

Distributional Shrinkage

generative models, empirical Bayes, and deconvolution

Tengyuan Liang

University of Chicago

Main takeaway

Denoising methodology

practical algorithm for denoising diffusion-based generative models with improved accuracy

Structural understanding

complete hierarchy revealing how higher-order score functions encode the optimal transport map for signal denoising

Main takeaway

Denoising methodology

practical algorithm for denoising diffusion-based generative models with improved accuracy

L. (2025a). Distributional Shrinkage I: Universal Denoiser Beyond Tweedie's Formula.

Structural understanding

complete hierarchy revealing how higher-order score functions encode the optimal transport map for signal denoising

L. (2025b). Distributional Shrinkage II: Higher-Order Scores Encode Brenier Map.

Motivation: Distributional Shrinkage

Methodological: Universal Denoiser

- generative modeling

- Monge-Ampère equation

- moment matching

Structural: Score Hierarchy and Optimal Transport

- score hierarchy and combinatorics

- optimal transport denoiser

- higher-order score matching

Conclusion

Motivation: Distributional Shrinkage

Denoiser and over-shrinkage

Toy example:


$$Y = X + \sigma Z, \quad Z \sim N(0, I_d)$$

- $X \sim P$ unknown signal, $Y \sim Q$ noisy observation, σ noise level
- Bayes-optimal denoiser ([Eddington-Robbins-Tweedie's formula](#)):
 q density of Q

$$\mathbf{T}^*(y) := \mathbb{E}[X|Y = y] = y + \sigma^2 \nabla \log q(y)$$

- Optimal in mean-squared error, BUT ... perhaps "too-aggressive" shrinkage

Over-shrinkage phenomenon




Observations

Bayes-optimal (and empirical-Bayes) denoiser: **overly aggressive shrinkage** on **data clouds**!

Loss of **distributional structure** in the denoised samples! (too much shrinkage towards the mean)

Over-shrinkage phenomenon



Observations

Loss of **distributional structure** in the denoised samples! (too much shrinkage towards the mean)

Question

What's the correct **distributional shrinkage**?


Over-shrinkage : $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{T}^*(Y) \otimes \mathbf{T}^*(Y)] - \mathbb{E}[X \otimes X] \preceq 0$

No-shrinkage : $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{T}^{\text{id}}(Y) \otimes \mathbf{T}^{\text{id}}(Y)] - \mathbb{E}[X \otimes X] \succeq 0$

Question

What's the correct **distributional shrinkage**?

A fix: take the **midpoint** between the noisy observation (no-shrinkage) and the Bayes-optimal denoiser, $\mathbf{T}_1 = (\mathbf{T}^{\text{id}} + \mathbf{T}^*)/2$



Shrinkage: from data level to distributional level

- Generative models: we care about the **distributional structure** of denoised samples, not just on average
e.g., denoising images, often we care about the quality of the distribution of the denoised images, not just the pixel-wise mean-squared error
- History:
 - 1950s **data-level shrinkage**: James-Stein shrinkage → empirical Bayes Stein, Efron, Morris, Brown, ...
 - 1990s **function-level shrinkage**: wavelet shrinkage → function estimation Donoho, Johnstone, ...
 - 2020s (?): **distributional shrinkage** → generative models
- Sampling: denoisers that can perform accurate and proper sampling!

Distributional shrinkage

A new shrinkage paradigm that connects generative models, empirical Bayes, deconvolution, and optimal transport.

Methodological: Universal Denoiser

Distributional shrinkage: denoisers

For [distributional denoising](#), we propose replacing the Bayes-optimal denoiser,

$$\mathbf{T}^*(y) = y + \boxed{\sigma^2 \nabla \log q(y)}$$


with denoisers exhibiting less-aggressive distributional shrinkage,

$$\mathbf{T}_1(y) = y + \boxed{\frac{\sigma^2}{2} \nabla \log q(y)}$$

$$\mathbf{T}_2(y) = y + \boxed{\frac{\sigma^2}{2} \nabla \log q(y)} - \boxed{\frac{\sigma^4}{8} \nabla \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \log q(y)\|^2 + \nabla \cdot \nabla \log q(y) \right)}$$

Unlike the Bayes-optimal denoiser, distributional shrinkage denoisers work beyond Gaussian Z !

Distributional shrinkage



Generative modeling

So, how is this important to generative modeling, i.e., denoising diffusions?

With $\eta = \sigma^2/2$ small, the forward diffusion step is

$$X_{t+\eta} = (1 - \eta)X_t + \sqrt{2\eta}Z_t, \quad Z_t \sim N(0, I_d)$$

The backward denoising diffusion is

$$(1 - \eta)X_t = \underbrace{\mathbf{T}^*(X_{t+\eta})}_{\text{Bayes-optimal denoiser}} + \underbrace{\sqrt{2\eta}W_t}_{\text{compensate for over-shrinkage}}, \quad W_t \sim N(0, I_d)$$

Generative modeling: $T \# Q \approx P$?

Rather than T^* , which **over-shrinks then compensates with injected noise**, we use the distributional shrinkage denoiser T_1 or T_2 with **increased accuracy**

Denote the estimated score $S_t := \widehat{\nabla \log q_t}$. Replace the denoising equation

T^* : Tweedie's formula

$$X_t + 2\eta S_t(X_t) + \sqrt{2\eta} W_t$$


by

T_1 and T_2 : Distributional shrinkage

$$X_t + \eta S_t(X_t) \quad \text{or} \\ X_t + \eta S_t(X_t) - \frac{\eta^2}{2} \nabla \left(\frac{1}{2} \|S_t(X_t)\|^2 + \nabla \cdot S_t(X_t) \right)$$

Generative modeling

$$\mathbb{T}_{\#} P_Y \approx P_X?$$



Why not other approaches

- Bayesian sampling: generate $P_{X|Y=y}$ for each $y \sim P_Y$.
needs $P_{X|Y}$ explicitly; requires a bespoke sampler
- Deconvolution: recover P_X by dividing Fourier transforms of P_Y by that of P_Z .
needs noise distribution explicitly; numerically unstable; no clear path to sampling X

Why not other approaches

- Bayesian sampling: generate $P_{X|Y=y}$ for each $y \sim P_Y$.
needs $P_{X|Y}$ explicitly; requires a bespoke sampler
- Deconvolution: recover P_X by dividing Fourier transforms of P_Y by that of P_Z .
needs noise distribution explicitly; numerically unstable; no clear path to sampling X

Distributional shrinkage

We design **simple, universal** maps $\mathbf{T}$ pushing P_Y toward P_X .

The **same** map works across a wide range of P_X and P_Z , using only the (score functions of) observed P_Y .

$$\mathbf{T}\#P_Y \approx P_X$$

Monge-Ampère equation

Monge-Ampère equation:

$$\mathbf{T}\#P_Y = P_X \iff \boxed{p_Y(y) = p_X(\mathbf{T}(y)) \det(\nabla \mathbf{T}(y))}, \forall y \in \Omega$$

A measure of distributional discrepancy:

$$d_{\text{MA}}(\mathbf{T}\#P_Y, P_X) := \sup_{y \in \Omega} |p_Y(y) - p_X(\mathbf{T}(y)) \det(\nabla \mathbf{T}(y))|.$$

$$d_{\text{MA}}(\mathbf{T}\#P_Y, P_X) = 0 \iff d_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{T}\#P_Y, P_X) = 0 \text{ under regularity conditions}$$

Differential equations for optimal denoisers

Let $\eta = \sigma^2/2$. The first- and second-order shrinkage denoisers are local-to-identity maps (induced by f, g)

$$\mathbf{T}_1^f(y) := y + \eta \nabla f(y) ,$$

$$\mathbf{T}_2^{f,g}(y) := y + \eta \nabla f(y) + \frac{\eta^2}{2} \nabla g(y) ,$$

where $f, g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are smooth functions whose gradients induce the shrinkage directions.

Differential equations for optimal denoisers

Let $\eta = \sigma^2/2$. The first- and second-order shrinkage denoisers are local-to-identity maps (induced by f, g)

$$\mathbf{T}_1^f(y) := y + \eta \nabla f(y) ,$$

$$\mathbf{T}_2^{f,g}(y) := y + \eta \nabla f(y) + \frac{\eta^2}{2} \nabla g(y) ,$$

where $f, g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are smooth functions whose gradients induce the shrinkage directions.

Optimal differential equations for f, g

$$\begin{aligned} q \nabla f &= \nabla q , \\ q \nabla g - \nabla^2 f \nabla q - \nabla f \Delta q &= -\nabla \Delta q . \end{aligned}$$

Solutions?

Connection to score matching

Optimal solution f_*, g_* for distributional shrinkage

$$f_* = \log q ,$$
$$g_* = - \left[\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f_*\|^2 + \nabla \cdot \nabla f_* \right]$$

variational interpretation of distributional denoisers

- first-order denoiser: score function $\nabla \log q$
- second-order denoiser: gradient of the score matching objective

$$\nabla f_* = \nabla \log q = \arg \min_S \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim q} \left[\frac{1}{2} \|S(Y)\|^2 + \nabla \cdot S(Y) \right]$$

$$\nabla g_* = - \nabla \left[\frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f_*\|^2 + \nabla \cdot \nabla f_* \right]$$

these denoisers are universal, and work beyond Gaussian noise

Thm. [L. (2025a), optimal first-order denoiser]

For σ small, p_X smooth, and the noise Z with bounded 4-th moments. Then with some universal constant $C_\Omega > 0$,

$$d_{\text{MA}}(\mathbf{T}_1^{f\sharp} P_Y, P_X) \leq C_\Omega \cdot \sigma^4,$$

if f satisfies the differential equation

$$q \nabla f = \nabla q.$$

Thm. [L. (2025a), optimal first-order denoiser]

For σ small, p_X smooth, and the noise Z with bounded 4-th moments. Then with some universal constant $C_\Omega > 0$,

$$d_{\text{MA}}(\mathbf{T}_1^f \# P_Y, P_X) \leq C_\Omega \cdot \sigma^4 ,$$

if f satisfies the differential equation

$$q \nabla f = \nabla q .$$

Cor. [L. (2025a), sub-optimality of Bayes denoiser]

The Bayes-optimal denoiser $\mathbf{T}^*(y) = y + \sigma^2 \nabla \log q(y)$, satisfies

$$d_{\text{MA}}(\mathbf{T}^* \# P_Y, P_X) \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \sup_{y \in \Omega} \Delta q(y) - C_\Omega \cdot \sigma^4 .$$

Bayes denoiser only works for Gaussian Z , yet the optimal first-order denoisers are **universal** that extend far beyond Gaussian Z .

Thm. [L. (2025a), optimal second-order denoiser]

Under slightly stronger regularity conditions on p_X and p_Z

$$d_{\text{MA}}(\mathbf{T}_2^{f,g} \# P_Y, P_X) \leq C_\Omega \cdot \sigma^6 ,$$

if f, g satisfy the differential equations

$$q \nabla f = \nabla q ,$$

$$q \nabla g = \nabla^2 f \nabla q + \Delta q \nabla f - \nabla \Delta q .$$

Distributional shrinkage denoisers:

- universal: same shrinkage maps work for a range of signal distributions P_X and noise distributions P_Z
- identifiable: only depends on the score functions (and its derivatives) of the observed distribution P_Y

Sandwich property: (over-shrinkage) Bayes-optimal denoiser and (no-shrinkage) identity denoiser

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{T}^*(Y) \otimes \mathbf{T}^*(Y)] - \Theta(\sigma^2) = \mathbb{E}[X \otimes X] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{T}^{\text{id}}(Y) \otimes \mathbf{T}^{\text{id}}(Y)] - \Theta(\sigma^2)$$

Questions

Do denoisers $\mathbf{T}_1$ and $\mathbf{T}_2$ match the second moments of X ? How about the [generalized moments](#)?

Thm. [L. (2025a), moment matching for first-order denoiser]

$\forall m \in \mathcal{M}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the 2-smooth moment functions




$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_Y} [m(\mathbf{T}_1^{f_*}(Y))] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X} [m(X)] \right| \leq C_m \cdot \boxed{\sigma^4}.$$

Thm. [L. (2025a), moment matching for second-order denoiser]

$\forall m \in \mathcal{M}^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the 3-smooth test moment functions

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_Y} [m(\mathbf{T}_2^{f_*, g_*}(Y))] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X} [m(X)] \right| \leq C_m \cdot \boxed{\sigma^6}.$$

Empirics: order-of-magnitude improvement



Structural: Score Hierarchy and Optimal Transport

Consider the denoiser $Y + h(Y)$, where $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a denoising function.

Stein's unbiased risk estimate (SURE):

$$\begin{aligned}\text{MSE}(h) &:= \mathbb{E}[\|Y + h(Y) - X\|^2] \\&= \sigma^2 + \mathbb{E}[h^2(Y)] + 2\sigma^2 \mathbb{E}[h'(X + \sigma Z)] \\&\quad \left(\int z e^{-z^2/2} h(x + \sigma z) dz = \sigma \int h'(x + \sigma z) e^{-z^2/2} dz \right) \\&= \sigma^2 + \int q(y) \left(h^2(y) - 2\sigma^2 \frac{q'(y)}{q(y)} h(y) \right) dy \\&\quad (\text{integration by parts: } \int h'(y) q(y) dy = - \int h(y) q'(y) dy) \\&= \sigma^2 - \sigma^4 \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{q'(Y)}{q(Y)} \right)^2 < \sigma^2, \quad \text{when } h(y) = \sigma^2 \frac{q'(y)}{q(y)}.\end{aligned}$$

Tweedie and James-Stein

Consider the denoiser $Y + h(Y)$, where $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a denoising function.

James-Stein shrinkage: $h_{\mathbf{Y}_{-j}}(Y_j) := -\sigma^2 \frac{(d-2)Y_j}{\|\mathbf{Y}\|^2}$, $j = 1, \dots, d$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSE}(h) &:= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}} \left[|Y_j + h_{\mathbf{Y}_{-j}}(Y_j) - X_j|^2 \right] \\ &= \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}} \left[h_{\mathbf{Y}_{-j}}^2(Y_j) + 2\sigma^2 \partial_{Y_j} h_{\mathbf{Y}_{-j}}(Y_j) \right] \\ &= \sigma^2 + \sigma^4 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}} \left[\frac{(d-2)^2}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{Y_j^2}{\|\mathbf{Y}\|^4} - \frac{2(d-2)}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{Y}\|^2} - \frac{2Y_j^2}{\|\mathbf{Y}\|^4} \right) \right] \\ &= \sigma^2 - \sigma^4 \frac{(d-2)^2}{d} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Z}} \left[\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{Y}\|^2} \right] < \sigma^2, \quad \text{when } d \geq 3. \end{aligned}$$

Tweedie, James-Stein, and distributional shrinkage

Why the Wasserstein metric?

Consider $X \sim \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \delta_{X_j}$, a discrete distribution,

$$\begin{aligned} W_2^2(\mathcal{L}(Y + h(Y)), \mathcal{L}(X)) &= \min_{\varsigma \in S_d} \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[|Y_j + h(Y_j) - X_{\varsigma(j)}|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E} \left[|Y_j + h(Y_j) - X_j|^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

where $\varsigma \in S_d$ is a permutation.

More generally, for any random variables X and Y ,

$$W_2^2(\mathcal{L}(Y + h(Y)), \mathcal{L}(X)) \leq \mathbb{E} |Y + h(Y) - X|^2$$

allowing permutation/coupling offers leeway for higher denoising accuracy

$$T_{\infty}(y) = y + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\eta^k}{k!} h_k(y) .$$

The functions $h_k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, k \geq 1$ are higher-order denoising functions that refine the map progressively at noise resolution σ^{2k} .

We define the [hierarchy of denoisers](#) $T_K, K = 1, 2, \dots$ by truncating this infinite expansion.

Combinatorics: Bell polynomials

Let $G(y) := \Pr(Y \leq y)$ be the CDF of Y , and $G^{(k)}$ be the k -th derivative of G

$$h_1 = \frac{G^{(2)}}{G^{(1)}}$$

$$h_2 = -\frac{G^{(4)}}{G^{(1)}} + 2\frac{G^{(3)}}{G^{(1)}}h_1 - \frac{G^{(2)}}{G^{(1)}}h_1^2$$

$$h_3 = \frac{G^{(6)}}{G^{(1)}} - 3\frac{G^{(5)}}{G^{(1)}}h_1 + 3\frac{G^{(4)}}{G^{(1)}}h_1^2 + 3\frac{G^{(3)}}{G^{(1)}}h_2 - \frac{G^{(3)}}{G^{(1)}}h_1^3 - 3\frac{G^{(2)}}{G^{(1)}}h_1h_2$$

$$h_4 = -\frac{G^{(8)}}{G^{(1)}} + 4\frac{G^{(7)}}{G^{(1)}}h_1 - 6\frac{G^{(6)}}{G^{(1)}}h_1^2 - 6\frac{G^{(5)}}{G^{(1)}}h_2 + 4\frac{G^{(5)}}{G^{(1)}}h_1^3 + 12\frac{G^{(4)}}{G^{(1)}}h_1h_2 + 4\frac{G^{(3)}}{G^{(1)}}h_3 \\ - \frac{G^{(4)}}{G^{(1)}}h_1^4 - 6\frac{G^{(3)}}{G^{(1)}}h_1^2h_2 - \frac{G^{(2)}}{G^{(1)}}(4h_1h_3 + 3h_2^2) .$$

Combinatorics: Bell polynomials

The structure of these formulas is governed by a **combinatorial recursion** involving **Bell polynomials**

$$h_k = -(-1)^k \frac{G^{(2k)}}{G^{(1)}} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (-1)^{k-i} \binom{k}{i} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{G^{(2k-i-j)}}{G^{(1)}} B_{i,i-j}(h_1, \dots, h_{j+1}) \\ - \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \frac{G^{(k-j)}}{G^{(1)}} B_{k,k-j}(h_1, \dots, h_{j+1}) .$$

Here $B_{n,k}$'s are the **partial Bell polynomials**. The above recursions can be solved sequentially to obtain h_k .

Thm. [L. (2025b), optimal K -order denoiser]

Recall $\eta = \sigma^2/2$. Define the K -th order denoiser as

$$T_K(y) := y + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\eta^k}{k!} h_k(y) .$$

Assume that F, G are $(2K + 2)$ -Hölder smooth. Then, for any y ,

$$|F \circ T_K(y) - G(y)| \leq C \cdot \eta^{K+1} .$$

LHS is an integrated form of Monge-Ampère equation. Similar results can be derived for Wasserstein metric $W_p(T_K \# P_Y, P_X), p \geq 1$.

Thm. [L. (2025b), score hierarchy encodes the Brenier map]

Recall $T_\infty(y) := y + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\eta^k}{k!} h_k(y)$. Then

$$T_\infty(y) = \underbrace{\arg \min_{T: T_\# P_Y = P_X} \mathbb{E}[|T(Y) - Y|^2]}_{\text{Brenier map}}$$

LHS: combinatorial recursion of the higher-order score functions, [polynomials of information geometric quantities](#).

RHS: the [optimal transport map](#) that pushes forward P_Y to P_X .

Thm. [L. (2025b), score hierarchy encodes the Brenier map]

Recall $T_\infty(y) := y + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\eta^k}{k!} h_k(y)$. Then

$$T_\infty(y) = \underbrace{\arg \min_{T: T_\# P_Y = P_X} \mathbb{E}[|T(Y) - Y|^2]}_{\text{Brenier map}}$$

A theorem that connects three classical objects:

- higher-order score functions (information geometry)
- Brenier map (optimal transport)
- integer partitions (combinatorics)

Higher-order score matching

How to estimate the higher-order score functions $q^{(m)}/q$, where $m \geq 1$ is any integer?

Higher-order score matching

How to estimate the higher-order score functions $q^{(m)}/q$, where $m \geq 1$ is any integer?

Empirical risk minimization for unsupervised learning

The generalized score matching estimator for the m -th order score function is defined as

$$\hat{f}_m \in \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \hat{\mathbb{E}}_n \left[\frac{1}{2} f(Y)^2 + (-1)^{m+1} f^{(m)}(Y) \right],$$

where $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_n$ is the empirical expectation over the i.i.d. samples $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ drawn from Q .

Thm. [L. (2025b), rates for higher-order score matching]


Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the class of α -Hölder smooth functions with $\alpha > m$. Assume that the m -th order score function $\frac{q^{(m)}}{q} \in \mathcal{F}$ and that q has vanishing boundaries.

Let $\hat{f}_m$ be the m -th order score matching estimator, then

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \hat{f}_m - \frac{q^{(m)}}{q} \right\|_{L_2(Q)}^2 \asymp \begin{cases} n^{-(\alpha-m)}, & \alpha < m + \frac{1}{2} \\ n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log n, & \alpha = m + \frac{1}{2} \\ n^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & \alpha > m + \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}.$$

Conclusion

Conclusion



Success of denoising diffusion models (deconvolution): empirical Bayes (score function estimation) + **distributional shrinkage** (optimal transport denoisers)

Success of denoising diffusion models (deconvolution): empirical Bayes (score function estimation) + **distributional shrinkage** (optimal transport denoisers)

A new shrinkage paradigm that connects generative models, empirical Bayes, deconvolution, and optimal transport.

- higher-order score functions (**information geometry**)
- Brenier map (**optimal transport**)
- integer partitions (**combinatorics**)

Thank you. Questions?

Methodological

L. (2025a). Distributional Shrinkage I: Universal Denoiser Beyond Tweedie's Formula. arXiv:2511.09500.

Structural

L. (2025b). Distributional Shrinkage II: Higher-Order Scores Encode Brenier Map. arXiv:2512.09295.