

# The Multivariate Gaussian Distribution

*David S. Rosenberg*

Notes from DS-GA 1002: Probability\_3 Section 2.4: Gaussian Random Vectors (pp. 23-26).

[TO DO: need to put something about inverses of block matrices; Also need to talk about iterated expectations]

See also: Murphy p. 113 Section 4.3.1.

## 1 One-Dimensional Gaussian

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

## 2 Multivariate Gaussian Density

A random vector  $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$  has a  **$d$ -dimensional multivariate Gaussian distribution** with mean  $\mu \in \mathbf{R}^d$  and covariance matrix  $\Sigma \in \mathbf{R}^{d \times d}$  if its density is given by

$$\mathcal{N}(x \mid \mu, \Sigma) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2} |\Sigma|^{1/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(x-\mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x-\mu)\right),$$

where  $|\Sigma|$  denotes the determinant of  $\Sigma$ . Note that this expression requires that the covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  be invertible<sup>1</sup>. Sometimes we will rewrite the factor in front of the  $\exp(\cdot)$  as  $|2\pi\Sigma|^{-1/2}$ , which follows from basic facts about determinants.

---

<sup>1</sup> We **can** have a  $d$ -dimensional Gaussian distribution with a non-invertible  $\Sigma$ , but such a distribution will not have a density on  $\mathbf{R}^n$ , and that case will not be of interest here.

**Exercise 1.** There are at least 2 claims implicit in this definition. First, that the expression given is, in fact, a density (i.e. it's non-negative and integrates to 1). Second, the density corresponds to a distribution with mean  $\mu$  and covariance  $\Sigma$ , as claimed.

### 3 Recognizing a Gaussian Density

If we come across a density function of the form  $p(x) \propto e^{-q(x)/2}$ , where  $q(x)$  is a positive definite quadratic function, then  $p(x)$  is the density for a Gaussian distribution. More precisely, we have the following theorem:

**Theorem 2.** Consider the quadratic function  $q(x) = x^T \Lambda x - 2b^T x + c$ , for any **symmetric positive definite**  $A \in \mathbf{R}^{d \times d}$ , any  $b \in \mathbf{R}^d$ , and  $c \in \mathbf{R}$ . If  $p(x)$  is a density function with

$$p(x) \propto e^{-q(x)/2},$$

then  $p(x)$  is a multivariate Gaussian density with mean  $\Lambda^{-1}b$  and covariance  $\Lambda^{-1}$ . That is,

$$p(x) = \frac{|\Lambda|^{1/2}}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} (x - \Lambda^{-1}b)^T \Lambda (x - \Lambda^{-1}b) \right).$$

Note: The inverse of the covariance matrix is called the **precision matrix**. Precision matrices of multivariate Gaussians have some interesting properties. [explain that this is the Gaussian density in “information form” or “canonical form” c.f. Murphy p. 117.]

*Proof.* Completing the square, we have

$$\begin{aligned} q(x) &= x^T \Lambda x - 2b^T x + c \\ &= (x - \Lambda^{-1}b)^T \Lambda (x - \Lambda^{-1}b) - b^T \Lambda^{-1}b + c. \end{aligned}$$

Since the last two terms are independent of  $x$ , when we exponentiate  $q(x)$ , they can be absorbed into the constant of proportionality. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-q(x)/2} &= \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} (x - \Lambda^{-1}b)^T \Lambda (x - \Lambda^{-1}b) \right] \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} [-b^T \Lambda^{-1}b + c] \right) \\ &\propto \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} (x - \Lambda^{-1}b)^T \Lambda (x - \Lambda^{-1}b) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Now recall that the density function for the multivariate Gaussian density  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$  is

$$\phi(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2} |\Sigma|^{1/2}} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} (x - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x - \mu) \right).$$

Thus we see that  $p(x)$  must also be a Gaussian density with covariance  $\Sigma = \Lambda^{-1}$  and mean  $\Lambda^{-1}b$ .  $\square$

## 4 Conditional Distributions (Bishop Section 2.3.1)

Let  $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$  have a Gaussian distribution:  $x \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ . Let's partition the random variables in  $x$  into two pieces:

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $x_1 \in \mathbf{R}^{d_1}$ ,  $x_2 \in \mathbf{R}^{d_2}$  and  $d = d_1 + d_2$ . Similarly, we'll partition the mean vector, the covariance matrix, and the precision matrix as

$$\mu = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \mu_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{21} & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad \Lambda = \Sigma^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_{11} & \Lambda_{12} \\ \Lambda_{21} & \Lambda_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\mu_1 \in \mathbf{R}^{d_1}$ ,  $\Sigma_{12} \in \mathbf{R}^{d_1 \times d_2}$ ,  $\Lambda_{12} \in \mathbf{R}^{d_1 \times d_2}$ , etc. Note that by the symmetry of the covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ , we have  $\Sigma_{12} = \Sigma_{21}^T$ .

When  $x = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix}$  has a Gaussian distribution, we say that  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are **jointly Gaussian**. Can we conclude anything about the marginal distributions of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ ? Indeed, the following theorem states that they are individually Gaussian:

**Theorem 3.** . *Let  $x$ ,  $\mu$ , and  $\Sigma$  be as defined above. Then the marginal distributions of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are each Gaussian, with*

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \Sigma_1) \\ x_2 &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \Sigma_2). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* (See Bishop Section 2.3.2, p. 88) This can be done by showing that the marginal density  $p(x_1) = \int p(x_1, x_2) dx_2$  has the form claimed, and similarly for  $x_2$ .  $\square$

So when  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are jointly Gaussian, we know that  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are also marginally Gaussian. It turns out that the conditional distributions  $x_1 | x_2$  and  $x_2 | x_1$  are also Gaussian:

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $x$ ,  $\mu$ , and  $\Sigma$  be as defined above. Assume that  $\Sigma_{22}$  is positive definite<sup>2</sup>. Then the distribution of  $x_1$  given  $x_2$  is multivariate normal. More specifically,*

$$x_1 | x_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{1|2}, \Sigma_{1|2}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{1|2} &= \mu_1 + \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}(x_2 - \mu_2) \\ \Sigma_{1|2} &= \Sigma_{11} - \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}\Sigma_{21}.\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* (See Bishop Section 2.3.1, p. 85) □

**Example.** Consider a standard regression framework in which we are building a predictive model for  $x_1 \in \mathbf{R}$  given  $x_2 \in \mathbf{R}^d$ . Recall that if we are using a square loss, then the Bayes optimal prediction function is  $f^*(x_2) = \mathbb{E}[x_1 | x_2]$ . If we assume that  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are jointly Gaussian with a positive definite covariance matrix, then Theorem 4 gives us tells us that

$$\mathbb{E}[x_1 | x_2] = \mu_1 + \Sigma_{12}\Sigma_{22}^{-1}(x_2 - \mu_2).$$

Of course, in practice we don't know  $\mu$  and  $\Sigma$ . Nevertheless, what's interesting is that the Bayes optimal prediction function is an affine function of  $x_2$  (i.e. a linear function plus a constant). Thus if we think that our input vector  $x_2$  and our response variable  $x_1$  are jointly Gaussian, there's no reason to go beyond a hypothesis space of affine functions of  $x_2$ . In other words, linear regression is all we need.

## 5 Joint Distribution from Marginal + Conditional

In Section 4, we found that if  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are jointly Gaussian, then  $x_2$  is marginally Gaussian and the conditional distribution  $x_1 | x_2$  was also Gaussian, where the mean is a linear function of  $x_2$ . The following theorem shows that we can **we can go in the reverse direction as well**.

---

<sup>2</sup> In fact, this is implied by our assumption that  $\Sigma$  is positive definite.

**Theorem.** Suppose  $x_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \Sigma_1)$  and  $x_2 \mid x_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(Ax_1 + b, \Sigma_{2|1})$ , for some  $\mu_1 \in \mathbf{R}^{d_1}$ ,  $\Sigma_1 \in \mathbf{R}^{d_1 \times d_1}$ ,  $A \in \mathbf{R}^{d_2 \times d_1}$ , and  $\Sigma_{2|1} \in \mathbf{R}^{d_2 \times d_2}$ . Then  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are jointly Gaussian with

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ A\mu_1 + b \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_1 & \Sigma_1 A^T \\ A\Sigma_1 & \Sigma_{2|1} + A\Sigma_1 A^T \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

We'll prove this with two steps. First, we'll show that the mean and variance of  $x$  take the form claimed above. Then, we'll write down the joint density  $p(x_1, x_2) = p(x_1)p(x_2 \mid x_1)$  and show that it's proportional to  $e^{-q(x)/2}$  for an appropriate quadratic  $q(x)$ . The result then follows from 2.

*Proof.* We're given that  $\mathbb{E}x_1 = \mu_1$ . For the other part of the mean vector, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}x_2 &= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}[x_2 \mid x_1] \\ &= \mathbb{E}(Ax_1 + b) = A\mu_1 + b, \end{aligned}$$

which explains the lower entry in the mean.

We are given that the marginal covariance of  $x_1$  is  $\Sigma_1$ . That is,

$$\mathbb{E}(x_1 - \mu_1)(x_1 - \mu_1)^T = \Sigma_1.$$

We're also given the conditional covariance of  $x_2$ :

$$\mathbb{E}[(x_2 - Ax_1 - b)(x_2 - Ax_1 - b)^T \mid x_1] = \Sigma_{2|1}.$$

We'll now try to express  $\text{Cov}(x_2)$  in terms of these expressions above. For convenience, we'll introduce the random variable  $m_{2|1} = Ax_1 + b$ . (It's random because it depends on  $x_1$ .) Note that  $\mathbb{E}m_{2|1} = \mathbb{E}x_2 = A\mu_1 + b$ . So

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(x_2) &= \mathbb{E}(x_2 - \mathbb{E}x_2)(x_2 - \mathbb{E}x_2)^T \text{ (by definition)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}[(x_2 - \mathbb{E}x_2)(x_2 - \mathbb{E}x_2)^T \mid x_1] \text{ (law of iterated expectations)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\underbrace{x_2 - m_{2|1} + m_{2|1} - \mathbb{E}x_2}_{=0}\right)\left(\underbrace{x_2 - m_{2|1} + m_{2|1} - \mathbb{E}x_2}_{=0}\right)^T \mid x_1\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}\left[\left((x_2 - m_{2|1}) + (m_{2|1} - \mathbb{E}x_2)\right)\left((x_2 - m_{2|1}) + (m_{2|1} - \mathbb{E}x_2)\right)^T \mid x_1\right] \\ &= U + 2V + W, \end{aligned}$$

where we've multiplied out the parenthesized terms. The terms are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \left[ (x_2 - m_{2|1}) (x_2 - m_{2|1})^T \mid x_1 \right] \\ &= \Sigma_{2|1} \end{aligned}$$

The cross-term turns out to be zero:

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \left[ (x_2 - m_{2|1}) (m_{2|1} - \mathbb{E}x_2)^T \mid x_1 \right] \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \left[ (x_2 - Ax_1 - b) (Ax_1 + b - A\mu_1 - b)^T \mid x_1 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[(x_2 - Ax_1 + b) \mid x_1]}_{=0} (Ax_1 + b - A\mu_1 - b)^T \right] \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second to last step we used the fact that  $\mathbb{E}[f(x)g(x, y) \mid x] = f(x)\mathbb{E}[g(x, y) \mid x]$ . This same identity is used a couple more times below. Finally the last term is

$$\begin{aligned} W &= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \left[ (m_{2|1} - \mathbb{E}m_{2|1}) (m_{2|1} - \mathbb{E}m_{2|1})^T \mid x_1 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \left[ (Ax_1 - A\mu_1) (Ax_1 - A\mu_1)^T \mid x_1 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ (Ax_1 - A\mu_1) (Ax_1 - A\mu_1)^T \right] \\ &= A \left[ \mathbb{E} (x_1 - \mu_1) (x_1 - \mu_1)^T \right] A^T \\ &= A\Sigma_1 A^T \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\text{Cov}(x_2) = \Sigma_{2|1} + A\Sigma_1 A^T,$$

The top-right cross-covariance submatrix can be computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} (x_1 - \mu_1) (x_2 - A\mu_1 - b)^T &= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E} \left[ (x_1 - \mu_1) (x_2 - A\mu_1 - b)^T \mid x_1 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ (x_1 - \mu_1) \mathbb{E} \left[ (x_2 - A\mu_1 - b)^T \mid x_1 \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ (x_1 - \mu_1) (Ax_1 + b - A\mu_1 - b)^T \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ (x_1 - \mu_1) (x_1 - \mu_1)^T \right] A^T \\ &= \Sigma_1 A^T. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the bottom left cross-covariance matrix is just the transpose of the top right.

So far we have shown that the  $x = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix}$  has the mean and covariance specified in the theorem statement. We now show that the joint density is indeed Gaussian:

$$\begin{aligned}
 p(x_1, x_2) &= p(x_1)p(x_2 \mid x_1) \\
 &= \mathcal{N}(x_1 \mid \mu_1, \Sigma_1) \mathcal{N}(x_2 \mid Ax_1 + b, \Sigma_{2|1}) \\
 &\propto \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(x_1 - \mu_1)^T \Sigma_1^{-1}(x_1 - \mu_1)\right) \\
 &\quad \times \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(x_2 - Ax_1 - b)^T \Sigma_{2|1}^{-1}(x_2 - Ax_1 - b)\right) \\
 &= e^{-q(x)/2},
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$q(x) = (x_1 - \mu_1)^T \Sigma_1^{-1}(x_1 - \mu_1) + (x_2 - Ax_1 - b)^T \Sigma_{2|1}^{-1}(x_2 - Ax_1 - b).$$

To apply Theorem 2, we need to make sure we can write the quadratic terms of  $q(x)$  as  $x^T M x$ , where  $M$  is symmetric positive definite. We'll separate the quadratic terms in  $q(x)$  and write **l.o.t. for "lower order terms"**, which includes linear terms of the form  $b^T x$  and constants:

$$\begin{aligned}
 q(x) &= -\frac{1}{2} \left[ x_2^T \Sigma_{2|1}^{-1} x_2 - 2x_1^T A^T \Sigma_{2|1}^{-1} x_2 + x_1^T \left( \Sigma_1^{-1} + A^T \Sigma_{2|1}^{-1} A \right) x_1 \right] + \text{l.o.t.} \\
 &= -\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} \left( \Sigma_1^{-1} + A^T \Sigma_{2|1}^{-1} A \right) & -A^T \Sigma_{2|1}^{-1} \\ -\Sigma_{2|1}^{-1} A & \Sigma_{2|1}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} + \text{l.o.t.}
 \end{aligned}$$

Let  $M$  be that matrix in the middle. We only need to show that  $M$  is positive definite. From the Schur complement condition,  $M$  is positive definite if and only if both  $\Sigma_{2|1}^{-1}$  and  $M/\Sigma_{2|1}^{-1}$  are positive definite, where

$$\begin{aligned}
 M/\Sigma_{2|1}^{-1} &= \left( \Sigma_1^{-1} + A^T \Sigma_{2|1}^{-1} A \right) - \left( -A^T \Sigma_{2|1}^{-1} \Sigma_{2|1} \left( -\Sigma_{2|1}^{-1} A \right) \right) \\
 &= \Sigma_1^{-1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Sigma_{2|1}^{-1}$  and  $\Sigma_1^{-1}$  are both inverses of covariance matrices (by assumption), they are each positive definite. Thus  $M$  must be positive definite.

Thus  $p(x) \propto e^{-q(x)/2}$ , where  $q(x)$  has the form required by Theorem 2. We conclude that  $x = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix}$  is jointly Gaussian. We have also shown that the marginal means and covariances, as well as the cross-covariances all have the forms claimed. We still need a theorem saying that if  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are jointly gaussian and have given marginals and covariances, then the joint distribution is what we'd expect to have...  $\square$