Supplementary Material: Temporal alignment and latent Gaussian process factor inference in population spike trains

Lea Duncker & Maneesh Sahani Gatsby Computational Neuroscience Unit University College London London, W1T 4JG {duncker,maneesh}@gatsby.ucl.ac.uk

1 Derivation of the svGPFA Variational Lower Bound

In order to arrive at a scalable variational inference algorithm, we make use of a sparse GP approximation. We introduce a set of inducing points $U = [\boldsymbol{u}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{u}_K]$ for each latent process, which are each evaluated on a set of inducing point locations $Z = [\boldsymbol{z}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{z}_K]$.

The joint-data likelihood of the full model, now including the inducing points, is hence

$$p(\mathcal{Y}, \boldsymbol{x}(\cdot), U) = p(\mathcal{Y} | \boldsymbol{x}(\cdot)) \prod_{k=1}^{K} p(x_k(\cdot) | \boldsymbol{u}_k) p(\boldsymbol{u}_k | \boldsymbol{z}_k)$$
(1)

where we have omitted explicit conditioning on model parameters to avoid cluttered notation. A variational lower bound to the log-likelihood can be obtained by applying Jensen's inequality:

$$\log p(\mathcal{Y}) \ge \iint q(\{\boldsymbol{u}_k\}_{k=1}^K, \boldsymbol{x}(\cdot)) \log \left(\frac{p(\mathcal{Y}|\boldsymbol{x}(\cdot)) \prod_{k=1}^K p(\boldsymbol{x}_k(\cdot)|\boldsymbol{u}_k) p(\boldsymbol{u}_k|\boldsymbol{z}_k)}{q(\{\boldsymbol{u}_k\}_{k=1}^K, \boldsymbol{x}(\cdot))}\right) d\boldsymbol{u}_1 \dots d\boldsymbol{u}_K d\boldsymbol{x}$$
(2)

We choose a factorised approximating distribution of the form

$$q(\{\boldsymbol{u}_k\}_{k=1}^K, \boldsymbol{x}(\cdot)) = \prod_{k=1}^K q(\boldsymbol{u}_k, x_k(\cdot)) = \prod_{k=1}^K p(x_k(\cdot)|\boldsymbol{u}_k)q(\boldsymbol{u}_k)$$
(3)

and choose $q(\boldsymbol{u}_k) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{m}_k, S_k)$ to be multivariate Gaussian. This choice of approximating distribution allows one to write the lower bound as

$$\log p(\mathcal{Y}) \ge \iint \prod_{k=1}^{K} q(\boldsymbol{u}_k) p(\boldsymbol{x}_k(\cdot) | \boldsymbol{u}_k) \log \left(p(\mathcal{Y} | \boldsymbol{x}(\cdot)) \right) d\boldsymbol{u}_k d\boldsymbol{x} - \sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathrm{KL} \left[q(\boldsymbol{u}_k) \| p(\boldsymbol{u}_k) \right]$$
(4)

The second term is the Kullback-Leibler divergence between two Gaussian distributions, which can be evaluated analytically. In order to manipulate the first term, let $h_n(\cdot) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} c_{n,k} x_k(\cdot) + d_n$ denote the affine transformation of latent GPs for the *n*-th neuron. We can obtain a marginal variational distribution over $h_n(\cdot)$ as a GP with additive structure

$$q(h_n(\cdot)) = \int \prod_{k=1}^{K} q(\boldsymbol{u}_k) p(h_n(\cdot) | \{\boldsymbol{u}_k\}) d\boldsymbol{u}_k = \mathcal{GP}(\nu_n(\cdot), \sigma_n(\cdot, \cdot))$$
(5)

32nd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2018), Montréal, Canada.

where

$$\nu_n(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} c_{n,k} \, \boldsymbol{\kappa}_k(t, \boldsymbol{z}_k) \, \mathsf{K}_{zz}^{(k)^{-1}} \, \boldsymbol{m}_k + d_n \tag{6}$$

$$\sigma_n(t,t') = \sum_{k=1}^{K} c_{n,k}^2 \Big(\kappa_k(t,t') + \kappa_k(t, \mathbf{z}_k) \Big(\mathsf{K}_{\mathsf{zz}}^{(\mathsf{k})^{-1}} S_k \mathsf{K}_{zz}^{(k)^{-1}} - \mathsf{K}_{zz}^{(k)^{-1}} \Big) \kappa_k(\mathbf{z}_k,t') \Big)$$
(7)

 $\kappa_k(\cdot, z_k)$ is a vector valued function taking a single time-point as an input argument and consisting of evaluations of the kernel $\kappa_k(\cdot, \cdot)$ at the inducing point locations. $\mathsf{K}_{zz}^{(k)}$ is the kernel Gram matrix of the *k*th process evaluated at the respective inducing point locations.

To obtain the final expression for the variational lower bound, we can simply rewrite the expression in equation (??):

$$\log p(\mathcal{Y}) \ge \mathbb{E}_{q(h_n)} \left[\log p(\mathcal{Y}|h_n(\cdot))\right] - \sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathrm{KL} \left[q(\boldsymbol{u}_k) \| p(\boldsymbol{u}_k)\right]$$
(8)

2 Use of a point-process likelihood

Using a point-process likelihood in the GPFA model amounts to evaluating the expected log-likelihood in the first term in (??):

$$\mathbb{E}_{q(h_n^{(r)})} \left[\log p(\boldsymbol{t}_n^{(r)} | h_n^{(r)}) \right] = -\mathbb{E}_{q(h_n^{(r)})} \left[\int_{\mathcal{T}} g(h_n^{(r)}(t)) dt \right] + \sum_{i_n=1}^{\Phi(n,r)} \mathbb{E}_{q(h_n^{(r)})} \left[\log g(h_n^{(r)}(t_i)) \right]$$
(9)

We can apply Fubini's theorem to switch the order of integration in the first term:

$$\mathbb{E}_{q(h_n^{(r)})} \left[\log p(\boldsymbol{t}_n^{(r)} | h_n^{(r)}) \right] = -\int_{\mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}_{q(h_n^{(r)})} \left[g(h_n^{(r)}(t)) \right] dt + \sum_{i_n=1}^{\Phi(n,r)} \mathbb{E}_{q(h_n^{(r)})} \left[\log g(h_n^{(r)}(t_i)) \right]$$
(10)

Which gives the final form of the expected log-likelihood. Depending on the choice of non-linearity $g(\cdot)$, the expectation terms can either be evaluated analytically, or efficiently using Gauss-Hermite quadrature. The first term in (??) involves one-dimensional integrals, which can be computed using efficient numerical approximations such as Gauss-Legendre quadrature.

Condition-grouped model with time-warping 3

< >

The full approximating distribution across trials is chosen to be of the form

$$q(\{\{\{\zeta_{k}^{(r)}, \boldsymbol{u}_{k}^{\zeta,(r)}\}_{k=1}^{K}\}_{\zeta}, \tau^{(r)}, \boldsymbol{u}^{\tau,(r)}\}_{r=1}^{R}) = \prod_{r=1}^{R} \left(\prod_{\zeta = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}} \prod_{k=1}^{K} p(\zeta_{k}^{(r)} | \boldsymbol{u}_{k}^{\zeta,(r)}, \tau^{(r)}) q(\boldsymbol{u}_{k}^{\zeta,(r)})\right) p(\tau^{(r)} | \boldsymbol{u}^{\tau,(r)}) q(\boldsymbol{u}^{\tau,(r)})$$
(11)

Under this approximation, the variational lower bound to the log-likelihood becomes

$$\log p(\mathcal{Y}) \geq \sum_{r=1}^{R} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}_{q(h_{n}^{(r)})} \left[\log p(\boldsymbol{y}_{n}^{(r)} | h_{n}^{(r)}) \right] - \sum_{r=1}^{R} \mathrm{KL} \left[q(\boldsymbol{u}^{\tau,(r)}) \| p(\boldsymbol{u}^{\tau,(r)}) \right] - \sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathrm{KL} \left[q(\boldsymbol{u}^{\alpha}_{k}) \| p(\boldsymbol{u}^{\alpha}_{k}) \right] - \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathrm{KL} \left[q(\boldsymbol{u}^{\beta,(\ell)}_{k}) \| p(\boldsymbol{u}^{\beta,(\ell)}_{k}) \right] - \sum_{r=1}^{R} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \mathrm{KL} \left[q(\boldsymbol{u}^{\gamma,(r)}_{k}) \| p(\boldsymbol{u}^{\gamma,(r)}_{k}) \right]$$
(12)

Where

$$q(h_{n}^{(r)}(t)) = \int d\boldsymbol{u}_{k}^{\alpha} d\boldsymbol{u}_{k}^{\beta,\ell(r)} d\boldsymbol{u}_{k}^{\gamma,(r)} d\boldsymbol{u}^{\tau,(r)} d\tau^{(r)}$$

$$\prod_{k=1}^{K} q(\boldsymbol{u}_{k}^{\alpha}) q(\boldsymbol{u}_{k}^{\beta,\ell(r)}) q(\boldsymbol{u}_{k}^{\gamma,(r)}) p(h_{n}^{(r)}(t) | \{\boldsymbol{u}_{k}^{\zeta,(r)}\}_{k,\zeta}, \tau^{(r)}) p(\tau^{(r)} | \boldsymbol{u}^{\tau,(r)}) q(\boldsymbol{u}^{\tau,(r)})$$
(13)

Letting

$$q(\tau^{(r)}) = \int d\boldsymbol{u}^{\tau,(r)} p(\tau^{(r)} | \boldsymbol{u}^{\tau,(r)}) q(\boldsymbol{u}^{\tau,(r)})$$
(14)

We can marginalise out the inducing points and evaluate $q(h_n^{(r)}(t))$ as an additive Gaussian Process with mean and covariance function:

$$\nu_{n}^{(r)}(t) = \sum_{\zeta,k} c_{n,k}^{\zeta} \Psi_{k,1}^{\zeta,(r)}(t, \boldsymbol{z}_{k}^{\zeta}) \,\mathsf{K}_{zz}^{\zeta,(k)^{-1}} \,\boldsymbol{m}_{k}^{\zeta,(r)} + d_{n}$$

$$\sigma_{n}^{(r)}(t,t) = \sum_{\zeta,k} c_{n,k}^{\zeta^{-2}} \Big(\Psi_{k,0}^{\zeta,(r)}(t) + \mathsf{Tr} \left[\Big(\mathsf{K}_{zz}^{\zeta,(k)^{-1}} S_{k}^{\zeta,(r)} \mathsf{K}_{zz}^{\zeta,(r)} - \mathsf{K}_{zz}^{\zeta,(k)^{-1}} \Big) \Psi_{k,2}^{\zeta,(r)}(t, \boldsymbol{z}_{k}^{\zeta}) \right] \Big)$$
(15)

where

$$\Psi_{k,0}^{\zeta,(r)}(t) = \mathbb{E}_{q(\tau^{(r)})} \left[\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{k}^{\zeta} \left(\tau^{(r)}(t) , \tau^{(r)}(t) \right) \right]$$

$$\Psi_{k,1}^{\zeta,(r)}(t, \boldsymbol{z}_{k}^{\zeta}) = \mathbb{E}_{q(\tau^{(r)})} \left[\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{k}^{\zeta} \left(\tau^{(r)}(t) , \boldsymbol{z}_{k}^{\zeta} \right) \right]$$

$$\Psi_{k,2}^{\zeta,(r)}(t, \boldsymbol{z}_{k}^{\zeta}) = \mathbb{E}_{q(\tau^{(r)})} \left[\boldsymbol{\kappa}_{k}^{\zeta} (\boldsymbol{z}_{k}^{\zeta}, \tau^{(r)}(t)) \boldsymbol{\kappa}_{k}^{\zeta} (\tau^{(r)}(t), \boldsymbol{z}_{k}^{\zeta} \right] \right]$$
(16)