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How might a smooth probability distribution be estimated, with accurately quantified uncertainty, from a limited amount of sampled data? Here we describe a field-theoretic approach that addresses this problem remarkably well in one dimension, providing an exact nonparametric Bayesian posterior without relying on tunable parameters or large-data approximations. Strong non-Gaussian constraints, which require a non-perturbative treatment, are found to play a major role in reducing distribution uncertainty. A software implementation of this method is provided.

The need to estimate smooth probability distributions from limited data is ubiquitous in research. Still, this “density estimation” problem presents many fundamental and practical challenges that have yet to be resolved. The analysis of small datasets is particularly vexing, since most density estimation methods rely on large-dataset approximations which may not be valid in this context. Here we investigate the potential for Bayesian field theory, an area of statistical learning based on field-theoretic methods in physics, to estimate one-dimensional probability densities without relying on any large-dataset approximations.

Density estimation requires answering two distinct questions: (i) what is the best estimate for the underlying probability distribution, and (ii) what do other plausible distributions look like? Ideally, one would answer these questions by considering all possible distributions, regardless of mathematical form, then identifying those that fit the data while satisfying a transparent notion of smoothness. Such an approach should not require the manual specification of critical parameters or boundary conditions, nor should it require mathematical approximations that are not valid in the small data regime. Yet standard density estimation approaches, such as kernel density estimation (KDE) and Dirichlet process mixture modeling (DPMM), do not satisfy these requirements.

Previous work has described a Bayesian field theory approach, called “Density Estimation using Field Theory” (DEFT), for addressing the density estimation problem in low dimensions. DEFT satisfies the above requirements for an ideal density estimation method in one dimension. Simulation tests further show that DEFT often outperforms KDE and DPMM in practice. To make DEFT available to the broad research community, we have developed a fast and robust Python-based software package called “Statistics Using Field Theory,” or SUFTware for short. See https://software.readthedocs.io for installation and usage instructions.

We first recap the DEFT approach to density estimation. Consider $N$ data points $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$ drawn from a smooth one-dimensional probability distribution $Q_{\text{true}}(x)$ that is confined to an $x$-interval of length $L$. From these data we wish to obtain a best estimate $Q^*$ of $Q_{\text{true}}$, as well as an ensemble of plausible distributions with which to quantify the uncertainty in this estimate. DEFT first reparametrizes each candidate distribution $Q$ in terms of a field $\phi$ via $Q(x) = \exp(-\phi(x)) \int dx' \exp(-\phi(x'))$. A Bayesian prior $p(Q|\ell) \propto \exp(-S^0_{\ell}[\phi])$ is then adopted, where the prior action

$$S^0_{\ell}[\phi] = \int dx \frac{2\alpha}{L} \left( \partial^\alpha \phi \right)^2$$

is used to quantify the smoothness of $\phi$. $S^0_{\ell}$ involves two parameters: $\alpha$, the order of $x$-derivative we wish to constrain, and $\ell$, the smoothness lengthscale. $\alpha$ is chosen by the user, whereas $\ell$ (which we hold fixed for the moment) is ultimately selected based on the data. The resulting Bayesian posterior is given by $p(Q|\text{data}, \ell) \propto \exp(-S[\phi])$, which is defied by the posterior action

$$S[\phi] = S^0_{\ell}[\phi] + N \int dx \left[ R\phi + \frac{e^{-\phi}}{L} \right],$$

where $R(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta(x-x_i)$ is a histogram (of bin width zero) summarizing the data. $S[\phi]$ is minimized
at the maximum a posteriori (MAP) field $\phi_\ell$, which satisfies the equation of motion $0 = \ell^2 \Delta^\alpha \phi_\ell + N L R - N e^{-\phi_\ell}$ where $\Delta^\alpha$ is the $\alpha$-order bilateral Laplacian (described in [9]). The MAP field $\phi_\ell$ is unique, even in the absence of boundary conditions, and is related to its corresponding distribution via $Q_\ell(x) = e^{-\phi_\ell(x)}/L$. It cannot be found analytically, but is readily computed after discretization of the $x$-domain at $G$ equally-spaced grid points. In this discrete representation, $R$ becomes a histogram with bin width $h = L/G$. As long as $h \ll \ell$, the choice of $G$ will not greatly affect $\phi_\ell$. Finally, the optimal length scale $\ell^*$ is identified by maximizing the Bayesian evidence $p(\text{data}|\ell)$, computed as in [9]. $Q^* = Q_{\ell^*}$ is then used as our best density estimate. Fig. 1(a-c) illustrates this procedure on simulated data.

To characterize the uncertainty in the DEFT estimate $Q^*$, we sample the Bayesian posterior $p(Q|\text{data}) = \int d\ell p(\ell|\text{data})p(Q|\text{data}, \ell)$. Each sample is generated by first drawing $\ell$ from $p(\ell|\text{data})$, then drawing $Q$ from $p(Q|\text{data}, \ell)$. Previous work [8] has suggested that this sampling task be performed using the Laplace approximation, i.e., approximating $p(Q|\text{data}, \ell)$ with a Gaussian that has the same mean and Hessian. Specifically, this approximation is given by $p_{\text{Lap}}(Q|\text{data}, \ell) \propto \exp(-S^\text{Lap}_\ell[\phi])$

$$S^\text{Lap}_\ell[\phi] = S_\ell[\phi_\ell] + \frac{1}{2} \int dx \delta \phi \Lambda_\ell \delta \phi,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $\delta \phi = \phi - \phi_\ell$, and $\Lambda_\ell = \frac{\ell^2}{T} \Delta^\alpha + N Q_\ell$. This Laplace approximation has the advantage that, after discretization of $x$ and an eigendecomposition of the operator $\Lambda_\ell$, posterior samples $Q$ can be rapidly and independently generated (see [8]).

Fig. 1 shows $Q$s sampled from the Laplace posterior $p_{\text{Lap}}(Q|\text{data}) = \int d\ell p(\ell|\text{data})p_{\text{Lap}}(Q|\text{data}, \ell)$. Clearly something is very wrong. Although many of these $Q$s appear reasonable, many others exhibit wisps that have substantial probability mass far from the data. Note that these wisps primarily occur at the boundary of the $x$-interval, although some have local maxima in the bulk.

We hypothesized that wisps are an artifact of the Laplace approximation, i.e., they reflect the inappropriateness of the large-data assumption in this problem. To correct for potential inaccuracies of this approximation, we tested an importance resampling approach [7]. For each sampled $Q$ we computed a weight

$$w_\ell[Q] = \exp \left( S^\text{Lap}_\ell[\phi] - S_\ell[\phi] \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

We then resampled the Laplace ensemble with replacement, selecting each $Q$ with a probability proportional to $w_\ell[Q]$. A mixture of such resampled ensembles across lengthscales $\ell$ was then used to generate an ensemble reflecting $p(Q|\text{data})$. These tests confirmed that importance resampling effectively eliminates wisps (Fig. 1).

Eliminating wisps is especially important when estimating distribution entropy. Here the goal is to discern a value for the quantity $H_{\text{true}} = H[Q_{\text{true}}]$ where $H[Q] = -\int dx Q(x) \log_2 Q(x)$. Using the DEFT posterior ensemble, we can estimate $H_{\text{true}}$ as $\tilde{H} \pm \delta \tilde{H}$, where $\tilde{H} = \langle H \rangle$ and $\delta \tilde{H} = \sqrt{\langle H^2 \rangle - \langle H \rangle^2}$, with $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denoting a posterior average. Previous work expressed hope that the ensemble provided by the Laplace approximation might serve this purpose [8], but in this case we see that $\tilde{H}$ is far less accurate than the point estimates $H[R]$ or $H[Q^*]$, and $\delta \tilde{H}$ is enormous (Fig. 1). Importance resampling fixes both problems: the resulting $\tilde{H}$ is closer to $H_{\text{true}}$ than the other point estimates, and $\delta \tilde{H}$ is remarkably small (Fig. 1).

To further characterize the performance of DEFT, we simulated datasets (using $N = 10$ or $N = 100$)
from a variety of $Q_{\text{true}}$ distributions. We then asked two questions. First, how accurately does $Q^*$ estimate $Q_{\text{true}}$? Second, how typical is $Q_{\text{true}}$ among the distributions $Q$ that are judged to be plausible? In both contexts, DEFT was compared to KDE and DPMM [11]. As in [8] we quantified the difference between any two distributions $Q$ and $Q'$ using the geodesic distance $D(Q, Q') = 2\cos^{-1} \int dx \sqrt{Q(x)Q'(x)}$, which provides a well-behaved alternative to the Kullback-Leibler divergence; see [12, 13]. Fig. 2 shows the results of these performance tests for two different choices of $Q_{\text{true}}$ (Fig. 2a). Fig. S1 in Supplemental Information provides analogous results for other $Q_{\text{true}}$ distributions.

To answer the first question, we compared the distances $D(Q^*, Q_{\text{true}})$ obtained by each estimator on simulated datasets. Smaller values for these distances indicate better method accuracy. As illustrated in Fig. 2b), DEFT usually performed comparably to KDE and DPMM at $N = 10$, and somewhat better at $N = 100$. DEFT appears to have a particular advantage over both KDE and DPMM when $Q_{\text{true}}$ bumps up against one or both $x$-interval boundaries. Note that DEFT performs notably better with $\alpha = 2, 3$, or 4 than with $\alpha = 1$. This is unsurprising, since $\alpha = 1$ yields non-smooth $Q^*$ distributions with cusps at each data point [8, 14].

To answer the second question, we computed the p-value of $D(Q^*, Q_{\text{true}})$ relative to the $D(Q^*, Q)$ values observed for plausible distributions $Q$. If the plausible $Q$s accurately reflected distribution uncertainty, these p-values should be uniformly distributed between 0 and 1. Alternatively, p-values clustered close to 0 would indicate underestimated uncertainty, while values clustered close to 1 would indicate underestimated uncertainty. Fig. 2c) shows our results. In general, the p-values for DEFT (with $\alpha = 2, 3$, and 4) were distributed with remarkable uniformity. DEFT with $\alpha = 1$ tended to over-estimate uncertainties.

We now turn to the problem of understanding the origin of wisps, i.e., why the Laplace approximation performs so poorly. First we divide the action into three parts [15]: $S[\phi] = S[\phi^*] + S[\delta\phi] + \int \frac{1}{2} V(\phi^*(x), \delta\phi(x)))$, where

$$V(\phi^*, \delta\phi) = Ne^{-\phi^*} f(\delta\phi)$$

and $f(\delta\phi) = e^{-\delta\phi} - 1 + \delta\phi$. Here $V$ acts as a potential landscape that constrains fluctuations in $\delta\phi$. The Laplace action $S_{\text{Lap}}[\phi]$ is recovered by replacing $V$ with its quadratic approximation,

$$V_{\text{Lap}}(\phi^*, \delta\phi) = \frac{N}{2} e^{-\phi^*} \delta\phi^2.$$  

We proceed by deriving approximate expressions for the
level curves of $V$, i.e., fluctuations $\delta \phi$ (expressed as functions of $\phi^*$) for which $V$ maintains a fixed value $C$. To facilitate this discussion we let $\delta \phi^+$ and $\delta \phi^-$ respectively denote positive and negative fluctuations. In the data rich regime of the $x$ domain, which we define using the criterion $Q' (x) \gg C/NL$, we find that $1 \ll f(\delta \phi^*) \approx 1/2 (\delta \phi^*)^2$. $V_{\text{Lap}}$ is a good approximation of $V$ here, and the corresponding level curves are

$$\delta \phi_{\text{rich}}^+ \approx \pm \sqrt{2C \frac{e^{\phi^*}}{N}}. \tag{7}$$

In the data poor regime, defined by $Q' \ll C/NL$, we find that $1 \ll f(\delta \phi^*)$. This implies that $\delta \phi^+ \gg 1 \Rightarrow f(\delta \phi^*) \approx \delta \phi^+$ and that $\delta \phi^- \ll -1 \Rightarrow f(\delta \phi^-) \approx e^{-\delta \phi^-}$. Using these approximations in Eq. (1) one obtains

$$\delta \phi_{\text{poor}}^+ \approx \frac{C}{N} e^{\phi^*}, \quad \delta \phi_{\text{poor}}^- \approx -\phi^- + \log \frac{N}{C}. \tag{8}$$

Unsurprisingly, the Laplace approximation works well in the data rich regime. Here, $\delta \phi^+ \sim \pm e^{\phi^*}/N$ regardless of the specific value of $C$. In the data poor regime, however, the constraints on $\delta \phi$ are highly asymmetric: $\delta \phi^+ \sim e^{\phi^*}$ while $\delta \phi^- \sim -\phi^-$. Thus, the Laplace approximation exponentially overestimates the size of allowable downward fluctuations in $\phi$, which correspond to large upward fluctuations in $Q$. This is how wisps arise (see Fig. 3).

Feynman diagrams provide a systematic approach for computing non-Gaussian corrections to the Laplace approximation. Might such diagrams provide a route for analytically countering the effect of wisps? The answer appears to be ‘no’. Consider an expansion of the potential $V$ in Eq. (5) to $m$’th order in $\delta \phi$:

$$V_m(\phi^*, \delta \phi) = Ne^{-\phi^*} \sum_{n=0}^{m} \frac{(-\delta \phi)^n}{n!}. \tag{9}$$

If the potential $V_m$ is to suppress wisps, it must include enough terms to sufficiently approximate $V$ when evaluated at $\delta \phi^- = -\phi^- + \log(N/C)$. This would require $m_{\text{min}} = \phi^* - \log(N/C)$ terms at the very least, since not until here do the terms in this power series begin to decrease. Thus, the number of terms that would be needed cannot be fixed a priori, but rather must increase with $\phi^*$. This presents a major problem for Feynman-diagram-based expansions. Any diagram influenced by the the $m_{\text{min}}$’th term in Eq. (9) must contain an $m_{\text{min}}$’th order vertex. But $m_{\text{min}}$ can be quite large: in Fig. 3 one finds $m_{\text{min}} > 100$ near the boundaries of the $x$-interval. Evaluating Feynman diagrams up to such high order is not feasible.

To empirically test the utility of Feynman diagrams in this density estimation problem, we compared two different ways of computing the quantity $\log(Z_\ell/Z_{\text{Lap}}^\ell)$, where

$$Z_\ell = \int D\phi e^{-S_\ell[\phi]} \quad \text{and} \quad Z_{\text{Lap}}^\ell = \int D\phi e^{-S_{\text{Lap}}^\ell[\phi]}, \tag{10}$$

are the partition functions for the exact and Laplace-approximated DEFT actions. At order $N^{-1}$, this log ratio can be estimated using three vacuum diagrams \[10\]:

$$\log \frac{Z_\ell}{Z_{\text{Lap}}^\ell} \approx + \circ \circ \circ \circ.$$ \[11\]

See Supplemental Information for the specific formulas used to evaluate these diagrams. Alternatively, one can compute this log ratio using the weights in Eq. (4) via

$$\log \frac{Z_\ell}{Z_{\text{Lap}}^\ell} = \log \left< w \right>_{\text{Lap}} \ell,$$ \[12\]

where the Laplace ensemble is generated at fixed $\ell$.

Fig. 4 compares these two ways of computing $\log(Z_\ell/Z_{\text{Lap}}^\ell)$ for two different choices of $Q_{\text{true}}$. The Feynman diagram approximation in Eq. (11) works well when $Q_{\text{true}}$ fills the entire $x$-interval, but in this case there are no wisps (Fig. 4a,c). Alternatively, prominent wisps are observed when $Q_{\text{true}}$ vanishes in large regions of the sampling domain, but in this case Eq. (11) proves to be a very bad approximation (Fig. 4b,d). These observations support our argument that suppressing wisps requires a fundamentally non-perturbative approach.
Finally, recall that the Laplace approximation is also 
used when computing the Bayesian evidence $p(data | \ell)$, and thus when identifying $\ell^*$ or sampling $\ell \sim p(\ell | data)$ (see [9] for details). This evidence approximation assumes that $Z \approx Z_{\text{Lap}}$. In contrast to our results on posterior sampling, we find the Laplace approximation generally works quite well in this context. This is because $Z_{\text{Lap}}$ typically varies by many orders of magnitude across different values of $\ell$, swamping potential inaccuracies in the $Z \approx Z_{\text{Lap}}$ assumption.

Here we have shown that DEFT can effectively address density estimation needs on small datasets in one dimension. DEFT provides point estimates comparable to or better than KDE and DPMM, and does not suffer from the multiple drawbacks of these other methods. In particular, the only fundamentally important parameter that the user must specify is a small positive integer $\alpha$ used to define the concept of smoothness (via Eq. 1). As described in [9], $\alpha$ also controls the relationship of DEFT-based inference to standard maximum entropy density estimation [17]. In our experience, however, using $\alpha = 3$ seems to work well nearly all of the time and is thus specified by default. Other parameters (such as the number of grid points $G$) reflect computational practicalities, and can often be chosen automatically, and have minuscule effects on the results as long as reasonable values are used. DEFT also provides an ensemble of plausible distributions without requiring any large-data approximations. We have shown here that this capability requires a non-perturbative treatment of highly non-Gaussian Bayesian posteriors. This finding contrasts with prior literature, which has relied on the the Laplace approximation [8][10] or on Feynman diagram corrections to this approximation [4][5], for characterizing posterior ensembles.

DEFT therefore addresses a major outstanding need, not just in statistical learning theory, but also in the computational methods available for day-to-day data analysis. SUFTware allows users to apply DEFT to their own univariate data, and in the future will include additional field-theory-based statistical methods. This implementation of DEFT is sufficiently fast for routine use: e.g., the computations for Fig. 1 took about 0.25 seconds on a standard laptop computer. SUFTware has minimal dependencies, is compatible with both Python 2 and Python 3, and is readily installed using the pip package manager.
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[11] For KDE, $Q^*$ was defined as the estimate obtained from the full dataset, while estimates from bootstrap-resampled datasets were used as plausible densities $Q$. For DPMM, Gibbs sampling of the Bayesian posterior was used to generate plausible densities $Q$, and $Q^*$ was defined as the mean of these densities. See Supplemental Information for details.
[15] To simplify our discussion, we keep $\ell$ implicit and fix it to the optimal value $\ell^*$.
Here we describe the kernel density estimation (KDE) and Dirichlet process mixture modeling (DPMM) algorithms used for the computations shown in Fig. 2 and Fig. S1.

**Kernel Density Estimation**

KDE is arguably the most common approach to density estimation in one dimension. Given data \( \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N \), the KDE density estimate is given by

\[
Q^*(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{w} K \left( \frac{x - x_i}{w} \right)
\]

where \( K(z) \) is the kernel function and \( w \) is the "bandwidth". In our computations we used the KDE estimator `scipy.stats.gaussian_kde` (SciPy v1.0.0) with default settings. This yielded KDE estimates computed using a Gaussian kernel,

\[
K(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-z^2/2},
\]

and a bandwidth \( w \) chosen using Scott’s rule:

\[
w = 1.059 AN^{-1/5},
\]

where \( N \) is the number of data points, \( A = \min(\hat{\sigma}, \text{IQR}/1.349) \), IQR is the interquartile range of the data,

\[
\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \hat{\mu})^2, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i.
\]

KDE is a plug-in estimator, not a Bayesian estimator, and does not naturally specify a posterior that can be sampled. To quantify the uncertainty in KDE estimates, we therefore generated an ensemble of plausible KDE estimates \( Q \) by applying the same KDE algorithm to bootstrap-resampled versions of the dataset.

**Dirichlet process mixture modeling**

DPMM is arguably the most popular nonparametric Bayesian method for estimating probability densities. DPMMs have a hierarchical structure, in the sense that each data point is assumed to be drawn from one of a number of “clusters,” with each cluster having a probability density defined by a fixed kernel function.

In our computations, we adopted the finite DPMM described in [6, 7]. Densities were assumed to be of the form

\[
Q(x) = \sum_{h=1}^H w_h K_{m_h}(x),
\]

where \( H \) is the number of clusters, \( w_h \) is the probability of cluster \( h \), and \( m_h \) is the set of parameters defining the density of cluster \( h \). \( K_m(z) \) was assumed to be a Gaussian density specified by \( m = (\mu, \sigma^2) \), i.e., a mean and a variance. A normal-inverse-gamma distribution was used as the prior on \( m \):

\[
p(\mu, \sigma^2) = \mathcal{N}(\mu|\hat{\mu}, \hat{\kappa} \sigma^2) \Gamma^{-1}(\sigma^2|\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}),
\]

where \( \hat{\kappa} = 1, \hat{\alpha} = 1, \) and \( \hat{\beta} = \hat{\sigma}^2 \). Here \( \hat{\mu} \) and \( \hat{\sigma} \) were defined as in Eq. 16. For the number of clusters we used \( H = 10 \). For each dataset, we used Gibbs sampling to sample an ensemble of plausible densities. The optimal estimate was then defined as the mean density in this ensemble. Following [7], our Gibbs sampling algorithm worked as follows. For each cluster \( h = 1, 2, \ldots, H \), we chose an initial weight \( w_h = 1/H \) and a set of kernel parameters \( m_h \sim p(\mu, \sigma^2) \). The sampler was then run by iterating the following steps:
1. Data were redistributed across clusters. Specifically, each data point \( x_i \) was allocated to cluster \( h \) with probability
\[
p(h|x_i) = \frac{w_h K_m(x_i)}{\sum_{h=1}^H w_h K_m(x_i)}.
\] (19)

2. The mean and variance of each cluster were updated using
\[
m_h \sim N(\mu_h, \kappa_h \sigma_h^2) \quad \Gamma^{-1}(\sigma_h^2 | \hat{\alpha}_h, \hat{\beta}_h),
\] (20)
where
\[
\hat{\mu}_h = \kappa_h \left( \frac{\hat{\mu}}{\kappa} + n_h \langle x_h \rangle \right),
\] (21)
\[
\hat{\kappa}_h = \frac{\kappa}{1 + n_h \kappa},
\] (22)
\[
\hat{\alpha}_h = \hat{\alpha} + \frac{n_h}{2},
\] (23)
\[
\hat{\beta}_h = \hat{\beta} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i \in h} (x_i - \langle x_h \rangle)^2 + \frac{n_h}{1 + n_h \kappa} (\langle x_h \rangle - \hat{\mu})^2 \right).
\] (24)

Here, \( x_h \) represents the set of data points belonging to cluster \( h \) and \( n_h = |x_h| \).

3. The cluster weights were updated by sampling
\[
w_1, \ldots, w_H \sim \text{Dirichlet}(1 + n_1, \ldots, 1 + n_H).
\] (25)

**Feynman Diagrams**

The action in Eq. 2 is given in the discrete space representation by
\[
S_l[\phi] = \frac{\ell^2 \alpha}{2G} \sum_{ij} \Delta_{ij}^G \phi_i \phi_j + \frac{NL}{G} \sum_i R_i \phi_i + \frac{N}{G} \sum \phi_i e^{-\phi},
\] (26)
where \( N \) is the number of data points, \( G \) is the number of grid points, \( i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, G\} \), \( L \) is the size of the bounding box, and \( \ell \) is the smoothness length scale. We represent the departure of \( \phi \) from the MAP field \( \phi^\ell \) using the rescaled fluctuation \( x = \sqrt{N} (\phi - \phi^\ell) \). The action can then be expanded in the following way:
\[
S_l[\phi] = S_l^{\text{Lap}}[\phi] + \frac{1}{3!} \sum_{ijk} B_{ijk} \sqrt{N} x_i x_j x_k + \frac{1}{4!} \sum_{ijkl} C_{ijkl} \sqrt{N} x_i x_j x_k x_l + \ldots,
\] (27)
where the Laplace action is
\[
S_l^{\text{Lap}}[\phi] = S_l[\phi^\ell] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} A_{ij} x_i x_j,
\] (28)
and
\[
A_{ij} = \left. \frac{\partial^2 S_l[\phi]}{\partial \phi_i \partial \phi_j} \right|_{\phi^\ell} = \frac{\ell^2 \alpha}{NG} \Delta_{ij}^G + \frac{1}{G} e^{-\phi^\ell} \delta_{ij},
\] (29)
\[
B_{ijk} = \left. \frac{\partial^3 S_l[\phi]}{\partial \phi_i \partial \phi_j \partial \phi_k} \right|_{\phi^\ell} = -\frac{1}{G} e^{-\phi^\ell} \delta_{ijk},
\] (30)
\[
C_{ijkl} = \left. \frac{\partial^4 S_l[\phi]}{\partial \phi_i \partial \phi_j \partial \phi_k \partial \phi_l} \right|_{\phi^\ell} = \frac{1}{G} e^{-\phi^\ell} \delta_{ijkl}.
\] (31)

Our goal is to compute \( \log(Z_l/Z_l^{\text{Lap}}) \) where, in the discrete space representation,
\[
Z_l = \int d^G \phi e^{-S_l[\phi]} \quad \text{and} \quad Z_l^{\text{Lap}} = \int d^G \phi e^{-S_l^{\text{Lap}}[\phi]}.
\] (32)
The quantity $\log \left( \frac{Z_L}{Z_{L^{\text{Lap}}}^{\ell}} \right)$ is conveniently given by the sum of connected vacuum diagrams [16]. At $O(N^{-1})$, the relevant diagrams contain only 3rd-order and 4th-order vertices. From the expansion we see that the values corresponding to these vertices are given by $-B_{ijk}/\sqrt{N}$ and $-C_{ijkl}/N$, respectively. We also need the propagator matrix $P$, which is given by the inverse of the Hessian $A$, i.e., $P_{ij} = (A^{-1})_{ij}$. We thus obtain

$$\log \frac{Z_L}{Z_{L^{\text{Lap}}}^{\ell}} = \mathcal{O} + \mathcal{O} + \mathcal{O} + O(N^{-2}), \quad (33)$$

where the contribution from each diagram is

$$= \frac{1}{8} \sum_{ijkl} \left( \frac{-C_{ijkl}}{N} \right) P_{ij} P_{kl} = - \sum_i \frac{e^{-\phi_i}}{8NG} (P_{ii})^2, \quad (34)$$

$$= \frac{1}{8} \sum_{ijk} \sum_{lmn} \left( - \frac{B_{ijk}}{\sqrt{N}} \right) \left( - \frac{B_{lmn}}{\sqrt{N}} \right) P_{ij} P_{kl} P_{mn} = \sum_i \sum_l \frac{e^{-\phi_i - \phi_l}}{8NG^2} P_{ii} P_{il} P_{ll}, \quad (35)$$

$$= \frac{1}{12} \sum_{ijk} \sum_{lmn} \left( - \frac{B_{ijk}}{\sqrt{N}} \right) \left( - \frac{B_{lmn}}{\sqrt{N}} \right) P_{il} P_{jm} P_{kn} = \sum_i \sum_l \frac{e^{-\phi_i - \phi_l}}{12NG^2} (P_{il})^3. \quad (36)$$

These are the formulas used for the computations shown in Fig. 4c,d.
FIG. S1. (Color) **Comparison of density estimation methods across distributions.** The same analysis as in Fig. 2 was performed for twelve additional $Q_{true}$ distributions, which were selected from among the built-in distributions in the `scipy.stats` library.