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Abstract

Learning to differentiate model distributions from observed data is a fundamental problem in statistics and machine learning, and high-dimensional data remains a challenging setting for such problems. Metrics that quantify the disparity in probability distributions, such as the Stein discrepancy, play an important role in statistical testing in high dimensions. In this paper, we consider the setting where one wishes to distinguish between data sampled from an unknown probability distribution and a nominal model distribution. While recent studies revealed that the optimal $L^2$-regularized Stein critic equals the difference of the score functions of two probability distributions up to a multiplicative constant, we investigate the role of $L^2$ regularization when training a neural network Stein discrepancy critic function. Motivated by the Neural Tangent Kernel theory of training neural networks, we develop a novel staging procedure for the weight of regularization over training time. This leverages the advantages of highly-regularized training at early times while also empirically delaying overfitting. Theoretically, we relate the training dynamic with large regularization weight to the kernel regression optimization of “lazy training” regime in early training times. The benefit of the staged $L^2$ regularization is demonstrated on simulated high dimensional distribution drift data and an application to evaluating generative models of image data.
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1 Introduction

Understanding the discrepancy between probability distributions is a central problem in machine learning and artificial intelligence. In training generative models, learning to minimize such a discrepancy can be used to construct a probability density model given observed data, such as in the case of generative adversarial networks (GANs) trained to minimize $f$-divergences [26], Wasserstein GANs [1], and score matching techniques [18, 28]. Generally, GANs and other generative models require discriminative critics to distinguish between data and a distribution [9]; such critics have the ability to localize the departure between model and reality. Recent developments in the training of generative models have facilitated advancements in out-of-distribution detection [12], in which such models learn to predict higher-likelihood for in-distribution samples. There exists a wide array of integral probability metrics that quantify distances on probability distributions [29], including the Stein discrepancy [10].

Implicit in the minimization of the discrepancy between a model distribution and observed data is the concept of goodness-of-fit (GoF). In this and the closely related two-sample test problem, the goal of the
analysis is to approximate and estimate the discrepancy between two probability distributions. Integral probability metrics are widely used for such problems. For example, Reproducing Kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD) [14], a kernel-based approach, is used for two-sample testing among other testing tasks. Kernels parameterized by deep neural networks have been adopted recently in [23] to improve the testing power. For GoF tests, where the task is to detect the departure of an unknown distribution of observed data from a model distribution, methods using the Stein discrepancy metric have been developed. The Stein discrepancy is also calculated using kernel methods [24, 25, 6] and more recently using deep neural network-aided techniques [13]. We provide more background information related to the Stein discrepancy and its role in GoF testing in Section 1.1.

In the field of machine learning, there exists a wide array of modern generative model architectures. Energy-based models (EBMs) are a particularly useful subset of generative models. Such models can be described by an energy function which describes a probability density up to a normalizing constant [31]. While such models provide flexibility in the representation of a probability density, the normalizing constant (which requires an integration over the energy function to compute) is required to compute the likelihood of data given the model. The Stein discrepancy provides a metric to evaluate EBMs without knowledge of this normalization constant [13]. Another popular class of generative model is flow-based models [7, 8]. Flow-based modeling approaches, such as RealNVP and Glow [21], provide reversible and efficient transformations representing complex distributions, yielding simple computation of log-likelihood. In Section 2.5, we outline our approach for evaluating generative EBM models using neural Stein critics.

In this paper, we introduce a method for learning the Stein discrepancy via a novel staged regularization strategy when training neural network Stein critics. Past studies have enforced square integrability of neural Stein critics by using a fixed-weight regularization term in the training objective [16]. Our study reveals the benefit of softening the impact of this regularization over the course of training, yielding critics which fit more quickly at early times followed by stable convergence with weaker regularization. Figures 1(A)-(C) illustrate the fact that the target critic changes in magnitude throughout training as the weight of regularization is decreased, while Figures 1(D)-(F) show the rough approximation of the optimum at early times followed by more nuanced changes in the later stages of training. This method yields critics which provide model comparison capabilities that assess the accuracy of a model’s approximation of reality, allowing for the localization of the departure in distribution. While the neural network Stein critic learns a map from \( \mathbb{R}^d \) to \( \mathbb{R}^d \), we theoretically show the connection to Neural Tangent Kernel (NTK) theory of neural network optimization [19], in the early stage of training and particularly when the regularization weight is large. The proposed staging algorithm of the \( L^2 \)-regularization is naturally motivated by the so-called “lazy training” regime of neural networks [4], which approximately solves a kernel regression problem using the NTK at the initial time. In summary, the contributions of the current work are as follows:

- We introduce a new method for training neural Stein critics which incorporates a staging of the weight of the \( L^2 \) regularization over the process of mini-batch training.
- We connect our staging approach to the lazy-training theory of Neural Tangent Kernels, providing a theoretical basis for the improved performance of our technique.
- Using the proposed training scheme, we experimentally demonstrate the improved capability of the neural Stein critic to learn the optimal critic function, exhibiting improvements in GoF testing power on simulated data and in the application of evaluating generative models of image data.
Figure 1: Visualization of staged $L^2$ regularization throughout training. In (A)-(C), the neural Stein critic function $f(x, \theta)$ is compared to the optimal critic $f^*(x)$ \cite{5}. The target critic function changes scale through training as the weight of regularization is decreased. In (D)-(F), the scaleless neural Stein critic $f^{(\lambda)}(x)$ \cite{10} is compared to the scaleless optimal critic $f^*(x)$ \cite{9}. The critic roughly approximates the optimum at early times, followed by fine-tuned changes in the later epochs of training.

1.1 Background: Stein Discrepancy and Goodness-of-Fit tests

We first review the needed background information of the Stein Discrepancy and then introduce the preliminaries of GoF testing.

1.1.1 Stein Discrepancy

The recent works in the area of learning the Stein discrepancy using neural networks are grounded in the theory of Stein’s operator, the study of which dates back to statistical literature of the 1970s. Specifically, let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a domain, and we consider probability distributions on $\mathcal{X}$ with differentiable densities which vanish at the boundary of the domain, denoting such a class of densities as $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. For $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and any sufficiently regular vector field $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, the Stein operator $T_p$ is defined as

$$T_p f(x) = s_p(x) \cdot f(x) + \nabla \cdot f(x),$$

(1)
where $s_p$ is the score function of $q$ defined as $s_q = \nabla_q q$. Stein’s identity \cite{30} gives that

$$E_{x \sim p} \left[ T_p f(x) \right] = 0. \tag{2}$$

One may define the Stein discrepancy \cite{10} to measure the difference between two distributions $p$ and $q$:

$$S = \sup_{f \in F} E_{x \sim p} \left[ T_q f(x) \right]. \tag{3}$$

A common approach is to allow $F$ to be the unit ball associated with an RKHS, yielding the kernelized Stein discrepancy (KSD) \cite{24, 6}. A pitfall of using the KSD approach is that an RKHS is often too restrictive a function space, especially in high dimension \cite{11}. The chief benefit of the neural network Stein critic in our approach is that it expands relatively restrictive RKHS’s to $L^2$, a generally larger space of functions \cite{16}.

1.1.2 Goodness-of-Fit tests

By Stein’s identity, the (population) Stein discrepancy will be zero when $p = q$. Therefore, a chief utility of a neural Stein critic is in the setting of GoF hypothesis testing, which we briefly review in this section. In GoF testing, we are presented with a sample from an unknown probability distribution $p$ and we wish to assess whether this sample is likely to have come from the “model” distribution $q$. That is, we may define the null and alternative hypotheses as follows:

$$H_0 : p = q \quad H_1 : p \neq q. \tag{4}$$

A GoF test is conducted using a test statistic $\hat{T}$ which is computed using the sample from the unknown distribution $p$. Using $n_{\text{boot}}$ bootstrapped samples from the model distribution $q$, the distribution of the test statistic can be constructed under $H_0$. The null hypothesis is rejected if $\hat{T} > \hat{T}_{\text{thresh}}$, where the threshold $\hat{T}_{\text{thresh}}$ is computed using the distribution of the test statistic under $H_0$. This is often selected to control the Type-I error, which is $P[\hat{T} > \hat{T}_{\text{thresh}}]$ under $H_0$. Similarly, the Type-II error is $P[\hat{T} \leq \hat{T}_{\text{thresh}}]$ under $H_1$: the probability that the null hypothesis is improperly accepted as true. Finally, the power is defined as one minus the Type-II error.

In view of the GoF test statistic, the current work develops a test statistic computed using a Stein critic parameterized and learned by a neural network, computed via a training-testing split of the dataset. The details will be introduced in Section 2.4.

1.2 Related works

The Stein discrepancy has seen great utility in recent years \cite{10}. For example, in the field of generative modeling, diffusion kernel Stein discrepancy has been used to unify score matching with minimum Stein discrepancy estimators \cite{2}. In the GoF testing scenario, a kernel Stein discrepancy (KSD) approach has allowed for closed-form computation of the discrepancy metric \cite{24, 6}. Similar metrics have been used in the GoF setting, such as the finite set Stein discrepancy (FSSD), which behaves as the KSD but can be computed in linear time \cite{20}. Our work extends these by leveraging deep neural networks, expanding the function space $F$, thereby permitting a more discriminative metric \cite{16}.

Recent studies have expanded on kernelized approaches to computing the Stein discrepancy, computing the Stein discrepancy by directly learning the Stein critic function using neural networks, for example in
the training of high-quality samplers from un-normalized densities [10]. The discrepancy computed using a learned Stein critic is known as the learned Stein discrepancy (LSD), and has also been applied to the GoF hypothesis test setting to evaluate EBMs [13]. These methods impose a square integrability ($L^2$) constraint on the neural network using a regularization term applied to the training objective. The optimal critic associated with this method yields a Stein discrepancy which is equivalent to the Fisher divergence and provides an additional benefit in that the critic can be used as a diagnostic tool to identify regions of poor fit [16]. The staging method we introduce is an extension of previous neural Stein critic training approaches, yielding an improvement upon past techniques used to learn the $L^2$-penalized critic.

Many methods have been developed to train and evaluate generative models without knowledge of the likelihood of a model. Early works used the method of Score Matching, which minimizes the difference in score function between the data and model distributions using a proxy objective [18]. Methods building on this approach are known as score-based methods. Score-based methods include approaches which can estimate the normalizing constant for computation of likelihoods, as in the case of Noise-Contrastive Estimation [15], and can conduct score matching using deep networks with robust samplers, as in the case of Noise Conditional Score Networks with Langevin sampling [28]. Our approach potentially provides a more efficient training scheme to obtain discriminative Stein discrepancy critics, which then leads to a metric representing the discrepancy between distributions. We also experimentally observe that the trained Stein critic function serves to indicate the differential regions between distributions of high dimensional data.

The current paper also utilizes understandings developed by Neural Tangent Kernel (NTK) theory [19] of neural network training. Particularly, we utilize ideas surrounding the “lazy training” phenomenon of over-parameterized deep networks, suggesting the loss through training of such networks decays rapidly with very little change to the parameters of the network, exhibiting a kernel regression optimization dynamic [4]. Similar to recent applications of the neural Stein critic, the NTK neural network training has been utilized in computing neural network MMD for two-sample testing [3]. As for when neural network training falls under the lazy training regime, [4] argued that it depends on a choice of scaling of the network mapping in computing the mean-squared loss. Algorithm-wise, we adopt a staging of the weight of $L^2$ regularization, which can utilize the NTK kernel learning regime at early periods of training and can also go beyond kernel learning at later phases.

## 2 Method

### 2.1 Learning the Stein critic

In learning the critic function of the Stein discrepancy, we impose a square integrability ($L^2$) constraint on the function. To achieve this, the critic function $f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is modeled by a neural network with parameters $\theta$ defined over $x \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For such a function, we denote the quantity inside the supremum in (3) as follows:

$$ SD[f] = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p} [T_q f(x)] , $$

known as the learned Stein discrepancy (LSD). Given regularization weight $\lambda$, the critic network $f(\cdot, \theta)$ is trained to minimize the following objective:

$$ L_\lambda(\theta) = -SD[f] + \frac{\lambda}{2} R[f] , \quad R[f] := \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p} \|f(x)\|_2^2 . $$
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The first term is the negative Stein discrepancy and the second term serves to regularize the $L^2$ norm of critic $f$ in $(X, p(x)dx)$. The Stein critic can be learned by maximizing a finite-sample representation of the objective in Equation (6). Given $n_{\text{train}}$ training samples $x_i \sim p$, the loss may be computed as follows:

$$\hat{L}_\lambda(\theta) = -\sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{train}}} T_q f(x_i) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{train}}} \|f(x_i)\|_2^2.$$  

(7)

Theorem 4.1 of [16] reveals that the minimizer of Equation (6) has the following form:

$$f^*_\lambda = \frac{1}{\lambda}(s_q - s_p).$$  

(8)

Suppose the trained critic function $f(\cdot, \theta)$ approximates $f^*_\lambda$, then both $f(\cdot, \theta)$ and the value of SD scale like $1/\lambda$, the reciprocal weight of regularization.

### 2.2 Staged-$\lambda$ regularization in training

In Section 2.1 it has been shown that the $\lambda$-optimal neural Stein critic function $f^*_\lambda$ carries with it a factor of $1/\lambda$. We instead define a scaleless version of this optimal critic function, denoted

$$f^* = \lambda f^*_\lambda = s_q - s_p.$$  

(9)

The neural Stein critic $f(\cdot, \theta)$ trained to maximize the objective in Equation (6) also scales like $1/\lambda$, and thus $\lambda f(\cdot, \theta)$ acts to approximate Equation (9). We thus define

$$f^{(\lambda)}(x) := \lambda f(x, \theta)$$  

(10)

to be the scaleless neural Stein critic, which is comparable to the optimal critic $f^*$. With this in mind, we define a $\lambda$-agnostic training objective $L_0$:

$$L_0[f] = -\text{SD}[f] + \frac{1}{2} \text{R}[f],$$  

(11)

which yields a minimizer that approximates the scaleless optimal critic in Equation (9). This is related to the $\lambda$-scaled objective in Equation (6) in the following manner:

$$L_\lambda(\theta) = \frac{1}{\lambda} L_0[\lambda f(\cdot, \theta)],$$  

(12)

where $f(\cdot, \theta)$ is the neural network parameterized critic function mapping from $X$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$.

We develop a log-linear staged regularization scheme by which we decrease $\lambda$ via application of a multiplicative factor after each epoch of training. This staging scheme uses three parameters: the initial weight $\lambda_{\text{init}}$, the decay factor $\beta$, and the terminal weight $\lambda_{\text{term}}$ (at which point the decay ceases). We denote the discrete-time regularization staging with these parameters as $\Lambda(t|\lambda_{\text{init}}, \lambda_{\text{term}}, \beta)$ for $t \in [0, 1, \ldots, n_{\text{epochs}}]$, where time $t$ denotes the end of the $t$th epoch and $n_{\text{epochs}}$ is the number of epochs of training. Explicitly, $t = 0$ refers to time before training has begun ($\Lambda(0) = \lambda_{\text{init}}$) and:

$$\Lambda(t|\lambda_{\text{init}}, \lambda_{\text{term}}, \beta) = \max (\lambda_{\text{init}} \cdot \beta^t, \lambda_{\text{term}}).$$  

(13)
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This staging of $\lambda$ through training exploits the $\lambda$-agnostic perspective of the training objective relation in Equation (12), whereby the base objective in Equation (11) is optimized via $\lambda$-dependent $L_\lambda$.

In Section 3, we discuss the advantages of beginning with large regularization weight $\lambda$. We employ a staging of the regularization weight $\lambda$ that begins with large $\lambda$ to encourage large changes in early training followed by fine-tuning of the critic network at later stages. In short, at early times with large regularization weight $\lambda$, the training of the neural Stein critic can be approximately understood from the perspective of kernel regression optimization, rapidly reaching its best approximation in $O(1/\lambda)$ time (see Theorem 3.1).

2.3 Mean-squared error of learned critics

Consider a neural Stein critic trained to minimize Equation (6) denoted $f(\cdot, \theta)$ which maps $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$. Recall via Equation (9), given a choice of regularization weight $\lambda$, the scaleless neural Stein critic $f^{(\lambda)}$ approximates the scaleless optimal critic $f^*$ throughout training. To quantify difference between the scaleless trained critic $f^{(\lambda)}$ and the scaleless optimal critic $f^*$, we define the mean-squared error with respect to probability density $p$ as follows:

$$\text{MSE}_p[f] = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p} \left\| f^{(\lambda)}(x) - f^*(x) \right\|_2^2.$$  (14)

The following theorem relates the MSE to the training objective of the neural Stein critic network.

**Theorem 2.1.** Given model probability distribution $q$ and data probability distribution $p$, and given a neural Stein critic network $f(\cdot, \theta)$ trained using the objective in Equation (6) and scaleless optimal critic function $f^*$ via Equation (9), the mean-squared error between the trained critic and the scaleless optimal critic satisfies the following relation:

$$\text{MSE}_p[f] = 2\lambda \left( -\text{SD}[f] + \frac{\lambda}{2} \text{R}[f] \right) + C_{p,q},$$  (15)

where $C_{p,q}$ is a constant depending only upon the distributions $p$ and $q$.

See Section 6 for the proof. Given a sample of $n_{\text{val}}$ validation data $x_i \sim p$, we can compute the finite-sample approximation of the MSE$_p$ metric up to an additive constant:

$$\widehat{\text{MSE}}_{p}[f] = \frac{2\lambda}{n_{\text{val}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{val}}} \left( -T_q f(x_i) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \| f(x_i) \|_2^2 \right).$$  (16)

Alternatively, in settings wherein we have direct access to the scaleless optimal critic $f^*$ and given a size $n_{\text{mse}}$ sample $x_i \sim q$, we can directly estimate the MSE$_q$ metric:

$$\widehat{\text{MSE}}_{q}[f] = \frac{1}{n_{\text{mse}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{mse}}} \left\| f^{(\lambda)}(x_i) - f^*(x_i) \right\|_2^2.$$  (17)

Over the course of training, we may use the $\widehat{\text{MSE}}_{q}$ as a monitor of the progress using $n_{\text{mse}}$ samples from $q$. While Equation (17) provides a “ground truth” measure of performance, we can still compute Equation (16) in settings where we do not have knowledge of the scaleless optimal critic network $f^*$. 


Goodness-of-Fit testing

We consider the setting in which we can sample from a probability distribution \( q \) supported on \( X \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) and have access to its score function \( s_q \). Given a critic function \( f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \) and a finite sample of data \( x_i \sim p \) of \( n_{\text{test}} \) number of samples, one may compute the test statistic

\[
\hat{T} = \frac{1}{n_{\text{test}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{test}}} T_q f(x_i). \tag{18}
\]

Note that this is a finite-sample approximation of the Stein discrepancy operator applied to \( f \). To assess the null hypothesis of Equation (4), we sample \( n_{\text{boot}} \) number of bootstrapped sets from the distribution \( q \), each having \( n_{\text{test}} \) samples. We construct a distribution of \( n_{\text{boot}} \) realizations of the test statistic \( (18) \) under the null hypothesis which, for appropriately trained neural Stein critic \( f \), should be a centered distribution. Finally, the null hypothesis may be rejected if the test statistic evaluated over the sample of \( n_{\text{test}} \) samples from \( p \) exceeds the \((1 - \alpha)\) quantile of the null test statistic distribution, where \( \alpha \) is chosen to control the Type-I error of the GoF test. To estimate the test power of a particular method, we sample \( n_{\text{runs}} \) number of samples from \( p \) (each having size \( n_{\text{test}} \)), performing the GoF test \( n_{\text{runs}} \) times.

Evaluation of EBM generative models

We also consider the application of the Stein discrepancy in evaluating generative models. The Stein discrepancy learned using a scaleless neural Stein critic (10) can be used as an evaluation metric for the difference between the model distribution \( q \) and the unknown data distribution \( p \). In the case of EBMs, the model probability density defined over \( x \in X \) has the following form:

\[
q(x) = \frac{\exp(-E_\phi(x))}{Z} \tag{19}
\]

for normalizing constant \( Z \) and real-valued energy function \( E_\phi(x) \) parameterized by \( \phi \), which e.g. is a neural network. The score function of \( q \) therefore depends only upon the gradient of the energy function:

\[
s_q = -\nabla E_\phi(x), \tag{20}
\]

which can be computed from the parameterized form of \( E_\phi(x) \). In the case that the energy function is represented by a deep generative neural network, the gradient (20) can be computed by back-propagation, which is compatible with the auto-differentiation implementation of widely-used deep network platforms. In practice, the evaluation metric of a trained EBM can be computed on a holdout validation dataset.

Below we give the expression of the score function for Gaussian-Bernoulli Restricted Boltzmann Machines (RBMs), which are a specific type of EBM [5]. As has been derived in [13], the energy of an RBM with latent Bernoulli variable \( h \) is defined as follows:

\[
E(x,h|B,b,c) = \frac{1}{2} x^T Bh - b^T x - c^T h + \frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2. \tag{21}
\]

Therefore, the score function has the following form:

\[
s_q(x) = b - x + B \cdot \tanh(B^T x + c). \tag{22}
\]
In Section 4.3, we evaluate Gaussian-Bernoulli RBMs using a Stein discrepancy test computed via neural Stein critic functions, and we also compare trained critics using different regularization strategies.

3 Theoretical connection to lazy training

In this section we show the connection between lazy learning and choosing large $L^2$ penalty weight $\lambda$. We assume $s_q$ is accessible, the score of data distribution $s_p$ is unknown, and thus we aim to infer the optimal critic $f^*$ from data. Throughout this section, all the losses are in population form for simplicity. We derive the continuous-time optimization dynamics of gradient descent, which reveals the large sample and small learning rate limit of the minibatch-based stochastic gradient descent methods used in practice. All the proofs are in Section 6.

3.1 Evolution of network critic under gradient descent

Consider a neural Stein critic $f(\cdot, \theta)$ parameterized by $\theta$ which maps $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$. We assume $\theta \in \Theta$, which is some bounded set in $\mathbb{R}^{M_{\Theta}}$, where $M_{\Theta}$ is the total number of trainable parameters. Recall that for regularization weight $\lambda > 0$, the training objective $L_\lambda(\theta)$ is defined as in (12). Suppose the neural network parameter $\theta$ evolving over training time is denoted as $\theta(t)$ for $t > 0$. The gradient descent (GD) dynamic is defined by

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} L_\lambda(\theta(t)), \tag{23}$$

starting from some initial value of $\theta(0)$. The following lemma gives the expression of (23).

Lemma 3.1. For $\lambda > 0$, the GD dynamic of $\theta(t)$ of minimizing $L_\lambda(\theta)$ can be written as

$$\dot{\theta}(t) = -\mathbb{E}_{x \sim p} \partial^2 f(x, \theta(t)) \cdot (\lambda f(x, \theta(t)) - f^*(x)). \tag{24}$$

Next, we derive the evolution of the network critic over time. We start by defining

$$u(x, t) := f(x, \theta(t)), \tag{25}$$

and by Chain Rule we have that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(x, t) = \langle \partial^2 f(x, \theta(t)), \dot{\theta}(t) \rangle_{\Theta}, \tag{26}$$

where the notation $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\Theta}$ stands for the inner-product in the space of $\Theta$, which is a finite-dimensional vector space. Combining Lemma 3.1 and (26) leads to the evolution equation of $u(x, t)$, and to describe that we introduce the definition of the finite-time (matrix) neural tangent kernel (NTK) $\hat{K}_t(x, x')$ as

$$\left[ \hat{K}_t(x, x') \right]_{ij} = \langle \partial_i^2 f_i(x, \theta(t)), \partial_j^2 f_j(x', \theta(t)) \rangle_{\Theta}, \quad i, j = 1, \cdots, d, \tag{27}$$

where $f_i$ denotes the $i$-th coordinate of $f$. With the notation of $\hat{K}_t(x, x')$ we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. The dynamic of $u(x, t)$ follows that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(x, t) = -\mathbb{E}_{x' \sim p} \hat{K}_t(x, x') \circ (\lambda u(x', t) - f^*(x')). \tag{28}$$
where $\circ$ stands for a matrix-vector multiplication.

3.2 Lazy-training dynamic by NTK approximation

Following the Neural Tangent Kernel theory, we consider the kernel $\mathbf{K}_i(x, x')$ defined in (27) at time zero, which is

$$[\mathbf{K}_0(x, x')]_{i,j} = \langle \partial_\theta f_i(x, \theta(0)), \partial_\theta f_j(x', \theta(0)) \rangle_\Theta, \quad i, j = 1, \ldots, d. \quad (29)$$

The kernel $\mathbf{K}_0(x, x')$ only depends on the initial network weights $\theta(0)$, which is usually random and independent from the data samples. We call $\mathbf{K}_0(x, x')$ the zero-time finite-width (matrix) NTK.

The NTK analysis of the neural network training suggests that under certain theoretical settings, the evolution dynamic of the network function for a short training time can be approximated by the kernel regression optimization - the so-called “lazy-training” dynamic - which can be expressed by replacing the finite-time NTK by the zero-time NTK. For the dynamic in (28), the lazy-training dynamic counterpart is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \tilde{u}(x, t) = -\mathbb{E}_{x' \sim p} \mathbf{K}_0(x, x') \circ (\lambda \tilde{u}(x', t) - f^*(x')). \quad (30)$$

For simplicity, one can assume that at initialization the network function is zero mapping, that is, both $u(x, 0)$ and $\tilde{u}(x, 0)$ are zero.

To analyze the dynamic of (30), we introduce the eigen-decomposition of the kernel in the next lemma. We first define the inner-product and 2-norm of vector fields on $(\mathcal{X}, p(x)dx)$ as the following: for $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}^d$, let

$$\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \rangle := \int_\mathcal{X} \mathbf{v}_k(x) \cdot \mathbf{w}_l(x)p(x)dx; \quad (31)$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^2(p)} := \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_p. \quad (32)$$

**Lemma 3.3.** Suppose the network function $f(x, \theta(0))$ as a mapping from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$ and its derivatives are squared integrable on $(\mathcal{X}, p(x)dx)$. The kernel $\mathbf{K}_0(x, x')$ on $(\mathcal{X}, p(x)dx)$ has a finite collection of $M$ eigen-functions $\mathbf{v}_k : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}^d$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$, associated with positive eigenvalues, in the sense that

$$\int_\mathcal{X} \mathbf{K}_0(x, x') \circ \mathbf{v}_k(x)p(x')dx' = \mu_k \mathbf{v}_k(x), \quad (33)$$

where $\mu_1 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_M > 0$, and the eigen-functions are ortho-normal, namely, $\langle \mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{v}_l \rangle_p = \delta_{kl}$.

The integrability of derivatives of the network function can be fulfilled under certain boundedness conditions of $\Theta$ or the law of $\theta(0)$, combined with boundedness of $\mathcal{X}$ or the sufficient decay condition of $p(x)dx$ on the domain $\mathcal{X}$. The finite rank of the kernel, as shown in the proof, is due to the fact that we use a neural network of finite-width. Our analysis may extend to NTK in the infinite-width limit which is taken in most NTK theory works, which is postponed here.

The optimization guarantee is obtained by assuming that the optimal critic $f^*$ has a significant projection on the eigen-space of the kernel $\mathbf{K}_0(x, x')$ associated with large eigenvalues, which is described by the following theorem. Suppose the neural network initialization induces a kernel $\mathbf{K}_0(x, x')$ which has eigenvalues of order $O(1)$ on $(\mathcal{X}, p(x)dx)$. Without loss of generality, we assume that largest eigenvalue $\mu_1 = 1$ (because otherwise one can re-parametrize the training time by a positive factor which is then equivalent to multiplying a positive constant to the kernel).
Theorem 3.1. Under the condition of Lemma 3.3 and notations as therein, suppose for \( \delta > 0 \) and some integer \( m \leq M \), \( f^* \) can be orthogonally decomposed into two parts \( f_1^* \) and \( f_2^* \) such that

\[
f^* = f_1^* + f_2^*, \quad f_1^* = \text{span}\{v_1, \cdots, v_m\}, \quad f_2^* \in \text{span}\{v_1, \cdots, v_m\}^\perp,
\]
and \( \mu_1 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_m \geq \delta > 0 \), where orthogonality is with respect to \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_p \). Then, starting from \( \bar{u}(x, 0) = 0 \), for all \( t > 0 \),

\[
\| \lambda \bar{u}(x, t) - f^* \|_{L^2(p)} \leq e^{-t\lambda \delta} \| f_1^* \|_{L^2(p)} + \| f_2^* \|_{L^2(p)}.
\]

In particular, if for some small \( \epsilon > 0 \), \( \| f_2^* \|_{L^2(p)} \leq \epsilon \| f^* \|_{L^2(p)} \), then we have

\[
\| \lambda \bar{u}(x, t) - f^* \|_{L^2(p)} \leq 2\epsilon \| f^* \|_{L^2(p)}, \quad \text{when} \quad t > \frac{1}{\lambda} \log(1/\epsilon).
\]

This shows that, under the NTK approximation, we expect the network critic \( \bar{u} \) to obtain kernel regression solution of the target vector field \( f^*/\lambda \) within \( 1/\lambda \) time. For large \( \lambda \), the target function is of order \( O(1/\lambda) \), and the \( O(1/\lambda) \) training time is also a short time. This means that the change of kernel may also be bounded to be small in the limit of large \( \lambda \). We thus conjecture that, with large value of \( \lambda \), the evolution dynamic (30) of the network function \( u(x, t) \) can be approximated by that of the lazy-training dynamic (30) of \( \bar{u}(x, t) \), which achieves its best approximation (characterized by kernel regression) of the target function \( f^*/\lambda \) within \( O(1/\lambda) \) time as shown in Theorem 3.1. The precise analysis is left to future work.

4 Experiments

In this section, we present numerical experiments applying the proposed neural Stein method on differentiating a data distribution \( p \) (from which we have access to a set of data samples) and a model distribution \( q \) (of which the score function is assumed to be known). We compare the proposed neural Stein method with staged regularization to that with fixed \( L^2 \) regularization, as well as a kernel Stein method previously developed in the literature.

In Sections 4.1 and 4.2, we consider a set of Gaussian mixture models for both \( p \) and \( q \). In Section 4.3, the data are sampled from the MNIST handwritten digits dataset [22], and the model distribution is a Gaussian-Bernoulli RBM neural network model. Codes to reproduce the results in this section can be found at the following repository: [https://github.com/mrepasky3/Staged_L2_Neural_Stein_Critics](https://github.com/mrepasky3/Staged_L2_Neural_Stein_Critics).

4.1 Gaussian Mixture data

4.1.1 Simulated datasets

We compare the performance of a variety of neural Stein critics in the scenario in which the distributions are bimodal, \( d \)-dimensional Gaussian mixtures, following an example studied in [23]. The model \( q \) has equally-weighted components with means \( \mu_1 = 0_d \) and \( \mu_2 = 0.5 \times 1_d \), both having identity covariance. The data distribution \( p \) has the following form:

\[
p = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho_1 & 0_{d-2}^T \\ \rho_1 & 1 & 0_{d-2}^T \\ 0_{d-2} & 0_{d-2} & I_{d-2} \end{bmatrix}) + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \begin{bmatrix} \omega_2^2 & \omega \rho_2 & 0_{d-2}^T \\ \omega \rho_2 & 1 & 0_{d-2}^T \\ 0_{d-2} & 0_{d-2} & I_{d-2} \end{bmatrix}), \tag{36}
\]
where $\rho_1 = -\rho_2$ represents the covariance shift with respect to the model distribution. We also introduce a parameter $\omega$ which scales the covariance matrix of the second component of the mixture. We examine this scenario in three settings of increasingly high dimension. In each setting of this section, we fix the parameters $\rho_1 = 0.5$ and $\omega = 0.8$.

### 4.1.2 Experimental setup

The goal of the experiment is to compare the neural Stein critics using fixed-$\lambda$ regularization strategies to staged regularization schemes. All trained critics in the Gaussian mixture settings are two-hidden-layer MLPs with Swish activation \cite{27}, where each hidden layer includes 512 hidden units. The weights of the linear layers of the models are initialized using the standard PyTorch weight initialization, and the biases of the linear layers are initialized as 0. The Adam optimizer using the default momentum parameters as defined by PyTorch was used for network optimization. The critics are trained using 2,000 samples from the data distribution $p$; the learning rate is fixed at $10^{-3}$ and the minibatch size is 200 samples. All models are trained for 60 epochs. For each choice of regularization strategy, we train 10 neural Stein critic networks.

Having knowledge of the score functions of both $p$ and $q$, we are able to compute the $\hat{\text{MSE}}_q$ \cite{16} using $n_{\text{mle}} = 20,000$ samples from the model $q$. Over the course of training, we also calculate $\hat{\text{MSE}}_p$ \cite{16} calculated on $n_{\text{cal}} = 1,000$ samples from the data distribution $p$. This validation metric is used to select the “best” model over the course of training, where the model has the lowest $\hat{\text{MSE}}_p$ value is selected. Having obtained a fit neural Stein critic using this validation scheme, we then perform the GoF hypothesis test power analysis as described in Section 2.2. For the experiments in this section, $n_{\text{boot}} = 500$, $n_{\text{runs}} = 500$, and $\alpha = 0.05$. That is, for each fit critic function, 500 GoF tests are performed, each having a bootstrap of 500 sets of $n_{\text{test}}$ samples from the model distribution $q$. We introduce the specifics of the experimental setup for Gaussian mixtures in 2D, 10D, and 25D below. Note that the divergence in the Stein operator calculation requires expensive computation in high dimensions. Following \cite{13}, we use Hutchinson’s unbiased estimator of the trace Jacobian \cite{17} when computing the Stein operator in greater than two dimensions throughout this paper.

- **2-dimensional mixture.** The selected fixed-$\lambda$ regularization strategies in 2 dimensions are $\lambda \in \{1 \times 10^{-3}, 1 \times 10^{-2}, 1 \times 10^{-1}, 1 \times 10^0\}$. We compare these fixed schemes to a few staged regularization strategies. Using the notation of Equation \cite{13}, these are the $\Lambda(1 \times 10^0, 5 \times 10^{-2}, 0.95)$ and $\Lambda(1 \times 10^0, 5 \times 10^{-2}, 0.90)$ staged regularization schemes. In 2D, the number of test samples for the GoF testing is $n_{\text{test}} = 75$.

- **10-dimensional mixture.** For this setting, we examine fixed $\lambda \in \{2.5 \times 10^{-4}, 1 \times 10^{-3}, 4 \times 10^{-3}, 1.6 \times 10^{-2}, 6.4 \times 10^{-2}, 2.56 \times 10^{-1}, 1.024 \times 10^0\}$. We analyze the staging schemes $\Lambda(5 \times 10^{-1}, 1 \times 10^{-3}, 0.80)$ and $\Lambda(5 \times 10^{-1}, 1 \times 10^{-3}, 0.85)$. For the GoF power analysis, we use $n_{\text{test}} = 200$ test samples from the data distribution $p$.

- **25-dimensional mixture.** The fixed regularization weights are selected as $\lambda \in \{2.5 \times 10^{-4}, 1 \times 10^{-3}, 4 \times 10^{-3}, 1.6 \times 10^{-2}, 6.4 \times 10^{-2}\}$. The staging schemes analyzed in this case are $\Lambda(4 \times 10^{-1}, 5 \times 10^{-4}, 0.80)$, $\Lambda(4 \times 10^{-1}, 5 \times 10^{-4}, 0.85)$, and $\Lambda(4 \times 10^{-1}, 5 \times 10^{-4}, 0.90)$. We use $n_{\text{test}} = 500$ test samples from the data distribution $p$ for the GoF tests in 25D.

### 4.1.3 Results

**2-dimensional mixture.** The value of $\hat{\text{MSE}}_q$ computed via Equation \cite{17} throughout training for all 2D critics can be seen in Figure 2(A), where the mean and standard deviation are plotted across the 10 networks for
Figure 2: \( \hat{\text{MSE}}_q \) results for the Gaussian mixture model settings in 2 dimensions (A), in 10 dimensions (B), and in 25 dimensions (C). In each case, 10 replica models are trained for 60 epochs using each regularization strategy; the mean and standard deviation are visualized over these 10 replicas. The legends indicate the value of \( \lambda \) corresponding to each curve, where \( \Lambda(\cdot) \) contains only the decay factor \( \beta \) for staged regularization, for brevity. We use \( \Lambda(1 \times 10^{0}, 5 \times 10^{-2}, \cdot) \) staging in 2D, \( \Lambda(5 \times 10^{-1}, 1 \times 10^{-3}, \cdot) \) in 10D, and \( \Lambda(4 \times 10^{-1}, 5 \times 10^{-4}, \cdot) \) in 25D. The advantage of staged regularization becomes more pronounced with increasing dimension.

We observe rapid descent in \( \hat{\text{MSE}}_q \) early in training for large \( \lambda \) and slower and steadier progress for small \( \lambda \). The staged regularization strategies exploit this rapid descent at early times, followed by steady late-stage training. Note, however, that the advantage of staging in 2 dimensions only yields a marginal benefit in MSE. In Figure 3, we visualize the critic vector field plotted through training for the \( \Lambda(1 \times 10^{0}, 5 \times 10^{-2}, 0.90) \) staging scheme. Rapid fitting of some regions can be seen at the beginning of training in Figure 3 (A), followed by more nuanced adjustments in Figures 3 (B) and 3 (C), resulting in a good fit to the theoretically optimal critic function in Figure 3 (D). Furthermore, consider the test power results displayed in Figure 4 (A). While the staged regularization cases have among the lowest \( \hat{\text{MSE}}_q \) values, higher testing power is achieved by the fixed-\( \lambda \) settings. For more detail regarding the 2-dimensional experiment, see Table A.1 in Appendix A, which shows the average GoF hypothesis testing power at the approximate “best” training epoch as chosen by finding the average lowest validation \( \hat{\text{MSE}}_p \) calculated using Equation (16). The table also displays the average \( \hat{\text{MSE}}_q \) as calculated by Equation (17) at the “best” epoch for each regularization scheme.

10-dimensional mixture. As in 2D, the \( \hat{\text{MSE}}_q \) is plotted for all critics over the course of training in Figure 2 (B). In higher dimension, the difference in using a wider range of regularization weights \( \lambda \) is more pronounced. Larger values result in networks which rapidly fit to a (relatively) poor representation of the optimal critic followed by dramatic overfitting. Smaller choices of fixed \( \lambda \) delay both phenomena, fitting to a critic which has lower value of \( \hat{\text{MSE}}_q \) at best. The staged regularization strategies exploit both types of training dynamic, descending in \( \hat{\text{MSE}}_q \) more rapidly than most fixed-\( \lambda \) strategies while achieving lower value (and hence better fit) than any fixed strategy, on average. Examining the results in Figure 3 (B), we find that the power of the \( \Lambda(5 \times 10^{-1}, 1 \times 10^{-3}, 0.80) \) regularization strategy exceeds (on average) that of all the fixed-\( \lambda \) strategies. More detail related to the networks obtained via validation can be found in Table A.2 in Appendix A.

25-dimensional mixture. As in the previous settings, the \( \hat{\text{MSE}}_q \) computed via Equation (17) is plotted in
Figure 3: A visualization of the scaleless trained Stein critic function $f^{(λ)}$ defined as in Equation (10) throughout training, where we use the $Λ(1 \times 10^0, 5 \times 10^{-2}, 0.90)$ staging strategy in the 2-dimensional Gaussian mixture setting. In (A), the critic quickly approximates some regions in the first epoch, whereas in (B) and (C) the critic makes smaller adjustments throughout the domain, creating an approximation of the scaleless optimal critic function (9) pictured in (D).

Figure 2 (C) for the 25D regularization strategies. The observed trend of increasing the dimension from 2 to 10 is further exemplified by the increase to 25 dimensions. The larger choices of fixed $λ$ result in networks that quickly obtain a poor fit of the optimal critic, followed by overfitting. The smaller choices of fixed $λ$ yield more stable $\hat{\text{MSE}}_q$ curves. Combining these dynamics in our staging strategies, the $\hat{\text{MSE}}_q$ performance gap between fixed- and staged-$λ$ regularization dramatically increases, where the staged strategies substantially outperform the fixed strategies. Figure 4 (C) further corroborates this finding. The GoF hypothesis test power of the staged critics is dramatically higher than any fixed-$λ$ training strategy. See Table A.3 in Appendix A for more detail pertaining to trained networks in 25D.

In the simulated Gaussian mixture setting, we find that staging the regularization of the neural Stein critic throughout training yields greater benefit as the dimension increases from 2 to 25. The critic rapidly fits to the scaleless optimal critic (9) at early times when $λ$ is large, followed by stable convergence to a low-$\hat{\text{MSE}}_q$ critic throughout training. Furthermore, we find that the GoF hypothesis testing power follows a similar trend as that of the $\hat{\text{MSE}}_q$, such that staging $λ$ yields an increase in power, especially in higher-dimension.

4.2 Comparison to kernel Stein discrepancy

Using the simulated Gaussian mixture data as in Section 4.1, we compare the testing power of the neural Stein critic GoF hypothesis test to that of KSD. To do so, we perform the GoF hypothesis test by computing the KSD test statistic outlined in [24, 6], whereby the Stein discrepancy is computed using a critic restricted to an RKHS. Following common practice in the literature, we construct this RKHS to be defined by a radial basis function (RBF) with a bandwidth equal to the median of the data $ℓ_2$ distances in a given GoF test. To compute the KSD test, we adopt the implementation of [6]. Further details of the KSD GoF test are given in Appendix B.
4.2.1 Experimental Setup

Using the model distribution $q$ and data distribution $p$ as defined in Section 4.1.1, we construct a two-component Gaussian mixture setting in 50D to compare the power and computation time of the neural Stein discrepancy GoF hypothesis test (Section 2.4) to the kernel Stein discrepancy test (Appendix B). The model distribution $q$ remains as the isotropic, two-component Gaussian mixture, while the data distribution $p$ has the form of (36) with covariance shift $\rho_1 = 0.99$ and covariance scaling $\omega = 0.05$. The neural Stein critics are learned using two-hidden-layer (512 node) MLPs with Swish activation, initialized using PyTorch standard initialization with biases set to 0. We use the Adam optimizer with learning rate set to $5 \times 10^{-3}$, minibatch size equal to 40, and the critics are trained for 60 epochs. The $\Lambda(4 \times 10^{-1}, 5 \times 10^{-4}, 0.85)$ staging is used in the training of the neural Stein critics. The networks are trained using $n_{\text{train}}$ number of training samples from the data distribution $p$, which are split into an 80%/20% train/validation split for model selection. As in Section 4.1.2, the networks are selected to minimize the validation $\hat{\text{MSE}}_p$ of Equation (14).

For all neural Stein critic GoF tests, a total of $n_{\text{train}} + n_{\text{test}} = n_{\text{sample}}$ samples from $p$ are used, where $n_{\text{sample}}$ take on values in $\{100, 200, 300, 500, 1000, 1500, 2500\}$. In each case, $n_{\text{train}}$ and $n_{\text{test}}$ are equal to $n_{\text{sample}} / 2$. The 50%/50% training/testing split was chosen by comparing the testing power for various training/testing splits. Our findings indicate a range of training/testing splits exist for which the testing power performance is comparable. While the training duration contributes most significantly to the computation time, the test achieves high power once the training split reaches 50% of the sample size. That is, the 50%/50% train/test split is a generic split choice in this range of high power splits, and therefore we use this split in the results outlined in Section 4.2.2 and in Figure 5. The details of this finding can be found in Appendix C, Figure A.1. Furthermore, the training data are partitioned into an 80%/20% train/validation split. To compare to the kernel method, the KSD is computed using each value of $n_{\text{sample}}$ number of samples from the data distribution $p$. The KSD test is conducted with an RBF kernel using the median data distance heuristic for bandwidth. We compare the test power of the neural Stein test and the KSD test. The parameter $\alpha$ is set to 0.05 in all tests. The neural Stein tests use $n_{\text{boot}} = 500$ bootstrapped sets from $q$ and are computed using $n_{\text{test}}$ samples from $p$. The number of wild bootstrap samples used for KSD is equal to the number of bootstrap samples.
Figure 5: Comparison between neural Stein critic GoF test and KSD test [6, 24] in the 50D setting described in 4.2.1. We perform \( n_{\text{runs}} = 400 \) number of GoF tests to compute power. All results use \( n_{\text{boot}} = 500 \) bootstrap samples. The KSD is computed using an RBF kernel with bandwidth chosen according to the median data distance heuristic. In each plot, the x-axis indicates the overall sample size \( n_{\text{sample}} \) provided to each method, where the neural Stein GoF test uses half for training and half for computation of the test statistic (refer to Figure A.1 for a comparison of neural Stein tests with other choices of train/test split), and KSD uses the entire sample for computation of the test statistic. In (A), the average test power and its standard deviation error bar are shown, which is computed over the 5 replicas in each case. Figure (B) shows the average duration of network training plus an individual GoF test (computation of test statistic and bootstrap) for the neural Stein test, and the average duration of a single test (test statistic and bootstrap) for the KSD test. Finally, (C) shows the breakdown between the average computation time required to compute a test statistic (including training for the neural network test) and the time required to compute the bootstrap. See Section 4.2.1 for details of the GoF test power and computation time calculations.

Each power computation procedure is conducted 5 times using the same parameters in each setting. Additionally, we compare the time taken to perform an individual KSD GoF test to training a neural Stein critic and performing an individual GoF test. To find the computation time of the neural Stein method, we measure the average duration of training (using 5 networks for each value of \( n_{\text{sample}} \)) followed by the average (over 10 GoF tests per network) computation time of a single test statistic, in addition to the average computation time of the bootstrap (where \( n_{\text{boot}} = 500 \)). To determine the computation time of the KSD test in each setting, we measure the average duration of 10 tests, which can be broken down into the average time taken to compute an individual test statistic in addition to the average computation time of the wild bootstrap (with \( n_{\text{boot}} = 500 \)). All times are associated with experiments conducted using a laptop with an Intel Core i7-1165G7 processor with 16 GB of RAM.

### 4.2.2 Results

The result of the testing power comparison on the 50D data can be found in Figure 5. First, examining the comparison in power between the two methods in Figure 5 (A), the neural Stein critic GoF test achieves nearly 1.0 power with little variation by the time \( n_{\text{sample}} = 500 \). The KSD GoF test does not achieve comparable power to the staged-regularization neural Stein critic approach, even for as many as 2500 samples. Next, Figure 5 (B) highlights the quadratic time complexity of the KSD GoF test, resulting in a dramatic increase...
in computation time that surpasses the overall time to train a neural Stein critic and compute a test by the time \( n_{\text{sample}} = 1000 \). Furthermore, the breakdown into test statistic computation time and bootstrap computation time in Figure 5 (C) reveals that the time to compute an individual test statistic for the neural Stein approach becomes more time-efficient than KSD when \( n_{\text{sample}} \) is just larger than 1000. While the test statistic computation and wild bootstrap of KSD both contribute substantially to the overall computation time of KSD, the neural Stein GoF test computation time is dominated by the training period.

Our findings indicate that the neural Stein critic clearly outperforms KSD in this setting for a larger sample size, having both higher power and lower computation time. This result highlights the deeper expressivity of the \( L^2 \) function space compared to kernel methods in addition to the benefit of the linear time complexity of the neural Stein critic GoF test, as opposed to the quadratic complexity of KSD.

4.3 MNIST handwritten digits data

The results of Section 4.1 indicate that the staging of regularization when training neural Stein critics yields greater benefit in higher dimension. Therefore, we extend to a real-data example in an even higher dimension: the MNIST handwritten digits dataset [22]. We compare the fixed and staged regularization strategies to train critics that discriminate between an RBM and a mixture model of MNIST digits.

4.3.1 Authentic and synthetic MNIST data

To construct the model distribution \( q \) for the MNIST setting, we follow the approach of [13]. That is, we use a Gaussian-Bernoulli RBM that models the MNIST data distribution, trained using a learned neural Stein critic to minimize the Stein discrepancy between the true MNIST density and the RBM. We declare the model distribution \( q \) to be this 728-dimensional RBM. The data distribution \( p \) is a mixture model which is composed of 97% the RBM and 3% true digits “1” from the MNIST dataset. Therefore, any disparity in the distributions of \( p \) and \( q \) are caused by this infusion of digits from MNIST into \( p \).

4.3.2 Learned neural Stein critics

In addition to being a realistic setting, training a neural Stein critic using MNIST digits will allow us to better interpret the discrepancy. Of course, since we do not have access to the “true” score function \( p \), we cannot calculate the \( \hat{\text{MSE}}_q \) for the trained critics using Equation (17). Furthermore, the approximation of \( \hat{\text{MSE}}_p \) using validation data from \( p \) via Equation (16) becomes less accurate in high dimension, as the method would require a large amount of validation data to be an accurate representation of the population \( \text{MSE}_p \).

Therefore, we introduce an additional validation metric to evaluate the fit of the trained critic. First, in the language of the GoF test introduced in Section 2.4, we denote the quantity computed by applying the Stein operator with respect to \( q \) on critic \( f \) evaluated at a sample \( x \in X \) as the “critic witness” of the sample \( x \):

\[
w(x) = T_q f(x). \tag{37}\]

Intuitively, this witness captures the magnitude of the departure of the distribution \( p \) from \( q \) at location \( x \). Evaluating the critic witness at \( n_{\text{test}} \) samples \( x_i \sim q \), under the central limit theorem (CLT) assumption, random variables \( w(x_i) \) have a (centered) normal distribution with standard deviation \( \sigma(w)/\sqrt{n_{\text{test}}} \) when \( n_{\text{test}} \) is large, where \( \sigma(w) \) is the standard deviation of \( w(x_i) \).

Note that the test statistic (18) is the mean of \( w(x_i) \) computed over testing data \( x_i \sim p \). As an assessment for the GoF testing power for the critic function \( f \) (which is expensive to compute in such high dimension), we
may compare the mean and variance of \(w(\cdot)\) applied to a testing dataset sampled from \(p\) to a “null” dataset drawn from \(q\), both of size \(n_{\text{test}}\):

\[
P = \frac{\bar{w}_p}{\sigma(w_p) + \sigma(w_q)}, \quad \bar{w}_p = \frac{1}{n_{\text{test}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{test}}} w(x_i), \quad \sigma(w_p) = \frac{1}{n_{\text{test}}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{test}}} (w(x_i) - \bar{w}_p)^2}
\]  

This quantity acts to reflect the capability of the neural Stein critic to differentiate between the distributions in the GoF hypothesis testing setting described in Section 2.4. In addition to the \(P\) metric from Equation (38), we may also apply the Stein discrepancy to the holdout dataset from the data distribution as an evaluation metric for the models as described in Section 2.5.

### 4.3.3 Experimental setup

We again train 2-hidden-layer MLP’s with Swish activation, where each hidden layer is composed of 512 hidden units, using the default Adam optimizer parameters defined by PyTorch. The critics observe 2,000 training samples from \(p\), training on minibatches of size 100 with learning rate \(10^{-3}\). Each model is trained for 25 epochs. We consider fixed \(\lambda \in \{1 \times 10^{-3}, 1 \times 10^{-2}, 1 \times 10^{-1}, 1 \times 10^{0}, 2 \times 10^{0}\}\) and staging scheme \(\Lambda(5 \times 10^{-1}, 1 \times 10^{-3}, 0.90)\). We fit 10 critics per regularization strategy. For each critic, we compute the validation Stein discrepancy and the power metric (38) throughout training using \(n_{\text{test}} = 1,000\) samples from \(p\) and the same number of “null” samples from \(q\).

In addition to assessing the proxy for the test power of the neural Stein critic in the GoF test via Equation (38), we examine the interpretability of the critic as a diagnostic tool for anomalous observations. By Equation (9), the optimal neural Stein critic captures the difference in the score of the data distribution and model distribution. Therefore, a trained neural Stein critic can indicate which samples in a validation dataset represent the largest departure from the distribution \(q\). We isolate such samples by identifying samples with high critic witness value (37). We do so by both visualizing the images in a holdout validation dataset sampled from \(p\) which have a high \(w(\cdot)\) value, in addition to plotting a heatmap of \(w(\cdot)\) reduced using a t-SNE embedding [32] applied to the entire validation dataset.

### 4.3.4 Results

The power approximation using Equation (38) is plotted in Figure 6 (A) for each regularization strategy, where the means and standard deviations are calculated using the ten replicas for each regularization scheme. While the staging strategy does not exhibit such an advantage as in the high-dimension Gaussian mixture settings, staging indeed provides a more rapid increase in the validation metric in the early training period, yielding a final model of comparable performance to the fixed-\(\lambda\) strategies. In Figure 6 (B), we observe that the test statistic (18) exhibits clear separation from its bootstrapped \((n_{\text{boot}} = 500)\) null distribution, even in the case when the number of test samples is relatively small (in this case, \(n_{\text{test}} = 100\)). While Figure 6 (B) shows this distribution for the \(\Lambda(5 \times 10^{-1}, 1 \times 10^{-3}, 0.90)\) staged regularization strategy, this holds for fixed-\(\lambda\) training as well. Finally, the Stein discrepancy using the scaleless neural Stein critics \(f^{(\lambda)}\) applied to the holdout dataset from \(p\) is visualized throughout training for each model in Figure 6 (C). This result is similar to the result from Figure 6 (A) in that the staged approach performs comparably to the best fixed-\(\lambda\) regularization strategies.

For a more direct understanding of how the critics perform, consider instances of validation data sampled from \(p\) in which the critic witness (37) value is very large. These are samples that indicate the largest deviation.
Figure 6: In (A), we visualize the $\hat{P}$ metric from Equation (38) throughout training for various regularization strategies when training neural Stein critics using the MNIST mixture dataset. To compute $\hat{P}$, the model is applied to a validation dataset of 1,000 samples. In each case, 10 replica models are trained for 25 epochs using each regularization strategy; the mean and standard deviation are visualized over these 10 replicas. In (B), a distribution of null statistics [18] are plotted alongside a statistic calculated over an $n_{\text{test}} = 100$ sample testing set from $p$, computed using a $\Lambda(5 \times 10^{-1}, 1 \times 10^{-3}, 0.90)$ staged critic. In (C), the Stein discrepancy through training computed using the scaleless neural Stein critic $f^{(\lambda)}[10]$ and the same validation datasets of 1,000 samples used to compute $\hat{P}$ in (A) is visualized.

Figure 7: Embedding via t-SNE of the critic witness function [37] scaled by the regularization weight $\lambda$ using a $\Lambda(5 \times 10^{-1}, 1 \times 10^{-3}, 0.90)$ staged, regularized neural Stein critic applied to a validation dataset of 6,000 samples from the data distribution $p$ used to evaluate the diagnostic capacity of the neural Stein critic. The critic after 25 epochs of training was selected to produce these critic witness values. In (A), the black points represent the portion of the validation set coming from the RBM, while the red points represent the portion that are true digits 1 from MNIST. In (B), the points having high critic witness value are more darkly colored. In (C), the 12 images in the validation set which have the highest critic witness value are shown, applying the critic trained by the staging strategy. Similarly, (D) shows the 12 images in the validation set which have the lowest critic witness value.

between the model distribution $q$ and the data distribution $p$. In the staged $\Lambda(5 \times 10^{-1}, 1 \times 10^{-3}, 0.90)$ setting, we visualize the critic witness applied to a validation set of 6,000 samples from $p$ by reducing the images to a two-dimensional embedding via t-SNE. In Figure 7 (A), we observe the embedding of the validation data
into this space, where the true MNIST points are highlighted in red. In Figure 7 (B), the true MNIST digits are found to have larger critic witness value than those of RBM samples in the validation dataset.

Furthermore, in the Λ(5 × 10^{-1}, 1 × 10^{-3}, 0.90) case, visualizing the images in the validation set from p which have the highest critic witness value in Figure 7 (C) and those which have the lowest critic witness value in Figure 7 (D), we find that this approach correctly identifies true digits one from MNIST as anomalous while accepting those generated by the RBM as normal. In the case of the fixed-λ regularization strategies as well, it seems that all methods do well to identify the true digits “1” in samples from the data distribution p.

5 Discussion

We have developed a novel training approach for learning neural Stein critics by progressively decreasing the weight of the $L^2$ penalty over the course of training. The advantage of staging the regularization during the training of neural Stein critics is empirically observed in the experiments, especially in the high dimension Gaussian mixture setting. In the task of detecting distribution difference between authentic and synthetic MNIST data, the staged regularization training strategy makes more rapid progress at early times in training than the fixed-λ methods, achieving comparable performance by the end of training. In all the experiments, it is also observed that critics trained using larger regularization weight at the beginning of training enjoy a more rapid approximation of the target function, which is consistent with the NTK lazy-training theory to which we theoretically connect. Furthermore, the benefit of staging to smaller regularization weight λ is observed as the staged approaches achieve a closer fit to the target network throughout training than fixed-λ approaches, delaying the process of overfitting as well.

Future works can focus on a more precise analysis of the lazy training dynamic of the staged regularization method at early times in training. Additionally, a more nuanced regularization staging could be constructed to evolve with the model’s fit. That is, an adaptive (rather than pre-defined) staging scheme could yield greater benefit in the fitting of neural Stein critics. A more rigorous evaluation metric applied to the staged-learning critics could be employed to examine if their diagnostic capacity differs significantly from that of the fixed-λ learning approach. As we have found, the $\hat{\text{MSE}}_p$ metric suffers from sparsity in high dimensions, and therefore a more robust metric can be developed. Further analysis can also be conducted on other modern generative modeling approaches in the same manner as the Gaussian-Bernoulli RBM, including normalizing flow architectures. Finally, further analysis of the role of staged regularization in training neural Stein critics for application to statistical hypothesis testing, such as the GoF problem and two-sample testing, is a promising direction for future work.

6 Proofs

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* Given neural Stein critic network $f(\cdot, \theta)$ trained using the objective in Equation (6) and the scaleless optimal critic function $f^*$ via Equation (9), the Stein discrepancy operator (1) satisfies the
following relation:

$$SD[f] = \int p(x) \left( s_q(x) \cdot f(x) + \nabla_x \cdot f(x) \right)$$

$$= \int p(x) s_q(x) \cdot f(x) - \int \frac{\nabla_x p(x)}{p(x)} f(x) p(x)$$

$$= \int p(x) \left( s_q(x) \cdot f(x) - s_p(x) \cdot f(x) \right)$$

$$= \int p(x) \left( f^*(x) \cdot f(x) \right)$$

$$= E_{x \sim p} f^*(x) \cdot f(x)$$

We expand the normed term in the MSE formula:

$$MSE_p[f] = \int p(x) \left\| f^*(x) - f^{(\lambda)}(x) \right\|^2_2$$

$$= \int p(x) \left( \left\| f^*(x) \right\|^2_2 - 2\lambda f^*(x) \cdot f(x) + \lambda^2 \right)$$

$$= E_{x \sim p} \left\| f^*(x) \right\|^2_2 - 2\lambda E_{x \sim p} f^*(x) \cdot f(x) + \lambda^2 E_{x \sim p} \left\| f(x) \right\|^2_2$$

Note that the first term is a constant depending only upon the distributions $p$ and $q$ (denoted $C_{p,q}$), the second term is proportional to the SD[$f$], and the third term is proportional to $R[f]$ such that:

$$MSE_p[f] = C_{p,q} + 2\lambda \left( -SD[f] + \frac{\lambda}{2} R[f] \right)$$

This proves Equation (15), giving the relation between the population MSE$_p$ via Equation (14) and the training objective in Equation (6).

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Because

$$L_\lambda(\theta) = E_{x \sim p} \left( -T_q f(x, \theta) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\| f(x, \theta) \right\|^2 \right)$$

$$= \int_X \left( -s_q(x) \cdot f(x, \theta) - \nabla \cdot f(x, \theta) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\| f(x, \theta) \right\|^2 \right) p(x) dx$$

$$= \int_X \left( -s_q(x) \cdot f(x, \theta) + \lambda \left\| f(x, \theta) \right\|^2 \right) p(x) dx$$

$$= \int_X \left( -f^*(x) \cdot f(x, \theta) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\| f(x, \theta) \right\|^2 \right) p(x) dx, \quad \text{(by definition of } f^* \text{ in (9)})$$

we have that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} L_\lambda(\theta) = E_{x \sim p} \left( -f^* \cdot \partial_\theta f(x, \theta) + \lambda f(x, \theta) \cdot \partial_\theta f(x, \theta) \right)$$

$$= E_{x \sim p} \partial_\theta f(x, \theta) \cdot (\lambda f(x, \theta) - f^*(x)).$$

This proves (24) according to the GD dynamic defined in (23).
Proof of Lemma 3.2. Inserting (24) to (26) gives that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(x, t) = -\langle \partial_\theta f(x, \theta(t)), \mathbb{E}_{x' \sim p} \partial_\theta f(x', \theta(t)) \cdot (\lambda u(x', t) - f^*(x')) \rangle_\Theta,$$

(39)

where we use the definition (25). The lemma then follows by the definition (27) and the linearity of inner-product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\Theta$.

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Consider

$$[K_0(x, x')]_{ij} = K((x, i), (x', j)),$$

where $K(z, z')$ is a positive semi-definite (PSD) kernel defined on the space of $Z = \mathcal{X} \times [d]$, that is,

$$z = (x, i), \quad x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad i \in [d],$$

with $dz$ being the induced product measure. The kernel $K$ is PSD due to the definition (29). One can also verify that $K$ is Hilbert-Schmidt because

$$\int_Z \int_Z K(z, z')^2 dz dz' = \sum_{i, j=1}^d \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} [K_0(x, x')]_{ij}^2 p(x)p(x') dxdx'$$

$$= \sum_{i, j=1}^d \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} (\partial_\theta f_i(x, \theta(0)), \partial_\theta f_j(x', \theta(0)))_p^2 p(x)p(x') dxdx'$$

$$\leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \int_{\mathcal{X}} \|\partial_\theta f_i(x, \theta(0))\|^2_\Theta p(x) dx \right)^2, \quad \text{(by Cauchy-Schwarz)}$$

(40)

and the integrability follows by the integrability of $\|\partial_\theta f_i(x, \theta(0))\|^2_\Theta$ in $(\mathcal{X}, p(x)dx)$ assumed in the condition of the lemma. As a result, the spectral theorem implies that $K(z, z')$ has discrete spectrum $\mu_k, k = 1, 2, \cdots$ which decreases to 0, each $\mu_k$ is associated with an eigenfunction $v_k(z)$, and $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ form an orthonormal basis on $Z$. This means that

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathcal{X}} [K_0(x, x')]_{ij} v_k(x', j) p(x') dx' = \mu_k v_k(x, i), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, i \in [d],$$

and for any $k, l = 1, 2, \cdots$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \int_{\mathcal{X}} v_k(x, i) v_l(x, i) p(x) dx = \delta_{kl}.$$

At last, because the neural network has finite width and thus $\Theta$ is a finite-dimensional Euclidean space, suppose dimensionality $M_\Theta$. By (29), the kernel $K$ has finite rank which is at most $M_\Theta$. Let the rank of $K$ be $M$, then $\mu_1 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_M > 0$, and the other eigenvalues are zero. Defining $v_k$ by $(v_k(x, i))_{i=1}^d$ finishes the proof.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. As shown in the proof of Lemma 3.3 there are ortho-normal basis $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of $\mathcal{X}$ with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_p$, where the first $M$ many consist of eigen-functions of $K_0(x, x')$. Because $f^*$ is squared
integrable on $(X, p(x)dx)$, we have that for $c_k \in \mathbb{R}$,
\[
\mathbf{f}^* = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k \mathbf{v}_k, \quad \|f\|_{L^2(p)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k^2 < \infty. \tag{41}
\]

The uniqueness of orthogonal decomposition gives that
\[
f_1^* = \sum_{k=1}^{m} c_k \mathbf{v}_k, \quad f_2^* = \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} c_k \mathbf{v}_k. \tag{42}
\]

To prove the theorem, it suffices to prove (34), and then (35) follows by that
\[
\|f_1^*\|_{L^2(p)} \leq \|f^*\|_{L^2(p)}
\]
which follows from (42), and that $e^{-t\delta\lambda} < \epsilon$ when $t > \log(1/\epsilon)/\delta\lambda$.

To prove (34): By (30), and define
\[
\mathbf{w}(x, t) := \lambda \hat{\mathbf{u}}(x, t) - \mathbf{f}^*(x),
\]
we have
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \mathbf{w}(x, t) = -\lambda \int_X K_0(x, x') \circ \mathbf{w}(x', t)p(x')dx', \tag{43}
\]
and, by that $\hat{\mathbf{u}}(x, 0) = 0$, starting from $\mathbf{w}(x, 0) = -\mathbf{f}^*(x)$.

By Lemma 3.3 equation (41), and that $m \leq M$, we then have that for any $t > 0$,
\[
-\mathbf{w}(x, t) = \sum_{k=1}^{M} e^{-t\mu_k} c_k \mathbf{v}_k(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} e^{-t\mu_k} c_k \mathbf{v}_k(x) + \sum_{k=m+1}^{M} e^{-t\mu_k} c_k \mathbf{v}_k(x) =: 1 + 2.
\]

Because $\mu_k \geq \delta$ for $k = 1, \cdots, m$,
\[
\|\mathbf{1}\|_{L^2(p)}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{m} e^{-2t\mu_k} c_k^2 \leq e^{-2t\delta\lambda} \sum_{k=1}^{m} c_k^2 = e^{-2t\delta\lambda} \|\mathbf{f}_1^*\|_{L^2(p)}^2.
\]

In addition,
\[
\|\mathbf{2}\|_{L^2(p)}^2 = \sum_{k=m+1}^{M} e^{-2t\mu_k} c_k^2 \leq \sum_{k=m+1}^{M} c_k^2 \leq \|\mathbf{f}_2^*\|_{L^2(p)}^2.
\]

Putting together, this gives that
\[
\|\mathbf{w}(x, t)\|_{L^2(p)} \leq \|\mathbf{1}\|_{L^2(p)} + \|\mathbf{2}\|_{L^2(p)} \leq e^{-t\delta\lambda} \|\mathbf{f}_1^*\|_{L^2(p)} + \|\mathbf{f}_2^*\|_{L^2(p)},
\]
which proves (34).
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A Supplementary Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regularization ($\lambda$)</th>
<th>Mean Power Epoch</th>
<th>Mean Selected $\hat{\text{MSE}}_q$</th>
<th>Mean Stopping Epoch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1e-3$</td>
<td>0.813 ±0.042</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1e-2$</td>
<td>0.841 ±0.043</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1e-1$</td>
<td>0.839 ±0.040</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1e-0$</td>
<td>0.844 ±0.039</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda(1e0, 5e-2, 0.90)$</td>
<td>0.836 ±0.075</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda(1e0, 5e-2, 0.95)$</td>
<td>0.833 ±0.036</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.1: In 2 dimensions, we consider the approximate epoch at which the validation $\hat{\text{MSE}}_p$ (Equation 15) is minimized. At this epoch of training, we display the average GoF testing power ($n_{\text{test}} = 75$) and $\hat{\text{MSE}}_q$ (Equation 16) over 10 replica models for each regularization strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regularization ($\lambda$)</th>
<th>Mean Power Epoch</th>
<th>Mean Selected $\hat{\text{MSE}}_q$</th>
<th>Mean Stopping Epoch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2.500e-4$</td>
<td>0.828 ±0.061</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.000e-3$</td>
<td>0.887 ±0.038</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.000e-3$</td>
<td>0.920 ±0.030</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.600e-2$</td>
<td>0.909 ±0.020</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6.400e-2$</td>
<td>0.907 ±0.049</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.560e-1$</td>
<td>0.859 ±0.047</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.024e-0$</td>
<td>0.836 ±0.051</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda(5e-1, 1e-3, 0.80)$</td>
<td>0.926 ±0.020</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda(5e-1, 1e-3, 0.85)$</td>
<td>0.912 ±0.027</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.2: In 10 dimensions, we consider the epoch that minimizes validation $\hat{\text{MSE}}_p$, at which point we display the average testing power ($n_{\text{test}} = 200$) and $\hat{\text{MSE}}_q$ over 10 replica models for each regularization strategy.
Table A.3: In 25 dimensions, we consider the epoch that minimizes validation $\hat{\text{MSE}}_p$, at which point we display the average testing power ($n_{\text{test}} = 500$) and $\hat{\text{MSE}}_q$ over 10 replica models for each regularization strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regularization ($\lambda$)</th>
<th>Mean Power</th>
<th>Epoch</th>
<th>Mean Selected $\hat{\text{MSE}}_q$</th>
<th>Mean Stopping Epoch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2.500e-4$</td>
<td>0.856 ±0.130</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.000e-3$</td>
<td>0.953 ±0.029</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.000e-3$</td>
<td>0.936 ±0.035</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.600e-2$</td>
<td>0.451 ±0.100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6.400e-2$</td>
<td>0.250 ±0.062</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda(4e^{-1}, 5e^{-4}, 0.80)$</td>
<td>0.998 ±0.002</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda(4e^{-1}, 5e^{-4}, 0.85)$</td>
<td>1.000 ±0.001</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Lambda(4e^{-1}, 5e^{-4}, 0.90)$</td>
<td>0.997 ±0.003</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B The kernel Stein discrepancy goodness-of-fit test**

As in Section 2.4, consider the setting in which we are provided with probability distribution $q$ supported on $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ from which we can sample, and consider the scenario wherein we are provided with a finite sample of data $x_i \sim p$ of $n_{\text{test}}$ samples. As an alternative to learning the Stein critic function using a neural network for estimation of the test statistic in (18), one may defined the function space $\mathcal{F}$ to be an RKHS defined by a kernel denoted $k(\cdot, \cdot)$. In this case, the KSD admits computation in closed form by the following relation:

$$\text{KSD} = \mathbb{E}_{x, x' \sim p}[u_q(x, x')],$$

(A.1)

where

$$u_q(x, x') = s_q(x)k(x, x')s_q(x') + s_q(x)^T \nabla_{x'} k(x, x')$$

$$+ \nabla_{x} k(x, x')^T s_q(x') + \text{tr}(\nabla_{x,x'} k(x, x')).$$

(A.2)

Using this formulation, [6] defines a quadratic-time $V$-statistic which estimates the KSD as follows:

$$\hat{V}_q = \frac{1}{n_{\text{test}}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n_{\text{test}}} u_q(x_i, x_j).$$

(A.3)

Given the test statistic [A.3], a “wild bootstrap” is used to approximate the distribution of the test statistic under the null hypothesis, which is outlined in [6]. Given the test set of $n_{\text{test}}$ samples $x_i \sim p$, the null hypothesis may be rejected if [A.3] computed using these $x_i$ exceeds the $(1 - \alpha)$ quantile of the wild bootstrapped distribution under the null hypothesis (where, again, $\alpha$ is selected to tune the Type-I error). The power is then estimated using $n_{\text{runs}}$ number of such GoF tests.

**C Neural testing power split comparison**

This section analyzes the power and running time of the neural Stein GoF hypothesis testing procedure as outlined in Section 2.4. In Section 4.2.1, we outline a procedure for comparing the neural Stein test to the KSD GoF test by considering varying overall sample size $n_{\text{sample}}$, training the neural network using half of these samples and conducting tests using the other half. In this section, we fix $n_{\text{sample}} = 500$ and consider
other choices of training/testing split, comparing to the KSD results for \( n_{\text{sample}} = 500 \). That is, we partition the 500 points into splits whereby the number of training samples takes on a proportion in the range of \{10\%, 20\%, 30\%, 40\%, 50\%, 60\%, 70\%, 80\%, 90\%\} of \( n_{\text{sample}} \). The testing procedure is otherwise identical to that of Section 4.2.1. The result can be seen in Figure A.1. Figure A.1 (A) shows that there exists a range of splits for which the power is nearly one and that since the computation time is dominated by the training, as seen in Figures A.1 (B) and (C), a 50%/50% split is a good generic choice of the split. Therefore, this split is used in the experiments outlined in Section 4.2.1 and displayed in Figure 5.

![Figure A.1: Comparison between neural Stein critic GoF test in the 50D setting described in 4.2.1 for various proportions of training/testing split, where the setting and testing procedure is otherwise the same as that in Figure 5. In all cases, the total number of points is \( n_{\text{sample}} = 500 \). The power and duration of the KSD test for \( n_{\text{sample}} = 500 \) is shown in red in each figure. The x-axis of each plot refers to the percentage of these points which are allocated to training for the neural network test. The remainder are used for computation of the neural Stein test statistic. The y-axes of (A), (B), and (C) correspond to those of Figure 5.](image-url)