Debiaser Beware: Pitfalls of Centering Regularized Transport maps

Aram-Alexandre Pooladian New York University ICML 2022

Debiaser Beware: Pitfalls of Centering Regularized Transport maps

Aram-Alexandre Pooladian New York University ICML 2022

Joint work with Jonathan Niles-Weed, and Marco Cuturi





1. Regularized Transport maps

2. Centering/Debiasing

3. Beware of Pitfalls



P and *Q* are two (nice) probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d :

()



P and *Q* are two (nice) probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d :

Q

- have densities -----
- bounded domain —



T is a transport map from P to Q if: for $X \sim P, T(X) \sim Q$

()



(write $T \in \mathcal{T}(P, Q)$)

T is a transport map from P to Q if: for $X \sim P, T(X) \sim Q$



optimal transport map:

$$T_0 := \underset{T}{\operatorname{argmin}} \int \frac{1}{2} ||x - x||_T$$



Given i.i.d samples $X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim P$ and $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \sim Q$

Question: How to estimate T_0 on the basis of samples?



Goal: Construct estimator \hat{T}_n with "good" computational and statistical properties



$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{T}_n - T_0\|_{L^2(P)}^2 \lesssim n^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha - 2 + d}} \log^3(n) \qquad (T_0 \in C^{\alpha})$$



$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{T}_n - T_0\|_{L^2(P)}^2 \lesssim n^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha - 2 + d}} \log^3(n) \qquad (T_0 \in C^{\alpha})$$

- (Near) minimax optimal
- numerically intractable in d > 3; complexity $O(N^d)$



$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{T}_n - T_0\|_{L^2(P)}^2 \lesssim n^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha - 2 + d}} \log^3(n) \qquad (T_0 \in C^{\alpha})$$

- (Near) minimax optimal
- numerically intractable in d > 3; complexity $O(N^d)$

Estimators from [DGS21] and [MB+21] also achieve minimax rate



$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{T}_n - T_0\|_{L^2(P)}^2 \lesssim n^{-\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha - 2 + d}} \log^3(n) \qquad (T_0 \in C^{\alpha})$$

- (Near) minimax optimal
- numerically intractable in d > 3; complexity $O(N^d)$

- Estimators from [DGS21] and [MB+21] also achieve minimax rate - 1-Nearest-Neighbor is computationally tractable in $O(n^3)$



Workaround: entropic map

Inspired by entropic optimal transport, we [PNW21] studied the entropic map between two distributions



$$T_{\varepsilon} := \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\varepsilon}}[Y | X = x]$$

- GPU-friendly implementations
- Complexity: $O(n^2 \varepsilon^{-2})$
- O(n) time to evaluate

Drawbacks: underdispersed

Drawbacks: underdispersed



Approximation of the target distribution is underdispersed for large ε



Drawbacks: underdispersed



Approximation of the target distribution is underdispersed for large ε

but we want ε large! e.g. [CT+20]





- Conventional wisdom in optimal transport: debias the entropic problem
- Seen in several works [GPC18, GC+19, FS+19, CR+20]
- Idea: add a correction term so that when $\mu = \nu$, we recover $T_{\varepsilon} \simeq \mathrm{id}$
- The correction term is obtained by solving the entropic transport problem from a measure onto itself

Debiased entropic map T_{ε}^{D}

Debiased entropic map T_{ε}^{D}



<u>Overdispersed</u> for large ε





Debiased entropic map T_{ε}^{D} versus (biased) entropic map T_{ε}

For large ε , the entropic map concentrates around the mean of Q

For a well-chosen value of ε , we see that debiasing significantly aids in estimating (smooth) optimal transport maps (plots are in d = 10)

 $T_0(x) = Ax$



$$T_0(x) = (\exp(x_i))_{i=1}^d$$



Gaussian-to-Gaussian example

If $P = \mathcal{N}(0,A)$ and $Q = \mathcal{N}(0,B)$, then as $\varepsilon \to 0$

 $\|T_{\varepsilon} - T_0\|_{L^2(P)}^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 + O(\varepsilon^4)$ VS. $\|T_{\varepsilon}^{D} - T_{0}\|_{L^{2}(P)}^{2} \lesssim \varepsilon^{4} + O(\varepsilon^{6})$





(a) \hat{T}_{ε} vs. $\hat{T}_{\varepsilon}^{D}$ with Σ concentrated in d = 2

Beware of pitfalls

(b) \hat{T}_{ε} vs. $\hat{T}_{\varepsilon}^{D}$ with Σ concentrated in d = 15

	3.8×10^{-1}
- Predicting genomic traiectories in stem cells	3.6×10^{-1}
[SS+19]	$\stackrel{\sim}{\geq} 3.4 \times 10^{-1}$
	3.2×10^{-1}
- Tradeoff in performance as $\varepsilon \to 0$	3×10^{-1}







- Question the convention wisdom in optimal transport, that suggests debiasing is always better
- Empirically and theoretically complicate this conventional wisdom
- Important for practitioners to be wary of these phenomena in downstream tasks

Bibliography

- [PNW21] A-A. Pooladian, and J. Niles-Weed. Entropic estimation of optimal transport maps. (submitted) 2021
- [CT+20] M. Cuturi, O. Teboule, J. Niles-Weed, and JP. Vert. <u>Supervised Quantile Normalization for Low Rank</u> Matrix Factorization. ICML 2020
- [CP+20] L. Chizat, P. Roussillon, F. Léger, F-X. Vialard, and G. Peyré. *Faster Wasserstein Distance Estimation* with the Sinkhorn divergence. NeurIPS 2020
- [GC+19] A. Genevay, L. Chizat, F. Bach, M. Cuturi, and G. Peyré. Sample complexity of Sinkhorn divergences. AISTATS 2019
- [GPC18] A. Genevay, G. Peyré, and M. Cuturi. *Learning generative models with the Sinkhorn divergences*. AISTATS 2018
- [F+19] J. Feydy, T. Séjourné, F-X. Vialard, S-i. Amari, A. Trouvé, and G. Peyré. Interpolating between optimal transport and MMD using Sinkhorn Divergences. AISTATS 2019
- [C13] M. Cuturi. Sinkhorn distances: Lightspeed computation of optimal transport. NIPS, 2013
- [SS+19] G. Schiebinger, J. Shu, M. Tabaka, B. Cleary, et al. Optimal Transport Analysis of Single-Cell Gene Expression Identifies Developmental Trajectories in Reprogramming Cell, 2019