



Calo4pQVAE: Progress and updates









RIUMF

Canada's particle accelerator centre Centre canadien d'accélération des particules



Summary

- ✓ Weight decay removal?
- ✓ Papers status
- \checkmark Using the QPU w/ Pegasus and in Zephyr
- V High temperature gradient approximation for trained RBMs
- RBM and Diffusion model equivalence.
- Relaxation time in RBMs

Papers status

- EPJC -> Rebuttal submitted?
- iEEE QCE Conf -> haven't seen the proceedings online yet
- Neurips ML4Phys -> Got accepted!
- PRX draft -> on countdown for submission



Using QPU w/ Pegasus ¹⁰⁻² (a) (b)ц ^{10-э} Geant4 MCMC Samples 10^{-4} **OPU Samples** -4750 -4700 -4650 -4600 -4550 -4500 -4450 RBM Energy **RBM Energy** (d)4.2 4.4 ₹ 4.0 4.2 ed β in QA œ. 3.8 - 8.6 Estimat Estimat 9.6 — Estimated β per condition in QA --- Estimated β in QA 3.4 3.4 ---- Estimated β in conditioned QA --- Mean estimated β in conditioned QA 3.2 5 3.2 -600 800 1000 400 200 0 Iteration

We estimate the QA inverse Temperature before generating each sample.



Using QPU w/ Pegasus ¹⁰⁻² (a) (b)ц ^{10-э} Geant4 MCMC Samples 10^{-4} **OPU Samples** -4750 -4700 -4650 -4600 -4550 -4500 -4450 RBM Energy **RBM** Energy (d)4.2 4.4 ₹^{4.0} 4.2 ed β in QA .**⊆** പ്പ 3.8 ed - 8.6 Estimat Estimat 9.6 — Estimated β per condition in QA --- Estimated β in QA 3.4 3.4 ---- Estimated β in conditioned QA -- Mean estimated β in conditioned QA 3.2 -600 800 1000 400 200 0 Iteration

We estimate the QA inverse Temperature before generating each sample.





We estimate the QA inverse Temperature 1 time. Then generate all samples.

Using QPU w/ Pegasus We estimate the QA inverse Temperature 1 time. Then generate all samples. Wait 2.5 seconds between samples



What if we estimate the QA inverse by generating 1 sample per API call? (Wojtek's method)

programming.



What if we estimate the QA inverse by generating 1 sample per API call?

This way we should account for the heating due to the QPU programming.

 $\beta_{QA} \approx 2.6$





Winning method!



We estimate the QA inverse Temperature before generating each sample.

Using QPU w/ Zephyr :: Winning method







Using QPU w/ Zephyr :: vs Woitek's method

Model A











Using QPU w/ Zephyr :: vs Wojtek's method



Using QPU w/ Zephyr :: vs Wojtek's method



- Time required to train using QPU:
- (1 sample generation time)X(# of samples)X(epochs) (20ms)X(100k)X(200) = 111.1 hrs

Using QPU w/ Zephyr :: vs Wojtek's method

- Train Enc and Decoder and train QPU afterwards with a smaller sample.
- Discuss with dwave options and roadmaps

High Temperature gradient approximation

 $\left\langle E\frac{\partial E}{\partial \Theta}\right\rangle - \left\langle E\right\rangle \left\langle \frac{\partial E}{\partial \Theta}\right\rangle = 0$



Condition

1000 Gibbs sampling steps

High Temperature gradient approximation Untrained RBM Untrained RBM 100 a: non-zero vals = 1.0b: non-zero vals = 1.0 60 50 75 Histogram Histogram 40 50 30 $= \frac{\langle E \frac{\partial E}{\partial \Theta} \rangle - \langle E \rangle \langle \frac{\partial E}{\partial \Theta} \rangle}{=}$ 20 25 10 $\epsilon =$ ∂E 0 0.0 0.5 1.0 -0.50.0 0.5 1.0 -0.5 $\partial \Theta$ e e

 5.0×10^{4}

 4.0×10^{4}

Histogram 3.0×10^{4} 2.0×10^{4}

 1.0×10^{4}

Untrained RBM







-25

25

0

50

-50

-75

High Temperature gradient approximation







Trained RBMin MNIST w/ CD



High Temperature gradient approximation Trained RBM in MNIST W/ PCD Trained RBM in MNIST W/ PCD

 $c' = \frac{\langle E \frac{\partial E}{\partial \Theta} \rangle - \langle E \rangle \langle \frac{\partial E}{\partial \Theta} \rangle}{\langle \frac{\partial E}{\partial \Theta} \rangle}$

 1.00×10^{5} 10 Q 8 6 3 6 5 8 5 3 7.50×10^{4} 5.00×10^{4} 2.50×10^{4}









High Temperature gradient approximation

Each point in the histogram correspondence separately from the rest.

Each point in the histogram corresponds to a parameter being updated

High Temperature gradient approximation CaloQVAE Model B



Let's assume an RBM w/ 10 visible and 10 hidden nodes.

$$\epsilon = \frac{\langle E \frac{\partial E}{\partial \Theta} \rangle - \langle E \rangle \langle \frac{\partial E}{\partial \Theta} \rangle}{\langle \frac{\partial E}{\partial \Theta} \rangle}$$

Let's assume the weights and biases are sampled from a normal N(0,0.1)



BGS



Let's assume the weights and biases are sampled from a Uni(-1,1)



BGS

For Uni(-1,1) distributed weights and biases, the range of epsilons do not match between exact and BGS.

Let's look at the energy histograms

N(0,1) weights and biases



10k states sampled via BGS. We measure the state degeneracy





Let's look at the energy histograms

U(-1,1) weights and biases



10k states sampled via BGS. We measure the state degeneracy





 $\mathcal{N}(J_0, J_1)$ $\tilde{J}_0 = NJ_0 \to 20 \cdot \delta$ $\tilde{J} = N^{1/2}J \to \sqrt{20} \cdot 1$ kT = 1



FIG. 1. Phase diagram of spin-glass ferromagnet. Solvable Model of Spin glass, Kirkpatrick, Sherrington



High Temperature gradient approximation

• Next step: Train model w/o this approximation.

Ratio between couplers and fields

For a given spin i, what is the ratio between the some over its couplers and the self-field?



Ratio between couplers and fields



Ratio between couplers and fields



34

RBM to Diffusion Model equivalence $Z = \sum e^{-\beta E(v,h)}$ v,h $W = U\Sigma V^t (SVD)$ $|x\rangle = U|v\rangle, \qquad |y\rangle = V|h\rangle$ $Z = \sum e^{-\beta E(x,y)}$

х,у

 $E(v,h) = -\langle v | a_0 \rangle - \langle b_0 | h \rangle - \langle v | W | h \rangle$

Diffusion models How good are they?

CaloDiffusion



CaloLatentDiffusion

Madula, Mikuni



Reconstruct. $\mathbf{\tilde{x}}$





Summary

- ✓ Papers status
- \checkmark Using the QPU w/ Pegasus and in Zephyr
 - Meet with dwave to discuss strategy?
- V High temperature gradient approximation for trained RBMs
 - Train model w/o this approximation
- ✓ Weight decay removal?
- RBM and Diffusion model equivalence.
- Relaxation time in RBMs

ToDo

- ✓ UNet for CaloQVAE Ian
- ✓ CaloQVAE w/ linear attention layers
- Train current model with large RBM in Pegasus
- \checkmark From RBM to diffusion models. Equivalence.
- \checkmark Relaxation times in RBMs
- in RBM
- \checkmark Associative mem in GAN Coherent samples from Zephyr

 \checkmark Training model with average of the gradient as opposed to gradient of the average