Machine Learning

The Multivariate Normal Distributions

Lecture Notes 2: The Multivariate Normal Distributions

Professor: Zhihua Zhang

Scribe: Cheng Chen, Luo Luo, Cong Xie

1.2.3 Sample Mean and Covariance Matrix

Definition 1.10. Sample mean is $\overline{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x}_i$ in which $\mathbb{E}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_j) = \boldsymbol{\mu}$

Definition 1.11. Sample covariance is

$$\mathbf{S} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\mathbf{x}_i - \overline{\mathbf{x}}) (\mathbf{x}_i - \overline{\mathbf{x}})^T$$

$$= \frac{1}{n-1} \mathbf{X}^T (\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T) (\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T) \mathbf{X}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n-1} \mathbf{X}^T (\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}_n^T) \mathbf{X}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{H}_n \mathbf{X}$$

where $\mathbf{X} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1^T \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_n^T \end{pmatrix}$ and \mathbf{H}_n is the centering matrix. And we can prove that $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{S}) = \mathbf{\Sigma}$.

Definition 1.12. With metric $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is p.d, the Mahalanbis distance between $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, is the square root of $\Delta^2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})^T \Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$. If the $\Sigma = \mathbf{I}$, then the resulting distance measure is Euclidean distance.

For given transformation

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{b}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}} = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{B}^T$$

where **B** is non-singular, the Mahalanbis distance is invariant:

$$(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})^T \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = (\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{\mathbf{y}})^T \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}).$$

If **B** is singular, we can use pseudo inverse to replace inverse.

1.2.4 Conditional Expectation

Definition 1.13. For random variable X and Y, the conditional expectation is

$$\mathbb{E}(X|Y=y) = \begin{cases} \sum_{x} x f_{X|Y}(x|y) & \text{for discrete variable} \\ \int x f_{X|Y}(x|y) dx & \text{for continous variable} \end{cases}$$

If g(x, y) is function of x and y then

$$\mathbb{E}(g(X,Y)|Y=y) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \sum_x g(x,y) f_{X|Y}(x|y) & \text{for discrete variable} \\ \int g(x,y) f_{X|Y}(x|y) dx & \text{for continous variable} \end{array} \right.$$

- $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x})$ is a constant;
- $\mathbb{E}(X|Y=y)$ is a function with respect to y;
- $\mathbb{E}(X|Y)$ is a random variable with respect to Y.

Example 1.3. Given $X \sim U(0,1)$, after we observe X = x, we draw $Y|X = x \sim U(x,1)$. Then $f(y|x) = \frac{1}{1-x}$ for x < y < 1, $\mathbb{E}(Y|X = x) = \int_{x}^{1} y \frac{1}{1-x} dy = \frac{1+x}{2}$, and $\mathbb{E}(Y|X) = \frac{1+X}{2}$.

Theorem 1.2. The rule of iterated expectation. Assume X and Y's expectation exist, then $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(Y|X)) = \mathbb{E}(Y)$ and $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(X|Y)) = \mathbb{E}(X)$. More generally, for g(x,y), $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(g(X,Y)|X)) = \mathbb{E}(g(X,Y))$. (homework)

Definition 1.14. The conditional variance is $Var(Y|X=x) = \int (y-\mu(x))^2 f(y|x) dy$, where $\mu(x) = \mathbb{E}(Y|X=x)$.

Theorem 1.3. X and Y is random variable, $Var(Y) = \mathbb{E}(Var(Y|X)) + Var(\mathbb{E}(Y|X)) \Rightarrow Var(Y) \geq Var(\mathbb{E}(Y|X))$. (homework)

1.3 Moment Generating Function

Definition 1.15. The Moment Generating Function (MGF) of X with CDF $F_X(s)$ is $\psi_X(t) \triangleq \mathbb{E}(e^{tX}) = \int e^{tx} dF_X(x)$.

- $\mathbb{E}(e^{-tX}) = \int e^{-tx} dF_X(x)$ is Laplace transformation.
- $\mathbb{E}(e^{itX}) = \int e^{itx} dF_X(x)$ is characteristic function.
- $\psi_X'(t) = \int x e^{tx} dF_X(x), \ \psi(0) = \int x dF(x) = \mathbb{E}(x), \ \mathbb{E}(x^k) = \psi^{(k)}(0).$

Theorem 1.4. The function ψ on $(0, +\infty)$ is the Laplace transform of CDF F iff it is completely monotone and $\lim_{\lambda \to 0} \phi(\lambda) = 1$.

Definition 1.16. L is completely monotone if $L^{(n)}$ exists and $(-1)^n L^{(n)}(\lambda) \geq 0$, $\lambda > 0$.

Example 1.4.

$$\frac{1}{1+\lambda} = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} e^{-x} dx$$

$$\exp(-\lambda) = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \delta(x) dx$$

2 The Multivariate Normal Distributions

 $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_m)^T$ with $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m)^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is $p \times p$ positive definite, its p.d.f of multivariate normal distributions is

$$\mathcal{N}_m(X = \mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{m}{2}} |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \exp\{\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\}.$$

We have $\mathbb{E}(X) = \mu$, $\text{Var}(X) = \Sigma$ and Σ^{-1} is concentration matrix (precision matrix).

Theorem 2.1. If $X \sim \mathcal{N}_m(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$, **b** is $k \times 1$ and **B** is an $k \times m$ matrix such that $\mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{B}^T$ is non-singular, (imply $k \leq m$ and **B** is full rank) then $Y = \mathbf{B}X + \mathbf{b} \sim \mathcal{N}_k(\mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\mu} + \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{B}^T)$. And $Z = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(X - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$.

Let
$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \end{bmatrix}$$
, $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{11} & \mathbf{\Sigma}_{12} \\ \mathbf{\Sigma}_{21} & \mathbf{\Sigma}_{22} \end{bmatrix}$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 \end{bmatrix}$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{22.1} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{22} - \mathbf{\Sigma}_{21} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{12}$ where $\mathbf{x}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\mathbf{x}_2, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^q$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{21} \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times p}$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times q}$ and $m = p + q$.

Lemma 2.1. If $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$, then $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{x}$ are independent iff $\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{B}^T = 0$.

Theorem 2.2. If $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}_m(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \succ 0$, then \mathbf{x}_1 and $\mathbf{x}_{2.1} = \mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_1$ are statistically independent and

$$\mathbf{x}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}_p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}), \quad \mathbf{x}_{2.1} \sim \mathcal{N}_q(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{2.1}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22.1}),$$

where $\mu_{2.1} = \mu_2 - \Sigma_{21} \Sigma_{11}^{-1} \mu_1$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{B}_1 = [\mathbf{I}_p, 0]$, then $\mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_1$ and $\mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{B}_1^T = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{11}$. Let $\mathbf{B}_2 = [-\mathbf{\Sigma}_{21} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1}, \mathbf{I}_q]$, then $\mathbf{x}_{2.1} = \mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{\Sigma}_{21} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{B}_2 \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{B}_2 \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{B}_2^T = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{22.1}$. \mathbf{x}_1 and $\mathbf{x}_{2.1}$ are independent by lemma 2.1, $\mathbf{x}_1 \perp \mathbf{x}_{2.1}$.

We also have
$$p(\mathbf{x}) = p(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \end{bmatrix}) = p(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_{2.1}) = p(\mathbf{x}_1)p(\mathbf{x}_{2.1}).$$

Proof. By LDU decomposition

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12} \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_p & 0 \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} & \mathbf{I}_q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22.1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_p & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I}_q \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then we have

$$|\mathbf{\Sigma}| = |\mathbf{\Sigma}_{11}||\mathbf{\Sigma}_{22.1}|$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12} \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_p & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I}_q \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22.1} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_p & 0 \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} & \mathbf{I}_q \end{bmatrix}^{-1}$$
$$= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_p & -\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I}_q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22.1}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_p & 0 \\ -\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} & \mathbf{I}_q \end{bmatrix}$$

Hence, consider exponents of these Normal distribution

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{m}{2}} |\mathbf{\Sigma}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \exp\{-\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^T \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\},$$

$$p(\mathbf{x}_1) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{p}{2}} |\mathbf{\Sigma}_1|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \exp\{-\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)\},$$

$$p(\mathbf{x}_{2.1}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{q}{2}} |\mathbf{\Sigma}_{22.1}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \exp\{-\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x}_{2.1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{22.1})^T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{22.1}^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_{2.1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{2.1})\}.$$

We can write

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \\ & = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_p & -\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12} \\ 0 & \mathbf{I}_q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22.1}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_p & 0 \\ -\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} & \mathbf{I}_q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 \end{bmatrix} \\ & = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \\ (\mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_1) - (\boldsymbol{\mu}_2 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22.1}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ & \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \\ (\mathbf{x}_2 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_1) - (\boldsymbol{\mu}_2 - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) \end{bmatrix} \\ & = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_{2.1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{2.1} \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22.1}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_{2.1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{2.1} \end{bmatrix} \\ & = (\mathbf{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{1}^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) + (\mathbf{x}_{2.1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{2.1})^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22}^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_{2.1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{2.1}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $p(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{x}_1)p(\mathbf{x}_{2.1})$.

Theorem 2.3. The condition distribution has

$$\mathbf{x}_{2}|\mathbf{x}_{1} \sim \mathcal{N}_{q}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{2} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_{1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{1}), \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22.1})$$

 $\mathbf{x}_{2} = \mathbf{x}_{2.1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{x}_{1}, \quad \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_{2}|\mathbf{x}_{1}) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_{2.1} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{21}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1}\mathbf{x}_{1}.$

Theorem 2.4. Assume $X = [X_1, \dots X_m]^T \sim \mathcal{N}_m(0, \Sigma)$, $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})$ and $\Theta = \Sigma^{-1} = (\theta_{ij})$. Then $X_i \perp \!\!\! \perp X_j$ iff $\sigma_{ij} = 0$ and $X_i \perp \!\!\! \perp X_j | X_{\{1...m\}\setminus\{i,j\}}$ iff $\theta_{ij} = 0$.

$$(\boldsymbol{homework})$$
Prove $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11.2} = \boldsymbol{\Theta}_{11}^{-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12} = \boldsymbol{\Theta}_{12} \boldsymbol{\Theta}_{22}^{-1}$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, consider that i = 1 and j = 2. Let $\mathbf{y}_1 = [X_1, X_2]^T$ and $\mathbf{y}_2 = [X_3, \dots, X_m]^T$. We have

$$egin{array}{lcl} \mathbf{y}_1 & \sim & \mathcal{N}(m{\mu}_1, m{\Sigma}_{11}) \ \mathbf{y}_1 | \mathbf{y}_2 & \sim & \mathcal{N}(m{\mu}_1 + m{\Sigma}_{12} m{\Sigma}_{22}^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_2 - m{\mu}_2), m{\Sigma}_{11.2}). \end{array}$$

where the subscript 1, 2 and 11.2 are with respect to \mathbf{y}_1 and \mathbf{y}_2 . Then we have $X_1 \perp \!\!\! \perp X_2$ iff $\sigma_{12} = 0$. By homework,

$$\Sigma_{11.2} = \begin{bmatrix} \theta_{11} & \theta_{12} \\ \theta_{21} & \theta_{22} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \frac{1}{\theta_{11}\theta_{22} - \theta_{12}\theta_{21}} \begin{bmatrix} \theta_{22} & -\theta_{21} \\ -\theta_{12} & \theta_{11} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence we have $X_1 \perp \!\!\! \perp X_2 | X_{\{1...m\} \setminus \{1,2\}}$ iff $\theta_{12} = \theta_{21} = 0$