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**Abstract**

We introduce a prototype probabilistic programming language (PPL) called PusH for performing Bayesian inference on function spaces with a focus on Bayesian deep learning (BDL). We describe the core abstraction of PusH based on particles that links models, specified as neural networks (NNs), with inference, specified as procedures on particles using a concurrent programming model inspired by message passing. Finally, we test PusH on a variety of models and datasets used in scientific machine learning (SciML), a domain with natural function space inference problems, and we evaluate scaling of PusH on single-node multi-GPU devices. Thus we explore the combination of probabilistic programming, NNs, and concurrency in the context of Bayesian inference on function spaces. The code can be found at https://github.com/lbai-lab/PusH.

**1 Introduction**

Bayesian deep learning (BDL) [4, 7, 11, 12, 18, 31, 32] brings the benefits of Bayesian inference to function spaces. However, Bayesian inference over function spaces can be compute intensive and difficult to scale. BDL is also an emerging discipline whose benefits and feasibility is an active area of research. Consequently, we would like to lower the barrier to experimenting with novel algorithms and models.

Probabilistic programming [33, 34, 8, 19, 35, 13, 30, 23, 27, 28, 25, 29, 3, 1] is an approach to Bayesian inference where programming language and systems technology is applied to aid Bayesian inference. However, most existing probabilistic programming languages (PPLs) do not focus on function space priors nor Bayesian inference on function spaces. In this paper, we introduce a PPL called PusH for performing Bayesian inference on function spaces with a focus on BDL to address this gap. Our contributions are as follows.

- We introduce a language called PusH (abbreviation for particle pushforward on Hilbert space) and a core abstraction based on particles (Section 2). The main idea behind PusH is that particles link models, specified as neural networks (NNs), with inference, specified as procedures on particles using a concurrent programming model inspired by message passing (between particles). Thus we explore the combination of probabilistic programming, NNs, and concurrency in the context of Bayesian inference on function spaces. The code can be found at https://github.com/lbai-lab/PusH.

Preprint. Under review.
• We demonstrate how to encode various Bayesian inference algorithms in Pus\(\mathbb{H}\) using the particle abstraction including SWAG \cite{18} and Stein Variational Gradient Descent \cite{17} (Section 3). The idea is that the language designer and BDL researchers can implement various Bayesian inference algorithms using the particle abstraction.

• We evaluate Pus\(\mathbb{H}\) on various scientific machine learning \cite{21,10} (SciML) models/datasets and demonstrate promising single-node performance scaling as a function of GPU devices utilized (Section 4). SciML is an emerging discipline that studies inference problems on data generated from natural processes and has an abundance of natural function space inference problems. Thus Pus\(\mathbb{H}\) may be of independent interest to users in the SciML community.

1.1 Related Work

Our work is inspired by probabilistic programming and deep probabilistic programming, although there are three main differences. First, most existing PPL designs are ill-adapted for the use case of specifying function space priors. In particular, many PPLs specify distributions on program traces \cite{33,34,8,19,35,15,30} or use a restricted modeling language to provide notation to define familiar probabilistic models such as graphical models \cite{23,27}. The former approach is general which increases the difficulty of inference since gradient-based methods are typically not used. The latter approach is typically not expressive enough to capture function space distributions. Our approach will focus on function spaces explicitly.

Second, most existing PPL designs do not focus on enabling Bayesian inference on function space priors. Deep probabilistic programming \cite{28,25,29,3,1} is a emerging paradigm that enables lightweight interoperability between probabilistic programs and NNs. However, these frameworks focus on enabling Bayesian inference for non-function space priors by leveraging the underlying NN library to take derivatives. Our approach will introduce a unified abstraction for model and inference based on particles. Similar to some deep probabilistic programming languages \cite{29}, Pus\(\mathbb{H}\) also provides no separation of concerns between models and inference.

Third, most existing PPLs focus on a sequential model of computation whereas our work is based on a concurrent model of computation. Thus our work explores the intersection of probabilistic programming, NNs, and concurrency.

2 Language

We walk through an example of Pus\(\mathbb{H}\) first (Section 2.1) to illustrate the main ideas before discussing it’s design (Section 2.2) and implementation (Section 2.3) in more detail.

2.1 Motivation and Example

Many BDL algorithms consist of replicas of a NN. For example, a deep ensemble \cite{14} replicates a NN multiple times. SWAG \cite{18} maintains two additional parameter sets corresponding to the first and second moments of a NN. Stein Variational Gradient Descent (SVGD) \cite{17}, when applied to a Bayesian NN, will replicate NN parameter sets multiple times as well. In this paper, we will refer to each NN replica as a \textit{particle}.

The obvious challenge with many BDL algorithms is that we have to work with \(N\) particles, which can be time-consuming and memory-intensive. Moreover, such an approach may require communication between various particles to compute required information. Figure 1 illustrates common communication patterns in BDL algorithms. A deep ensemble requires no communication, SWAG requires communication between a main particle and two children particles, and SVGD requires communication between all particles. Consequently, it can be tedious and error-prone to implement BDL algorithms without language support. Instead, we might hope that an abstraction that (1) enables us to scalably declare \(N\) NNs and (2) primitives for point-to-point communication between each of the \(N\) NNs to exchange information useful for speeding up training may enable more rapid exploration and implementation of BDL algorithms. This forms the core idea behind the \textit{particle abstraction} in Pus\(\mathbb{H}\).

To illustrate this idea, consider the implementation of a deep ensemble \cite{14}, a simple BDL algorithm \cite{32}. Figure 2 provides an encoding of a deep ensemble \cite{14} involving three NNs in Pus\(\mathbb{H}\).
Figure 1: Communication patterns of various BDL algorithms. Each color represents a separate particle, i.e., NN instance. Each arrow represents communication of parameters. Each box corresponds to one logical step across all particles.
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Figure 2: A centralized communication pattern for encoding a deep ensemble in PusH.

On Line 4, we construct a particle neural network ParticleNN where SomeTorchNN is a generic PyTorch NN created with arguments *args. This wraps an ordinary NN in a form where the language implementation can now introspect and manipulate it to provide support for Bayesian inference. On Line 6, we use pinit to initialize three particles where each particle corresponds to one setting of NN parameters. The particles are indexed by 0, 1, and 2 respectively.

Lines 7-14 give an example encoding of a deep ensemble. On Line 10, we enumerate each particle. On Line 12, we use a pstep function that calls the typical optimization step on a particle specified by the appropriate index: (1) compute a forward pass, (2) zero the gradients, (3) compute the loss, (4) compute a backward pass, and (5) update the parameters. By default, pstep is asynchronous. Finally, on Line 14, we synchronize across all three particles using pjoin using the returned events that we have accumulated. Thus we have a centralized method of encoding a deep ensemble where the particle neural network synchronizes each batch of training.

### 2.2 From Example to Particle Abstraction

While it may be conceptually simple to map the usage of particles to deep ensembles in the example above, the challenge of presenting the idea of a particle as an abstraction in a language is that it should be general. Towards this end, we would like to demonstrate that the particle abstraction (1) is expressive so that it can encode arbitrary distributions on function spaces and (2) is flexible so that it can express a variety of inference algorithms.
Model: Particles approximate function space distributions via a pushforward. One method for specifying a distribution on functions is using weight space view. For example,

\[ nn(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) = g(f(x; \theta_1); \theta_2) \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where random variables \( \theta_1 \sim \mu_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \sim \mu_2 \) for some distributions \( \mu_1 \) and \( \mu_2 \), and parameterized functions \( f(\cdot; \theta_1) \) and \( g(\cdot; \theta_2) \), defines a distribution on functions. Alternatively, we can also define the same distribution on functions using the pushforward of a distribution with respect to (w.r.t) a function. As a reminder, the pushforward of a distribution \( \mu \) on \( \Theta \) w.r.t. \( F : \Theta \rightarrow Y \) is \( \mu(F) = B \mapsto \mu(F^{-1}(B)) \) for any measurable subset \( B \) of \( \Theta \). Obviously, it is not practical to represent high-dimensional distributions as general measures. Instead, we can define the particle pushforward

\[ \mu^\alpha_x(F) = \{ \theta^\alpha_1 \mapsto F(\theta^\alpha_1), \ldots, \theta^\alpha_n \mapsto F(\theta^\alpha_n) \} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

which approximates \( \mu \), using particles \( \{ \theta^\alpha_1, \ldots, \theta^\alpha_n \} \) where the superscript indicates that the particles are chosen in a manner dependent on \( \mu \) (e.g., a sample) and will be dropped from now on to declutter the notation. In the case of parameterized functions \( g(x; \theta) \), we can define the particle pushforward as

\[ \text{ppush}(\mu)(g(x; \cdot)) = \mu^\delta_x(g(x; \cdot)) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

when the parameter \( \theta \) is random (i.e., the argument \( x \) is given). When both the argument and the parameter are random, we use the notation

\[ \text{ppush}(\mu \otimes \mu_0)(g) = \mu^\delta_x(g) \]  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where \( \otimes \) is the product distribution so that the first component defines the distribution on the argument and the second component defines the distribution on the parameter. Putting this together, the function space prior that we have defined previously is

\[ nn(x; \theta_1, \theta_2) = \text{ppush}(\text{ppush}(\mu_1)(f(x; \cdot)) \otimes \mu_2)(g) \]

\[ = \{ (\theta^\alpha_1, \theta^\alpha_1 \mapsto g(f(x; \theta^\alpha_1); \theta^\alpha_2), \ldots, (\theta^\alpha_n, \theta^\alpha_n \mapsto g(f(x; \theta^\alpha_n); \theta^\alpha_n)) \} \]  \hspace{1cm} (5

PushH uses NNs with particles, i.e., particle neural networks, to directly express a distribution on functions. Since ppush is simply an alternative method for defining a distribution on functions that highlights the link with particles, we choose to define models in PushH using standard NN definitions to maintain interoperability. Consequently, a particle neural network can simply wrap an existing NN. Each call to pinit in a particle neural network creates an instance of \( g(\cdot; \theta_i) \) where \( i \) is the index of the particle. PushH is named after particle pushforwards: particle pushforward on Hilbert space.

Inference: Particles and gradients provide the link between model and inference. PushH provides no separation of concerns between model and inference. Instead, the interaction between particles and gradients provides the link to an inference algorithm implementation. The observation that particles and gradients can be used in tandem to construct Bayesian algorithms is not new. In our example, it is used (trivially) to implement inference for deep ensembles which can be understood from a Bayesian perspective [32]. It is also used in SVGD [17]. However, from a language perspective, it is important that we can extract out a key principle that can be used across a range of algorithms involving particles so that we can justify the usefulness of the particle abstraction for supporting inference.

Towards this end, suppose \( \mu = p(\theta) \) is a prior distribution with differentiable density and \( f = p(D \mid \theta) \) is a differentiable likelihood. Then

\[ \nabla \log p(\theta_i \mid D) = \nabla \log \left( \frac{p(D \mid \theta_i)p(\theta_i)}{p(D)} \right) = \nabla \log (p(D \mid \theta_i)p(\theta_i)) \]  \hspace{1cm} (7)

for any particle \( \theta_i \) so that the gradient of the posterior at a particle (hard to compute) is equal to the gradient of the unnormalized joint distribution (computable by definition). The key point is that \( p(D) \) is a constant so its derivative is 0. Notably, SVGD relies on this principle (among many other insights). We make two remarks about this principle with regards to probabilistic programming.

First, many PPLs rely on Markov-Chain-Monte-Carlo (MCMC), another popular Bayesian inference method. While there are many design decisions, the key idea is that MCMC eliminates the need to compute the intractable denominator \( p(D) \) via a division (symmetry via detailed balance). PPLs can leverage this key idea to generate model specific inference code. Similarly, our hope here is that PushH...
Figure 3: High-level PusH architecture. A particle neural network provides a particle abstraction which enables (1) definition of an arbitrary number of particles, (2) point-to-point communication between each particle, and (3) asynchronous execution of each particle. The implementation maps this to (1) a device event loop and (2) a context switching mechanism (active/inactive) similar to an operating system for resource management.

will enable the study of more algorithms that perform (approximate) Bayesian inference on function spaces that rely on the idea that the intractable denominator $p(D)$ can be eliminated via gradients.

Second, Bayesian inference in probabilistic programs is often presented as “running a program backwards from observations to inputs”. Equation (7) expresses the intuition that posterior inference can be seen as running a program backwards from observations to parameters since back-propagation transmits information backwards along the particle. This adds credence to the view that particles link model and inference. More generally, we might imagine any linguistic support for reversible computation (e.g., if the density is invertible) enables Bayesian inference. Similar ideas have been explored in reversible NNs for generative modeling [6, 13].

2.3 From Particle Abstraction to Implementation

Solving the language design problem is only half the challenge. The second challenge involves developing a practical implementation of the language. Our previous discussion of a deep ensemble alludes to two issues that we will encounter in implementing PusH: (1) scaling the number of particles and (2) communication between particles.

In solving these challenges, we are inspired by techniques for distributed NN training [2], although our challenges are orthogonal to those solved by data parallelism and model parallelism. Data parallelism requires distributing data across hardware accelerators, and thus, requires synchronization of gradients for back propagation. In our case, we will use the same data to fit different particles. Consequently, we do not need to distribute data. Model parallelism involves splitting a large model across multiple hardware accelerators when a single model does not fit on a single hardware accelerator, and thus, requires synchronization of gradients across accelerators during back propagation. In our case, particles share the same model so this is not necessary as well. Instead, synchronization is required when particles communicate with each other.

Figure 3 illustrates the main architecture of PusH which borrows from systems and language implementation design techniques designed to implement concurrent systems. The main idea is that each particle can be implemented as a lightweight process called a device event loop that can communicate via message passing with other particles and the main particle neural network. This strategy is inspired by the approaches taken to implement concurrent languages such as Erlang and Go, although the setting of Bayesian inference will suggest different design choices. We describe the components of PusH in more detail now.
**Component 1: Device event loop** A device event loop is an isolated process that maps to a single physical GPU accelerator. As the name suggests, a device event loop is an event loop whose primary responsibilities include (1) performing operations on all the particles on the device event loop and (2) handling communication between other device event loops and the parent particle neural network. Operations on a particle include normal NN operations such as (1) computing a forward pass, (2) computing a backward pass, and (3) performing a parameter update. These operations use the appropriate accelerator device that the device event loop is mapped to. Thus a device event loop forms the primary place where computations in Push take place.

We make the design decision to create a single device event loop for a single physical GPU accelerator. Thus a Push program running on hardware that has four physical GPUs will spawn four independent device event loops. Because a user can define an arbitrary number of particles, this means that multiple particles may map to the same device event loop. We make this choice for at least two reasons.

First, mapping each particle to a separate device event loop increases fault-tolerance but incurs communication overhead. While fault tolerance is also important in our setting, our first concern is on scaling the number of particles that Push can handle in a non-distributed setting such as single multi-GPU node so we can explore the benefits of scaling BDL algorithms. We leave it for future work to consider the case of fault-tolerance. Second, communication with an accelerator device such as a GPU is already asynchronous. Consequently, introducing more processes may not necessarily improve speed of the computation.

Message passing between two different particles is handled by their respective device event loops. If the particles are on different device event loops, messages are communicated via message queues handled by their respective device event loops. This incurs communication overhead. If particles are on the same device event loop, messages are handled locally and communication overhead can be eliminated. Currently, users are given control over which device event loop to place a particle on.

The tradeoff with our approach is that we may run into memory issues on any single GPU. In particular, since a device event loop may contain multiple particles and each particle corresponds to a NN which may be large, the accelerator itself may run out of memory. In a traditional operating system, abstractions such as virtual memory and context-switching is used to share the compute and memory resources for threads. Inspired by this, Push also contains a simple context switching mechanism for particles.

Every device event loop contains an active set which limits the maximum number of active particles allowable on a single device. When more particles are used by a BDL algorithm than allowed by the particle cache, the device event loop will perform a context switch to swap out particles to an inactive set using a least-recently-used (LRU) policy similar to one found in hardware caching. It would be an interesting direction of future work to explore other kinds of replacement policies. It would also be interesting to explore advanced optimizations such as just-in-time compilation where particles with static computation graphs can be pinned in accelerator memory although we leave this for future work.

**Component 2: Particle neural network** The particle neural network contains the top-level Push program. It serves as the entry point for managing all resources, creating new particles (via pinit), and synchronizing across all particles. The creation of a particle neural network will create multiple device event loops depending on the underlying hardware availability. Particles are allocated on an existing device event loop and broadcast across all other device event loops so that point-to-point communication between particles is possible. The particle neural network primarily serves as a point of synchronization as most work is done on the respective device event loops. Currently, a particle neural network does not support distributed device event loops although there is no technical reason why Push cannot since device event loops are isolated processes with point-to-point communication. It would be an interesting direction of future work to explore a distributed Push implementation.

Push is embedded in Python and is implemented on top of PyTorch. This enables us to take advantage of an established ecosystem for enabling a probabilistic programming approach to Bayesian inference on function spaces and experiment with the particle abstraction. In particular, the design and implementation of Push attempts to take advantage of existing accelerator infrastructure used for distributed NN training, but adapting it for other purposes scaling Bayesian inference on function spaces.
def _svgd_step(particle, state):
    # Gather every other particle's parameters
    evts = []; particle_to_evt = {}
    for p in particle.particles():
        if p != particle.pid:
            evts += [particle.get(p)]; particle_to_evt[p] = evts[-1]
    params = particle.join(evts)

    # SVGD update using 'params' and 'state' ...

def svgd_push(dataloader, loss_fn, epochs, n, nn, *args):
    with ParticleNN(nn, *args) as pnn:
        for p in range(n):
            pnn.pinit(mk_empty_optim)
        for p in range(n):
            pnn.phook_register(p, "SVGD_UPDATE", _svgd_step,
                state={"kernel_bandwidth": 1.0, 'lr': 1e-3})
        for e in range(epochs):
            for data, label in dataloader:
                # 1. Perform gradient computations on each particle
                events = [pnn.pstep(p, loss_fn, data, label) for p in range(n)]
                # 2. Synchronize
                pnn.pjoin(events)
                # 3. All-to-all and update
                events2 = [pnn.psend(p, "SVGD_UPDATE") for p in range(n)]
                pnn.pjoin(events2)

Figure 4: An excerpt of an SVGD implementation.

3 Bayesian Inference in PusH

In this section, we encode various existing BDL algorithms using the particle abstraction in PusH. The idea is that users and BDL researchers can use these abstractions to more easily experiment with algorithms that require more particles.

3.1 Example: SWAG

We have implemented SWAG using the particle abstraction. Related algorithms such as SWA and MultiSWAG are conceptually similar. This family of algorithms typically use a standard optimizer to train a NN for some number of epochs. Subsequently they begin to keep track of estimates of first and/or second moments of the parameters to make a Gaussian approximation of the posterior. In our implementation, we use the particle abstraction to store these estimates and the communication primitives in the language to synchronize first and/or second moment computations as illustrated in Figure 1b.

3.2 Example: Stein Variational Gradient Descent

Figure 4 provides an excerpt of a SVGD implementation in PusH that illustrate the salient points. Lines 3-7 implements an all-to-all communication pattern present in SVGD between all particles (Figure 1c). On Line 4, the code particle.particles() gives each particle access to particle identifiers for every other particle that is present. On Line 6, the code particle.get(p) asynchronously accesses the state of particle p. On Line 7, the code particle.join(evts) blocks until all parameters have been retrieved. We then use this information to complete the rest of the SVGD step.

The top-level SVGD functionality is contained in svgd_push. Lines 13-17 initialize and register n particles. On Line 21, we asynchronously initiate a pstep on each particle so that every particle now contains gradient information. Note that particles executed on different device event loops are handled in parallel in a manner that is transparent to the user and one of the advantages of using a language like PusH. On Line 23, we synchronize on the particle neural network so that every particle

Figure 5: SciML uses cases to test performance of Push. The reported time per epoch is averaged across 20 epochs. FNO and UNet learn a partial differential equation. CGCNN and Schnet learn a potential energy surface.

has a gradient before it is passed to every other particle. This communication pattern would be more difficult to express if a particle neural network was not distinct from a particle event loop. Finally, on Line 25, we send a message to trigger _svgd_step to invoke the SVGD step which exchanges information between every particle.

4 Experiments

We evaluate Push in two different ways. First, we apply Push to several models and tasks in SciML to demonstrate its applicability in a setting with natural function space inference problems (Section 4.1). Second, we study the scaling properties of Push given our design decisions (Section 4.2).

4.1 SciML Use Cases

Deep learning and NNs are becoming increasingly popular in SciML for the purposes of constructing surrogate models and solving inverse problems. Uncertainty quantification is important in these contexts since scientists and engineers want to provide guarantees on the trustworthiness of surrogate models and inferred solutions to inverse problems. Due to the natural fit of Bayesian methods for SciML use cases, we choose several SciML datasets and models to test Push on.

Our goal is to test Push’s applicability and not the performance of any specific Bayesian inference algorithms. Towards this end, we select NNs that give us a wide range of architectures to test Push. We choose UNEt and Fourier Neural Operator (FNO) from PDEBench, a SciML benchmark. These networks are similar to convolutional NNs. We use the Advection dataset introduced in PDEBench. FNO and UNet learn a partial differential equation. We also select two quantum chemistry networks Schnet and CGCNN, both of which is a graph NN. Both networks are designed specifically for the use case of learning a potential energy surface. We train on 1000 geometries of the Asprin molecule from MD17 for our quantum chemistry experiments. The quantum chemistry networks are interesting in that their loss functions use derivatives of the model w.r.t. the input. Thus we can also test Push’s ability to cope with higher-order gradients. Importantly, we can incorporate these NNs into Push with minimal effort. Some porting is required since many SciML NNs have non-standard prediction functions that need to be wrapped to match Push’s interface.

Figure 5 compares the time per epoch of training for each NN for each method averaged across 20 epochs of training. We did not observe high variance in time per epoch. Standard training is handled with each NN’s respective training procedures detailed in either PDEBench or their original papers. For UNEt training, we do not use autoregressive training. The method SWAG uses the original code provided in the paper. SWAG Push uses our implementation of these BDL
We make two observations. First, for a smaller NN where $D = 200$, we obtain no distinguishable behavior between 1, 2, or 4 active particles. We find that using 2 devices is slightly slower than 1 device. This suggests that the cost of context switching and the cost of communication dominate the computation. Second, for a larger NN where $D = 2000$, the 2 device PushH implementation is roughly 2 − 3 times faster than the single device implementation. This suggests that the cost of computation outweighs the cost of communication. Moreover, we observe that larger active sets are beneficial for further improving the performance of computation so that the cost of computation outweighs the cost of context switching.

All tests are done on workstations with 2x RTX 3090 GPUs with 24GB of video RAM. We have not tested on 4 and 8 GPU hardware but anticipate similar performance gains as the number of devices is increased.

4.2 Scaling

We test the scaling of PushH on a simple NN architecture using SVGD (bandwidth 1 and step size of $10^{-3}$) with a uniform prior on all NN weights. The NN architecture consists of $N = 10$ fully connected layers of size $D \times D$ followed by a $D \times 1$ prediction layer. We choose a random dataset with 10 batches of 128 datapoints of dimension $D = 200$ and $D = 2000$. Since we only are measuring performance and not quality, we train for 20 epochs and report the average time. The standard deviation is small compared to the average time so we do not report it. Figure 6 illustrates the scaling of time per epoch (in seconds) as a function of the number of SVGD particles on one device and two devices. As a reminder, SVGD has an all-to-all communication pattern and synchronization. Consequently, we should expect to see a quadratic scaling in the time per epoch as each graph illustrates.

We make two observations. First, for a smaller NN where $D = 200$, we obtain no distinguishable behavior between 1, 2, or 4 active particles. We find that using 2 devices is slightly slower than 1 device. This suggests that the cost of context switching and the cost of communication dominate the computation. Second, for a larger NN where $D = 2000$, the 2 device PushH implementation is roughly 2 − 3 times faster than the single device implementation. This suggests that the cost of computation outweighs the cost of communication. Moreover, we observe that larger active sets are beneficial for further improving the performance of computation so that the cost of computation outweighs the cost of context switching.

Figure 6: Scaling behavior of PushH as a function of number of active particles ($A$) and size of fully connected layer ($D$) using SVGD with a varying number of particles. The reported time per epoch is averaged across 20 epochs.

4.1Implementations

For SVGD PushH, we use two particles and uniform priors on the NNs since we are interested in performance of PushH. All tests are done on one device.

We make several observations. First, the BDL algorithms are slower than the standard training procedure as expected. Second, the PushH implementation of SWAG is slower than the handwritten implementation of SWAG. This is due to the fact that we have extra costs associated with managing particles as opposed to simply keeping track of two extra parameter sets. Thus there is a performance cost to using the particle abstraction. Third, SVGD is a costly method so we will need language support for scaling. In the next section, we will analyze the scaling properties of PushH on single-node and multi-GPU devices in more detail.
increased. As we have mentioned previously, it should be easy to extend PusH to a distributed setting as future work.

5 Discussion

We explore the combination of probabilistic programming, NNs, and concurrency in the context of Bayesian inference on function spaces in this paper. In particular, we demonstrate (1) how particles can be used to approximately describe function space distributions in PusH and (2) BDL algorithms can be implemented as concurrent procedures on particles that interact seamlessly with gradients. We also explore the challenges of scaling such an implementation and demonstrate promising single-node multi-GPU scaling results.

If a sequential process is analogous to a point-estimate, then a concurrent process is analogous to obtaining a distributional estimate. This analogy reframes aspects of Bayesian inference in language and systems terms, and hints at why a combined language and systems approach offered by probabilistic programming is not only feasible, but well-founded and advantageous as well. Our hope is that PusH can form a springboard for exploring more BDL algorithms that have more expressive communication patterns. Applying more advanced language and systems optimizations to PusH is also an interesting direction of research, particularly since we can leverage the same hardware architectures that are used for distributed NN training.
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6 Supplementary Material

6.1 Bayesian Inference Algorithms in PushH in More Detail

```python
def _deep_ensemble_main(particle: Particle, state: dict[str, any]) -> None:
    # Unpack state
    dataloader, loss_fn, epochs = state["dataloader"], state["loss_fn"], state["epochs"]

    # Training loop
    for e in tqdm(range(epochs)):
        losses = []
        for data, label in dataloader:
            loss = particle.step(loss_fn, data.to(particle.device), label.to(particle.device))
            losses += [loss]
        print(f"Average loss {particle.pid}", torch.mean(torch.tensor(losses)))

    def train_deep_ensemble_distribute(mk_dataloader: Callable, loss_fn: Callable, epochs: int,
                                         num_ensembles: int, nn: Callable, *args) -> None:
        with push_pnn.ParticleNN(nn, *args) as pnn:
            # Create particles
            for n in range(num_ensembles):
                pnn.pinit(mk_optim)

            # Register hooks
            for p in range(pnn.num_particles()):
                pnn.phook_register(p, "ENSEMBLE_MAIN", _deep_ensemble_main, state={
                    "dataloader": mk_dataloader(),
                    "loss_fn": loss_fn,
                    "epochs": epochs,
                })

            # Perform independent training
            for p in range(pnn.num_particles()):
                pnn.psend(p, "ENSEMBLE_MAIN")
```

Figure 7: Distributed deep ensemble in PushH.

Figure[7] provides the code in PushH for a deep ensemble. Unlike the deep ensemble presented in the main text, we train each particle independently of one another by asynchronously sending a message to each particle.

Figure[8] provides the code in PushH for SWAG. The code _swag_1st_moment is used to update the second particle which keeps track of the first moment. The code _swag_2nd_moment is used to update the third particle which keeps track of the second moment. The first and second moment update codes each obtain information from the first particle which contains the NN weights. We use the particle neural network to synchronize updating the NN weights with updating the first and second moment updates. The state n is used to keep track of the number of training iterations. In our experience, the primary advantage of writing SWAG in PushH as opposed to a hand-written implementation is a first-class and functional interface for keeping track of the first and second moments without resorting to code that modifies the state of an existing NN.

Figure[9] provides the code in PushH for SVGD. The code _svgd_update performs the SVGD update. The first part of the code obtains the particle state and gradients from every other particle. The second part of the code performs the SVGD update by computing a step using a pairwise comparison using the kernel w.r.t. every other particle. The user can select the prior distribution on the NN parameters by setting ppush to an appropriate function that computes the log density of the NN weights w.r.t. the prior distribution. There is potential for speedup on multi-GPU devices since the code is less specific about the order-of-evaluation compared to a hand-written implementation. In particular, since PushH is asynchronous, particles allocated on different device event loops can execute in parallel, leading to speedups. This is shown in Figure[6]
```python
def _swag_1st_moment(particle: Particle, state: dict[str, any]) -> None:
    eid = particle.get(0)
    params = particle.join([eid])[eid]
    with torch.no_grad():
        for thetas, p in zip(particle.module.parameters(), params):
            thetas.copy_((thetas*state["n"] + p) / (state["n"] + 1))
    state["n"] += 1

def _swag_2nd_moment(particle: Particle, state: dict[str, any]) -> None:
    eid = particle.get(0)
    params = particle.join([eid])[eid]
    with torch.no_grad():
        for thetas, p in zip(particle.module.parameters(), params):
            thetas.copy_((thetas*state["n"] + p**2) / (state["n"] + 1))
    state["n"] += 1

def swag_push(dataloader: DataLoader, loss_fn: Callable, pretrain_epochs: int,
              swag_epochs: int, nn: Callable, *args) -> None:
    with push_pnn.ParticleNN(nn, *args, cache_size=4) as pnn:
        # Particle for parameter
        param_pid = pnn.pinit(mk_optim)
        # Pretraining
        for e in tqdm(range(pretrain_epochs)):
            losses = []
            for data, label in dataloader:
                loss = pnn.pstep(param_pid, loss_fn, data, label, sync=True)
                losses += [loss]
            print(f"Average loss", torch.mean(torch.tensor(losses)))
        # Particle for Swag 1st moment
        mom1_pid = pnn.pinit(mk_optim)
        pnn.phook_register(mom1_pid, "SWAG_1st_MOMENT", _swag_1st_moment, state={"n": 1})
        # Particle for Swag 2nd moment
        mom2_pid = pnn.pinit(mk_optim)
        pnn.phook_register(mom2_pid, "SWAG_2nd_MOMENT", _swag_2nd_moment, state={"n": 1})
        # Swag training
        for e in tqdm(range(swag_epochs)):
            losses = []
            swag_losses = []
            for data, label in dataloader:
                # Update
                loss = pnn.pstep(param_pid, loss_fn, data, label, sync=True)
                losses += [loss]
                # SWAG update
                evt1 = pnn.psend(mom1_pid, "SWAG_1st_MOMENT", sync=False)
                evt2 = pnn.psend(mom2_pid, "SWAG_2nd_MOMENT", sync=False)
                pnn.pjoin([evt1, evt2])
```

Figure 8: SWAG in Push.
```python
def _svgd_update(particle: Particle, state: dict[str, any]) -> None:
    # Gather
    evts = []; particle_to_evt = {}
    for p in particle.particles():
        if p != particle.pid:
            evts += [particle.get(p)]; particle_to_evt[p] = evts[-1]
    params = particle.join(evts)
    # Remap
    particles = {p: params[evt] for p, evt in particle_to_evt.items()}
    particles[particle.pid] = list(particle.module.parameters())
    # Unpack state
    l, lr, ppush = state["kernel_bandwidth"], state["lr"], state["ppush"]
    n = len(particle.particles())
    # Accumulator for update
    acc = [torch.zeros_like(p) for p in particles[particle.pid]]
    for j in range(n):
        if ppush: # Compute gradients of prior distribution
            grads = ppush(particles[j])
            for idx, tmp in enumerate(acc):
                p_i = particles[particle.pid][idx]; p_j = particles[j][idx].to(p_i.device)
                k_ij = torch_squared_exp_kernel(p_j.flatten(), p_i.flatten(), length_scale=l).item()
                if p_j.grad is not None: # grad p(p_j)
                    tmp.add_(p_j.grad, alpha=k_ij)
                if ppush: # Add in prior
                    tmp.add_(grads[idx])
                k_ij_grad = torch_squared_exp_kernel_grad_arg1(p_j.flatten(), p_i.flatten(), length_scale=l)
                tmp.add_(k_ij_grad.reshape(p_j.size()), alpha=1/n)
                with torch.no_grad():
                    for idx, p in enumerate(particles[particle.pid]):
                        p.add_(acc[idx], alpha=-lr)

def svgd_push(dataloader: DataLoader, loss_fn: Callable, epochs: int, num_particles: int, nn: Callable, *args) -> None:
    with push_pnn.ParticleNN(nn, *args) as pnn:
        # Create particles
        for p in range(num_particles):
            pnn.pinit(mk_empty_optim, 0)
        for p in range(num_particles):
            pnn.phook_register(p, "SVGD_UPDATE", _svgd_update, state={
                "kernel_bandwidth": 1.0, "lr": 1e-3, "ppush": normal_nn_ppush,
            })
        # SVGD loop
        for e in tqdm(range(epochs)):
            for data, label in dataloader:
                # Compute gradients
                pnn.pjoin([nn.pstep(p, loss_fn, data, label, sync=False) for p in range(num_particles)])
                # SVGD update
                pnn.pjoin([nn.psend(p, "SVGD_UPDATE") for p in range(num_particles)])
                # Tracking loss on first particle
                loss = torch.nn.MSELoss()(nn.pforward(0, data, sync=True), label)
                losses += [torch.mean(torch.tensor(loss))]
            print(f"Average loss", torch.mean(torch.tensor(losses)))
```

Figure 9: SVGD in PushH.
6.2 Scaling in Pus\(\mathbb{H}\) in More Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
<th>Slowdown, Device = 1</th>
<th>Slowdown, Device = 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D=1000/D=200 D=2000/D=1000</td>
<td>D=1000/D=200 D=2000/D=1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.04 1.03</td>
<td>1.05 1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.61 3.17</td>
<td>1.15 2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.41 3.46</td>
<td>3.42 3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.34 3.57</td>
<td>3.41 3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.77 3.60</td>
<td>3.29 3.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Slowdown of Pus\(\mathbb{H}\) across NNs of various sizes with an active set of 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
<th>Slowdown, Device = 1</th>
<th>Slowdown, Device = 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D=1000/D=200 D=2000/D=1000</td>
<td>D=1000/D=200 D=2000/D=1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.34 1.06</td>
<td>1.07 1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.16 1.15</td>
<td>1.16 2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.37 3.52</td>
<td>1.46 1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.27 3.59</td>
<td>3.26 3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.75 3.61</td>
<td>3.24 3.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Slowdown of Pus\(\mathbb{H}\) across NNs of various sizes with an active set of 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
<th>Slowdown, Device = 1</th>
<th>Slowdown, Device = 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D=1000/D=200 D=2000/D=1000</td>
<td>D=1000/D=200 D=2000/D=1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05 1.02</td>
<td>1.08 1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.05 1.09</td>
<td>1.16 2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.02 1.39</td>
<td>1.33 2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.14 3.56</td>
<td>1.54 2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.75 3.60</td>
<td>3.12 3.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Slowdown of Pus\(\mathbb{H}\) across NNs of various sizes with an active set of 4.

Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3 provide the slowdowns of Pus\(\mathbb{H}\) across NNs of various sizes and active sets, and expands upon the experiments summarized in Figure 6. A NN with \(D=1000\) compared to one with \(D=200\) is 25 times smaller since \(1000^2/200^2 = 25\). Similarly, a NN with \(D=2000\) compared to one with \(D=1000\) is 4 times smaller since \(2000^2/1000^2 = 4\). Thus we should theoretically expect a 25 x slowdown for \(D=1000/D=200\) and a 4 x slowdown for \(D=2000/D=1000\).

There are at least two reasons why the observed slowdown can deviate from the theoretical slowdown. First, this can occur due to overhead in Pus\(\mathbb{H}\)’s implementation. For example, in Table 1 with 1 device and an active set of 1, we should expect all the observed slowdowns to be close to the theoretical slowdowns. When comparing \(D=1000/D=200\), we see that the observed slowdown here is much lower than the theoretical slowdown. Rather than this indicating a speedup, this means that small NNs have large overhead in Pus\(\mathbb{H}\). When comparing \(D=2000/D=1000\), we see that the observed slowdown here is much closer to the theoretical slowdown. As the number of particles increases, we trend closer to the theoretical slowdown as Pus\(\mathbb{H}\)’s overhead becomes dominated by scaling the number of particles.

Second, the deviation between an observed slowdown and a theoretical slowdown can result from the size of the active set or number of devices which can improve the performance. For example, in Table 2 when comparing \(D=2000/D=100\) with an active set of 2 and 1 device, we see that slowdown for 2 particles is 1.15 whereas the slowdown for 4 particles is 3.52. The deviation of 1.15 from 4 can be attributed here to eliminating the need for context switching. When comparing \(D=1000/D=200\) with an active set of 2 and 2 devices, we see that the slowdown decreases to 1.99 from 3.52. This can be attributed to doubling the number of compute by doubling the number of
devices. However, the slowdown is still larger than 1.15, which means that on a relative basis it is harder to improve performance across multiple devices than it is on a single device.