Product Distribution Field Theory

David H. Wolpert
NASA Ames Research Center,
Moffett Field, CA, 94035, USA
dhw@email.arc.nasa.gov

arXiv:cond-mat/0307630v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 25 Jul 2003

This paper presents a novel way to approximate a distribution governing a system of coupled particles with a product of independent distributions. The approach is an extension of mean field theory that allows the independent distributions to live in a different space from the system, and thereby capture statistical dependencies in that system. It also allows different Hamiltonians for each independent distribution, to facilitate Monte Carlo estimation of those distributions. The approach leads to a novel energy-minimization algorithm in which each coordinate Monte Carlo estimates an associated spectrum, and then independently sets its state by sampling a Boltzmann distribution across that spectrum. It can also be used for high-dimensional numerical integration, (constrained) combinatorial optimization, and adaptive distributed control. This approach also provides a simple, physics-based derivation of the powerful approximate energy-minimization algorithms semi-formally derived in [8, 9, 11]. In addition it suggests many improvements to those algorithms, and motivates a new (bounded rationality) game theory equilibrium concept.

PACS numbers: 89.20.Ff,89.75.-k , 89.75.Fb

I. INTRODUCTION

Mean Field Approximations (MFA's) have many applications outside of physics, combinatorial optimization by mean-field annealing being perhaps the most prominent of them [5, 6]. One problem with MFA's is that because they treat all particles as independent, they can be a poor approximation of the desired distribution. Another is that especially in large systems with complex Hamiltonians, they can be expensive to evaluate.

We extend MFA's by introducing coordinate transformations that allow us to convert a coupled distribution into a decoupled one. This allows us to improve the accuracy of the MFA. It also allows us to employ Monte Carlo mean-field annealing for optimal adaptive control. We also introduce separate Hamiltonians for each particle. This allows us to exploit recent results in collectives theory [9] to speed up MFA evaluations. This extended MFA justifies heuristics recently found to beat simulated annealing in adaptive control problems by orders of magnitude [8, 10, 11]. It also provides novel ways to do (constrained) combinatorial optimization, a novel (bounded rational) game theory equilibrium concept [1, 7], and a way to calculate such equilibria.

II. SELF-CONSISTENT DISTRIBUTIONS

Let ζ be a space with elements z and cardinality $|\zeta|$. A *semi-coordinate system* of ζ, Ξ, is a space ξ having elements $x = (x_1 \in \xi_1, \ldots, x_M \in \xi_M)$ together with a surjective map from ξ to ζ, written as $\zeta(.)$. $\zeta(.)$ need not be invertible; the (semi-)coordinates of a point $x \in \xi$ may not be unique. No a priori restriction is made on whether ξ and ζ are countable, uncountable, time-extended, etc.

The space of possible probability distributions (or density functions, as the case may be) over ξ is $\mathcal{P}^\dagger$. Any $p \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger$ induces a distribution over ζ, $p(z) = \int dx\ p(x)\delta(z - \zeta(x))$. (We implicitly assume integral measures and delta functions that match ξ.) Expressions like "$p(\xi) = p'(\xi)$", "$p_i = p'_i$" and "$p_{(i)} = p'_{(i)}$", where $p, p' \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger$, mean $\forall x \in \xi$, $p(x) = p'(x)$, $p(x_i) = p'(x_i)$, and $p(x_j) = p'(x_j)\ \forall j \neq i$, respectively. $\mathcal{P}$ is the set of all product distributions over ξ, i.e., the submanifold of all $p \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger$ obeying $p(\xi) = \prod_i p(\xi_i)$. We will use the obvious parameterization of elements of $\mathcal{P}$ as the vectors of their marginal distributions, written $q = (q_1(\xi_1), \ldots, q_M(\xi_M))$. Note that changing $\zeta(.)$ with ξ fixed will change the manifold $\mathcal{P}$ in general but won't affect $\mathcal{Q}$, the space of all q.

We are interested in *self-consistent* q that obey $q_i(\xi_i) = A_i(\xi_i, q_{(i)})\ \forall i$ for some functions $\{A_i\}$. By Brouwer's theorem, for any smooth $\{A_i\}$, the map $q \rightarrow \{A_i(\xi_i, q_{(i)})\}$ (which we call *parallel Brouwer updating*) has at least one fixed point. Here we consider such A_i that set q_i by minimizing a functional of $(q_i, q_{(i)})$. As an example, that functional might be the same for all i, for each one measuring the error of $(q_i, q_{(i)})$ as an approximation of some $p \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger$. In this case the fixed point(s) of the $\{A_i\}$ are locally optimal approximations in $\mathcal{P}$ of that p.

Write the cross entropy from p to p' as $S(p \mid\mid p') \equiv -\int dx\ p(x) \ln[\frac{p'(x)}{\mu(x)}]$, where as usual μ is a prior probability over ξ that ensures the argument of the logarithm is unitless. So the entropy of p is just $S(p \mid\mid p) \equiv S(p)$, and the Kullback-Leibler distance from p to p' is $KL(p \mid\mid p') \equiv S(p \mid\mid p') - S(p)$ [**?**]. Next define *private Hamiltonians* $h_{i,j}$ where $\zeta(x) = \zeta(x') \Rightarrow h_{i,j}(x) = h_{i,j}(x')\ \forall i, j, x$ and x', so expected values of a Hamiltonian have the same value in ζ and ξ. We write $h_i(\xi) \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \beta_{i,j} h_{i,j}(\xi)$ where the temperatures $\{\beta_{i,j}\}$ are usually non-negative and write the associated free energies as $F_{h_i}(p) \equiv \int dx\ p(x) h_i(x) - S(p)$. So $\text{argmin}_{q'_i \in \mathcal{Q}_i} F_{h_i}(q'_i, q_{(i)})$ is the q'_i maximizing the entropy of $q'_i(\xi_i) \prod_{k \neq i} q_k(\xi_k)$, subject to expected values of i's

private Hamiltonians implicit in i's temperatures. The associated fixed points obey

$$q_i^g(\xi_i) \;=\; \frac{\mu_i(\xi_i)}{N_i([h_i]_{i,q^g})} e^{-[h_i]_{i,q^g}(\xi_i)}$$

where $N_i([U]_{i,p})$ is the partition function and the bracket notation indicates expectation conditioned on the value of the subscripted coordinate: for any U and $p \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger$, $[U]_{i,p}(\xi_i) \equiv \int dx_{(i)} U(\xi_i, x_{(i)}) p(x_{(i)} \mid \xi_i)$.

We can choose $\{A_i\}$ based on objective functions other than the free energy; the important thing is to incorporate a concave function like entropy, to avoid the expensive process of checking the borders of $\mathcal{Q}$ for fixed points. For example, all the local minima of $F_{h_i}(q)$ over $\mathcal{Q}$ are interior to $\mathcal{Q}$. Moreover, for any fixed $q_{(i)}$, there is only one local minimum over $\mathcal{Q}_i$.

The following six examples all have uniform μ. $\xi = \zeta$ (as in conventional MFA's) in all but the fifth example:

Example 1: Let $m_i = 1 \; \forall i$. Then at q^g each coordinate i obeys its own canonical ensemble and is independent of the values of the other coordinates. It is coupled to its own heat bath, with its own effective Hamiltonian set by the distributions over the other coordinates, $[h_i]_{i,q^g}(\xi_i)$. In contrast, if $\forall i, m_i = 2$ and $h_{i,2} = (h_{i,1})^2$, each $q_i^g(\xi_i)$ is a Gaussian over the values $[h_i]_{i,1}(\xi_i)$ rather than a Boltzmann distribution over them. In this case $\beta_{i,1}$ and $\beta_{i,2}$ specify the mean and variance of $h_{i,1}$.

Example 2: We have a *team game* when $\forall i, i'$, and j, $m_i = m_{i'}$, and $h_i = h_{i'}$. In a team game we have a single shared objective function trading off entropy and expected values of the Hamiltonians. For $m = 1$ we define the *world Hamiltonian* H as the single shared private Hamiltonian. For this the minimizer of the free energy over all $\mathcal{P}^\dagger$ is the joint canonical ensemble distribution, $\mathbf{p}^{\beta H}$ [4]. In contrast, $q^{\beta H}$, the minimizer over $\mathcal{P}$, is an MFA for $\mathbf{p}^{\beta H}$. Since ζ is arbitrary, by gradually increasing β one can converge on a q that is a delta function about the z that minimizes $H(z)$. Since ζ is arbitrary, this optimization algorithm can be applied for any underlying space one wishes to search. In particular, parallel Brouwer updating with gradually increasing β is equivalent to mean-field annealing [6].

In general $q^{\beta H}(\xi_i) \neq \mathbf{p}^{\beta H}(\xi_i)$, the marginal of $\mathbf{p}^{\beta H}(\xi_i)$. However the $q^{\beta H}$ with the lowest free energy is the q that best approximates $\mathbf{p}^{\beta H}$, as measured by $KL(q^{\beta H}, \mathbf{p}^{\beta H})$ To have the fixed points equal the marginals we must instead have the $\{A_i\}$ minimize $KL(\mathbf{p}^{\beta H}, q^{\beta H})$.)

Example 3: One way to enforce a constraint $f(z) = 0$ is via a generalization of penalty functions. Say we have an $m = 1$ team game with world Hamiltonian H. Choose the objective function $\int dx p(x)[\beta H(x) + \beta_f [f(\zeta(x))]^2] - S(p)$. Then for $\beta_f \to \infty$ our constraint will be enforced, if possible. Often that solution is on $\mathcal{Q}$'s border though, which slows the search — finite β_f moves the solution(s) to the interior of $\mathcal{Q}$, by weakening the constraint. Alternatively, choose the objective function $\int dx p(x)(\beta H(x) + \lambda [f(\zeta(x))]^2) + \gamma\lambda^2 - S(p)$, where $\gamma \geq 0$ is a constant. Minimizing over both $p \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ forces $f(z) = 0$ if $\gamma = 0$, while nonzero γ_j weakens the constraint but forces the fixed point q(s) inside $\mathcal{Q}$.

Example 4: Consider a team game with $m = m'+1$ and $h_j(x) = h_j(x_j) \in \mathbb{N}^+ \; \forall j \leq m'$. Here p^g is an MFA for the grand canonical ensemble of a system with m' particle types and Hamiltonian $h_{m'+1}$: x_i encodes the states of all type i particles, and h_i counts their number [4].

Example 5: Say $\zeta(.)$ is bijective but $\xi \neq \zeta$. Then $\zeta(.)$ is akin to a rotation, in that each ξ_i couples multiple components of ζ. More generally, $|\xi| \neq |\zeta|$ means ξ is an M-dimensional representation of an $M' < M$-dimension system. This allows arbitrary distributions over ζ to be expressed as a product distribution.

As an illustration, say ζ is two-dimensional with elements (z_1, z_2). Take $\xi_1 = \zeta_1$, and have an additional ξ coordinate for each separate value of z_1, which we write as ξ_{z_1}. So there are $1 + |\zeta_1|$ coordinates altogether. Have each ξ_{z_1} contain $|\zeta_2|$ elements, i.e., $|\zeta_2|$ separate subsets of ζ, and label those subsets by the values $z_2 \in \zeta_2$. Have $\zeta(x_1, \ldots, x_{1+|\zeta_1|}) = (x_1, x_{x_1})$, i.e., $z_1 = x_1$ and $z_2 = x_{z_1}$. So we can write $p(z_1) = \sum_{z_2} p(z_1, z_2) = \sum_{z_2} \sum_{x : x_1 = z_1, x_{z_1} = z_2} q(x) = q_{x_1}(z_1)$. Therefore $p(z_2 \mid z_1) = q(\xi_{z_1} = z_2 \mid \xi_1 = z_1)$. So $p(z_2 \mid z_1) = q_{z_1}(z_2)$.

This allows us to do optimal distributed adaptive control in ζ with an MFA over ξ. Let ζ_2 be the state of the plant one wants to control, ζ_1 the control variable you can set, and $\mathcal{H}(\zeta_2)$ the objective function one wants to minimize. The goal in optimal control is to find $\text{argmin}_{z_1} E(\mathcal{H} \mid z_1)$. Have the $q_{i \geq 2}$ fixed to $P(\zeta_2 \mid \zeta_1)$, the distribution relating the plant variable and the control variables. Take $m_1 = 1$, $h_{1,1}(\xi) = \mathcal{H}(\zeta(\xi))$, and redefine F_{h_1} to involve the entropy of just ξ_1 rather than all of ξ. Anneal $\beta \to \infty$, so that $q_1(\xi_1)$ becomes a single delta function. Write the resultant $q^{\beta H}(\xi)$ as $\delta_{\xi_1, x_1} \prod_{i \geq 2} q_i(\xi_i)$. This distribution minimizes $\sum_{x'} h_{1,1}(x') \delta_{x'_1, x_1} \prod_{i \geq 2} q_i(x'_i) = \sum_{x'} h_{1,1}(x') q_{x_1}(x'_{x_1}) = \sum_z \mathcal{H}(z) p(z_2 \mid z_1 = x_1)$. So $z_1 = x_1$ solves our optimal control problem.

Example 6: Formally, when $m_i = 1 \; \forall i$ and $\xi = \zeta$, each coordinate is a player in a non-cooperative game [1, 7], with x the players' joint move and $\{-h_{i,1}\}$ their payoff functions. As the $\beta_i \to \infty$, $q^{\{\beta_i h_{i,1}\}}$ becomes a (normal form) mixed strategy Nash equilibria.

Now consider the general bounded rational (i.e., non-Nash equilibrium) scenario. Say the players are told the entropy of the joint system, and each finds its best possible mixed strategy subject to the other players' strategies and entropy value. Then the system is at a q^g.

As an alternative interpretation of q^g, say we have a *rationality* functional $R(U, q_i)$ that measures how peaked any q_i is about $\text{argmax}_{x_i} U(x_i)$ for any $U : \xi_i \to \mathbb{R}$. We require that $R(U, q_i) = \beta$ if $q_i(\xi_i) \propto \mu(\xi_i) e^{-\beta U(\xi_i)}$, and that the q_i satisfying $R(U, q_i) = \beta$ that has maximal entropy is $\mu(\xi_i) e^{-\beta U(\xi_i)} / N_i(U)$. Now say we are told the $\{\beta_i^*\}$, the rationalities of the M players for their associated effective Hamiltonians $\{[h_{i,1}]_{i,q}\}$. Then the information-theoretic optimal estimate for the associated

q is the minimizer over q and the $\{\lambda_i\}$ of the free energy $\sum_i \lambda_i[f_i(R([h_{i,1}]_{i,q}, q_i)) - f_i(\beta_i^*)] - S(q)$ for any monotonically increasing functions $\{f_i\}$ [4]. At any local minimum of this free energy $q = q^g$ with $\beta_i = \beta_i^* \; \forall i$.

This use of rationality functionals expresses the bounded-rational solution to any non-team game as the minimizer of a single objective function whose local minima are all interior to $\mathcal{Q}$. As an illustration, choose $f_i(\beta)$ to be the ideal expected Hamiltonian $\partial_\beta \ln(N_i(\beta[h_{i,1}]_{i,q}))$, and $R(U, q_i) \equiv \text{argmin}_\beta \; KL(q_i \; || \; \frac{e^{-\beta U}}{N_i(\beta U)})$. For such a choice $f_i(R([h_{i,1}]_{i,q}, q_i))$ is the actual expected Hamiltonian, $\int dx_i \; q_i(x_i)[h_{i,1}]_{i,q}(x_i)$.

III. FINDING FIXED POINTS

When we have an $m = 1$ team game we can use variants of gradient descent to find minima of the (single) free energy. Another approach for such scenarios is parallel Brouwer updating. More generally, define the *free energy gap* at q for coordinate i as $\ln[N_i([h_i]_{i,q^g})] + \int dx_i q_i(x_i)[h_i]_{i,q^g}(x_i) + \int dx_i q_i(x_i) \ln \frac{q_i(x_i)}{\mu_i(x_i)}$. This is how much F_{h_i} is reduced if only q_i undergoes the Brouwer update. Define *serial* Brouwer updating as only updating one q_i at a time. In an $m = 1$ team game, any such update must reduce $F_{\beta H}(p)$, in contrast to the case with parallel Brouwer updating. In *greedy* serial Brouwer updating, instead of cycling through all i, at each iteration we update only the coordinate with the largest gap; this maximizes the free energy drop in that update.

A practical difficulty with these schemes for finding fixed points is that evaluating $[h_i]_{i,q^g}$ can be very difficult in large systems. An alternative is to use Monte Carlo simple sampling to get estimates of the effective Hamiltonians, and use those to update p. In this scheme, given a q at iteration t, each x_i is separately set by randomly sampling $q_i(t)$, thereby generating $x(t)$. Next the pair $(x_i(t), h_i(x(t)))$ is combined with previous pairs and the update rule to set $q_i(t+1)$, and then the process repeats.

To simplify the analysis, consider simple gradient descent of the free energy for the $m = 1$ team game. Have p be constant through each successive block of τ timesteps, updating only when we go from some block m to block $m + 1$, with the update based on observations during block m. Say we have a team game and are at a block-transition, $t = \tau m + 1$, and let $n_i(t) \in \nu_i(t)$ be all information the algorithm controlling q_i has at that time, including the associated Monte Carlo samples. So we have a posterior conditional distribution of possible gradient descent directions $P(\vec{F}^i_{H,\beta}(q(t)) \mid n_i(t))$, where $\vec{F}^i_{H,\beta}(q(t))$ is the components involving coordinate i of the projection onto $\mathcal{P}$ of the free energy gradient $\nabla F_{H,\beta}(q(t))$.

In gradient descent updating, that distribution should set the vector to add to $q_i(t)$ to get $q_i(t+1)$. More precisely, since agent i knows $q_i(t)$, presuming quadratic loss reflects quality of the update, the Bayes-optimal estimate of the gradient is the posterior expected gradient, $\int d[q_{(i)}(t)] \; P(q_{(i)}(t) \mid n_i) \times \vec{F}^i_{H,\beta}(q(t))$. Expanding, the x_i component of $\vec{F}^i_{H,\beta}(q)$ is $u_i(x_i) - \sum_{x_i} u_i(x_i)/|\xi_i|$, where $u_i(x_i) \equiv \beta[H]_{i,q^g}(x_i) + \ln[q(x_i)]$. Rather than evaluate the integral of $[H]_{i,q^g}(\xi_i)$, we can use a maximum likelihood estimator, i.e., replace that integral with $(\hat{H})_{i,n_i}(\xi_i)$, the average of the observed H values over the τ_{x_i} instances (of the just-completed block) when $\xi_i = x_i$.

Unfortunately, often in very large systems the convergence of $(\hat{H})_{i,n_i}(\xi_i)$ is very slow, since the distribution sampled by the Monte Carlo to produce n_i is very broad. To address this, posit that the differences $\{(\hat{H})_{i,q^g}(x_i) - (\hat{H})_{i,q^g}(x_i'), \;\; x_i, x_i' \in \xi_i\}$ are unchanged when one replaces H with some h_i. This means that q_i(t) is unchanged by that replacement. The set of all h_i guaranteed to have this character, regardless of the form of $q(x_i, \xi_{(i)})$, is the set of all *difference Hamiltonians*, $h_i(\xi) = H(\xi) - D_i(\xi_{(i)})$ for some function D_i. Now across block m we are sampling $P(h_i(\xi))$ to generate n_i, and then evaluating $(\hat{h_i})_{i,n_i}(x_i)$. The associated variances of values (one for each of the x_i), $\text{Var}((\hat{h_i})_{i,\nu_i}(x_i))$, govern the accuracy of the estimate of the free energy gradient. For well-chosen D_i these variances may be far smaller than when $h_i = H$. In particular, if the number of coordinates coupled to ξ_i through H does not grow as the system does, often such difference Hamiltonian variances will not grow much with system size, whereas the variances $\text{Var}(\hat{H}_{i,\nu_i}(x_i))$ will grow greatly. Furthermore, very often such a difference Hamiltonian is far easier to evaluate than is H, due to cancellation in subtracting D_i.

More precisely, for practical reasons we want i's update algorithm to be robust against misperception of $q_{(i)}$. So for quadratic loss, assuming no $\tau_{x_i} = 0$, consider the h_i minimizing $\int dq_{(i)} \; P(q_{(i)}) [\int dn_i^u P(n_i^u \mid n_i^{\xi_i}, q_{(i)}, h_i) \{\vec{F}^i_H(q(\xi)) - \hat{F}^i_{n_i}(q_i)\}^2]$, where $P(q_{(i)})$ reflects any prior information we might have concerning $q_{(i)}$ (e.g., that it is likely that the associated $\vec{F}^i_H(q)$ is close to that estimated for the previous block of τ steps). Here $\hat{F}^i_{n_i}(q_i)$ is our estimator for $\vec{F}^i_{\beta H}(q)$, and n_i^u is the Hamiltonian values contained in n_i, the associated ξ_i values, $n_i^{\xi_i}$, being independent of h_i and $q_{(i)}$ and therefore fixed.

The inner integral is a sum, of the (square of the) bias $\hat{F}^i(q_i) - \vec{F}^i_H(q)$ with the variance, $\int dn_i^u P(n_i^u \mid n_i^{\xi_i}, q_{(i)}, h_i) \;\; \{\hat{F}^i_{n_i}(q_i) - \hat{F}^i(q_i)\}^2$, where $\hat{F}^i(q_i) \equiv \int dn_i^u P(n_i^u \mid n_i^{\xi_i}, q_{(i)}, h_i) \hat{F}^i_{n_i}(q_i)$. By only considering difference utilities we guarantee that the bias equals 0. Now expand our variance of vectors as a sum of variances of scalars, one for each value x_i. Since n_i is IID generated that sum is $\frac{|\xi_i|-1}{|\xi_i|} \sum_{x_i} \text{Var}((\hat{h_i})_{i,\nu_i}(x_i))/\tau_{x_i}$. The difference Hamiltonian minimizing this is $H(s) - \sum_{x_i'} \frac{\tau_{x_i'}^{-1}}{\sum_{x_i''} \tau_{x_i''}^{-1}} H(x_i', x_{(i)})$ [9]. (If all the terms in this sum cannot be stored because $|\xi_i|$ is too large, then $n_i^{\xi_i}$ must be averaged over as well, which can be approximated by

replacing the τ_{x_i} with $q(x_i)\tau$.) Being independent of $q_{(i)}$, this Hamiltonian minimizes our $q_{(i)}$ integral, regardless of $P(q_{(i)})$. For the same reason it is optimal if if the integral is replaced by a worst-case bound over $q_{(i)}$.

An extensive series of experiments have been conducted with this optimal Hamiltonian under the approximation of uniform $q(x_i)$, and under the approximation that $\tau_{x_i} = 0$ for one and only one x_i value. These experiments compared this Hamiltonian with the team game, for many different H, under a variant of the parallel Brouwer update rule [8, 11] that crudely corrected for non-stationarity. In that work these algorithms were semi-formally justified as ways to minimize H, with no appreciation for free energy, self-consistency, or the like. Indeed, due to the nonlinearity of the Brouwer update rule's dependence on $[h_i]_{i,q^g}$, bad distortions may arise with the update used in that previous work, $q(x_i) \rightarrow e^{-\beta E(h_i|n_i,\xi_i=x_i)} / \sum_{x'_i} e^{-\beta E(h_i|n_i,\xi_i=x_i)}$. Also, there are no known assurances that small $\mathrm{Var}(h_i \mid n_i, \xi_i = x_i)$ result in more accurate updating with parallel Brouwer updating, even when that updating is done correctly. Despite these shortcomings, in the experiments in [8, 11] the approximations to the optimal Hamiltonian minimized H up to orders of magnitude faster than team games, with the improvement growing with problem size.

IV. AVOIDING LOCAL MINIMA

Say we have an $m = 1$ team game, are ultimately interested in annealing β, and are currently at a local minimum $q^H \in \mathcal{Q}$ of the shared free energy. Then to break out of that minimum we can simply raise β and restart the updating, since we want to raise β anyway, and in general doing so will change the F_H so that the Lagrange gaps become nonzero.

A way to break free without changing the free energies is to switch to a coordinate system Ξ^2 for ξ, and thereby change $\mathcal{P}$. As an example, Ξ^2 can join two components of ξ into an aggregate coordinate. Since we can now have statistical dependencies between those two components, the ξ^2 space product distributions map to a superset of $\mathcal{P}$. In general the local minima of that superset do not coincide with local minima of $\mathcal{P}$.

Less trivially, say $\xi^2 = \xi$, and $\xi(.)$ is the identity map for all but a few components, indicated as indices $1 \rightarrow n$. Have $\xi(.)$ be a bijection, so that for any fixed $x^2_{n+1\rightarrow M} = x_{n+1\rightarrow M}$, the effect of the coordinate transformation is merely to "shuffle" the associated mapping taking coordinates $1 \rightarrow n$ to ζ. Say we have a $m = 1$ team game, and set $q^{\xi^2}_{n+1\rightarrow M} = q^{\xi}_{n+1\rightarrow M}$. This means we can estimate the expectations of βH conditioned on possible $x^2_{1\rightarrow n}$ from the Monte Carlo samples conditioned on $\xi(x^2_{1\rightarrow n})$. So for any $\xi(.)$ we can estimate $E(H)$ as $\int dx^2_{1\rightarrow n} p^{\xi^2}(x^2_{1\rightarrow n}) E(H \mid \xi(x^2_{1,\ldots,n}))$. Now entropy is the sum of the entropy of coordinates $n+1 \rightarrow M$ plus that of coordinates $1 \rightarrow n$. Accordingly, for any choice of $\xi(.)$ and $q^{\xi^2}_{1\rightarrow n}$, we can approximate L^{ξ}_H as (our associated estimate of) $E(H)$ minus the entropy of $p^{\xi^2}_{1\rightarrow n}$, minus a constant unaffected by choice of $\xi(.)$.

So for finite and small enough $|\xi_{1\rightarrow n}|$, we can use our estimates $E(H \mid \xi(x^2_{1\rightarrow n}))$ to search for the "shuffling" $\xi(.)$ and distribution $q^{\xi^2}_{1\rightarrow n}$ that minimizes L^{ξ}_H (penalizing by the bias^2 plus variance expression if we intend to do more Monte Carlo). The search can involve a series of free energy descents over $\xi^2_{1\rightarrow n}$ for each possible $\xi(.)$, or use cruder heuristics, like having $q^{\xi^2}_{1\rightarrow n} = q^{\xi}_{1\rightarrow n}$, and only varying $\xi(.)$. Not only should this coordinate transformation lower the free energy, it should also result in a new surface through $\mathcal{P}^\dagger$ that is no longer at a local minimum. More generally, for arbitrary ξ^2 we can bound $F_{\xi^2} \geq F_{\xi^1} \geq F_{\xi^2} - \max_{x^1} [\ln(\sum_{x^2} \delta_{\xi^1(x^2),x^1})]$ (and similarly for uncountable ξ^2). So if after switching to ξ^2 we can then reduce F_{ξ^2} to less than the value F_{ξ^1} had when we made the switch, then we know we have also reduced F_{ξ^1} to below that pre-switch value. An upper bound on the how large that drop in F_{ξ^2} needs to be is $\max_{x^1} [\ln(\sum_{x^2} \delta_{\xi^1(x^2),x^1})]$.

I would like to thank Chiu Fan Lee, Bill Macready, and Stefan Bieniawski for helpful discussion.

[1] R.J. Aumann and S. Hart. *Handbook of Game Theory with Economic Applications*. North-Holland Press, 1992.

[2] D. Challet and N. F. Johnson. Optimal combinations of imperfect objects. *Phys. Rev. Let.*, 89:028701, 2002.

[3] G. Korniss et al. *Science*, 299:677, 2003.

[4] E. T. Jaynes. Information theory and statistical mechanics. *Physical Review*, 106:620, 1957.

[5] H. Nishimori. *Statistical physics of spin glasses and information processing*. Oxford University Press, 2001.

[6] C. Peterson and J. R. Anderson. A mean-field theory learning algorithm for neural networks. *Complex Systems*, 1:995, 1987.

[7] E. W. Piotrowski and J. Sladkowski. An invitation to quantum game theory. /quant-ph/0211191, 2002.

[8] D. Wolpert and K. Tumer. Beyond mechanism design. In H. Gao et al., editor, *International Congress of Mathematicians 2002 Proceedings*. Qingdao Publishing, 2002.

[9] D. H. Wolpert. Theory of collective intelligence. In K. Tumer and D. H. Wolpert, editors, *Collectives and the Design of Complex Systems*, New York, 2003. Springer.

[10] D. H. Wolpert, K. Tumer, and E. Bandari. Improving search by using intelligent coordinates. 2003. submitted.

[11] D. H. Wolpert, K. Wheeler, and K. Tumer. Collective intelligence for control of distributed dynamical systems. *Europhysics Letters*, 49(6), March 2000.