

Bayesian Nonparametrics in Document and Language Modeling



Yee Whye Teh

Gatsby Computational Neuroscience Unit, UCL

July 2009

Overview


A horizontal yellow brushstroke with a textured, painterly appearance, extending across the width of the slide below the title.

- Dirichlet processes and infinite mixture models
- Hierarchical Dirichlet processes
- Document topic modeling
- Language modeling

Dirichlet Processes and Infinite Mixture Models

A thick, horizontal yellow brushstroke with a textured, painterly appearance, extending across the width of the slide below the title.

Clustering



- Basic technique of machine learning, data mining, statistics.
- Many algorithms and models:
 - ❖ K-means
 - ❖ mixture models
 - ❖ spectral clustering
 - ❖ affinity propagation
- Issues:
 - ❖ Where are the clusters?
 - ❖ How many clusters?

Mixture Models



- Data $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$
- Probabilistic generative model:
 - ❖ Each cluster is modeled by a distribution (e.g. Gaussian parametrized by mean and covariance).
 - ❖ For each data item x_i
 - ▶ pick a cluster z_i from K clusters
 - ▶ generate x_i from corresponding distribution.

$$p(\mathbf{x}|\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n \sum_{z_i=1}^K \pi_{z_i} p(x_i|z_i, \theta_{z_i})$$

- Find “best fitting” parameter for data.

$$\theta^{\text{ML}} = \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmax}} p(\mathbf{x}|\theta)$$

Bayesian Mixture Models

- How do we determine the number of clusters?
 - ❖ Probability of data always increases with increasing K since more flexibility with more degrees of freedom.
 - ❖ Can use cross-validation or other external measures of fitness.
- Bayesian approach:
 - ❖ Account for parameters by introducing a *prior* to regularize them.
 - ❖ Compute *posterior distribution* over parameters and latent variables:

$$p(\theta, \mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{p(\theta)p(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}|\theta)}{p(\mathbf{x})}$$

- ❖ Because nothing is “fitted” to data, the Bayesian approach does not overfit (if done properly).
- ❖ Since Bayesian approaches do not overfit, there is (theoretically) no reason to use small models anymore.

Infinite Mixture Models

- We can consider mixture models with *really large* numbers of clusters.
 - ❖ Consider infinite mixture models [Neal 1992, Rasmussen 2000].

- The finite mixture model with K components:

$$\pi \sim \text{Dirichlet}\left(\frac{\alpha}{K}, \dots, \frac{\alpha}{K}\right)$$


$$\theta_k \sim H$$

$$z_i | \pi \sim \text{Multinomial}(\pi)$$

$$x_i | z_i, \theta_{z_i} \sim F(\theta_{z_i})$$

- Now take $K \rightarrow \infty$.

- But what does this infinite limit mean?



Infinite Mixture Models



- Philosophically: encode prior belief that data arise from complex processes that cannot be described with a finite mixture model.
- Algorithmically: infinite limit of algorithms for posterior computation makes sense (and can in fact be more efficient than finite versions).
- But what is the infinite limit of the model itself?
 - ❖ This is a stochastic process called the *Dirichlet process*.


Dirichlet Processes

- Dirichlet process is a distribution over distributions:

$$G \sim \text{DP}(\alpha, H)$$

- A draw from a DP is a random discrete distribution:

$$G = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \pi_k \delta_{\theta_k} \quad \begin{array}{l} \pi_k \geq 0 \\ \sum_k \pi_k = 1 \\ \theta_k \sim H \end{array}$$



[Ferguson 1973, Blackwell & MacQueen 1973, Sethuraman 1994]


Dirichlet Processes

- Dirichlet process is a distribution over distributions:

$$G \sim \text{DP}(\alpha, H)$$

- A draw from a DP is a random discrete distribution:

$$G = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \pi_k \delta_{\theta_k} \quad \begin{array}{l} \pi_k \geq 0 \\ \sum_k \pi_k = 1 \\ \theta_k \sim H \end{array}$$



[Ferguson 1973, Blackwell & MacQueen 1973, Sethuraman 1994]


Dirichlet Processes

- Dirichlet process is a distribution over distributions:

$$G \sim \text{DP}(\alpha, H)$$

- A draw from a DP is a random discrete distribution:

$$G = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \pi_k \delta_{\theta_k} \quad \begin{array}{l} \pi_k \geq 0 \\ \sum_k \pi_k = 1 \\ \theta_k \sim H \end{array}$$



[Ferguson 1973, Blackwell & MacQueen 1973, Sethuraman 1994]



Dirichlet Processes

- Dirichlet process is a distribution over distributions:

$$G \sim \text{DP}(\alpha, H)$$

- A draw from a DP is a random discrete distribution:

$$G = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \pi_k \delta_{\theta_k} \quad \begin{array}{l} \pi_k \geq 0 \\ \sum_k \pi_k = 1 \\ \theta_k \sim H \end{array}$$



[Ferguson 1973, Blackwell & MacQueen 1973, Sethuraman 1994]



Dirichlet Processes

- Dirichlet process is a distribution over distributions:

$$G \sim \text{DP}(\alpha, H)$$

- A draw from a DP is a random discrete distribution:

$$G = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \pi_k \delta_{\theta_k} \quad \begin{array}{l} \pi_k \geq 0 \\ \sum_k \pi_k = 1 \\ \theta_k \sim H \end{array}$$



[Ferguson 1973, Blackwell & MacQueen 1973, Sethuraman 1994]

Dirichlet Process Mixture Models

- Dirichlet process mixture model:

$$G|\alpha, H \sim \text{DP}(\alpha, H)$$

$$\phi_i|G \sim G$$


$$x_i|\phi_i \sim F(\phi_i)$$

- Since

$$G = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \pi_k \delta_{\theta_k}$$

Data item i is assigned to cluster k ($\phi_i = \theta_k$) with probability π_k .

- This is a mixture of an infinite number of clusters.



Bayesian Nonparametrics




- Real data is often complicated, no parametric model is suitable.
- Model selection is often hard, and nonparametric models sidestep this issue at a little extra cost.
- Nonparametric models are never truly “nonparametric”:
 - ❖ often start with a parametric backbone, and “nonparametrize” aspects that do not fit data well.
 - ❖ results in semiparametric models.
- Note of caution on consistency:
 - ❖ some nonparametric models are not.
 - ❖ Lots of recent work on showing consistency of various models.

Hierarchical Dirichlet Processes


A thick, horizontal yellow brushstroke with a textured, painterly appearance, extending across the width of the slide below the title.

Clustering of Related Groups of Data



- Multiple groups of data.
- Wish to cluster each group, using DP mixture models.
- Clusters are shared across multiple groups.

Clustering of Related Groups of Data



- Multiple groups of data.
- Wish to cluster each group, using DP mixture models.
- Clusters are shared across multiple groups.

Document Topic Modeling

- Model each document as bag of words coming from an underlying set of topics [Hofmann 2001, Blei et al 2003].


CARSON, Calif., April 3 - Nissan Motor Corp said it is raising the suggested retail price for its cars and trucks sold in the United States by 1.9 pct, or an average 212 dollars per vehicle, effective April 6....

Auto industry
Market economy
US geography
Plain old English

DETROIT, April 3 - Sales of U.S.-built new cars surged during the last 10 days of March to the second highest levels of 1987. Sales of imports, meanwhile, fell for the first time in years, succumbing to price hikes by foreign carmakers.....


- Summarize documents.
- Document/query comparisons.
- Topics are shared across documents.
- Don't know #topics beforehand.

Multi-Population Genetics



- Individuals can be clustered into a number of genotypes, with each population having a different proportion of genotypes [Xing et al 2006].
- Sharing genotypes among individuals in a population, and across different populations.
- Indeterminate number of genotypes.


Visual Modeling



- Model each image as bag of visual words (descriptors) organized into scenes and objects [Fei-Fei & Perona 2005, Sivic et al 2005, Sudderth et al 2007].
- Objects can appear in multiple scenes.
- Number of object types to be inferred from data.


Sharing in Grouped Data

- Sharing in grouped data using hierarchical Bayesian models [Gelman et al 1995].




- The hierarchical Dirichlet process is a hierarchical Bayesian model that shares clusters among groups.

Dirichlet Process Mixture for Grouped Data?




- Introduce dependencies between groups by making parameters random?
- If H is smooth, then clusters will not be shared between groups.



- But if the base distribution were discrete....

Hierarchical Dirichlet Process Mixture Models



➤ Making base distribution discrete forces groups to share clusters.

➤ Hierarchical Dirichlet process:

$$G_0 \sim \text{DP}(\gamma, H)$$


$$G_1 \sim \text{DP}(\alpha, G_0)$$

$$G_2 \sim \text{DP}(\alpha, G_0)$$

➤ Extension to deeper hierarchies is straightforward.

[Teh et al 2006]

Hierarchical Dirichlet Process Mixture Models



Document Topic Modeling

A thick, horizontal yellow brushstroke with a textured, painterly appearance, extending across the width of the slide below the title.

Document Topic Modeling

- Model each document as bag of words coming from an underlying set of topics [Hofmann 2001, Blei et al 2003].

CARSON, Calif., April 3 - Nissan Motor Corp said it is raising the suggested retail price for its cars and trucks sold in the United States by 1.9 pct, or an average 212 dollars per vehicle, effective April 6....

Auto industry
Market economy
US geography
Plain old English

DETROIT, April 3 - Sales of U.S.-built new cars surged during the last 10 days of March to the second highest levels of 1987. Sales of imports, meanwhile, fell for the first time in years, succumbing to price hikes by foreign carmakers.....

- Summarize documents.
- Document/query comparisons.
- Topics are shared across documents.
- Don't know #topics beforehand.

Latent Dirichlet Allocation

- Latent Dirichlet Allocation models each document as a finite mixture model, with clusters (topics) shared across documents.

- Each document j has its own mixing proportions:

$$\pi_j \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K)$$

- Each word i in document j is generated as follows:

$$z_{ji} \sim \text{Multinomial}(\pi_j) \qquad x_{ji} | z_{ji} \sim \text{Multinomial}(\theta_{z_{ji}})$$

- Each cluster (topic) has a prior:

$$\theta_k \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_W)$$

[Blei et al 2003]

Latent Dirichlet Allocation

217
INSECT
MYB
PHEROMONE
LENS
LARVAE

274
SPECIES
PHYLOGENETIC
EVOLUTION
EVOLUTIONARY
SEQUENCES

126
GENE
VECTOR
VECTORS
EXPRESSION
TRANSFER

63
STRUCTURE
ANGSTROM
CRYSTAL
RESIDUES
STRUCTURES

200
FOLDING
NATIVE
PROTEIN
STATE
ENERGY

209
NUCLEAR
NUCLEUS
LOCALIZATION
CYTOPLASM
EXPORT

42
NEURAL
DEVELOPMENT
DORSAL
EMBRYOS
VENTRAL

2
SPECIES
GLOBAL
CLIMATE
CO2
WATER

280
SPECIES
SELECTION
EVOLUTION
GENETIC
POPULATIONS

15
CHROMOSOME
REGION
CHROMOSOMES
KB
MAP

64
CELLS
CELL
ANTIGEN
LYMPHOCYTES
CD4

102
TUMOR
CANCER
TUMORS
HUMAN
CELLS

112
HOST
BACTERIAL
BACTERIA
STRAINS
SALMONELLA

210
SYNAPTIC
NEURONS
POSTSYNAPTIC
HIPPOCAMPAL
SYNAPSES

201
RESISTANCE
RESISTANT
DRUG
DRUGS
SENSITIVE

165
CHANNEL
CHANNELS
VOLTAGE
CURRENT
CURRENTS

142
PLANTS
PLANT
ARABIDOPSIS
TOBACCO
LEAVES

222
CORTEX
BRAIN
SUBJECTS
TASK
AREAS

39
THEORY
TIME
SPACE
GIVEN
PROBLEM

105
HAIR
MECHANICAL
MB
SENSORY
EAR

221
LARGE
SCALE
DENSITY
OBSERVED
OBSERVATIONS

270
TIME
SPECTROSCOPY
NMR
SPECTRA
TRANSFER

55
FORCE
SURFACE
MOLECULES
SOLUTION
SURFACES

114
POPULATION
POPULATIONS
GENETIC
DIVERSITY
ISOLATES

109
RESEARCH
NEW
INFORMATION
UNDERSTANDING
PAPER

120
AGE
OLD
AGING
LIFE
YOUNG

[Griffiths & Steyvers 2004]

Infinite Latent Dirichlet Allocation



- The HDP can be directly applied to produce a nonparametric LDA with an infinite number of topics.

- Each document j has its own DP:

$$G_j \sim \text{DP}(\alpha, G_0)$$


- Each word i in document j is generated as follows:

$$\phi_{ji} \sim G_j \qquad x_{ji} | \phi_{ji} \sim \text{Multinomial}(\phi_{ji})$$


- Clusters (topics) are shared across documents by imposing DP prior on base distribution:

$$G_0 \sim \text{DP}(\gamma, \text{Dirichlet}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_W))$$

Document Topic Modeling



Document Topic Modeling



Other HDP-based Models



- Topic models:
 - ❖ Topic models for multiple collections of documents.
 - ❖ Nested Chinese restaurant process [Blei et al 2004]
 - ▶ Tree of topics, specialized topics at leaves, general ones at top.
 - ❖ Pachinko allocation [Li et al 2007]
 - ▶ DAG-structure modeling complex correlations among topics.
- Multi-population haplotype inference [Xing et al 2006, 2007]
 - ❖ Infers haplotypes from genotypes of haploid organisms.
- Infinite hidden Markov models [Beal et al 2002, Teh et al 2006]
 - ❖ HMMs with an infinite number of states.
- Transformed DPs [Sudderth et al 2007]

Language Modeling

A thick, horizontal yellow brushstroke with a textured, painterly appearance, extending across the width of the slide below the title.

Statistical Language Models

- Consider N-gram language models:

$$P(\text{sentence}) = \prod P(\text{word}_i | \text{word}_{i-N+1} \dots \text{word}_{i-1})$$

- Large vocabulary size means naïvely estimating parameters of this model from data counts is almost useless for $N > 2$.

$$P^{\text{ML}}(\text{word}_i | \text{word}_{i-N+1} \dots \text{word}_{i-1}) = \frac{C(\text{word}_{i-N+1} \dots \text{word}_i)}{C(\text{word}_{i-N+1} \dots \text{word}_{i-1})}$$

- Naïve regularization fails as well---*most* parameters will have *no* associated data.
- Sparsity becomes worse for more complex language models---*minuscule* amounts of labelled data.
 - ❖ Smoothing techniques are necessary to make language models work.

Hierarchical Bayesian Language Models



- Hierarchical Bayesian modeling to share statistical strength among different components of the language model.
 - ❖ [MacKay and Peto 1994], [Gelman et al 1995]
- Specifically: hierarchical model based on the *tree of suffixes*.
 - ❖ Assumes more recent words in context are more important.
- Use *Pitman-Yor processes* as priors [Teh 2006, Goldwater et al 2006]:
 - ❖ [Perman, Pitman and Yor 1992], [Ishwaran and James 2001]
 - ❖ Better models of power-law behaviour in natural languages [Goldwater et al 2006].
- State-of-the-art language modeling results.
- Strongly related to *interpolated and modified Kneser-Ney*.

Hierarchical Modelling on the Suffix Tree

- Basic assumption: words appearing later in a context are more important.


hidden Markov \rightarrow model

$G_{\text{hidden Markov}}(\text{model})$

- Vector of probabilities over current word after context u : $G_u = [G_u(w)]$

$$G_u(w) \geq 0$$

$$\sum_w G_u(w) = 1$$



Hierarchical Dirichlet Language Models


- What is $P(G_u | G_{\text{pa}(u)})$?
- Standard Dirichlet distribution over probability vectors---bad!
 - ❖ [MacKay and Peto 1994]

T	N	IKN	MKN	HDLM
2e6	3	148.8	144.1	191.2
4e6	3	137.1	132.7	172.7
6e6	3	130.6	126.7	162.3
8e6	3	125.9	122.3	154.7
10e6	3	122.0	118.6	148.7
12e6	3	119.0	115.8	144.0
14e6	3	116.7	113.6	140.5
14e6	2	169.9	169.2	180.6
14e6	4	106.1	102.4	136.6

*Data derived from
APNews limited to a
vocabulary of
17964 words.
[Bengio et al 2003]
14M training set
1M validation set
1M test set*

Pitman-Yor Processes

- Easiest to understand them using Chinese restaurant processes.




$$p(\text{ sit at table } k) \propto n_k - d$$
$$p(\text{ sit at new table }) \propto \alpha + dK$$

- Pitman-Yor processes produce power-law distributions over words [Goldwater, Griffiths and Johnson 2005]:
 - ❖ Small number of common word types, large number of rare types.
- This is more suitable than Dirichlet distributions for languages.

Pitman-Yor Processes

- Easiest to understand them using Chinese restaurant processes.




$$p(\text{ sit at table } k) \propto n_k - d$$
$$p(\text{ sit at new table }) \propto \alpha + dK$$

- Pitman-Yor processes produce power-law distributions over words [Goldwater, Griffiths and Johnson 2005]:
 - ❖ Small number of common word types, large number of rare types.
- This is more suitable than Dirichlet distributions for languages.

Pitman-Yor Processes

- Easiest to understand them using Chinese restaurant processes.




$$p(\text{ sit at table } k) \propto n_k - d$$
$$p(\text{ sit at new table }) \propto \alpha + dK$$

- Pitman-Yor processes produce power-law distributions over words [Goldwater, Griffiths and Johnson 2005]:
 - ❖ Small number of common word types, large number of rare types.
- This is more suitable than Dirichlet distributions for languages.

Pitman-Yor Processes

- Easiest to understand them using Chinese restaurant processes.




$$p(\text{ sit at table } k) \propto n_k - d$$
$$p(\text{ sit at new table }) \propto \alpha + dK$$

- Pitman-Yor processes produce power-law distributions over words [Goldwater, Griffiths and Johnson 2005]:
 - ❖ Small number of common word types, large number of rare types.
- This is more suitable than Dirichlet distributions for languages.

Pitman-Yor Processes

- Easiest to understand them using Chinese restaurant processes.




$$p(\text{ sit at table } k) \propto n_k - d$$
$$p(\text{ sit at new table }) \propto \alpha + dK$$

- Pitman-Yor processes produce power-law distributions over words [Goldwater, Griffiths and Johnson 2005]:
 - ❖ Small number of common word types, large number of rare types.
- This is more suitable than Dirichlet distributions for languages.

Pitman-Yor Processes

- Easiest to understand them using Chinese restaurant processes.




$$p(\text{ sit at table } k) \propto n_k - d$$
$$p(\text{ sit at new table }) \propto \alpha + dK$$

- Pitman-Yor processes produce power-law distributions over words [Goldwater, Griffiths and Johnson 2005]:
 - ❖ Small number of common word types, large number of rare types.
- This is more suitable than Dirichlet distributions for languages.

Pitman-Yor Processes

- Easiest to understand them using Chinese restaurant processes.




$$p(\text{ sit at table } k) \propto n_k - d$$
$$p(\text{ sit at new table }) \propto \alpha + dK$$

- Pitman-Yor processes produce power-law distributions over words [Goldwater, Griffiths and Johnson 2005]:
 - ❖ Small number of common word types, large number of rare types.
- This is more suitable than Dirichlet distributions for languages.

Pitman-Yor Processes

- Easiest to understand them using Chinese restaurant processes.




$$p(\text{ sit at table } k) \propto n_k - d$$
$$p(\text{ sit at new table }) \propto \alpha + dK$$

- Pitman-Yor processes produce power-law distributions over words [Goldwater, Griffiths and Johnson 2005]:
 - ❖ Small number of common word types, large number of rare types.
- This is more suitable than Dirichlet distributions for languages.

Pitman-Yor Processes

- Easiest to understand them using Chinese restaurant processes.




$$p(\text{ sit at table } k) \propto n_k - d$$
$$p(\text{ sit at new table }) \propto \alpha + dK$$

- Pitman-Yor processes produce power-law distributions over words [Goldwater, Griffiths and Johnson 2005]:
 - ❖ Small number of common word types, large number of rare types.
- This is more suitable than Dirichlet distributions for languages.

Pitman-Yor Processes

- Easiest to understand them using Chinese restaurant processes.




$$p(\text{ sit at table } k) \propto n_k - d$$
$$p(\text{ sit at new table }) \propto \alpha + dK$$

- Pitman-Yor processes produce power-law distributions over words [Goldwater, Griffiths and Johnson 2005]:
 - ❖ Small number of common word types, large number of rare types.
- This is more suitable than Dirichlet distributions for languages.


Power Law Properties of Pitman-Yor Processes

- Produce power-law distributions more suitable for languages.



Power Law Properties of Pitman-Yor Processes

- Produce power-law distributions more suitable for languages.



Perplexity Results

- We get state-of-the-art language modeling results using a hierarchical Pitman-Yor language model (HPYLM).

T	n	IKN	MKN	HDLM	HPYLM	HPYCV
2e6	3	148.8	144.1	191.2	145.7	144.3
4e6	3	137.1	132.7	172.7	134.3	132.7
6e6	3	130.6	126.7	162.3	127.9	126.4
8e6	3	125.9	122.3	154.7	123.2	121.9
10e6	3	122.0	118.6	148.7	119.4	118.2
12e6	3	119.0	115.8	144.0	116.5	115.4
14e6	3	116.7	113.6	140.5	114.3	113.2
14e6	2	169.9	169.2	180.6	169.6	169.3
14e6	4	106.1	102.4	136.6	103.8	101.9

Extensions and Applications



- Conversational speech recognition [Huang and Renals 2007].
- Domain adaptation [Wood and Teh 2009].
- Variable/infinite length contexts [Mochihashi and Sumita 2007, Wood et al 2009].
- Combining word level and character level models for word segmentation [Mochihashi et al 2009].

Conclusions



- Bayesian nonparametrics
 - ❖ allows flexible modeling of data
 - ❖ automates choice of model complexity
 - ❖ leads to state-of-the-art models
- Bayesian nonparametrics for document modeling:
 - ❖ Topic models that succinctly describes documents.
 - ❖ Model complexity learned automatically.
- Bayesian nonparametrics for language modeling:
 - ❖ Coherent probabilistic model with state-of-the-art results.
 - ❖ Interpolated Kneser-Ney as approximate inference in the hierarchical Pitman-Yor language model.

Thank You!



- For more information:
 - ❖ Dirichlet Processes. Y. W. Teh (submitted).
 - ❖ Hierarchical Bayesian Nonparametric Models with Applications. Y. W. Teh and M. I. Jordan (2009).
 - ❖ Various tutorials by Michael Jordan, Zoubin Ghahramani, Volker Tresp, Peter Orbanz, myself.