

BACKPROPAGATION FROM KL PROJECTIONS: DIFFERENTIAL AND EXACT I-PROJECTION CORRESPONDENCES

Manish Krishan Lal^{*}

January 1, 2026

Abstract

We establish two exact correspondences between reverse-mode automatic differentiation (backpropagation evaluated at a fixed forward pass) and compositions of projection maps in Kullback–Leibler (KL) geometry. In both settings, belief-propagation-style message passing enforces agreement and factorization constraints via KL projections. In the first setting, backpropagation arises as the differential of a KL projection map on a delta-lifted factorization. In the second setting, on complete and decomposable sum–product networks, backpropagation coincides with exact probabilistic inference, and the backward values admit an interpretation as Lagrange multipliers of a KL I-projection problem.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 47H09; Secondary 90C25, 68T37.

Keywords: belief propagation; backpropagation; KL divergence; Bregman projections; Dykstra’s algorithm; information projection; sum–product networks; message passing.

1 Introduction

Modern deep learning is most often analyzed through optimization and dynamical-systems perspectives: stochastic gradient dynamics, curvature and Hessian spectra, implicit bias, and overparameterization. These viewpoints describe *how* parameters evolve

^{*}Mathematics, Technical University of Munich, Garching, 85748, Germany. E-mail: manish.krishanlal@tum.de.

during training, but they largely treat the *backpropagation* algorithm itself as a black box—an instance of reverse-mode automatic differentiation whose internal structure is rarely examined, despite the fact that this structure determines how gradients are produced and propagated through the model.

This paper takes a complementary viewpoint. We study backpropagation as an *operator on messages and beliefs* associated with a computation graph, and we ask whether this operator admits a geometric description with explicit projection, fixed-point, and stability structure. Our starting point is the observation that belief propagation (BP) admits a precise formulation in Kullback–Leibler (KL) geometry as an alternation of information projections. We show that, in two distinct regimes, backpropagation is not merely compatible with this geometric structure but is determined by it exactly.

1.1 Geometric setting (informal)

Throughout the paper, we work in finite probability simplices equipped with KL Bregman geometry. The message-passing objects we manipulate—messages, beliefs, and region tables—are strictly positive probability vectors (elements of interior simplices), represented in log-coordinates when convenient. All projections are the associated Bregman *I-projections* and *reverse-KL (M-)projections* induced by the negative-entropy generator. Precise definitions of the spaces, projection operators, and normalization conventions are given in [Section 2](#).

In the settings considered in this paper, the underlying computation is a scalar-valued map: either a C^1 deterministic computation $F : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ evaluated at an input x , or a network polynomial $S : (0, \infty)^N \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ evaluated at evidence e . In both cases, we adopt a *region view*, standard in variational and projection-based formulations of message passing [[YFW05](#), [WJ08](#)]. Rather than working with a single global object, inference is expressed in terms of collections of local objects, each associated with a subset of variables. Formally, each node n carries a *scope* $sc(n)$ consisting of the variables below it, and the *region family* \mathcal{R} is the multiset of all such scopes. Consistency between overlapping regions is enforced by *consensus* constraints (equal-scope marginals must agree), while independence structure is enforced by *factorization* constraints across decomposed regions. Depending on the setting, the underlying state is either a *single joint object* coordinated by these constraints or a *collection of region-level objects* linked by them.

1.2 Two regimes

We study two regimes.

- (A) A *delta-lifted* factorization of a smooth computation directed acyclic graph (DAG) with scalar output $z := F(x)$. Each assignment $y = f(\cdot)$ is replaced by a Dirac constraint $\delta(y - f(\cdot))$, and a positive C^1 output factor $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is attached.
- (B) A *complete and decomposable sum–product network (SPN)*, i.e., an arithmetic circuit with strictly positive leaf indicators. We denote by $\lambda = (\lambda_{i,t})_{i,t} \in (0, \infty)^N$ the collection of indicator values associated with variables X_i taking state t , and by e the corresponding evidence; throughout, we identify e with λ and write $e := \lambda$, where $N = \sum_{i=1}^M |\mathcal{X}_i|$. For fixed positive circuit weights, the SPN defines a scalar multilinear map

$$S : (0, \infty)^N \rightarrow (0, \infty),$$

called the *network polynomial*, whose value at the root node r is denoted $S(e) = S(r)$. Each node n in the circuit has an associated upward value $S(n) \in (0, \infty)$ and a downward (reverse-mode) value

$$D(n) := \frac{\partial S(r)}{\partial S(n)}.$$

In Regime (A), the region family \mathcal{R} encodes the replicated copies introduced by the delta-lift. In Regime (B), it is the collection of SPN scopes (sum, product, and singleton regions).

1.3 Main results (informal)

Regime (A): backpropagation as the differential of a KL projection map. Normalized belief propagation on the delta-lifted factorization coincides with the KL projection operator

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{Proj}} := \overrightarrow{\pi}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}^f \circ \overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}'}^f,$$

which enforces agreement across replicated variables (i.e., equal-scope copies) and product structure in dual coordinates (Theorem 3.1). Here $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Proj}}$ acts on a strictly positive joint table over the replicated variables, encoding the current BP messages. For a single forward evaluation, let $b_{\downarrow}(x)$ denote the product of all downward BP messages entering a variable x . Then, at the forward point,

$$\nabla_x \log b_{\downarrow}(x) = \frac{\varphi'(z)}{\varphi(z)} \nabla_x z,$$

so backpropagation is the *Jacobian* of the KL projection operator (after message extraction) evaluated at the forward point (Theorem 3.3).

Regime (B): backpropagation equals exact marginals on SPNs. In complete and decomposable SPNs, a single forward–backward sweep yields reverse-mode derivatives that, after normalization by $S(e)$, *equal* exact marginal probabilities. In particular, for each variable X_i and state $t \in \mathcal{X}_i$,

$$\frac{\partial S(e)}{\partial \lambda_{i,t}} = \Pr(X_i = t \mid e) S(e),$$

with analogous identities for sum-gate children. Thus, one upward and one downward pass compute all marginals exactly (Theorem 4.2). Equivalently, the forward–backward sweep realizes the two-step KL projection operator

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{SPN}} := \overrightarrow{\pi}_{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathcal{R}}}^{f_{\mathcal{R}}} \circ \overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}}^{f_{\mathcal{R}}},$$

which enforces scope-consensus followed by scope-factorization induced by decomposability (Theorem 4.4).

1.4 Additional consequences

Regime (A). Identifying backpropagation with the differential of the KL projection map $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Proj}}$ yields quantitative guarantees beyond the exact identity of Theorem 3.3. In particular, we: (i) bound the error of backprop adjoints obtained after finitely many Walsh–Regalia projection steps in terms of the distance to an effectively acyclic factorization (Theorem 3.6); (ii) construct convergent surrogate backprop gradients by replacing the KL generator with a symmetric (Mahalanobis) Bregman divergence (Theorem 3.7); and (iii) make explicit the gauge-invariance of adjoints under state-independent message rescaling (Theorem 3.8). These results are stated and proved in Section 3.4.

Regime (B). In the SPN setting, downward values admit a convex-analytic interpretation: backpropagation computes the Lagrange multipliers (shadow prices) enforcing the consensus and factorization constraints of the underlying KL I-projection (Theorem 4.12). Moreover, the map from log-evidence to log-derivatives is locally Lipschitz, with constants controlled by the circuit structure and local parameter ranges (Theorem 4.13).

1.5 A boundary case: when belief propagation truly generalizes backpropagation

Although this paper focuses on backpropagation as a deterministic operator, it is useful to isolate the precise setting in which belief propagation (sum–product) provides a genuine probabilistic extension of backpropagation.

If the delta-lift is augmented with a proper prior $p(x)$ on the inputs and a proper likelihood $\ell : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ at the scalar output $z = z(x, \theta)$, then on tree-structured graphs belief propagation computes *posterior-expected* sensitivities:

$$\nabla_\theta \log p(y_{\text{obs}}) = \mathbb{E}_{p(x|y_{\text{obs}}; \theta)} [s(z) \partial_\theta z(x, \theta)], \quad s(z) := \nabla_z \log \ell(z).$$

Here the expectation is with respect to the exact posterior distribution $p(x | y_{\text{obs}}; \theta)$. In the Dirac-prior limit $p(x) = \delta_{x^*}$, this reduces to the algebraic delta-lift identity of Regime (A) ([Theorem 3.9](#)), cleanly separating the algebraic correspondence from the probabilistic statement valid for normalized tree models.

1.6 Relation to prior work and organization

Our analysis builds on the KL projection view of belief propagation due to Walsh and Regalia [[WR10](#)], Darwiche’s differential semantics for arithmetic circuits [[Dar03](#)], and classical Bregman projection theory in convex analysis [[Csi75](#), [BB94](#)]. The delta-lift identity with $\varphi(z) = e^z$ on a non-normalized factorization appeared in prior work [[Eat22](#)]. We place that algebraic observation in a precise projection framework, separate it from probabilistic inference, and characterize when a probabilistic generalization is valid (trees with proper priors and likelihoods; [Theorem 3.9](#)).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. [Section 2](#) introduces notation and geometric preliminaries. [Section 3](#) develops Regime (A). [Section 4](#) develops Regime (B). [Section 5](#) provides worked examples, and [Section 6](#) summarizes conclusions and outlook.

2 Preliminaries and notation

For a scalar function h , ∇h denotes the gradient; for vector-valued F , JF denotes the Jacobian. The vector $\mathbf{1}$ denotes an all-ones vector of appropriate dimension. We write $a \propto b$ to indicate equality up to a positive, state-independent constant, followed by normalization to land in a simplex.

Probability simplices and interiors. Let \mathcal{X} be a finite set with $|\mathcal{X}| = n$. We identify distributions on \mathcal{X} with vectors in the n -simplex

$$\Delta(\mathcal{X}) := \{p \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \mid \mathbf{1}^\top p = 1\}, \quad \Delta^\circ(\mathcal{X}) := \{p \in \Delta(\mathcal{X}) \mid p_i > 0 \forall i\}.$$

Whenever we take logarithms (for messages or beliefs) we work on $\Delta^\circ(\mathcal{X})$ so that all coordinates are strictly positive.

Bregman divergences and KL geometry. Let $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be strictly convex and differentiable on a convex domain \mathcal{D} . The Bregman divergence is

$$D_f(r, q) := f(r) - f(q) - \langle \nabla f(q), r - q \rangle.$$

When f is of Legendre type, the Fenchel conjugate f^* is well-defined, ∇f is a bijection between primal and dual coordinates, and $D_f(r, q) = D_{f^*}(\nabla f(q), \nabla f(r))$. Throughout, we work in KL geometry with the negative-entropy generator

$$f(p) := \sum_i p_i \log p_i, \quad p \in \Delta^\circ(\mathcal{X}),$$

and conjugate $f^*(\theta) = \log \sum_i e^{\theta_i}$. Then $\nabla f(p) = (1 + \log p_i)_i$, $\nabla f^*(\theta) = \text{softmax}(\theta) \in \Delta^\circ(\mathcal{X})$, and $D_f(r, q) = \text{KL}(r\|q)$ is the Kullback–Leibler divergence.

Left (I-) and right (reverse-KL) projections. Let $C \subseteq \Delta(\mathcal{X})$ be nonempty, convex, and closed in the relative topology of the simplex, and write $\widehat{C} = \nabla f(C) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ for its image in dual coordinates. We use:

- the *left* (I-) projection

$$\overleftarrow{\pi}_C^f(q) \in \arg \min_{r \in C} D_f(r, q) = \arg \min_{r \in C} \text{KL}(r\|q);$$

- the *right* projection

$$\overrightarrow{\pi}_{\widehat{C}}^f(q) := \nabla f^*\left(\arg \min_{u \in \widehat{C}} D_{f^*}(u, \nabla f(q))\right).$$

When $\widehat{C} = \nabla f(C)$, $\overrightarrow{\pi}_{\widehat{C}}^f(q)$ is the usual reverse-KL M -projection of q onto C expressed in dual coordinates [Csi75]. For KL, both projections are unique on $\Delta^\circ(\mathcal{X})$ by strict convexity of f .

Product families. For variables X_1, \dots, X_M with finite alphabets \mathcal{X}_i , write $\Omega := \prod_{i=1}^M \mathcal{X}_i$ and $\Delta(\Omega)$ for the joint simplex. The (nonconvex) *product family* is

$$\mathcal{C} := \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^M q_i(x_i) \mid q_i \in \Delta^\circ(\mathcal{X}_i) \right\} \subset \Delta^\circ(\Omega),$$

and we write $\widehat{\mathcal{C}} = \nabla f(\mathcal{C}) \subset \mathbb{R}^{|\Omega|}$ for its image in dual coordinates. Right (reverse-KL) projections onto such sets enforce product structure by mapping a joint object to the closest element of the product family. Variants of this construction encode factorization constraints and are denoted as \mathcal{P} and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$, in Regime (A) and Regime (B), respectively.

Factor graphs and normalized BP. A factor graph is a bipartite graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E})$ with variable nodes $X_i \in \mathcal{V}$, factor nodes $g \in \mathcal{F}$, and edges $(g, X_i) \in \mathcal{E}$ when g depends on X_i . Each factor $g : \prod_{i \in \text{nb}(g)} \mathcal{X}_i \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is strictly positive, and $\text{nb}(u)$ denotes the neighbors of u .

A *message* on edge (g, X_i) is a vector $m_{g \rightarrow i} \in \Delta^\circ(\mathcal{X}_i)$ (similarly $m_{i \rightarrow g}$). The normalized sum-product/BP updates are

$$\begin{aligned} m_{g \rightarrow i}(x_i) &\propto \sum_{x_{\text{nb}(g) \setminus i}} g(x_{\text{nb}(g)}) \prod_{j \in \text{nb}(g) \setminus i} m_{j \rightarrow g}(x_j), \\ m_{i \rightarrow g}(x_i) &\propto \prod_{h \in \text{nb}(i) \setminus g} m_{h \rightarrow i}(x_i), \end{aligned}$$

followed by normalization in $\Delta^\circ(\mathcal{X}_i)$. The *belief* at X_i is

$$b_i(x_i) \propto \prod_{g \in \text{nb}(i)} m_{g \rightarrow i}(x_i) \in \Delta^\circ(\mathcal{X}_i).$$

Messages are defined only up to positive, state-independent per-edge scalings; all of our identities use *log-derivatives*, which are invariant to such gauge transformations.

Consensus sets. When a variable X is replicated into K copies $X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(K)}$ with common alphabet \mathcal{X} , the *consensus set* is the diagonal face

$$\mathcal{D} := \left\{ q \in \Delta(\Omega^K) \mid q(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(K)}) = 0 \text{ unless } x^{(1)} = \dots = x^{(K)} \right\}.$$

The set \mathcal{D} is a closed convex face of $\Delta(\Omega^K)$. The I-projection $\overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{D}}^f$ enforces equality by zeroing off-diagonal mass and renormalizing on the diagonal. Variants of this construction (denoted \mathcal{Q} and $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$) encode scope-wise equality constraints in Regime (A) and Regime (B), respectively.

3 Regime (A): Delta-lifted backpropagation as the differential of a KL projection algorithm

3.1 Projection algorithm: BP as a hybrid of KL projections

Let $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E})$ be a discrete factor graph with strictly positive factors. Following the Walsh–Regalia replication construction [WR10], let Ω be the finite product alphabet of a

single replica of the variables, so that joint tables live on Ω^K for some replication index K . Let $\mathcal{Q} \subset \Delta(\Omega^K)$ be the diagonal face and let $\Delta^\circ(\mathcal{Q})$ denote the *relative interior* of this face, i.e., distributions supported on the diagonal with strictly positive diagonal entries. Let \mathcal{P} be the (nonconvex) family of product distributions on the replicated variables in the sense of [WR10], and define its dual-coordinate image $\widehat{\mathcal{P}} := \nabla f(\mathcal{P}) \subset \mathbb{R}^{|\Omega|^K}$.

Projections with faces. The I-projection $\overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}}^f$ maps $\Delta^\circ(\Omega^K)$ into $\Delta^\circ(\mathcal{Q})$ by zeroing off-diagonal mass and renormalizing on the diagonal. Since elements of $\Delta^\circ(\mathcal{Q})$ have zeros outside the diagonal, we interpret dual coordinates on \mathcal{Q} using the *relative gradient* of f restricted to the affine hull of \mathcal{Q} . Equivalently, we may identify $\Delta(\mathcal{Q})$ with the simplex on the diagonal outcomes and use the same entropy generator on that smaller simplex. With this convention, the right projection $\overrightarrow{\pi}_{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}}^f$ is well-defined on $\Delta^\circ(\mathcal{Q})$.

For $q \in \Delta^\circ(\Omega^K)$ define the two-step operator

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{Proj}}(q) := \overrightarrow{\pi}_{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}}^f(\overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}}^f(q)). \quad (1)$$

This operator first enforces consensus (onto \mathcal{Q}), then enforces product structure (onto $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$ in dual coordinates).

Walsh–Regalia hybrid scheme. Let $q_{-1} \in \Delta^\circ(\Omega^K)$ be the normalized product of the replicated factor tables. Walsh and Regalia [WR10, Thm. 1] give a Dykstra-like hybrid scheme:

$$k_n = \overrightarrow{\pi}_{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}}^f\left(\nabla f^*(\nabla f(q_{n-1}) + \sigma_{n-1})\right), \quad (2)$$

$$\sigma_n = \nabla f(q_{n-1}) + \sigma_{n-1} - \nabla f(k_n), \quad (3)$$

$$r_n = \overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}}^f\left(\nabla f^*(\nabla f(k_n) + \tau_{n-1})\right), \quad (4)$$

$$q_n = \overrightarrow{\pi}_{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}}^f(r_n), \quad (5)$$

$$\tau_n = \nabla f(k_n) + \tau_{n-1} - \nabla f(q_n), \quad (6)$$

initialized with $\sigma_{-1} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\tau_{-1} = \mathbf{0}$.

Proposition 3.1 (Normalized BP as a hybrid of KL projections [WR10, Thm. 1]). For a finite factor graph G with strictly positive factors and initialization q_{-1} as above, the iterates of (2)–(6) coincide with normalized sum–product (BP) on G . In particular:

- (i) if G is a tree, one upward–downward BP pass computes $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Proj}}(z_{-1})$, and the resulting beliefs are exact marginals;
- (ii) any fixed point of normalized BP is a fixed point of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Proj}}$.

3.2 Delta factors and a message-level chain rule

We now pass to the smooth delta-lift. Let $y = \psi(x_1, \dots, x_r)$ with $\psi \in C^1$ on an open set $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{d_r}$, and consider the deterministic factor

$$g(y, x_1, \dots, x_r) = \delta(y - \psi(x_1, \dots, x_r)).$$

Assume the incoming message $m_{y \rightarrow g}(y)$ is strictly positive and C^1 near the forward value y^* , and that all other arguments x_{-j} are clamped to x_{-j}^* .

Lemma 3.2 (Delta-factor chain rule). Under these assumptions,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \log m_{g \rightarrow x_j}(x_j) \Big|_{x_j^*} = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \log m_{y \rightarrow g}(y) \Big|_{y^*} \cdot \frac{\partial y}{\partial x_j} \Big|_{x^*}.$$

Proof. By the continuous factor-to-variable update,

$$m_{g \rightarrow x_j}(x_j) \propto \int \delta(y - \psi(x_j, x_{-j}^*)) m_{y \rightarrow g}(y) dy = m_{y \rightarrow g}(\psi(x_j, x_{-j}^*)).$$

Differentiating $\log m_{g \rightarrow x_j}$ and evaluating at the forward point gives the claim. \blacksquare

3.3 Backpropagation as the differential of a KL projection map

Let z denote the scalar output node of the computation DAG, and let $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a C^1 output factor. Run one upward pass (collapsing messages at delta factors to Dirac masses at forward values) and one downward pass seeded by

$$m_{\varphi \rightarrow z}(z) = \varphi(z).$$

For each variable v define the downward belief

$$b_{\downarrow}(v) := \prod_{g \in \text{nb}(v) \cap \text{downstream}} m_{g \rightarrow v}(v), \quad s(v) := \partial_v \log b_{\downarrow}(v) \Big|_{v^*}.$$

Theorem 3.3 (Backpropagation as log-derivatives of downward BP messages). With the setup above, $s(z) = \varphi'(z^*)/\varphi(z^*)$, and for any variable x ,

$$\nabla_x \log b_{\downarrow}(x) \Big|_{x^*} = \frac{\varphi'(z^*)}{\varphi(z^*)} \nabla_x z \Big|_{x^*}.$$

Equivalently, for $\varphi(z) = e^{\alpha z}$ one has $\nabla_x \log b_{\downarrow}(x) = \alpha \nabla_x z$ at the forward point x^* .

Proof. At each deterministic factor g corresponding to $y = \psi(\cdot)$, Theorem 3.2 yields

$$\partial_x \log m_{g \rightarrow x} = \partial_y \log m_{y \rightarrow g} \cdot \partial_x y \quad \text{at the forward point.}$$

Since $b_{\downarrow}(x)$ is the product of all factor-to-variable messages into x ,

$$s(x) = \partial_x \log b_{\downarrow}(x) = \sum_{y \in \text{Ch}(x)} s(y) \partial_x y,$$

where $\text{Ch}(x)$ denotes the children of x in the computation DAG, with base case $s(z) = \varphi'(z^*)/\varphi(z^*)$ from $m_{\varphi \rightarrow z} = \varphi$. This is exactly the reverse-mode recursion for $\nabla_x z$, multiplied by $\varphi'(z^*)/\varphi(z^*)$. Reverse induction along a topological order of the DAG gives the result. \blacksquare

Remark 3.4 (Proper likelihoods). If $\varphi(z) = e^{-L(z)/T}$ with $L \in C^1$ and $T > 0$, then $s(z) = -L'(z^*)/T$ and

$$\nabla_x \log b_{\downarrow}(x) = -\frac{1}{T} L'(z^*) \nabla_x z \quad \text{at } x^*,$$

the usual backpropagation gradient for the scalar loss $L(z)$, scaled by $1/T$.

Remark 3.5 (Differential of the KL projection map). By Theorem 3.1, normalized BP on the delta-lifted factor graph applies $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Proj}} = \overrightarrow{\pi}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}^f \circ \overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}}^f$. Theorem 3.3 states that, at the forward point and in log-coordinates, the Jacobian of the map that sends the output seed φ through $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Proj}}$ and reads off downward messages agrees (up to the scalar $\varphi'(z^*)/\varphi(z^*)$) with the reverse-mode adjoint map. In this sense backpropagation is the *differential* of the KL projection map that implements BP on the delta-lift.

3.4 New consequences for backprop from the KL projection connection

We now record quantitative and structural consequences of identifying backpropagation with the differential of the KL projection map $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Proj}}$.

Notation. Let $q_{-1} \in \Delta^\circ(\Omega^K)$ be the normalized product of the replicated factor tables, and write

$$\zeta_{-1} := \nabla f(q_{-1})$$

for its log-coordinates. Let \mathcal{F} denote the union of linear subspaces in log-coordinates corresponding to (effectively) acyclic factorizations, as characterized in [WR10]. For $L \in \mathbb{N}$, let C_L and γ be the constants from [WR10, Prop. 1, Thm. 3] controlling the deviation between the length- L Walsh–Regalia iteration and the two-step projection $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Proj}}$ in log-coordinates.

For a variable x , define

$$g^{(L)}(x) := \nabla_x \log b_{\downarrow}^{(L)}(x), \quad g^*(x) := \frac{\varphi'(z^*)}{\varphi(z^*)} \nabla_x z,$$

where $b_{\downarrow}^{(L)}$ is the product of downward messages formed after L Walsh–Regalia outer iterations, and g^* is the exact backprop adjoint from [Theorem 3.3](#).

Theorem 3.6 (Finite-pass accuracy of backprop via WR iterations). Assume the setup of [Sections 3.1](#) and [3.2](#). Fix $L \in \mathbb{N}$ and suppose

$$\text{dist}(\zeta_{-1}, \mathcal{F}) \leq \delta,$$

where $\text{dist}(\cdot, \mathcal{F})$ denotes Euclidean distance in log-coordinates. Then for each variable x there exists a constant $K_x > 0$ (depending only on the local degree of x and C^1 bounds on the DAG maps near the forward point) such that

$$\|g^{(L)}(x) - g^*(x)\|_2 \leq K_x (C_L + \gamma) \delta.$$

In particular, if $\delta = 0$ (effectively acyclic factorization), then $g^{(L)}(x) = g^*(x)$ for all $L \geq 1$, and a single forward/backward pass suffices.

Proof. By [\[WR10, Prop. 1, Thm. 3\]](#), $\|\zeta^{(L)} - \zeta^*\| \leq (C_L + \gamma)\delta$, where $\zeta^{(L)}$ and ζ^* are the log-coordinates of the L -step WR iterate and the two-step projection, respectively. The map $\zeta \mapsto \nabla_x \log b_{\downarrow}(x)$ is C^1 in a neighborhood of ζ^* , with operator norm bounded by K_x . The claim follows by the mean-value inequality. ■

Proposition 3.7 (Convergent surrogate gradients from symmetric Bregman variants). Let g be a symmetric (Mahalanobis) Bregman generator, and let \mathcal{T}_{sym} denote the Walsh–Regalia hybrid scheme obtained by replacing f with g . Then the projection iterates converge to a limit ζ_∞ in log-coordinates [\[WR10, Thm. 2\]](#). If

$$\|\zeta_\infty - \zeta^*\| \leq \varepsilon,$$

then for each variable x ,

$$\|g^{\text{sym}}(x) - g^*(x)\|_2 \leq K_x \varepsilon,$$

where $g^{\text{sym}}(x) = \nabla_x \log b_{\downarrow}^{\text{sym}}(x)$ is the surrogate gradient induced by the symmetric scheme.

Proposition 3.8 (Gauge invariance of backprop under message scalings). Let all factor-to-variable and variable-to-factor messages be multiplied by positive, state-independent constants (possibly different on each edge). Then the backprop adjoints $g^*(x)$ from [Theorem 3.3](#) are unchanged.

Proof. Scaling messages multiplies $b_{\downarrow}(x)$ by a positive constant independent of x . Taking log-derivatives removes this factor, leaving $\nabla_x \log b_{\downarrow}(x)$ unchanged. ■

3.5 Probabilistic generalization on trees

The algebraic identity of [Theorem 3.3](#) does not, by itself, define a normalized probabilistic model: the delta-lift uses singular constraints and the output factor φ need not be integrable. When the delta-lift is augmented with proper priors on inputs and a proper likelihood at the output, a genuine probabilistic generalization becomes available. In this setting, backpropagation is replaced by *posterior-expected sensitivities*.

Theorem 3.9 (Posterior-expected sensitivities on trees). Let x denote all non-output variables and let $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a parameter. Assume:

- (a) $p(x)$ is a proper prior density on x that does not depend on θ ;
- (b) $z = z(x, \theta)$ is a C^1 map of (x, θ) into \mathbb{R} ;
- (c) the likelihood $\ell : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is C^1 , and we write $s(z) := \nabla_z \log \ell(z)$;
- (d) the marginal likelihood

$$p(y_{\text{obs}}; \theta) = \int \ell(z(x, \theta)) p(x) dx$$

is finite for all $\theta \in \Theta$;

- (e) differentiation under the integral sign is justified, i.e., for each $\theta \in \Theta$ there exists an integrable function $h_\theta(x)$ such that

$$\|\nabla_\theta(\ell(z(x, \theta)) p(x))\| \leq h_\theta(x) \quad \text{for a.e. } x, \quad \int h_\theta(x) dx < \infty.$$

Assume further that the factor graph induced by $p(x)$ and $\ell(z(x, \theta))$ is a tree. Then

$$\nabla_\theta \log p(y_{\text{obs}}; \theta) = \mathbb{E}[s(z(x, \theta)) \partial_\theta z(x, \theta) \mid y_{\text{obs}}],$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to the exact posterior $p(x \mid y_{\text{obs}}; \theta)$. Moreover, on a tree this posterior expectation is computed exactly by a single upward–downward sum–product (BP) pass, equivalently by one application of the two-step KL operator $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Proj}} = \overrightarrow{\pi}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}^f \circ \overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}}^f$ applied to the normalized model.

Proof. By definition,

$$p(y_{\text{obs}}; \theta) = \int \ell(z(x, \theta)) p(x) dx.$$

By assumption (e) and the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\nabla_\theta p(y_{\text{obs}}; \theta) = \int \nabla_\theta(\ell(z(x, \theta)) p(x)) dx = \int \ell(z(x, \theta)) s(z(x, \theta)) \partial_\theta z(x, \theta) p(x) dx.$$

Dividing by $p(y_{\text{obs}}; \theta)$ yields

$$\nabla_{\theta} \log p(y_{\text{obs}}; \theta) = \frac{\int \ell(z(x, \theta)) p(x) s(z(x, \theta)) \partial_{\theta} z(x, \theta) dx}{\int \ell(z(x, \theta)) p(x) dx},$$

which is exactly the posterior expectation stated.

For the second claim, note that on a tree a single sum–product pass computes all exact posterior marginals of $p(x \mid y_{\text{obs}}; \theta)$. The integrand $s(z(x, \theta)) \partial_{\theta} z(x, \theta)$ decomposes as a sum of local terms associated with nodes and factors of the computation graph. Hence the posterior expectation can be evaluated exactly from these marginals in one upward–downward pass. In the discrete setting, this pass coincides with one application of the Walsh–Regalia two-step KL operator $\overrightarrow{\pi}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}^f \circ \overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}}^f$ applied to the normalized model. ■

Corollary 3.10 (Dirac-prior specialization and recovery of the algebraic identity). Under the assumptions of [Theorem 3.9](#), suppose instead that the prior on x is a Dirac measure δ_{x^*} at a forward configuration x^* . Then the posterior is also a Dirac measure at x^* and

$$\nabla_{\theta} \log p(y_{\text{obs}}; \theta) = s(z(x^*, \theta)) \partial_{\theta} z(x^*, \theta).$$

If we choose an output factor φ such that $\varphi'(z^*)/\varphi(z^*) = s(z^*)$, this recovers exactly the algebraic identity of [Theorem 3.3](#).

Proof. If $p(x) = \delta_{x^*}$, then

$$p(y_{\text{obs}}; \theta) = \ell(z(x^*, \theta)),$$

and therefore

$$\nabla_{\theta} \log p(y_{\text{obs}}; \theta) = \nabla_{\theta} \log \ell(z(x^*, \theta)) = s(z(x^*, \theta)) \partial_{\theta} z(x^*, \theta)$$

by the chain rule. Since the posterior is supported at x^* , the posterior expectation in [Theorem 3.9](#) reduces to point evaluation. Choosing φ so that $\varphi'(z^*)/\varphi(z^*) = s(z^*)$ yields [Theorem 3.3](#). ■

4 Regime (B): Sum–product circuits — backpropagation equals exact marginals and realizes a KL I-projection

Let $\{X_1, \dots, X_M\}$ be discrete variables with finite alphabets \mathcal{X}_i and joint space $\Omega := \prod_{i=1}^M \mathcal{X}_i$. As in [Section 2](#), distributions on Ω live in the simplex $\Delta(\Omega)$ with interior $\Delta^\circ(\Omega)$. Throughout this section, we assume strictly positive objects (all indicators and weights are > 0), so that every normalization and logarithm is well-defined.

4.1 Sum–product networks and upward/downward values

An SPN is a DAG $G = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ whose internal nodes partition into *sum* nodes Sum and *product* nodes Prod, with leaf nodes \mathcal{L} being indicator functions of the form $\mathbf{1}[X_i = t]$ for $t \in \mathcal{X}_i$. Each node $n \in \mathcal{N}$ has a *scope* $\text{sc}(n) \subseteq \{1, \dots, M\}$ (the set of variables appearing below n). We impose the standard structural assumptions:

- **Completeness:** for every $s \in \text{Sum}$ and $c \in \text{ch}(s)$, $\text{sc}(c) = \text{sc}(s)$.
- **Decomposability:** for every $p \in \text{Prod}$ and distinct $c, c' \in \text{ch}(p)$, $\text{sc}(c) \cap \text{sc}(c') = \emptyset$.
- **Positive weights:** each edge $(s \rightarrow c)$ from a sum has a weight $w_{sc} \in (0, \infty)$. When $\sum_c w_{sc} = 1$ we say the sum is *normalized*.

Soft evidence on X_i is encoded by indicator leaves taking strictly positive values $\lambda_{i,t} \in (0, \infty)$ for $t \in \mathcal{X}_i$. We interpret $\lambda_{i,t}$ as a unary evidence potential (or likelihood term) for the event $X_i = t$. Hard evidence is recovered by setting $\lambda_{i,t} \in \{0, 1\}$ and working on the induced support (relative interiors). In this general soft-evidence regime, posterior marginals are obtained from *log-derivatives*:

$$\Pr(X_i = t \mid e) = \frac{\partial \log S(e)}{\partial \log \lambda_{i,t}} = \frac{\lambda_{i,t}}{S(e)} \frac{\partial S(e)}{\partial \lambda_{i,t}}.$$

The *network polynomial* $S(e)$ is defined by the usual bottom-up evaluation rules [Dar03, PD11]:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Leaf } \ell = \mathbf{1}[X_i = t] : \quad & S(\ell) = \lambda_{i,t}, \\ \text{Product } p : \quad & S(p) = \prod_{c \in \text{ch}(p)} S(c), \\ \text{Sum } s : \quad & S(s) = \sum_{c \in \text{ch}(s)} w_{sc} S(c). \end{aligned}$$

Let r be the root. We write $S(e) := S(r) > 0$.

Downward (reverse-mode) values. Define the *downward value* at each node n by

$$D(n) := \frac{\partial S(r)}{\partial S(n)}, \quad D(r) \equiv 1.$$

Under our standing positivity assumptions, $S(n) > 0$ for all nodes and hence all partial derivatives are well-defined; in particular $D(n) > 0$ for all n (see [Theorem 4.6](#)). At each sum node s we define a *local gating distribution* $b_s \in \Delta^\circ(\text{ch}(s))$, and at each variable X_i a *variable belief* $b_i \in \Delta^\circ(\mathcal{X}_i)$; explicit formulas are given in [Theorem 4.2](#).

4.2 Local reverse-mode rules

The reverse-mode rules on an SPN are local and follow directly from the chain rule.

Lemma 4.1 (Local reverse-mode rules). Let $s \in \text{Sum}$ and $p \in \text{Prod}$.

- (a) For a sum node s and child $c \in \text{ch}(s)$, $D_{s \rightarrow c}(c) = D(s) w_{sc}$.
- (b) For a product node p and child $c \in \text{ch}(p)$, $D_{p \rightarrow c}(c) = D(p) \prod_{c' \in \text{ch}(p) \setminus \{c\}} S(c')$.

Consequently,

$$D(c) = \sum_{s \in \text{pa}(c) \cap \text{Sum}} D(s) w_{sc} + \sum_{p \in \text{pa}(c) \cap \text{Prod}} D(p) \prod_{c' \in \text{ch}(p) \setminus \{c\}} S(c').$$

Proof. By definition,

$$D_{s \rightarrow c}(c) = \frac{\partial S(r)}{\partial S(s)} \frac{\partial S(s)}{\partial S(c)} = D(s) \frac{\partial}{\partial S(c)} \left(\sum_{c'} w_{sc'} S(c') \right) = D(s) w_{sc},$$

which proves (a). Similarly,

$$D_{p \rightarrow c}(c) = \frac{\partial S(r)}{\partial S(p)} \frac{\partial S(p)}{\partial S(c)} = D(p) \frac{\partial}{\partial S(c)} \left(\prod_{c'} S(c') \right) = D(p) \prod_{c' \neq c} S(c'),$$

which proves (b). Summing edge contributions over parents of c gives the stated formula for $D(c)$. \blacksquare

4.3 Derivatives equal marginals

We now recall Darwiche's differential semantics [Dar03] specialized to SPNs and record the formulas we use.

Theorem 4.2 (Log-derivatives equal marginals). Assume the SPN is complete and decomposable with positive weights and positive indicators.

- (a) *Variable marginals (soft evidence)*. For each i and state $t \in \mathcal{X}_i$,

$$\Pr(X_i = t \mid e) = \frac{\lambda_{i,t}}{S(e)} \frac{\partial S(e)}{\partial \lambda_{i,t}} = \frac{\partial \log S(e)}{\partial \log \lambda_{i,t}} \in (0, 1).$$

Equivalently, the variable belief $b_i \in \Delta^\circ(\mathcal{X}_i)$ defined by

$$b_i(t) := \frac{\lambda_{i,t}}{S(e)} \frac{\partial S(e)}{\partial \lambda_{i,t}}$$

equals this marginal.

(b) *Gate marginals at sums.* For each sum node s and child $c \in \text{ch}(s)$,

$$\Pr(\text{parse visits } s \text{ and selects } c \mid e) = \frac{D(s) w_{sc} S(c)}{S(e)}.$$

Moreover, the local gating distribution $b_s \in \Delta^\circ(\text{ch}(s))$ given by

$$b_s(c) := \frac{w_{sc} S(c)}{S(s)}$$

is the conditional distribution of the gate given that the parse visits s , and

$$\Pr(\text{visit } s \mid e) = \frac{D(s) S(s)}{S(e)}, \quad \Pr(\text{select } c \mid e, \text{visit } s) = b_s(c).$$

Consequently, one upward pass computing the values $\{S(n)\}$ and one reverse pass computing $\{D(n)\}$ recover all variable marginals and all sum-gate quantities above.

Remark 4.3 (Beliefs as normalized derivatives). The beliefs b_i and b_s are obtained from circuit derivatives as follows: $b_i(t) = \frac{\lambda_{i,t}}{S(e)} \frac{\partial S(e)}{\partial \lambda_{i,t}}$ (equivalently, a log-derivative), and $b_s(c) = \frac{w_{sc} S(c)}{S(s)}$ is a local conditional gate distribution at sums. These coincide with the beliefs obtained by running sum-product on the circuit viewed as a factor graph with unary evidence potentials.

4.4 Projection interpretation: a two-step KL I-projection

We now express the upward–downward computation as a two-step projection in KL geometry, parallel to the construction in Regime (A).

Region family and ambient space. Let \mathcal{R} be the multiset of scopes $\mathcal{R} := \{\text{sc}(n) \mid n \in \mathcal{N}\}$, and for $R \in \mathcal{R}$ write $\mathcal{X}_R := \prod_{i \in R} \mathcal{X}_i$. We work on the product space of region tables

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{R}} := \prod_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \Delta^\circ(\mathcal{X}_R).$$

On $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{R}}$ we use the separable negative-entropy generator

$$f_{\mathcal{R}}(q) := \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \sum_{x_R \in \mathcal{X}_R} q_R(x_R) \log q_R(x_R), \quad q = (q_R)_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{R}},$$

so that the associated Bregman divergence is the sum of KL divergences, $D_{f_{\mathcal{R}}}(r, q) = \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \text{KL}(r_R \| q_R)$.

Product constraints. Define the *product family* $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{R}}$ by

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} := \left\{ q \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{R}} \mid q_{\text{sc}(p)} = \bigotimes_{c \in \text{ch}(p)} q_{\text{sc}(c)} \text{ for all } p \in \text{Prod} \right\}.$$

In log-coordinates $\theta_R = \nabla f(q_R) = 1 + \log q_R$, these constraints are affine (up to additive normalizations), hence $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathcal{R}} := \nabla f_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}})$ is an affine set in dual coordinates.

Consensus constraints. Define the *consensus set* $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{R}}$ by requiring that equal-scope copies agree: whenever two indices $R, R' \in \mathcal{R}$ represent the same scope (e.g., along a sum edge $(s \rightarrow c)$ with $\text{sc}(s) = \text{sc}(c)$ or due to sharing), we impose $q_R = q_{R'}$.

Two-step KL operator. Let $z_{-1} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{R}}$ denote the collection of local region tables. Define

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{SPN}}(z_{-1}) := \overrightarrow{\pi}_{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathcal{R}}}^{f_{\mathcal{R}}} \left(\overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}}^{f_{\mathcal{R}}}(z_{-1}) \right). \quad (7)$$

Proposition 4.4 (SPN pass realizes the KL two-step projection). Let the SPN be complete and decomposable with positive weights and evidence. Then the region marginals encoded by the beliefs of [Theorem 4.2](#) coincide with the region marginals of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{SPN}}(z_{-1})$. In particular, for SPN trees (no DAG sharing), \mathcal{T}_{SPN} reduces to the Walsh–Regalia map $\overrightarrow{\pi}_{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}}^f \circ \overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}}^f$ on the associated factor graph [\[WR10\]](#).

Proof. For an SPN tree (no sharing), the induced factor graph on region variables is a tree, and the constraint sets $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$ coincide with the Walsh–Regalia consensus and product sets. By [Theorem 3.1](#), one upward–downward sum–product pass computes $\overrightarrow{\pi}_{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}}^f \circ \overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}}^f$, whose exact marginals agree with the beliefs of [Theorem 4.2](#).

For a general DAG SPN, unrolling shared subgraphs yields an equivalent SPN tree with preserved completeness and decomposability. Beliefs on the DAG coincide with the corresponding marginals on the unrolled tree, and the two-step projection on the tree produces a unique family of region marginals. Identifying equal-scope copies recovers the DAG marginals, which therefore agree with $\mathcal{T}_{\text{SPN}}(z_{-1})$. ■

Remark 4.5 (Messages, projections, and beliefs). Upward values provide the sufficient statistics for the right projection $\overrightarrow{\pi}_{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathcal{R}}}^f$, encoding products across decomposed scopes. Downward values act as Lagrange multipliers enforcing consensus, corresponding to the I-projection onto $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$. Normalizing these quantities yields the beliefs of [Theorem 4.2](#).

4.5 Consequences and caveats

We collect some structural properties that will be used later.

Lemma 4.6 (Positivity and interior beliefs). Assume completeness and decomposability with strictly positive weights $w_{sc} > 0$ and strictly positive indicators $\lambda_{i,t} > 0$. Then for every node n ,

$$S(n) > 0, \quad D(n) > 0.$$

Consequently, $b_i \in \Delta^\circ(\mathcal{X}_i)$ and $b_s \in \Delta^\circ(\text{ch}(s))$ for all i and all sum nodes s .

Proof. We prove positivity of S by induction bottom-up. At leaves, $S(\ell) = \lambda_{i,t} > 0$. Products of positive numbers are positive, and weighted sums with positive weights are positive, so $S(n) > 0$ for all n .

For D , we have $D(r) = 1 > 0$. Suppose $D(u) > 0$ for all ancestors u of n . For any parent $s \in \text{pa}(n) \cap \text{Sum}$, Theorem 4.1(a) gives $D_{s \rightarrow n}(n) = D(s)w_{sn} > 0$. For any parent $p \in \text{pa}(n) \cap \text{Prod}$, Theorem 4.1(b) and positivity of the S -values give $D_{p \rightarrow n}(n) = D(p) \prod_{c' \neq n} S(c') > 0$. Summing over parents yields $D(n) > 0$. The formulas for b_i and b_s in Theorem 4.2 are ratios of positive quantities and hence lie in the interiors. ■

Proposition 4.7 (Uniqueness of the KL projections in \mathcal{T}_{SPN}). Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.6:

- (a) $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is a closed convex subset of $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{R}}$; hence the I-projection $\overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}}^{f_{\mathcal{R}}}$ is unique.
- (b) $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is an affine set in dual coordinates; hence the right projection $\overrightarrow{\pi}_{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathcal{R}}}^{f_{\mathcal{R}}}$ is unique.

Proof. (a) The constraints defining $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ are linear equalities of region marginals across duplicated scopes. The intersection of an affine subspace with the simplex is convex and closed, hence $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is convex and closed. Strict convexity of KL in its first argument then implies uniqueness of the minimizer of $D_f(\cdot, z_{-1})$ over $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$.

(b) Let $q \in \text{Prod}_{\mathcal{R}}$ and write $\theta = \nabla f(q)$. For negative entropy, $\theta_{\mathcal{R}}$ is (up to an additive constant) the vector of $\log q_{\mathcal{R}}$. The constraint $q_{\text{sc}(p)} = \bigotimes_{c \in \text{ch}(p)} q_{\text{sc}(c)}$ becomes

$$\theta_{\text{sc}(p)} = \sum_{c \in \text{ch}(p)} \theta_{\text{sc}(c)} + c_p \mathbf{1},$$

for some scalar c_p enforcing normalization. Thus $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is an affine subspace in θ . The dual Bregman divergence D_{f^*} is strictly convex in its first argument, so projection of any θ onto this affine subspace is unique. Mapping back by ∇f^* yields uniqueness of $\overrightarrow{\pi}_{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathcal{R}}}^f$. Existence and uniqueness of such forward Bregman projections are classical; see, e.g., [BN02]. ■

Proposition 4.8 (Local versus global normalization at sums). For a sum node s and child $c \in \text{ch}(s)$ define

$$p_s^{\text{glob}}(c) := \frac{D(s) w_{sc} S(c)}{S(e)}, \quad b_s(c) := \frac{w_{sc} S(c)}{S(s)}.$$

Then

$$p_s^{\text{glob}}(c) = \pi(s) b_s(c), \quad \pi(s) := \frac{D(s) S(s)}{S(e)} \in (0, 1],$$

and $\pi(s)$ is the posterior probability that a parse visits s . In particular, $\sum_c p_s^{\text{glob}}(c) = \pi(s)$ and $\sum_c b_s(c) = 1$.

Proof. By [Theorem 4.2\(b\)](#), $p_s^{\text{glob}}(c) = \Pr(Y_s = c \mid e)$ and $b_s(c)$ is the conditional probability of choosing child c given that a parse has reached s . Thus

$$\Pr(Y_s = c \mid e) = \Pr(\text{parse visits } s \mid e) \Pr(Y_s = c \mid e, \text{visit } s),$$

so $\pi(s) := \Pr(\text{visit } s \mid e)$ satisfies $p_s^{\text{glob}}(c) = \pi(s) b_s(c)$. By definition,

$$\pi(s) = \sum_c \Pr(Y_s = c \mid e) = \sum_c \frac{D(s) w_{sc} S(c)}{S(e)} = \frac{D(s) S(s)}{S(e)}.$$

The remaining statements follow immediately. ■

Corollary 4.9 (Tree case: equality of local and global gates). Suppose the SPN is a tree (no DAG sharing) and s lies on every root-to-leaf path. Then $\pi(s) = 1$ and hence

$$p_s^{\text{glob}}(c) = b_s(c) \quad \text{for all } c \in \text{ch}(s).$$

Proof. In a tree SPN, each parse corresponds to a single root-to-leaf path (with one choice at each encountered sum). If s lies on every root-to-leaf path, then every parse visits s , hence $\Pr(\text{visit } s \mid e) = 1$ and therefore $\pi(s) = 1$. The claim follows from [Theorem 4.8](#). ■

Proposition 4.10 (Reduction to tree BP and Walsh–Regalia two-step). If the SPN is a tree (no sharing), the operator \mathcal{T}_{SPN} in (7) coincides with the Walsh–Regalia two-step map $\vec{\pi}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}^f \circ \overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}}^f$ on the associated factor graph, and the upward–downward computation equals standard tree BP. Moreover, for each sum node s the local gate distribution b_s is the conditional distribution of the gate given that the parse visits s , and the corresponding global gate marginals satisfy $p_s^{\text{glob}}(c) = \pi(s) b_s(c)$ with $\pi(s) = D(s) S(s) / S(e)$. In particular, at the root sum node one has $\pi(r) = 1$ and hence $p_r^{\text{glob}} = b_r$.

Proof. As noted in the proof of [Theorem 4.4](#), when the SPN is a tree the induced factor graph on region variables is a tree whose consensus/product sets are exactly \mathcal{Q} and \mathcal{P} in [\[WR10\]](#). By [Theorem 3.1](#), one BP pass computes the two-step projection $\vec{\pi}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}^f \circ \overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}}^f$ and yields exact marginals. The equality of gate distributions is [Theorem 4.9](#). \blacksquare

Remark 4.11 (Hard evidence). If some indicators are zero (hard evidence), the computation restricts to the induced support. All statements above remain valid after replacing simplices by their relative interiors on that support; strict convexity of KL on each relative interior guarantees uniqueness of the projections in [Theorem 4.7](#).

4.6 New results on backpropagation

We finally record two structural properties of backpropagation on SPNs in the projection language.

Theorem 4.12 (KKT interpretation of SPN backpropagation). Consider the composite projection

$$\vec{\pi}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathcal{R}}}^f \circ \overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}}^f$$

associated with a complete and decomposable SPN with positive weights and evidence. Let $\hat{q} \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{R}}$ denote its unique fixed point. Then there exists a choice of Lagrange multipliers for the consensus and factorization constraints such that, for each sum node s and each product edge (p, c) ,

$$\pi(s) := \frac{D(s) S(s)}{S(e)} \in (0, 1], \quad \mu_{p \rightarrow c} := \frac{1}{S(e)} D_{p \rightarrow c}(c) > 0,$$

where

$$D_{p \rightarrow c}(c) = D(p) \prod_{c' \in \text{ch}(p) \setminus \{c\}} S(c').$$

These dual variables satisfy

$$\frac{D(s)}{S(e)} = \frac{\pi(s)}{S(s)}, \quad \frac{D_{p \rightarrow c}(c)}{S(e)} = \mu_{p \rightarrow c}.$$

Proof. We work on $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{R}}$ with the separable generator $f_{\mathcal{R}}$ and consider the convex optimization problem

$$\min_{q \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{R}}} D_{f_{\mathcal{R}}}(q, z_{-1}) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}, \quad q \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}.$$

By [Theorem 4.7](#), both projections are unique, and hence the optimizer \hat{q} is unique. We write the consensus constraints as linear equalities $Aq = 0$ and the factorization constraints as affine equalities in dual coordinates $B\theta = 0$, where $\theta = \nabla f_{\mathcal{R}}(q)$. Introducing Lagrange multipliers λ and μ , the Lagrangian takes the form

$$\mathcal{L}(q, \lambda, \mu) = D_{f_{\mathcal{R}}}(q, z_{-1}) + \langle \lambda, Aq \rangle + \langle \mu, B\nabla f_{\mathcal{R}}(q) \rangle.$$

Stationarity of \mathcal{L} at \hat{q} yields

$$\nabla f_{\mathcal{R}}(\hat{q}) - \nabla f_{\mathcal{R}}(z_{-1}) + A^\top \lambda + J(\nabla f_{\mathcal{R}})(\hat{q})^\top B^\top \mu = 0.$$

The multipliers associated with $Aq = 0$ enforce consensus of replicated region tables, while those associated with $B\nabla f_{\mathcal{R}}(q) = 0$ enforce factorization in dual coordinates. The upward–downward quantities of the SPN provide an explicit parametrization of these dual variables. For each sum node s we define

$$\pi(s) := \frac{D(s) S(s)}{S(e)},$$

and for each product node p and child $c \in \text{ch}(p)$ we define the edge-level quantity

$$\mu_{p \rightarrow c} := \frac{1}{S(e)} D_{p \rightarrow c}(c), \quad D_{p \rightarrow c}(c) = D(p) \prod_{c' \in \text{ch}(p) \setminus \{c\}} S(c').$$

A direct substitution using [Theorem 4.1](#) shows that these quantities satisfy the stationarity condition and therefore constitute valid KKT multipliers. \blacksquare

Proposition 4.13 (Local Lipschitz continuity of SPN adjoints). Consider a complete and decomposable SPN with positive weights and evidence. Let Λ be a compact set of log-evidence vectors $\log \lambda = (\log \lambda_{i,t})_{i,t}$ such that all $\lambda_{i,t}$ are bounded away from 0 and ∞ . Then the map

$$\log \lambda \longmapsto \left(\frac{\partial \log S(e)}{\partial \log \lambda_{i,t}} \right)_{i,t}$$

is Lipschitz on Λ .

Proof. Write $u_{i,t} := \log \lambda_{i,t}$. By [Theorem 4.2\(a\)](#),

$$\frac{\partial \log S(e)}{\partial u_{i,t}} = \Pr(X_i = t \mid e).$$

Define $p(u) := (\Pr(X_i = t \mid e))_{i,t}$. For a complete and decomposable SPN with positive weights and indicators, the map $u \mapsto p(u)$ is C^1 on the open set $\{\lambda_{i,t} > 0\}$. Since

Λ is compact and bounded away from the boundary $\{\lambda_{i,t} = 0\}$, the Jacobian $Jp(u)$ is uniformly bounded on Λ . Thus

$$L := \sup_{u \in \Lambda} \|Jp(u)\|_{\text{op}} < \infty.$$

By the mean value theorem, for all $u, u' \in \Lambda$, $\|p(u) - p(u')\|_2 \leq L \|u - u'\|_2$, which proves the claim. \blacksquare

5 Examples

5.1 Example A: two operations under a delta-lift

Example 5.1 (Logistic unit with exponential output; explicit messages and derivatives). This example instantiates the projection operator

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{Proj}} = \overrightarrow{\pi}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}^f \circ \overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}}^f$$

on a minimal delta-lifted computation graph.

Variables and domains. Let $x, w \in \mathbb{R}$ (input and parameter), $u \in \mathbb{R}$, and $z \in (0, 1)$ with

$$u = w x, \quad z = \sigma(u) := \frac{1}{1 + e^{-u}},$$

and let the output factor be $\varphi(z) = e^{\alpha z}$ with $\alpha > 0$ (hence $\varphi \in C^1((0, 1); \mathbb{R}_{>0})$).

Delta-lift factorization. Introduce deterministic factors

$$g_1(u, w, x) = \delta(u - wx), \quad g_2(z, u) = \delta(z - \sigma(u)).$$

Assume x is clamped at a given forward value $x^* \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $w^* \in \mathbb{R}$ be the evaluation point and set $u^* = w^* x^*$ and $z^* = \sigma(u^*)$.

Upward pass. Because g_1 and g_2 are Dirac constraints, upward messages into u and z collapse to point masses at u^* and z^* , respectively.

Downward seeding at the output. Seed the downward pass with

$$m_{\varphi \rightarrow z}(z) = \varphi(z) = e^{\alpha z}, \quad s(z) := \partial_z \log m_{\varphi \rightarrow z}(z) \big|_{z^*} = \alpha.$$

Message through g_2 (from z to u).

$$m_{g_2 \rightarrow u}(u) \propto \int \delta(z - \sigma(u)) m_{\varphi \rightarrow z}(z) dz = e^{\alpha \sigma(u)},$$

hence

$$\partial_u \log m_{g_2 \rightarrow u}(u) \Big|_{u^*} = \alpha \sigma'(u^*) = \alpha \sigma(u^*)(1 - \sigma(u^*)).$$

Message through g_1 (from u to w and x). With x clamped at x^* ,

$$m_{g_1 \rightarrow w}(w) \propto m_{g_2 \rightarrow u}(wx^*) = e^{\alpha \sigma(wx^*)},$$

so

$$\partial_w \log m_{g_1 \rightarrow w}(w) \Big|_{w^*} = \alpha \sigma'(u^*) x^*.$$

Similarly,

$$\partial_x \log m_{g_1 \rightarrow x}(x) \Big|_{x^*} = \alpha \sigma'(u^*) w^*.$$

Action of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Proj}}$. Since g_1 is the only downstream factor, $b_{\downarrow}(w) = m_{g_1 \rightarrow w}$ and $b_{\downarrow}(x) = m_{g_1 \rightarrow x}$. Evaluating the downward log-beliefs yields

$$\nabla_w \log b_{\downarrow}(w) \Big|_{w^*} = \alpha \sigma'(u^*) x^*, \quad \nabla_x \log b_{\downarrow}(x) \Big|_{x^*} = \alpha \sigma'(u^*) w^*.$$

Because $\nabla_w z = \sigma'(u^*) x^*$ and $\nabla_x z = \sigma'(u^*) w^*$, these quantities coincide with the differential of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Proj}}$ at the forward configuration, recovering backpropagation as stated in [Theorem 3.3](#) with $\varphi'(z^*)/\varphi(z^*) = \alpha$.

Variant with proper likelihood. If $\varphi(z) = e^{-L(z)/T}$ with $L \in C^1$ and $T > 0$, then $s(z) = -L'(z^*)/T$ and the same calculation yields the standard backpropagation gradient scaled by $1/T$.

5.2 Example B: a tiny SPN

Example 5.2 (Two-variable SPN with one root sum and two product children). *Variables and evidence.* Let X, Y be binary with alphabets $\{0, 1\}$. Soft evidence is encoded by indicator leaves $\lambda_{X,0}, \lambda_{X,1}, \lambda_{Y,0}, \lambda_{Y,1} \in (0, 1]$.

Circuit (complete & decomposable). Define two product nodes

$$P_1 = \mathbf{1}[X = 0]\mathbf{1}[Y = 0], \quad P_2 = \mathbf{1}[X = 1]\mathbf{1}[Y = 1],$$

and the root sum $r = w_1 P_1 + w_2 P_2$, $w_1, w_2 > 0$. The circuit is complete, decomposable, and a tree.

Upward values.

$$S(P_1) = \lambda_{X,0}\lambda_{Y,0}, \quad S(P_2) = \lambda_{X,1}\lambda_{Y,1},$$

$$S(e) = S(r) = w_1\lambda_{X,0}\lambda_{Y,0} + w_2\lambda_{X,1}\lambda_{Y,1}.$$

Downward values. Initialize $D(r) = 1$. Then

$$D(P_1) = w_1, \quad D(P_2) = w_2,$$

and

$$D(\mathbf{1}[X = 0]) = w_1\lambda_{Y,0}, \quad D(\mathbf{1}[X = 1]) = w_2\lambda_{Y,1},$$

$$D(\mathbf{1}[Y = 0]) = w_1\lambda_{X,0}, \quad D(\mathbf{1}[Y = 1]) = w_2\lambda_{X,1}.$$

Exact marginals. By [Theorem 4.2](#),

$$\Pr(X = 0 \mid e) = \frac{\lambda_{X,0}}{S(e)} \frac{\partial S(e)}{\partial \lambda_{X,0}} = \frac{w_1\lambda_{X,0}\lambda_{Y,0}}{S(e)}, \quad \Pr(X = 1 \mid e) = \frac{w_2\lambda_{X,1}\lambda_{Y,1}}{S(e)},$$

$$\Pr(Y = 0 \mid e) = \frac{w_1\lambda_{X,0}\lambda_{Y,0}}{S(e)}, \quad \Pr(Y = 1 \mid e) = \frac{w_2\lambda_{X,1}\lambda_{Y,1}}{S(e)}.$$

Gate beliefs. At the root,

$$b_r(P_1) = \frac{w_1 S(P_1)}{S(e)}, \quad b_r(P_2) = \frac{w_2 S(P_2)}{S(e)}.$$

Since the circuit is a tree, these coincide with the global gate marginals.

Projection viewpoint. This SPN realizes, in one upward-downward pass, the two-step KL operator

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{SPN}} = \overrightarrow{\pi}_{\widehat{\text{Prod}}_{\mathcal{R}}}^{f_{\mathcal{R}}} \circ \overleftarrow{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}}^{f_{\mathcal{R}}}$$

from [Theorem 4.4](#), acting on the product space of region tables $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{R}}$ with the separable negative-entropy generator $f_{\mathcal{R}} = \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} f(\cdot)$. Here the I-projection enforces consensus of equal-scope regions (the two product children of r), and the reverse-KL projection enforces factorization across decomposed scopes, as witnessed by $S(P_k) = \lambda_{X,k}\lambda_{Y,k}$ and the exact marginal identities above.

6 Conclusion

This note examined backpropagation through the lens of KL projection geometry, with the goal of making explicit the operator-theoretic structure underlying message passing and reverse-mode differentiation.

Scope and limitations. Regime (A) is algebraic: the delta-lift includes Dirac constraints and typically an improper output factor, so the correspondence concerns the local structure of messages and their differentials rather than normalized marginals. Regime (B) is probabilistic: completeness, decomposability, and strict positivity ensure interior beliefs and uniqueness of the KL projections. In both regimes, our analysis concerns a single evaluation of the relevant projection operators; the dynamics induced by parameter updates depend on the chosen optimization scheme and are not addressed here.

When BP truly generalizes backpropagation. [Theorem 3.9](#) isolates the regime in which sum-product strictly generalizes backpropagation. With proper priors, a proper likelihood, and a tree-structured graph, belief propagation computes posterior-expected sensitivities exactly. In the Dirac-prior limit, this reduces to the algebraic delta-lift identity of Regime (A); on loopy graphs, the same expression is evaluated in the usual Bethe/EP approximation regime.

Outlook. Three directions appear particularly natural.

- *Training dynamics from projection-derived gradients.* Since each backprop evaluation arises from a KL projection operator or its differential, tools from Bregman geometry and operator splitting may be used to study stability, implicit regularization, and alternative update schemes.
- *Projection-modified message passing and architectures.* The projection viewpoint suggests modifying BP schemes (e.g., via symmetric generators, damping, or explicit consensus enforcement) and designing architectures that encode consensus and factorization constraints directly.
- *Sampling and KL gradient flows.* Sampling methods can be viewed as dynamical processes whose stationary distributions solve related KL variational problems, often expressible as gradient flows in KL geometry. Understanding how projection operators and their differentials interact with such flows, and how they relate to the projection structures identified here, is a natural direction for future work.

Perspective. More broadly, Bregman projections provide a unifying geometric language for learning, inference, and sampling. Our results place standard backpropagation and SPN message passing within this projection calculus by identifying specific projection operators whose differentials or KKT multipliers coincide with the adjoints used in practice. Exploiting this shared geometric interface remains an open and promising direction.

Acknowledgments. Parts of this work were presented in an invited talk at the Banff workshop Strategies for Handling Applications with Nonconvexity (SHAWN), May 2025. MKL acknowledges partial travel support from the PIMS–BIRS–Simons Travel Award.

References

- [BB94] Heinz H. Bauschke and Jonathan M. Borwein. Dykstra’s alternating projection algorithm for two sets. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 79(3):418–443, 1994.
- [BN02] Heinz H. Bauschke and Dominikus Noll. The method of forward projections. *Journal of Nonlinear and Convex Analysis*, 3(2):191–205, 2002.
- [Csi75] Imre Csiszár. I-divergence geometry of probability distributions and minimization problems. *Annals of Probability*, 3(1):146–158, 1975.
- [Dar03] Adnan Darwiche. A differential approach to inference in Bayesian networks. *Journal of the ACM*, 50(3):280–305, 2003.
- [Eat22] Frederik Eaton. Belief propagation generalizes backpropagation. arXiv:2210.00610, 2022.
- [PD11] Hoifung Poon and Pedro Domingos. Sum-product networks: A new deep architecture. In *Proceedings of the 27th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI)*, pages 337–346, 2011.
- [WJ08] Martin J. Wainwright and Michael I. Jordan. *Graphical Models, Exponential Families, and Variational Inference*, volume 1 of *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*. Now Publishers, 2008.
- [WR10] John MacLaren Walsh and Phillip A. Regalia. Belief propagation, dykstra’s algorithm, and iterated information projections. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(8):4114–4128, 2010.
- [YFW05] Jonathan S. Yedidia, William T. Freeman, and Yair Weiss. Constructing free-energy approximations and generalized belief propagation algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 51(7):2282–2312, 2005.