

Target Score Matching

Valentin De Bortoli^{*1}, Michael Hutchinson², Peter Wirnsberger², and Arnaud Doucet¹

¹Google DeepMind

²Isomorphic Labs

Abstract

Denoising Score Matching estimates the score of a “noised” version of a target distribution by minimizing a regression loss and is widely used to train the popular class of Denoising Diffusion Models. A well known limitation of Denoising Score Matching, however, is that it yields poor estimates of the score at low noise levels. This issue is particularly unfavourable for problems in the physical sciences and for Monte Carlo sampling tasks for which the score of the “clean” original target is known. Intuitively, estimating the score of a slightly noised version of the target should be a simple task in such cases. In this paper, we address this shortcoming and show that it is indeed possible to leverage knowledge of the target score. We present a Target Score Identity and corresponding Target Score Matching regression loss which allows us to obtain score estimates admitting favourable properties at low noise levels.

1 Introduction and Motivation

1.1 Denoising Score Identity and Denoising Score Matching

Consider a \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variable $X \sim p_X$ and let $Y|(X=x) \sim p_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)$ be a “noisy” version of X . We denote the joint density of (X, Y) by $p_{X,Y}(x, y) = p_X(x)p_{Y|X}(y|x)$ and refer to expectation and variance w.r.t. to this distribution as $\mathbb{E}_{X,Y}$ and $\text{Var}_{X,Y}$, respectively. We are interested in estimating the score of the distribution of Y , that is $\nabla \log p_Y(y)$, where

$$p_Y(y) = \int p_X(x)p_{Y|X}(y|x)dx. \quad (1)$$

Evaluating this score is particularly useful for denoising tasks, especially Denoising Diffusion Models (DDM) which require estimates at different noise levels (Sohl-Dickstein et al., 2015; Ho et al., 2020; Song et al., 2021). A standard derivation shows that the identity

$$\nabla \log p_Y(y) = \int \nabla \log p_{Y|X}(y|x) p_{X|Y}(x|y)dx \quad (2)$$

holds under mild regularity assumptions, where henceforth $\nabla \log p_{Y|X}(y|x)$ denotes the gradient with respect to y and

$$p_{X|Y}(x|y) = \frac{p_X(x)p_{Y|X}(y|x)}{p_Y(y)}$$

is the posterior density of X given $Y = y$ (see, for example, Vincent (2011)). We will refer to (2) as the *Denoising Score Identity* (DSI). In scenarios where it is possible to compute $\nabla \log p_{Y|X}(y|x)$ and $p_{X|Y}(x|y)$ is known up to a normalizing constant, the score can then be approximated by estimating

^{*}vdebortoli@google.com, mhutchin@google.com, pewi@google.com, arnauldoucet@google.com

the expectation in (2) using Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC); see e.g. Appendix D.3 in (Vargas et al., 2023a) and (Huang et al., 2024).

However, in most standard generative modeling applications, we only have access to $\nabla \log p_{Y|X}(y|x)$ and i.i.d. samples $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^n$ from $p_{X,Y}(x,y)$ and do not know $p_{X|Y}(x|y)$. In this context, *Denoising Score Matching* (DSM) (Vincent, 2011) leverages DSI (2) by approximating $\nabla \log p_Y(y)$ using some function $s_Y^\theta(y)$ whose parameters are obtained by minimizing the regression loss

$$\ell_{\text{DSM}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} [\|s_Y^\theta(Y) - \nabla \log p_{Y|X}(Y|X)\|^2], \quad (3)$$

which is in practice approximated using samples $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^n$. DSM is an alternative to Implicit Score Matching (Hyvärinen, 2005) which only requires access to noisy samples $(Y_i)_{i=1}^n$ from $p_Y(y)$ but is computationally more expensive in high dimensions as optimizing the corresponding loss requires computing the gradient of the divergence of a d -dimensional vector field.

1.2 Limitations

Consider the case where Y is obtained by adding some independent noise W to X , i.e.

$$Y = X + W, \quad W \sim p_W(\cdot). \quad (4)$$

If one can sample from $p_{X|Y}(x|y)$, DSI (2) suggests a Monte Carlo estimator of the score $\nabla \log p_Y(y)$ obtained by averaging $\nabla \log p_{Y|X}(y|X)$ over samples $X \sim p_{X|Y}(\cdot|y)$. In the case of Gaussian noise, $p_W(w) = \mathcal{N}(w; 0, \sigma^2 I)$, we have that $\sum_{i=1}^d \text{Var}_{X|Y}((\nabla \log p_{Y|X}(Y|X))_i) \sim d\sigma^{-2}$ as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$. So the variance of such an estimator is higher for low noise levels.

The high variance of the Monte Carlo estimator for low noise levels is an independent issue to the high variance of the DSM regression loss used to approximate this estimator. Indeed, while the original DSM loss also exhibits high variance at low noise levels, we can re-arrange (2) to obtain the so-called *Tweedie identity* (Robbins, 1956; Miyasawa, 1961; Raphan and Simoncelli, 2011)

$$\mathbb{E}[X|Y = y] = y + \sigma^2 \nabla \log p_Y(y).$$

This identity provides us with an alternative way for computing the score by estimating $\mathbb{E}[X|Y = y]$, using a regression loss of the form $\mathbb{E}_{X,Y} [\|x^\theta(Y) - X\|^2]$. In this case, the regression target is simply X and therefore does not exhibit exploding variance as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$. However, this approximation x^θ is used to compute the score as

$$s^\theta(y) = (x^\theta(y) - y)/\sigma^2.$$

Hence the error of x^θ is amplified as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$. In fact, this approach is simply equivalent to a rescaling of the DSM loss as $\mathbb{E}_{X,Y} [\|x^\theta(Y) - X\|^2] = \sigma^4 \ell_{\text{DSM}}(\theta)$. In the DDM literature, this reparameterisation is sometimes called the x_0 -prediction. Many other regression targets have been proposed in the context of diffusion models, see Salimans and Ho (2022) for instance. All these parameterisations exhibit the same issues as the direct score prediction or the x_0 -prediction, since the resulting score approximation s_θ exhibits exploding variance as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$.

Other techniques have also been proposed in order to derive better behaved regression losses, see for example Wang et al. (2020) and Karras et al. (2022). While these works mitigate the high variance of the regression target, we emphasize that they fail to address the fundamental variance issue of the score estimator itself.

2 Target Score Identity and Target Score Matching

We will focus hereafter on scenarios where the score $\nabla \log p_X(x)$ of the “clean” target $p_X(x)$ can be computed exactly. As mentioned earlier, this is not the case for most generative modeling applications where $p_X(x)$ is only available through samples. However, the score $\nabla \log p_X(x)$ is known in many

physical science applications and Monte Carlo sampling tasks that are actively investigated using denoising techniques; see e.g. Zhang and Chen (2022); Arts et al. (2023); Cotler and Rezhikov (2023); Herron et al. (2023); Vargas et al. (2023a,b); Wang et al. (2023); Zhang et al. (2023); Zheng et al. (2023); Akhound-Sadegh et al. (2024); Huang et al. (2024); Phillips et al. (2024); Richter et al. (2024).

For ease of presentation, we restrict ourselves to the additive noise model (4) in this section and discuss a more general setup in the next section. At low noise levels, we expect $\nabla \log p_Y(y) \approx \nabla \log p_X(x)$ yet neither the DSI (2) nor the DSM loss (3) take advantage of this fact. On the contrary, the *Target Score Identity* (TSI) and the *Target Score Matching* (TSM) loss that we present below address this shortcoming and leverage explicit knowledge of $\nabla \log p_X(x)$. Henceforth, we assume that all the regularity conditions allowing us to differentiate the densities and interchange differentiation and integration are satisfied.

Proposition 2.1. *For the additive noise model (4), the following Target Score Identity holds*

$$\nabla \log p_Y(y) = \int \nabla \log p_X(x) p_{X|Y}(x|y) dx. \quad (5)$$

Corollary 2.2. *By symmetry, we also have*

$$\nabla \log p_Y(y) = \int \nabla \log p_W(w) p_{W|Y}(w|y) dw = \int \nabla \log p_W(y-x) p_{X|Y}(x|y) dx,$$

which is DSI for (4).

The proof of this result and all other results in the main paper are given in Appendix A. An alternative proof of this identity for additive Gaussian noise relying on the Fokker–Planck equation is provided in Appendix B.

This result is not new, which is to be expected given its simplicity. It is part of the folklore in information theory and can be found, for example, in (Blachman, 1965)¹. However, to the recent exception of Phillips et al. (2024), the remarkable computational implications of this identity do not appear to have been exploited previously. As discussed further, Akhound-Sadegh et al. (2024) also rely implicitly on this identity. TSI shows that, if $p_{X|Y}(x|y)$ is known pointwise up to a normalizing constant, then the score can be estimated by using an Importance Sampling (IS) or MCMC approximation of $p_{X|Y}(x|y)$ to compute the expectation (5). The integrand $\nabla \log p_X(x)$ will typically have much smaller variance under $p_{X|Y}$ than the integrand $\nabla \log p_{Y|X}(y|x)$ appearing in (2) at low noise levels.

Having access to samples $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^n$ from $p_{X,Y}$, we can also estimate the score $\nabla \log p_Y(y)$ by minimizing the following *Target Score Matching* (TSM) regression loss.

Proposition 2.3. *Consider a class of regression functions $s_Y^\theta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ for $\theta \in \Theta$. For the additive noise model (4), we can estimate the score $\nabla \log p_Y(y)$ by minimizing the following regression loss*

$$\ell_{\text{TSM}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} [\|s_Y^\theta(Y) - \nabla \log p_X(X)\|^2].$$

Additionally, the TSM loss $\ell_{\text{TSM}}(\theta)$ and the DSM loss $\ell_{\text{DSM}}(\theta)$ satisfy

$$\ell_{\text{TSM}}(\theta) = \ell_{\text{DSM}}(\theta) + \int \|\nabla \log p_X(x)\|^2 p_X(x) dx - \int \|\nabla \log p_{Y|X}(y|x)\|^2 p_{X,Y}(x,y) dx dy. \quad (6)$$

Contrary to $\ell_{\text{DSM}}(\theta)$, $\ell_{\text{TSM}}(\theta)$ does not require having access to $\nabla \log p_{Y|X}(y|x) = \nabla \log p_W(y-x)$. This can be useful when the score of the noise distribution is not analytically tractable; see e.g. Section 3 for applications to Riemmanian manifolds. Finally, we note that the relationship (6) shows that $\ell_{\text{DSM}}(\theta)$ takes large values compared to $\ell_{\text{TSM}}(\theta)$ at low noise levels as both quantities are positive and the expected conditional Fisher information, $\mathbb{E}_{X,Y} [\|\nabla \log p_{Y|X}(Y|X)\|^2]$, takes large values.

¹In machine learning, it was used (and derived independently) in Appendix C.1.3. of (De Bortoli et al., 2021) to establish some theoretical properties of DDM.

Corollary 2.4. *In many applications, the observation model of interest is of the form*

$$Y = \alpha X + W \tag{7}$$

for $\alpha \neq 0$ and W independent of X . In this case, TSI becomes

$$\nabla \log p_Y(y) = \alpha^{-1} \int \nabla \log p_X(x) p_{X|Y}(x|y) dx, \tag{8}$$

while TSM is given by

$$\ell_{\text{TSM}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} [\|s_Y^\theta(Y) - \alpha^{-1} \nabla \log p_X(X)\|^2].$$

For model (7), if the score is estimated through TSM, it is thus sensible to use a parameterization for s_Y^θ of the form $s_Y^\theta(y) = \alpha^{-1} \nabla \log p_X(y) + \epsilon^\theta(y)$.

In practice, we can consider any convex combination of DSI (equation (2)) and TSI (equation (8)) to obtain another score identity which we can use to derive a score matching loss². The score identity considered by Phillips et al. (2024) and corresponding score matching loss follow this approach. Therein one considers a variance preserving denoising diffusion model (Song et al., 2021) where $Y_t = \alpha_t X + \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t^2} \epsilon$ for $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ and $(\alpha_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ a continuous decreasing function such that $\alpha_0 = 1$ and $\alpha_1 \approx 0$. In this case, $\alpha_t^{-1} \nabla \log p_X(x)$ will typically be better behaved than $\nabla \log p_{Y_t|X}(y|x)$ for t close to 0 and vice-versa for t close to 1. Phillips et al. (2024) exploits this behaviour to propose the score identity

$$\nabla \log p_{Y_t}(y) = \int [\alpha_t(x + \nabla \log p_X(x)) - y] p_{X|Y_t}(x|y) dx, \tag{9}$$

which is the sum of α_t^2 times TSI (equation (8)) and $1 - \alpha_t^2$ times DSI (equation (2)). They use the integrand in (9) to define a score matching loss. The rationale for this choice is that the integrand will be close to the true score for $t \approx 0$ and $t \approx 1$ when $X \sim p_{X|Y_t}$. In practice, the “best” loss function one can consider will be a function of the target p_X , “noise” $p_{Y|X}$ and α . In Appendix D, we follow the analysis Karras et al. (2022) to derive a loss admitting desirable properties in a simplified Gaussian setting.

We finally note that the very recent score estimate proposed in (Akhound-Sadegh et al., 2024) (see Eq. (8) therein) can be reinterpreted as a self-normalized IS approximation in disguise of TSI. It considers for the model (4) and $W \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$ the IS proposal distribution $q(x) = \mathcal{N}(x; y, \sigma^2 I) = p_W(y - x)$ to approximate $p_{X|Y}(x|y) \propto p_X(x) p_W(y - x)$. For $\sigma \ll 1$, this importance distribution will perform well as $p_{X|Y}(x|y)$ is concentrated around y . For larger σ , the variance of the resulting IS estimate could be significant.

3 Extensions

Next, we present a few extensions of TSI and TSM.

3.1 Extension to non-Additive Noise

We consider here a general noising process defined by

$$p_{Y|X}(y|x) = F(\Phi(y, x)), \tag{10}$$

where we assume that $\Phi(y, \cdot)$ is a C^2 -diffeomorphism for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and that Φ is smooth. We denote by ∇_1 , respectively ∇_2 , the gradient of Φ or Φ^{-1} with respect to its first, respectively second, argument.

²We can alternatively consider a convex combination of the DSM and TSM losses.

Proposition 3.1. *For the noise model (10), the following Target Score Identity holds*

$$\nabla \log p_Y(y) = \int [\nabla_1 \Phi^{-1}(y, \Phi(y, x))^\top \nabla \log p_X(x) + \nabla_y \log |\det(\nabla_2 \Phi^{-1}(y, \cdot))|(\Phi^{-1}(y, x))] p_{X|Y}(x|y) dx.$$

For $\Phi(y, x) = y - \alpha x$ and $F(w) = p_W(w)$, we have $\Phi^{-1}(y, z) = (y - z)/\alpha$ and therefore one has $\nabla_1 \Phi^{-1}(y, \Phi(y, x))^\top = \text{Id}/\alpha$ and $\nabla_y \log |\det(\nabla_2 \Phi^{-1}(y, \cdot))| = 0$. Hence, we recover (8). We can thus estimate the score by minimizing the following TSM loss

$$\ell_{\text{TSM}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} [\|s_Y^\theta(Y) - [\nabla_1 \Phi^{-1}(Y, \Phi(Y, X))^\top \nabla \log p_X(X) + \nabla_y \log |\det(\nabla_2 \Phi^{-1}(Y, \cdot))|(\Phi^{-1}(Y, X))] \|^2].$$

3.2 Extension to Lie groups

Consider a Lie group G which admits a bi-invariant metric. We denote by μ the (left) Haar measure on G . Let p_X denotes the density of X w.r.t. μ . We assume the following additive model on the Lie group, i.e. $Y = X +_G W$, where $+_G$ is the group addition on G and $W \sim p_W$ with density p_W w.r.t. μ . If $G = \mathbb{R}^d$, we recover the Euclidean additive model of Section 2. For any smooth $f : G \rightarrow G$ and $x \in G$, we denote $df(x) : T_x G \rightarrow T_{f(x)} G$, the differential operator of f evaluated at x . Similarly, for any smooth $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we denote $\nabla f(x)$ its *Riemannian* gradient.

Proposition 3.2. *For a Lie group, the following Target Score Identity holds*

$$\nabla \log p_Y(y) = \int dR_{x^{-1}y}(x) \nabla \log p_X(x) p_{X|Y}(x|y) d\mu(x),$$

where $R_x(y) = yx$ for any $x, y \in G$. In particular, if G is a matrix Lie group, we have

$$\nabla \log p_Y(y) = \int \nabla \log p_X(x) x^{-1} y p_{X|Y}(x|y) d\mu(x).$$

DSI and DSM have been extended to Riemannian manifolds in (De Bortoli et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2022); see e.g. Watson et al. (2023) for an application to protein modeling. Leveraging the Lie group structure to obtain a tractable expression of the heat kernel defining $p_{Y|X}$ and therefore obtain more amenable DSI and DSM was considered in (Yim et al., 2023; Lou et al., 2023; Leach et al., 2022). Contrary to these works, we do not need to know the exact form of the additive noising process p_W .

Adapting DSI and DSM to Riemannian manifolds simply requires replacing the Euclidean gradient by the Riemannian gradient. This is not the case for TSI, i.e. Proposition 3.2 is not obtained by replacing the Euclidean gradient by the Riemannian gradient in Proposition 2.1. This is because, while $s_Y^\theta(y) \in T_y G$, where $T_y G$ is the tangent space of G at y . However, we have that $\nabla \log p_X(x) \in T_x G$ and therefore these two quantities are not immediately comparable and we use $dR_{x^{-1}y}(x)$ which transports $T_x G$ onto $T_y G$. In contrast, in the case of DSI, both $s_Y^\theta(y) \in T_y G$ and $\nabla_y \log p_{Y|X}(y|x) \in T_y G$. It is also possible to extend straightforwardly Proposition 2.3 to the context of Lie groups.

Proposition 3.3. *Consider a class of regression functions such that for any $y \in G$, $s_\theta(y) \in T_y G$ for $\theta \in \Theta$. We can estimate the score $\nabla \log p_Y(y)$ by minimizing the TSM regression loss*

$$\ell_{\text{TSM}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} [\|s_Y^\theta(Y) - dR_{X^{-1}Y}(X) \nabla \log p_X(X) \|^2],$$

where $R_x(y) = yx$ for any $x, y \in G$.

3.3 Extension to Bridge Matching

Let Y be given by

$$Y = \alpha X_0 + (1 - \alpha) X_1 + W, \tag{11}$$

where $X_0 \sim p_{X_0}$, $X_1 \sim p_{X_1}$, $W \sim p_W$ are independent and $0 < \alpha < 1$. We are interested in evaluating the score $\nabla \log p_Y(y)$. In the context of generative modeling, (11) appears when one builds a transport map bridging p_{X_0} to p_{X_1} ; see e.g. (Peluchetti, 2021; Liu et al., 2022; Albergo et al., 2023; Lipman et al., 2023). We are again considering here a scenario where we have access to the exact scores of p_{X_0} and p_{X_1} .

Proposition 3.4. *For the model (11), the following Target Score Identity holds*

$$\nabla \log p_Y(y) = \alpha^{-1} \int \nabla \log p_{X_0}(x_0) p_{X_0, X_1|Y}(x_0, x_1|y) dx_0 dx_1 \quad (12)$$

$$= (1 - \alpha)^{-1} \int \nabla \log p_{X_1}(x_1) p_{X_0, X_1|Y}(x_0, x_1|y) dx_0 dx_1, \quad (13)$$

where $p_{X_0, X_1|Y}(x_0, x_1|y) \propto p_{X_0}(x_0)p_{X_1}(x_1)p_W(y - \alpha x_0 - (1 - \alpha)x_1)$ is the posterior density of X_0, X_1 given $Y = y$.

A convex combination of (12) and (13) yields the elegant identity

$$\nabla \log p_Y(y) = \int (\nabla \log p_{X_0}(x_0) + \nabla \log p_{X_1}(x_1)) p_{X_0, X_1|Y}(x_0, x_1|y) dx_0 dx_1. \quad (14)$$

We can use these score identities to compute the score using MCMC if $p_{X_0, X_1|Y}(x_0, x_1|y)$ is available up to a normalizing constant. Alternatively, given samples from the joint distribution $p_{X_0, X_1, Y}(x_0, x_1, y) = p_{X_0}(x_0)p_{X_1}(x_1)p_{Y|X_0, X_1}(y|x_0, x_1)$, we can approximate the score by minimizing a regression loss, e.g. for (15)

$$\ell_{\text{TSM}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{X_0, X_1, Y} [\|s_Y^\theta(Y) - (\nabla \log p_{X_0}(X_0) + \nabla \log p_{X_1}(X_1))\|^2]. \quad (15)$$

4 Experiments

4.1 Analytic estimators

We explore experimentally the benefits of these novel score estimators by considering 1-d mixture of Gaussian targets defined by

$$p_0(x_0) = \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i \mathcal{N}(x_0; \mu_i, \sigma_i^2).$$

Motivated by DDM, the noising process is defined by a “noising” diffusion

$$dX_t = f_t X_t dt + g_t dB_t, \quad (16)$$

where $f_t = \frac{d}{dt} \log \alpha_t$ and $g_t^2 = \frac{d}{dt} \sigma_t^2 - 2f_t \sigma_t^2$ and B_t is a standard Brownian motion. Initialized at $X_0 = x_0$, (16) defines the following conditional distribution of X_t given $X_0 = x_0$, $p_{t|0}(x_t|x_0) = \mathcal{N}(x_t; \alpha_t x_0, \sigma_t^2)$. In what follows, we focus on the cosine schedule where $\alpha_t = \cos((\pi/2)t)$ and $\sigma_t = \sin((\pi/2)t)$. Consider $X_0 \sim p_0$ then the distribution of X_t is given by

$$p_t(x_t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i \mathcal{N}(x_t; \mu_{i,t}, \sigma_{i,t}^2), \quad \mu_{i,t} = \alpha_t \mu_i, \quad \sigma_{i,t}^2 = \alpha_t^2 \sigma_i^2 + \sigma_t^2.$$

The posterior distribution of X_0 given $X_t = x_t$ is given by another mixture of Gaussians,

$$p_{0|t}(x_0|x_t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_{i,t} \mathcal{N}(x_0; \nu_{i,t}, \gamma_{i,t}^2), \quad (17)$$

with $\pi_{i,t} \propto \pi_i \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_{i,t}^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x_t - \mu_{i,t})^2}{2\sigma_{i,t}^2}\right)$, $\nu_{i,t} = \mu_{i,t} + \frac{c_{i,t}^2}{\sigma_{i,t}^2}(x_t - \mu_{i,t})$, $\gamma_{i,t}^2 = \sigma_i^2 - \frac{c_{i,t}^4}{\sigma_{i,t}^2}$ and $c_{i,t}^2 = \alpha_t(\sigma_i^2 + \mu_i^2) - \mu_i\mu_{i,t}$.

For convenience, we define the following quantities

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\text{DSI}}(x_0, x_t, t) &= \nabla \log p_{t|0}(x_t|x_0), & \text{Denoising} \\ L_{\text{TSI}}(x_0, x_t, t) &= \alpha_t^{-1} \nabla \log p_0(x_0), & \text{Target} \\ L_{w_t}(x_0, x_t, t) &= w_t L_{\text{DSI}}(x_0, x_t, t) + (1 - w_t) L_{\text{TSI}}(x_0, x_t, t), & \text{A } w_t \text{ mixture} \end{aligned}$$

where $w_t \in [0, 1]$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$ is a mixture weight. As described before, for any of these targets denoted $L \in \{L_{\text{DSI}}, L_{\text{TSI}}, L_{w_t}\}$, we have

$$\nabla \log p_t(x_t) = \int L(x_0, x_t, t) p_{0|t}(x_0|x_t) dx_0.$$

We can then estimate $\nabla \log p_t(x_t)$ via the Monte Carlo estimate

$$\nabla \log p_t(x_t) \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N L(X_0^i, x_t, t) \quad X_0^i \sim p_{0|t}(\cdot|x_t), \quad (18)$$

since $p_{0|t}(x_0|x_t)$ given by (17) is easy to sample from. Note that in more complicated scenarios, we would have had to use MCMC or IS. In addition, we consider the score matching loss

$$\nabla \log p_t(x_t) \approx \arg \min_{s^\theta} \int_0^1 \lambda_t \mathbb{E}_{X_0, X_t} [\|L(X_0, X_t, t) - s^\theta(X_t, t)\|^2] dt, \quad (19)$$

where λ_t is a weighting function over time and this approximation holds true jointly over all t . Picking L_{DSI} within (19) gives us the usual DSM loss, and picking the other identities give a series of novel score matching losses. In what follows, we explore two key quantities:

1. The variance of the Monte Carlo estimates (18) of the score and
2. the distribution of the estimated score matching loss functions around the true score, estimated using Monte Carlo.

We investigate these quantities on a series of target distributions.

1. A unit Gaussian,
2. a gentle mixture of Gaussians,
3. a hard mixture of Gaussians with very separated modes, with the same mode variances,
4. a hard mixture of Gaussians with very separated modes, with the different mode variances.

The unit Gaussian case we use to find appropriate values for the mixture weights w_t . Assuming that we have a target density $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\text{data}}^2 I)$ it is possible to compute the w_t that minimises the variance of the mixture estimator. For this we recover

$$\kappa_t := \frac{\sigma_t^2}{\sigma_t^2 + \alpha_t^2 \sigma_{\text{data}}^2},$$

see Appendix C. In addition we can define another mixing weight

$$\bar{\kappa}_t := \frac{\sigma_t^2}{\sigma_t^2 + \alpha_t^2 \sigma_{\text{data mode}}^2}.$$




Figure 1: Target distributions (top panel), and the mixture weights κ_t and $\bar{\kappa}_t$ through time induced by these targets (bottom panel).

The difference between these two is that one used the variance of the whole target distribution, and the other used the mixture-weighted average of the variance of each mode in the mixture, $\sigma_{\text{data mode}}^2 = \sum_i \pi_i \sigma_i^2$. While κ is optimal for the unimodal Gaussian, we will see that $\bar{\kappa}$ performs significantly better for mixtures of Gaussians.

Figure 1 shows these distributions, and the mixture weightings κ_t and $\bar{\kappa}_t$ for these distributions. In Figure 2 reports the variance of the Monte Carlo estimators of the score (18) through time. For each time t , we sample 10,000 samples from p_t . For each of these, we estimate the score with 100 Monte Carlo samples from $p_{0|t}$. We then compute the variance of these samples of the estimator.

In this we see a few points of note. On the Unit Gaussian example, the Monte Carlo estimates based on DSI and TSI perform exactly oppositely, with alternatively large and small variances at $t \approx 0$ and $t \approx 1$. The κ_t and $\bar{\kappa}_t$ estimators perform the same as σ_{data} and $\sigma_{\text{data mode}}$ are the same. They also have approximately zero variance, as for this simple case the optimal mixture of the two estimators in fact gives exactly the score.

In the easy mixture case, we see the expected story. Again the DSI and TSI estimators perform opposite along time, with variance blowing up at $t = 0$ and $t = 1$ respectively. There is however a shift in when the one becomes better than the other towards $t = 0$. The κ_t and $\bar{\kappa}_t$ estimators both perform well, with neither showing a variance blowup near $t = 0$ or $t = 1$. The κ_t mixture is not quite as good as the DSI estimator for $t \geq 0.2$, but the $\bar{\kappa}_t$ performs exactly as well, showing that this is the correct optimal mixture.

In the hard mixture cases, we see again the optimal switching point between DSI and TSI move further towards $t = 0$. We again see that the κ_t mixture is not optimal, but that $\bar{\kappa}_t$ gives us the best of both DSI and TSI. Even though the time frame in which TSI is better than DSI is small, in this region we see that the DSI variance blows up and would cause difficulty estimating the score well. One thing of note is that in the hard mixture with the same mode variance the $\bar{\kappa}_t$ estimator variance becomes almost zero. In this case as the modes are so far separated that as $t \rightarrow 0$, $p_{0|t}$ effectively becomes uni-model, bringing us back to the optimal mixture case.

Next we investigate the variance in the score matching loss functions derived from the score identities discussed. In this case we need to pick a weighting scheme λ_t across time for the score matching




Figure 2: The estimated variance of each estimator based the score identities. Computed using 10,000 samples of the estimator. For each estimator sample, X_t is sampled from p_t . For each X_t , we use 100 samples from $p_{0|t}$ to estimate the score.

losses. We investigate four weighting schemes here:

- The weighting from Song et al. (2021), $\lambda_t = \frac{1}{\sigma_t^2}$.
- The weighting from Karras et al. (2022) which ensures for a Gaussian target that the variance of the DSM loss at initialization is 1, given by

$$\lambda_t = \frac{\sigma_t^2}{\sigma_{\text{data}}^2} (\sigma_t^2 + \sigma_{\text{data}}^2).$$

We refer to this as the DSM optimal weighting.

- A new weighting derived in the spirit of Karras et al. (2022) which ensures for a Gaussian target that the variance of the TSM loss is 1 at initialization, given by

$$\lambda_t = \frac{\alpha_t^2 \sigma_{\text{data}}^2}{\sigma_t^2} (\sigma_t^2 + \alpha_t^2 \sigma_{\text{data}}^2).$$

We refer to this as the TSM optimal weighting (see Appendix D).

- The uniform weighting, $\lambda_t = 1$.

In addition, we numerically normalise these schedules so that they integrate to 1. This will not change the properties of the loss function, but will re-scale the overall value of the loss, and is done to better compare between losses. Figure 3 depicts the different weighting functions across time, for a $\sigma_{\text{data}}^2 = 1$, which we ensure all the densities we employ have. From Figure 3, we observe that the DSM and TSM optimal weightings respectively up- and down-weight times where Figure 2 shows that the DSI and TSI estimators had larger variances. Figure 4 is produced by looking at the 4^3 combinations of




Figure 3: The different weighting functions across time, for a $\sigma_{\text{data}}^2 = 1$

the 4 targets, 4 weighting functions and 4 score matching losses. For each histogram in the chart, we estimate the loss function at the true score setting $s_\theta(x_t, t) = \nabla \log p_t(x_t)$ 10,000 times, using 100 samples from the combined time integral (sampling t uniformly) and expectations. The distribution of these losses is plotted.

4.2 Trained score models

Finally, we train our models on a 2 dimensional Gaussian mixture model to illustrate some of the advantages of our approach. We consider the four different settings of DSM, TSM, κ and $\bar{\kappa}$ as described before. To parameterize s_θ we consider a MLP with three layers of size 128, sinusoidal time embedding with embedding dimension 128. We used the ADAM optimizer with learning rate 10^{-4} .

In Figure 5 (left), we let $L \in \{L_{\text{DSM}}, L_{\text{TSM}}, L_{\kappa_t}, L_{\bar{\kappa}_t}\}$ and compute the mean of the regression loss $\|s_\theta(t, X_t) - L\|^2$. We consider a uniform weighting strategy for all these losses. The exploding behavior of the DSM loss at time 0 and the exploding behavior of the TSM loss at time 1 is coherent with the theoretical results of Section 1.2 and Section 2. Note that only the mixture of targets κ and $\bar{\kappa}$ achieve a non-exploding behavior for all times. In Figure 5 (right), we show the empirical MMD distance between the empirical data distribution and generated samples with score s_θ for a RBF kernel. We emphasize the faster convergence of the mixture of targets with κ and $\bar{\kappa}$.

References

- Akhound-Sadegh, T., Rector-Brooks, J., Bose, A. J., Mittal, S., Lemos, P., Liu, C.-H., Sendera, M., Ravanbakhsh, S., Gidel, G., Bengio, Y., Malkin, N., and Tong, A. (2024). Iterated denoising energy matching for sampling from Boltzmann densities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06121*.
- Albergo, M. S., Boffi, N. M., and Vanden-Eijnden, E. (2023). Stochastic interpolants: A unifying framework for flows and diffusions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08797*.
- Arts, M., Garcia Satorras, V., Huang, C.-W., Zugner, D., Federici, M., Clementi, C., Noe, F., Pinsler, R., and van den Berg, R. (2023). Two for one: Diffusion models and force fields for coarse-grained molecular dynamics. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, 19(18):6151–6159.
- Blachman, N. (1965). The convolution inequality for entropy powers. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 11(2):267–271.




Figure 4: Comparison of the distribution of training losses for the combinations of the 4 target densities, 4 training losses, and 4 weighting functions.




Figure 5: (Left) Mean of the regression loss $\|s_\theta(t, X_t) - L\|^2$ with $\|s_\theta(t, X_t) - L\|^2$ with $L \in \{L_{\text{DSM}}, L_{\text{TSM}}, L_{\kappa_t}, L_{\bar{\kappa}_t}\}$ across training iterations. (Right) MMD distance between the empirical data distribution and generated samples with score s_θ for a RBF kernel.

Cattiaux, P., Conforti, G., Gentil, I., and Léonard, C. (2023). Time reversal of diffusion processes under a finite entropy condition. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probabilités et statistiques*, 59(4):1844–1881.

Cotler, J. and Rezchikov, S. (2023). Renormalizing diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12355*.

De Bortoli, V., Mathieu, E., Hutchinson, M., Thornton, J., Teh, Y. W., and Doucet, A. (2022). Riemannian score-based generative modelling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:2406–2422.

De Bortoli, V., Thornton, J., Heng, J., and Doucet, A. (2021). Diffusion Schrödinger bridge with applications to score-based generative modeling. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.

Herron, L., Mondal, K., Schneekloth, J. S., and Tiwary, P. (2023). Inferring phase transitions and critical exponents from limited observations with thermodynamic maps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14885*.

Ho, J., Jain, A., and Abbeel, P. (2020). Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.

Huang, C.-W., Aghajohari, M., Bose, J., Panangaden, P., and Courville, A. C. (2022). Riemannian diffusion models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.

Huang, X., Dong, H., Hao, Y., Ma, Y., and Zhang, T. (2024). Reverse diffusion Monte Carlo. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Hyvärinen, A. (2005). Estimation of non-normalized statistical models by score matching. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 6:695–709.

Karras, T., Aittala, M., Aila, T., and Laine, S. (2022). Elucidating the design space of diffusion-based generative models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.

Leach, A., Schmon, S. M., Degiacomi, M. T., and Willcocks, C. G. (2022). Denoising diffusion probabilistic models on $so(3)$ for rotational alignment. In *ICLR 2022 Workshop on Geometrical and Topological Representation Learning*.

Lipman, Y., Chen, R. T., Ben-Hamu, H., Nickel, M., and Le, M. (2023). Flow matching for generative modeling. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

- Liu, X., Wu, L., Ye, M., and Liu, Q. (2022). Let us build bridges: Understanding and extending diffusion generative models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.14699*.
- Lou, A., Xu, M., and Ermon, S. (2023). Scaling Riemannian diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20030*.
- Miyasawa, K. (1961). An empirical Bayes estimator of the mean of a normal population. *Bull. Inst. Internat. Statist.*, 38(181-188):1–2.
- Peluchetti, S. (2021). Non-denoising forward-time diffusions. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=oVfIKuhqfC>.
- Phillips, A., Dang, H. D., Hutchinson, M., De Bortoli, V., Deligiannidis, G., and Doucet, A. (2024). Particle denoising diffusion sampler. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06320*.
- Raphan, M. and Simoncelli, E. P. (2011). Least squares estimation without priors or supervision. *Neural Computation*, 23(2):374–420.
- Richter, L., Berner, J., and Liu, G.-H. (2024). Improved sampling via learned diffusions. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Robbins, H. E. (1956). An empirical Bayes approach to statistics. In *Proc. 3rd Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Probab., 1956*, volume 1, pages 157–163.
- Salimans, T. and Ho, J. (2022). Progressive distillation for fast sampling of diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.00512*.
- Sohl-Dickstein, J., Weiss, E., Maheswaranathan, N., and Ganguli, S. (2015). Deep unsupervised learning using nonequilibrium thermodynamics. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Song, Y., Sohl-Dickstein, J., Kingma, D. P., Kumar, A., Ermon, S., and Poole, B. (2021). Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Vargas, F., Grathwohl, W., and Doucet, A. (2023a). Denoising diffusion samplers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Vargas, F., Ovsianas, A., Fernandes, D., Girolami, M., Lawrence, N. D., and Nüsken, N. (2023b). Bayesian learning via neural Schrödinger–Föllmer flows. *Statistics and Computing*, 33(1):3.
- Vincent, P. (2011). A connection between score matching and denoising autoencoders. *Neural Computation*, 23(7):1661–1674.
- Wang, L., Aarts, G., and Zhou, K. (2023). Generative diffusion models for lattice field theory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03578*.
- Wang, Z., Cheng, S., Yueru, L., Zhu, J., and Zhang, B. (2020). A Wasserstein minimum velocity approach to learning unnormalized models. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*.
- Watson, J. L., Juergens, D., Bennett, N. R., Trippe, B. L., Yim, J., Eisenach, H. E., Ahern, W., Borst, A. J., Ragotte, R. J., Milles, L. F., et al. (2023). De novo design of protein structure and function with RFdiffusion. *Nature*, 620(7976):1089–1100.
- Yim, J., Trippe, B. L., De Bortoli, V., Mathieu, E., Doucet, A., Barzilay, R., and Jaakkola, T. (2023). Se(3) diffusion model with application to protein backbone generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.

Zhang, D., Chen, R. T. Q., Liu, C.-H., , A., and Bengio, Y. (2023). Diffusion generative flow samplers: Improving learning signals through partial trajectory optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02679*.

Zhang, Q. and Chen, Y. (2022). Path integral sampler: a stochastic control approach for sampling. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Zheng, S., He, J., Liu, C., Shi, Y., Lu, Z., Feng, W., Ju, F., Wang, J., Zhu, J., Min, Y., Zhang, H., Tang, S., Hao, H., Jin, P., Chen, C., Noé, F., Liu, H., and Liu, T.-Y. (2023). Towards predicting equilibrium distributions for molecular systems with deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05445*.

Appendix

In Appendix [A](#), we present the proofs of all the Propositions presented in the main paper. In Appendix [B](#), we present another proof of TSI (equation (5)) for additive Gaussian noise based on diffusion techniques. In Appendix [C](#) we derive the variance of Monte Carlo estimates of the score based on DSI and TSI in the Gaussian case. In Appendix [D](#), we transpose the analysis of [Karras et al. \(2022\)](#) developed to obtain a stable training loss for DDM to the TSM loss.

A Proofs of the Main Results

A.1 Proof of Proposition [2.1](#)

For completeness, we present two proofs of this result (without any claim for originality).

First proof. We have $Y = X + W$, X and W being independent, so

$$p_Y(y) = \int p_X(y-w)p_W(w)dw,$$

hence

$$\nabla p_Y(y) = \int \nabla \log p_X(y-w) p_X(y-w)p_W(w)dw.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \log p_Y(y) &= \int \nabla \log p_X(y-w) \frac{p_X(y-w)p_W(w)}{p_Y(y)} dw \\ &= \int \nabla \log p_X(x) \frac{p_X(x)p_W(y-x)}{p_Y(y)} dx \\ &= \int \nabla \log p_X(x) p_{X|Y}(x|y) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Second proof. For this alternative proof, it is essential for clarity to emphasize notationally which variable we differentiate with respect to. This proof starts from DSI and shows that we can recover TSI. We have $p_{Y|X}(y|x) = p_W(y-x)$ so by the chain rule

$$\nabla_y \log p_{Y|X}(y|x) = -\nabla_x \log p_{Y|X}(y|x). \tag{20}$$

Now by Bayes rule, we have

$$\log p_{Y|X}(y|x) = \log p_{X|Y}(x|y) + \log p_Y(y) - \log p_X(x). \tag{21}$$

Hence, from (21) and (20), we obtain directly

$$\nabla_y \log p_{Y|X}(y|x) = \nabla_x \log p_X(x) - \nabla_x \log p_{X|Y}(x|y). \quad (22)$$

Additionally, we have by the divergence theorem

$$\int \nabla_x \log p_{X|Y}(x|y) p_{X|Y}(x|y) dx = 0. \quad (23)$$

The identity (5) follows directly by combining (2) with (22) and (23).

A.2 Proof of Proposition 2.3

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\text{DSM}}(\theta) &= \int \|s_Y^\theta(y) - \nabla \log p_{Y|X}(y|x)\|^2 p_{X,Y}(x, y) dx dy \\ &= \int \|s_Y^\theta(y)\|^2 p_Y(y) dy - 2 \int \langle s_Y^\theta(y), \nabla \log p_{Y|X}(y|x) \rangle p_{X,Y}(x, y) dx dy \\ &\quad + \int \|\nabla \log p_{Y|X}(y|x)\|^2 p_{X,Y}(x, y) dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

From (22) and (23), we get

$$\int \langle s_Y^\theta(y), \nabla \log p_{Y|X}(y|x) \rangle p_{X,Y}(x, y) dx = \int \langle s_Y^\theta(y), \nabla \log p_X(x) \rangle p_{X,Y}(x, y) dx$$

so it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\text{DSM}}(\theta) &= \int \|s_Y^\theta(y)\|^2 p_Y(y) dy - 2 \int \langle s_Y^\theta(y), \nabla \log p_X(x) \rangle p_{X,Y}(x, y) dx dy \\ &\quad + \int \|\nabla \log p_{Y|X}(y|x)\|^2 p_{X,Y}(x, y) dx dy \\ &= \int \|s_Y^\theta(y) - \nabla \log p_X(x)\|^2 p_Y(y) dy - \int \|\nabla \log p_X(x)\|^2 p_X(x) dx \\ &\quad + \int \|\nabla \log p_{Y|X}(y|x)\|^2 p_{X,Y}(x, y) dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the r.h.s. is equal to $\ell_{\text{TSM}}(\theta)$ so the result follows.

A.3 Proof of Proposition 3.1

Combining (1) and (10), one has

$$\begin{aligned} p_Y(y) &= \int p_X(x) F(\Phi(y, x)) dx \\ &= \int p_X(\Phi^{-1}(y, z)) F(z) |\det(\nabla_2 \Phi(y, \Phi^{-1}(y, z))^{-1})| dz \\ &= \int p_X(\Phi^{-1}(y, z)) |\det(\nabla_2 \Phi^{-1}(y, z))| F(z) dz \end{aligned}$$

where we use the change of variables $z = \Phi(y, x)$. Hence, we have by the chain rule and the change of variables $x = \Phi^{-1}(y, z)$

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla \log p_Y(y) &= \int [\nabla_1 \Phi^{-1}(y, z)^\top \nabla \log p_X(\Phi^{-1}(y, z)) + \nabla_y \log |\det(\nabla_2 \Phi^{-1}(y, z))|] \\ &\quad \times p_X(\Phi^{-1}(y, z)) |\det(\nabla \Phi^{-1}(y, z))| F(z) / p_Y(y) dz \\ &= \int [\nabla_1 \Phi^{-1}(y, \Phi(y, x))^\top \nabla \log p_X(x) \\ &\quad + \nabla_y \log |\det(\nabla_2 \Phi^{-1}(y, \cdot))| (\Phi^{-1}(y, x))] p_{X|Y}(x|y) dx.\end{aligned}$$

A.4 Proof of Proposition 3.2

Using that μ is left-invariant

$$p_Y(y) = \int p_X(x) F(y^{-1}x) d\mu(x) = \int p_X(R_x(y)) F(x) d\mu(x), \quad (24)$$

where $R_x(y) = yx$ for any $x, y \in G$. We have that $dR_x(y) dR_{x^{-1}}(yx) = \text{Id}$. Therefore for any $y \in G$ and $h \in T_y(G)$ we have

$$d(p_X \circ R_x)(y)(h) = dp_X(yx) dR_x(y)(h) = \langle \nabla p_X(yx), dR_x(y)(h) \rangle = \langle dR_x(y) dR_{x^{-1}}(yx) \nabla p_X(yx), dR_x(y)(h) \rangle.$$

Finally, using that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is right-invariant we get for any $y \in G$ and $h \in T_y(G)$

$$d(p_X \circ R_x)(y)(h) = \langle dR_{x^{-1}}(yx) \nabla p_X(yx), h \rangle.$$

Combining this result and (24) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla p_Y(y) &= \int dR_{x^{-1}}(yx) \nabla \log p_X(yx) p_X(yx) F(x) d\mu(x) \\ &= \int dR_{x^{-1}y}(x) \nabla \log p_X(x) p_X(x) F(y^{-1}x) d\mu(x).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we get that

$$\nabla \log p_Y(y) = \int dR_{x^{-1}y}(x) \nabla \log p_X(x) p_{X|Y}(x|y) d\mu(x).$$

A.5 Proof of Proposition 3.4

It follows directly from (11) that

$$p_Y(y) = \int p_W(y - \alpha x_0 - (1 - \alpha)x_1) p_{X_0}(x_0) p_{X_1}(x_1) dx_0 dx_1.$$

So by considering the change of variables $w = y - \alpha x_0 - (1 - \alpha)x_1$, i.e. $x_0 = \alpha^{-1}(y - (1 - \alpha)x_1 - w)$, we obtain

$$p_Y(y) = \alpha^{-1} \int p_{X_0}(\alpha^{-1}(y - (1 - \alpha)x_1 - w)) p_W(w) p_{X_1}(x_1) dw dx_1.$$

so, emphasizing here which variable we differentiate with for clarity, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\nabla_y \log p_Y(y) \\ &= \alpha^{-1} \int \nabla_y \log p_{X_0}(\alpha^{-1}(y - (1 - \alpha)x_1 - w)) \frac{p_{X_0}(\alpha^{-1}(y - (1 - \alpha)x_1 - w)) p_W(w) p_{X_1}(x_1)}{p_Y(y)} dw dx_1 \\ &= \alpha^{-2} \int \nabla_{x_0} \log p_{X_0}(\alpha^{-1}(y - (1 - \alpha)x_1 - w)) \frac{p_{X_0}(\alpha^{-1}(y - (1 - \alpha)x_1 - w)) p_W(w) p_{X_1}(x_1)}{p_Y(y)} dw dx_1 \\ &= \alpha^{-1} \int \nabla_{x_0} \log p_{X_0}(x_0) \frac{p_{X_0}(x_0) p_{X_1}(x_1) p_W(y - \alpha x_0 - (1 - \alpha)x_1)}{p_Y(y)} dx_0 dx_1.\end{aligned}$$

The result (12) follows immediately and (13) is obtained similarly.

B Fokker–Planck derivation

So far our derivation of TSI (5) relies on $\nabla_y \log p_{Y|X}(y|x) = -\nabla_x \log p_{Y|X}(y|x)$. This identity is due to the additive nature of the noising process, i.e. $Y = X + W$ with W independent from X . The change of variables used in Proposition 3.1 uses implicitly the same property in the case of additive noise. In what follows, we provide another derivation of TSI leveraging instead the Fokker-Planck equation, the time-reversal of diffusions and backward Kolmogorov equation. We consider the case where $Y = X + W$ with $W \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$.

In our setting, $Y = X_{t_0}$ with $t_0 = \sigma$, $X_0 = X$ and $dX_t = dB_t$, where $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a d -dimensional Brownian motion. For any $t \geq 0$, we denote by p_t the density of X_t . The Fokker-Planck equation shows that $(p_t(x))_{t \in [0, t_0]}$ satisfies the heat equation

$$\partial p_t(x) = \frac{1}{2} \Delta p_t(x), \quad p_0(x) = p_X(x).$$

Hence, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \log p_t(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \Delta p_t(x) / p_t(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \log p_t(x)\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \log p_t(x). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

If we denote $F_t(x) = \nabla \log p_{t_0-t}(x)$ then we obtain by differentiating (25) w.r.t. x that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \in [0, t_0]$

$$\partial F_t(x) + \nabla F_t(x) F_t(x) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta F_t(x) = 0.$$

Hence, using the backward Kolmogorov equation we get that for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$F_t(y) = \mathbb{E}[F_{t_0}(Z_{t_0}) | Z_t = y], \quad dZ_t = F_t(Z_t)dt + dB_t = \nabla \log p_{t_0-t}(Z_t)dt + dB_t.$$

As $F_0 = \nabla \log p_Y$ and $F_{t_0} = \nabla \log p_X$, we get that

$$\nabla \log p_Y(y) = F_0(y) = \mathbb{E}[F_{t_0}(Z_{t_0}) | Z_0 = y] = \mathbb{E}[\nabla \log p_X(Z_{t_0}) | Z_0 = y]. \quad (26)$$

Finally, we notice that $(Z_t)_{t \in [0, t_0]} = (X_{t_0-t})_{t \in [0, t_0]}$ is the time-reversal of $dX_t = dB_t$ (Cattiaux et al., 2023). Hence, we get that (Z_0, Z_{t_0}) admits the same distribution as (Y, X) . Combining this result and (26) we obtain

$$\nabla \log p_Y(y) = \mathbb{E}_{X|Y}[\nabla \log p_X(X)],$$

which corresponds to TSI.

C Combining DSI and TSI Monte Carlo estimates

We consider a Gaussian target $p_X(x) = \mathcal{N}(x; 0, \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2 I)$ as well as additive Gaussian noise $p_W(x) = \mathcal{N}(w; 0, \sigma^2 I)$. For $\alpha > 0$, we set $Y = \alpha X + W \sim \mathcal{N}(0, (\alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2 + \sigma^2) I)$. The posterior density appearing in DSI and TSI is given in this case by

$$p_{X|Y}(x|y) = \mathcal{N}(x; \alpha \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2 / (\alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2 + \sigma^2) y, \sigma^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2 / (\alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2 + \sigma^2) I).$$

We compute the variance of the Monte Carlo estimates of the score obtaining by averaging $\nabla \log p_{Y|X}(y|X^i)$ (DSI estimate) and $\nabla \log p_X(X^i) / \alpha$ (TSI estimate) over samples $X^i \sim p_{X|Y}(\cdot|y)$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^d \text{Var}_{X|Y}(\nabla_i \log p_{Y|X}(y|X)) &= \sum_{i=1}^d \text{Var}_{X|Y}((\alpha X - y) / \sigma^2) \\ &= d \alpha^2 (\sigma_{\text{tar}} / \sigma)^2 / (\alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2 + \sigma^2). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^d \text{Var}_{X|Y}(\nabla_i \log p_X(X)/\alpha) &= \sum_{i=1}^d (1/\alpha^2) \text{Var}_{X|Y}(-X/\sigma_{\text{tar}}^2) \\ &= d(\sigma/\sigma_{\text{tar}})^2/(\alpha^2\sigma_{\text{tar}}^2 + \sigma^2).\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \text{Var}_{X|Y}(\nabla_i \log p_{Y|X}(y|X)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \text{Var}_{X|Y}(\nabla_i \log p_X(X)/\alpha)$$

if and only if $\sigma_{\text{tar}}^2 \leq \sigma^2/\alpha$. Again, this is aligned with our previous observations. For $\sigma \gg 1$ then the variance of the DSI estimator is lower than the variance of the TSI estimator. For $\sigma \ll 1$ then the variance of the TSI estimator is lower than the variance of the DSI estimator.

We now consider any convex combination of the integrands appearing in DSI and TSI

$$\begin{aligned}Z &= \kappa \nabla \log p_{Y|X}(Y|X) + (1 - \kappa) \nabla \log p_X(X)/\alpha \\ &= \kappa \alpha X/\sigma^2 - (1 - \kappa)X/(\alpha\sigma_{\text{tar}}^2) - \kappa Y/\sigma^2 \\ &= (\kappa\alpha/\sigma^2 - (1 - \kappa)/(\alpha\sigma_{\text{tar}}^2))X - \kappa Y/\sigma^2 \\ &= (1/\alpha\sigma_{\text{tar}}^2)(\kappa(1 + \alpha^2\sigma_{\text{tar}}^2/\sigma^2) - 1)X - \kappa Y/\sigma^2.\end{aligned}$$

By construction, the expectation of Z under $p_{X|Y}(x|y)$ is equal to the score $\nabla_y \log p_Y(y)$. In order to minimize the variance of Z under $p_{X|Y}(x|y)$, we set $\kappa = 1/(1 + \alpha^2\sigma_{\text{tar}}^2/\sigma^2)$. Hence when $\sigma \gg 1$ we get that $\kappa = 1$ and when $\sigma \ll 1$ we get that $\kappa = 0$. In this specific Gaussian setting we have that the estimator has actually zero variance since $Z = -Y/(\alpha^2\sigma_{\text{tar}}^2 + \sigma^2) = \nabla_y \log p_Y(Y)$.

D Preconditioning the training loss

In this section, we follow the analysis (Karras et al., 2022, Appendix B.6) and derive a rescaled training loss for TSM from first principles for the additive model $Y = \alpha X + W$.

In Karras et al. (2022), the input of the network is scaled by c_i and the output is scaled by c_o . An additional skip-connection is considered with weight c_s . Hence we have

$$s_Y^\theta(y) = c_o F_\theta(\sigma, c_i y) + c_s y.$$

The total loss is weighted by $\lambda > 0$ and we have

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \lambda \ell_{\text{TSM}}(\theta) = \lambda \mathbb{E}_{X,Y}[\|c_o F_\theta(\sigma, c_i Y) + c_s Y - \alpha^{-1} \nabla \log p_X(X)\|^2].$$

In (Karras et al., 2022, Appendix B.6) the hyperparameters λ, c_i, c_o, c_s are computed in the case of the DSM loss with x_0 -prediction using the following principles

- (i) the input of the network F_θ should have unit variance,
- (ii) the target of the regression loss should have unit variance,
- (iii) the effective weighting of the loss defined as λc_o^2 should be equal to one,
- (iv) we choose c_s to minimize c_o so that the errors of the network are not amplified.

For simplicity, we assume that $p_X = \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2 I)$ and $W \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$. In this case, we have that $\nabla \log p_X(x) = -x/\sigma_{\text{tar}}^2$. We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}(\theta) &= \lambda \mathbb{E}_{X,Y}[\|c_o F_\theta(\sigma, c_i Y) + c_s Y + X/(\alpha\sigma_{\text{tar}}^2)\|^2] \\ &= \lambda/(\alpha\sigma_{\text{tar}})^4 \mathbb{E}_{X,Y}[\| -(\alpha\sigma_{\text{tar}})^2 c_o F_\theta(\sigma, c_i Y) - (\alpha\sigma_{\text{tar}})^2 c_s Y - \alpha X \|^2] \\ &= \lambda' \mathbb{E}_{X,Y}[\|c'_o F_\theta(\sigma, c'_i Y) + c'_s Y - \alpha X\|^2],\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\lambda' = \lambda/(\alpha\sigma_{\text{tar}})^4, \quad c'_o = -(\alpha\sigma_{\text{tar}})^2 c_o, \quad c'_s = -(\alpha\sigma_{\text{tar}})^2 c_s, \quad c'_i = c_i. \quad (27)$$

We emphasize that $\lambda'(c'_o)^2 = \lambda c_o^2$. Therefore, the rescaled effective weight is the same as the effective weight described in [Karras et al. \(2022\)](#).

Using ([Karras et al., 2022](#), (117), (131), (138),(144)), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda' &= (\sigma^2 + \alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2)/(\alpha\sigma\sigma_{\text{tar}})^2, & c'_o &= \alpha\sigma\sigma_{\text{tar}}/(\sigma^2 + \alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2)^{1/2}, \\ c'_s &= \alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2/(\alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2 + \sigma^2), & c_i &= 1/\sqrt{\sigma^2 + \alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, combining this result and (27) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2 (\sigma^2 + \alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2)/\sigma^2, & c_o &= -\sigma/[\alpha\sigma_{\text{tar}}(\sigma^2 + \alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2)^{1/2}], \\ c_s &= -1/(\sigma^2 + \alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2), & c_i &= 1/\sqrt{\sigma^2 + \alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using ([Karras et al., 2022](#), (151)), we get that the variance of $\lambda\|c_o F_\theta(\sigma, c_i y) + c_s y + x/(\alpha\sigma_{\text{tar}}^2)\|^2$ is equal to one for every time $\sigma, \alpha > 0$, at initialization for $F_\theta = 0$. In the general case, using the hyperparameters λ, c_i, c_s, c_o we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\theta) &= \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2 (\sigma^2 + \alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2)/\sigma^2 \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} [\|\sigma F_\theta(\sigma, Y/(\sigma^2 + \alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2)^{1/2})/[\sigma_{\text{tar}}(\sigma^2 + \alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2)^{1/2}] \\ &\quad + \alpha Y/(\sigma^2 + \alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2) + \nabla \log p_X(X)\|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

The score network is then given by

$$s_Y^\theta(y) = -(1/\alpha)[\sigma F_\theta(\sigma, y/(\sigma^2 + \alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2)^{1/2})/\sigma_{\text{tar}}(\sigma^2 + \alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2)^{1/2} + \alpha^2 y/(\alpha^2 \sigma_{\text{tar}}^2 + \sigma^2)].$$