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Abstract—Probabilistic generative models are attractive for scientific modeling because their inferred parameters can be used to generate hypotheses and design experiments. This requires that the learned model provide an accurate representation of the input data and yield a latent space that effectively predicts outcomes relevant to the scientific question. Supervised Variational Autoencoders (VAEs) have previously been used for this purpose, where a carefully designed decoder can be used as an interpretable generative model while the supervised objective ensures a predictive latent representation. Unfortunately, the supervised objective forces the encoder to learn a biased approximation to the generative posterior distribution, which renders the generative parameters unreliable when used in scientific models. This issue has remained undetected as reconstruction losses commonly used to evaluate model performance do not detect bias in the encoder. We address this previously-unreported issue by developing a second order supervision framework (SOS-VAE) that influences the decoder to induce a predictive latent representation. This ensures that the associated encoder maintains a reliable generative interpretation. We extend this technique to allow the user to trade-off some bias in the generative parameters for improved predictive performance, acting as an intermediate option between VAEs and our new SOS-VAE. We also use this methodology to address missing data issues that often arise when combining recordings from multiple scientific experiments. We demonstrate the effectiveness of these developments using synthetic data and electrophysiological recordings with an emphasis on how our learned representations can be used to design scientific experiments.
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I. INTRODUCTION

DEVELOPING interpretable and explainable generative models has long been an integral area of machine learning and Bayesian modeling [1][2][3][4]. Generative models have great scientific utility in developing testable hypotheses and designing gold-standard causal experiments [5][6][7]. An interpretable relationship between the generative model representation and the observed covariates provides insight as to how to develop causal scientific experiments [7][8].

An interpretable relationship between the observed covariates and model representation, while necessary, is often not sufficient in scientific settings. Many scientific applications require that the learned representation also be predictive of an auxiliary variable. In the neuroscience research motivating this work, this is often a behavioral outcome [9], a genetic phenotype [10], or the presence of some disorder or disability [11]. Obtaining a predictive latent representation allows for researchers to identify patterns relevant to this auxiliary variable and establish causality through experimental modification [12]. Unfortunately, exclusively generative models often fail to represent the desired auxiliary variable [13], and are typically dominated by other irrelevant sources of variation. Returning to our motivating work as an example, neural dynamics associated with motion [14] and even blinking [15] are often substantially stronger than the auxiliary variables of interest.

One class of generative models called Variational Autoencoders (VAEs) can be encouraged to yield a predictive latent representation by including a supervision loss during training. This yields a Supervised Variational Autoencoder (SVAE), which has been commonly used in the machine learning community [16][17][18]. In those applications, the reconstruction loss of the generative model has often been motivated as an effective method of improving predictive models, as the reconstructive loss has been shown theoretically and empirically to be an effective regularization technique [19]. Based on this work it might seem that VAEs satisfy both the generative and predictive criteria for scientific utility.

Unfortunately, the supervision loss in an SVAE biases the generative encoder away from approximating the true posterior. We demonstrate this bias by analyzing the fixed points of the SVAE objective. This bias caused by the inclusion of the supervision loss has not been noticed in previous work, in part because these applications focused on obtaining a predictive model. When the generative model is used merely as a convenient and effective regularization technique, the scientific utility of the generative parameters is irrelevant. However, this bias in the variational objective can have a profoundly negative impact on causal scientific experiments designed using the generative parameters. In these applications, the generative model will give misleading conclusions on how modification of the observed covariates will influence the auxiliary variable via the latent representation. As our motivating work uses these generative models as a means for modifying behavior, addressing this issue is critical.

We remove this previously unobserved bias in VAEs by developing a novel optimization framework using second-order gradient techniques [20][21]. This second-order supervision (SOS) framework maintains the interpretation of the variational encoder as an unbiased approximation to the posterior while inducing the latent representation to be predictive of an auxiliary
This approach yields a model that possesses both properties required for scientific utility, a predictive latent space and an unbiased posterior approximation. We empirically demonstrate that our proposed learning framework possesses these properties on a dataset which uses Local Field Potentials (LFPs) to predict a behavioral trait. We show that our framework yields more accurate predictions when compared to an exclusively generative model [22] while maintaining a more accurate variational approximation of the posterior when compared to an SVAE.

We then develop two scientifically useful extensions of the initial framework. Previous work has shown that generative models can handicap a predictive objective [23]. Because of this, our SOS framework can cause degraded predictive performance relative to a standard SVAE that is unconstrained by the generative model. While sometimes this degradation is scientifically necessary and unavoidable, often a faint amount of bias is acceptable to obtain substantial gains in predictive ability. Our first extension provides a means to relax the constraint on the variational encoder, allowing it to maintain high predictive ability with minimal bias in the approximation. Using Kullback-Liebler (KL) divergences, we demonstrate on both synthetic and real data examples that this regularization approach improves predictive performance for a given level of posterior discrepancy compared to a SVAE-based model. We denote this method as SOS-Double Variational Autoencoder (SOS-DVAE), and conceptually show the relationship to the other models in Figure 1.

Second, we develop a framework with multiple encoders to stitch multiple datasets together through the generative model. This mimics the idea of “shotgun sampling” of scientific data where each dataset has a different subset of observed values or locations [24]. We show that our novel approach yields dramatically improved predictive performance relative to SVAEs when used in this fashion.

II. RELATED WORK

Joint Factor Modeling. Joint modeling, such as probabilistic supervised PCA [25] or supervised Gaussian processes [26], assumes that the observations and the outcome are independent given a latent representation. Once the prior distribution of the latent factors and the conditional distributions have been defined, statistical estimation is straightforward by maximum likelihood or Bayesian methods [27]. However, it has been demonstrated that joint models suffer under model misspecification, particularly when the number of learned factors is less than the true latent dimensionality [23, 28]. Furthermore, the variance of the outcomes is often small relative to the variance of the observations, which leads to the outcome being poorly characterized [13].

Supervised Autoencoders. To address some of these limitations, SAEs can be used to effectively approximate traditional factor models while including a predictive term. SAEs have been shown to ameliorate some concerns about model misspecification [28]. SAEs have been shown to give gains in many predictive applications [18, 16]. Using an SAE can be viewed as a form of regularization and prevents the latent representation from over-fitting, which has been shown theoretically to enhance generalizability [19]. It has also been shown in deep learning that adding auxiliary tasks can act as a form of regularization [29, 30, 31]. Recent work has also developed strategies for unsupervised generation of the tasks [21]. However, none of these works evaluated how well the inferred latent space fit the generative model and instead focused solely on prediction.

Second-order Optimization. Finally, our novel learning technique will require the use of second derivatives to indirectly induce the learned latent variable model to yield a predictive posterior. This is difficult to implement directly via back-propagation. However, by incorporating computational tricks used in some meta-learning and self-supervision techniques [20, 32, 21], this can be efficiently implemented in modern learning platforms.

III. METHODS

We first introduce notation. Let \( \{x_i\}_{i=1,...,N} \in \mathbb{R}^p \) be \( N \) independent samples with associated outcomes \( \{y_i\}_{i=1,...,N} \in \mathcal{Y} \) drawn from the true joint probability distribution \( p_{\theta}(x,y) \). Given these data, we fit a joint model defined as \( x, s \sim p_{\theta}(x, s) \) and \( y|s \sim p_{\psi}(y|s) \), where \( s \in \mathbb{R}^L \) is the \( L \)-dimensional latent space. We view \( \theta \) as parameterizing our generative model while \( \psi \) parameterizes the predictive model of the outcome given the latent space. We approximate our true posterior \( p_{\theta}(s|x) \) by a variational encoder \( q_{\phi}(s|x) \) to enable variational inference
In our model, as in SVAEs or any standard supervised model, the variational approximation is not conditioned on \( y \) as this variable is unknown when the model is used for prediction.

### A. Supervised Variational Autoencoders

If our only objective were to obtain a generative model of \( x \), we could simply parameterize \( q_\phi \) with a flexible neural network and maximize the evidence lower bound (ELBO) used in VAEs. However, focusing exclusively on the generative model often yields poor predictions of \( y \) [28]. This motivates the inclusion of a supervised loss, forming the VAE objective

\[
L_{\phi, \theta, \psi} = E_{p(x)} \left[ E_{q_\phi(s|x)} \left[ \log p_\phi(x, s) - \log q_\phi(s|x) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|s) \right] \right],
\]

(1)

where \( \lambda \) functions as a tuning parameter controlling the relative weight of the supervised loss. This objective can be approximated by empirical risk minimization of the observed data and estimated via gradient descent, as is commonly done with standard VAEs. For simplicity, we omit \( E_{p(x)} \) in further derivations so our losses are defined for a single data sample. We note that in practice we would use an empirical risk minimization formulation rather than an expectation. If \( \lambda = 0 \), then (1) reduces to the standard VAE objective. In practice, \( \lambda \) is usually set to a fairly high value to emphasize prediction, as the variance of \( y \) is often substantially outweighed by the variance of \( x \) [28].

The SVAE approach may appear ideal; the encoder \( q_\phi \) simultaneously provides an accurate reconstruction of \( x \) and a latent representation predictive of \( y \). However, the inclusion of the predictive loss biases the encoder to no longer approximate the posterior distribution of the generative model. This can be seen by analyzing the fixed point associated with \( \phi \) in Proposition 1 [proof given in Supplemental Section A].

**Proposition 1.** The fixed points of (1) can be found using the reparameterization trick used by Kingma et al. [33]. This reparameterization expresses the random variable \( s \sim q_\phi(s|x) \) as a transformation of a random variable \( \epsilon \) dependent on the observed data \( x \), denoted \( g_\phi(\epsilon, x) \). Under this transformation, the fixed point such that \( \nabla_\phi L_{\phi, \theta, \psi} = 0 \) is

\[
E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\phi \log p_\phi(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) - \log q_\phi(g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) \right] = -\lambda E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\phi \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) \right].
\]

(2)

The fixed points for \( \theta \) and \( \psi \), given \( \phi \), match a standard VAE and are provided in the appendix.

In the case where \( \lambda = 0 \) the left hand side of (2) must also be 0. This represents the standard fixed point of a VAE learned without the supervised loss. In the standard VAE, the values of \( \phi \) minimize the divergence of the variational approximation and the true posterior defined by \( \theta \). Thus, the right hand side is the bias induced in the latent representation by the predictive objective. This bias ensures increased relevance of the latent space to the outcome \( y \), as larger values of \( \lambda \) correspond to an increased emphasis on the predictive objective and corresponds to a stronger bias in the variational approximation. As \( \theta \) is dependent only on the generative loss, the strength of this bias indicates the amount of information relevant to \( y \) that is not included in the generative model.

This mismatch is highly undesirable if \( \theta \) is used to draw scientific conclusions or design causal manipulations, even if the mismatch is not pertinent nor detectable in predictive accuracy or reconstruction loss. This bias implies that if we were to refit the encoder parameters \( \phi \) exclusively on the generative model, the refit encoder would be quite different as it would learn the standard VAE fixed point. Thus, manipulations of the observed covariates determined via the generative parameters do not indicate how the predictive latent variables will change in response. We show empirically that this discrepancy can be substantial in Section 1V-A. Given that \( \theta \) is used to design neural stimulation methods in our applications, it is crucial that the generative parameters accurately relate to the latent space.

### B. A Modified Objective Function to Maintain a Proper Posterior

To obtain statistically valid inference of the posterior, we must “recouple” the encoder to the generative model by ensuring that the right hand side of (2) vanishes at the fixed points. This recoupling can be done by constraining the SVAE objective function in (1) so that the encoder is constrained to approximate the generative posterior distribution. Our novel formulation that incorporates this recoupling is

\[
\max_{\psi, \theta} \quad E_{q_\phi(s|x)} \left[ \log p_\phi(x, s) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|s) \right]
\]

\[\text{s.t. } \phi = \arg \max_{\phi'} E_{q_\phi(s|x)} \left[ \log p_\phi(x, s) - \log q_{\phi'}(s|x) \right].\]

(3)

This formulation yields an unbiased variational approximation of the posterior, as \( \phi \) is learned in the constraint which exclusively depends on the generative loss. Supervision of the latent space instead is induced in the generative model indirectly via the decoder. This is demonstrated via an analysis of the fixed points in Proposition 2 [with the proof deferred to Section A].

**Proposition 2.** The fixed points of (3) can be found using the same reparameterization trick in Proposition 1. The fixed point of \( \phi \) matches a standard VAE and is

\[
E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\phi \log p_\phi(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) - \log q_\phi(g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) \right] = 0.
\]

(4)

However, \( \theta \) is modified to induce a predictive posterior and has a fixed point of

\[
E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\theta \log p_\phi(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) \right] = -\lambda E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\theta \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) \right].
\]

(5)

The form of the fixed point for \( \psi \) given \( \phi \) matches a standard SVAE.

The form of (3) is somewhat surprising, as under traditional inference \( \nabla_\phi \log p_\psi(y|x) \) would be 0 by definition. However, in this objective function we have included \( \phi \) explicitly as a constraint, and the constraint induces dependence between the two variables.

From this fixed point analysis, we can see that our modified objective induces predictive latent space by influencing the
We construct a set of gradient-based updates to approximate experiments [34]. To track the auxiliary variable, such as in real-time stimulation, performance can be incredibly valuable when the model is used to inform predictive parameters, it may be preferable to allow the encoder to deviate slightly from the posterior to obtain informative generative parameters. The second update of \( \theta \) in Line 11 corresponds to the second-order update to approximate \( \nabla_\theta \log p_\psi(y|x) \). This update can be viewed as an approximation to how changes in \( \theta \) will induce changes in \( \psi \) by modifying the gradient term. For this reason, our SOS-VAE can be intuitively viewed as supervising the decoder unlike a traditional SVAE which supervises the encoder.

IV. EXTENSIONS OF THE SOS-VAE FRAMEWORK

We provide two extensions to the SOS-VAE. The first extension relaxes the constraint that the encoder must provide a completely unbiased approximation of the generative posterior. The generative constraint can be highly restrictive on the predictive objective [23], particularly with shallow interpretable models, resulting in substantially degraded predictive performance. While sometimes necessary, often a slight relaxation can yield substantial gains in predictive accuracy with only slight bias in the variational approximation. This improved performance can be incredibly valuable when the model is used to track the auxiliary variable, such as in real-time stimulation experiments [34].

C. Second Order Supervision VAE and Gradient Approximations

The constraint on \( \phi \) induces dependence between \( \psi \) and \( \theta \) to make the term \( \nabla_\theta \log p_\psi(y|x) \) nonzero. However, it is not straightforward to evaluate such a gradient in a standard computational graph. This gradient can be approximated, however, via a second-order optimization technique [20, 21]. When combined with the previously-mentioned reparameterization technique for \( q \), this allows this gradient to be computed efficiently yielding our novel Second Order Supervision (SOS)-VAE with the full objective,

\[
\max_{\psi, \theta} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim \mathcal{P}(\epsilon)} \left[ \log p(y_i | g_\psi(\epsilon_i, x_i)) + \lambda p(y_i | g_\phi(\epsilon_i, x_i)) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{y_i \sim \mathbb{Q}(\epsilon)} \left[ \log q_\phi(g_\phi(\epsilon_i, x_i) | x_i) \right].
\]

(6)

We construct a set of gradient-based updates to approximate these requirements in Algorithm 1 and visualize the approach in Figure 2. In the algorithm as written, Lines 5, 7, and 9 correspond to standard gradients on \( \theta \), \( \phi \), and \( \psi \). The first \( \theta \) update corresponds to only the first term in the objective function and ignores the coupling between \( \psi \) and \( \theta \). The update on \( \phi \) corresponds only to the gradient taken on the constraint. The update on \( \psi \) corresponds to the second term of the objective.

The second update of \( \theta \) in Line 11 corresponds to the second-order update to approximate \( \nabla_\theta \log p_\psi(y|x) \). This update can be viewed as an approximation to how changes in \( \theta \) will induce changes in \( \phi \) by modifying the gradient term. For this reason, our SOS-VAE can be intuitively viewed as supervising the decoder unlike a traditional SVAE which supervises the encoder.

Algorithm 1: Second Order Supervision VAE (SOS-VAE)

Input: \( X = \{x_1, ..., x_N\} \in \mathbb{R}^p \), \( Y = \{y_1, ..., y_N\} \in \mathcal{Y} \).

Initialize: Network parameters: \( \phi, \theta, \psi \); learning rate: \( \alpha, \beta \); weights: \( \lambda \).

1. for epoch in iterations do
2. \((x_i, y_i), i \in \{1, ..., N\} \) # Batch data
3. \( \eta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I), \epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{Q}(\epsilon) \) # Latent space definition
4. # Step 1: decoder update
5. \( \theta^+ \leftarrow \theta + \alpha \nabla_\theta \left( \log p_\psi(y_i, g_\phi(\epsilon_i, x_i)) - KL(\epsilon_i, \eta) \right) \)
6. # Step 2: encoder update
7. \( \phi^+ \leftarrow \phi + \alpha \nabla_\phi \left( \log p_\psi(y_i, g_\phi(\epsilon_i, x_i)) - KL(\epsilon_i, \eta) \right) \)
8. # Step 3: classifier update
9. \( \psi^+ \leftarrow \psi + \alpha \nabla_\psi \left( \lambda \log p_\psi(y_i, g_\phi(\epsilon_i, x_i)) \right) \)
10. # Step 4: second-order decoder update
11. \( \theta^{++} \leftarrow \theta^+ + \beta \nabla_\theta \left( \lambda \log p_\psi(y_i, g_\phi(\epsilon_i, x_i)) \right) \)
12. # Step 5: Model parameters update
13. \( \psi \leftarrow \psi^+, \phi \leftarrow \phi^+ \), \( \theta \leftarrow \theta^{++} \)
14. end

The second extension develops methodology for incorporating systematically missing data. Such missingness commonly arises when datasets obtained from multiple experiments are combined to broaden conclusions and increase statistical power. Related experiments often record from different, overlapping sets of variables depending on the initial scientific objective. In neural electrophysiology recordings, the common occurrence of electrode failure provides additional motivation to account for missing data.

A. Relaxing the Unbiased Posterior Approximation

SAEs can be viewed as a regularization technique on a flexible classifier [19]. In contrast, the SOS-VAE explicitly uses the generative model to induce a predictive latent space, which has been demonstrated to be highly restrictive [23]. If a need for predictive accuracy matches or exceeds the need for informative generative parameters, it may be preferable to allow the encoder to deviate slightly from the posterior to obtain increased flexibility. We provide a method for relaxing the constraint by developing a new method, which we refer to as the Second Order Supervision Double VAE (SOS-DVAE). This approach defines two distinct encoders, a generative encoder \( q_{\phi_1}(s|x) \) that exclusively approximates the generative posterior and a predictive encoder \( q_{\phi_2}(s|x) \) that includes the supervision task. The generative encoder is learned as in Section III-B to approximate the true generative posterior. However, the predictive encoder is learned to maintain high predictive ability but with regularization towards the generative encoder. The objective function of this model is

\[
\max_{\psi, \theta, \phi_1, \phi_2} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi_1}(s|x)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, s) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|s) \right] + \mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi_2}(s|x)} \left[ \lambda \log p_\psi(y|s) - \mu KL(q_{\phi_1}, q_{\phi_2}) \right] \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \phi_1 = \arg \max_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi}(x)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, s) - \log q_{\phi}(s|x) \right].
\]

(7)
Here, \( \mu \) is a tuning parameter controlling the strength of regularizing \( \phi_2 \) to yield proper posterior inference (as \( \mu \to \infty \), \( \phi_2 \) is forced to exactly match \( \phi_1 \)). The parameters of the generative encoder, \( \phi_1 \), are learned in the same way as \( \phi \) in Section III-C meaning that it will approximate the posterior of the generative model while inducing the generative model parameters to be useful for prediction. The parameters of the predictive encoder \( \phi_2 \) are free to use biased approximations to yield improved predictions, provided that \( q_{\phi_2} \) is close to the generative encoder as measured by a KL regularization term. This KL term also allows straightforward estimation of how much deviation there is from the generative model. This learning approach is visualized in Figure 2 and follows the same logic as SOS-VAE (Figure 2b). Pseudo-code is provided in Supplemental Algorithm 2. We note that removing that second order optimization step is empirically detrimental to the predictive accuracy and increases the bias of the variational approximation. This importance of the second-order step contrasts with other work that uses this technique, which found that such a change was largely inconsequential [20].

B. Incorporating Missing Data with SOS

It is often scientifically useful to combine datasets that have overlapping but distinct measurements. In neural recording applications, this occurs frequently when multiple experiments that record from distinct but largely overlapping brain regions are combined to increase sample size. A common approach for combining these distinct datasets is to treat synthesis as a missing data problem. Generative models with Bayesian inference provide a natural method to impute the missing covariates and extract scientific conclusions from the generative parameters [24 55]. In our motivating application, we will combine datasets that recorded local field potentials (LFPs) from distinct brain regions with some overlap and use a VAE framework for efficient and predictive inference.

We assume that the data come from \( T \) experiments, where \( \{x_1^t, ..., x_N^t\} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_t} \) are \( N_t \) independent samples from the \( t \)-th experiment. We let \( x \in \mathbb{R}^{q} \) represent the entire (but not completely observed) data from all recorded regions, where \( \max(p_1, ..., p_T) \leq q < p_1 + \cdots + p_T \). We defer all proofs and derivations to the appendix for brevity.

We learn \( T \) encoder networks \( \{q_{\phi^t}(s|x^t)\} \) to approximate the \( t \)-th posterior \( p_0(s|x^t) \) conditioned on the observed covariates for each experiment. At test time on a new experiment with different regions observed, we would need to approximate the posterior, which we can do by learning one additional encoder. Unfortunately, the inherent issues of biased encoders arises if we were to maximize an adapted version of (1). We show empirically that this approach is flawed in our applications since the posterior distribution is inconsistent. Fortunately, the objective of (7) can easily be adapted to handle the missing data as

\[
\max_{\psi, \theta} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi^t}(s|x^t)} \left[ \log p_0(x^t, s) + \lambda \log \psi(y|s) \right]
\]

s.t. \( \phi^t = \arg \max_{\phi^t} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi^t}(s|x^t)} \left[ \log p_0(x^t, s) - \log q_{\phi^t}(s|x^t) \right] \) for \( t = 1, ..., T \).

(8)

The constraints in (8) ensure that each encoder performs proper posterior inference with the objective ensuring that the latent spaces obtained via both encoders are predictive and reconstructive of the observed data. Dependence between the encoders is obtained as \( \theta \) is shared on the data observed from all experiments. Given a new set of observed regions at test time distinct from each training pattern, we can approximate the posterior by the observed data as

\[
\phi^* = \arg \max_{\phi^*} \mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi^*}(s|x^*)} \left[ \log p_0(x^*, s) - \log q_{\phi^*}(s|x^*) \right].
\]

If the training encoders approximate exclusively a generative model (a standard VAE), this objective will be consistent. However, in an SVAE formulation this approach will approximate the “refit” encoder defined by the generative model. If the predictive capability of the SVAE is largely obtained via the bias, this approximation will lose most of the predictive ability. Our methodology will be resilient to such problems, as the supervision is induced in the decoder parameters \( \theta \), which are used to train the new encoder.

V. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We present empirical evaluations on the SOS-VAE and SOS-DVAE inference strategies compared to several baseline approaches: (1) a sequential fitting strategy with a VAE approximating a generative model and then using a supervised network on the frozen latent representation, denoted as VAE-refit (this matches the “cutting-the-feedback” strategy in statistics [22]); (2) a supervised variational autoencoder, SVAE, (3) an SVAE where the encoder is refit to approximate only the learned generative model after training, which we denote SVAE-refit, and (4) SDVAE, the SOS-DVAE approach without the second order step (Supplemental Algorithm 3). These strategies are chosen to compare different aspects of scientific utility. The VAE in (1) enforces that the encoder approximate a true generative posterior, albeit at the cost of a potentially unpredictable latent space. The SVAE in (2) represents the standard SVAE technique, which will yield good predictive and reconstructive performance but has a biased approximation of the posterior. A refit encoder of an SVAE (3) reveals this inherent bias, as predictive improvements often do not induce changes in the generative parameters. Finally, (4) illustrates the need for our second-order strategies.

We first demonstrate this as a proof-of-concept on a common dataset (MNIST) to illustrate the issues associated with a biased approximation. This was chosen due to the greater familiarity of writing and images as compared to electrophysiology making such evaluations easier. We then demonstrate scientific applications on two neural recording datasets, one consisting of Local Field Potentials (LFPs) recorded in mice and the other consisting of Electroencephalography (EEG) measurements in humans.

Predictive performance was quantified via accuracy (ACC) and area under the ROC curve (AUC) in all three evaluations. In multi-class scenarios the AUC was averaged over all individual classification tasks. We used the KL-divergence to demonstrate the divergence between the posteriors from the two encoders in the SOS-DVAE to evaluate the discrepancy caused by
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were made to match common settings where supervised was used as the encoder for all experiments. We evaluated two latent space dimension of 20. These parameter choices broad applicability of the methods. All models were given MLP decoder with a single hidden layer to demonstrate the electrophysiological data [4, 28, 39, 40]. Second, we used an as a model capable of uncovering latent networks from neural Matrix Factorization (NMF), which has been frequently used types of generative decoders. First, we used a Non-negative stems from the supervised objective rather than the similarity using the KL-divergence makes it clear that the bias are learned to minimize this KL-divergence, and evaluating divergence was chosen for two important reasons. First, the comparing distribution similarity [36, 37, 38]. However, KL-divergence was chosen for two important reasons. First, the supervision. There are other commonly-used methods for evaluating similarity [35, 37, 38]. However, KL-divergence was chosen for two important reasons. First, the likelihood is nearly ubiquitous in statistics to evaluate model fit, and as this work is motivated by generative modeling the KL-divergence is a natural choice. More importantly, these models and as this work is motivated by generative modeling the KL-divergence is a natural choice. More importantly, these models are learned to minimize this KL-divergence, and evaluating similarity using the KL-divergence makes it clear that the bias stems from the supervised objective rather than the similarity metric used for training.

A Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) with a single hidden layer was used as the encoder for all experiments. We evaluated two types of generative decoders. First, we used a Non-negative Matrix Factorization (NMF), which has been frequently used as a model capable of uncovering latent networks from neural electrophysiological data [4, 28, 39, 40]. Second, we used an MLP decoder with a single hidden layer to demonstrate the broad applicability of the methods. All models were given a latent space dimension of 20. These parameter choices were made to match common settings where supervised generative models have been used [9] [8]. Details on training and implementation are given in Supplemental Section [10].

### A. Demonstrating the Effect of Posterior Bias

Unfortunately, humans do not have an intuitive grasp of electrophysiological dynamics nor deep neural networks, which has allowed the issue of bias in the variational approximation to remain undetected. To demonstrate the consequences of this bias and the effectiveness of our proposed solution, we perform baseline comparisons in a situation where people do possess an intuitive grasp, image recognition. This is done with the MNIST database of handwritten digits [41]. The 70,000 images were trained and evaluated using 10-fold cross-validation for all models. Full training parameters are in Supplemental Table [11].

We first evaluate predictive performance of our methods compared to the baselines previously mentioned, with results of both accuracy and averaged one-vs-all AUCs given in Table [11]. From these results there are several critical observations we can make. Unsurprisingly, among the models that used an MLP decoder there was little variation between our novel
model and the predictive baselines. The “cutting-the-feedback” method had lower accuracy due to the latent space not focusing on prediction, but the classes are still largely distinguishable in this latent representation. However, refitting the encoder of the SVAE (the refit encoder approximates the posterior of the SVAE generative parameters) resulted in a dramatic drop in predictive performance. In other words, the bias introduced when estimating the encoder was absolutely critical for maintaining predictive ability and this predictive information was not incorporated into the generative parameters. The generative parameters learned by the SVAE would yield highly misleading conclusions if they were used for scientific exploration in a manner similar to our applications.

The results of the models using an NMF decoder are equally interesting, yielding patterns that are dramatically different from the MLP decoder. Here, the SOS-VAE results in a dramatic drop in predictive ability relative to the SVAE. This drop is unsurprising due to the restrictive constraint imposed by shallow generative models that was noted previously [23]. As an NMF decoder is substantially less complex as compared to an MLP, we would expect this constraint to become more apparent. However, the SOS-DVAE, by relaxing this stringent condition, is able to maintain a high predictive accuracy marginally superior to a standard SVAE. The novel method without the second order step (SDVAE) is also able to maintain high predictive accuracy.

We now analyze the other aspect required for scientific utility, that the latent space estimated by the encoder approximates the posterior of the generative model. While it is difficult to inspect this posterior, we can visualize the reconstruction of samples to determine the quality of the variational approximation to the posterior defined by the decoder. An example of this is shown in Figure 3 using an MLP decoder. The top left represents the original image, with the remaining images depicting the reconstructions provided by various models. The SOS-VAE strongly resembles the original image, which is unsurprising as it is an unbiased approximation to the true posterior. Below, we show the reconstruction of the SVAE, along with the reconstruction after the encoder is refit. Both methods provide reasonable reconstructions of the image, but the refit SVAE has substantially worse predictive performance. This is precisely why bias in the encoder has remained undetected; the SVAE provides reasonable reconstructions and excellent predictions.

However, the predictive encoder \( f_{\phi_2} \) increasingly diverges from the generative encoder as this regularization shrinks, yielding increasingly poor reconstructions from the predictive encoder. However, this relaxation in alignment between the two encoders corresponds to increasingly improved predictions, emphasizing the utility of \( \mu \) as a tuning parameter. In particular, it is worth noting that a substantial improvement in predictive ability can be obtained with minimal increase in bias as shown when \( \mu = 20 \).

Finally, we can analyze the impact of the second-order update by performing a similar analysis without this step (SDVAE), with results shown in the bottom row. We can see that the predictive accuracy is worse almost uniformly over the entire range. Furthermore, while the bias in the encoder is smaller relative to the SOS-DVAE initially, it quickly becomes substantially larger. This results in almost unrecognizable reconstructions using the predictive encoder at the weakest regularization strengths. From this, we conclude that the novel second-order optimization step developed in this work substantially improves both predictive and generative performance.

B. Modeling Functional Brain Networks

1) Decoding Emotional Affect from Electroencephalography Recordings: We applied the models described above to the publicly available SEED electroencephalography (EEG) dataset [42, 43]. It includes 15 subjects recorded while watching movie clips designated with a negative/neutral/positive emotion label. We analyzed signals from a curated subset of 19 of the original 62 electrodes (see Supplemental Figure 5). We split the signals into non-overlapping 1 s time windows. For each window, we calculated the spectral power and coherence for 5 different frequency bands: 1–4 Hz, 5–8 Hz, 9–12 Hz, 13–30 Hz, and 31–50 Hz, corresponding to the Delta, Theta, Alpha, Beta, and Low Gamma bands typically used in EEG analysis, respectively.

Models were trained to reconstruct the power and coherence values and to classify the emotion label associated with each window. A leave-one-participant-out cross-validation was used to select hyperparameters [44].

Table 1 reports the performance of each model. We see that with the MLP decoder, the SOS-VAE gives much better decoding performance than the SVAE-refit model, indicating that the decoding performance of the SVAE model is driven by features in the latent space that are not relevant to the generative model. The SOS-DVAE sacrifices relatively little performance compared to the SVAE while we again find that SOS-DVAE can get higher predictive performance at smaller KL-divergences compared to SDVAE, as shown in Supplemental Figures 6 and 8.

A major goal of this work is to improve the usefulness of generative models for drawing scientific conclusions. We have shown that our proposed modifications to the SVAE produce generative models that are more closely associated with variables of interest through a supervised task. For neural datasets such as this one, we can use the decoder parameters to draw scientific conclusions. By using a non-negative matrix factorization model as our decoder, we can interpret the learned factors of the decoder as network factors of the electrical functional connectome (electome) [4, 28, 6].
the practical usefulness of this approach, we visualize the latent electome factor with the largest weight in the logistic regression classifier in Figure 4a. This factor represents a network of brain regions defined by the power and coherence signatures we expect the network to produce. This network is defined by nearly full-brain synchrony in the alpha band, whereas the other bands have localized coherence between PZ, P4, P8, O1, and O2.

2) Decoding Behavioral Context from Local Field Potential Recordings: We next applied the models to a dataset of local field potentials (LFPs) recorded from 11 different brain regions (see Supplemental Table IV) across 26 mice [5, 4]. Full brain region names are given in the supplement, with abbreviated names referenced in the figures. Each mouse was recorded in overlapping time windows. Spectral power within each brain region and coherence between brain regions were calculated at frequencies from 1 Hz to 56 Hz in 1 Hz increments for each time window [28]. A multinomial logistic regression was used for the supervised classification of the behavioral context. A 5-fold cross-validation over mice was used to evaluate model performance. We report results for two different types of decoders, MLP and NMF, as in the previous sections.

For each model we evaluated performance on the supervised task as well as the KL-divergence between posterior distributions if possible (see Table II). As expected, SVAE and SOS-DVAE display comparable classification performance while SVAE-refit has near random performance, indicating that the performance of the SVAE model is not associated with the generative aspects of the model. Supplemental Figures 6e and 6f visualize the tradeoff between predictive performance and generative aspects of the model. Supplemental Figures 6g and 6h visualize the tradeoff between predictive performance and KL-divergence for SDVAE and SOS-DVAE. The SOS-DVAE is more predictive at the same KL-divergence, demonstrating that it is guiding the generative model towards the classification goal.

We visualize the electome network with the largest weight in the logistic regression classifier in Figures 4a and 4b. This network is positively associated with the open field (medium stress) behavioral context, and demonstrates significant increases in connectivity between several brain regions in the low Gamma band of 30-50 Hz and synchrony between an overlapping group of regions around 12 Hz.

3) SOS-VAE Improves Robustness to Missing Data: In practice, data may not be collected consistently, resulting in missing portions of the data. For example, LFP recordings such as the ones used above often suffer from overly noisy channels that prevent signal from being observed in one or more of

Table II: Prediction performance on LFP dataset with all channels (default) and with missing channels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>ACC (%)</th>
<th>AUC</th>
<th>ACC (%)</th>
<th>AUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAE-refit</td>
<td>58.27 ± 1.01</td>
<td>0.61 ± 0.009</td>
<td>54.76 ± 0.80</td>
<td>0.56 ± 0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVAE</td>
<td>88.80 ± 1.21</td>
<td>0.90 ± 0.010</td>
<td>88.73 ± 1.25</td>
<td>0.90 ± 0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVAE-refit</td>
<td>35.70 ± 1.70</td>
<td>0.52 ± 0.013</td>
<td>44.50 ± 0.58</td>
<td>0.51 ± 0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS-VAE</td>
<td>73.80 ± 2.22</td>
<td>0.78 ± 0.018</td>
<td>69.37 ± 1.86</td>
<td>0.73 ± 0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDVAE</td>
<td>88.42 ± 1.41</td>
<td>0.90 ± 0.010</td>
<td>88.60 ± 1.22</td>
<td>0.90 ± 0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS-DVAE</td>
<td>88.50 ± 1.45</td>
<td>0.91 ± 0.010</td>
<td>88.64 ± 1.34</td>
<td>0.91 ± 0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVAE missing channels</td>
<td>51.69 ± 0.62</td>
<td>0.61 ± 0.003</td>
<td>53.78 ± 1.63</td>
<td>0.53 ± 0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS-VAE missing channels</td>
<td>66.71 ± 0.44</td>
<td>0.73 ± 0.003</td>
<td>64.71 ± 1.62</td>
<td>0.68 ± 0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3: Comparison of predictive and generative performance using an MLP decoder on MNIST. The prediction accuracy is reported below an example reconstruction from the generative portion of each model. In the brown box, we show the results for an SVAE model before and after (SVAE-refit) updating the encoder to prioritize the generative model. The results of SOS-DVAE (magenta box) and SDVAE (blue box) are shown for 3 different KL-divergence in nats between the posteriors given by \( \phi_1 \) and \( \phi_2 \) (controlled by \( \mu \)), see Section IV-A. For each \( \mu \), the left and right pictures are reconstructed from the generative encoder \( f_{\phi_1}(\cdot) \) and the classification \( f_{\phi_2}(\cdot) \) encoder, respectively.
the brain regions in the study. We simulate this scenario by randomly removing 3 brain regions in each mouse in the LFP dataset from Section V-B and we apply the missing data methodology from Section IV-B.

The missing data scenario is much less harmful to the SOS-VAE model than to a standard SVAE. We show in Table II that the SOS-VAE performs better than the SVAE at decoding behavioral context in all scenarios. The single latent factor with the largest weight in the logistic regression classifier is shown in Figure 4c next to the equivalent factor from a model with all channels present (Figure 3b). We see that these factors share many features in common.

VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Generative latent variable models have great utility in scientific and clinical trial analysis to improve scientific understanding [45, 46]. This scientific utility often depends on two goals, obtaining an accurate representation of the data and yielding a latent representation predictive of an auxiliary task. A commonly used approach, the SVAE, has been previously used to achieve both of these objectives. However, this results in a previously-undetected bias in the encoder that hinders scientific utility. We developed a novel inference technique that allows for supervision of an auxiliary task while maintaining a generative representation. We have shown, both on synthetic and real data, that the bias in SVAEs can have a substantial impact on learned representations, that our novel inference technique achieves both issues without bias, and demonstrated the efficacy of the proposed methodology in relevant neuroscience applications. Furthermore, we have provided two relevant extensions to our methods that address critical needs in the neuroscience community.

We see two possible limitations of the proposed method. First, our models are designed for interpretable generative models commonly used in scientific analysis. This objective was not typically present in related work, which largely used the generative model as a regularization technique. When pursuing purely a predictive problem, a user can choose to use a much more complex yet difficult-to-interpret deep generative model [47, 48, 49, 20, 21], making comparisons with supervised generative models to the SOS-VAE with its simpler, interpretable generative models, irrelevant. Second, our contributions are applicable to models that include both a generative and a supervised component in the class of SAEs, whereas many supervised models have alternative inference strategies, such as [4].

In conclusion, our developed inference techniques are highly relevant to scientific fields such as neuroscience that use latent variable models to design experiments and discover novel relationships in high-dimensional data. These techniques improve the scientific utility of these latent variable models by incorporating predictive information while maintaining a clear understanding of how manipulations of observed covariates will result in changes in the latent space. In the future, we will continue applying this to real-world scientific problems and work to build greater integration with standard black-box variational inference tools [50, 51, 52].
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A. Supervised Variational Autoencoder

The objective of a SVAE for a single sample is

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\phi, \theta, \psi} = E_{q_\psi(s|x)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, s) - \log q_\phi(s|x) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|s) \right]. \]  

The gradients of \( \theta \) and \( \psi \) are straightforward. However, the gradients of \( \phi \) are more difficult, as the ELBO expectation is taken with respect to a random sample from \( q_\phi(s|x) \). However, if we express the random variable \( s \sim q_\phi(s|x) \) as a transformation of random variable \( \epsilon \) given \( x \) and \( \phi \), \( g_\phi(\epsilon, x) \), the distribution of \( \epsilon \) will be independent of \( x \) and \( \phi \). The gradients for \( \theta \) are

\[ \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\phi, \theta, \psi} = \nabla_\theta E_{q_\psi(s|x)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, s) - \log q_\phi(s|x) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|s) \right], \]

\[ = \nabla_\theta E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) - \log q_\phi(g_\phi(\epsilon, x)|x) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x))) \right], \]

\[ = E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\theta \log p_\theta(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) - \log q_\phi(g_\phi(\epsilon, x)|x) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x))) \right], \]

while the gradients for \( \psi \) are

\[ \nabla_\psi \mathcal{L}_{\phi, \theta, \psi} = \nabla_\psi E_{q_\psi(s|x)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, s) - \log q_\phi(s|x) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|s) \right], \]

\[ = \nabla_\psi E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) - \log q_\phi(g_\phi(\epsilon, x)|x) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x))) \right], \]

\[ = E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\psi \log p_\theta(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) - \log q_\phi(g_\phi(\epsilon, x)|x) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x))) \right], \]

\[ = \lambda E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\psi \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x))) \right]. \]

Finally, the gradients for \( \phi \) are

\[ \nabla_\phi \mathcal{L}_{\theta, \psi, \phi} = \nabla_\phi E_{q_\psi(s|x)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, s) - \log q_\phi(s|x) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|s) \right], \]

\[ = \nabla_\phi E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) - \log q_\phi(g_\phi(\epsilon, x)|x) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x))) \right], \]

\[ = E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\phi \log p_\theta(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) - \log q_\phi(g_\phi(\epsilon, x)|x) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x))) \right]. \]

Thus, the fixed points for \( \phi \), \( \theta \) and \( \psi \) are

\[ 0 = E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\theta \log p_\theta(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) \right], \]

\[ 0 = E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\psi \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x))) \right], \]

\[ -\lambda E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\phi \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x))) \right] = E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\phi \log p_\theta(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) - \log q_\phi(g_\phi(\epsilon, x)|x) \right]. \]

B. Second Order Supervision

To repeat, our objective is

\[ \max_{\psi, \theta} \quad E_{q_\psi(s|x)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, s) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|s) \right] \]

s.t. \( \phi = \arg \max_{\phi} \quad E_{q_\psi(s|x)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, s) - \log q_\phi(s|x) \right]. \]

The gradients for \( \psi \) follow almost identically to the SVAE as

\[ \nabla_\psi \mathcal{L}_{\theta, \psi, \phi} = \nabla_\psi E_{q_\psi(s|x)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, s) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|s) \right], \]

\[ = \nabla_\psi E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x))) \right], \]

\[ = E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\psi \log p_\theta(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x))) \right], \]

\[ = \lambda E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\psi \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x))) \right]. \]

The gradients taken with respect to \( \phi \) are done wrt the constraint as

\[ \nabla_\phi = \nabla_\phi E_{q_\psi(s|x)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, s) - \log q_\phi(s|x) \right], \]

\[ = \nabla_\phi E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) - \log q_\phi(g_\phi(\epsilon, x)|x) \right], \]

\[ = E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\phi \log p_\theta(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) - \log q_\phi(g_\phi(\epsilon, x)|x) \right]. \]

Finally, the gradients with respect to \( \theta \) are

\[ \nabla_\theta \mathcal{L}_{\theta, \psi, \phi} = \nabla_\theta E_{q_\psi(s|x)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, s) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|s) \right], \]

\[ = \nabla_\theta E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \log p_\theta(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x))) \right], \]

\[ = E_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\theta \log p_\theta(x, g_\phi(\epsilon, x)) + \lambda \log p_\psi(y|g_\phi(\epsilon, x))) \right]. \]
This implies that the fixed points of the SOS-VAE are
\[
0 = \mathbb{E}_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\phi \log p_\psi(y | g_{\phi}(\epsilon, x)) \right],
\]
\[
0 = \mathbb{E}_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\phi \log p_\psi(y | g_{\phi}(\epsilon, x)) \right],
\]
\[
-\lambda \mathbb{E}_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\phi \log p_\psi(y | g_{\phi}(\epsilon, x)) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{p(\epsilon)} \left[ \nabla_\phi \log p_\psi(y | g_{\phi}(\epsilon, x)) \right].
\]

C. Gradient Update Derivations

As mentioned previously, \( \nabla_\theta \log p_\psi(y | g_{\phi}(\epsilon, x)) \) is strange given that \( \theta \) and \( \phi \) are both variables in common implementations. However, the constraint induces dependence on \( \phi \). To evaluate the gradient on \( \theta \), note that the total derivative of the Monte Carlo estimate for \( \theta \) is
\[
\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\partial \log p_\psi(x, s)}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial \log p_\psi(x, s)}{\partial \phi} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \theta} + \frac{\partial \log p_\psi(y | s)}{\partial \phi} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \theta}.
\]
The first term is trivial to implement in modern software packages. When the constraint on \( \phi \) is approximately satisfied \( \partial \phi/\partial \theta \) is small and can be ignored. While this term is not close to zero when the networks are initialized, it is still small comparatively and can be reasonably ignored. The third term can be approximately evaluated using the second order trick described in [20].

Algorithm 2: Second Order Supervision Double VAE (SOS-DVAE)

Input: \{\(x_1, ..., x_N\) \(\in \mathbb{R}^p\), \(y_1, ..., y_N\) \(\in \mathcal{Y}\).

Initialize: Network parameters: \(\phi_1, \phi_1, \phi_2, \theta, \psi\); learning rate: \(\alpha, \beta\); weights: \(\lambda, \mu\).

1 for epoch in iterations do
2 (\(x_i, y_i\), \(i \in \{1, ..., N\}\)) \# Training data batch
3 \(\eta \sim N(0, I), \epsilon_i \sim g_\phi(\epsilon_i, x_i)\) \# Latent space definition
4 \(\theta^+ \leftarrow \theta + \alpha \nabla_\theta \log p_\psi(x_i, g_{\phi}(\epsilon_i, x_i)) - KL(\epsilon_i, \eta)\) \# Step 1: decoder update wrt VAE
5 \(\phi^+_1 \leftarrow \phi_1 + \alpha \nabla_\phi \log p_\psi(x_i, g_{\phi}(\epsilon_i, x_i)) - KL(\epsilon_i, \eta)\) \# Step 2: Update \(\phi_1\)
6 \(q_1 \sim q_{\phi_1}^+(s | x_i)\) \# Step 3: Sample latent space
7 \(\psi^+ \leftarrow \psi + \alpha \nabla_\psi \log p_\psi(y_i | g_{\phi_1}(\epsilon_i, x_i)) - \mu KL(q_2, q_1)\) \# Step 4: Update classifier
8 \(\phi^+_2 \leftarrow \phi_2 + \alpha \nabla_\phi \log p_\psi(y_i | g_{\phi}(\epsilon_i, x_i)) + \mu KL(q_2, q_1)\) \# Step 5: Second order update to the decoder
9 \(\theta^{++} \leftarrow \theta^+ - \beta \nabla_\theta \log p_\psi(y_i | g_{\phi_1}(\epsilon_i, x_i))\) \# Step 6: Update model parameters
10 end

Algorithm 3: Supervised Double VAE (SDVAE)

Input: \{\(x_1, ..., x_N\) \(\in \mathbb{R}^p\), \(y_1, ..., y_N\) \(\in \mathcal{Y}\).

Initialize: Network parameters: \(\phi_1, \phi_2, \theta, \psi\); learning rate: \(\alpha\); weights: \(\lambda, \mu, \eta\).

1 for epoch in iterations do
2 (\(x_i, y_i\), \(i \in \{1, ..., N\}\)) \# Training data batch
3 \(\eta \sim N(0, I), \epsilon_i \sim g_\phi(\epsilon_i, x_i)\) \# Latent space definition
4 \(\theta^+ \leftarrow \theta + \alpha \nabla_\theta \log p_\psi(x_i, g_{\phi}(\epsilon_i, x_i)) - KL(\epsilon_i, \eta)\) \# Step 1: Update decoder wrt VAE
5 \(\phi^+_1 \leftarrow \phi_1 + \alpha \nabla_\phi \log p_\psi(x_i, g_{\phi}(\epsilon_i, x_i)) - KL(\epsilon_i, \eta)\) \# Step 2: Update \(\phi_1\)
6 \(q_1 \sim q_{\phi_1}^+(s | x_i)\) \# Step 3: Sample latent space
7 \(\psi^+ \leftarrow \psi + \alpha \nabla_\psi \log p_\psi(y_i | g_{\phi_1}(\epsilon_i, x_i)) - \mu KL(q_2, q_1)\) \# Step 4: Update classifier
8 \(\phi^+_2 \leftarrow \phi_2 + \alpha \nabla_\phi \log p_\psi(y_i | g_{\phi}(\epsilon_i, x_i)) + \mu KL(q_2, q_1)\) \# Step 5: Update \(\phi_2\)
9 \(\psi \leftarrow \psi^+, \phi_1 \leftarrow \phi^+_1, \phi_2 \leftarrow \phi^+_2, \theta \leftarrow \theta^+\) \# Update model parameters
10 end

Algorithm 2 provides detailed pseudocode for the Second Order Supervision Double VAE (SOS-DVae) matching the 5 steps in Figure 2. If we ignore step 5 (the second order update on the decoder), the algorithm is the Supervised Double VAE (SDVAE) as in Algorithm 3.

For the reported experiments, all models use a Gaussian distribution as the prior on the latent space \((\epsilon_0 \sim N(0, 1))\). The Adam optimizer is used for the gradient optimization. Parameters used for each dataset are listed in Table III.

Code and instructions have been included with the submission to recreate the experimental results on the MNIST and SEED datasets.

For all models, the encoder uses a single hidden layer MLP with 512 nodes. Two decoders are investigated: (i) a single layer MLP with 512 nodes, and (ii) a Non-negative Matrix Factorization (NMF) decoder. In the NMF decoder, the latent space is
mapped to non-negative values through a softplus non-linearity, and then a non-negative linear mapping is learned to project to the outputs.

All models were implemented using Pytorch. The experiments were run on a cluster with a Red Hat Enterprise Linux 7 operating system and a range of Nvidia GPUs, including TitanXPs and RTX2080Tis. Training parameters used for the experiments for each dataset are summarized in Table III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Feature size</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Batch size</th>
<th>Epoch</th>
<th>Learning rate</th>
<th>Step size</th>
<th>$\lambda$</th>
<th>$\eta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MNIST</td>
<td>28x28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1e-3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1e-3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFP</td>
<td>1x3696</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1e-4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEED</td>
<td>1x950</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1e-5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1e-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We varied the parameters $\mu$ over a wide range of (1e-5,5) to investigate the trade off between generation and inference for each dataset using MLP decoder (see Figure 6). Note that we used a single hidden layer MLP to demonstrate the broad applicability of the methods, and that the modification to a more complex architecture is straightforward to implement.

D. MNIST

The MNIST contains 60,000 training images and 10,000 test images, which we concatenated together into one dataset for a 10-fold cross-validation with random splits. No data augmentation is applied to the dataset, since our goal is to compare the performance among different models, not to pursue the best prediction.

E. Local Filed Potential (LFP)

The Local Filed Potentials (LFPs) were recorded from 11 different brain regions (see Table IV) for each mouse [5]. Recordings are split into 1s intervals, each with an associated genotype and condition label. We estimated the spectral power features for each time interval using Welch’s method [53] and mean squared coherence between pairs of brain regions [54] as measures of frequency-resolved synchrony within and between regions, respectively. These features were calculated at 1 Hz intervals from 1 Hz to 56 Hz, yielding a 3696 dimensional observation space.

The model for the outcome given the latent factors naturally lends itself to multinomial regression for the prediction of low-, medium-, and high-stress contexts corresponding to experimental conditions of home cage, open field, and tail suspension respectively. The NMF decoder naturally lends itself as a biologically interpretable model for neural electrophysiology [28]. It views each observation as a positive sum of non-negative features, which matches the biological assumption that no network of neural activity can be negatively activated or be associated with with negative power or coherence. We also use a MLP decoder to demonstrate the broad applicability of these methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acb Core</td>
<td>Nucleus Accumbens Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Acb Sh</td>
<td>Nucleus Accumbens Shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BLA</td>
<td>Basolateral Amygdala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IL Cx</td>
<td>Infralimbic Cortex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Md Thal</td>
<td>Mediodorsal Nucleus of the Thalamus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PrL Cx</td>
<td>Prelimbic Cortex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>Ventral Tegmental Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>lDHip</td>
<td>Lateral Dorsal Hippocampus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>lSNC</td>
<td>Lateral Substantia Nigra Pars Compacta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>mDHip</td>
<td>Medial Dorsal Hippocampus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>mSNC</td>
<td>Medial Substantia Nigra Pars Compacta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. SOS-VAE Missing Data

One of the appealing novelties of our method is that it addresses missing data issues that often arise when combining recordings from multiple scientific experiments. To demonstrate the concept of such application, we first generate a synthetic dataset by randomly removing 3 brain regions in each mouse in the LFP dataset (described in Section [V-B2]), and then we apply the extension of our proposed method to handling such missing data. Finally, we compare the trained models with that trained on full channels as shown in Figures 4b and 4c.
**G. Electroencephalography (EEG)**

For the electroencephalography (EEG) recordings of the SEED dataset \[42, 43\], we use a subset of 19 electrodes (as shown in Figure 5) that approximate the whole head to simplify visualizations, but it would be a straightforward extension to use the full set of 62 electrodes. Power and coherence features are calculated for the 19 electrodes in 1 second time windows at the following frequency bands: 1-4, 5-8, 9-12, 13-30, and 31-50 Hz, corresponding to the Delta, Theta, Alpha, Beta, and Low Gamma, respectively. The resulting power and coherence features are flattened and concatenated to yield a 950 dimensional observation space. We used the MNE package (an open-source tool available at: [https://mne.tools/stable/index.html](https://mne.tools/stable/index.html)) to extract the power and coherent features for this EEG dataset.

As can be seen from Algorithm 2, \( \mu \) weights the KL-divergence between the inference encoder \( q_{\phi_1}(\cdot) \) and the classification \( q_{\phi_2}(\cdot) \) encoder, with higher values for \( \mu \) emphasizing that KL-divergence term over the classification loss. We tune \( \mu \) to investigate the trade-off between prediction performance and the fidelity of generative model. We report some of these results in the main paper, and included additional supplemental results here.

Figures 6b, 6d, and 6f show the prediction performance against the KL-divergence on all three datasets using MLP decoders. We can see that the proposed SOS-DVAE obtains higher predictive performance (ACC or AUC) for the same level of KL-divergence. As visualized in Figures 7 for the LFP dataset and Figure 8 for the SEED dataset, a smaller KL-divergence (greater \( \mu \)) in SOD-DVAE and SDVAE means the \( \phi_2 \) encoders are more influenced by the generative model and thus are able to reconstruct the input sample much better. In both figures, the trained models with a Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) decoder are used to reconstruct an arbitrary input sample from the hold-out data. Note that the SVAE and SVAE-refit only has a single encoder thus they do not have a KL-divergence value. The SVAE, SOS-DVAE, and SDVAE perform similarly in prediction. Similar to Figure 3 for the MNIST dataset, the SVAE-refit presents a huge decrease in prediction. Despite predicting less well, the refitted model is able to generate the input features better than that of SVAE.
Fig. 6: Prediction performance on MNIST (left), SEED (middle), and LFP (right) datasets using NMF decoder (top row) and MLP decoder (bottom row).

Fig. 7: Visualization of reconstructed power features on LFP dataset using MLP decoder. In the brown box, we show the results for an SVAE model before and after (SVAE-refit) updating the encoder to prioritize the generative model. The results of SOS-DVAE (magenta box) and SDVAE (blue box) models are shown with 3 different KL-divergences (controlled by $\mu$ as detailed in Section IV-A and in Algorithm 2). For each $\mu$, the left and right pictures are reconstructed from the inference encoder $q_{\phi_1}(\cdot)$ and the classification $q_{\phi_2}(\cdot)$ encoder, respectively. Bigger $\mu$ (smaller KL-divergence) yields similar reconstruction from the two encoders, vice versa. The numbers under the picture are (prediction AUC and KL-divergence in nats). The models used in this figure is trained on a single split of training set, and the reconstruction is for a random input in the hold-out test set.
Fig. 8: Visualization of reconstructed power features on SEED dataset using an MLP decoder. In the brown box, we show the results for an SVAE model before and after (SVAE-refit) updating the encoder to prioritize the generative model. The results of SOS-DVAE (magenta box) and SDVAE (blue box) models are shown with 3 different KL-divergences (controlled by $\mu$ in Algorithm 2). For each $\mu$, the left and right pictures are reconstructed from the inference encoder $q_{\phi_1}(\cdot)$ and the classification $q_{\phi_2}(\cdot)$ encoder, respectively. Bigger $\mu$ (smaller KL-divergence) yields similar reconstruction from the two encoders, vice versa. The numbers under the picture are (prediction accuracy in percentage, KL-divergence in nats). The models used in this figure is trained on a single split of training set, and the reconstruction is for a random input in the hold-out test set.