

11/1/23

Lecture 16: Mean-field limit

Derivation and meaning of continuity equation:

$$\partial_t \rho_t = \operatorname{div}(\rho_t \cdot \nabla \Psi_{\rho_t}) \quad (*)$$

Holds in "weak sense", i.e. for any "nice" (e.g. bounded, differentiable, with bounded gradient)

test function $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int \varphi(\theta) \partial_t \rho_t(\theta) d\theta = \int \varphi(\theta) \cdot \operatorname{div}(\rho_t \cdot \nabla \Psi_{\rho_t})(\theta) d\theta \quad (**)$$

(b/c differentiable solution to (*) may not exist).

Note that for $\bar{\theta}_t \sim \rho_t$,

$$\text{LHS } (*) = \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\bar{\theta}_t)]$$

(diff. under integral)

$$= \mathbb{E}[\langle \nabla \varphi(\bar{\theta}_t), \frac{d}{dt} \bar{\theta}_t \rangle]$$

(gradient flow for $\bar{\theta}_t$)

$$\int \langle \nabla \varphi(\theta), -\nabla \Psi_{\rho_t}(\theta) \rangle d\rho_t(\theta)$$

(integration by parts)

$$\text{RHS } (*) = - \int \langle \nabla \varphi(\theta), \nabla \Psi_{\rho_t}(\theta) \rangle d\rho_t(\theta)$$

Non-asymptotic convergence to the mean-field limit:

"Propagation of chaos" [Kac '56], [McKean '69],
[Sznitman '91]

want to compare:

• $(\Theta_i^{(k)})_{k=0,1,2,\dots}$: GD iterates given by
$$\Theta_i^{(k+1)} \leftarrow \Theta_i^{(k)} - h \nabla L(\Theta^{(k)})$$

• $(\bar{\Theta}_i^t)_{t \geq 0}$: mean-field iterates given by
$$d\bar{\Theta}_i^t = -\nabla L_{\rho_t}(\bar{\Theta}_i^t) dt$$

where $\rho_t = \text{law}(\bar{\Theta}_i^t)$

Note:

$$\Theta_i^{(k)} = \Theta_i^{(0)} + 2h \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} F_i(\Theta^{(l)}; (x_{l+1}, y_{l+1}))$$

$$\bar{\Theta}_i^t = \Theta_i^{(0)} + 2 \int_0^t G(\bar{\Theta}_i^s; \rho_s) ds$$

$$\text{for } F_i(\Theta; (x, y)) \doteq (y - f_\theta(x)) \cdot \nabla_{\Theta_i} \sigma(x; \Theta_i)$$

$$G(\Theta, \rho) \doteq -\nabla \Psi_\rho(\Theta)$$

Our goal: upper bound $\|\bar{\Theta}_i^{kh} - \Theta_i^{(k)}\|$

To do so, will bound by a self-similar expression of the form
(small terms) + $\int_0^{kh} \|\bar{\Theta}_i^s - \Theta_i^{(l s/h)}\| ds$

This will imply (by Grönwall's inequality), the desired bound

$$\text{Let } [s] = h \cdot \lfloor s/h \rfloor$$

$$\| \bar{\Theta}_i^{kh} - \Theta_i^k \|$$

$$= 2 \left\| \int_0^{kh} G(\bar{\Theta}_i^s; \rho_s) ds - h \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} F_i(\Theta^{(l)}, (x_{l+1}, y_{l+1})) \right\|$$

$$\leq 2 \left\| \int_0^{kh} \left[G(\bar{\Theta}_i^s; \rho_s) - G(\bar{\Theta}_i^{[s]}; \rho_{[s]}) \right] ds \right\| \quad \textcircled{1}$$

$$+ 2 \left\| \int_0^{kh} \left[G(\bar{\Theta}_i^{[s]}; \rho_{[s]}) - G(\Theta_i^{(\lfloor s/h \rfloor)}; \rho_{[s]}) \right] ds \right\| \quad \textcircled{2}$$

$$+ 2 \left\| h \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \left[G(\Theta_i^{(l)}; \rho_{lh}) - F_i(\Theta^{(l)}, (x_{l+1}, y_{l+1})) \right] \right\| \quad \textcircled{3}$$

① (easy):

Small because G is Lipschitz by assumption,
and can show ρ varies smoothly over time
so that ρ_s and $\rho_{[s]}$ are close

② :

Again by Lipschitzness of G ,

$$\|G(\bar{\theta}_i^s; \mathcal{P}_{[s]}) - G(\theta_i^{(Ls/h)}; \mathcal{P}_{[s]})\| \leq \|\bar{\theta}_i^s - \theta_i^{(Ls/h)}\|,$$

So ② is bounded by

$$\int_0^{kh} \underbrace{\|\bar{\theta}_i^s - \theta_i^{(Ls/h)}\|}_{\text{looks analogous to what we want to bound on LHS...}} ds$$

looks analogous
to what we want
to bound on LHS...

$$\textcircled{3}: \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \left[G(\theta_i^{(l)}; \mathcal{P}_{lh}) - \underbrace{F_i(\theta_i^{(l)}; (x_{l+1}, y_{l+1}))}_{\text{this has expectation } G(\theta_i^{(l)}; \hat{\mathcal{P}}_l)} \right]$$

Key idea: this has expectation $G(\theta_i^{(l)}; \hat{\mathcal{P}}_l)$,

where $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_l$ is empirical dist $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\theta_i^{(l)}}$

Over many steps l , the total deviation between

$F_i(\theta_i^{(l)}; (x_{l+1}, y_{l+1}))$'s and $G(\theta_i^{(l)}; \hat{\mathcal{P}}_l)$'s is
of order $h\sqrt{kp}$ by martingale concentration

Remains to bound

$$\sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \left[G(\theta_i^{(l)}; \beta_{lh}) - G(\theta_i^{(l)}; \hat{\beta}_l) \right]$$
$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\frac{\oplus}{\bar{\theta}} U(\theta_i^{(l)}, \bar{\theta}_j^{lh}) - U(\theta_i^{(l)}, \theta_j^{(l)}) \right]$$

again, by martingale concentration we can essentially replace $\frac{\oplus}{\bar{\theta}} U(\theta_i^{(l)}, \bar{\theta}_j^{lh})$ (deterministic)

with $U(\theta_i^{(l)}, \bar{\theta}_j^{lh})$ (random)

Then we use Lipschitzness of U to get

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \left\| U(\theta_i^{(l)}, \bar{\theta}_j^{lh}) - U(\theta_i^{(l)}, \theta_j^{(l)}) \right\|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \left\| \underbrace{\bar{\theta}_j^{lh} - \theta_j^{(l)}} \right\|$$

once again, a term that looks similar to what we want to bound

When data distribution has symmetries,
PDE simplifies considerably:

Suppose training data $\{(x_i, y_i)\}$ satisfy $x_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{I}_d)$
and $y_i = \varphi(\Pi x)$ for Π a projection to a low-dim
subspace V° .

Then joint dist over (x, y) invariant under rotations of x
that preserve V° , i.e. $R \forall v \in V^\circ \forall v \in V^\circ$.

Observation: Let R be such a rotation. If
 ρ_0 and ρ'_0 are two different initializations of
the weights related by $\rho'_0 = R_\# \rho_0$ (i.e. to
sample (a', w') from ρ'_0 , sample (a, w) from ρ_0
and take $a' = a$, $w' = R w$), then $\rho'_t = R_\# \rho_t$.

So if ρ_0 rotation-invariant, ρ_t is invariant to
rotations preserving V° , for any $t \geq 0$!

ρ_t thus completely specified by distribution on
 $(a, \underbrace{\Pi w}_{\tilde{w}}, \underbrace{\|\Pi^\perp w\|_2}_{\tilde{r}})$,

i.e. we get a $\boxed{\dim(V^d) + 2}$ -dimensional PDE!

Denote dist. on (a, \vec{s}, r) by \bar{p}_+ .

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \bar{p}_+ &= \operatorname{div}(\bar{p}_+ \cdot \nabla_{\vec{s}} \Psi_{\bar{p}_+}) + \\ &\quad \partial_a(\bar{p}_+ \cdot \partial_a \Psi_{\bar{p}_+}) + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{r} \partial_r(r \cdot \bar{p}_+ \cdot \partial_r \Psi_{\bar{p}_+}). \end{aligned}$$