

Probabilistic Graphical Models

David Sontag

New York University

Lecture 6, March 7, 2013

Today's lecture

- ① Dual decomposition
- ② MAP inference as an integer linear program
- ③ Linear programming relaxations for MAP inference

MAP inference

- Recall the MAP inference task,

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{x}} p(\mathbf{x}), \quad p(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{c \in C} \phi_c(\mathbf{x}_c)$$

(we assume any evidence has been subsumed into the potentials, as discussed in the last lecture)

- Since the normalization term is simply a constant, this is equivalent to

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{x}} \prod_{c \in C} \phi_c(\mathbf{x}_c)$$

(called the *max-product* inference task)

- Furthermore, since log is monotonic, letting $\theta_c(\mathbf{x}_c) = \lg \phi_c(\mathbf{x}_c)$, we have that this is equivalent to

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{x}} \sum_{c \in C} \theta_c(\mathbf{x}_c)$$

(called *max-sum*)

Exactly solving MAP, beyond trees


- MAP as a discrete optimization problem is

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{x}} \sum_{i \in V} \theta_i(x_i) + \sum_{c \in C} \theta_c(\mathbf{x}_c)$$

- Very general discrete optimization problem – many hard combinatorial optimization problems can be written as this (e.g., 3-SAT)
- Studied in operations research communities, theoretical computer science, AI (constraint satisfaction, weighted SAT), etc.
- Very fast moving field, both for theory and heuristics

Motivating application: protein side-chain placement


- Find “minimum energy” conformation of amino acid side-chains along a fixed carbon backbone:



- Orientations of the side-chains are represented by discretized angles called rotamers
- Rotamer choices for nearby amino acids are energetically coupled (attractive and repulsive forces)

Motivating application: dependency parsing

- Given a sentence, predict the dependency tree that relates the words:



- Arc from head word of each phrase to words that modify it
- May be *non-projective*: each word and its descendants may not be a contiguous subsequence
- m words $\implies m(m-1)$ binary arc selection variables $x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$
- Let $\mathbf{x}_{|i} = \{x_{ij}\}_{j \neq i}$ (all outgoing edges). Predict with:

$$\max_{\mathbf{x}} \theta_T(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{ij} \theta_{ij}(x_{ij}) + \sum_i \theta_{i|}(\mathbf{x}_{|i})$$

Dual decomposition

- Consider the MAP problem for pairwise Markov random fields:

$$\text{MAP}(\theta) = \max_{\mathbf{x}} \sum_{i \in V} \theta_i(x_i) + \sum_{ij \in E} \theta_{ij}(x_i, x_j).$$

- If we push the maximizations *inside* the sums, the value can only *increase*:



$$\text{MAP}(\theta) \leq \sum_{i \in V} \max_{x_i} \theta_i(x_i) + \sum_{ij \in E} \max_{x_i, x_j} \theta_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$$

- Note that the right-hand side can be easily evaluated
- In PS3, problem 2, you showed that one can always *reparameterize* a distribution by operations like

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_i^{\text{new}}(x_i) &= \theta_i^{\text{old}}(x_i) + f(x_i) \\ \theta_{ij}^{\text{new}}(x_i, x_j) &= \theta_{ij}^{\text{old}}(x_i, x_j) - f(x_i)\end{aligned}$$

for **any** function $f(x_i)$, without changing the distribution/energy

Dual decomposition



Dual decomposition

- Define:

$$\tilde{\theta}_i(x_i) = \theta_i(x_i) + \sum_{ij \in E} \delta_{j \rightarrow i}(x_i)$$

$$\tilde{\theta}_{ij}(x_i, x_j) = \theta_{ij}(x_i, x_j) - \delta_{j \rightarrow i}(x_i) - \delta_{i \rightarrow j}(x_j)$$

- It is easy to verify that

$$\sum_i \theta_i(x_i) + \sum_{ij \in E} \theta_{ij}(x_i, x_j) = \sum_i \tilde{\theta}_i(x_i) + \sum_{ij \in E} \tilde{\theta}_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \quad \forall \mathbf{x}$$

- Thus, we have that:

$$\text{MAP}(\theta) = \text{MAP}(\tilde{\theta}) \leq \sum_{i \in V} \max_{x_i} \tilde{\theta}_i(x_i) + \sum_{ij \in E} \max_{x_i, x_j} \tilde{\theta}_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$$

- Every value of δ gives a different upper bound on the value of the MAP!
- The **tightest** upper bound can be obtained by minimizing the r.h.s. with respect to δ !

Dual decomposition

- We obtain the following **dual** objective: $L(\delta) =$

$$\sum_{i \in V} \max_{x_i} \left(\theta_i(x_i) + \sum_{ij \in E} \delta_{j \rightarrow i}(x_i) \right) + \sum_{ij \in E} \max_{x_i, x_j} \left(\theta_{ij}(x_i, x_j) - \delta_{j \rightarrow i}(x_i) - \delta_{i \rightarrow j}(x_j) \right),$$

$$\text{DUAL-LP}(\theta) = \min_{\delta} L(\delta)$$

- This provides an upper bound on the MAP assignment!

$$\text{MAP}(\theta) \leq \text{DUAL-LP}(\theta) \leq L(\delta)$$


- How can find δ which give tight bounds?

Solving the dual efficiently

- Many ways to solve the dual linear program, i.e. minimize with respect to δ :

$$\sum_{i \in V} \max_{x_i} \left(\theta_i(x_i) + \sum_{ij \in E} \delta_{j \rightarrow i}(x_i) \right) + \sum_{ij \in E} \max_{x_i, x_j} \left(\theta_{ij}(x_i, x_j) - \delta_{j \rightarrow i}(x_i) - \delta_{i \rightarrow j}(x_j) \right),$$

- One option is to use the subgradient method
- Can also solve using **block coordinate-descent**, which gives algorithms that look very much like max-sum belief propagation:



Max-product linear programming (MPLP) algorithm

Input: A set of factors $\theta_i(x_i), \theta_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$

Output: An assignment x_1, \dots, x_n that approximates the MAP

Algorithm:

- Initialize $\delta_{i \rightarrow j}(x_j) = 0, \quad \delta_{j \rightarrow i}(x_i) = 0, \quad \forall ij \in E, x_i, x_j$
- Iterate until small enough change in $L(\delta)$:
For each edge $ij \in E$ (sequentially), perform the updates:

$$\delta_{j \rightarrow i}(x_i) = -\frac{1}{2}\delta_i^{-j}(x_i) + \frac{1}{2} \max_{x_j} \left[\theta_{ij}(x_i, x_j) + \delta_j^{-i}(x_j) \right] \quad \forall x_i$$

$$\delta_{i \rightarrow j}(x_j) = -\frac{1}{2}\delta_j^{-i}(x_j) + \frac{1}{2} \max_{x_i} \left[\theta_{ij}(x_i, x_j) + \delta_i^{-j}(x_i) \right] \quad \forall x_j$$

where $\delta_i^{-j}(x_i) = \theta_i(x_i) + \sum_{ik \in E, k \neq j} \delta_{k \rightarrow i}(x_i)$

- Return $x_i \in \arg \max_{\hat{x}_i} \tilde{\theta}_i^{\delta}(\hat{x}_i)$

Generalization to arbitrary factor graphs

Inputs:

- A set of factors $\theta_i(x_i), \theta_f(\mathbf{x}_f)$.

Output:

- An assignment x_1, \dots, x_n that approximates the MAP.

Algorithm:

- Initialize $\delta_{fi}(x_i) = 0, \quad \forall f \in F, i \in f, x_i$.
- Iterate until small enough change in $L(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ (see Eq. 1.2):
For each $f \in F$, perform the updates


$$\delta_{fi}(x_i) = -\delta_i^{-f}(x_i) + \frac{1}{|f|} \max_{\mathbf{x}_{f \setminus i}} \left[\theta_f(\mathbf{x}_f) + \sum_{\hat{i} \in f} \delta_{\hat{i}}^{-f}(x_{\hat{i}}) \right], \quad (1.16)$$

simultaneously for all $i \in f$ and x_i . We define $\delta_i^{-f}(x_i) = \theta_i(x_i) + \sum_{\hat{f} \neq f} \delta_{\hat{f}i}(x_i)$.

- Return $x_i \in \arg \max_{\hat{x}_i} \bar{\theta}_i^{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\hat{x}_i)$ (see Eq. 1.6).


Experimental results

Comparison of four coordinate descent algorithms on a 10×10 two dimensional Ising grid:



Experimental results

Performance on stereo vision inference task:



Today's lecture

- ① Dual decomposition
- ② MAP inference as an integer linear program
- ③ Linear programming relaxations for MAP inference

MAP as an integer linear program (ILP)

- MAP as a discrete optimization problem is

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{x}} \sum_{i \in V} \theta_i(x_i) + \sum_{ij \in E} \theta_{ij}(x_i, x_j).$$

- To turn this into an integer linear program, we introduce indicator variables


- ① $\mu_i(x_i)$, one for each $i \in V$ and state x_i
- ② $\mu_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$, one for each edge $ij \in E$ and pair of states x_i, x_j

- The objective function is then

$$\max_{\mu} \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{x_i} \theta_i(x_i) \mu_i(x_i) + \sum_{ij \in E} \sum_{x_i, x_j} \theta_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \mu_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$$

- What is the dimension of μ , if binary variables?

Visualization of feasible μ vectors



What are the constraints?

- Force every “cluster” of variables to choose a local assignment:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_i(x_i) &\in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i \in V, x_i \\ \sum_{x_i} \mu_i(x_i) &= 1 \quad \forall i \in V \\ \mu_{ij}(x_i, x_j) &\in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall ij \in E, x_i, x_j \\ \sum_{x_i, x_j} \mu_{ij}(x_i, x_j) &= 1 \quad \forall ij \in E\end{aligned}$$

- Enforce that these local assignments are globally consistent:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_i(x_i) &= \sum_{x_j} \mu_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \quad \forall ij \in E, x_i \\ \mu_j(x_j) &= \sum_{x_i} \mu_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \quad \forall ij \in E, x_j\end{aligned}$$

MAP as an integer linear program (ILP)

$$\text{MAP}(\theta) = \max_{\mu} \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{x_i} \theta_i(x_i) \mu_i(x_i) + \sum_{ij \in E} \sum_{x_i, x_j} \theta_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \mu_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$$

subject to:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_i(x_i) &\in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i \in V, x_i \\ \sum_{x_i} \mu_i(x_i) &= 1 \quad \forall i \in V \\ \mu_i(x_i) &= \sum_{x_j} \mu_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \quad \forall ij \in E, x_i \\ \mu_j(x_j) &= \sum_{x_i} \mu_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \quad \forall ij \in E, x_j \end{aligned}$$

- Many extremely good off-the-shelf solvers, such as CPLEX and Gurobi

Linear programming relaxation for MAP

Integer linear program was:

$$\text{MAP}(\theta) = \max_{\mu} \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{x_i} \theta_i(x_i) \mu_i(x_i) + \sum_{ij \in E} \sum_{x_i, x_j} \theta_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \mu_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$$

subject to

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_i(x_i) &\in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i \in V, x_i \\ \sum_{x_i} \mu_i(x_i) &= 1 \quad \forall i \in V \\ \mu_i(x_i) &= \sum_{x_j} \mu_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \quad \forall ij \in E, x_i \\ \mu_j(x_j) &= \sum_{x_i} \mu_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \quad \forall ij \in E, x_j \end{aligned}$$

Relax integrality constraints, allowing the variables to be **between** 0 and 1:

$$\mu_i(x_i) \in [0, 1] \quad \forall i \in V, x_i$$

Linear programming relaxation for MAP

Linear programming relaxation is:

$$\text{LP}(\theta) = \max_{\mu} \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{x_i} \theta_i(x_i) \mu_i(x_i) + \sum_{ij \in E} \sum_{x_i, x_j} \theta_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \mu_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_i(x_i) &\in [0, 1] \quad \forall i \in V, x_i \\ \sum_{x_i} \mu_i(x_i) &= 1 \quad \forall i \in V \\ \mu_i(x_i) &= \sum_{x_j} \mu_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \quad \forall ij \in E, x_i \\ \mu_j(x_j) &= \sum_{x_i} \mu_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \quad \forall ij \in E, x_j \end{aligned}$$

- Linear programs can be solved **efficiently**! Simplex method, interior point, ellipsoid algorithm
- Since the LP relaxation maximizes over a **larger** set of solutions, its value can only be *higher*

$$\text{MAP}(\theta) \leq \text{LP}(\theta)$$

- LP relaxation is **tight** for tree-structured MRFs

Dual decomposition = LP relaxation

- Recall we obtained the following **dual** linear program: $L(\delta) =$

$$\sum_{i \in V} \max_{x_i} \left(\theta_i(x_i) + \sum_{ij \in E} \delta_{j \rightarrow i}(x_i) \right) + \sum_{ij \in E} \max_{x_i, x_j} \left(\theta_{ij}(x_i, x_j) - \delta_{j \rightarrow i}(x_i) - \delta_{i \rightarrow j}(x_j) \right),$$
$$\text{DUAL-LP}(\theta) = \min_{\delta} L(\delta)$$

- We showed two ways of upper bounding the value of the MAP assignment:

$$\text{MAP}(\theta) \leq \text{LP}(\theta) \tag{1}$$


$$\text{MAP}(\theta) \leq \text{DUAL-LP}(\theta) \leq L(\delta) \tag{2}$$

- Although we derived these linear programs in seemingly very different ways, it turns out that:

$$\text{LP}(\theta) = \text{DUAL-LP}(\theta)$$

- The dual LP allows us to upper bound the value of the MAP assignment without solving a LP to optimality

Linear programming duality



(Dual) LP relaxation

(Primal) LP relaxation

Marginal polytope

$$\text{MAP}(\theta) \leq \text{LP}(\theta) = \text{DUAL-LP}(\theta) \leq L(\delta)$$

Other approaches to solve MAP

- Graph cuts
- Local search
 - Start from an arbitrary assignment (e.g., random). Iterate:
 - Choose a variable. Change a new state for this variable to maximize the value of the resulting assignment
- Branch-and-bound
 - Exhaustive search over space of assignments, pruning branches that can be provably shown not to contain a MAP assignment
 - Can use the LP relaxation or its dual to obtain upper bounds
 - Lower bound obtained from value of any assignment found
- Branch-and-cut (most powerful method; used by CPLEX & Gurobi)
 - Same as branch-and-bound; spend more time getting tighter bounds
 - Adds *cutting-planes* to cut off fractional solutions of the LP relaxation, making the upper bound tighter