelihood of $-3.42 \text{nats}$.

Although the image quality is not comparable to e.g. GAN models (Goodfellow et al., 2014), we want to stress that EiNets permit tractable inference, while GANs and most other generative models are restricted to sampling. In particular, tractable inference can be immediately used for image inpainting, as demonstrated in Figure 5, (c) for SVHN and (f) for CelebA. Here, we marked parts of test samples as missing (top or left image half) and reconstructed it by drawing a sample from the conditional distribution, conditioned on the visible image part. We see that the reconstructions are plausible, in particular for SVHN.

4.3. EiNets for Outlier Detection

A natural application of generative models is outlier detection, by monitoring the sample probability. For example, if we have trained an EiNet over the feature space of a classifier, an atypically low value for the density $P(x)$ might indicate outlier data. In this case, we can trigger a reject option, rather than feeding the sample to the classifier. In (Peharz et al., 2019), it was demonstrated that PCs deliver very good outlier signals, even for (semi-)discriminative models. We ran a similar experiment as in (Peharz et al., 2019), and trained an EiNet on the training set of MNIST.
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(a) Real SVHN images.  
(b) EiNet SVHN samples.  
(c) Real images (top), covered images, and EiNet reconstructions  
(d) Real CelebA samples.  
(e) EiNet CelebA samples.  
(f) Real images (top), covered images, and EiNet reconstructions

Figure 5. Qualitative results of EiNets trained on RGB data. Top: SVHN (32 × 32). Bottom: CelebA (128 × 128).

Figure 6. Histograms of sample-wise log-probabilities of the test sets of MNIST, SEMEION and SVHN, under EiNet trained on MNIST training data. Note that the histograms do not overlap.

Unlike as in (Peharz et al., 2019), who used Gaussian leaves, we trained our model on discrete pixel data and used Categorical distributions with 256 states. We used a PD structure (Poon & Domingos, 2011) with \( \Delta = [7, 28] \), such that the 28 × 28 images are first split into 4 × 4 super-pixels, which are then further split into single pixels. We used distribution vectors of length \( K = 40 \). This structure yields are rather large model (107M parameters) which we trained for 10 hours on a single NVidia P100, cross-validating over epochs (early stopping). The final test log-likelihood of this model was \(-686.20 \) nats per sample.

In Fig. 6 we see histograms over sample-wise log-probabilities for the MNIST test set, SEMEION (Buscema, 1998) and SVHN. We see that, in this case, the EiNet does a perfect job in discriminating inliers (MNIST) from outliers (SEMEION and SVHN). In fact, the smallest log-probability of an MNIST test sample was \(-1362.91 \) nats, while the largest log-probabilities for SEMEION and SVHN were \(-1796.84 \) nats and \(-8327.78 \) nats, respectively.

5. Conclusion

Probabilistic models form a spectrum of machine learning techniques. Most of the research is focused on representing and learning flexible and expressive models, but ignore the down-stream impact on the set of inference tasks which can be provably solved within the model. The philosophy of tractable modeling also aims to push the expressivity boundaries, but under the constraint to maintain a defined set of exact inference routines. Probabilistic circuits are certainly a central and prominent approach for this philosophy. In this paper, we addressed a major obstacle for PCs, namely their scalability in comparison to unconstrained models. Our improvements of training speed and memory-use reduction, both in the orders of one or two orders of magnitude, are compelling, and we hope that our results stimulates further developments in the area of tractable models.
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1. Inference Time Comparison

Section 4.1, in the main paper compared training time and memory consumption for EiNets, LibSPN (Pronobis et al., 2017) and SPFlow (Molina et al., 2019), showing that EiNets scale much more gracefully than its competitors. The same holds true for inference time. Fig. 1 shows the results corresponding to Fig. 3 in the main paper, but for inference time per sample rather than training time per epoch. Inference was done for a batch of 100 test samples for each model, i.e. the displayed inference time is 1/100 of the evaluation time for the whole batch. Again, we see significant speedups for EiNets, of up to three orders of magnitude (for maximal depth and EiNet vs. SPFlow).
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Figure 1. Illustration of inference time and peak memory consumption of EiNets, SPFlow and LibSPN when training randomized binary PC trees, and varying hyper-parameters $K$ (number of densities per sum/leaf), depth $D$, and number of replica $R$, respectively. The blob size directly corresponds to the respective hyper-parameter under change. The total number of parameters ranged within $10k - 9.4M$ (for varying $K$), $100k - 5.2M$ (for varying $D$), and $24k - 973k$ (for varying $R$). For LibSPN, some settings exhausted GPU memory and are therefore missing.