

Neural+Symbolic Learning A Probabilistic Journey

Jaron Maene - DTAI Seminar - 7/5/2024

- What is "neural-symbolic"? 1. => Introduce the *probabilistic view* from first-principles
- Contribution 1: embeddings & neural-symbolic 2.
- 3. Contribution 2: complexity & gradients

()utline

Part 1: What is neural-symbolic?



3



Supervised Learning

Find θ that maximises $p_{\theta}(Y \mid X)$ over dataset

$p_{\theta}(Y \mid X)$

Χ	Y
	ambulance
•••	•••



p(Cross | Vehicle = car, Lights = red)

To keep it simple: ϕ is propositional Boolean formula $\phi = (cross \leftrightarrow ambulance \lor (car \land green_lights))$ \land (car $\leftrightarrow \neg$ ambulance) \land (lights_green $\leftrightarrow \neg$ lights_red)

Logical Reasoning

$p_{\phi}(X = x) = \mathbb{1}(x \models \phi)$



- Not just logic...
- Not just a neural network...

p(Cross | Image = p(Cross | Image = ?)



$p(Cross \mid Image = 1, Lights = red) =$

p(Cross, Vehicle = car | Image = 2000, Lights = red)+p(Cross, Vehicle = ambulance | Image = 2000, Lights = red)

Marginalise



$p(V = car \mid I = \boxed{o}) \cdot p(C \mid V = car, L = red)$ $+p(V = ambulance | I = \square) \cdot p(C | V = ambulance, L = red)$

Decompose





We re-invented DeepProbLog*!

Neural networks Logic $p(Y | X) = \sum p(Y | Z = z) \prod p(Z_i = z_i | X)$ Z_i possible worlds

Weighted Model Counting

$p(Y \mid X) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(Z_i = z_i \mid X)$ $z:z \models Y \quad i$

- Linear combination of models.
- Generalisation of SAT solving.
- #P-hard in general, but decades of research have created strong solvers.

Neural-Symbolic Learning

Find θ such that



=> Weakly-supervised => Find "right" solution (c.f. reasoning shortcuts)



Neural-Symbolic Learning $\nabla p(Y \mid X) = \sum_{z} p(Y \mid Z = z) \ \nabla p(Z = z \mid X)$

End-to-end differentiable!

=> Parameter learning (vs. Structure Learning)

Why would you do this?

- ML view: bias-variance trade-off.
 => Craft bias for your problem (c.f. probabilistic programming)
 => Better performance / less data required
- 2. Safety view: get guarantees, more trustworthy.
- 3. Causality view: out-of-distribution generalisation.
- 4. KR view: many more possible questions you can ask.
- 5. Interpretability view: why did my model do this?
- 6. Psychology view: Compositionality, System 1 vs. System 2

Part 2: Embeddings & Neural-Symbolic







p(Cross | Image = 2000, Lights = orange) = ?



 $p(\text{orange} = \text{red})p(\text{Cross} \mid \text{Image} = \textbf{M})$, Lights = red)

$+p(\text{orange} = \text{green})p(\text{Cross} \mid \text{Image} = \fbox)$, Lights = green)



If you want a well-defined equality relation, you need a metric space. In other words, probabilistic equality = **embeddings**

$$p(x = y) = e^{-d(e(x), e(y))}$$

1.
$$p(x = x)$$

2. $p(x = y) = p(y = x)$
3. $p(x = y) \ge p(x = z) \cdot p(z)$





Soft-Unification

- Corresponds with Soft-Unification
- Corresponds with DeepProbLog: neural facts <=> embeddings.
- End-to-end differentiable learning of embeddings from proofs.
- Generalises knowledge graph embeddings

```
cross :- vehicle(car), light(green).
light(orange).
vehicle(car).
query(cross).
```

```
light(orange) == light(green)
=> Unification: No
=> Soft-unification: p(green == orange)
```



Part 3: Complexity & Gradients

Reduction of VWMC to WMC

If you have a WMC $p(\phi) = \sum \prod p(x)$, $I \models \phi \quad x \in I$

Proof: Using linearity of WMC. (Theorem 3.1, Maene et al., 2024)

Corollaries

- Computing $\nabla p(\phi)$ is #P-complete. 1.
- 2. (ϵ, δ) -approximating $\nabla p(\phi)$ is NP-hard.

then
$$\frac{\partial p(\phi)}{\partial x} = p(\phi \mid x) - p(\phi \mid \neg x).$$

Scalable gradients for NeSy

- Gradients can be approximate. (No-one uses exact gradients!)
- We do want unbiased and (ϵ, δ) -approximate (i.e. high probability of being close to true gradient).
- Existing gradient estimators unbiased, or require exponential number of samples.
- Score function estimator (aka REINFORCE): $\frac{\partial p(\phi)}{\partial x} = \mathbb{E}_{I \sim p(\cdot)} \left| \mathbbm{1}(I \models \phi) \frac{\partial \log p(x)}{\partial x} \right|$
- => Does become provably tractable for low-entropy distributions.

Weighted Model Estimator (WeightME)

=> Lot's of progress in approximate WMC solvers, can we leverage this for ∇ WMC? => Sample models instead of interpretations!

$$\frac{\partial \log p(\phi)}{\partial x} = \mathbb{E}_{I \sim p(\cdot | \phi)} \left[\frac{\partial \log p(x)}{\partial x} \mathbb{1}(I \models x) + \frac{\partial \log p(\neg x)}{\partial x} \mathbb{1}(I \models \neg x) \right]$$

=> Under mild assumptions, (ϵ , δ)-approximation using constant number of samples. => Requires a logarithmic number of SAT calls.

References

- J. Maene & L. De Raedt, "Soft-Unification in Deep Probabilistic Logic", Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2023.
- J. Maene, V. Derkinderen & L. De Raedt, "On the Hardness of Probabilistic Neurosymbolic Learning", International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML), 2024.

More general overview of Probabilistic NeSy:

- V. Derkinderen et al., "Semirings for Probabilistic & Neuro-probabilistic Programming", International Journal of Approximate Reasoning, 2024.
- G. Marra et al., "From Statistical Relational to Neurosymbolic AI", Artificial Intelligence Journal, 2024.