

Problem 1. ([AI] Ex. 3.2-3.3)

We discussed the discriminant functions $g_i(x), i \in [K]$ where K is the number of classes. When $K = 2$ we can also define a single discriminant

$$g(x) = g_1(x) - g_2(x)$$

and we choose C_1 if $g(x) > 0$ and C_2 if $g(x) < 0$.

1. In a two-class problem, the likelihood ratio is

$$\frac{p(x | C_1)}{p(x | C_2)}$$

Write a discriminant function in terms of the likelihood ratio.

Solution. We could introduce a discriminant function as

$$g(x) = \frac{P(C_1 | x)}{P(C_2 | x)} = \frac{P(x | C_1) P(C_1)}{P(x | C_2) P(C_2)}$$

Then, we choose C_1 if $g(x) \geq 1$ and C_2 if $g(x) < 1$. ■

2. In a two-class problem, the log odds is defined as

$$\log \frac{P(C_1 | x)}{P(C_2 | x)}$$

Write a discriminant function in terms of the log odds.

Solution. We could introduce a similar discriminant function as

$$g(x) = \log \frac{P(C_1 | x)}{P(C_2 | x)} = \log \frac{P(x | C_1)}{P(x | C_2)} + \log \frac{P(C_1)}{P(C_2)}$$

Then, we choose C_1 if $g(x) \geq 0$ and C_2 if $g(x) < 0$. ■

Problem 2. ([AI] Ex. 3.4)

In a two-class, two-action problem, if the loss function is $\lambda_{11} = \lambda_{22} = 0, \lambda_{12} = 10$ and $\lambda_{21} = 5$, write the optimal decision rule. How does the rule change if we add a third action of reject with $\lambda = 1$? [Note: we don't have 0/1 loss for this problem.]

Solution. The expected risks are

$$R(\alpha_1 | x) = \lambda_{11}P(C_1 | x) + \lambda_{12}P(C_2 | x) = 10P(C_2 | x)$$

$$R(\alpha_2 | x) = \lambda_{21}P(C_1 | x) + \lambda_{22}P(C_2 | x) = 5P(C_1 | x)$$

We choose C_1 if $R(\alpha_1 | x) < R(\alpha_2 | x)$, or $10P(C_2 | x) < 5P(C_1 | x)$, $P(C_1 | x) > \frac{2}{3}$, choose C_2 if $P(C_1 | x) \leq \frac{2}{3}$.

The risk of reject is

$$R(\alpha_3 | x) = \lambda P(C_1 | x) + \lambda P(C_2 | x) = \lambda = 1$$

Then, we choose C_1 if

$$\begin{cases} R(\alpha_1 | x) < R(\alpha_2 | x) \\ R(\alpha_1 | x) < R(\alpha_3 | x) \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} 10P(C_2 | x) < 5P(C_1 | x) \\ 10P(C_2 | x) < 1 \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} P(C_1 | x) > \frac{2}{3} \\ P(C_1 | x) > \frac{9}{10} \end{cases} \Rightarrow P(C_1 | x) > \frac{9}{10}$$

We choose C_2 if

$$\begin{cases} R(\alpha_2 | x) < R(\alpha_1 | x) \\ R(\alpha_2 | x) < R(\alpha_3 | x) \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} 5P(C_1 | x) < 10P(C_2 | x) \\ 5P(C_1 | x) < 1 \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} P(C_1 | x) < \frac{2}{3} \\ P(C_1 | x) < \frac{1}{5} \end{cases} \Rightarrow P(C_1 | x) < \frac{1}{5}$$

We reject if

$$\begin{cases} R(\alpha_3 | x) \leq R(\alpha_1 | x) \\ R(\alpha_3 | x) \leq R(\alpha_2 | x) \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} 1 \leq 10P(C_2 | x) \\ 1 \leq 5P(C_1 | x) \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} P(C_1 | x) \leq \frac{9}{10} \\ P(C_1 | x) \geq \frac{1}{5} \end{cases} \Rightarrow \frac{1}{5} \leq P(C_1 | x) \leq \frac{9}{10}$$

■

Problem 3. (Poisson MLE)

Let X be a random variable. $X \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ with the density

$$p(x) = \frac{\lambda^x e^{-\lambda}}{x!}$$

1. Find $\mathbb{E}[X]$ and $\text{Var}(X)$ if $X \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$.

Solution.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X] &= \sum_{x \in \text{Im}g(X)} x \mathbb{P}(X = x) \\ &= \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} x \frac{\lambda^x e^{-\lambda}}{x!} \\ &= e^{-\lambda} \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} x \frac{\lambda^x}{x!} \\ &= e^{-\lambda} \lambda \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{x-1}}{(x-1)!} \\ &= e^{-\lambda} \lambda \sum_{y=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^y}{y!} \\ &= e^{-\lambda} \lambda e^{\lambda} \\ &= \lambda \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X^2] &= \sum_{x \in \text{Im}g(X)} x^2 \mathbb{P}(X = x) \\ &= \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} x^2 \frac{\lambda^x e^{-\lambda}}{x!} = e^{-\lambda} \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} x^2 \frac{\lambda^x}{x!} \\ &= e^{-\lambda} \lambda \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} (x-1+1) \frac{\lambda^{x-1}}{(x-1)!} \\ &= e^{-\lambda} \lambda \left(\sum_{x=1}^{\infty} (x-1) \frac{\lambda^{x-1}}{(x-1)!} + \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{x-1}}{(x-1)!} \right) \\ &= e^{-\lambda} \lambda \left(\lambda \sum_{x=2}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{x-2}}{(x-2)!} + \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{x-1}}{(x-1)!} \right) \\ &= e^{-\lambda} \lambda \left(\lambda \sum_{y=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^y}{y!} + \sum_{y=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^y}{y!} \right) \\ &= e^{-\lambda} \lambda (\lambda e^{\lambda} + e^{\lambda}) \\ &= \lambda^2 + \lambda \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(X) &= \mathbb{E}[X^2] - (\mathbb{E}[X])^2 \\ &= \lambda^2 + \lambda - \lambda^2 = \lambda \end{aligned}$$

■

2. Consider the sample $\mathcal{X} = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^N$ where $x_n \sim^{i.i.d.} \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$. For the parameter λ above, write the likelihood $l(\lambda | \mathcal{X})$ and the log-likelihood $\mathcal{L}(\lambda | \mathcal{X})$.

Solution. Since they are i.i.d. samples,

$$l(\lambda | \mathcal{X}) = \prod_{n=1}^N \frac{\lambda^{x_n} e^{-\lambda}}{x_n!}$$

By taking the logarithm of the likelihood,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}(\lambda \mid \mathcal{X}) &= \log \left(\prod_{n=1}^N \frac{\lambda^{x_n} e^{-\lambda}}{x_n!} \right) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \log \left(\frac{\lambda^{x_n} e^{-\lambda}}{x_n!} \right) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \log(\lambda^{x_n}) + \log(e^{-\lambda}) - \log(x_n!) \\ &= -n\lambda + \log(\lambda) \sum_{n=1}^N x_n - \sum_{n=1}^N \log(x_n!)\end{aligned}$$

3. Find the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\lambda}_{\text{MLE}}$.

Solution. To maximize $\mathcal{L}(\lambda \mid \mathcal{X})$, we need to solve

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\text{MLE}} = \underset{\lambda}{\operatorname{argmax}} = \underbrace{-n\lambda + \log(\lambda) \sum_{n=1}^N x_n - \sum_{n=1}^N \log(x_n!)}_{f(\lambda)}$$

By the first order condition of the maximum,

$$\frac{df}{d\lambda} = -n + \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n=1}^N x_n = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \hat{\lambda}_{\text{MLE}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{n=1}^N x_n$$

4. Is $\hat{\lambda}_{\text{MLE}}$ biased?

Solution. The bias of the estimator is

$$d_{\lambda}(\hat{\lambda}_{\text{MLE}}) = \mathbb{E}[\hat{\lambda}_{\text{MLE}}] - \lambda = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{n=1}^N x_n \right] - \lambda = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}[x_n] - \lambda = \lambda - \lambda = 0$$

therefore it is unbiased.

Problem 4. (Uniform MLE) Let X be a random variable. $X \sim \text{Unif}(\theta)$ with the density

$$p(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\theta}, & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq \theta \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

1. Find $\mathbb{E}[X]$ and $\text{Var}(X)$ if $X \sim \text{Unif}(\theta)$.

Solution.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[X] &= \int_0^{\theta} x \frac{1}{\theta} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{x^2}{2} \Big|_{x=0}^{\theta} \\ &= \frac{\theta}{2}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[X^2] &= \int_0^{\theta} x^2 \frac{1}{\theta} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{x^3}{3} \Big|_{x=0}^{\theta} = \frac{\theta^2}{3} \\ \text{Var}(X) &= \mathbb{E}[X^2] - (\mathbb{E}[X])^2 \\ &= \frac{\theta^2}{3} - \frac{\theta^2}{4} = \frac{\theta^2}{12}\end{aligned}$$

2. Consider the sample $\mathcal{X} = \{x_n\}_{n=1}^N$ where $x_n \sim^{i.i.d.} \text{Unif}(\theta)$. For the parameter θ above, write the likelihood $l(\theta | \mathcal{X})$ and the log-likelihood $\mathcal{L}(\theta | \mathcal{X})$.

Solution. Suppose $I(\cdot)$ is the indicator function. The likelihood function is,

$$l(\theta | \mathcal{X}) = \prod_{n=1}^N p(x_n | \theta) = \frac{1}{\theta^N} I\left(\{x_n\}_{n=1}^N \in [0, \theta]\right) = \frac{1}{\theta^N} I\left(\max\{x_n\}_{n=1}^N \leq \theta\right)$$

By taking the logarithm of the likelihood,

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta | \mathcal{X}) = \log\left(\frac{1}{\theta^N} I\left(\max\{x_n\}_{n=1}^N \leq \theta\right)\right) = -N \log(\theta) + \log\left(I\left(\max\{x_n\}_{n=1}^N \leq \theta\right)\right)$$

■

3. Find the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}}$.

Solution. When $\theta < \max\{x_n\}_{n=1}^N$, $l(\theta | \mathcal{X}) = 0$. When $\theta \geq \max\{x_n\}_{n=1}^N$, $l(\theta | \mathcal{X}) = \frac{1}{\theta^N}$.

Since $\frac{1}{\theta^N}$ is monotonically decreasing, the maximum likelihood estimator is $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \max\{x_n\}_{n=1}^N$.

■

4. Is $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}}$ biased?

Solution. In order to take the expectation of $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}}$, we need to find its distribution. The CDF of the estimator is obvious,

$$P(\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} \leq m) = P(\max\{x_n\}_{n=1}^N \leq m) = P(x_1 \leq m, x_2 \leq m, \dots, x_N \leq m) = \underbrace{\left(\frac{m}{\theta}\right)^N}_{F(m)}$$

Then, we could get the PDF by,

$$f(m) = \frac{dF(m)}{dm} = \frac{1}{\theta} N \left(\frac{m}{\theta}\right)^{N-1}$$

The bias of the estimator is,

$$d_{\theta}(\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}}) = \mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}}] - \theta = \int_0^{\theta} m \frac{1}{\theta} N \left(\frac{m}{\theta}\right)^{N-1} dm - \theta = \frac{N}{\theta^N} \frac{m^{N+1}}{N+1} \Big|_{m=0}^{\theta} - \theta = \frac{N}{N+1} \theta - \theta = -\frac{\theta}{N+1}$$

therefore it is biased.

■

Problem 5. (See [AL] Ch.16.2.2) Find \hat{q}_{MAP} for the Bernoulli likelihood

$$p(\mathcal{X} | q) = \prod_{n=1}^N q^{x_n} (1-q)^{1-x_n}$$

with the beta prior

$$p(q) = \text{beta}(q | \alpha, \beta) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)} q^{\alpha-1} (1-q)^{\beta-1}$$

Solution.

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{q}_{\text{MAP}} &= \operatorname{argmax}_q \mathbb{P}(q \mid \mathcal{X}) = \operatorname{argmax}_q \log \mathbb{P}(q \mid \mathcal{X}) = \operatorname{argmax}_q \log \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X} \mid q)\mathbb{P}(q)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X})} = \operatorname{argmax}_q \log \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X} \mid q)\mathbb{P}(q) \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_q \log \prod_{n=1}^N \mathbb{P}(x_n \mid q)\mathbb{P}(q) = \operatorname{argmax}_q \sum_{n=1}^N \log \mathbb{P}(x_n \mid q) + \log \mathbb{P}(q) \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_q \underbrace{\sum_{n=1}^N x_n \log q + (1 - x_n) \log(1 - q) + \log \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)} + (\alpha - 1) \log q + (\beta - 1) \log(1 - q)}_{\mathcal{L}}\end{aligned}$$

By the first order condition of the maximum,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q} &= \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial q} x_n \log q + \frac{\partial}{\partial q} (1 - x_n) \log(1 - q) + \frac{\partial}{\partial q} \log \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)} + \frac{\partial}{\partial q} (\alpha - 1) \log q + \frac{\partial}{\partial q} (\beta - 1) \log(1 - q) \\ &= \frac{1}{q} \sum_{n=1}^N x_n - \frac{1}{1 - q} \sum_{n=1}^N (1 - x_n) + 0 + \frac{\alpha - 1}{q} - \frac{\beta - 1}{1 - q}\end{aligned}$$

Let $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial q} = 0$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{q} \sum_{n=1}^N x_n - \frac{1}{1 - q} \sum_{n=1}^N (1 - x_n) + \frac{\alpha - 1}{q} - \frac{\beta - 1}{1 - q} &= 0 \\ q \left(\sum_{n=1}^N (1 - x_n) + \beta - 1 \right) &= (1 - q) \left(\sum_{n=1}^N x_n + \alpha - 1 \right) \\ q \left(\sum_{n=1}^N (1 - x_n) + \sum_{n=1}^N x_n + \beta - 1 + \alpha - 1 \right) &= \sum_{n=1}^N x_n + \alpha - 1 \\ q(N + \beta + \alpha - 2) &= \sum_{n=1}^N x_n + \alpha - 1 \\ q &= \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N x_n + \alpha - 1}{N + \beta + \alpha - 2}\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\hat{q}_{\text{MAP}} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N x_n + \alpha - 1}{N + \beta + \alpha - 2}$$

■

Problem 6. (Exponential family) A probability distribution in the exponential family is given by

$$p(\mathbf{x} \mid \boldsymbol{\eta}) = h(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\top T(\mathbf{x}) - A(\boldsymbol{\eta}))$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is the parameter vector.

1. Prove that $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I})$ with identity covariance (where $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the parameter) is in the exponential family.

Solution. Suppose $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{I})$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}p(\mathbf{x} \mid \boldsymbol{\mu}) &= (2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\right) \\ &= (2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \exp\left(\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}\right) \\ &= (2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \exp\left(\langle \boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{x} \rangle + \left\langle \operatorname{vec}\left(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I}\right), \operatorname{vec}(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\top)\right\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}\right)\end{aligned}$$

Then, we write $h(\mathbf{x}) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}}$, $T(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \text{vec}(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\top) \end{bmatrix}$, $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\mu} \\ \text{vec}(-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I}) \end{bmatrix}$, $A(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top\boldsymbol{\mu} = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\top\boldsymbol{\eta} - \frac{d}{4})$ ■

2. Prove that

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} A = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\eta})}[T(\mathbf{x})].$$

Hint: Use the fact that $\int p(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\eta}) d\mathbf{x} = 1$ to get an expression of A first.

Solution. As the Hint shows,

$$\begin{aligned} \int h(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\top T(\mathbf{x}) - A(\boldsymbol{\eta})) d\mathbf{x} &= 1 \\ \exp(-A(\boldsymbol{\eta})) \int h(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\top T(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x} &= 1 \\ A(\boldsymbol{\eta}) &= \log \int h(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\top T(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x} \end{aligned}$$

Then, we take the derivative,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} A &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\eta}^\top} \left(\log \int h(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\top T(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x} \right) \\ &= \frac{\int T(\mathbf{x}) h(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\top T(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}}{\int h(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\top T(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}} \\ &= \int T(\mathbf{x}) h(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\top T(\mathbf{x}) - A(\boldsymbol{\eta})) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\eta})}[T(\mathbf{x})] \end{aligned}$$

3. Verify Part 2 using the example in Part 1.

Solution. We first consider

$$(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\top])_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\top)_{ij}] = \mathbb{E}[x_i x_j] = \text{cov}(x_i, x_j) + \mathbb{E}[x_i]\mathbb{E}[x_j] = \Sigma_{ij} + \mu_i \mu_j$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{vec}(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\top)] = \mathbb{E}\left[\begin{pmatrix} x_1^2 \\ \vdots \\ x_1 x_d \\ \vdots \\ x_d^2 \end{pmatrix}\right] = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[x_1^2] \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{E}[x_1 x_d] \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{E}[x_d^2] \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} + \mu_1^2 \\ \vdots \\ \Sigma_{1d} + \mu_1 \mu_d \\ \vdots \\ \Sigma_{dd} + \mu_d^2 \end{pmatrix} = \text{vec}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\top])$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[T(\mathbf{x})] = \mathbb{E}\left[\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \text{vec}(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^\top) \end{pmatrix}\right] = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\mu} \\ \text{vec}(\mathbf{I} + \boldsymbol{\mu}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top) \end{pmatrix}$$

We can verify that $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} A = \mathbb{E}[T(\mathbf{x})]$ by direct differentiation. ■