

“The mind is a neural computer, fitted by natural selection with combinatorial algorithms for causal and probabilistic reasoning about plants, animals, objects, and people.”

...

“In a universe with any regularities at all, decisions informed about the past are better than decisions made at random. That has always been true, and we would expect organisms, especially informavores such as humans, to have evolved acute intuitions about probability. The founders of probability, like the founders of logic, assumed they were just formalizing common sense.”

Steven Pinker, *How the Mind Works*, 1997, pp. 524, 343.

Learning Objectives

At the end of the class you should be able to:

- justify the use and semantics of probability
- know how to compute marginals and apply Bayes' theorem
- build a belief network for a domain
- predict the inferences for a belief network
- explain the predictions of a causal model

Using Uncertain Knowledge

- Agents don't have complete knowledge about the world.

Using Uncertain Knowledge

- Agents don't have complete knowledge about the world.
- Agents need to make (informed) decisions given their uncertainty.

Using Uncertain Knowledge

- Agents don't have complete knowledge about the world.
- Agents need to make (informed) decisions given their uncertainty.
- It isn't enough to assume what the world is like.
Example: wearing a seat belt.

Using Uncertain Knowledge

- Agents don't have complete knowledge about the world.
- Agents need to make (informed) decisions given their uncertainty.
- It isn't enough to assume what the world is like.
Example: wearing a seat belt.
- An agent needs to reason about its uncertainty.

Using Uncertain Knowledge

- Agents don't have complete knowledge about the world.
- Agents need to make (informed) decisions given their uncertainty.
- It isn't enough to assume what the world is like.
Example: wearing a seat belt.
- An agent needs to reason about its uncertainty.
- When an agent makes an action under uncertainty, it is gambling \implies probability.

Probability

- Probability is an agent's measure of belief in some proposition — **subjective probability**.

Probability

- Probability is an agent's measure of belief in some proposition — **subjective probability**.
- An agent's belief depends on its prior belief and what it observes.
- **Example:** An agent's probability of a particular bird flying
 - ▶ Other agents may have different probabilities
 - ▶ An agent's belief in a bird's flying ability is affected by what the agent knows about that bird.

Random Variables

- A **random variable** starts with upper case.
- The **domain** of a variable X , written $domain(X)$, is the set of values X can take. (Sometimes use “range”, “frame”, “possible values”).

Random Variables

- A **random variable** starts with upper case.
- The **domain** of a variable X , written $domain(X)$, is the set of values X can take. (Sometimes use “range”, “frame”, “possible values”).
- A tuple of random variables $\langle X_1, \dots, X_n \rangle$ is a complex random variable with domain $domain(X_1) \times \dots \times domain(X_n)$.
Often the tuple is written as X_1, \dots, X_n .

Random Variables

- A **random variable** starts with upper case.
- The **domain** of a variable X , written $domain(X)$, is the set of values X can take. (Sometimes use “range”, “frame”, “possible values”).
- A tuple of random variables $\langle X_1, \dots, X_n \rangle$ is a complex random variable with domain $domain(X_1) \times \dots \times domain(X_n)$.
Often the tuple is written as X_1, \dots, X_n .
- Assignment **$X = x$** means variable X has value x .

Random Variables

- A **random variable** starts with upper case.
- The **domain** of a variable X , written $domain(X)$, is the set of values X can take. (Sometimes use “range”, “frame”, “possible values”).
- A tuple of random variables $\langle X_1, \dots, X_n \rangle$ is a complex random variable with domain $domain(X_1) \times \dots \times domain(X_n)$.
Often the tuple is written as X_1, \dots, X_n .
- Assignment **$X = x$** means variable X has value x .
- A **proposition** is a Boolean formula made from assignments of values to variables or inequality (e.g., $<$, \leq , ...) between variables and values.

Possible World Semantics

- A **possible world** specifies an assignment of one value to each random variable.
- A **random variable** is a function from possible worlds into the domain of the random variable.

Possible World Semantics

- A **possible world** specifies an assignment of one value to each random variable.
- A **random variable** is a function from possible worlds into the domain of the random variable.
- $\omega \models X = x$
means variable X is assigned value x in world ω .

Possible World Semantics

- A **possible world** specifies an assignment of one value to each random variable.
- A **random variable** is a function from possible worlds into the domain of the random variable.
- $\omega \models X = x$
means variable X is assigned value x in world ω .
- Logical connectives have their standard meaning:
 - $\omega \models \alpha \wedge \beta$ if $\omega \models \alpha$ and $\omega \models \beta$
 - $\omega \models \alpha \vee \beta$ if $\omega \models \alpha$ or $\omega \models \beta$
 - $\omega \models \neg \alpha$ if $\omega \not\models \alpha$
- Let Ω be the set of all possible worlds.

Semantics of Probability

Probability defines a measure on sets of possible worlds.

A **probability measure** is a function μ from sets of worlds into the non-negative real numbers such that:

- $\mu(\Omega) = 1$
- $\mu(S_1 \cup S_2) = \mu(S_1) + \mu(S_2)$
if $S_1 \cap S_2 = \{\}$.

Semantics of Probability


Probability defines a measure on sets of possible worlds.

A **probability measure** is a function μ from sets of worlds into the non-negative real numbers such that:

- $\mu(\Omega) = 1$
- $\mu(S_1 \cup S_2) = \mu(S_1) + \mu(S_2)$
if $S_1 \cap S_2 = \{\}$.


Then $P(\alpha) = \mu(\{\omega \mid \omega \models \alpha\})$.

Possible Worlds:



Suppose the measure of each singleton world is 0.1.


Possible Worlds:



Suppose the measure of each singleton world is 0.1.

- What is the probability of circle?


Possible Worlds:



Suppose the measure of each singleton world is 0.1.

- What is the probability of circle?
- What is the probability of star?


Possible Worlds:



Suppose the measure of each singleton world is 0.1.

- What is the probability of circle?
- What is the probability of star?
- What is the probability of triangle?


Possible Worlds:



Suppose the measure of each singleton world is 0.1.

- What is the probability of circle?
- What is the probability of star?
- What is the probability of triangle?
- What is the probability of orange?


Possible Worlds:



Suppose the measure of each singleton world is 0.1.

- What is the probability of circle?
- What is the probability of star?
- What is the probability of triangle?
- What is the probability of orange?
- What is the probability of orange and star?

Possible Worlds:



Suppose the measure of each singleton world is 0.1.

- What is the probability of circle?
- What is the probability of star?
- What is the probability of triangle?
- What is the probability of orange?
- What is the probability of orange and star?
- What are the random variables?

Axioms of Probability (finite case)

Three axioms define what follows from a set of probabilities:

Axiom 1 $0 \leq P(a)$ for any proposition a .

Axiom 2 $P(\text{true}) = 1$

Axiom 3 $P(a \vee b) = P(a) + P(b)$ if a and b cannot both be true.

- These axioms are sound and complete with respect to the semantics.

Conditioning

- Probabilistic conditioning specifies how to revise beliefs based on new information.

Conditioning

- Probabilistic conditioning specifies how to revise beliefs based on new information.
- An agent builds a probabilistic model taking all background information into account.
This gives a **prior probability**.
- All other information must be conditioned on.
- If **evidence** e is the all of the information obtained subsequently, the **conditional probability** $P(h \mid e)$ of h given e is the **posterior probability** of h .

Semantics of Conditional Probability

- Evidence e rules out possible worlds incompatible with e .

Semantics of Conditional Probability

- Evidence e rules out possible worlds incompatible with e .
- Evidence e induces a new measure, μ_e , over possible worlds:

Semantics of Conditional Probability

- Evidence e rules out possible worlds incompatible with e .
- Evidence e induces a new measure, μ_e , over possible worlds:

$$\mu_e(S) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \omega \models e \text{ for all } \omega \in S \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Semantics of Conditional Probability

- Evidence e rules out possible worlds incompatible with e .
- Evidence e induces a new measure, μ_e , over possible worlds:

$$\mu_e(S) = \begin{cases} c \times \mu(S) & \text{if } \omega \models e \text{ for all } \omega \in S \end{cases}$$

Semantics of Conditional Probability

- Evidence e rules out possible worlds incompatible with e .
- Evidence e induces a new measure, μ_e , over possible worlds:

$$\mu_e(S) = \begin{cases} c \times \mu(S) & \text{if } \omega \models e \text{ for all } \omega \in S \\ & \text{if } \omega \not\models e \text{ for all } \omega \in S \end{cases}$$

Semantics of Conditional Probability

- Evidence e rules out possible worlds incompatible with e .
- Evidence e induces a new measure, μ_e , over possible worlds:

$$\mu_e(S) = \begin{cases} c \times \mu(S) & \text{if } \omega \models e \text{ for all } \omega \in S \\ 0 & \text{if } \omega \not\models e \text{ for all } \omega \in S \end{cases}$$

Semantics of Conditional Probability

- Evidence e rules out possible worlds incompatible with e .
- Evidence e induces a new measure, μ_e , over possible worlds:

$$\mu_e(S) = \begin{cases} c \times \mu(S) & \text{if } \omega \models e \text{ for all } \omega \in S \\ 0 & \text{if } \omega \not\models e \text{ for all } \omega \in S \end{cases}$$

We can show $c =$

Semantics of Conditional Probability

- Evidence e rules out possible worlds incompatible with e .
- Evidence e induces a new measure, μ_e , over possible worlds:

$$\mu_e(S) = \begin{cases} c \times \mu(S) & \text{if } \omega \models e \text{ for all } \omega \in S \\ 0 & \text{if } \omega \not\models e \text{ for all } \omega \in S \end{cases}$$

We can show $c = \frac{1}{P(e)}$.

- The conditional probability of formula h given evidence e is

$$P(h \mid e) =$$

Semantics of Conditional Probability

- Evidence e rules out possible worlds incompatible with e .
- Evidence e induces a new measure, μ_e , over possible worlds:

$$\mu_e(S) = \begin{cases} c \times \mu(S) & \text{if } \omega \models e \text{ for all } \omega \in S \\ 0 & \text{if } \omega \not\models e \text{ for all } \omega \in S \end{cases}$$

We can show $c = \frac{1}{P(e)}$.

- The conditional probability of formula h given evidence e is

$$\begin{aligned} P(h \mid e) &= \mu_e(\{\omega : \omega \models h\}) \\ &= \end{aligned}$$

Semantics of Conditional Probability

- Evidence e rules out possible worlds incompatible with e .
- Evidence e induces a new measure, μ_e , over possible worlds:

$$\mu_e(S) = \begin{cases} c \times \mu(S) & \text{if } \omega \models e \text{ for all } \omega \in S \\ 0 & \text{if } \omega \not\models e \text{ for all } \omega \in S \end{cases}$$


We can show $c = \frac{1}{P(e)}$.

- The conditional probability of formula h given evidence e is

$$\begin{aligned} P(h \mid e) &= \mu_e(\{\omega : \omega \models h\}) \\ &= \frac{P(h \wedge e)}{P(e)} \end{aligned}$$


Conditioning

Possible Worlds:



Conditioning


Possible Worlds:




Observe $Color = orange$:

Conditioning

Possible Worlds:



Observe $Color = orange$:



Exercise

<i>Flu</i>	<i>Sneeze</i>	<i>Snore</i>	μ
true	true	true	0.064
true	true	false	0.096
true	false	true	0.016
true	false	false	0.024
false	true	true	0.096
false	true	false	0.144
false	false	true	0.224
false	false	false	0.336

What is:

- (a) $P(\textit{flu} \wedge \textit{sneeze})$
- (b) $P(\textit{flu} \wedge \neg \textit{sneeze})$
- (c) $P(\textit{flu})$
- (d) $P(\textit{sneeze} \mid \textit{flu})$
- (e) $P(\neg \textit{flu} \wedge \textit{sneeze})$
- (f) $P(\textit{flu} \mid \textit{sneeze})$
- (g) $P(\textit{sneeze} \mid \textit{flu} \wedge \textit{snore})$
- (h) $P(\textit{flu} \mid \textit{sneeze} \wedge \textit{snore})$

Chain Rule

$$P(f_1 \wedge f_2 \wedge \dots \wedge f_n)$$
$$=$$

Chain Rule

$$\begin{aligned} P(f_1 \wedge f_2 \wedge \dots \wedge f_n) \\ &= P(f_n \mid f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_{n-1}) \times \\ &\quad P(f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_{n-1}) \\ &= \end{aligned}$$

Chain Rule

$$\begin{aligned} &P(f_1 \wedge f_2 \wedge \dots \wedge f_n) \\ &= P(f_n \mid f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_{n-1}) \times \\ &\quad P(f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_{n-1}) \\ &= P(f_n \mid f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_{n-1}) \times \\ &\quad P(f_{n-1} \mid f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_{n-2}) \times \\ &\quad P(f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_{n-2}) \\ &= P(f_n \mid f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_{n-1}) \times \\ &\quad P(f_{n-1} \mid f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_{n-2}) \\ &\quad \times \dots \times P(f_3 \mid f_1 \wedge f_2) \times P(f_2 \mid f_1) \times P(f_1) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n P(f_i \mid f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_{i-1}) \end{aligned}$$

Bayes' theorem

The chain rule and commutativity of conjunction ($h \wedge e$ is equivalent to $e \wedge h$) gives us:

$$P(h \wedge e) =$$

Bayes' theorem

The chain rule and commutativity of conjunction ($h \wedge e$ is equivalent to $e \wedge h$) gives us:

$$P(h \wedge e) = P(h \mid e) \times P(e)$$

Bayes' theorem

The chain rule and commutativity of conjunction ($h \wedge e$ is equivalent to $e \wedge h$) gives us:

$$\begin{aligned} P(h \wedge e) &= P(h \mid e) \times P(e) \\ &= P(e \mid h) \times P(h). \end{aligned}$$

Bayes' theorem

The chain rule and commutativity of conjunction ($h \wedge e$ is equivalent to $e \wedge h$) gives us:

$$\begin{aligned}P(h \wedge e) &= P(h \mid e) \times P(e) \\ &= P(e \mid h) \times P(h).\end{aligned}$$

If $P(e) \neq 0$, divide the right hand sides by $P(e)$:

$$P(h \mid e) =$$

Bayes' theorem

The chain rule and commutativity of conjunction ($h \wedge e$ is equivalent to $e \wedge h$) gives us:

$$\begin{aligned}P(h \wedge e) &= P(h \mid e) \times P(e) \\&= P(e \mid h) \times P(h).\end{aligned}$$

If $P(e) \neq 0$, divide the right hand sides by $P(e)$:

$$P(h \mid e) = \frac{P(e \mid h) \times P(h)}{P(e)}.$$

This is **Bayes' theorem**.

Why is Bayes' theorem interesting?

- Often you have causal knowledge:

$$P(\text{symptom} \mid \text{disease})$$

$$P(\text{light is off} \mid \text{status of switches and switch positions})$$

$$P(\text{alarm} \mid \text{fire})$$

$$P(\text{image looks like } \text{🚗} \mid \text{a tree is in front of a car})$$

- and want to do evidential reasoning:

$$P(\text{disease} \mid \text{symptom})$$

$$P(\text{status of switches} \mid \text{light is off and switch positions})$$

$$P(\text{fire} \mid \text{alarm}).$$

$$P(\text{a tree is in front of a car} \mid \text{image looks like } \text{🚗})$$

Exercise

A cab was involved in a hit-and-run accident at night. Two cab companies, the Green and the Blue, operate in the city. You are given the following data:

- 85% of the cabs in the city are Green and 15% are Blue.
- A witness identified the cab as Blue. The court tested the reliability of the witness in the circumstances that existed on the night of the accident and concluded that the witness correctly identifies each one of the two colours 80% of the time and failed 20% of the time.

What is the probability that the cab involved in the accident was Blue?

[From D. Kahneman, Thinking Fast and Slow, 2011, p. 166.]

Conditional independence

Random variable X is **independent** of random variable Y **given** random variable(s) Z if,

$$P(X \mid YZ) = P(X \mid Z)$$

Conditional independence

Random variable X is **independent** of random variable Y **given** random variable(s) Z if,

$$P(X \mid YZ) = P(X \mid Z)$$

i.e. for all $x \in \text{dom}(X)$, $y, y' \in \text{dom}(Y)$, and $z \in \text{dom}(Z)$,

$$\begin{aligned} P(X = x \mid Y = y \wedge Z = z) \\ &= P(X = x \mid Y = y' \wedge Z = z) \\ &= P(X = x \mid Z = z). \end{aligned}$$

That is, knowledge of Y 's value doesn't affect the belief in the value of X , given a value of Z .


Example

Consider a student writing an exam.

What are reasonable independences among the following?

- Whether the student works hard
- Whether the student is intelligent
- The student's answers on the exam
- The student's mark on an exam

Example domain (diagnostic assistant)



Examples of conditional independence?

- Suppose you know whether there was power in w_1 and whether there was power in w_2 what information is relevant to whether light l_1 is lit? What is independent?

Examples of conditional independence?

- Suppose you know whether there was power in w_1 and whether there was power in w_2 what information is relevant to whether light l_1 is lit? What is independent?
- Whether light l_1 is lit is independent of the position of light switch s_2 given what?

Examples of conditional independence?


- Suppose you know whether there was power in w_1 and whether there was power in w_2 what information is relevant to whether light l_1 is lit? What is independent?
- Whether light l_1 is lit is independent of the position of light switch s_2 given what?
- Every other variable may be independent of whether light l_1 is lit given

Examples of conditional independence?

- Suppose you know whether there was power in w_1 and whether there was power in w_2 what information is relevant to whether light l_1 is lit? What is independent?
- Whether light l_1 is lit is independent of the position of light switch s_2 given what?
- Every other variable may be independent of whether light l_1 is lit given whether there is power in wire w_0 and the status of light l_1 (if it's *ok*, or if not, how it's broken).


Idea of belief networks

- *l1* is lit (*L1_lit*) depends only on the status of the light (*L1_st*) and whether there is power in wire *w0*.
- In a belief network, *W0* and *L1_st* are **parents** of *L1_lit*.
- *W0* depends only on



Idea of belief networks

- *l1* is lit (*L1_lit*) depends only on the status of the light (*L1_st*) and whether there is power in wire *w0*.
- In a belief network, *W0* and *L1_st* are **parents** of *L1_lit*.
- *W0* depends only on whether there is power in *w1*, whether there is power in *w2*, the position of switch *s2* (*S2_pos*), and the status of switch *s2* (*S2_st*).



Belief networks

- Totally order the variables of interest: X_1, \dots, X_n
- Theorem of probability theory (chain rule):
$$P(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n P(X_i \mid X_1, \dots, X_{i-1})$$
- The **parents** $parents(X_i)$ of X_i are those predecessors of X_i that render X_i independent of the other predecessors. That is,

Belief networks

- Totally order the variables of interest: X_1, \dots, X_n
- Theorem of probability theory (chain rule):
$$P(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n P(X_i \mid X_1, \dots, X_{i-1})$$
- The **parents** $parents(X_i)$ of X_i are those predecessors of X_i that render X_i independent of the other predecessors. That is, $parents(X_i) \subseteq X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}$ and
$$P(X_i \mid parents(X_i)) = P(X_i \mid X_1, \dots, X_{i-1})$$
- So $P(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n P(X_i \mid parents(X_i))$
- A **belief network** is a graph: the nodes are random variables; there is an arc from the parents of each node into that node.

Example: fire alarm belief network

Variables:


- **Fire**: there is a fire in the building
- **Tampering**: someone has been tampering with the fire alarm
- **Smoke**: what appears to be smoke is coming from an upstairs window
- **Alarm**: the fire alarm goes off
- **Leaving**: people are leaving the building *en masse*.
- **Report**: a colleague says that people are leaving the building *en masse*. (A noisy sensor for leaving.)

Components of a belief network

A belief network consists of:

- a directed acyclic graph with nodes labeled with random variables
- a domain for each random variable
- a set of conditional probability tables for each variable given its parents (including prior probabilities for nodes with no parents).

Example belief network



Example belief network (continued)

The belief network also specifies:

- The domain of the variables:

W_0, \dots, W_6 have domain $\{live, dead\}$

S_{1_pos} , S_{2_pos} , and S_{3_pos} have domain $\{up, down\}$

S_{1_st} has $\{ok, upside_down, short, intermittent, broken\}$.

- Conditional probabilities, including:

$P(W_1 = live \mid s_{1_pos} = up \wedge S_{1_st} = ok \wedge W_3 = live)$

$P(W_1 = live \mid s_{1_pos} = up \wedge S_{1_st} = ok \wedge W_3 = dead)$

$P(S_{1_pos} = up)$

$P(S_{1_st} = upside_down)$

Belief network summary

- A belief network is a directed acyclic graph (DAG) where nodes are random variables.
- The **parents** of a node n are those variables on which n directly depends.
- A belief network is automatically acyclic by construction.
- A belief network is a graphical representation of dependence and independence:
 - ▶ A variable is independent of its non-descendants given its parents.


Constructing belief networks

To represent a domain in a belief network, you need to consider:

- What are the relevant variables?
 - ▶ What will you observe?
 - ▶ What would you like to find out (query)?
 - ▶ What other features make the model simpler?
- What values should these variables take?
- What is the relationship between them? This should be expressed in terms of a directed graph, representing how each variable is generated from its predecessors.
- How does the value of each variable depend on its parents? This is expressed in terms of the conditional probabilities.


Understanding Independence: Common ancestors

- *alarm* and *smoke* are




Understanding Independence: Common ancestors

- *alarm* and *smoke* are dependent




Understanding Independence: Common ancestors

- *alarm* and *smoke* are dependent
- *alarm* and *smoke* are independent given *fire*




Understanding Independence: Common ancestors

- *alarm* and *smoke* are dependent
- *alarm* and *smoke* are independent given *fire*




Understanding Independence: Common ancestors



- *alarm* and *smoke* are dependent
- *alarm* and *smoke* are independent given *fire*
- Intuitively, *fire* can **explain** *alarm* and *smoke*; learning one can affect the other by changing your belief in *fire*.


Understanding Independence: Chain

- *alarm* and *report* are




Understanding Independence: Chain

- *alarm* and *report* are dependent




Understanding Independence: Chain




- *alarm* and *report* are dependent
- *alarm* and *report* are given *leaving*

Understanding Independence: Chain




- *alarm* and *report* are dependent
- *alarm* and *report* are independent given *leaving*

Understanding Independence: Chain




- *alarm* and *report* are dependent
- *alarm* and *report* are independent given *leaving*
- Intuitively, the only way that the *alarm* affects *report* is by affecting *leaving*.

Understanding Independence: Common descendants




- *tampering* and *fire* are

Understanding Independence: Common descendants




- *tampering* and *fire* are independent

Understanding Independence: Common descendants




- *tampering* and *fire* are independent
- *tampering* and *fire* are given *alarm*

Understanding Independence: Common descendants




- *tampering* and *fire* are independent
- *tampering* and *fire* are dependent given *alarm*

Understanding Independence: Common descendants



- *tampering* and *fire* are independent
- *tampering* and *fire* are dependent given *alarm*
- Intuitively, *tampering* can explain away *fire*

Understanding independence: example



Understanding independence: questions

1. On which given probabilities does $P(N)$ depend?

Understanding independence: questions

1. On which given probabilities does $P(N)$ depend?
2. If you were to observe a value for B , which variables' probabilities will change?

Understanding independence: questions

1. On which given probabilities does $P(N)$ depend?
2. If you were to observe a value for B , which variables' probabilities will change?
3. If you were to observe a value for N , which variables' probabilities will change?

Understanding independence: questions

1. On which given probabilities does $P(N)$ depend?
2. If you were to observe a value for B , which variables' probabilities will change?
3. If you were to observe a value for N , which variables' probabilities will change?
4. Suppose you had observed a value for M ; if you were to then observe a value for N , which variables' probabilities will change?

Understanding independence: questions

1. On which given probabilities does $P(N)$ depend?
2. If you were to observe a value for B , which variables' probabilities will change?
3. If you were to observe a value for N , which variables' probabilities will change?
4. Suppose you had observed a value for M ; if you were to then observe a value for N , which variables' probabilities will change?
5. Suppose you had observed B and Q ; which variables' probabilities will change when you observe N ?

What variables are affected by observing?

- If you observe variable(s) \overline{Y} , the variables whose posterior probability is different from their prior are:
 - ▶ The ancestors of \overline{Y} and
 - ▶ their descendants.
- Intuitively (if you have a causal belief network):
 - ▶ You do **abduction** to possible causes and
 - ▶ **prediction** from the causes.

- A connection is a meeting of arcs in a belief network. A connection is **open** is defined as follows:
 - ▶ If there are arcs $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow C$ such that $B \notin \overline{Z}$, then the connection at B between A and C is open.
 - ▶ If there are arcs $B \rightarrow A$ and $B \rightarrow C$ such that $B \notin \overline{Z}$, then the connection at B between A and C is open.
 - ▶ If there are arcs $A \rightarrow B$ and $C \rightarrow B$ such that B (or a descendent of B) is in \overline{Z} , then the connection at B between A and C is open.

d-separation

- A connection is a meeting of arcs in a belief network. A connection is **open** is defined as follows:
 - ▶ If there are arcs $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow C$ such that $B \notin \overline{Z}$, then the connection at B between A and C is open.
 - ▶ If there are arcs $B \rightarrow A$ and $B \rightarrow C$ such that $B \notin \overline{Z}$, then the connection at B between A and C is open.
 - ▶ If there are arcs $A \rightarrow B$ and $C \rightarrow B$ such that B (or a descendent of B) is in \overline{Z} , then the connection at B between A and C is open.
- X is **d-connected** from Y given \overline{Z} if there is a path from X to Y , along open connections.
- X is **d-separated** from Y given \overline{Z} if it is not d-connected.

d-separation

- A connection is a meeting of arcs in a belief network. A connection is **open** is defined as follows:
 - ▶ If there are arcs $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow C$ such that $B \notin \overline{Z}$, then the connection at B between A and C is open.
 - ▶ If there are arcs $B \rightarrow A$ and $B \rightarrow C$ such that $B \notin \overline{Z}$, then the connection at B between A and C is open.
 - ▶ If there are arcs $A \rightarrow B$ and $C \rightarrow B$ such that B (or a descendent of B) is in \overline{Z} , then the connection at B between A and C is open.
- X is **d-connected** from Y given \overline{Z} if there is a path from X to Y , along open connections.
- X is **d-separated** from Y given \overline{Z} if it is not d-connected.
- \overline{X} is independent \overline{Y} given \overline{Z} for all conditional probabilities iff \overline{X} is d-separated from \overline{Y} given \overline{Z}

Markov Random Field

A **Markov random field** is composed of

- of a set of discrete-valued random variables:
 $\mathbf{X} = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$ and
- a set of factors $\{f_1, \dots, f_m\}$, where a factor is a non-negative function of a subset of the variables.

and defines a joint probability distribution:

$$P(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_k f_k(\mathbf{x}_k = \mathbf{x}_k) .$$
$$Z = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \prod_k f_k(\mathbf{x}_k = \mathbf{x}_k)$$

where $f_k(\mathbf{x}_k)$ is a factor on $\mathbf{X}_k \subseteq \mathbf{X}$, and \mathbf{x}_k is \mathbf{x} projected onto \mathbf{X}_k .

Z is a normalization constant known as the **partition function**.

Markov Networks and Factor graphs

- A **Markov network** is a graphical representation of a Markov random field where the nodes are the random variables and there is an arc between any two variables that are in a factor together.

Markov Networks and Factor graphs

- A **Markov network** is a graphical representation of a Markov random field where the nodes are the random variables and there is an arc between any two variables that are in a factor together.
- A **factor graph** is a bipartite graph, which contains a variable node for each random variable and a factor node for each factor. There is an edge between a variable node and a factor node if the variable appears in the factor.

Markov Networks and Factor graphs

- A **Markov network** is a graphical representation of a Markov random field where the nodes are the random variables and there is an arc between any two variables that are in a factor together.
- A **factor graph** is a bipartite graph, which contains a variable node for each random variable and a factor node for each factor. There is an edge between a variable node and a factor node if the variable appears in the factor.
- A **belief network** is a

Markov Networks and Factor graphs

- A **Markov network** is a graphical representation of a Markov random field where the nodes are the random variables and there is an arc between any two variables that are in a factor together.
- A **factor graph** is a bipartite graph, which contains a variable node for each random variable and a factor node for each factor. There is an edge between a variable node and a factor node if the variable appears in the factor.
- A **belief network** is a type of Markov random field where the factors represent conditional probabilities, there is a factor for each variable, and directed graph is acyclic.

Independence in a Markov Network

- The **Markov blanket** of a variable X is the set of variables that are in factors with X .
- A variable is independent of the other variables given its Markov blanket.

Independence in a Markov Network

- The **Markov blanket** of a variable X is the set of variables that are in factors with X .
- A variable is independent of the other variables given its Markov blanket.
- X is **connected** to Y given \overline{Z} if there is a path from X to Y in the Markov network, which does not contain an element of Z .
- X is **separated** from Y given \overline{Z} if it is not connected.

Independence in a Markov Network

- The **Markov blanket** of a variable X is the set of variables that are in factors with X .
- A variable is independent of the other variables given its Markov blanket.
- X is **connected** to Y given \bar{Z} if there is a path from X to Y in the Markov network, which does not contain an element of Z .
- X is **separated** from Y given \bar{Z} if it is not connected.
- A **positive** distribution is one that does not contain zero probabilities.
- \bar{X} is independent \bar{Y} given \bar{Z} for all positive distributions iff \bar{X} is separated from \bar{Y} given \bar{Z}

Canonical Representations

- The **parameters** of a graphical model are the numbers that define the model.
- A belief network is a **canonical representation**: given the structure and the distribution, the parameters are uniquely determined.
- A Markov random field is not a canonical representation. Many different parameterizations result in the same distribution.

Representations of Conditional Probabilities

There are many representations of conditional probabilities and factors:

- Tables
- Decision Trees
- Rules
- Weighted Logical Formulae
- Contextual Tables
- Logistic Functions

Tabular Representation

	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	Prob
$P(D \mid A, B, C) :$	true	true	true	true	0.9
	true	true	true	false	0.1
	true	true	false	true	0.9
	true	true	false	false	0.1
	true	false	true	true	0.2
	true	false	true	false	0.8
	true	false	false	true	0.2
	true	false	false	false	0.8
	false	true	true	true	0.3
	false	true	true	false	0.7
	false	true	false	true	0.4
	false	true	false	false	0.6
	false	false	true	true	0.3
	false	false	true	false	0.7
	false	false	false	true	0.4
	false	false	false	false	0.6

Decision Tree Representation

Rule Representation

$$0.9 : d \leftarrow a \wedge b$$

$$0.2 : d \leftarrow a \wedge \neg b$$

$$0.3 : d \leftarrow \neg a \wedge c$$

$$0.4 : d \leftarrow \neg a \wedge \neg c$$

Weighted Logical Formulae

$$\begin{aligned}d \leftrightarrow & ((a \wedge b \wedge n_0) \\& \vee (a \wedge \neg b \wedge n_1) \\& \vee (\neg a \wedge c \wedge n_2) \\& \vee (\neg a \wedge \neg c \wedge n_2))\end{aligned}$$

n_i are independent:

$$P(n_0) = 0.9$$

$$P(n_1) = 0.2$$

$$P(n_2) = 0.3$$

$$P(n_3) = 0.4$$

Contextual-Table Representation

Logistic Functions

$$P(h \mid e) = \frac{P(h \wedge e)}{P(e)}$$

Logistic Functions

$$\begin{aligned} P(h \mid e) &= \frac{P(h \wedge e)}{P(e)} \\ &= \frac{P(h \wedge e)}{P(h \wedge e) + P(\neg h \wedge e)} \end{aligned}$$

Logistic Functions

$$\begin{aligned}P(h \mid e) &= \frac{P(h \wedge e)}{P(e)} \\&= \frac{P(h \wedge e)}{P(h \wedge e) + P(\neg h \wedge e)} \\&= \frac{1}{1 + P(\neg h \wedge e)/P(h \wedge e)}\end{aligned}$$

Logistic Functions

$$\begin{aligned}P(h \mid e) &= \frac{P(h \wedge e)}{P(e)} \\&= \frac{P(h \wedge e)}{P(h \wedge e) + P(\neg h \wedge e)} \\&= \frac{1}{1 + P(\neg h \wedge e)/P(h \wedge e)} \\&= \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\log P(h \wedge e)/P(\neg h \wedge e)}}\end{aligned}$$

Logistic Functions


$$\begin{aligned}P(h \mid e) &= \frac{P(h \wedge e)}{P(e)} \\&= \frac{P(h \wedge e)}{P(h \wedge e) + P(\neg h \wedge e)} \\&= \frac{1}{1 + P(\neg h \wedge e)/P(h \wedge e)} \\&= \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\log P(h \wedge e)/P(\neg h \wedge e)}} \\&= \textit{sigmoid}(\log \textit{odds}(h \mid e))\end{aligned}$$

$$\textit{sigmoid}(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x}}$$

$$\textit{odds}(h \mid e) = \frac{P(h \wedge e)}{P(\neg h \wedge e)}$$

Logistic Functions

A conditional probability is the sigmoid of the log-odds.



$$\text{sigmoid}(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x}}$$

A **logistic function** is the sigmoid of a linear function.

Logistic Representation of Conditional Probability

$$\begin{aligned}P(d \mid A, B, C) = & \textit{sigmoid}(0.9^\dagger * A * B \\& + 0.2^\dagger * A * (1 - B) \\& + 0.3^\dagger * (1 - A) * C \\& + 0.4^\dagger * (1 - A) * (1 - C))\end{aligned}$$

where 0.9^\dagger is $\textit{sigmoid}^{-1}(0.9)$.

Logistic Representation of Conditional Probability

$$\begin{aligned}P(d \mid A, B, C) = & \text{sigmoid}(0.9^\dagger * A * B \\& + 0.2^\dagger * A * (1 - B) \\& + 0.3^\dagger * (1 - A) * C \\& + 0.4^\dagger * (1 - A) * (1 - C))\end{aligned}$$

where 0.9^\dagger is $\text{sigmoid}^{-1}(0.9)$.

$$\begin{aligned}P(d \mid A, B, C) = & \text{sigmoid}(0.4^\dagger \\& + (0.2^\dagger - 0.4^\dagger) * A \\& + (0.9^\dagger - 0.2^\dagger) * A * B \\& + \dots)\end{aligned}$$

Main approaches to determine posterior distributions in graphical models:

- Variable Elimination, recursive conditioning: exploit the structure of the network to eliminate (sum out) the non-observed, non-query variables one at a time.

Main approaches to determine posterior distributions in graphical models:

- Variable Elimination, recursive conditioning: exploit the structure of the network to eliminate (sum out) the non-observed, non-query variables one at a time.
- Stochastic simulation: random cases are generated according to the probability distributions.

Main approaches to determine posterior distributions in graphical models:

- Variable Elimination, recursive conditioning: exploit the structure of the network to eliminate (sum out) the non-observed, non-query variables one at a time.
- Stochastic simulation: random cases are generated according to the probability distributions.
- Variational methods: find the closest tractable distribution to the (posterior) distribution we are interested in.

Main approaches to determine posterior distributions in graphical models:

- Variable Elimination, recursive conditioning: exploit the structure of the network to eliminate (sum out) the non-observed, non-query variables one at a time.
- Stochastic simulation: random cases are generated according to the probability distributions.
- Variational methods: find the closest tractable distribution to the (posterior) distribution we are interested in.
- Bounding approaches: bound the conditional probabilities above and below and iteratively reduce the bounds.
- ...

- A **factor** is a representation of a function from a tuple of random variables into a number.
- We write factor f on variables X_1, \dots, X_j as $f(X_1, \dots, X_j)$.

- A **factor** is a representation of a function from a tuple of random variables into a number.
- We write factor f on variables X_1, \dots, X_j as $f(X_1, \dots, X_j)$.
- We can assign some or all of the variables of a factor:
 - ▶ $f(X_1 = v_1, X_2, \dots, X_j)$, where $v_1 \in \text{dom}(X_1)$, is a factor on X_2, \dots, X_j .
 - ▶ $f(X_1 = v_1, X_2 = v_2, \dots, X_j = v_j)$ is a number that is the value of f when each X_i has value v_i .

The former is also written as $f(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_j)_{X_1 = v_1}$, etc.

Example factors

$r(X, Y, Z):$

X	Y	Z	val
t	t	t	0.1
t	t	f	0.9
t	f	t	0.2
t	f	f	0.8
f	t	t	0.4
f	t	f	0.6
f	f	t	0.3
f	f	f	0.7

$r(X=t, Y, Z):$

Y	Z	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	
f	t	
f	f	

Example factors

$r(X, Y, Z)$:

X	Y	Z	val
t	t	t	0.1
t	t	f	0.9
t	f	t	0.2
t	f	f	0.8
f	t	t	0.4
f	t	f	0.6
f	f	t	0.3
f	f	f	0.7

$r(X=t, Y, Z)$:

Y	Z	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	
f	f	

Example factors

$r(X, Y, Z):$

X	Y	Z	val
t	t	t	0.1
t	t	f	0.9
t	f	t	0.2
t	f	f	0.8
f	t	t	0.4
f	t	f	0.6
f	f	t	0.3
f	f	f	0.7

$r(X=t, Y, Z):$

Y	Z	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	

Example factors

$r(X, Y, Z):$

X	Y	Z	val
t	t	t	0.1
t	t	f	0.9
t	f	t	0.2
t	f	f	0.8
f	t	t	0.4
f	t	f	0.6
f	f	t	0.3
f	f	f	0.7

$r(X=t, Y, Z):$

Y	Z	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

Example factors

$r(X, Y, Z):$

X	Y	Z	val
t	t	t	0.1
t	t	f	0.9
t	f	t	0.2
t	f	f	0.8
f	t	t	0.4
f	t	f	0.6
f	f	t	0.3
f	f	f	0.7

$r(X=t, Y, Z):$

Y	Z	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

$r(X=t, Y, Z=f):$

Example factors

$r(X, Y, Z)$:

X	Y	Z	val
t	t	t	0.1
t	t	f	0.9
t	f	t	0.2
t	f	f	0.8
f	t	t	0.4
f	t	f	0.6
f	f	t	0.3
f	f	f	0.7

$r(X=t, Y, Z)$:

Y	Z	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

$r(X=t, Y, Z=f)$:

Y	val
t	
f	

Example factors

$r(X, Y, Z)$:

X	Y	Z	val
t	t	t	0.1
t	t	f	0.9
t	f	t	0.2
t	f	f	0.8
f	t	t	0.4
f	t	f	0.6
f	f	t	0.3
f	f	f	0.7

$r(X=t, Y, Z)$:

Y	Z	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

$r(X=t, Y, Z=f)$:

Y	val
t	0.9
f	

Example factors

$r(X, Y, Z):$

X	Y	Z	val
t	t	t	0.1
t	t	f	0.9
t	f	t	0.2
t	f	f	0.8
f	t	t	0.4
f	t	f	0.6
f	f	t	0.3
f	f	f	0.7

$r(X=t, Y, Z):$

Y	Z	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

$r(X=t, Y, Z=f):$

Y	val
t	0.9
f	0.8

Example factors

$r(X, Y, Z):$

X	Y	Z	val
t	t	t	0.1
t	t	f	0.9
t	f	t	0.2
t	f	f	0.8
f	t	t	0.4
f	t	f	0.6
f	f	t	0.3
f	f	f	0.7

$r(X=t, Y, Z):$

Y	Z	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

$r(X=t, Y, Z=f):$

Y	val
t	0.9
f	0.8

$r(X=t, Y=f, Z=f) =$

Example factors

$r(X, Y, Z):$

X	Y	Z	val
t	t	t	0.1
t	t	f	0.9
t	f	t	0.2
t	f	f	0.8
f	t	t	0.4
f	t	f	0.6
f	f	t	0.3
f	f	f	0.7

$r(X=t, Y, Z):$

Y	Z	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

$r(X=t, Y, Z=f):$

Y	val
t	0.9
f	0.8

$r(X=t, Y=f, Z=f) = 0.8$

Multiplying factors

The **product** of factor $f_1(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})$ and $f_2(\overline{Y}, \overline{Z})$, where \overline{Y} are the variables in common, is the factor $(f_1 * f_2)(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}, \overline{Z})$ defined by:

$$(f_1 * f_2)(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}, \overline{Z}) = f_1(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})f_2(\overline{Y}, \overline{Z}).$$

Multiplying factors example

f_1 :

A	B	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

f_2 :

B	C	val
t	t	0.3
t	f	0.7
f	t	0.6
f	f	0.4

$f_1 * f_2$:

A	B	C	val
t	t	t	0.03
t	t	f	
t	f	t	
t	f	f	
f	t	t	
f	t	f	
f	f	t	
f	f	f	

Multiplying factors example

f_1 :

A	B	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

f_2 :

B	C	val
t	t	0.3
t	f	0.7
f	t	0.6
f	f	0.4

$f_1 * f_2$:

A	B	C	val
t	t	t	0.03
t	t	f	0.07
t	f	t	
t	f	f	
f	t	t	
f	t	f	
f	f	t	
f	f	f	

Multiplying factors example

f_1 :

A	B	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

f_2 :

B	C	val
t	t	0.3
t	f	0.7
f	t	0.6
f	f	0.4

$f_1 * f_2$:

A	B	C	val
t	t	t	0.03
t	t	f	0.07
t	f	t	0.54
t	f	f	
f	t	t	
f	t	f	
f	f	t	
f	f	f	

Multiplying factors example

f_1 :

A	B	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

f_2 :

B	C	val
t	t	0.3
t	f	0.7
f	t	0.6
f	f	0.4

$f_1 * f_2$:

A	B	C	val
t	t	t	0.03
t	t	f	0.07
t	f	t	0.54
t	f	f	0.36
f	t	t	
f	t	f	
f	f	t	
f	f	f	

Multiplying factors example

f_1 :

A	B	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

f_2 :

B	C	val
t	t	0.3
t	f	0.7
f	t	0.6
f	f	0.4

$f_1 * f_2$:

A	B	C	val
t	t	t	0.03
t	t	f	0.07
t	f	t	0.54
t	f	f	0.36
f	t	t	0.06
f	t	f	
f	f	t	
f	f	f	

Multiplying factors example

f_1 :

A	B	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

f_2 :

B	C	val
t	t	0.3
t	f	0.7
f	t	0.6
f	f	0.4

$f_1 * f_2$:

A	B	C	val
t	t	t	0.03
t	t	f	0.07
t	f	t	0.54
t	f	f	0.36
f	t	t	0.06
f	t	f	0.14
f	f	t	
f	f	f	

Multiplying factors example

f_1 :

A	B	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

f_2 :

B	C	val
t	t	0.3
t	f	0.7
f	t	0.6
f	f	0.4

$f_1 * f_2$:

A	B	C	val
t	t	t	0.03
t	t	f	0.07
t	f	t	0.54
t	f	f	0.36
f	t	t	0.06
f	t	f	0.14
f	f	t	0.48
f	f	f	

Multiplying factors example

f_1 :

A	B	val
t	t	0.1
t	f	0.9
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

f_2 :

B	C	val
t	t	0.3
t	f	0.7
f	t	0.6
f	f	0.4

$f_1 * f_2$:

A	B	C	val
t	t	t	0.03
t	t	f	0.07
t	f	t	0.54
t	f	f	0.36
f	t	t	0.06
f	t	f	0.14
f	f	t	0.48
f	f	f	0.32

Summing out variables

We can **sum out** a variable, say X_1 with range $\{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$, from factor $f(X_1, \dots, X_j)$, resulting in a factor on X_2, \dots, X_j defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{X_1} f \right) (X_2, \dots, X_j) \\ &= f(X_1 = v_1, \dots, X_j) + \dots + f(X_1 = v_k, \dots, X_j) \end{aligned}$$

Summing out a variable example

f_3 :

A	B	C	val
t	t	t	0.03
t	t	f	0.07
t	f	t	0.54
t	f	f	0.36
f	t	t	0.06
f	t	f	0.14
f	f	t	0.48
f	f	f	0.32

$\sum_B f_3$:

A	C	val
t	t	0.57
t	f	
f	t	
f	f	

Summing out a variable example

f_3 :

A	B	C	val
t	t	t	0.03
t	t	f	0.07
t	f	t	0.54
t	f	f	0.36
f	t	t	0.06
f	t	f	0.14
f	f	t	0.48
f	f	f	0.32

$\sum_B f_3$:

A	C	val
t	t	0.57
t	f	0.43
f	t	
f	f	

Summing out a variable example

f_3 :

A	B	C	val
t	t	t	0.03
t	t	f	0.07
t	f	t	0.54
t	f	f	0.36
f	t	t	0.06
f	t	f	0.14
f	f	t	0.48
f	f	f	0.32

$\sum_B f_3$:

A	C	val
t	t	0.57
t	f	0.43
f	t	0.54
f	f	

Summing out a variable example

f_3 :

A	B	C	val
t	t	t	0.03
t	t	f	0.07
t	f	t	0.54
t	f	f	0.36
f	t	t	0.06
f	t	f	0.14
f	f	t	0.48
f	f	f	0.32

$\sum_B f_3$:

A	C	val
t	t	0.57
t	f	0.43
f	t	0.54
f	f	0.46

Exercise

Given factors:

s:

A	val
t	0.75
f	0.25

t:

A	B	val
t	t	0.6
t	f	0.4
f	t	0.2
f	f	0.8

o:

A	val
t	0.3
f	0.1

What are the following factors over?

- (a) $s * t$
- (b) $\sum_A s * t$
- (c) $\sum_B s * t$
- (d) $\sum_A \sum_B s * t$
- (e) $s * t * o$
- (f) $\sum_B s * t * o$

- If we want to compute the posterior probability of Z given evidence $Y_1 = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Y_j = v_j$:

$$P(Z | Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j)$$

=

- If we want to compute the posterior probability of Z given evidence $Y_1 = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Y_j = v_j$:

$$\begin{aligned} &P(Z|Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j) \\ &= \frac{P(Z, Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j)}{P(Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j)} \\ &= \end{aligned}$$

- If we want to compute the posterior probability of Z given evidence $Y_1 = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Y_j = v_j$:

$$\begin{aligned} P(Z | Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j) \\ &= \frac{P(Z, Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j)}{P(Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j)} \\ &= \frac{P(Z, Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j)}{\sum_Z P(Z, Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j)}. \end{aligned}$$

- So the computation reduces to the probability of $P(Z, Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j)$.
- Normalize at the end, by summing out Z and dividing.

Probability of a conjunction

Suppose the variables of the belief network are X_1, \dots, X_n .
To compute $P(Z, Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j)$, we sum out the other variables, $Z_1, \dots, Z_k = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\} - \{Z\} - \{Y_1, \dots, Y_j\}$.
We order the Z_i into an **elimination ordering**.

$$P(Z, Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j) \\ =$$

Probability of a conjunction

Suppose the variables of the belief network are X_1, \dots, X_n .
To compute $P(Z, Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j)$, we sum out the other variables, $Z_1, \dots, Z_k = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\} - \{Z\} - \{Y_1, \dots, Y_j\}$.
We order the Z_i into an **elimination ordering**.

$$\begin{aligned} &P(Z, Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j) \\ &= \sum_{Z_k} \cdots \sum_{Z_1} P(X_1, \dots, X_n)_{Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j} \\ &= \end{aligned}$$

Probability of a conjunction

Suppose the variables of the belief network are X_1, \dots, X_n .
To compute $P(Z, Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j)$, we sum out the other variables, $Z_1, \dots, Z_k = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\} - \{Z\} - \{Y_1, \dots, Y_j\}$.
We order the Z_i into an **elimination ordering**.

$$\begin{aligned} &P(Z, Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j) \\ &= \sum_{Z_k} \cdots \sum_{Z_1} P(X_1, \dots, X_n)_{Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j} \\ &= \sum_{Z_k} \cdots \sum_{Z_1} \prod_{i=1}^n P(X_i | \text{parents}(X_i))_{Y_1 = v_1, \dots, Y_j = v_j} \end{aligned}$$

Computing sums of products

Computation in belief networks reduces to computing the sums of products.

- How can we compute $ab + ac$ efficiently?

Computing sums of products

Computation in belief networks reduces to computing the sums of products.

- How can we compute $ab + ac$ efficiently?
- Distribute out the a giving $a(b + c)$

Computation in belief networks reduces to computing the sums of products.

- How can we compute $ab + ac$ efficiently?
- Distribute out the a giving $a(b + c)$
- How can we compute $\sum_{Z_1} \prod_{i=1}^n P(X_i | \text{parents}(X_i))$ efficiently?

Computation in belief networks reduces to computing the sums of products.

- How can we compute $ab + ac$ efficiently?
- Distribute out the a giving $a(b + c)$
- How can we compute $\sum_{Z_1} \prod_{i=1}^n P(X_i | \text{parents}(X_i))$ efficiently?
- Distribute out those factors that don't involve Z_1 .

Variable elimination algorithm

To compute $P(Z|Y_1 = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Y_j = v_j)$:

- Construct a factor for each conditional probability.
- Set the observed variables to their observed values.
- Sum out each of the other variables (the $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_k\}$) according to some elimination ordering.
- Multiply the remaining factors. Normalize by dividing the resulting factor $f(Z)$ by $\sum_Z f(Z)$.

Summing out a variable

To sum out a variable Z_j from a product f_1, \dots, f_k of factors:

- Partition the factors into
 - ▶ those that don't contain Z_j , say f_1, \dots, f_i ,
 - ▶ those that contain Z_j , say f_{i+1}, \dots, f_k


We know:

$$\sum_{Z_j} f_1 * \dots * f_k = f_1 * \dots * f_i * \left(\sum_{Z_j} f_{i+1} * \dots * f_k \right).$$

- Explicitly construct a representation of the rightmost factor. Replace the factors f_{i+1}, \dots, f_k by the new factor.


Example

$$P(E \mid g) =$$




Example

$$P(E \mid g) = \frac{P(E \wedge g)}{\sum_E P(E \wedge g)}$$




Example




$$\begin{aligned} P(E \mid g) &= \frac{P(E \wedge g)}{\sum_E P(E \wedge g)} \\ &= \sum_F \sum_B \sum_C \sum_A \sum_D \end{aligned}$$

Example




$$\begin{aligned} P(E | g) &= \frac{P(E \wedge g)}{\sum_E P(E \wedge g)} \\ &= \sum_F \sum_B \sum_C \sum_A \sum_D P(A)P(B | AC) \\ &\quad P(C)P(D | C)P(E | B)P(F | E)P(g | ED) \\ &= \end{aligned}$$

Example



$$\begin{aligned} P(E | g) &= \frac{P(E \wedge g)}{\sum_E P(E \wedge g)} \\ &= \sum_F \sum_B \sum_C \sum_A \sum_D P(A)P(B | AC) \\ &\quad P(C)P(D | C)P(E | B)P(F | E)P(g | ED) \\ &= \left(\sum_D P(D | C)P(g | ED) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Example




$$P(E | g) = \frac{P(E \wedge g)}{\sum_E P(E \wedge g)}$$

$$= \sum_F \sum_B \sum_C \sum_A \sum_D P(A)P(B | AC) \\ P(C)P(D | C)P(E | B)P(F | E)P(g | ED)$$

=

$$\left(\sum_A P(A)P(B | AC) \right) \\ \left(\sum_D P(D | C)P(g | ED) \right)$$

Example




$$P(E | g) = \frac{P(E \wedge g)}{\sum_E P(E \wedge g)}$$

$$= \sum_F \sum_B \sum_C \sum_A \sum_D P(A)P(B | AC) \\ P(C)P(D | C)P(E | B)P(F | E)P(g | ED)$$

=

$$\sum_C \left(P(C) \left(\sum_A P(A)P(B | AC) \right) \right. \\ \left. \left(\sum_D P(D | C)P(g | ED) \right) \right)$$

Example




$$P(E | g) = \frac{P(E \wedge g)}{\sum_E P(E \wedge g)}$$

$$= \sum_F \sum_B \sum_C \sum_A \sum_D P(A)P(B | AC) \\ P(C)P(D | C)P(E | B)P(F | E)P(g | ED)$$

=

$$\sum_B P(E | B) \sum_C \left(P(C) \left(\sum_A P(A)P(B | AC) \right) \right. \\ \left. \left(\sum_D P(D | C)P(g | ED) \right) \right)$$

Example




$$P(E | g) = \frac{P(E \wedge g)}{\sum_E P(E \wedge g)}$$

$$= \sum_F \sum_B \sum_C \sum_A \sum_D P(A)P(B | AC) \\ P(C)P(D | C)P(E | B)P(F | E)P(g | ED)$$

$$= \left(\sum_F P(F | E) \right)$$


$$\sum_B P(E | B) \sum_C \left(P(C) \left(\sum_A P(A)P(B | AC) \right) \right. \\ \left. \left(\sum_D P(D | C)P(g | ED) \right) \right)$$

Variable elimination example


$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(A) \\ P(B|A) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } A}$$
$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(C) \\ P(D|BC) \\ P(E|C) \end{array} \right\}$$
$$P(F|D)$$
$$P(G|FE)$$
$$P(H|G) \}$$
$$P(I|G) \}$$

$$P(D, h) = \dots (\sum_A P(A)P(B|A)) (\sum_I P(I|G))$$


Variable elimination example



$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(A) \\ P(B|A) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } A} f_1(B)$$
$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(C) \\ P(D|BC) \\ P(E|C) \end{array} \right\}$$
$$P(F|D)$$
$$P(G|FE)$$
$$P(H|G) \}$$
$$P(I|G) \}$$

$$P(D, h) = \dots (\sum_A P(A)P(B|A)) (\sum_I P(I|G))$$

Variable elimination example



$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(A) \\ P(B|A) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } A} f_1(B)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(C) \\ P(D|BC) \\ P(E|C) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } C}$$


$$\begin{array}{l} P(F|D) \\ P(G|FE) \end{array}$$

$$P(H|G) \}$$

$$P(I|G) \}$$

$$P(D, h) = \dots (\sum_A P(A)P(B|A)) (\sum_I P(I|G))$$

Variable elimination example



$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(A) \\ P(B|A) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } A} f_1(B)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(C) \\ P(D|BC) \\ P(E|C) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } C} f_2(BDE)$$


$$\begin{array}{l} P(F|D) \\ P(G|FE) \end{array}$$

$$P(H|G) \}$$

$$P(I|G) \}$$

$$P(D, h) = \dots (\sum_A P(A)P(B|A)) (\sum_I P(I|G))$$

Variable elimination example



$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(A) \\ P(B|A) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } A} f_1(B)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(C) \\ P(D|BC) \\ P(E|C) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } C} f_2(BDE)$$


$$\begin{array}{l} P(F|D) \\ P(G|FE) \end{array}$$

$$P(H|G) \} \xrightarrow{\text{obs } H}$$

$$P(I|G) \}$$

$$P(D, h) = \dots (\sum_A P(A)P(B|A)) (\sum_I P(I|G))$$

Variable elimination example



$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(A) \\ P(B|A) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } A} f_1(B)$$


$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(C) \\ P(D|BC) \\ P(E|C) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } C} f_2(BDE)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(F|D) \\ P(G|FE) \\ P(H|G) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{obs } H} f_3(G)$$

$$P(I|G) \}$$

$$P(D, h) = \dots (\sum_A P(A)P(B|A)) (\sum_I P(I|G))$$

Variable elimination example



$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(A) \\ P(B|A) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } A} f_1(B)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(C) \\ P(D|BC) \\ P(E|C) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } C} f_2(BDE)$$


$$\begin{array}{l} P(F|D) \\ P(G|FE) \end{array}$$

$$P(H|G) \} \xrightarrow{\text{obs } H} f_3(G)$$

$$P(I|G) \} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } I}$$

$$P(D, h) = \dots (\sum_A P(A)P(B|A)) (\sum_I P(I|G))$$

Variable elimination example



$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(A) \\ P(B|A) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } A} f_1(B)$$


$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(C) \\ P(D|BC) \\ P(E|C) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } C} f_2(BDE)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(F|D) \\ P(G|FE) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{obs } H} f_3(G)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(H|G) \\ P(I|G) \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{elim } I} f_4(G)$$

$$P(D, h) = \dots (\sum_A P(A)P(B|A)) (\sum_I P(I|G))$$


Variable Elimination example



Query: $P(G|f)$; elimination ordering: A, H, E, D, B, C

$$P(G|f) \propto$$


Variable Elimination example



Query: $P(G|f)$; elimination ordering: A, H, E, D, B, C

$$P(G|f) \propto \sum_C \sum_B \sum_D \sum_E \sum_H \sum_A P(A)P(B|A)P(C|B) \\ P(D|C)P(E|D)P(f|E)P(G|C)P(H|E)$$

Variable Elimination example



Query: $P(G|f)$; elimination ordering: A, H, E, D, B, C

$$P(G|f) \propto \sum_C \sum_B \sum_D \sum_E \sum_H \sum_A P(A)P(B|A)P(C|B) \\ P(D|C)P(E|D)P(f|E)P(G|C)P(H|E)$$

$$= \sum_C \left(\sum_B \left(\sum_A P(A)P(B|A) \right) P(C|B) \right) P(G|C) \\ \left(\sum_D P(D|C) \left(\sum_E P(E|D)P(f|E) \sum_H P(H|E) \right) \right)$$


Pruning Irrelevant Variables (Belief networks)

Suppose you want to compute $P(X \mid e_1 \dots e_k)$:

- Prune any variables that have no observed or queried descendants.
- Connect the parents of any observed variable.
- Remove arc directions.
- Remove observed variables.
- Remove any variables not connected to X in the resulting (undirected) graph.

Markov chain

- A **Markov chain** is a special sort of belief network:



What probabilities need to be specified?

Markov chain

- A **Markov chain** is a special sort of belief network:




What probabilities need to be specified?

- $P(s_0)$ specifies initial conditions
- $P(s_{i+1}|s_i)$ specifies the dynamics

Markov chain

- A **Markov chain** is a special sort of belief network:



What probabilities need to be specified?

- $P(S_0)$ specifies initial conditions
- $P(S_{i+1}|S_i)$ specifies the dynamics

What independence assumptions are made?

Markov chain

- A **Markov chain** is a special sort of belief network:



What probabilities need to be specified?

- $P(S_0)$ specifies initial conditions
- $P(S_{i+1}|S_i)$ specifies the dynamics

What independence assumptions are made?

- $P(S_{i+1}|S_0, \dots, S_i) = P(S_{i+1}|S_i)$.

Markov chain

- A **Markov chain** is a special sort of belief network:



What probabilities need to be specified?

- $P(S_0)$ specifies initial conditions
- $P(S_{i+1}|S_i)$ specifies the dynamics

What independence assumptions are made?

- $P(S_{i+1}|S_0, \dots, S_i) = P(S_{i+1}|S_i)$.
- Often S_t represents the **state** at time t . Intuitively S_t conveys all of the information about the history that can affect the future states.

Markov chain

- A **Markov chain** is a special sort of belief network:



What probabilities need to be specified?

- $P(S_0)$ specifies initial conditions
- $P(S_{i+1}|S_i)$ specifies the dynamics

What independence assumptions are made?

- $P(S_{i+1}|S_0, \dots, S_i) = P(S_{i+1}|S_i)$.
- Often S_t represents the **state** at time t . Intuitively S_t conveys all of the information about the history that can affect the future states.
- “The future is independent of the past given the present.”

Stationary Markov chain

- A **stationary Markov chain** is when for all $i > 0, i' > 0$,
 $P(S_{i+1}|S_i) = P(S_{i'+1}|S_{i'})$.
- We specify $P(S_0)$ and $P(S_{i+1}|S_i)$.
 - ▶ Simple model, easy to specify
 - ▶ Often the natural model
 - ▶ The network can extend indefinitely

Stationary Distribution

- A distribution over states, P is a **stationary distribution** if for each state s , $P(S_{i+1}=s) = P(S_i=s)$.

Stationary Distribution

- A distribution over states, P is a **stationary distribution** if for each state s , $P(S_{i+1}=s) = P(S_i=s)$.
- Every Markov chain has a stationary distribution.

Stationary Distribution

- A distribution over states, P is a **stationary distribution** if for each state s , $P(S_{i+1}=s) = P(S_i=s)$.
- Every Markov chain has a stationary distribution.
- A Markov chain is **ergodic** if, for any two states s_1 and s_2 , there is a non-zero probability of eventually reaching s_2 from s_1 .

Stationary Distribution

- A distribution over states, P is a **stationary distribution** if for each state s , $P(S_{i+1}=s) = P(S_i=s)$.
- Every Markov chain has a stationary distribution.
- A Markov chain is **ergodic** if, for any two states s_1 and s_2 , there is a non-zero probability of eventually reaching s_2 from s_1 .
- A Markov chain is **periodic** if there is a strict temporal regularity in visiting states. A state is only visited divisible at time t if $t \bmod n = m$ for some n, m .

Stationary Distribution

- A distribution over states, P is a **stationary distribution** if for each state s , $P(S_{i+1}=s) = P(S_i=s)$.
- Every Markov chain has a stationary distribution.
- A Markov chain is **ergodic** if, for any two states s_1 and s_2 , there is a non-zero probability of eventually reaching s_2 from s_1 .
- A Markov chain is **periodic** if there is a strict temporal regularity in visiting states. A state is only visited divisible at time t if $t \bmod n = m$ for some n, m .
- An ergodic and aperiodic Markov chain has a unique stationary distribution P and $P(s) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} P_i(s)$ — equilibrium distribution

Pagerank

Consider the Markov chain:

- Domain of S_i is the set of all web pages
- $P(S_0)$ is uniform; $P(S_0 = p_j) = 1/N$

$$P(S_{i+1} = p_j \mid S_i = p_k) \\ = (1 - d)/N + d * \begin{cases} 1/n_k & \text{if } p_k \text{ links to } p_j \\ 1/N & \text{if } p_k \text{ has no links} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where there are N web pages and n_k links from page p_k

- $d \approx 0.85$ is the probability someone keeps surfing web

Pagerank

Consider the Markov chain:

- Domain of S_i is the set of all web pages
- $P(S_0)$ is uniform; $P(S_0 = p_j) = 1/N$

$$P(S_{i+1} = p_j \mid S_i = p_k) \\ = (1 - d)/N + d * \begin{cases} 1/n_k & \text{if } p_k \text{ links to } p_j \\ 1/N & \text{if } p_k \text{ has no links} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$


where there are N web pages and n_k links from page p_k

- $d \approx 0.85$ is the probability someone keeps surfing web
- This Markov chain converges to a distribution over web pages (original $P(S_i)$ for $i = 52$ for 322 million links):

Pagerank - basis for Google's initial search engine

Hidden Markov Model


- A **Hidden Markov Model (HMM)** is a belief network:



The probabilities that need to be specified:

Hidden Markov Model

- A **Hidden Markov Model (HMM)** is a belief network:



The probabilities that need to be specified:

- $P(s_0)$ specifies initial conditions
- $P(s_{i+1}|s_i)$ specifies the dynamics
- $P(o_i|s_i)$ specifies the sensor model

Filtering

Filtering:

$$P(S_i | o_1, \dots, o_i)$$

What is the current belief state based on the observation history?

Filtering

Filtering:

$$P(S_i | o_1, \dots, o_i)$$

What is the current belief state based on the observation history?

$$\begin{aligned} P(S_i | o_1, \dots, o_i) &\propto P(o_i | S_i, o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}) P(S_i | o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}) \\ &= ??? \sum_{S_{i-1}} P(S_i S_{i-1} | o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}) \\ &= ??? \end{aligned}$$

Filtering

Filtering:

$$P(S_i | o_1, \dots, o_i)$$

What is the current belief state based on the observation history?

$$\begin{aligned} P(S_i | o_1, \dots, o_i) &\propto P(o_i | S_i, o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}) P(S_i | o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}) \\ &= ??? \sum_{S_{i-1}} P(S_i S_{i-1} | o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}) \\ &= ??? \end{aligned}$$

- Observe O_0 , query S_0 .

Filtering

Filtering:

$$P(S_i | o_1, \dots, o_i)$$

What is the current belief state based on the observation history?

$$\begin{aligned} P(S_i | o_1, \dots, o_i) &\propto P(o_i | S_i, o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}) P(S_i | o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}) \\ &= ??? \sum_{S_{i-1}} P(S_i S_{i-1} | o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}) \\ &= ??? \end{aligned}$$

- Observe O_0 , query S_0 .
- then observe O_1 , query S_1 .

Filtering

Filtering:

$$P(S_i | o_1, \dots, o_i)$$


What is the current belief state based on the observation history?

$$\begin{aligned} P(S_i | o_1, \dots, o_i) &\propto P(o_i | S_i, o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}) P(S_i | o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}) \\ &= ??? \sum_{S_{i-1}} P(S_i S_{i-1} | o_1, \dots, o_{i-1}) \\ &= ??? \end{aligned}$$

- Observe O_0 , query S_0 .
- then observe O_1 , query S_1 .
- then observe O_2 , query S_2 .
- ...


Example: localization

- Suppose a robot wants to determine its location based on its actions and its sensor readings: **Localization**
- This can be represented by the augmented HMM:



Example localization domain

- Circular corridor, with 16 locations:



- Doors at positions: 2, 4, 7, 11.
- Noisy Sensors
- Stochastic Dynamics
- Robot starts at an unknown location and must determine where it is.

Example Sensor Model


- $P(\text{Observe Door} \mid \text{At Door}) = 0.8$
- $P(\text{Observe Door} \mid \text{Not At Door}) = 0.1$

Example Dynamics Model

- $P(loc_{t+1} = L | action_t = goRight \wedge loc_t = L) = 0.1$
- $P(loc_{t+1} = L + 1 | action_t = goRight \wedge loc_t = L) = 0.8$
- $P(loc_{t+1} = L + 2 | action_t = goRight \wedge loc_t = L) = 0.074$
- $P(loc_{t+1} = L' | action_t = goRight \wedge loc_t = L) = 0.002$ for any other location L' .
 - ▶ All location arithmetic is modulo 16.
 - ▶ The action *goLeft* works the same but to the left.

Combining sensor information

- **Example:** we can combine information from a light sensor and the door sensor **Sensor Fusion**




S_t robot location at time t

D_t door sensor value at time t


L_t light sensor value at time t

Naive Bayes Classifier: User's request for help




H is the help page the user is interested in.

Naive Bayes Classifier: User's request for help



H is the help page the user is interested in.
What probabilities are required?

Naive Bayes Classifier: User's request for help




H is the help page the user is interested in.

What probabilities are required?

- $P(h_i)$ for each help page h_i . The user is interested in one best web page, so $\sum_i P(h_i) = 1$.

Naive Bayes Classifier: User's request for help




H is the help page the user is interested in.

What probabilities are required?

- $P(h_i)$ for each help page h_i . The user is interested in one best web page, so $\sum_i P(h_i) = 1$.
- $P(w_j \mid h_i)$ for each word w_j given page h_i . There can be multiple words used in a query.

Naive Bayes Classifier: User's request for help




H is the help page the user is interested in.

What probabilities are required?

- $P(h_i)$ for each help page h_i . The user is interested in one best web page, so $\sum_i P(h_i) = 1$.
- $P(w_j \mid h_i)$ for each word w_j given page h_i . There can be multiple words used in a query.
- Given a help query:

Naive Bayes Classifier: User's request for help



H is the help page the user is interested in.


What probabilities are required?

- $P(h_i)$ for each help page h_i . The user is interested in one best web page, so $\sum_i P(h_i) = 1$.
- $P(w_j \mid h_i)$ for each word w_j given page h_i . There can be multiple words used in a query.
- Given a help query: condition on the words in the query and display the most likely help page.

Simple Language Models: set-of-words

Sentence: w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots

Set-of-words model:




- Each variable is Boolean: *true* when word is in the sentence and *false* otherwise.

Simple Language Models: set-of-words

Sentence: w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots

Set-of-words model:




- Each variable is Boolean: *true* when word is in the sentence and *false* otherwise.
- What probabilities are provided?

Simple Language Models: set-of-words

Sentence: w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots

Set-of-words model:




- Each variable is Boolean: *true* when word is in the sentence and *false* otherwise.
- What probabilities are provided?
 - ▶ $P(\text{"a"}), P(\text{"aardvark"}), \dots, P(\text{"zzz"})$

Simple Language Models: set-of-words

Sentence: w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots

Set-of-words model:



- Each variable is Boolean: *true* when word is in the sentence and *false* otherwise.
- What probabilities are provided?
 - ▶ $P("a"), P("aardvark"), \dots, P("zzz")$
- How do we condition on the question “how can I phone my phone”?

Simple Language Models: bag-of-words

Sentence: $w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots, w_n$.

Bag-of-words or unigram:



- Domain of each variable is the set of all words.

Simple Language Models: bag-of-words

Sentence: $w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots, w_n$.

Bag-of-words or unigram:



- Domain of each variable is the set of all words.
- What probabilities are provided?

Simple Language Models: bag-of-words

Sentence: $w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots, w_n$.

Bag-of-words or unigram:



- Domain of each variable is the set of all words.
- What probabilities are provided?
 - ▶ $P(w_i)$ is a distribution over words for each position

Simple Language Models: bag-of-words

Sentence: $w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots, w_n$.

Bag-of-words or unigram:




- Domain of each variable is the set of all words.
- What probabilities are provided?
 - ▶ $P(w_i)$ is a distribution over words for each position
- How do we condition on the question “how can I phone my phone”?

Simple Language Models: bigram

Sentence: $w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots, w_n$.

bigram:




- Domain of each variable is the set of all words.

Simple Language Models: bigram

Sentence: $w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots, w_n$.

bigram:




- Domain of each variable is the set of all words.
- What probabilities are provided?

Simple Language Models: bigram

Sentence: $w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots, w_n$.

bigram:




- Domain of each variable is the set of all words.
- What probabilities are provided?
 - ▶ $P(w_i|w_{i-1})$ is a distribution over words for each position given the previous word

Simple Language Models: bigram

Sentence: $w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots, w_n$.

bigram:




- Domain of each variable is the set of all words.
- What probabilities are provided?
 - ▶ $P(w_i|w_{i-1})$ is a distribution over words for each position given the previous word
- How do we condition on the question “how can I phone my phone”?

Simple Language Models: trigram

Sentence: $w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots, w_n$.

trigram:




Domain of each variable is the set of all words.

Simple Language Models: trigram

Sentence: $w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots, w_n$.

trigram:




Domain of each variable is the set of all words.
What probabilities are provided?

Simple Language Models: trigram

Sentence: $w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots, w_n$.

trigram:



Domain of each variable is the set of all words.


What probabilities are provided?

- $P(w_i | w_{i-1}, w_{i-2})$

N-gram


- $P(w_i | w_{i-1}, \dots, w_{i-n+1})$ is a distribution over words given the previous $n - 1$ words

Logic, Probability, Statistics, Ontology over time



From: Google Books Ngram Viewer
(<https://books.google.com/ngrams>)

Predictive Typing and Error Correction



$domain(W_i) = \{ "a", "aardvark", \dots, "zzz", "\perp", "?" \}$

$domain(L_{ji}) = \{ "a", "b", "c", \dots, "z", "1", "2", \dots \}$


Beyond N-grams

- *A man with a big hairy cat drank the cold milk.*
- Who or what drank the milk?


Beyond N-grams

- *A man with a big hairy cat drank the cold milk.*
- Who or what drank the milk?


Simple syntax diagram:




Topic Model




Topic Model



Google's rephil



Deep Belief Networks



Stochastic Simulation

- **Idea:** probabilities \leftrightarrow samples
- Get probabilities from samples:

X	<i>count</i>
x_1	n_1
\vdots	\vdots
x_k	n_k
<i>total</i>	m

 \leftrightarrow

X	<i>probability</i>
x_1	n_1/m
\vdots	\vdots
x_k	n_k/m



- If we could sample from a variable's (posterior) probability, we could estimate its (posterior) probability.

Generating samples from a distribution

For a variable X with a discrete domain or a (one-dimensional) real domain:

- Totally order the values of the domain of X .
- Generate the cumulative probability distribution:
 $f(x) = P(X \leq x)$.
- Select a value y uniformly in the range $[0, 1]$.
- Select the x such that $f(x) = y$.

Cumulative Distribution



Hoeffding's inequality

Theorem (Hoeffding): Suppose p is the true probability, and s is the sample average from n independent samples; then

$$P(|s - p| > \epsilon) \leq 2e^{-2n\epsilon^2}.$$

Guarantees a **probably approximately correct** estimate of probability.

Hoeffding's inequality

Theorem (Hoeffding): Suppose p is the true probability, and s is the sample average from n independent samples; then

$$P(|s - p| > \epsilon) \leq 2e^{-2n\epsilon^2}.$$

Guarantees a **probably approximately correct** estimate of probability.

If you are willing to have an error greater than ϵ in δ of the cases, solve $2e^{-2n\epsilon^2} < \delta$ for n , which gives

$$n > \frac{-\ln \frac{\delta}{2}}{2\epsilon^2}.$$

Hoeffding's inequality

Theorem (Hoeffding): Suppose p is the true probability, and s is the sample average from n independent samples; then

$$P(|s - p| > \epsilon) \leq 2e^{-2n\epsilon^2}.$$

Guarantees a **probably approximately correct** estimate of probability.

If you are willing to have an error greater than ϵ in δ of the cases, solve $2e^{-2n\epsilon^2} < \delta$ for n , which gives

$$n > \frac{-\ln \frac{\delta}{2}}{2\epsilon^2}.$$

ϵ	δ	n
0.1	0.05	185
0.01	0.05	18,445
0.1	0.01	265

Forward sampling in a belief network

- Sample the variables one at a time; sample parents of X before sampling X .
- Given values for the parents of X , sample from the probability of X given its parents.

Rejection Sampling

- To estimate a posterior probability given evidence $Y_1 = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Y_j = v_j$:
- Reject any sample that assigns Y_i to a value other than v_i .
- The non-rejected samples are distributed according to the posterior probability:


$$P(\alpha \mid \text{evidence}) \approx \frac{\sum_{\text{sample} \models \alpha} 1}{\sum_{\text{sample}} 1}$$

where we consider only samples consistent with evidence.

Rejection Sampling Example: $P(ta \mid sm, re)$

Observe $Sm = true, Re = true$


	Ta	Fi	Al	Sm	Le	Re
s_1	false	true	false	true	false	false



Rejection Sampling Example: $P(ta \mid sm, re)$

Observe $Sm = true, Re = true$


	Ta	Fi	Al	Sm	Le	Re	
s_1	false	true	false	true	false	false	X
s_2	false	true	true	true	true	true	



Rejection Sampling Example: $P(ta \mid sm, re)$


Observe $Sm = true, Re = true$

	Ta	Fi	Al	Sm	Le	Re	
s_1	false	true	false	true	false	false	✗
s_2	false	true	true	true	true	true	✓
s_3	true	false	true	false			



Rejection Sampling Example: $P(ta \mid sm, re)$


Observe $Sm = true, Re = true$



	Ta	Fi	Al	Sm	Le	Re	
s_1	false	true	false	true	false	false	✗
s_2	false	true	true	true	true	true	✓
s_3	true	false	true	false	—	—	✗
s_4	true	true	true	true	true	true	

Rejection Sampling Example: $P(ta \mid sm, re)$


Observe $Sm = true, Re = true$



	Ta	Fi	Al	Sm	Le	Re	
s_1	false	true	false	true	false	false	✗
s_2	false	true	true	true	true	true	✓
s_3	true	false	true	false	—	—	✗
s_4	true	true	true	true	true	true	✓
...							
s_{1000}	false	false	false	false			

Rejection Sampling Example: $P(ta \mid sm, re)$

Observe $Sm = true, Re = true$



	Ta	Fi	Al	Sm	Le	Re	
s_1	false	true	false	true	false	false	✗
s_2	false	true	true	true	true	true	✓
s_3	true	false	true	false	—	—	✗
s_4	true	true	true	true	true	true	✓
...							
s_{1000}	false	false	false	false	—	—	✗

$$P(sm) = 0.02$$

$$P(re \mid sm) = 0.32$$

How many samples are rejected?

How many samples are used?

Importance Sampling

- Samples have weights: a real number associated with each sample that takes the evidence into account.
- Probability of a proposition is weighted average of samples:


$$P(\alpha \mid \text{evidence}) \approx \frac{\sum_{\text{sample} \models \alpha} \text{weight}(\text{sample})}{\sum_{\text{sample}} \text{weight}(\text{sample})}$$

- Mix exact inference with sampling: don't sample all of the variables, but weight each sample according to $P(\text{evidence} \mid \text{sample})$.

Importance Sampling (Likelihood Weighting)

```
procedure likelihood_weighting( $Bn, e, Q, n$ ):  
   $ans[1 : k] := 0$  where  $k$  is size of  $dom(Q)$   
  repeat  $n$  times:  
     $weight := 1$   
    for each variable  $X_i$  in order:  
      if  $X_i = o_i$  is observed  
         $weight := weight \times P(X_i = o_i \mid parents(X_i))$   
      else assign  $X_i$  a random sample of  $P(X_i \mid parents(X_i))$   
    if  $Q$  has value  $v$ :  
       $ans[v] := ans[v] + weight$   
  return  $ans / \sum_v ans[v]$ 
```

Importance Sampling Example: $P(ta \mid sm, re)$



	Ta	Fi	Al	Le	Weight
s_1	true	false	true	false	
s_2	false	true	false	false	
s_3	false	true	true	true	
s_4	true	true	true	true	
...					
s_{1000}	false	false	true	true	


$$P(sm \mid fi) = 0.9$$

$$P(sm \mid \neg fi) = 0.01$$

$$P(re \mid le) = 0.75$$

$$P(re \mid \neg le) = 0.01$$

Importance Sampling Example: $P(ta \mid sm, re)$



	Ta	Fi	Al	Le	Weight
s_1	true	false	true	false	0.01×0.01
s_2	false	true	false	false	0.9×0.01
s_3	false	true	true	true	0.9×0.75
s_4	true	true	true	true	0.9×0.75
...					
s_{1000}	false	false	true	true	0.01×0.75


$$P(sm \mid fi) = 0.9$$

$$P(sm \mid \neg fi) = 0.01$$

$$P(re \mid le) = 0.75$$

$$P(re \mid \neg le) = 0.01$$

Importance Sampling Example: $P(le \mid sm, ta, \neg re)$



$$P(ta) = 0.02$$

$$P(fi) = 0.01$$

$$P(al \mid fi \wedge ta) = 0.5$$

$$P(al \mid fi \wedge \neg ta) = 0.99$$

$$P(al \mid \neg fi \wedge ta) = 0.85$$

$$P(al \mid \neg fi \wedge \neg ta) = 0.0001$$

$$P(sm \mid fi) = 0.9$$

$$P(sm \mid \neg fi) = 0.01$$

$$P(le \mid al) = 0.88$$

$$P(le \mid \neg al) = 0.001$$

$$P(re \mid le) = 0.75$$

$$P(re \mid \neg le) = 0.01$$

Computing Expectations & Proposal Distributions

Expected value of f with respect to distribution P :

$$\mathcal{E}_P(f) = \sum_w f(w) * P(w)$$

Computing Expectations & Proposal Distributions

Expected value of f with respect to distribution P :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_P(f) &= \sum_w f(w) * P(w) \\ &\approx \frac{1}{n} \sum_s f(s)\end{aligned}$$

s is sampled with probability P . There are n samples.

Computing Expectations & Proposal Distributions

Expected value of f with respect to distribution P :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_P(f) &= \sum_w f(w) * P(w) \\ &\approx \frac{1}{n} \sum_s f(s)\end{aligned}$$

s is sampled with probability P . There are n samples.

$$\mathcal{E}_P(f) = \sum_w f(w) * P(w) / Q(w) * Q(w)$$

Computing Expectations & Proposal Distributions

Expected value of f with respect to distribution P :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_P(f) &= \sum_w f(w) * P(w) \\ &\approx \frac{1}{n} \sum_s f(s)\end{aligned}$$

s is sampled with probability P . There are n samples.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_P(f) &= \sum_w f(w) * P(w)/Q(w) * Q(w) \\ &\approx \frac{1}{n} \sum_s f(s) * P(s)/Q(s)\end{aligned}$$

s is selected according the distribution Q .

The distribution Q is called a **proposal distribution**.

$P(c) > 0$ then $Q(c) > 0$.

Particle Filtering

Importance sampling can be seen as:

for each particle:

for each variable:

sample / absorb evidence / update query

where **particle** is one of the samples.

Particle Filtering

Importance sampling can be seen as:

for each particle:

for each variable:

sample / absorb evidence / update query

where **particle** is one of the samples.

Instead we could do:

for each variable:

for each particle:

sample / absorb evidence / update query

Why?

Particle Filtering

Importance sampling can be seen as:

for each particle:

for each variable:

sample / absorb evidence / update query

where **particle** is one of the samples.

Instead we could do:

for each variable:

for each particle:

sample / absorb evidence / update query

Why?

- We can have a new operation of resampling
- It works with infinitely many variables (e.g., HMM)

Particle Filtering for HMMs

- Start with random chosen particles (say 1000)
- Each particle represents a history.
- Initially, sample states in proportion to their probability.
- Repeat:
 - ▶ **Absorb evidence**: weight each particle by the probability of the evidence given the state of the particle.
 - ▶ **Resample**: select each particle at random, in proportion to the weight of the particle.
Some particles may be duplicated, some may be removed. All new particles have same weight.
 - ▶ **Transition**: sample the next state for each particle according to the transition probabilities.

To answer a query about the current state, use the set of particles as data.

Markov Chain Monte Carlo

To sample from a distribution P :

- Create (ergodic and aperiodic) Markov chain with P as equilibrium distribution.

Let $T(S_{i+1} | S_i)$ be the transition probability.

- Given state s , sample state s' from $T(S | s)$

Markov Chain Monte Carlo

To sample from a distribution P :

- Create (ergodic and aperiodic) Markov chain with P as equilibrium distribution.

Let $T(S_{i+1} | S_i)$ be the transition probability.

- Given state s , sample state s' from $T(S | s)$
- After a while, the states sampled will be distributed according to P .

Markov Chain Monte Carlo

To sample from a distribution P :

- Create (ergodic and aperiodic) Markov chain with P as equilibrium distribution.

Let $T(S_{i+1} | S_i)$ be the transition probability.

- Given state s , sample state s' from $T(S | s)$
- After a while, the states sampled will be distributed according to P .
- Ignore the first samples “burn-in”
— use the remaining samples.
- Samples are not independent of each other
“autocorrelation”.

Sometimes use subset (e.g., 1/1000) of them “thinning”

Markov Chain Monte Carlo

To sample from a distribution P :

- Create (ergodic and aperiodic) Markov chain with P as equilibrium distribution.

Let $T(S_{i+1} | S_i)$ be the transition probability.

- Given state s , sample state s' from $T(S | s)$
- After a while, the states sampled will be distributed according to P .
- Ignore the first samples “burn-in”
— use the remaining samples.
- Samples are not independent of each other
“autocorrelation”.

Sometimes use subset (e.g., 1/1000) of them “thinning”

- **Gibbs sampler**: sample each non-observed variable from the distribution of the variable given the current (or observed) value of the variables in its Markov blanket.