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

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

1 Derivation of the svGPFA Variational Lower Bound

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

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

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

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

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

We choose a factorised approximating distribution of the form

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

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

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

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

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

where

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

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

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

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

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

2 Use of a point-process likelihood

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

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

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

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

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

3 Condition-grouped model with time-warping

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

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

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

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

Where

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

Letting

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

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

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

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

where

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

$$\Psi_{k,1}^{\zeta,(r)}(t, \boldsymbol{z}_k^\zeta) = \mathbb{E}_{q(\tau^{(r)})} \left[\boldsymbol{\kappa}_k^\zeta(\tau^{(r)}(t) , \boldsymbol{z}_k^\zeta) \right] \tag{16}$$

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