

T.61.5140 Machine Learning: Advanced Probabilistic Methods

Hollmén, Raiko (Spring 2008)

Problem session, 25th of April, 2008

<http://www.cis.hut.fi/Opinnot/T-61.5140/>

1. Show that the EM algorithm is a special case of the VB-EM algorithm where the family of approximate distributions $q(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for the parameters is restricted to delta distributions (distributions where the whole probability mass is concentrated on a single point). Some assumptions have to be made: The family of approximate distributions $q(\mathbf{Z})$ for latent variables \mathbf{Z} should include the true posterior $p(\mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$. KL-divergence will go to infinity, so the minimization has to be considered as a limiting process (in practice by ignoring the term $q \ln q$ that can be considered constant). Also, VB-EM usually has a prior for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, while EM does not. Let us consider the version of EM with a prior for the parameters.

EM algorithm with a prior for parameters:

$$q(\mathbf{Z}) \leftarrow p(\mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad (1)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} \leftarrow \underset{\boldsymbol{\theta}}{\operatorname{argmax}} E_{q(\mathbf{Z})} \{ \ln p(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \} \quad (2)$$

VB-EM algorithm:

$$q(\mathbf{Z}) \leftarrow \underset{q(\mathbf{Z})}{\operatorname{argmin}} E_{q(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \{ \operatorname{KL}(q(\mathbf{Z}) \| p(\mathbf{Z} | \mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})) \} \quad (3)$$

$$q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leftarrow \underset{q(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\operatorname{argmin}} E_{q(\mathbf{Z})} \{ \operatorname{KL}(q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \| p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z})) \} \quad (4)$$

Kullback-Leibler divergence:

$$\operatorname{KL}(q(x) \| p(x)) = E_{q(x)} \left\{ \ln \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} \right\} \quad (5)$$

$$(6)$$

2. Consider two extensions of probabilistic principal component analysis (PPCA) with mixture models. The model equation $\mathbf{x}_j = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{s}_j + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j$ and the noise model $p(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j) = N(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j | \mathbf{0}, v\mathbf{I})$. The parameters are fixed to $\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $v = 0.01$, and mixture coefficients $\pi = 0.5$ in all cases. The sources \mathbf{s}_j are distributed according to the mixture of Gaussians. The two cases are: (a) The mixing coefficients π_k are shared among the two sources s_{1j} and s_{2j}

$$p(\mathbf{s}_j) = \sum_{k=1}^2 \pi_k N(\mathbf{s}_j | \mu_k, \Sigma_k), \quad (7)$$

$$\mu_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mu_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

$$\Sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

(b) The mixture is done individually to the two sources s_{1j} and s_{2j} .

$$p(s_{1j}) = \sum_{k=1}^2 \pi_{1k} N(s_{1j} | \mu_{1k}, \sigma_{1k}^2), \quad (10)$$

$$p(s_{2j}) = \sum_{k=1}^2 \pi_{2k} N(s_{2j} | \mu_{2k}, \sigma_{2k}^2), \quad (11)$$

$$\mu_{11} = 0, \quad \mu_{12} = 0, \quad \mu_{21} = 0, \quad \mu_{22} = 0 \quad (12)$$

$$\sigma_{11} = 1, \quad \sigma_{12} = 0.3, \quad \sigma_{21} = 1, \quad \sigma_{22} = 0.3. \quad (13)$$

Sketch $p(\mathbf{x}_j | \mathbf{A}, v)$ in both cases.