

Information Geometry of Variational Bayes

Mohammad Emtiyaz Khan

RIKEN Center for AI Project, 1-4-1 Nihonbashi, Chuo-ku, Tokyo,
174-0055, Tokyo, Japan.

Contributing authors: emtiyaz.khan@riken.jp;

Abstract

We highlight a fundamental connection between information geometry and variational Bayes (VB) and discuss its consequences for machine learning. Under certain conditions, a VB solution always requires estimation or computation of natural gradients. We show several consequences of this fact by using the natural-gradient descent algorithm of [Khan and Rue \(2023\)](#) called the Bayesian Learning Rule (BLR). These include (i) a simplification of Bayes' rule as addition of natural gradients, (ii) a generalization of quadratic surrogates used in gradient-based methods, and (iii) a large-scale implementation of VB algorithms for large language models. Neither the connection nor its consequences are new but we further emphasize the common origins of the two fields of information geometry and Bayes with a hope to facilitate more work at the intersection of the two fields.

Keywords: Bayesian Inference, Variational Inference, Natural Gradient Descent

1 Introduction

The information geometry of variational Bayes (VB) ([Saul et al., 1996](#); [Bishop, 2006](#)) is a relatively less studied area compared to maximum-likelihood estimation ([Amari, 1998](#)). Some of the early works on natural gradients for VB were proposed as early as the 90s ([Amari, 1995](#); [Sato, 1999, 2001](#)) but they have only been popularized recently, for instance, by [Honkela et al. \(2010\)](#) and [Hoffman et al. \(2013\)](#), among others. These works clearly show that the two fields of VB and information geometry are inseparable. Our goal in this paper is to highlight this fundamental connection and show its impact on machine learning. Both the connection and its consequences are based on existing works. The goal of this work is to further emphasize the common origins of the two

fields of information geometry and Bayes. Our hope is that the connection will facilitate more work at the intersection of the two fields.

We start in [Sec. 2](#) with some background on VB and then, in [Sec. 3](#), illustrate the special role of information geometry and natural gradients for VB. In [Sec. 4](#), we present the Bayesian Learning Rule (BLR) ([Khan and Rue, 2023](#)) which exploits the power of natural gradients to optimize the VB objective. Subsequently, we discuss three consequences due to the connections between information geometry and VB.

1. In [Sec. 5](#), we show that Bayes' rule for conjugate models can be equivalently written as addition of natural gradients.
2. In [Sec. 6](#), we show that the natural gradients used in the BLR generalize the quadratic surrogates used in optimization methods.
3. In [Sec. 7](#), we highlight the impact of the above results on scaling VB to large deep networks (such as GPT-2) which was not possible until recently ([Shen et al., 2024](#)).

Throughout, we emphasize the role played by information geometry in VB. Our hope is that these results will facilitate future research at the intersection of the two fields of information geometry and Bayesian learning.

2 Variational Bayesian Learning

Variational Bayesian (VB) inference aims to approximate the posterior distribution by using an optimization problem over the space of distributions. For example, consider a Bayesian model with likelihood $p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ over the data \mathcal{D} with parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^P$ and a prior $p_0(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. For such models, [Zellner \(1988\)](#) shows that the posterior distribution $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D})$ obtained by using Bayes' rule can also be recovered by solving an optimization problem over the space \mathcal{P} of all possible distributions over $\boldsymbol{\theta}$,

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D}) = \frac{p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p_0(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{p(\mathcal{D})} = \arg \min_{q \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_q [-\log p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})] + \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}[q \| p_0]. \quad (1)$$

The optimization in the last expression is over distributions $q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathcal{P}$, and the second term there denotes the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between $q(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $p_0(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

VB restricts the optimization problem to approximate the posterior within a subset $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{P}$ of candidate distributions, for example, \mathcal{Q} can be the set of all Gaussian distributions. Below, we will write the VB formulation in a general form using a loss function, which is suited for machine learning and deep learning problems. Essentially, we rearrange the objective by expanding the KL term and clubbing the likelihood and prior together as shown below:

$$\mathbb{E}_q [-\log p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})] + \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}[q \| p_0] = \mathbb{E}_q [-\log (p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}))] - \mathcal{H}(q).$$

The second term on the right is the entropy denoted by $\mathcal{H}(q)$. Then, by defining the loss as $\bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\log (p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$, the optimization problem in [Eq. 1](#) can be rewritten

as the following VB problem over the subset of distributions \mathcal{Q} ,

$$q_*(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \arg \min_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathbb{E}_q [\bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] - \mathcal{H}(q). \quad (2)$$

We refer to this as the VB learning problem (as opposed to VB inference). The form applies more generally than VB inference, extending to cases when $\bar{\ell}$ does not correspond to a ‘proper’ Bayesian model. Such cases are often covered under a larger Bayesian framework that targets a *generalized* posterior which is proportional to $\exp(-\bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ with an arbitrary loss (Zhang, 1999; Catoni, 2007; Bissiri et al., 2016).

3 Information Geometry of VB Solutions

The goal of this paper is to highlight a fundamental connection between variational Bayes and information geometry. We will now show that computation of any q_* must involve computation of *natural* gradients, which are gradients scaled by a Fisher matrix. We believe that this result holds for general posterior forms, but here we will focus on cases where \mathcal{Q} is restricted to regular and minimal exponential-family members with respect to a fixed sufficient statistic $\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ as shown below:

$$q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = h(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \exp[\langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle - A(\boldsymbol{\lambda})]. \quad (3)$$

The candidates are parameterized through $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Omega$ which is called the natural parameter and takes values in a non-empty open set Ω . The cumulant function $A(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is finite, strictly convex and differentiable over Ω . Further, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is an inner product and $h(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is a function of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. The family is log-linear, that is, the log of $q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is linear in $\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

Natural gradients naturally arise for VB with exponential-family posterior distributions. This is because the derivative of the Shannon entropy $\mathcal{H}(q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$ with respect to natural parameters $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ necessarily involves the Fisher matrix of $q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. This is derived below (by assuming $h(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1$ for simplicity),

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mathcal{H}(q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) &= -\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}} [\log q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \\ &= -\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}} [\langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle - A(\boldsymbol{\lambda})] \\ &= -\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} [\langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} A(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \rangle - A(\boldsymbol{\lambda})] \\ &= -[\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^2 A(\boldsymbol{\lambda})] \boldsymbol{\lambda} - \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} A(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) + \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} A(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \\ &= -[\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^2 A(\boldsymbol{\lambda})] \boldsymbol{\lambda}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The second equality is obtained by simply substituting the definition of $q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$. The third equality is due to a well known property of exponential-families that the expected value of sufficient statistic is simply the derivative of the cumulant function, that is, $\mathbb{E}_{q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}}[\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} A(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$. The expectation $\mathbb{E}_{q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}}[\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$ is also known as the expectation parameter, as we will see in the next section where we will denote it by $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$. The fourth line applies the derivative, and the last line is obtained by cancelling the last two terms. For exponential-families, the Fisher matrix is $\mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^2 A(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$, which shows that the gradient of the entropy always contains this matrix.

Using this result, we can obtain the optimality condition of VB by simply setting the derivative of the objective at the optimal q_* to zero. Denoting the natural parameter of q_* by λ_* and rewriting q_* as q_{λ_*} , the optimality condition becomes $\nabla_{\lambda_*} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\lambda_*}} [\bar{\ell}(\theta)] = \nabla_{\lambda_*} \mathcal{H}(q_{\lambda_*})$. Then we substitute [Eq. 4](#) in the right hand side to get

$$\lambda_* = \mathbf{F}(\lambda_*)^{-1} \nabla_{\lambda_*} \mathbb{E}_{q_*} [-\bar{\ell}(\theta)]. \quad (5)$$

The quantity $\mathbf{F}(\lambda)^{-1} \nabla_{\lambda}$ on the right is a natural gradient due to the preconditioning by the inverse Fisher. The equation shows that the optimal natural parameter is equal to the natural gradient of the expected negative-loss at λ_* . This implies that the computation of λ_* necessarily involves the inversion of the Fisher matrix.

This result was first derived by [Salimans and Knowles \(2013\)](#) who draw an analogy to the solution of linear regression. For example, consider a linear model $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\theta + \epsilon$ with output vector \mathbf{y} , feature matrix \mathbf{X} , and error vector ϵ . Then, the optimal parameter is given by $\theta_* = (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{y}$ which, similarly to [Eq. 5](#), involves an inversion. Regardless of the choice of algorithm, computing θ_* necessarily requires us to solve a linear system. The convergence rate of an algorithm will therefore depend on the conditioning of the Gram matrix. A Newton step will immediately converge in one iteration, while gradient descent will take multiple steps, but both will solve the same linear system of equations. There is no escaping it.

By analogy, any algorithm estimating λ_* through VB is forced to deal with the geometry of q_{λ_*} . That is, the algorithm must solve [Eq. 5](#) and is forced to compute or estimate the required natural gradient. In this sense, any gradient based VB method ([Graves, 2011](#); [Blundell et al., 2015](#)) or even the black-box methods ([Ranganath et al., 2014](#)) all aim to compute the same natural gradient. The conditioning of the Fisher matrix thus contributes to their convergence behavior. Methods that ignore the geometry are expected to be slower than those that exploit it to their advantage. In summary, natural gradients are an integral part of all VB solutions and all VB methods must deal with computation or estimation of natural gradients, either directly or indirectly.

4 Information Geometry of the BLR

The result in [Eq. 5](#) highlights the information geometry of VB solutions but a similar result also holds for the *iterates* obtained during the optimization of the VB objective. We will now derive the latter result by using a natural-gradient descent algorithm. Specifically, we will use the Bayesian Learning Rule (BLR) of [Khan and Rue \(2023\)](#) which takes a form similar to the Bayes' rule.

To write the natural gradient descent in a computationally convenient form, we will exploit the ‘dual’ coordinates of exponential families. This form avoids an explicit inversion of the Fisher matrix, and can also be implemented easily. The dual coordinates are the expectation parameters defined as $\mu(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}_q[\mathbf{T}(\theta)] = \nabla A(\lambda)$ which we encountered while deriving [Eq. 4](#). The mapping between the pair (λ, μ) is a bijection, which makes μ a different way to parameterize q_{λ} ([Banerjee et al., 2005](#)).

The advantage of the dual coordinates is that they enable us to express natural gradients with respect to $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ as vanilla gradients with respect to $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, as shown below,

$$\mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})^{-1} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})^{-1} [\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})] \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = [\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^2 A(\boldsymbol{\lambda})]^{-1} [\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^2 A(\boldsymbol{\lambda})] \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}. \quad (6)$$

The first equality follows simply from the chain rule to switch to the gradient with respect to $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, while the second equality is obtained by using the result that $\mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^2 A(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$. The result shows that the natural gradient at $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is equivalent to vanilla gradient with respect to $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ at $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} A(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$. Thus, we can rewrite the optimality condition in [Eq. 5](#) as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_* = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_*} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_*}} [-\bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta})], \quad (7)$$

where we denote $\boldsymbol{\mu}_* = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} A(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_*)$. This provides yet another way to understand the information geometry of VB solutions: the natural parameter is simply equal to the gradients computed in the dual $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -space.

The Bayesian Learning Rule uses the following iterations with a learning rate $\rho_t > 0$ at each iteration t to find the solution,

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t+1} \leftarrow (1 - \rho_t) \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t + \rho_t \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_t} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t}} [-\bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta})], \quad (8)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_t = \nabla A(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t)$. It is easy to check that, when these steps converge, the optimal $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_*$ satisfies [Eq. 7](#) (assuming that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t$ are ‘valid’ natural parameters for all t). The algorithm performs natural-gradient descent in the $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ -space due to the property shown in [Eq. 6](#) and it is also a mirror-descent algorithm in the $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -space as originally proposed by [Khan and Lin \(2017\)](#) in the context of variational inference.

5 Bayes’ Rule as Addition of Natural Gradients

The BLR uses a convenient ‘additive’ update where natural-gradients are added to the previous natural parameters, but the same update can be written in a multiplicative form that resembles Bayes’ rule. This reformulation enables us to then connect additive updates used in machine learning to multiplicative updates used in Bayes’ rule.

To rewrite the BLR in a multiplicative form, we simply need to substitute $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t+1}$ from [Eq. 8](#) into [Eq. 3](#) and simplify to get

$$q_{t+1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \propto q_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{(1-\rho_t)} \left[\exp \left(\langle \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t, \mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle \right) \right]^{\rho_t} \quad \text{where } \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_t} \mathbb{E}_{q_t} [-\bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]. \quad (9)$$

Here, to simplify the notation, we denote $q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t}$ by q_t . This form is similar to a Bayes’ filter where the previous q_t is used as the prior and multiplied with a likelihood that has an exponential-family form using a natural parameter $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t$. Essentially, every step of the BLR converts the loss $\bar{\ell}$ into a likelihood with an exponential-family form. The step can therefore be seen as Bayesian inference on a ‘conjugate’ exponential-family model. This interpretation was originally proposed by [Khan and Lin \(2017\)](#) and we will use it to argue that natural gradients are also inherently present in Bayes’ rule.

We first illustrate the main idea on a simple ridge-regression example where the computation of the posterior can be written as addition of natural parameters. Afterward, we will show that this is equivalent to addition of natural gradients and provide a formal statement of the result.

Ex 1. Consider ridge regression for $\mathcal{D} = (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ with output vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and feature matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times P}$. The likelihood and prior are given as follows:

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{I}_N) \quad p_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_P).$$

where \mathbf{I}_N and \mathbf{I}_P are identity matrices of size N and P respectively. We can write both densities in a quadratic form with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ as shown below,

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) &\propto \exp \left[\mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\theta} + \text{Tr} \left((-\tfrac{1}{2} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}) \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \right) \right] \\ p_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &\propto \exp \left[\mathbf{0}^\top \boldsymbol{\theta} + \text{Tr} \left((-\tfrac{1}{2} \mathbf{I}_P) \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Multiplying the two densities, we can write their product in the same form too,

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{y}) \propto p(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \propto \exp \left[\left(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{0} \right)^\top \boldsymbol{\theta} + \text{Tr} \left(-\tfrac{1}{2} (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{I}_P) \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \right) \right]. \quad (11)$$

Because the product is quadratic in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, we can conclude that the posterior also takes a Gaussian form. This property is often referred to as ‘conjugacy’ in the Bayesian literature, and we can equivalently write any such conjugate operation as addition of natural parameters.

To show this, let us denote the Gaussian posterior by $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{m}_*, \mathbf{S}_*^{-1})$ with mean \mathbf{m}_* and precision \mathbf{S}_* , which can also be written in an exponential-family form,

$$\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{m}_*, \mathbf{S}_*^{-1}) \propto \exp \left[\mathbf{m}_*^\top \mathbf{S}_* \boldsymbol{\theta} + \text{Tr} \left(-\tfrac{1}{2} \mathbf{S}_* \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \right) \right]. \quad (12)$$

Now, by simply equating the terms in front of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top$ in Eq. 11 and Eq. 12 respectively, we can write the multiplication as an addition in the $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ -space,

$$\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}_* \mathbf{m}_* \\ -\tfrac{1}{2} \mathbf{S}_* \end{pmatrix}}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_*} = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{y} \\ -\tfrac{1}{2} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} \end{pmatrix}}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{lik}} + \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ -\tfrac{1}{2} \mathbf{I}_P \end{pmatrix}}_{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{prior}} \implies \boldsymbol{\lambda}_* = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{lik} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{prior} \quad (13)$$

The natural parameter $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_*$ is thus written as a sum of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{lik}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{prior}$.

In general, for conjugate models, the likelihood, prior, and posterior all take the same exponential-family form with respect to some sufficient statistic $\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. That is, for

some $\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{lik}}$, $\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{prior}}$, and λ_* , we can write them as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) &\propto \exp \left[\langle \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{lik}}, \mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle \right], \\ p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &\propto \exp \left[\langle \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{prior}}, \mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle \right], \\ p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{y}) &\propto \exp \left[\langle \lambda_*, \mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle \right], \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

and Bayes' rule can be expressed as a simple addition

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{y}) \propto p(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \iff \lambda_* = \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{lik}} + \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{prior}}. \tag{15}$$

The quantities being added above can also be seen as natural gradients. Below, we show that the natural gradients of the expected log-likelihood and expected log-prior are $\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{lik}}$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{prior}}$ respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\lambda}}[\log p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{y})] &= \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\lambda}}[\langle \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{lik}}, \mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle] = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}[\langle \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{lik}}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle] = \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{lik}} \\ \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\lambda}}[\log p_0(\boldsymbol{\theta})] &= \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\lambda}}[\langle \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{prior}}, \mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle] = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}[\langle \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{prior}}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle] = \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{prior}} \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

In general, whenever $\bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is linear in $\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, then the natural gradient of $\mathbb{E}_{q_{\lambda}}[\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$ is equal to the factor that is in front of $\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. The following theorem formalizes this.

Theorem 1. *For any loss of the form $\bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \propto \langle -\tilde{\lambda}, \mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle$, we have $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\lambda}}[\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = -\tilde{\lambda}$.*

Due to this property, Bayes' rule can be seen as a special case of the BLR with learning rate $\rho_t = 1$. The following theorem further shows that the BLR converges in one step, regardless of where it is initialized.

Theorem 2. *Bayes' rule in conjugate models is realized by one step of the BLR update in Eq. 8 with learning rate $\rho_t = 1$.*

The one-step convergence is a direct consequence of the fact that the posterior is available in closed form. In general, the BLR in Eq. 9 extends the closed-form multiplicative property of Bayes' rule to general cases. This is made possible by exploiting the information geometry of VB through natural gradients. At each iteration, natural gradients are used to write an update that resembles Bayes' rule which is also equivalent to a simple addition:

$$q_{t+1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \propto q_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{(1-\rho_t)} \left[\exp \left(\langle \tilde{\lambda}_t, \mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \rangle \right) \right]^{\rho_t} \iff \lambda_{t+1} = (1-\rho_t)\lambda_t + \rho_t \tilde{\lambda}_t. \tag{17}$$

This is an extension of Eq. 15 to problems involving non-conjugate terms $\bar{\ell}$ and where no closed-form expression for the posterior exists. The optimization will not terminate in one step, but the form still resembles Bayes' rule.

6 Beyond Quadratic Surrogates with BLR

The additive property of the BLR enables us to derive machine learning algorithms as special cases of natural gradient descent on VB, as shown by [Khan and Rue \(2023\)](#). We show now that this is made possible because the BLR yields a surrogate which is similar to the quadratic surrogates used in standard continuous optimization methods. Information geometry plays an important role here because the BLR surrogates are obtained by replacing vanilla gradients of the loss by natural gradients.

We start by discussing the standard quadratic-surrogate model used in popular optimization algorithms. For instance, the Newton step can be written as minimization of a local quadratic surrogate defined at $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t$,

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_t - \mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t)^{-1} \nabla \bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \nabla \bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) + \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_t)^\top \mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_t). \quad (18)$$

Here, we denote by $\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t)$ the Hessian of $\bar{\ell}$ at $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t$.

The BLR has a similar interpretation where, at each step, a surrogate linear in $\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is minimized at q_t but the optimization takes place in the $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -space. This is obtained by using the ‘mirror descent’ form of the BLR originally proposed by [Khan and Lin \(2017\)](#). The following theorem states the result.

Theorem 3. *The BLR performs mirror descent over the VB objective $\mathcal{L}(q) = \mathbb{E}_q[\bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] - \mathcal{H}(q)$, that is, the steps can be written as follows:*

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t+1} = (1 - \rho_t) \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t + \rho_t \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \langle \boldsymbol{\mu}, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \mathcal{L} \rangle + \frac{1}{\rho_t} \mathbb{D}_{KL}[q \| q_t]. \quad (19)$$

Proof. The result can be proved straightforwardly by taking the gradient with respect to $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and setting it to 0. To do so, we first write $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \mathcal{L}$ by using [Eq. 4](#),

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \mathcal{L} = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_t} \mathbb{E}_{q_t}[\bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] - \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_t} \mathcal{H}(q_t) = -\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t. \quad (20)$$

We substitute this in the second expression in [Eq. 19](#), and then take its derivative,

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \left[\langle \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t \rangle + \frac{1}{\rho_t} \mathbb{D}_{KL}[q \| q_t] \right] = (\boldsymbol{\lambda}_t - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t) + \frac{1}{\rho_t} (\boldsymbol{\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t).$$

The above expression is obtained by noting that the derivative of the KL divergence is equal to the difference in the respective natural parameters. Setting this to 0, we get the first equality in [Eq. 19](#), which proves the equality between the two formulations. \square

The mirror-descent formulation uses surrogates similar to the quadratic surrogates used in the Newton step (and also in gradient descent) but the linearization is done with respect to $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, and the quadratic term is replaced by the KL divergence. To connect the BLR surrogate to the quadratic surrogate, we rewrite the optimization problem of [Eq. 19](#) in a form where the terms depending on $\bar{\ell}$ are isolated from the rest, and then specialize the surrogate to the case of a full-covariance Gaussian. We use [Eq. 20](#)

to rewrite the BLR surrogate and then simplify in the second line by noting that $\langle \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t \rangle = \mathbb{E}_q[\log q_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t+1} &= \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \langle \boldsymbol{\mu}, -\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_t \rangle + \frac{1}{\rho_t} \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}[q \parallel q_t] \\ &= \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \langle \boldsymbol{\mu}, -\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t \rangle + \mathbb{E}_q[\log q_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})] + \frac{1}{\rho_t} \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}[q \parallel q_t] \\ &= \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \mathbb{E}_q \left[\langle \mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), -\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t \rangle \right] + \frac{1}{\rho_t} \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}[q \parallel q_t^{1-\rho_t}]. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The last line is obtained by merging the last two terms in the second line into one.

Finally, we specialize the surrogate for Gaussians of the form $q_t = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{m}_t, \mathbf{S}_t^{-1})$ by noting that the natural gradients can be expressed in terms of the gradient and Hessian. Specifically, we use the following result from [Khan and Rue \(2023, Eq. 11\)](#),

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t = -\mathbb{E}_{q_t} \left[\begin{pmatrix} \nabla \bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{m}_t \\ \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \end{pmatrix} \right]. \quad (22)$$

Noting that $\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = (\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top)$ for a full-covariance Gaussian, we get the following BLR surrogate which closely resembles the quadratic surrogate in [Eq. 18](#),

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), -\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t \rangle &= \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbb{E}_{q_t} [\nabla \bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \mathbf{m}_t] + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[\boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbb{E}_{q_t} [\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \right] \\ &= \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbb{E}_{q_t} [\nabla \bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] + \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{m}_t)^\top \mathbb{E}_{q_t} [\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{m}_t) + \text{const}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Compared to [Eq. 18](#), the difference here is that the gradient and Hessian are now evaluated at and averaged over the samples from q_t , and the quadratic term is centered at \mathbf{m}_t instead of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t$. The surrogate pays attention not only to the mean \mathbf{m}_t but also to its neighborhood. In this sense, this surrogate is more *global* than the one used in the Newton step.

In fact, the quadratic surrogate in [Eq. 18](#) can be obtained as a special case of the BLR surrogate by using the same approximations that are used by [Khan and Rue \(2023\)](#) to derive the Newton step. Essentially, we set $\rho_t = 1$ and then apply the delta method to approximate the expectations at the mean \mathbf{m}_t as shown below:

$$\mathbb{E}_{q_t} [\nabla \bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \approx \nabla \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{m}_t) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_{q_t} [\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] \approx \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{m}_t). \quad (24)$$

With $\rho_t = 1$, the KL term reduces to the entropy as shown in the second line below, then we substitute [Eq. 23](#), apply the delta method, and simplify,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_q \left[\langle \mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), -\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t \rangle \right] + \frac{1}{\rho_t} \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}[q \parallel q_t^{1-\rho_t}] \\ &= \langle \mathbb{E}_q [\mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta})], -\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_t \rangle - \mathcal{H}(q) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_q \left[\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbb{E}_{q_t} [\nabla \bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] + \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{m}_t)^\top \mathbb{E}_{q_t} [\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{m}_t) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \log |2\pi \mathbf{S}| \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\approx \mathbb{E}_q \left[\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \nabla \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{m}_t) + \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{m}_t)^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{m}_t) (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{m}_t) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \log |2\pi \mathbf{S}| \\
&= \mathbf{m}^\top \nabla \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{m}_t) + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}_t)^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{m}_t) (\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}_t) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{m}_t) \mathbf{S}^{-1}] + \frac{1}{2} \log |2\pi \mathbf{S}|.
\end{aligned}$$

Optimizing the above approximate surrogate yields the quadratic surrogate in [Eq. 18](#). For example, collecting the terms that depend on \mathbf{m} , we get the following:

$$\mathbf{m}_{t+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{m}^\top \nabla \bar{\ell}(\mathbf{m}_t) + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}_t)^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{m}_t) (\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{m}_t), \quad (26)$$

which is equivalent to [Eq. 18](#). Similarly, optimizing with respect to \mathbf{S} is also straightforward and yields $\mathbf{S}_{t+1} = \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{m}_t)$. We see that, for a full-covariance Gaussian, the BLR surrogate recovers the quadratic surrogate obtained by Taylor’s method. By using an arbitrary exponential-family form, the BLR surrogates give rise to novel surrogates, for example, those obtained by using Bernoulli or log-Normal forms.

For conjugate Bayesian models, the BLR surrogate reduces to the well known Fenchel conjugate. For instance, consider Bayes’ rule given in [Eq. 15](#). By using the second line of [Eq. 25](#), we can equivalently rewrite [Eq. 15](#) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{t+1} &= \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \mathbb{E}_q \left[\langle \mathbf{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), -(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\text{lik}} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\text{prior}}) \rangle \right] - \mathcal{H}(q) \\
&= \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \langle \boldsymbol{\mu}, -(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\text{lik}} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\text{prior}}) \rangle + A^*(\boldsymbol{\mu}),
\end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where the second line follows by noting that the Shannon entropy $\mathcal{H}(q) = -A^*(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is also equal to the negative of the convex conjugate of the log-partition function. The result of [Eq. 15](#) is recovered by setting the derivative to 0,

$$-(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\text{lik}} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\text{prior}}) + \nabla A^*(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = 0 \quad \implies \quad \boldsymbol{\lambda}_* = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\text{lik}} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\text{prior}}.$$

Fenchel conjugates are commonly used in machine learning ([Blondel et al., 2020](#); [Paulus et al., 2020](#)) and their origins are attributed to convex optimization and information geometry, but Bayes is rarely mentioned. The derivation highlights the close connections between these fields. Bayesian inference can be simply seen as the computation of Fenchel conjugates whenever the joint distribution of the Bayesian model is log-linear with respect to $\boldsymbol{\mu}$.

We end this section with some historical remarks about the BLR surrogate. The forms in [Eq. 19](#) and [Eq. 15](#) were first proposed by [Khan and Lin \(2017\)](#). The connections to natural gradients were made explicit in a later work by [Khan and Nielsen \(2018\)](#), where the surrogates were referred to as the *sites*, following the common nomenclature from the graphical model literature. The work of [Oppen and Archambeau \(2009\)](#) was the first to show the global nature of the VB solutions for Gaussian posteriors, which was later generalized to the exponential family by [Salimans and Knowles \(2013\)](#), but neither used natural gradients to derive surrogates.

7 A Large-Scale Implementation of VB for LLMs

Scaling VB to large problems has always been an issue. Directly optimizing the VB objective using deep-learning optimizers does not give satisfactory results, which has led to the belief that the VB objective is inferior to those used in deep-learning training. Recent work by [Shen et al. \(2024\)](#) addresses this issue by using the BLR. Natural gradients are powerful here because the natural-gradient update naturally takes a form similar to the popular Adam optimizer. We will now briefly describe the result.

[Khan and Rue \(2023\)](#) showed that the BLR update takes a strikingly similar form to RMSprop and Adam. The RMSprop update is shown below

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\theta}_t - \alpha \frac{\widehat{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t)}{\sqrt{\mathbf{v}_{t+1} + c\mathbf{1}}}, \quad \text{where } \mathbf{v}_{t+1} \leftarrow (1 - \beta)\mathbf{v}_t + \beta \left[\widehat{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) \right]^2. \quad (28)$$

Similarly to stochastic gradient descent, the update uses the minibatch gradient (denoted by $\widehat{\nabla}$) with learning rate α . The gradients are scaled by the square-root of a scale vector \mathbf{v}_t . The constant c is added to avoid dividing by 0. The scale vector contains a moving average of the squared gradient (element-wise square) with learning rate β . This is a heuristic used to reduce the stochastic noise due to minibatches ([Tieleman and Hinton, 2012](#)).

A surprising result shown by [Khan et al. \(2018\)](#) is that the BLR for the diagonal-covariance Gaussian family takes a form similar to RMSprop and, unlike RMSprop, no heuristics are required to derive it. The resemblance is primarily due to the information geometry of VB. Essentially, if we use $q_t = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{m}_t, \text{diag}(\mathbf{s}_t)^{-1})$ with a vector \mathbf{s}_t , then the BLR reduces to a Newton-like form where the gradient and Hessian are evaluated at samples from q_t . Due to the diagonal covariance, only the diagonal of the Hessian is needed. The BLR update for this case takes the following form,

$$\mathbf{m}_{t+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{m}_t - \rho_t \frac{\mathbb{E}_{q_t}[\widehat{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \bar{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta})]}{\mathbf{s}_{t+1}}, \quad \text{where } \mathbf{s}_{t+1} \leftarrow (1 - \rho_t)\mathbf{s}_t + \rho_t \mathbb{E}_{q_t}[\text{diag}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))]. \quad (29)$$

The update closely resembles RMSprop, but has some differences. Most notably, it evaluates gradients at samples from q_t and replaces the squared gradient by the Hessian. Moreover, the update of the mean is a Newton-like step where square-root is not used for the scale vector. This update is referred to as the Variational Online Newton (VON) algorithm.

Recently, [Shen et al. \(2024\)](#) used a Riemannian extension of VON, originally proposed by [Lin et al. \(2020\)](#) and showed that it often performs comparably to Adam and sometimes can even beat it. They call the new algorithm the Improved VON algorithm (IVON as an abbreviation). Pseudo-code is shown in [Fig. 1](#) where IVON is contrasted with the RMSprop/Adam pseudo-code. There is a line-by-line correspondence between the two methods, with some differences highlighted in red.

Because the IVON updates are almost identical to Adam, we can now efficiently compute natural gradients at large scale, for instance, for modern large language models (LLMs). The method overcomes a common criticism of natural gradients and Bayes, that they are too computationally intensive. The IVON algorithm defies such

RMSprop/Adam	Improved Variational Online Newton (IVON)
1 $\hat{g} \leftarrow \hat{\nabla} \ell(\theta)$	1 $\hat{g} \leftarrow \hat{\nabla} \ell(\theta)$ where $\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(m, \sigma^2)$
2 $\hat{h} \leftarrow \hat{g}^2$	2 $\hat{h} \leftarrow \hat{g} \cdot (\theta - m) / \sigma^2$
3 $h \leftarrow (1 - \rho)h + \rho \hat{h}$	3 $h \leftarrow (1 - \rho)h + \rho \hat{h} + \rho^2 (h - \hat{h})^2 / (2(h + \delta))$
4 $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \alpha(\hat{g} + \delta m) / (\sqrt{h} + \delta)$	4 $m \leftarrow m - \alpha(\hat{g} + \delta m) / (h + \delta)$
5	5 $\sigma^2 \leftarrow 1 / (N(h + \delta))$

Fig. 1 The figure shows a rough pseudo-code of RMSprop/Adam and compares it to the IVON algorithm which is the natural-gradient update of the BLR. We get a line by line correspondence between the two algorithms and the parts that are different are highlighted in red. The differences are essentially due to expectation in the VB objective which is approximated by one Monte-Carlo sample (in line 1). IVON computes the Hessian at this sample by using the reparameterization trick (line 2). The additional term in line 3 is due to a retraction obtained by using Riemannian gradient descent. The Hessian estimate is then used in a Newton-like update (line 4).




Fig. 2 Figures adopted from Shen et al. (2024). The first panel shows training of GPT-2 on OpenWebText and the second panel shows the same for ResNet-50 on ImageNet. Runtime in hours (h) is indicated by the arrows where we see that they are almost the same for IVON and AdamW. A small difference is due to the sampling in IVON. IVON obtains slightly better accuracy in the end.

criticism. The posterior expectations are conveniently approximated with one Monte-Carlo sample (line 1). The expectation of the Hessian is approximated by using the reparameterization trick (Lin et al., 2019a),

$$\mathbb{E}_q[\mathbf{H}(\theta)] = 2\nabla_{\mathbf{S}^{-1}} \mathbb{E}_q[\bar{\ell}(\theta)] = \mathbb{E}_q[\nabla \bar{\ell}(\theta) \mathbf{S}(\theta - \mathbf{m})^\top],$$

This example shows that not only can the natural gradients be computed efficiently at large scale, but also that natural gradient descent for VB can be implemented efficiently and in a form similar to deep-learning algorithms. Fig. 2 shows the results for GPT-2 training (on OpenWebText) and ResNet-50 (on ImageNet), demonstrating that the natural-gradient update used in the BLR can in fact work well at large scale.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we highlight a fundamental connection between information geometry and VB and discuss its consequences for machine learning. For exponential-family posteriors, a VB solution always requires estimation or computation of natural gradients. We believe this result extends beyond exponential families, for example, [Lin et al. \(2019b, 2021\)](#); [Kiral et al. \(2023\)](#) show such results. We discuss several consequences of this fact, connecting them to their common origin in the optimality condition of the VB objective. For instance, Bayes' rule, when seen as addition of natural gradients, achieves the optimality condition in one step. This is shown to be analogous to Newton's method. We further show that the natural-gradient update for VB generalizes the quadratic surrogates used in gradient-based optimization. Finally, we show how the natural-gradient updates resemble deep learning optimizers and how this fact can be exploited to scale VB to large problems.

The information geometry of VB helps us to connect VB to other machine learning algorithms and makes it useful for improving aspects of deep learning. It helps us to overcome a common criticism that Bayesian and information geometric methods are computationally intensive and may not scale well to modern models. Thanks to the fundamental connection between information geometry and VB, elegant theory of Bayesian principles can now be applied to solve important practical problems.

Acknowledgments. This work is supported by JST CREST Grant Number JP-MJCR2112. Many thanks to Sophia Sklaviadis (RIKEN, Tokyo, Japan, and Instituto de Telecomunicações and Instituto Superior Técnico, Lisbon, Portugal) for proof reading and giving constructive feedback.

References

- Khan, M.E., Rue, H.: The Bayesian learning rule. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **24**(281), 1–46 (2023)
- Saul, L.K., Jaakkola, T., Jordan, M.I.: Mean field theory for sigmoid belief networks. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* **4**, 61–76 (1996)
- Bishop, C.M.: *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning (Information Science and Statistics)*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2006)
- Amari, S.: Natural gradient works efficiently in learning. *Neural computation* **10**(2), 251–276 (1998)
- Amari, S.-i.: Information geometry of the EM and em algorithms for neural networks. *Neural networks* **8**(9), 1379–1408 (1995)
- Sato, M.-A.: Fast learning of on-line EM algorithm. Technical report, ATR Human Information Processing Research Laboratories (1999)

- Sato, M.-A.: Online model selection based on the variational Bayes. *Neural Computation* **13**(7), 1649–1681 (2001)
- Honkela, A., Raiko, T., Kuusela, M., Tornio, M., Karhunen, J.: Approximate Riemannian conjugate gradient learning for fixed-form variational Bayes. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **11**, 3235–3268 (2010)
- Hoffman, M.D., Blei, D.M., Wang, C., Paisley, J.: Stochastic variational inference. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **14**(1), 1303–1347 (2013)
- Shen, Y., Daheim, N., Cong, B., Nickl, P., Marconi, G.M., Bazan, C., Yokota, R., Gurevych, I., Cremers, D., Khan, M.E., Möllenhoff, T.: Variational learning is effective for large deep networks. In: *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2024* (2024)
- Zellner, A.: Optimal information processing and Bayes’s theorem. *The American Statistician* **42**(4), 278–280 (1988)
- Zhang, T.: Theoretical analysis of a class of randomized regularization methods. In: *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory. COLT ’99*, pp. 156–163. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (1999)
- Catoni, O.: PAC-Bayesian supervised classification: The thermodynamics of statistical learning. institute of mathematical statistics lecture notes—monograph series 56. IMS, Beachwood, OH. MR2483528 **5544465** (2007)
- Bissiri, P.G., Holmes, C.C., Walker, S.G.: A general framework for updating belief distributions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **78**(5), 1103–1130 (2016)
- Salimans, T., Knowles, D.A.: Fixed-form variational posterior approximation through stochastic linear regression. *Bayesian Analysis* **8**(4), 837–882 (2013)
- Graves, A.: Practical variational inference for neural networks. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 2348–2356 (2011)
- Blundell, C., Cornebise, J., Kavukcuoglu, K., Wierstra, D.: Weight uncertainty in neural networks. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1613–1622 (2015)
- Ranganath, R., Gerrish, S., Blei, D.M.: Black box variational inference. In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 814–822 (2014)
- Banerjee, A., Merugu, S., Dhillon, I.S., Ghosh, J.: Clustering with Bregman divergences. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **6**(Oct), 1705–1749 (2005)

- Khan, M.E., Lin, W.: Conjugate-computation variational inference: converting variational inference in non-conjugate models to inferences in conjugate models. In: International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, pp. 878–887 (2017)
- Blondel, M., Martins, A.F., Niculae, V.: Learning with Fenchel-Young losses. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **21**(35), 1–69 (2020)
- Paulus, M., Choi, D., Tarlow, D., Krause, A., Maddison, C.J.: Gradient estimation with stochastic softmax tricks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33**, 5691–5704 (2020)
- Khan, M.E., Nielsen, D.: Fast yet simple natural-gradient descent for variational inference in complex models. In: 2018 International Symposium on Information Theory and Its Applications (ISITA), pp. 31–35 (2018). IEEE
- Opper, M., Archambeau, C.: The variational Gaussian approximation revisited. *Neural Computation* **21**(3), 786–792 (2009)
- Tieleman, T., Hinton, G.: Lecture 6.5-RMSprop: Divide the gradient by a running average of its recent magnitude. COURSERA: Neural Networks for Machine Learning 4 (2012)
- Khan, M.E., Nielsen, D., Tangkaratt, V., Lin, W., Gal, Y., Srivastava, A.: Fast and scalable Bayesian deep learning by weight-perturbation in Adam. In: Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 80, pp. 2611–2620 (2018)
- Lin, W., Schmidt, M., Khan, M.E.: Handling the positive-definite constraint in the bayesian learning rule. In: International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 6116–6126 (2020). PMLR
- Lin, W., Khan, M.E., Schmidt, M.: Stein’s lemma for the reparameterization trick with exponential family mixtures. arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13398 (2019)
- Lin, W., Khan, M.E., Schmidt, M.: Fast and simple natural-gradient variational inference with mixture of exponential-family approximations. In: Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning, vol. 97, pp. 3992–4002 (2019)
- Lin, W., Nielsen, F., Khan, M.E., Schmidt, M.: Tractable structured natural-gradient descent using local parameterizations. In: International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 6680–6691 (2021)
- Kiral, E.M., Möllenhoff, T., Khan, M.E.: The Lie-group Bayesian learning rule. In: International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (2023)