

# Computational Complexity of Inference

Sargur Srihari

[srihari@cedar.buffalo.edu](mailto:srihari@cedar.buffalo.edu)

# Topics

1. What is Inference?
2. Complexity Classes
3. Exact Inference
  1. Variable Elimination
    - Sum-Product Algorithm
  2. Factor Graphs
  3. Exact Inference for Tree graphs
  4. Exact inference in general graphs

# Common BN Inference Problem

- Assume set of variables  $\mathcal{X}$ 
  - $E$ : evidence variables, whose known value is  $e$
  - $Y$ : query variables, whose distrib. we wish to know
- Conditional probability query  $P(Y|E=e)$

$$P(Y|E=e) = \frac{P(Y,e)}{P(e)}$$

From product rule

– Evaluation of Numerator  $P(Y,e)$

- If  $W = \mathcal{X} - Y - E$

$$P(y,e) = \sum_w P(y,e,w)$$

(1) Each term in summation is simply an entry in the distribution

– Evaluation of Denominator  $P(e)$

$$P(e) = \sum_y P(y,e)$$

Rather than marginalizing over  $P(y,e,w)$  this allows reusing computation of (1)

# Ex: Inference with Cancer BN


- Lung Cancer BN is given
  - If Serum Calcium is known, what is  $P(C)$ ?
- We can evaluate it as:

$$P(C | Se) = \frac{P(C, Se)}{P(Se)}$$

– where

$$\begin{aligned} P(C, Se) &= \sum_{A, Ge, E, Sm, L, Gd} P(A, Ge, E, Sm, Se, C, L, Gd) \\ &= \sum_{A, Ge, E, Sm, L, Gd} P(A)P(Ge)P(Gd)P(E | A), P(Sm | A, G)P(Se | C)P(C | E, Sm)P(L | C, Gd) \end{aligned}$$

$$P(Se) = \sum_C P(C, Se)$$



# Analysis of Complexity

- Approach of summing out the variables in the joint distribution is unsatisfactory

$$P(y, e) = \sum_w P(y, e, w)$$


- Returns us to exponential blow-up
    - PGM was precisely designed to avoid this!
- We now show that problem of inference in PGMs is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard
  - Requires exponential time in the worst case except if  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{NP}$
  - Even worse, approximate inference is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard
- Discussion for BNs applies to MNs also

# What is a decision problem?

- Subset sum decision problem
  - Given a set of integers, is there a subset that sums to zero?
    - No polynomial time algorithm to *decide* this
  - Given set  $\omega = \{-2, -3, 15, 14, 7, -10\}$ 
    - The guess  $\{-2, -3, -10, 15\}$  can be *verified* in poly time
- Definition of Decision Problem  $\Pi$ :
  - $L_{\Pi}$  defines a precise set of instances
    - $L_{\Pi}$  consists of integer sets which have a subset that sums to zero
  - Decision problem  $\Pi$ : Is instance  $\omega$  in  $L_{\Pi}$  ?
    - Is  $\omega$  a set of integers with a subset that sums to zero?

# $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{NP}$ decision problems

- Definition of Decision Problem  $\Pi$ :
  - $L_{\Pi}$  defines a precise set of instances
  - Decision problem: Is instance  $\omega$  in  $L_{\Pi}$ ?
- Decision problem  $\Pi$  is in
  - $\mathcal{P}$  if there is an algorithm that decides in poly time
  - $\mathcal{NP}$  if a guess can be verified in poly time
    - Guess is produced non-deterministically
    - Hence the name *non-deterministic polynomial time*
  - Subset sum problem is in  $\mathcal{NP}$
  - But not in  $\mathcal{P}$




# 3-SAT (Satisfiability) decision problem

- Propositional variables  $q_1, \dots, q_n$ 
  - Return *true* if  $C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge \dots \wedge C_m$ , where  $C_i$  is a DNF of 3 binary variables  $q_k$ , has a satisfying assignment,
    - e.g., return true for 3-SAT formula  $(q_1 \vee \sim q_2 \vee \sim q_3) \wedge (\sim q_1 \vee q_2 \vee \sim q_3)$   
since  $q_1=q_2=q_3=\text{true}$  is a satisfying assignment  
and return false for  $(\sim q_1 \vee q_2 \vee \sim q_3) \wedge (q_2 \vee q_3) \wedge (\sim q_1 \vee q_3)$   
which has no satisfying assignments
- SAT problem: whether there exists a satisfying assignment
  - To answer this we need to check  $n$  binary variables  
there are  $2^n$  assignments



# What is $P=NP$ ?

- Decision problem of whether  $\omega$  in  $L_{3-SAT}$ 
  - Can be verified in polynomial time  $P$
  - Another solution is to generate guesses  $\gamma$  that satisfy  $L_{3-SAT}$  and verify if one is  $\omega$
  - If guess verified in polynomial time, in  $NP$
- Deterministic problems are subset of nondeterministic ones. So  $P \subseteq NP$ .
  - Converse is biggest problem in complexity
    - If you can verify in polynomial time, can you decide in polynomial time?
      - Eg., is there a prime greater than  $n$ ?




# P=NP intuition

- *Creating great art*
  - Complexity is NP
- *Appreciating art:*
  - Complexity is P
- Is  $P=NP$ ?
  - Most mathematicians don't think so



# $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard and $\mathcal{NP}$ -complete

- Hardest problems in  $\mathcal{NP}$  are called  $\mathcal{NP}$ -complete
  - If poly time solution exists, can solve any in  $\mathcal{NP}$
  - $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard problems need not have polynomial time verification
- If  $\Pi$  is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard it can be transformed into  $\Pi'$  in  $\mathcal{NP}$
- 3-SAT is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -complete



# BN for 3-SAT

- Propositional variables  $q_1, \dots, q_n$ 
  - Return *true* if  $C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge \dots \wedge C_m$ , where  $C_i$  is a DNF of 3 binary variables  $q_k$ , has a satisfying assignment,
    - e.g., return true for 3-SAT formula  $(q_1 \vee \sim q_2 \vee \sim q_3) \wedge (\sim q_1 \vee q_2 \vee \sim q_3)$  since  $q_1=q_2=q_3=\text{true}$  is a satisfying assignment and return false for  $(\sim q_1 \vee q_2 \vee \sim q_3) \wedge (q_2 \vee q_3) \wedge (\sim q_1 \vee q_3)$  which has no satisfying assignments


BN to infer this:

$P(q_k^1) = 0.5$

$C_i$  are deterministic OR

$A_i$  are deterministic AND

$X$  is output (has value 1 iff all of the  $C_i$ 's are 1



# #P-complete Problem

- Counting the no. of satisfying assignments
  - E.g., Propositional variables  $q_1, \dots, q_n$   
Return *true* if  $C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge \dots \wedge C_m$ ,  
where  $C_i$  is a DNF of 3 binary variables  $q_k$ , has a satisfying assignment,

# Analysis of Exact Inference

- Worst case: CPD is a table of size  $|Val\{X_i\} \cup Pa_{X_i}|$
- Most analyses of complexity are stated as decision-problems
  - Consider decision problem first, then numerical one
- Natural version of conditional probability task:
  - *BN-Pr-DP*: Bayesian Network Decision Problem
    - Given a BN  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\chi$ , a variable  $X \in \chi$ , and a value  $x \in Val(X)$  decide  $P_{\mathcal{B}}(X=x) > 0$
  - This decision problem can be shown to be  $\mathcal{NP}$ -complete

# Proof of *BN-Pr-DP* is $\mathcal{NP}$ -complete

- Whether in  $\mathcal{NP}$  :
  - Guess assignment  $\xi$  to network variables.  
Check whether  $X=x$  and  $P(\xi)>0$
  - One such guess succeeds iff  $P(X=x)>0$ .
  - Done in linear time
- Is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard:
  - Answer for instances in BN-Pr-DP can be used to answer an  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard problem
  - Show a reduction from 3-SAT problem

# Reduction of 3-SAT to BN inference

- Given a 3-SAT formula  $\phi$  create BN  $B_\phi$  with variable  $X$  such that  $\phi$  is satisfiable iff  $P_{B_\phi}(X=x_1) > 0$
- If BN inference is solved in poly time we can also solve 3-SAT in poly time


BN to infer this:

$$P(q_k^1) = 0.5$$

$C_i$  are deterministic OR

$A_i$  are deterministic AND

$X$  is output





# Original Inference Problem

$$p(y) = \sum_x p(y/x)p(x)$$

- It is a numerical problem
  - rather than a decision problem
- *Define BN-Pr*
  - Given a BN  $\mathcal{B}$  over  $\chi$ , a variable  $X \in \chi$ , and a value  $x \in \text{Val}(X)$  compute  $P_{\mathcal{B}}(X=x)$
  - Task is to compute the total probability of instantiations that are consistent with  $X=x$ 
    - Weighted count of instantiations, with weight being the probability
    - This problem is #P-complete

# Analysis of Approximate Inference

- Metrics for quality of approximation

- Absolute Error

- Estimate  $\rho$  has error  $\varepsilon$  for  $P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{e})$  if

$$|P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{e}) - \rho| \leq \varepsilon$$

- If a rare disease has probability  $0.0001$  then error of  $0.0001$  is unacceptable. If the probability is  $0.3$  then error of  $0.0001$  is fine

- Relative Error

- Estimate  $\rho$  has error  $\varepsilon$  for  $P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{e})$  if

$$\rho/(1+\varepsilon) \leq P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{e}) \leq \rho(1+\varepsilon)$$

- $\varepsilon=4$  means  $P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{e})$  is at least 20% of  $\rho$  and at most 600% of  $\rho$ . For low values much better than absolute error

# Approximate Inference is NP-hard

- The following problem is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard
- Given a BN  $B$  over  $\chi$ , a variable  $X \in \chi$  and a value  $x \in \text{Val}(X)$ , find a number  $\rho$  that has relative error  $\varepsilon$  for  $P_B(X=x)$
- Proof:
  - It is NP-hard to decide if  $P_B(x^I) > 0$
  - Assume algorithm returns estimate  $\rho$  to  $P_B(x^I)$  which has relative error  $\varepsilon$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$
  - $\rho > 0$  if and only if  $P_B(x^I) > 0$
  - This achieving relative error is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard

# Inference Algorithms

- Worst case is exponential
- Two types of inference algorithms
  - Exact
    - Variable Elimination
    - Clique trees
  - Approximate
    - Optimization
      - Propagation with approximate messages
      - Variational (analytical approximations)
    - Particle-based (sampling)