

Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) Inference

Seung-Hoon Na

Chonbuk National University


Monte Carlo Approximation

- Generate some (unweighted) samples from the posterior: $\mathbf{x}^s \sim p(\mathbf{x}|\mathcal{D})$
- Use these samples to compute any quantity of interest
 - Posterior marginal: $p(x_1|D)$
 - Posterior predictive: $p(y|D)$
 - ...

$$\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{D}] \approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S f(\mathbf{x}^s)$$

Sampling from standard distributions

- Using the cdf
 - Based on the **inverse probability transform**



Sampling from standard distributions: Inverse CDF

Theorem 23.2.1. *If $U \sim U(0, 1)$ is a uniform rv, then $F^{-1}(U) \sim F$.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(F^{-1}(U) \leq x) &= \Pr(U \leq F(x)) \quad (\text{applying } F \text{ to both sides}) \\ &= F(x) \quad (\text{because } \Pr(U \leq y) = y)\end{aligned}$$

Sampling from standard distributions: Inverse CDF

- Example: Exponential distribution

$$\text{Expon}(x|\lambda) \triangleq \lambda e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{I}(x \geq 0)$$

$$F(x) = 1 - e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{I}(x \geq 0) \quad \leftarrow \text{cdf}$$

$$F^{-1}(p) = -\frac{\ln(1-p)}{\lambda}$$

➡ $U \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$

$$F^{-1}(U) \sim \text{Expon}(\lambda)$$

Sampling from a Gaussian: Box-Muller Method


- Sample $z_1, z_2 \in (-1, 1)$ uniformly
- Discard (z_1, z_2) that do not inside the unit-circle, so satisfying $\rightarrow z_1^2 + z_2^2 \leq 1$
- $p(z) = \frac{1}{\pi} I(z \text{ incide circle})$
- Define

$$x_i = z_i \left(\frac{-2 \ln r^2}{r^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad r^2 = z_1^2 + z_2^2$$


$$\begin{aligned} p(x_1, x_2) &= p(z_1, z_2) \left| \frac{\partial(z_1, z_2)}{\partial(x_1, x_2)} \right| \\ &= \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}x_1^2\right) \right] \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}x_2^2\right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Sampling from a Gaussian: Box-Muller Method

- Polar coordinate상에서 sampling
- r 을 normal distribution에 비례하도록 샘플 \rightarrow Exponential 분포
- θ 를 uniform하게 샘플 \rightarrow 주어진 r 에 대해 x, y 를 uniform하게 분포



Sampling from a Gaussian: Box-Muller Method

- $X \sim N(0,1)$ $Y \sim N(0,1)$
 - $p(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2+y^2}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{2}\right)$
 - $r^2 \sim \text{Exp}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)$  • $z = r^2$
 - $\text{Exp}(\lambda) = \frac{-\log(U(0,1))}{\lambda}$ • $P(z) = P(r) \frac{dr}{dz} = 0.5 P(r)$
 - $r \sim \sqrt{-2 \log(U(0,1))}$ • $P(r) = 2P(z) = \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{2}\right)$
- $$\begin{aligned} P(U \leq 1 - \exp(-0.5r^2)) \\ &= P(r^2 \leq -2\log U) \\ &= P(r \leq \sqrt{-2\log U}) \end{aligned}$$


Sampling from a Gaussian: Box-Muller Method

- 1. Draw $u_1, u_2 \sim U(0,1)$
- 2. Transform to polar rep.
 - $r = \sqrt{-2\log(u_1)}$ $\theta = 2\pi u_2$
- 3. Transform to Cartesian rep.
 - $x = r \cos \theta$ $y = r \sin \theta$

Rejection sampling

- when the inverse cdf method cannot be used
- Create a **proposal distribution** $q(x)$ which satisfies $Mq(x) \geq \tilde{p}(x)$
 - $Mq(x)$ provides an upper envelope for $\tilde{p}(x)$
- Sample $x \sim q(x)$
- Sample $u \sim U(0,1)$
- If $u > \frac{\tilde{p}(x)}{Mq(x)}$, reject the sample
- Otherwise accept it

Rejection sampling



Rejection sampling: Proof

- Why rejection sampling works?

- Let
$$S = \{(x, u) : u \leq \tilde{p}(x)/Mq(x)\}$$
$$S_0 = \{(x, u) : x \leq x_0, u \leq \tilde{p}(x)/Mq(x)\}$$

- The cdf of the accepted point:

$$\begin{aligned} P(x \leq x_0 | x \text{ accepted}) &= \frac{P(x \leq x_0, x \text{ accepted})}{P(x \text{ accepted})} \\ &= \frac{\int \int \mathbb{I}((x, u) \in S_0) q(x) du dx}{\int \int \mathbb{I}((x, u) \in S) q(x) du dx} = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{x_0} \tilde{p}(x) dx}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{p}(x) dx} \end{aligned}$$

➡ $p(x)$

Rejection sampling


- How efficient is this method?

- $P(\text{accept}) = \int q(x) \int [I(x, u) \in S] du dx$

$$= \int \frac{\tilde{p}(x)}{Mq(x)} q(x) dx = \frac{1}{M} \int \tilde{p}(x) dx$$

$$\int_0^1 I(u \leq y) = y$$

➔ We need to choose M as small as possible while still satisfying $Mq(x) \geq \tilde{p}(x)$



Rejection sampling: Example

- Suppose we want to sample from a Gamma

$$\text{Ga}(x|\alpha, \lambda) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} x^{\alpha-1} \lambda^{\alpha} \exp(-\lambda x)$$

- When α is an integer, i. e., $\alpha = k$, we can use:

$$X_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Expon}(\lambda)$$

$$Y = X_1 + \cdots + X_k$$

➔ $Y \sim \text{Ga}(k, \lambda)$

- But, for **non-integer** α , we cannot use this trick & instead use rejection sampling

Rejection sampling: Example

- Use $\text{Ga}(k, \lambda - 1)$ as a proposal, where $k = \lfloor \alpha \rfloor$
- To obtain M as small as possible, check the ratio $p(x)/q(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{p(x)}{q(x)} &= \frac{\text{Ga}(x|\alpha, \lambda)}{\text{Ga}(x|k, \lambda - 1)} = \frac{x^{\alpha-1} \lambda^\alpha \exp(-\lambda x) / \Gamma(\alpha)}{x^{k-1} (\lambda - 1)^k \exp(-(\lambda - 1)x) / \Gamma(k)} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(k) \lambda^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha) (\lambda - 1)^k} x^{\alpha-k} \exp(-x)\end{aligned}$$

- This ratio attains its maximum when $x = \alpha - k$


$$\Rightarrow M = \frac{\text{Ga}(\alpha - k|\alpha, \lambda)}{\text{Ga}(\alpha - k|k, \lambda - 1)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{p(x)}{q(x)} &\leq M \\ &\downarrow \\ \frac{p(x)}{Mq(x)} &\leq 1\end{aligned}$$

Rejection sampling: Example

$$\text{Ga}(\alpha = 5.7, \lambda = 2)$$

- Proposal $M\text{Ga}(k, \lambda - 1) \rightarrow k = \lfloor 5.7 \rfloor = 5$



Rejection Sampling:

Application to Bayesian Statistics

- Suppose we want to draw (unweighted) samples from the posterior

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D}) = p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})/p(\mathcal{D})$$


- Use rejection sampling
 - Target distribution $\tilde{p}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$
 - Proposal: $q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$
 - M: $M = p(\mathcal{D}|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \arg \max p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$
- Accepting probability:

$$\frac{\tilde{p}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{M q(\boldsymbol{\theta})} = \frac{p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})}{p(\mathcal{D}|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}$$

Adaptive rejection sampling

- Upper bound the log density with a piecewise linear function

$$q(x) = M_i \lambda_i \exp(-\lambda_i(x - x_{i-1})), \quad x_{i-1} < x \leq x_i$$



Importance Sampling

- MC methods for approximating integrals of the form:

$$I = \mathbb{E}[f] = \int f(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}$$

- The idea: Draw samples \mathbf{x} in regions which have high probability, $p(\mathbf{x})$, but also where $|f(\mathbf{x})|$ is large
- Define $f(\mathbf{x}) = I(\mathbf{x} \in E)$
- Sample from a proposal $q(\mathbf{x}) \propto f(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x})$ than to sample from $p(\mathbf{x})$ itself

Importance Sampling

- Samples from any proposal $q(\mathbf{x})$ to estimate the integral:

$$\mathbb{E}[f] = \int f(\mathbf{x}) \frac{p(\mathbf{x})}{q(\mathbf{x})} q(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S w_s f(\mathbf{x}^s) = \hat{I}$$

$$w_s \triangleq \frac{p(\mathbf{x}^s)}{q(\mathbf{x}^s)} \leftarrow \text{importance weights.}$$

- How should we choose the proposal?
 - Minimize the variance of the estimate \hat{I}

$$\text{var}_{q(\mathbf{x})} [f(\mathbf{x})w(\mathbf{x})] = \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{x})} [f^2(\mathbf{x})w^2(\mathbf{x})] - I^2$$

Importance Sampling

- By Jensen's inequality, we have $E[u^2(\mathbf{x})] \geq E[u(\mathbf{x})]^2$
- Setting $u(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{x})|f(\mathbf{x})|}{q(\mathbf{x})} = w(\mathbf{x})|f(\mathbf{x})|$, we have the lower bound:

$$\mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{x})} [f^2(\mathbf{x})w^2(\mathbf{x})] \geq (\mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{x})} [|f(\mathbf{x})w(\mathbf{x})|])^2 = \left(\int |f(\mathbf{x})|p(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} \right)^2$$

$u(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{x})|f(\mathbf{x})|}{q(\mathbf{x})}$ 가 상수이면 equality가 성립

➡ $q(\mathbf{x}) \propto p(\mathbf{x})|f(\mathbf{x})|$

$$q^*(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{|f(\mathbf{x})|p(\mathbf{x})}{\int |f(\mathbf{x}')|p(\mathbf{x}')d\mathbf{x}'}$$

Importance Sampling:


Handling unnormalized distributions

- When only **unnormalized target distribution** and **proposals** are available without Z_p, Z_q ?

$$\mathbb{E}[f] = \frac{Z_q}{Z_p} \int f(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\tilde{p}(\mathbf{x})}{\tilde{q}(\mathbf{x})} q(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \approx \frac{Z_q}{Z_p} \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \tilde{w}_s f(\mathbf{x}^s)$$
$$\tilde{w}_s \triangleq \frac{\tilde{p}(\mathbf{x}^s)}{\tilde{q}(\mathbf{x}^s)} \leftarrow \text{unnormalized importance weight}$$

- Use the **same** set of samples to evaluate Z_q / Z_p :

$$\frac{Z_p}{Z_q} = \frac{1}{Z_q} \int \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \int \frac{\tilde{p}(\mathbf{x})}{\tilde{q}(\mathbf{x})} q(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \tilde{w}_s$$


$$\hat{I} = \frac{\frac{1}{S} \sum_s \tilde{w}_s f(\mathbf{x}^s)}{\frac{1}{S} \sum_s \tilde{w}_s} = \sum_{s=1}^S w_s f(\mathbf{x}^s) \quad w_s \triangleq \frac{\tilde{w}_s}{\sum_{s'} \tilde{w}_{s'}}$$

Ancestral sampling for PGM

- **Ancestral sampling**
 - Sample the root nodes,
 - then sample their children,
 - then sample their children, etc.
- This is okay when we have no evidence

Ancestral sampling

Procedure Forward-Sample (

\mathcal{B} // Bayesian network over \mathcal{X}

)

1 Let X_1, \dots, X_n be a topological ordering of \mathcal{X}


2 **for** $i = 1, \dots, n$

3 $\mathbf{u}_i \leftarrow \mathbf{x} \langle \text{Pa}_{X_i} \rangle$ // Assignment to Pa_{X_i} in x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}

4 Sample x_i from $P(X_i \mid \mathbf{u}_i)$

5 **return** (x_1, \dots, x_n)

Ancestral sampling: Example



Rejection sampling for PGM

- Now, suppose that we have some **evidence** with interest in conditional queries :

$$P(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{E} = \mathbf{e})$$

- **Rejection sampling (local sampling)**
 - Perform ancestral sampling,
 - but as soon as we sample a value that is inconsistent with an observed value, reject the whole sample and start again
- However, rejection sampling is very inefficient (requiring so many samples) & cannot be applied for real-valued evidences

Importance Sampling for DGM: Likelihood weighting

- **Likelihood weighting**

- Sample unobserved variables as before, conditional on their parents; But don't sample observed variables; instead we just use their observed values.
- This is equivalent to using a proposal of the form:

$$q(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{t \notin E} p(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}(t)}) \prod_{t \in E} \delta_{x_t^*}(x_t)$$

←the set of observed nodes

- The corresponding importance weight:

$$w(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{x})}{q(\mathbf{x})} = \prod_{t \notin E} \frac{p(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}(t)})}{p(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}(t)})} \prod_{t \in E} \frac{p(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}(t)})}{1} = \prod_{t \in E} p(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{\text{pa}(t)})$$

Likelihood weighting

Procedure LW-Sample (

\mathcal{B} , // Bayesian network over \mathcal{X}

$\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{z}$ // Event in the network

)

1 Let X_1, \dots, X_n be a topological ordering of \mathcal{X}

2 $w \leftarrow 1$

3 **for** $i = 1, \dots, n$

4 $\mathbf{u}_i \leftarrow \mathbf{x} \langle \text{Pa}_{X_i} \rangle$ // Assignment to Pa_{X_i} in x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}

5 **if** $X_i \notin \mathbf{Z}$ **then**

6 Sample x_i from $P(X_i \mid \mathbf{u}_i)$


7 **else**

8 $x_i \leftarrow \mathbf{z} \langle X_i \rangle$ // Assignment to X_i in \mathbf{z}

9 $w \leftarrow w \cdot P(x_i \mid \mathbf{u}_i)$

10 **return** $(x_1, \dots, x_n), w$

Likelihood weighting



Sampling importance resampling (SIR)

- Draw unweighted samples by first using importance sampling $p(\mathbf{x}) \approx \sum_s w_s \delta_{\mathbf{x}^s}(\mathbf{x})$
- Sample with replacement where the probability that we pick \mathbf{x}_s is w_s

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{p}(x \leq x_0) &= \sum_s \mathbb{I}(x^s \leq x_0) w_s = \frac{\sum_s \mathbb{I}(x^s \leq x_0) \tilde{p}(x^s)/q(x^s)}{\sum_s \tilde{p}(x^s)/q(x^s)} \\ &\rightarrow \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(x \leq x_0) \frac{\tilde{p}(x)}{q(x)} q(x) dx}{\int \frac{\tilde{p}(x)}{q(x)} q(x) dx} \\ &= \frac{\int \mathbb{I}(x \leq x_0) \tilde{p}(x) dx}{\int \tilde{p}(x) dx} = \int \mathbb{I}(x \leq x_0) p(x) dx = p(x \leq x_0)\end{aligned}$$

Sampling importance resampling (SIR)

$$p(\mathbf{x}) \approx \frac{1}{S'} \sum_{s=1}^{S'} \delta_{\mathbf{x}^s}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{Typically } S' \ll S$$

- Application: Bayesian inference

- Goal: draw samples from the posterior

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathcal{D}) = p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})/p(\mathcal{D})$$

- Unnormalized posterior: $\tilde{p}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$

- Proposal: $q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$


- Normalized weights:

$$w_s = \frac{\tilde{p}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s)/q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s)}{\sum_{s'} \tilde{p}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{s'})/q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{s'})} = \frac{p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_s)}{\sum_{s'} p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{s'})}$$

- Then, we use SIR to sample from $p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$

Particle Filtering

- **Simulation based**, algorithm for recursive Bayesian inference
 - Sequential importance sampling → resampling



Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)

- 1) Construct a Markov chain on the state space X
 - whose stationary distribution is the target density $p^*(\mathbf{x})$ of interest
- 2) Perform a random walk on the state space
 - in such a way that the fraction of time we spend in each state \mathbf{x} is proportional to $p^*(\mathbf{x})$
- 3) By drawing (correlated!) samples $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots$, from the chain, perform Monte Carlo integration wrt p^*

Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) vs. Variational inference

- Variational inference
 - (1) for small to medium problems, it is usually faster;
 - (2) it is deterministic;
 - (3) is it easy to determine when to stop;
 - (4) it often provides a lower bound on the log likelihood.

Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) vs. Variational inference

- MCMC
 - (1) it is often easier to implement;
 - (2) it is applicable to a broader range of models, such as models whose size or structure changes depending on the values of certain variables (e.g., as happens in matching problems), or models without nice conjugate priors;
 - (3) sampling can be faster than variational methods when applied to really huge models or datasets.

Gibbs Sampling

- Sample each variable in turn, conditioned on the values of all the other variables in the distribution
- For example, if we have $D = 3$ variables

$$x_1^{s+1} \sim p(x_1 | x_2^s, x_3^s)$$

$$x_2^{s+1} \sim p(x_2 | x_1^{s+1}, x_3^s)$$

$$x_3^{s+1} \sim p(x_3 | x_1^{s+1}, x_2^{s+1})$$

- Need to derive **full conditional** for variable /

$$p(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{-i})$$

Gibbs Sampling: Ising model

$$p(x_t | \mathbf{x}_{-t}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \propto \prod_{s \in \text{nbr}(t)} \psi_{st}(x_s, x_t)$$

$$\psi(x_s, x_t) = \exp(J x_s x_t)$$

- Full conditional

$$\begin{aligned} p(x_t = +1 | \mathbf{x}_{-t}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{\prod_{s \in \text{nbr}(t)} \psi_{st}(x_t = +1, x_s)}{\prod_{s \in \text{nbr}(t)} \psi_{st}(x_t = +1, x_s) + \prod_{s \in \text{nbr}(t)} \psi_{st}(x_t = -1, x_s)} \\ &= \frac{\exp[J \sum_{s \in \text{nbr}(t)} x_s]}{\exp[J \sum_{s \in \text{nbr}(t)} x_s] + \exp[-J \sum_{s \in \text{nbr}(t)} x_s]} \\ &= \frac{\exp[J \eta_t]}{\exp[J \eta_t] + \exp[-J \eta_t]} = \text{sigm}(2J \eta_t) \end{aligned}$$

$$\eta_t \triangleq \sum_{s \in \text{nbr}(t)} J x_s = x_t(a_t - d_t)$$

Gibbs Sampling: Ising model

- Combine an Ising prior with a local evidence term ψ_t


$$\psi_t(x_t) = \mathcal{N}(y_t|x_t, \sigma^2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} p(x_t = +1|\mathbf{x}_{-t}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{\exp[J\eta_t]\psi_t(+1)}{\exp[J\eta_t]\psi_t(+1) + \exp[-J\eta_t]\psi_t(-1)} \\ &= \text{sigm} \left(2J\eta_t - \log \frac{\psi_t(+1)}{\psi_t(-1)} \right) \end{aligned}$$


Gibbs Sampling: Ising model

- Ising prior with $W_{ij} = J = 1$
 - Gaussian noise model with $\sigma = 2$

sample 1, Gibbs




sample 5, Gibbs



Gibbs Sampling: Ising model

mean after 15 sweeps of Gibbs



Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM)

$$p(\mathbf{x}_i | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_i | \boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k)$$

- Likelihood function

$$p(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{X} | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_i \prod_k \pi_k^{z_{ik}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_i | \boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k^{-1})^{z_{ik}}$$

- Factored conjugate prior

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \text{Dir}(\boldsymbol{\pi} | \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0) \prod_k \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k | \mathbf{m}_0, (\beta_0 \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)^{-1}) \text{Wi}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k | \mathbf{L}_0, \nu_0)$$

Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM): Variational EM

- Standard VB approximation to the posterior:

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}_{1:N} | \mathcal{D}) \approx q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \prod_i q(\mathbf{z}_i)$$

- Mean field approximation

$$\log q_j(\mathbf{x}_j) = \mathbb{E}_{-q_j} [\log \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x})] + \text{const}$$

- VBEM results in the optimal form of $q(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$:

$$q(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = q(\mathbf{z} | \boldsymbol{\theta}) q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \left[\prod_i \text{Cat}(\mathbf{z}_i | \mathbf{r}_i) \right] \left[\text{Dir}(\boldsymbol{\pi} | \boldsymbol{\alpha}) \prod_k \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k | \mathbf{m}_k, (\beta_k \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k)^{-1}) \text{Wi}(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_k | \mathbf{L}_k, \nu_k) \right]$$

[Ref] Gaussian Models

• Marginals and conditionals of a Gaussian model

• $p(\mathbf{x}) \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \mu_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{21} & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_{11} & \Lambda_{12} \\ \Lambda_{21} & \Lambda_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

• Marginals:

$$p(\mathbf{x}_1) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_1 | \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11})$$

$$p(\mathbf{x}_2) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_2 | \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22})$$

• Posterior

conditionals:

$$p(\mathbf{x}_1 | \mathbf{x}_2) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_1 | \boldsymbol{\mu}_{1|2}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{1|2})$$

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{1|2} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22}^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)$$

$$= \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{11}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{12} (\mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)$$

$$= \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{1|2} (\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{11} \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{12} (\mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2))$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{1|2} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21} = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{11}^{-1}$$

[Ref] Gaussian Models

- Linear Gaussian systems

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\mu}_x, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x)$$

$$p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y)$$

- The posterior:

$$p(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\mu}_{x|y}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{x|y})$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{x|y}^{-1} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x^{-1} + \mathbf{A}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y^{-1} \mathbf{A}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{x|y} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{x|y} [\mathbf{A}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{b}) + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_x]$$

- The normalization constant:

$$p(\mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\mu}_x + \mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y + \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x\mathbf{A}^T)$$

[Ref] Gaussian Models: Posterior distribution of μ

- The likelihood wrt μ : $p(\mathcal{D}|\mu) = \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}|\mu, \frac{1}{N}\Sigma)$
- The prior: $p(\mu) = \mathcal{N}(\mu|\mathbf{m}_0, \mathbf{V}_0)$
- The posterior:

$$p(\mu|\mathcal{D}, \Sigma) = \mathcal{N}(\mu|\mathbf{m}_N, \mathbf{V}_N)$$

$$\mathbf{V}_N^{-1} = \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} + N\Sigma^{-1}$$

$$\mathbf{m}_N = \mathbf{V}_N(\Sigma^{-1}(N\bar{\mathbf{x}}) + \mathbf{V}_0^{-1}\mathbf{m}_0)$$

[Ref] Gaussian Models: Posterior distribution of Σ

- The likelihood form of Σ

$$p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \propto |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|^{-\frac{N}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_\mu \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})\right)$$

- The conjugate prior: the inverse Wishart distribution

$$\text{IW}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|\mathbf{S}_0^{-1}, \nu_0) \propto |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|^{-(\nu_0+D+1)/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(\mathbf{S}_0 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})\right)$$

The posterior:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|\mathcal{D}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) &\propto |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|^{-\frac{N}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_\mu)\right) |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|^{-(\nu_0+D+1)/2} \\ &\quad \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_0)\right) \\ &= |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|^{-\frac{N+(\nu_0+D+1)}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}\left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(\mathbf{S}_\mu + \mathbf{S}_0)\right]\right) \\ &= \text{IW}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|\mathbf{S}_N, \nu_N) \end{aligned}$$

$$\nu_N = \nu_0 + N$$

$$\mathbf{S}_N^{-1} = \mathbf{S}_0 + \mathbf{S}_\mu$$

Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM): Gibbs Sampling

- Full joint distribution:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) &= p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})p(\mathbf{z}|\boldsymbol{\pi})p(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \prod_{k=1}^K p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k)p(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k) \\ &= \left(\prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^K (\pi_k \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_i | \boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k))^{\mathbb{I}(z_i=k)} \right) \times \\ &\quad \text{Dir}(\boldsymbol{\pi}|\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \prod_{k=1}^K \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k | \mathbf{m}_0, \mathbf{V}_0) \text{IW}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k | \mathbf{S}_0, \nu_0) \end{aligned}$$

Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM): Gibbs Sampling

- The full conditionals:

$$p(z_i = k | \mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) \propto \pi_k \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_i | \boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k)$$

$$p(\boldsymbol{\pi} | \mathbf{z}) = \text{Dir}(\{\alpha_k + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{I}(z_i = k)\}_{k=1}^K)$$

$$p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k | \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k | \mathbf{m}_k, \mathbf{V}_k)$$

$$\mathbf{V}_k^{-1} = \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} + N_k \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1}$$

$$\mathbf{m}_k = \mathbf{V}_k (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1} N_k \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k + \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{m}_0)$$

$$N_k \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{I}(z_i = k)$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \triangleq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{I}(z_i = k) \mathbf{x}_i}{N_k}$$

Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM): Gibbs Sampling

$$p(\Sigma_k | \mu_k, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}) = \text{IW}(\Sigma_k | \mathbf{S}_k, \nu_k)$$

$$\mathbf{S}_k = \mathbf{S}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{I}(z_i = k) (\mathbf{x}_i - \mu_k)(\mathbf{x}_i - \mu_k)^T$$

$$\nu_k = \nu_0 + N_k$$

Label switching problem

- **Unidentifiability**

- The parameters of the model θ , and the indicator functions \mathbf{z} , are unidentifiable
- We can arbitrarily permute the hidden labels without affecting the likelihood

- Monte Carlo average of the samples for clusters:

- Samples for cluster 1 may be used for samples for cluster 2

- **Labeling switching problem**

- If we could average over all modes, we would find $E[\boldsymbol{\mu}_k | D]$ is the same for all k

Collapsed Gibbs sampling

- Analytically integrate out some of the unknown quantities, and just sample the rest.
- Suppose we sample \mathbf{z} and integrate out $\boldsymbol{\theta}$
- Thus the $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ parameters do not participate in the Markov chain;
- Consequently we can draw conditionally independent samples

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^s \sim p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{z}^s, \mathcal{D})$$

➔ This will have much lower variance than samples drawn from the joint state space



Rao-Blackwellisation


Collapsed Gibbs sampling

- **Theorem 24.2.1** (Rao-Blackwell)
 - *Let \mathbf{z} and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ be dependent random variables, and $f(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ be some scalar function. Then*

$$\text{var}_{\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} [f(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta})] \geq \text{var}_{\mathbf{z}} [\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} [f(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) | \mathbf{z}]]$$

➔ The variance of the estimate created by analytically integrating out $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ will always be lower (or rather, will never be higher) than the variance of a direct MC estimate.

Collapsed Gibbs sampling



Collapsed Gibbs: GMM

- Analytically integrate out the model parameters $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, and just sample the indicators \mathbf{z}
 - Once we integrate out $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, all the z_i nodes become inter-dependent.
 - once we integrate out $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$, all the x_i nodes become inter-dependent
- Full conditionals:

$$\begin{aligned}
 p(z_i = k | \mathbf{z}_{-i}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) &\propto p(z_i = k | \mathbf{z}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) p(\mathbf{x} | z_i = k, \mathbf{z}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \\
 &\propto p(z_i = k | \mathbf{z}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) p(\mathbf{x}_i | \mathbf{x}_{-i}, z_i = k, \mathbf{z}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \\
 &\quad p(\mathbf{x}_{-i} | \cancel{z_i = k}, \mathbf{z}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \\
 &\propto p(z_i = k | \mathbf{z}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) p(\mathbf{x}_i | \mathbf{x}_{-i}, z_i = k, \mathbf{z}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\beta})
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\mathbf{m}_0, \mathbf{V}_0, \mathbf{S}_0, \nu_0)$$

Collapsed Gibbs: GMM

- Suppose a symmetric prior of the form $\boldsymbol{\pi} = \text{Dir}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ and $\alpha_v = \alpha/K$

$$p(z_1, \dots, z_N | \alpha) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)}{\Gamma(N + \alpha)} \prod_{k=1}^K \frac{\Gamma(N_k + \alpha/K)}{\Gamma(\alpha/K)}$$

- Integrating out $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, using Dirichlet-multinomial formula:

$$\begin{aligned} p(z_i = k | \mathbf{z}_{-i}, \alpha) &= \frac{p(\mathbf{z}_{1:N} | \alpha)}{p(\mathbf{z}_{-i} | \alpha)} = \frac{\frac{1}{\Gamma(N + \alpha)}}{\frac{1}{\Gamma(N + \alpha - 1)}} \times \frac{\Gamma(N_k + \alpha/K)}{\Gamma(N_{k,-i} + \alpha/K)} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(N + \alpha - 1)}{\Gamma(N + \alpha)} \frac{\Gamma(N_{k,-i} + 1 + \alpha/K)}{\Gamma(N_{k,-i} + \alpha/K)} = \frac{N_{k,-i} + \alpha/K}{N + \alpha - 1} \end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^K N_{k,-i} = N - 1$$

[ref] Dirichlet-multinomial

- The marginal likelihood for the Dirichlet-multinoulli model:


$$p(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{B(\mathbf{N} + \boldsymbol{\alpha})}{B(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}$$

$$B(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \frac{\prod_{k=1}^K \Gamma(\alpha_k)}{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)}$$

$$p(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{\Gamma(\sum_k \alpha_k)}{\Gamma(N + \sum_k \alpha_k)} \prod_k \frac{\Gamma(N_k + \alpha_k)}{\Gamma(\alpha_k)}$$

Collapsed Gibbs: GMM

$$p(\mathbf{x}_i | \mathbf{x}_{-i}, \mathbf{z}_{-i}, z_i = k, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = p(\mathbf{x}_i | \mathcal{D}_{-i,k})$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{-i,k} = \{\mathbf{x}_j : z_j = k, j \neq i\}$$


All the data assigned to cluster k except for \mathbf{x}_i

To compute $p(\mathbf{x}_i | \mathcal{D}_{-i,k})$, we remove \mathbf{x}_i 's statistics from its current cluster (namely z_i), and then evaluate \mathbf{x}_i under each cluster's posterior predictive. Once we have picked a new cluster, we add \mathbf{x}_i 's statistics to this new cluster


Collapsed Gibbs: GMM

- Collapsed Gibbs sampler for a mixture model

```
1 for each  $i = 1 : N$  in random order do  
2   Remove  $\mathbf{x}_i$ 's sufficient statistics from old cluster  $z_i$  ;  
3   for each  $k = 1 : K$  do  
4     Compute  $p_k(\mathbf{x}_i) \triangleq p(\mathbf{x}_i | \{\mathbf{x}_j : z_j = k, j \neq i\})$  ;  
5   Compute  $p(z_i = k | \mathbf{z}_{-i}, \mathcal{D}) \propto (N_{k,-i} + \alpha/K)p_k(\mathbf{x}_i)$ ;  
6   Sample  $z_i \sim p(z_i | \cdot)$  ;  
7   Add  $\mathbf{x}_i$ 's sufficient statistics to new cluster  $z_i$ 
```


Collapsed Gibbs vs. Vanilla Gibbs

a mixture of $K = 4$ 2-d Gaussians applied to $N = 300$ data points



Collapsed Gibbs vs. Vanilla Gibbs

logprob averaged over 100 different random initializations.



Metropolis Hastings algorithm

- At each step, propose to move from the current state \mathbf{x} to a new state \mathbf{x}' with probability $q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x})$
 - q : the **proposal distribution**
 - E.g.) $q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x}, \Sigma)$

Random walk Metropolis algorithm

$$q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x}) = q(\mathbf{x}')$$

independence sampler

Metropolis Hastings algorithm

- The acceptance probability if the proposal is symmetric, $q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x}) = q(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{x}')$

$$r = \min\left(1, \frac{p^*(\mathbf{x}')}{p^*(\mathbf{x})}\right) \quad \leftarrow \text{Given target distribution}$$

- The acceptance probability if the proposal is asymmetric $q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x}) \neq q(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{x}')$
 - Need the **Hastings correction**

$$r = \min(1, \alpha)$$
$$\alpha = \frac{p^*(\mathbf{x}')q(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{x}')}{p^*(\mathbf{x})q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x})} = \frac{p^*(\mathbf{x}')/q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x})}{p^*(\mathbf{x})/q(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{x}')}$$

Metropolis Hastings algorithm

- When evaluating α , we only need to know unnormalized density

- $$p^*(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \tilde{p}(\mathbf{x})$$

$$\alpha = \frac{(\tilde{p}(\mathbf{x}')/Z) q(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{x}')}{(\tilde{p}(\mathbf{x})/Z) q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x})}$$

Metropolis Hastings algorithm

1 Initialize x^0 ;

2 for $s = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ do

3	Define $x = x^s$;
---	--------------------

4	Sample $x' \sim q(x' x)$;
---	----------------------------

5	Compute acceptance probability
---	--------------------------------

$$\alpha = \frac{\tilde{p}(x')q(x|x')}{\tilde{p}(x)q(x'|x)}$$

Compute $r = \min(1, \alpha)$;

6	Sample $u \sim U(0, 1)$;
---	---------------------------

7	Set new sample to
---	-------------------

$$x^{s+1} = \begin{cases} x' & \text{if } u < r \\ x^s & \text{if } u \geq r \end{cases}$$

Metropolis Hastings algorithm

- Gibbs sampling is a special case of MH, using the proposal:

$$q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x}) = p(x'_i|\mathbf{x}_{-i})\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{x}'_{-i} = \mathbf{x}_{-i})$$

- Then, the acceptance probability is 100%

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= \frac{p(\mathbf{x}')q(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{x}')}{p(\mathbf{x})q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x})} = \frac{p(x'_i|\mathbf{x}'_{-i})p(\mathbf{x}'_{-i})p(x_i|\mathbf{x}'_{-i})}{p(x_i|\mathbf{x}_{-i})p(\mathbf{x}_{-i})p(x'_i|\mathbf{x}_{-i})} \\ &= \frac{p(x'_i|\mathbf{x}_{-i})p(\mathbf{x}_{-i})p(x_i|\mathbf{x}_{-i})}{p(x_i|\mathbf{x}_{-i})p(\mathbf{x}_{-i})p(x'_i|\mathbf{x}_{-i})} = 1\end{aligned}$$

Metropolis Hastings: Example


MH with $N(0, 1.000^2)$ proposal

An example of the Metropolis Hastings algorithm for sampling from a mixture of two 1D Gaussians

$(\mu = (-20, 20), \pi = (0.3, 0.7), \sigma = (100, 100))$

MH sampling results using a Gaussian proposal with the variance $v = 1$

$$q(x'|x) = \mathcal{N}(x'|x, v)$$



Metropolis Hastings: Example


MH with $\mathcal{N}(0, 500.000^2)$ proposal

An example of the Metropolis Hastings algorithm for sampling from a mixture of two 1D Gaussians

$(\mu = (-20, 20), \pi = (0.3, 0.7), \sigma = (100, 100))$

MH sampling results using a Gaussian proposal with the variance $v = 500$

$$q(x'|x) = \mathcal{N}(x'|x, v)$$



Metropolis Hastings: Example


MH with $N(0, 8.000^2)$ proposal

An example of the Metropolis Hastings algorithm for sampling from a mixture of two 1D Gaussians

$(\mu = (-20, 20), \pi = (0.3, 0.7), \sigma = (100, 100))$

MH sampling results using a Gaussian proposal with the variance $v = 8$

$$q(x'|x) = \mathcal{N}(x'|x, v)$$



Metropolis Hastings: Gaussian Proposals

- 1) an independence proposal

$$q(\mathbf{w}'|\mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{w}'|\hat{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{H}^{-1})$$

- 2) a random walk proposal

$$q(\mathbf{w}'|\mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{w}'|\mathbf{w}, s^2\mathbf{H}^{-1})$$

MH for binary logistic regression


$$q(\mathbf{w}'|\mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{w}, \frac{2.38^2}{D} (\mathbf{V}_0^{-1} + \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X})^{-1}\right)$$

$$p(\mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}_0) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{D} &= \text{diag}(\mu_i(1 - \mu_i)) \\ \mu_i &= \text{sigm}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}^T \mathbf{x}_i) \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbf{H}_l = \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} \quad \mathbf{H} = \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} + \mathbf{H}_l$$


Metropolis Hastings: Example

- MH for binary logical regression



Metropolis Hastings: Example

- MH for binary logical regression
 - Initialize the chain at the mode, computed using IRLS
 - Use the random walk Metropolis sampler



Metropolis Hastings: Example

- MH for binary logical regression

