

---

# A Non-negative VAE: the Generalized Gamma Belief Network

---

**Zhibin Duan**  
Xidian University  
xd\_zhibin@163.com

**Tiansheng Wen**  
Xidian University  
neilwen987@stu.xidian.edu.cn

**Muyao Wang**  
Xidian University  
muyaowang@stu.xidian.edu.cn

**Bo Chen\***  
Xidian University  
bchen@mail.xidian.edu.com

**Mingyuan Zhou**  
The University of Texas at Austin  
mingyuan.zhou@mcombs.utexas.edu

## Abstract

The gamma belief network (GBN), often regarded as a deep topic model, has demonstrated its potential for uncovering multi-layer interpretable latent representations in text data. Its notable capability to acquire interpretable latent factors is partially attributed to sparse and non-negative gamma-distributed latent variables. However, the existing GBN and its variations are constrained by the linear generative model, thereby limiting their expressiveness and applicability. To address this limitation, we introduce the generalized gamma belief network (Generalized GBN) in this paper, which extends the original linear generative model to a more expressive non-linear generative model. Since the parameters of the Generalized GBN no longer possess an analytic conditional posterior, we further propose an upward-downward Weibull inference network to approximate the posterior distribution of the latent variables. The parameters of both the generative model and the inference network are jointly trained within the variational inference framework. Finally, we conduct comprehensive experiments on both expressivity and disentangled representation learning tasks to evaluate the performance of the Generalized GBN against state-of-the-art Gaussian variational autoencoders serving as baselines.

## 1 Introduction

Variational autoencoders (VAEs) [Kingma and Welling, 2013, Rezende et al., 2014], which marry the expressiveness of deep neural networks with the robustness of stochastic latent variables, have gained great success in the last ten years. As a class of probabilistic generative models, VAEs are popularly used in generation tasks ranging from image generation [Vahdat and Kautz, 2020] to text generation [Bowman et al., 2015] to graph generation [Kipf and Welling, 2016]. In addition to their productive generative abilities, VAEs enjoy favorable properties in extracting meaningful and interpretable factorized representation, leading to their utilization in representation learning [Bengio et al., 2013, Higgins et al., 2016, Lake et al., 2017, Srivastava and Sutton, 2017]. Benefiting from VAE’s attractive characteristics, many efforts have been made to improve its expressivity [Van den Oord et al., 2016, Vahdat and Kautz, 2020, Child, 2020] and disentangled representation learning capability further [Higgins et al., 2016, Kim and Mnih, 2018, Chen et al., 2018a, Kumar et al., 2017].

---

\*Corresponding author




Figure 1: With a trained autoencoder on the MNIST dataset, the probability histogram for the hidden representation is displayed in  $I(a)$  as the output from a linear layer and  $I(c)$  as the output from a ReLU activation layer. The former is suitable to be approximated by Gaussian distribution ( $I(b)$ ), while the latter is suitable to be approximated by Gamma distribution ( $I(d)$ ).

Parallel to the development of Gaussian VAEs, adequate progress has been achieved on the gamma belief network (GBN) [Zhou et al., 2015, 2016]. In particular, the GBN, as a deep Bayesian factor analysis model, has the appealing property of learning interpretable multi-level latent representations from concrete to abstract [Lee and Seung, 1999]. To marry the expressiveness of the deep neural network, Zhang et al. [2020] extends GBN by utilizing the Weibull variational inference network to approximate the posterior of its gamma latent variables, resulting in a deep variational autoencoder. For modeling document bag-of-words representation, the GBN and its variants have achieved attractive performance in generative ability and extracting interpretable latent factors. The outstanding performance can be attributed to the sufficient ability of the gamma distribution to model sparsity [Zhang et al., 2018]. Furthermore, recent studies have been performed to enhance the expressiveness of GBN by incorporating deeper stochastic layers, resulting in impressive progress [Duan et al., 2021, Li et al., 2022, Duan et al., 2023].

While GBN and its variants have achieved great progress, they are limited to the linear generative model, restricting their expressiveness and applications [Zhou et al., 2015, Zhang et al., 2018, Wang et al., 2020, 2022]. The counterpart is the Gaussian VAE, which can employ more expressive neural networks as generative models (decoders) to improve its expressivity [Vahdat and Kautz, 2020, Child, 2020]. From another perspective, benefiting from the sparse and non-negative latent variables, the gamma latent model has potential advantages in learning disentangled representation [Lee and Seung, 1999, Bengio et al., 2013, Tonolini et al., 2020, Mathieu et al., 2019]. While a series of works have been developed to improve Gaussian VAE’s disentangled representation learning ability [Higgins et al., 2016, Chen et al., 2018a], they often rely on adding different regularizers, which may hurt the test reconstruction performance [Kim and Mnih, 2018, Mathieu et al., 2019]. Moreover, introducing non-negative and sparse gamma latent variables to neural networks is natural and reasonable. Generally, most neural networks are composed of linear feed-forward units and non-linear activation units, in which the former outputs dense real vectors and the latter outputs sparse non-negative vectors [Nair and Hinton, 2010], as illustrated in Fig. 1(a) and Fig. 1(c). While the Gaussian distribution is suitable for modeling dense real vectors, the gamma distribution is suitable for modeling sparse non-negative vectors, as demonstrated in Fig. 1(b) and Fig. 1(d).

All the considerations in the last section motivate us to explore gamma latent variable models further. Specifically, to remove the GBN’s limitation on the linear generative model, we develop the generalized gamma belief network (Generalized GBN), which employs a non-linear network to improve the model’s expressiveness and retain interpretation with sparse and non-negative gamma latent variables. Due to the fact that the gamma distribution can’t be reparameterized, we follow the former works [Zhang et al., 2018] that use the Weibull distribution to approximate its posterior in the generative model. To verify the effectiveness of the proposed model, we conduct two kinds of experiments to evaluate its expressivity and disentangled latent representation learning capabilities, respectively. The results of the expressivity experiment indicate that the Generalized GBN can perform on par with state-of-the-art hierarchical Gaussian VAEs on test likelihood. The disentangled experiment results verify our motivation that using sparse and non-negative gamma latent variables can effectively enhance the generative model’s disentangled ability. The main contributions of the paper can be summarized as follows:

- With the intention of removing the linear generative model constraint of the GBN, we construct the generalized gamma belief network, which can be equipped with more expressive non-linear neural networks as the generative model (decoder).
- To approximate the posterior of latent variables in the Generalized GBN, we design the Weibull variational upward-downward inference network.
- To verify the expressivity and disentangled representation learning capabilities of the Generalized GBN, we conducted extensive experiments on the benchmark datasets.




Figure 2: The graphical model of 2(a): the generative model of Gamma Belief Network (GBN), and a sketch of the upward-downward Gibbs sampler, where  $Z^{(l)}$  are augmented latent counts that are upward sampled in each Gibbs sampling iteration; 2(b): the generative model and inference network of the hierarchical Gaussian VAE; 2(c): the inference and generation of the Generalized gamma belief network (Generalized GBN). Circles are stochastic variables, and squares are deterministic variables.

## 2 Preliminaries

This section will give a detailed description of the gamma belief network and Gaussian VAEs.

### 2.1 Gamma Belief Network

Assuming the observations are multivariate count vectors  $x_j \in \mathbb{Z}^{K_0}$ , as shown in Fig.2(a), the generative model of the gamma belief network (GBN) [Zhou et al., 2015, 2016] with  $T$  hidden layers, from top to bottom, is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_j^{(L)} &\sim \text{Gamma}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}_j^{(L+1)}), \dots, \theta_j^{(l)} \sim \text{Gamma}(\Phi^{(l+1)} \theta_j^{(l+1)}, \mathbf{c}_j^{(l+1)}), \dots, \\ \theta_j^{(1)} &\sim \text{Gamma}(\Phi^{(2)} \theta_j^{(2)}, \mathbf{c}_j^{(2)}), \mathbf{x}_j \sim \text{Poisson}(\Phi^{(1)} \theta_j^{(1)}), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where, the count vector  $x_j$  (e.g., the bag-of-words of document  $j$ ) is factorized as the product of the factor loading matrix  $\Phi^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{K_l \times K_0}$  (topics), and gamma distributed factor scores  $\theta_j^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{K_1}$  (topic proportions), under the Poisson likelihood; and the hidden units  $\theta_j^{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{K_l}$  of layer  $l$  is further factorized into the product of the factor loading  $\Phi^{(l+1)} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{K_l \times K_{l+1}}$  and hidden units of the next layer to infer a multi-layer latent representation; the top layer's hidden units share the same vector as their gamma-shape parameters. and the  $p_j^{(2)}$  are probability parameters and  $\{1/c^{(t)}\}_{3, T+1}$  are gamma scale parameters, with  $c_j^{(2)} := (1 - p_j^{(2)})/p_j^{(2)}$ . For scale identifiability and ease of inference, each column of  $\Phi^{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{K_{l-1} \times K_l}$  is restricted to have a unit  $L_1$  norm. Benefiting from analytic conditional posteriors for all parameters, GBN, can be inferred via a Gibbs sampler.

### 2.2 Hierarchical Gaussian VAE

As shown in Fig. 2(b), the generative model of hierarchical VAE [Sønderby et al., 2016] for data  $x_j$  with  $L$  layers of Gaussian distribution latent variables  $\{z_j^{(l)}\}_{l=1}^L$ , can be described as:

$$\begin{aligned} z_j^{(L)} &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}), \dots, z_j^{(l)} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{g}_\mu^{(l+1)}(z_j^{(l+1)}), \mathbf{g}_\sigma^{(l+1)}(z_j^{(l+1)})), \dots, \\ z_j^{(1)} &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{g}_\mu^{(2)}(z_j^{(2)}), \mathbf{g}_\sigma^{(2)}(z_j^{(2)})), \mathbf{x}_j \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{g}_\mu^{(1)}(z_j^{(1)}), \mathbf{g}_\sigma^{(1)}(z_j^{(1)})), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the observation model is matching continuous-valued data, the  $\mathbf{g}^{(l)}(\cdot)$  are the non-linear neural networks in generative models. Since the parameters in VAEs don't have analytic conditional posteriors, they need to be inferred by variational inference [Kingma and Welling, 2013]. Specifically, conditioned on the stochastic layer below each stochastic layer, which is specified as a fully factorized Gaussian distribution, the variational posterior can be defined as:

$$q(\mathbf{z}_j^{(l)}) = \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{f}_\mu^{(l+1)}(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{z}_j^{(l+1)}), \mathbf{f}_\sigma^{(l+1)}(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{z}_j^{(l+1)})\right) \quad (3)$$

where the  $\mathbf{f}^{(l)}(\cdot)$  are non-linear neural networks in variational inference networks. We can write the variational lower bound  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{vae}}(\mathbf{x})$  on  $\log p(\mathbf{x})$  as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{vae}}(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})} \left[ \log p(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{z}^{(1)}) \right] - \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{z}^{>l}|\mathbf{x})} \left[ \text{KL} \left( q(\mathbf{z}^{(l)} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^{>l}) \| p(\mathbf{z}^{(l)} | \mathbf{z}^{>l}) \right) \right] \quad (4)$$

where  $q(\mathbf{z}^{>l} | \mathbf{x}) := \prod_{l=1}^{L-1} q(\mathbf{z}^{(l)} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}^{>l})$  is the approximate posterior up to the  $(l-1)^{\text{th}}$  layer. The objective is trained using the reparameterization trick with the reparameter trick [Kingma and Welling, 2013, Rezende et al., 2014].

### 3 The Generalized Gamma Belief Network

This section provides a detailed description of the proposed Generalized GBN, which consists of the hierarchical non-linear generative model (Sec.3.1) and the variational inference network (Sec.3.2). Followed by the description of the variational inference (Sec.3.3) and some techniques for stable training (Sec. 3.4).

#### 3.1 Hierarchical Generative Model

To generalize GBN with more expressive non-linear generative models (decoders), we take inspiration from the hierarchical Gaussian VAE [Vahdat and Kautz, 2020, Child, 2020] to build the Generalized GBN. As shown in Fig. 2(c), the generative model of the Generalized GBN with  $L$  layers, from top to bottom, can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(L)} &\sim \text{Gamma}\left(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{c}^{(L+1)}\right), \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(l)} \sim \text{Gamma}\left(\mathbf{g}_\alpha^{(l+1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(l+1)}), \mathbf{g}_\beta^{(l+1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(l+1)})\right), \dots, \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(1)} &\sim \text{Gamma}\left(\mathbf{g}_\alpha^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(2)}), \mathbf{g}_\beta^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(2)})\right), \mathbf{x}_j \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{g}_\mu^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(1)}), \mathbf{g}_\sigma^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(1)})\right), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where the observation model is matching continuous-valued data, the  $\mathbf{g}^{(l)}(\cdot)$  are non-linear neural networks, such as ResNet [He et al., 2016], as decoders. To satisfy different types of observation data, such as count data and binary data, the Generalized GBN can be adapted directly with different output layers as follows:

$$\mathbf{x}_j \sim \text{Poisson}\left(\mathbf{g}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(1)})\right), \mathbf{x}_j \sim \text{Bernoulli}\left(\mathbf{g}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(1)})\right). \quad (6)$$

To meet the demand in the Gamma distribution, the neural network  $\mathbf{g}^{(l)}(\cdot)$  in the Generalized GBN should output non-negative vectors. Considering the property of continuous differentiability, we employ Softplus( $\cdot$ ) non-linear function to each element to ensure positiveness in our generative model, where  $\text{Softplus}(\cdot) = \log(1 + \exp(\cdot))$ .

**Connection with GBN:** It's evident that the Generalized GBN will reduce to the GBN [Zhou et al., 2015] when  $\mathbf{g}_\alpha^{(l+1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(l+1)}) = \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{(l+1)}\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(l+1)}$  as the non-linear generative model reduces to linear generative models.

#### 3.2 Upward-Downward Variational Inference Network

Similar to Gaussian VAE, the parameters of the Generalized GBN do not have analytic conditional posteriors, which require a variational inference network to approximate the latent variable's posterior.

**Weibull Approximate Posterior:** Although the gamma distribution seems logical for the posterior distribution because it encourages sparsity and satisfies the nonnegative condition, it is not reparameterizable and cannot be optimized using gradient descent. And considering  $i$ , the Weibull distribution

has a simple reparameterization so that it is easier to optimize, and *ii*) the Weibull distribution is similar to a gamma distribution, capable of modeling sparse, skewed and positive distributions, we use the Weibull distribution [Zhang et al., 2018] to approximate the posterior for the gamma latent variables. Specifically, the latent variable  $x \sim \text{Weibull}(k, \lambda)$  can be easily reparameterized as:

$$x = \lambda(-\ln(1 - \varepsilon))^{1/k}, \quad \varepsilon \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1). \quad (7)$$

*ii*), The KL divergence from the gamma to Weibull distributions has an analytic expression as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(\text{Weibull}(k, \lambda) \parallel \text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)) = \\ \frac{\gamma\alpha}{k} - \alpha \log \lambda + \log k + \beta\lambda\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right) - \gamma - 1 - \alpha \log \beta + \log \Gamma(\alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $\gamma$  is the Euler-Mascheroni constant.

**Upward-Downward Inference Network:** As shown in Fig. 2(c), the variational inference network combines the obtained latent features with the prior from the stochastic up-down path to construct the variational posterior:

$$\begin{aligned} q\left(\theta_j^{(l)} \mid \mathbf{h}_j^{(l)}, \theta_j^{(l+1)}\right) &= \text{Weibull}\left(\mathbf{k}_j^{(l)}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^{(l)}\right), \\ \mathbf{k}_j^{(l)} &= \text{Softplus}\left(\mathbf{f}_k^{(l)}\left(\theta_j^{(l+1)}, \mathbf{h}_j^{(l)}\right)\right), \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^{(l)} = \text{Softplus}\left(\mathbf{f}_\lambda^{(l)}\left(\theta_j^{(l+1)}, \mathbf{h}_j^{(l)}\right)\right), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{f}^{(l)}(\cdot)$  denotes the neural network, and Softplus applies  $\log(1 + \exp(\cdot))$  nonlinearity to each element to ensure positive Weibull shape and scale parameters. The Weibull distribution is used to approximate the gamma-distributed conditional posterior, and its parameters  $\mathbf{k}_j^{(l)} \in \mathbf{R}_+^{K_l}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j^{(l)} \in \mathbf{R}_+^{K_l}$  are both inferred by combining the bottom-up likelihood information and the prior information from the generative distribution using the neural networks. The use of both top-down prior information and bottom-up data information is one of the linkages between the variational inference network and the Gibbs Sampler of GBN, as illustrated in Fig. 2.

### 3.3 Variational Inference

For the Generalized GBN, given the model parameters referred to as  $\mathbf{W}^{(l:L)}$ , which consist of the parameters in the generative model and inference network, the marginal likelihood of the dataset  $X$  is defined as:

$$p\left(X \mid \{\mathbf{W}^{(l)}\}_{l=1}^L\right) = \int \prod_{l=1}^L \prod_{j=1}^J p\left(\mathbf{x}_j \mid \theta_j^{(1)}\right) \prod_{l=1}^L \prod_{j=1}^J p\left(\theta_j^{(l)} \mid \theta_j^{(l+1)}\right) d\boldsymbol{\theta}_{l=1, j=1}^{L, J}. \quad (10)$$

The inference task is to learn the parameters of the generative model and the inference network. Similar to VAEs, the optimization objective of the Generalized GBN can be achieved by maximizing the evidence lower bound (ELBO) of log-likelihood as

$$\mathcal{L}(X) = \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbb{E}_{q(\theta_j^{(1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_j)} \left[ \ln p\left(\mathbf{x}_j \mid \theta_j^{(1)}\right) \right] - \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbb{E}_{q(\theta_j^{(l+1)} \mid \mathbf{x}_j)} \left[ \ln \frac{q\left(\theta_j^{(l)} \mid \mathbf{x}_j, \theta_j^{(l+1)}\right)}{p\left(\theta_j^{(l)} \mid \theta_j^{(l+1)}\right)} \right]. \quad (11)$$

where the first term is the expected log-likelihood of the generative model, which ensures reconstruction performance, and the second term is the Killback–Leibler (KL) divergence that constrains the variational distribution  $q(\theta_j^{(l)})$  to be close to its prior  $p(\theta_j^{(l)})$ . The parameters in the Generalized GBN can be directly optimized by advanced gradient algorithms, like Adam [Kingma and Ba, 2014]. The complete learning procedure of variational inference is summarized in Algorithm. 1.

### 3.4 Stable Training for the Generalized GBN

Practical training of the Generalized GBN is highly challenging because of the objective’s unbounded KL divergence [Razavi et al., 2019, Child, 2020]. In addition to applying the stable training techniques described in [Child, 2020], such as gradient skipping, we suggest three more technologies toward orienting the Generalized GBN.

**Shape Parameter Clipping of Weibull distribution:** As shown in Eq. (7), when the sampled noise  $\varepsilon$  is close to 1, e.g., 0.98, and the Weibull shape parameter  $k$  is less than  $1e^{-3}$ , the  $x$  will be extremely

huge, which could destabilize the training process. In practice, we constrain the shape parameter  $k$  such that  $1e^{-3}$  to avoid extreme value.

**Weibull Distribution Reparameter:** In our experiments, we reconstruct the inference network to stabilize the training. Specifically, for the approximated Weibull posterior distribution, after inferring  $\mathbf{k}_j^{(l)}$ , we let  $\lambda_j^{(l)} = \text{Softplus} \left( \mathbf{f}_\lambda(\mathbf{h}_j^{(l)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(l+1)}) \right) / \exp(1 + 1/\mathbf{k}_j)$ . Specifically, for the latent variable  $x \sim \text{Weibull}(k, \lambda)$ , the expectation of latent variable  $x$  is  $\lambda \exp(1 + 1/k)$ . In this case, if  $k$  is small, such as 0.001, the expectation of latent variable  $x$  is  $\lambda \exp(1000)$ , which is very large for unstable training. To alleviate this challenge, we let the latent variable  $x \sim \text{Weibull}(k, \lambda/\exp(1 + 1/k))$ . In this case, the expectation of latent variable  $x$  is  $\lambda$ , which is friendly with stable learning.

**Learning Rate Decreasing:** After training a few epochs with the initialized learning rate, the training stage in our experiments will diverge. To achieve convergence in the training stage, the learning rate is reduced to 1/10 based on the initialization learning rate after some epochs.

## 4 Related Work

**Variational Autoencoder and its extension:** Gaussian VAE [Kingma and Welling, 2013, Srivastava and Sutton, 2017], have been used in different tasks such as image generation [Vahdat and Kautz, 2020], graph generation [Kipf and Welling, 2016], language model [Bowman et al., 2015], time series forecasting [Krishnan et al., 2017], out-of-distribution detection [Havtorn et al., 2021]. To improve the expressivity of the Gaussian VAE, there is a lot of effort put into developing deeper latent variable models [Sønderby et al., 2016, Maaløe et al., 2019, Dieng et al., 2019, Vahdat and Kautz, 2020, Child, 2020, Apostolopoulou et al., 2021]. Apart from its expressive ability, the ability to disentangle data representation has also attracted wide attention [Higgins et al., 2016, Burgess et al., 2018]. A simple method to enhance disentangling ability is to increase beta parameters [Higgins et al., 2016], which may hurt the test reconstruction performance [Kim and Mnih, 2018]. Unlike these works, the Generalized GBN learns to disentangle representation by its sparse and non-negative latent variables. Apart from the Gaussian VAE, other works have been proposed to model latent variables with Dirichlet distribution and sticking distribution [Joo et al., 2020, Nalisnick and Smyth, 2016]. However, these works are mainly a single-layer latent variable model, which does not directly extend to hierarchical structure.

**Gamma Belief Network and its variants:** As a full Bayesian generative model, the GBN [Zhou et al., 2015, 2016] has greatly progressed in mining multi-layer text representation and extracting concepts. With its attractive characters, there is a lot of effort to push it to adapt to different application scenarios. Specifically, [Guo et al., 2018] extend GBN to a deep dynamic system for temporal count data; [Wang et al., 2019, 2022] develop a convolutional GBN to capture word order information in text; and Wang et al. [2020] model graph structure for document graph. Apart from the full Bayesian model that relies on Gibbs sampler for inference, Zhang et al. [2018, 2020] build a Weibull deep autoencoder for GBN, which can utilize the neural network encoder. And [Duan et al., 2021, Li et al., 2022, Duan et al., 2023] have tried to build a more effective and deeper GBN in the form of a variational autoencoder. However, all the above works use a linear decoder with  $L_1$  norm and are limited to modeling complex, dense data, such as neural images.

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Evaluating Expressiveness

**Datasets:** For binary images, we evaluate the models on two benchmark datasets: **MNIST** [LeCun et al., 1998], a dataset of  $28 \times 28$  images of handwritten digits, and **OMNIGLOT** [Lake et al., 2013], an alphabet recognition dataset of  $28 \times 28$  images. For convenience, we add two zero pixels to each border of the training images. In both cases, the observations are dynamically binarized by being resampled from the normalized real values using a Bernoulli distribution after each epoch, as suggested by Lake et al. [2013], which prevents over-fitting. We use the standard splits of MNIST into 60,000 training and 10,000 test examples, and of OMNIGLOT into 24,345 training and 8,070 test examples. For natural images, we evaluate the models on two benchmark datasets: **CIFAR-10** [Krizhevsky et al., 2009], a dataset of  $32 \times 32$  natural images with ten classes, and **CELEBA** [Liu et al., 2015, Larsen et al., 2016], a face dataset of  $64 \times 64$ .

**Experiment Setting:** For binary image datasets, we use a hierarchy of  $L = 16$  variational layers, and the image decoder employs a Bernoulli distribution. For natural images, we employ a hierarchy of

Table 1: Comparison against the state-of-the-art likelihood-based generative models. The performance is measured in bits/dimension (bpd) for the CIFAR-10 and CELEBA datasets, but MNIST and OMNIGLOT in which negative log-likelihood in nats is reported (Lower is better in all cases.). The marginal loglikelihood of the MNIST and OMNIGLOT datasets is estimated with 1000 important samples. ( The marginal loglikelihood of Attention VAE is estimated with 100 important samples on CIFAR-10 dataset.)

Model type	Model	MNIST	OMNIGLOT	CIFAR-10	CELEBA
<b>Gamma VAE Models</b>	<b>Generalized GBN</b>	77.86	<b>86.04</b>	2.84	<b>1.95</b>
VAE Models with an Unconditional Decoder	Attention VAE [Apostolopoulou et al., 2021]	<b>77.63</b>	89.50	<b>2.79</b>	-
	VDVAE [Child, 2020]	78.07	86.93	2.87	2.00
	NVAE [Vahdat and Kautz, 2020]	78.19	90.18	2.91	2.03
	BIVA [Maaløe et al., 2019]	78.41	93.54	3.08	2.48
	DVAE++ [Vahdat et al., 2018]	78.49	97.43	3.38	-
	Conv DRAW Gregor et al. [2016]	-	91.00	3.58	-
Flow Models without any Autoregressive Components	VFlow [Chen et al., 2020]	-	-	2.98	-
	ANF [Huang et al., 2020]	-	-	3.05	-
	Flow++ [Ho et al., 2019]	-	-	3.08	-
	Residual flow [Chen et al., 2019]	-	-	3.28	-
	Real NVP [Dinh et al., 2016]	-	-	3.49	3.02
VAE and Flow Models with Autoregressive Components	$\delta$ -VAE [Razavi et al., 2019]	-	-	2.83	-
	PixelVAE++ [Sadeghi et al., 2019]	78.00	-	2.90	-
	VampPrior [Tomczak and Welling, 2018]	78.45	-	-	-
	MAE [Ma et al., 2019a]	77.98	-	2.95	-
	Lossy VAE [Chen et al., 2016]	78.53	89.83	2.95	-
	MaCow [Ma et al., 2019b]	-	-	3.16	-
Autoregressive Models	PixelCNN++ [Salimans et al., 2017]	-	-	2.92	-
	PixelRNN [Van Den Oord et al., 2016]	-	-	3.00	-
	Image Transformer [Parmar et al., 2018]	-	-	2.90	-
	PixelSNAIL [Chen et al., 2018b]	-	-	2.85	-
	Gated PixelCNN [Van den Oord et al., 2016]	-	-	3.03	-
Non-Gaussian VAE Models	DirVAE [Joo et al., 2020]	84.76	95.82	-	-
	SBVAE[Nalisnick and Smyth, 2016]	99.27	128.82	-	-

$L = 33$  variational layers for the CIFAR-10 dataset and  $L = 42$  variational layers for the CELEBA dataset. Meanwhile, we use a mixture of discretized logistic distributions [Salimans et al., 2017] for the data distribution. It should be noted that Generalized GBN’s code is built on the VDVAE codebase<sup>2</sup>[Child, 2020], with minor modifications made to the variational Weibull posterior and loss functions. All experiments are performed on workstation equipped with a CPU i7-10700 and accelerated by four GPU NVIDIA RTX 3090 with 24GB VRAM.

**Benchmark Models:** We conducted a comparison between our model and the state-of-the-art variational autoencoder, which is comprised of AttnVAE [Apostolopoulou et al., 2021], VDVAE[Child, 2020], and NVAE[Vahdat and Kautz, 2020], as proposed recently. Additionally, the DirVAE[Joo et al., 2020] and SBVAE[Nalisnick and Smyth, 2016], which model latent variables with the Stick-breaking distribution and Dirichlet distribution, respectively, also serve as baseline models.




Figure 3: Reconstruction and unconditional generation samples of the Generalized GBN.

Model	FID↓
PixelCNN	65.9
Glow	48.9
NVAE	51.7
VDVAE	40.1
<b>Generalized GBN</b>	<b>38.4</b>

Figure 4: FID scores for unconditional generation on CIFAR-10

**Experiment Results:** Table. 1 reports the estimated marginal likelihood of our model along with the performance achieved by state-of-the-art models. We observe that in both datasets, the Generalized GBN consistently improves performance to different degrees than the base model VDVAE. These

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/openai/vdvae>

Table 2: Comparison against the state-of-the-art disentangled representation learning generative models.

Dataset	Model	$\beta$ -VAE	FactorVAE	DCI-D	DCI-I	DCI-C	Modularity	SAP
2D Shapes	VAE [Kingma and Welling, 2013]	0.778	0.617	0.103	0.393	0.100	0.793	0.032
	$\beta$ -VAE [Higgins et al., 2016]	0.817	0.597	0.238	0.501	0.266	0.820	0.065
	Factor VAE [Kim and Mnih, 2018]	0.871	0.746	0.238	0.499	0.205	0.775	0.074
	BetaTCVAE [Chen et al., 2018a]	0.884	0.759	0.304	0.567	0.304	0.877	0.069
	DIP-VAE [Kumar et al., 2017]	0.855	0.701	0.157	0.402	0.161	0.872	0.043
	<b>Generalized GBN</b>	0.853	0.626	0.187	0.433	0.271	<b>0.888</b>	0.058
3D Shapes	VAE [Kingma and Welling, 2013]	0.732	0.550	0.156	0.649	0.135	0.847	0.012
	$\beta$ -VAE [Higgins et al., 2016]	0.999	0.802	0.539	0.920	0.455	0.933	0.092
	Factor VAE [Kim and Mnih, 2018]	0.999	0.844	0.642	0.910	0.530	0.977	0.106
	BetaTCVAE [Chen et al., 2018a]	1.000	0.974	0.876	0.992	0.761	0.962	0.097
	DIP-VAE [Kumar et al., 2017]	0.976	0.921	0.687	0.900	0.594	0.932	0.089
	<b>Generalized GBN</b>	0.912	0.841	0.621	0.906	0.514	0.942	0.048
3D Cars	VAE [Kingma and Welling, 2013]	0.999	0.753	0.110	0.702	0.070	0.836	0.027
	$\beta$ -VAE [Higgins et al., 2016]	1.000	0.923	0.316	0.559	0.224	0.930	0.005
	Factor VAE [Kim and Mnih, 2018]	1.000	0.907	0.144	0.682	0.142	0.889	0.009
	BetaTCVAE [Chen et al., 2018a]	1.000	0.929	0.318	0.817	0.246	0.931	0.014
	DIP-VAE [Kumar et al., 2017]	1.000	0.873	0.261	0.704	0.142	0.837	0.014
	<b>Generalized GBN</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.946</b>	<b>0.323</b>	0.813	0.218	0.897	0.023

results confirm our motivation for the Generalized GBN to enhance its expressivity with a more powerful generative model. Further, the comparable performance of the Generalized GBN and hierarchical Gaussian VAE may be attributed to the fact that dense latent variables and sparse non-negative latent variables are integral parts of neural networks, as illustrated in Fig. 1. Correspondingly, Dirichlet VAE’s performance is relatively poor, partly due to shallow’s generative model, but more importantly, the  $L_1$  norm on its latent variables would limit the expression ability [Shen et al., 2023]. Thanks to its powerful attention mechanism, the Attention VAE performs superiorly on Mnist datasets. Additionally, it may be unfair to compare our results with Attention VAE on CIFAR-10 data, as the latter employs 100 important samples whereas ours uses only one. More results can be found in A.

**Unconditional Image Generation Results:** In order to evaluate the unconditional image generation ability of the proposed model, we further take the unconditional image generation experiments on the widely used CIFAR-10 dataset [Krizhevsky et al., 2009]. The FID scores for unconditional generation are shown in Fig. 4, and corresponding unconditional generate samples are shown in Fig. 3. The results show that the generalized GBN can generate meaningful samples and achieve better performance compared with strong baselines such as NVAE and VDVAE on the unconditional image generation task.

## 5.2 Evaluating Disentangled Representations

**Dataset:** We compare the Generalized GBN to various baseline models on the following data sets: 1) **2D Shapes** [Matthey et al., 2017]: 737,280 binary  $64 \times 64$  images of 2D shapes with ground truth factors [number of values]: shape[3], scale[6], orientation[40],  $x$ -position[32],  $y$ -position[32]. 2) **3D Shapes** [Burgess and Kim, 2018]: 480,000 RGB  $64 \times 64 \times 3$  images of 3D shapes with ground truth factors: shape[4], scale[8], orientation[15], floor colour[10], wall colour[10], object colour[10] *ii*) unknown generative factors: **3D Cars** [Reed et al., 2015]: 286,560 RGB  $64 \times 64 \times 3$  images of car CAD models.

**Evaluation Metric:** The disentanglement in BetaVAE metric [Higgins et al., 2016] is measured as the accuracy of a linear classifier that predicts the index of a fixed factor of variation. To address several issues in the BetaVAE metric, Kim and Mnih [2018] develop the FactorVAE metric by using a majority vote classifier on a different feature vector which accounts for a corner case in the BetaVAE metric. Differently, the Modularity [Ridgeway and Mozer, 2018] measures disentanglement if each dimension of the learned representation depends on at most a factor of variation using their mutual information. The Disentanglement metric of [Eastwood and Williams, 2018] (DCI Disentanglement) computes the entropy of the distribution obtained by normalizing the importance of each dimension of the learned representation for predicting the value of a factor of variation. The SAP score [Kumar et al., 2017] is the average difference in the prediction error of the two most predictive latent dimensions for each factor.






Figure 5: 5(a): Representations learned by the Generalized GBN. Each row represents a latent  $\theta_i$ . Column 1 (position) shows the mean activation (red represents high values) of each latent  $\theta_i$  as a function of all 32x32 locations averaged across objects, rotations and scales. Columns 2 and 3 show the mean activation of each unit  $\theta_i$  as a function of scale (respectively rotation), averaged across rotations and positions (respectively scales and positions). Square is red, oval is green and heart is blue. Columns 4-8 (second group) show reconstructions resulting from the traversal of each latent  $\theta_i$  over 0 to 6 while keeping the remaining 9/10 latent units fixed to the values obtained by running inference on an image from the dataset. 5(b): Similar analysis for Gaussian VAE.

**Baseline Models:** The baseline models consist of the base VAE [Kingma and Welling, 2013] and the methods by which the training loss is augmented with a regularizer, including the  $\beta$ -VAE [Higgins et al., 2016], introduce a hyperparameter in front of the KL regularizer of vanilla VAEs to constrain the capacity of the VAE bottleneck. The FactorVAE [Kim and Mnih, 2018] penalize the total correlation [Watanabe, 1960] with adversarial training [Nguyen et al., 2010, Sugiyama et al., 2012]; and the Beta-TCVAE [Chen et al., 2018a] with a tractable but biased Monte-Carlo estimator. The DIP-VAE [Kumar et al., 2017] penalize the mismatch between the aggregated posterior and a factorized prior. And all the experiments are taken with the open codebase [Locatello et al., 2019]<sup>3</sup>. The generalized GBN, based on the same codebase, has a slight difference in the Weibull variational posterior and loss functions.

**Quantitative Results:** The experiment results on different evaluation metric of disentanglement are listed in Table. 2. First of all, the results indicate that the Generalized GBN outperforms the basic Gaussian VAE, which retains the original VAE loss without any regularization. Secondly, the Generalized GBN achieves comparable performance compared with state-of-the-art disentangled models. It’s noted that the improved disentangled models based on Gaussian VAE often need different regularizations, which may negatively impact test reconstruction ability [Kim and Mnih, 2018]. However, the Generalized GBN relies directly on the gamma latent variable’s sparseness and does not apply more regularization. On the other hand, these regularizations could also potentially improve Generalized GBN’s performance. Furthermore, the Generalized GBN has the potential to learn hierarchical disentangled latent representations due to its hierarchical sparse gamma latent variables [Zhou et al., 2015, Ross and Doshi-Velez, 2021].

**Qualitative Result:** The qualitative results of the Gaussian VAE and the Generalized GBN disentangled representations are depicted in Fig. 5. Firstly, as the top three columns indicate, each dimension of latent variables in Generalized GBN has distinct semantics. In particular, position  $y$  and  $x$  are represented by  $\theta_9$ ,  $\theta_{10}$ , and scale is represented by  $\theta_7$ , respectively. However, the semantics of latent variables in Gaussian VAE are coupled, such as  $z_8$ , which simultaneously represents position, scale, and rotation. Secondly, columns 4-8 of Generalized GBN indicate that  $\theta_7$ ,  $\theta_9$ , and  $\theta_{10}$  can control the data’s scale and position, respectively. However, columns 4–8 of Gaussian VAE show the coupled semantics. Consequently, it is evident that the Generalized GBN outperforms Gaussian VAE in the disentangled ability, whereby each dimension latent variable influences distinct semantic structures. The qualitative result can also confirm the results of the quantitative results that are displayed in Table. 2 .

<sup>3</sup>[https://github.com/google-research/disentanglement\\_lib/tree/master](https://github.com/google-research/disentanglement_lib/tree/master)

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce the Generalized GBN, which extends the capabilities of the GBN by incorporating a more expressive non-linear generative model. To enable effective inference, we develop a Weibull variational upward-downward inference network to approximate the posterior distribution of latent variables. To assess the model’s expressivity, we conduct extensive experiments on benchmark datasets, utilizing test likelihood as a metric. Our experimental results demonstrate that removing the linear decoder limitation of GBN can significantly enhance the model’s modeling capabilities, achieving comparable performance with state-of-the-art Gaussian VAEs. Furthermore, in disentangled representation learning experiments, the Generalized GBN exhibits strong performance compared to various baseline models. This outstanding performance can be attributed to the sparse and non-negative properties of the gamma latent variables.

## References

- Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- Danilo Jimenez Rezende, Shakir Mohamed, and Daan Wierstra. Stochastic backpropagation and approximate inference in deep generative models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1278–1286. PMLR, 2014.
- Arash Vahdat and Jan Kautz. Nvae: A deep hierarchical variational autoencoder. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:19667–19679, 2020.
- Samuel R Bowman, Luke Vilnis, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew M Dai, Rafal Jozefowicz, and Samy Bengio. Generating sentences from a continuous space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06349*, 2015.
- Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. Variational graph auto-encoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.07308*, 2016.
- Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Pascal Vincent. Representation learning: A review and new perspectives. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 35(8):1798–1828, 2013.
- Irina Higgins, Loic Matthey, Arka Pal, Christopher Burgess, Xavier Glorot, Matthew Botvinick, Shakir Mohamed, and Alexander Lerchner. beta-vae: Learning basic visual concepts with a constrained variational framework. In *International conference on learning representations*, 2016.
- Brenden M Lake, Tomer D Ullman, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Samuel J Gershman. Building machines that learn and think like people. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 40:e253, 2017.
- Akash Srivastava and Charles Sutton. Autoencoding variational inference for topic models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.01488*, 2017.
- Aaron Van den Oord, Nal Kalchbrenner, Lasse Espeholt, Oriol Vinyals, Alex Graves, et al. Conditional image generation with pixelcnn decoders. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- Rewon Child. Very deep vaes generalize autoregressive models and can outperform them on images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.10650*, 2020.
- Hyunjik Kim and Andriy Mnih. Disentangling by factorising. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2649–2658. PMLR, 2018.
- Ricky TQ Chen, Xuechen Li, Roger B Grosse, and David K Duvenaud. Isolating sources of disentanglement in variational autoencoders. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018a.
- Abhishek Kumar, Prasanna Sattigeri, and Avinash Balakrishnan. Variational inference of disentangled latent concepts from unlabeled observations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00848*, 2017.
- Mingyuan Zhou, Yulai Cong, and Bo Chen. The poisson gamma belief network. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2015.

- Mingyuan Zhou, Yulai Cong, and Bo Chen. Augmentable gamma belief networks. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):5656–5699, 2016.
- Daniel D Lee and H Sebastian Seung. Learning the parts of objects by non-negative matrix factorization. *Nature*, 401(6755):788–791, 1999.
- Hao Zhang, Bo Chen, Yulai Cong, Dandan Guo, Hongwei Liu, and Mingyuan Zhou. Deep autoencoding topic model with scalable hybrid bayesian inference. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 43(12):4306–4322, 2020.
- Hao Zhang, Bo Chen, Dandan Guo, and Mingyuan Zhou. Whai: Weibull hybrid autoencoding inference for deep topic modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.01328*, 2018.
- Zhibin Duan, Dongsheng Wang, Bo Chen, Chaojie Wang, Wenchao Chen, Yewen Li, Jie Ren, and Mingyuan Zhou. Sawtooth factorial topic embeddings guided gamma belief network. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2903–2913. PMLR, 2021.
- Yewen Li, Chaojie Wang, Zhibin Duan, Dongsheng Wang, Bo Chen, Bo An, and Mingyuan Zhou. Alleviating "posterior collapse" in deep topic models via policy gradient. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:22562–22575, 2022.
- Zhibin Duan, Xinyang Liu, Yudi Su, Yishi Xu, Bo Chen, and Mingyuan Zhou. Bayesian progressive deep topic model with knowledge informed textual data coarsening process. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8731–8746. PMLR, 2023.
- Chaojie Wang, Hao Zhang, Bo Chen, Dongsheng Wang, Zhengjue Wang, and Mingyuan Zhou. Deep relational topic modeling via graph poisson gamma belief network. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:488–500, 2020.
- Chaojie Wang, Bo Chen, Zhibin Duan, Wenchao Chen, Hao Zhang, and Mingyuan Zhou. Generative text convolutional neural network for hierarchical document representation learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(4):4586–4604, 2022.
- Francesco Tonolini, Bjørn Sand Jensen, and Roderick Murray-Smith. Variational sparse coding. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 690–700. PMLR, 2020.
- Emile Mathieu, Tom Rainforth, Nana Siddharth, and Yee Whye Teh. Disentangling disentanglement in variational autoencoders. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4402–4412. PMLR, 2019.
- Vinod Nair and Geoffrey E Hinton. Rectified linear units improve restricted boltzmann machines. In *Proceedings of the 27th international conference on machine learning (ICML-10)*, pages 807–814, 2010.
- Casper Kaae Sønderby, Tapani Raiko, Lars Maaløe, Søren Kaae Sønderby, and Ole Winther. Ladder variational autoencoders. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- Ali Razavi, Aaron van den Oord, Ben Poole, and Oriol Vinyals. Preventing posterior collapse with delta-vaes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.03416*, 2019.
- Rahul Krishnan, Uri Shalit, and David Sontag. Structured inference networks for nonlinear state space models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 31, 2017.
- Jakob D Havtorn, Jes Frellsen, Søren Hauberg, and Lars Maaløe. Hierarchical vaes know what they don't know. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4117–4128. PMLR, 2021.

- Lars Maaløe, Marco Fraccaro, Valentin Liévin, and Ole Winther. Biva: A very deep hierarchy of latent variables for generative modeling. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Adji B Dieng, Yoon Kim, Alexander M Rush, and David M Blei. Avoiding latent variable collapse with generative skip models. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2397–2405. PMLR, 2019.
- Ifigeneia Apostolopoulou, Ian Char, Elan Rosenfeld, and Artur Dubrawski. Deep attentive variational inference. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Christopher P Burgess, Irina Higgins, Arka Pal, Loic Matthey, Nick Watters, Guillaume Desjardins, and Alexander Lerchner. Understanding disentangling in *beta*-vae. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.03599*, 2018.
- Weonyoung Joo, Wonsung Lee, Sungrae Park, and Il-Chul Moon. Dirichlet variational autoencoder. *Pattern Recognition*, 107:107514, 2020.
- Eric Nalisnick and Padhraic Smyth. Stick-breaking variational autoencoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.06197*, 2016.
- Dandan Guo, Bo Chen, Hao Zhang, and Mingyuan Zhou. Deep poisson gamma dynamical systems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- Chaojie Wang, Bo Chen, Sucheng Xiao, and Mingyuan Zhou. Convolutional poisson gamma belief network. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 6515–6525. PMLR, 2019.
- Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.
- Brenden M Lake, Russ R Salakhutdinov, and Josh Tenenbaum. One-shot learning by inverting a compositional causal process. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 26, 2013.
- Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.
- Ziwei Liu, Ping Luo, Xiaogang Wang, and Xiaoou Tang. Deep learning face attributes in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 3730–3738, 2015.
- Anders Boesen Lindbo Larsen, Søren Kaae Sønderby, Hugo Larochelle, and Ole Winther. Autoencoding beyond pixels using a learned similarity metric. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1558–1566. PMLR, 2016.
- Tim Salimans, Andrej Karpathy, Xi Chen, and Diederik P Kingma. Pixelcnn++: Improving the pixelcnn with discretized logistic mixture likelihood and other modifications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.05517*, 2017.
- Arash Vahdat, William Macready, Zhengbing Bian, Amir Khoshaman, and Evgeny Andriyash. Dvae++: Discrete variational autoencoders with overlapping transformations. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5035–5044. PMLR, 2018.
- Karol Gregor, Frederic Besse, Danilo Jimenez Rezende, Ivo Danihelka, and Daan Wierstra. Towards conceptual compression. *Advances In Neural Information Processing Systems*, 29, 2016.
- Jianfei Chen, Cheng Lu, Biqi Chenli, Jun Zhu, and Tian Tian. Vflow: More expressive generative flows with variational data augmentation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1660–1669. PMLR, 2020.
- Chin-Wei Huang, Laurent Dinh, and Aaron Courville. Augmented normalizing flows: Bridging the gap between generative flows and latent variable models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07101*, 2020.
- Jonathan Ho, Xi Chen, Aravind Srinivas, Yan Duan, and Pieter Abbeel. Flow++: Improving flow-based generative models with variational dequantization and architecture design. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2722–2730. PMLR, 2019.

- Ricky TQ Chen, Jens Behrmann, David K Duvenaud, and Jörn-Henrik Jacobsen. Residual flows for invertible generative modeling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Laurent Dinh, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, and Samy Bengio. Density estimation using real nvp. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.08803*, 2016.
- Hossein Sadeghi, Evgeny Andriyash, Walter Vinci, Lorenzo Buffoni, and Mohammad H Amin. Pixelvae++: Improved pixelvae with discrete prior. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.09948*, 2019.
- Jakub Tomczak and Max Welling. Vae with a vampprior. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1214–1223. PMLR, 2018.
- Xuezhe Ma, Chunting Zhou, and Eduard Hovy. Mae: Mutual posterior-divergence regularization for variational autoencoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.01498*, 2019a.
- Xi Chen, Diederik P Kingma, Tim Salimans, Yan Duan, Prafulla Dhariwal, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Pieter Abbeel. Variational lossy autoencoder. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.02731*, 2016.
- Xuezhe Ma, Xiang Kong, Shanghang Zhang, and Eduard Hovy. Macow: Masked convolutional generative flow. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019b.
- Aäron Van Den Oord, Nal Kalchbrenner, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. Pixel recurrent neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1747–1756. PMLR, 2016.
- Niki Parmar, Ashish Vaswani, Jakob Uszkoreit, Lukasz Kaiser, Noam Shazeer, Alexander Ku, and Dustin Tran. Image transformer. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4055–4064. PMLR, 2018.
- Xi Chen, Nikhil Mishra, Mostafa Rohaninejad, and Pieter Abbeel. Pixelsnail: An improved autoregressive generative model. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 864–872. PMLR, 2018b.
- Kai Shen, Junliang Guo, Xu Tan, Siliang Tang, Rui Wang, and Jiang Bian. A study on relu and softmax in transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06461*, 2023.
- Loic Matthey, Irina Higgins, Demis Hassabis, and Alexander Lerchner. dsprites: Disentanglement testing sprites dataset, 2017.
- Chris Burgess and Hyunjik Kim. 3d shapes dataset. <https://github.com/deepmind/3dshapes-dataset/>, 2018.
- Scott E Reed, Yi Zhang, Yuting Zhang, and Honglak Lee. Deep visual analogy-making. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.
- Karl Ridgeway and Michael C Mozer. Learning deep disentangled embeddings with the f-statistic loss. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Cian Eastwood and Christopher KI Williams. A framework for the quantitative evaluation of disentangled representations. In *International conference on learning representations*, 2018.
- Satosi Watanabe. Information theoretical analysis of multivariate correlation. *IBM Journal of research and development*, 4(1):66–82, 1960.
- XuanLong Nguyen, Martin J Wainwright, and Michael I Jordan. Estimating divergence functionals and the likelihood ratio by convex risk minimization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(11):5847–5861, 2010.
- Masashi Sugiyama, Taiji Suzuki, and Takafumi Kanamori. Density-ratio matching under the bregman divergence: a unified framework of density-ratio estimation. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 64:1009–1044, 2012.
- Francesco Locatello, Stefan Bauer, Mario Lucic, Gunnar Raetsch, Sylvain Gelly, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Olivier Bachem. Challenging common assumptions in the unsupervised learning of disentangled representations. In *international conference on machine learning*, pages 4114–4124. PMLR, 2019.

Andrew Ross and Finale Doshi-Velez. Benchmarks, algorithms, and metrics for hierarchical disentanglement. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9084–9094. PMLR, 2021.

## A Perplexity comparison

We conducted document modeling experiments on three popular text datasets to evaluate the improvement achieved by replacing a linear decoder with a non-linear neural network decoder. Table 3 shows that GGBN outperforms other baseline models, indicating that GGBN is an effective method for modeling text data, such as Bag-of-words. It should be emphasized that GGBN can also generalize to natural images and other complex data, while traditional GBN-like baselines are limited to count data only.

Table 3: Perplexity (the lower, the better) results on three popular text datasets between GGBN and popular GBN-like model. The experimental settings and some baseline results follow the work of Duan et al. [2023].

Methods	Depth	20NG	RCV1	R8
LDA	1	735	942	966
ProdLDA	1	784	951	561
ETM	1	742	921	985
GBN	5	678	877	657
WHAI	5	726	906	773
SawETM	5	685	873	530
dc-ETM	5	647	801	420
ProGBN-x	5	653	798	436
ProGBN-kg	5	620	753	411
ProGBN-wv	5	614	735	408
<b>Generlized GBN</b>	5	<b>589</b>	<b>685</b>	<b>385</b>

## B Training Algorithm

---

### Algorithm 1 Upward-Downward Variational Inference

---

**Input:** Observed data  $X = \{x_n\}_j^J$ .

**Output:** Global parameters of the Generlized GBN  $\mathbf{W}^{(l:L)}$ .

Set mini-batch size  $m$  and the number of layer  $L$

Initialize the parameters  $\mathbf{W}^{(l:L)}$ ;

**for** iter = 1,2, ... **do**

1. Randomly select a mini-batch of  $m$  documents to form a subset  $X = \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{1,m}$ ;

2. Infer the variational posterior for gamma latent variable  $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^{(l)}\}_{i=1,l=1}^{m,L-1}$  with the inference network via Eq. (9) ;

3. Drawn random noise  $\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^l\}_{i=1,l=1}^{m,L}$  from a uniform distribution;

4. Sample hierarchical latent variables  $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^{(l)}\}_{i=1,l=1}^{m,L-1}$  from Weibull distribution with  $\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^l\}_{i=1,l=1}^{m,L}$  via Eq. (7);

5. Calculate  $\nabla_{\mathbf{W}^{(l:L)}} \mathcal{L} \left( \mathbf{W}^{(l:L)}; X; \{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^l\}_{i=1,l=1}^{m,L} \right)$  according to Eq. (11), and update encoder parameters and decoder parameters  $\mathbf{W}^{(l:L)}$  jointly ;

**end for**

---