## 1. Markov random fields and Gibbs distributions

Let  $\{\underline{X}_t : t \in T\}$  be a finite collection of random variables—a stochastic process—with  $X_t$  taking values in a finite set  $\underline{S}_t$ . For simplicity of notation, suppose the index set T is  $\{1, 2, ..., n\}$  and  $S_t = \{0, 1, ..., m_t\}$ . The joint distribution of the variables is

$$\mathbb{Q}\{\mathbf{x}\} = \mathbb{P}\{X_t \equiv x_t \text{ for } t \in T\}$$
 where  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ ,

with  $0 \le x_t \le m_t$ . More formally, the vector  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$  takes values in  $\mathcal{X} = \prod_{t \in T} \mathcal{S}_t$ , the set of all *n*-tuples  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  with  $x_t \in \mathcal{S}_t$  for each t.

Suppose T is the set of nodes of a graph. Let  $\underline{N}_t$  denote the set of nodes (the neighbors of t) for which (t, s) is an edge of the graph.

- <1> Definition. The process is said to be a Markov random field if
  - (i)  $\mathbb{Q}\{\mathbf{x}\} \ge 0$  for every  $\mathbf{x}$  in  $\underline{\mathcal{X}}$
  - (ii) for each t and x,

$$\underline{\mathbb{P}}\{\underline{X_t} \equiv \underline{x_t} \mid \underline{X_s} \equiv \underline{x_s} \text{ for } \underline{s} \neq \underline{t}\} = \underline{\mathbb{P}}\{\underline{X_t} \equiv \underline{x_t} \mid \underline{X_s} \equiv \underline{x_s} \text{ for } \underline{s} \in \underline{\mathcal{N}_s}\}.$$

Property (ii) is equivalent to the requirement:

 $\underbrace{\text{(ii)}^t}_{only\ on\ x_s\ for\ s}\underbrace{\text{for}\ s}_{\underline{s}\ \underline{t}} \underbrace{\{\underline{t}\} \cup \underline{N}_t}_{\underline{t}} = \underline{x}_{\underline{t}} \mid \underline{X}_{\underline{s}} \equiv \underline{x}_{\underline{s}}\ \underline{\text{for}\ s} \in \underline{N}_{\underline{s}}\} \ \underline{\text{depends}}_{\underline{s}}$ 

A subset A of T is said to be *complete* if each pair of vertices in A defines an edge of the graph. Write  $\mathcal{C}$  for the collection of all complete subsets.

<2> **Definition.** The probability distribution  $\mathbb{Q}$  is called a *Gibbs distribution* for the graph if it can be written in the form

$$\mathbb{Q}\{\underline{\mathbf{x}}\} = \prod_{A \in \mathcal{C}} \underline{V_A}(\underline{\mathbf{x}}),$$

where each  $V_A$  is a positive function that depends on  $\mathbf{x}$  only through the coordinates  $\{x_t : t \in A\}$ .

The Hammersley-Clifford Theorem asserts that the process  $\{X_t : t \in T\}$  is a Markov random field if and only if the corresponding  $\mathbb{Q}$  is a Gibbs distribution.

It is mostly a matter of bookkeeping to show that every Gibbs distribution defines a Markov random field.

<3> **Example.** With only a slight abuse of notation, we may write  $V_A(\mathbf{x})$  as  $V_A(x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k})$  if  $A = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$ , ignoring the arguments that do not affect  $V_A$ . Suppose  $\mathcal{N}_1 = \{2, 3\}$ . Consider the variables  $x_j$  that actually appear in the conditional probability

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_1 = x_1 \mid X_2 = x_2, X_3 = x_3, \dots, X_n = x_n\} 
= \frac{\mathbb{P}\{X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2, X_3 = x_3, \dots, X_n = x_n\}}{\mathbb{P}\{X_2 = x_2, X_3 = x_3, \dots, X_n = x_n\}} 
= \frac{\prod_{A \in \mathcal{C}} V_A(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)}{\sum_w \prod_{A \in \mathcal{C}} V_A(w, x_2, \dots, x_n)}$$

For example, which terms actually involve the value  $x_4$ ? By assumption,  $V_A$  depends on  $x_4$  only if  $4 \in A$ . For such an A, we cannot also have  $1 \in A$ , because then we would have (1,4) as an edge of the graph, contradicting the assumption that  $4 \notin \mathcal{N}_1$ . For concreteness, suppose  $A = \{4,7,19\}$ . Then  $V_A(x_4, x_7, x_{19})$  appears once as a factor in the numerator and once as a factor in each summand in the denominator. It cancels from the ratio.

The only factors that do not cancel are those for which  $1 \in A$ . By definition of a complete subset, those factors can depend only on  $x_j$  values for  $j \in \{1\} \cup \mathcal{N}_1$ .

It is slightly harder to show that every Markov random field corresponds to some Gibbs distribution. The simplest proof that I know depends on a general representation of a function as a sum of simpler functions.

<4> Lemma. Let g be any real-valued function on  $\underline{X}$ . For each subset  $\underline{A} \subseteq \underline{S}$  define

$$\underline{g}_{\underline{A}}(\underline{\mathbf{x}}) \equiv \underline{g}(\underline{\mathbf{y}})$$
 where  $\underline{y}_{\underline{i}} \equiv \begin{cases} \underline{x}_{\underline{i}} & \text{if } \underline{i} \in \underline{A} \\ 0 & \text{if } \underline{i} \in \underline{A} \end{cases}$ 

and

$$\underline{\Psi}_{\underline{A}}(\underline{\mathbf{x}}) \equiv \sum_{\underline{B} \subseteq \underline{A}} (-\underline{1})^{\underline{\#(\underline{A} \setminus \underline{B})}} g_{\underline{B}}(\underline{\mathbf{x}}).$$

Then

(i) the function  $\underline{\Psi}_{\underline{A}}$  depends on  $\mathbf{x}$  only through those coordinates  $x_j$  with  $j \in A$  (in particular,  $\underline{\Psi}_{\emptyset}$  is a constant)

(ii) for  $A \neq \emptyset$ , if  $x_i \equiv 0$  for at least one i in A then  $\Psi_A(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 0$ 

$$\underline{\text{(iii)}} \ \ g(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \sum_{\underline{A} \subseteq \underline{T}} \underline{\Psi}_{\underline{A}}(\mathbf{x})$$
 x can be looked as a constant in this equal

*Proof.* Assertion (i) is trivial: every  $g_B$  appearing in the definition of  $\Psi_A(\mathbf{x})$  does not depend on the variables  $\{x_i : j \notin A\}$ .

For (ii), divide the subsets of A into two subcollections: those that contain i and those that do not contain i. For each B of the first type there is a unique set,  $\tilde{B} = \{i\} \cup B$ , of the second type. Note that  $g_B(\mathbf{x}) = g_{\tilde{B}}(\mathbf{x})$  because  $x_i = 0$ . The contributions to  $\Psi_A(\mathbf{x})$  from the sets B,  $\tilde{B}$  cancel, because one of the two numbers  $\#A \setminus B$  and  $\#A \setminus \tilde{B}$  is odd and the other is even.

For (iii), note that the coefficient of  $g_B$  in the double sum

$$\sum_{A\subseteq T} \Psi_A(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{A\subseteq T} \sum_{B\subseteq A} (-1)^{\#(A\setminus B)} g_B(\mathbf{x})$$

equals

$$\sum\nolimits_{A}\{B\subseteq A\subseteq T\}(-1)^{\#(A\backslash B)}=\sum\nolimits_{E\subset B^{c}}(-1)^{\#E}.$$

For B equal to T, the last sum reduces to  $(-1)^0$  because  $\emptyset$  is the only subset of  $T^c$ . For  $B^c \neq \emptyset$ , half of the subsets E have #E even and the other half have #E odd, which reduces the coefficient to 0. Thus the double sum <5> simplifies to  $g_T(\mathbf{x}) = g(\mathbf{x})$ .

Applying the Lemma with  $g(y) \equiv \log \mathbb{Q}\{y\}$  gives

$$\mathbb{Q}\{\underline{\mathbf{x}}\} = \exp\left(\sum_{A\subseteq\mathbb{I}} \underline{\Psi}_{\underline{A}}(\underline{\mathbf{x}})\right)$$

To show that the expression on the right-hand side is a Gibbs distribution, we have only to prove that  $\underline{\Psi}_{\underline{A}}(\underline{\mathbf{x}}) \equiv \underline{0}$  when  $\underline{A}$  is not a complete subset of the graph.

<7> Theorem. For a Markov random field, the term  $\underline{\Psi}_{\underline{A}}$  in  $\underline{<6>}$  is identically zero if A is not a complete subset of T.

*Proof.* For simplicity of notation, suppose  $1, 2 \in A$  but nodes 1 and 2 are not connected by an edge of the graph, that is, they are not neighbors. Consider the contributions to  $\Psi_A(\mathbf{x})$  from pairs  $B, \tilde{B}$ , where  $1 \notin B$  and  $\tilde{B} = B \cup \{1\}$ . The numbers  $\#A \setminus B$  and  $\#A \setminus B$  differ by 1; the pair contributes  $\pm \left(g_{\tilde{B}}(\mathbf{x}) - g_B(\mathbf{x})\right)$  to the sum. Define

$$y_i = \begin{cases} x_i & \text{if } i \in B \\ 0 & \text{if } i \in B^c \end{cases}$$

<<u>6</u>>

< 5>

15 February 2004

for any B < T, the sum =  $1 + (-1)C_{\#B^c}^1 +$ 

= 0

(-1)^2C\_{#B^c}^2 + ...

 $= (1-1)^{HB^c}$ 

Then

$$g_{\tilde{B}}(\mathbf{x}) - g_{B}(\mathbf{x}) = \log \frac{\mathbb{P}\{X_{1} = x_{1}, X_{2} = y_{2}, \dots, X_{n} = y_{n}\}}{\mathbb{P}\{X_{1} = 0, X_{2} = y_{2}, \dots, X_{n} = y_{n}\}}$$
$$= \log \frac{\mathbb{P}\{X_{1} = x_{1} \mid X_{2} = y_{2}, \dots, X_{n} = y_{n}\}}{\mathbb{P}\{X_{1} = 0 \mid X_{2} = y_{2}, \dots, X_{n} = y_{n}\}}$$

A common factor of  $\mathbb{P}\{X_2=y_2,\ldots,X_n=y_n\}$  has cancelled from numerator and denominator.

The Markov property ensures that the conditional probabilities in the last ratio do not depend on the value  $y_2$ . The ratio is unchanged if we replace  $y_2$  by 0. The same argument works for every B,  $\tilde{B}$  pair. Thus  $\Psi_A(\mathbf{x})$  is unchanged if we put  $x_2$  equal to 0. From Lemma <4> (ii), deduce that  $\Psi_A(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  for all  $\mathbf{x}$ , as asserted.

## References

Griffeath, D. (1976), *Introduction to Markov Random Fields*, Springer. Chapter 12 of *Denumerable Markov Chains* by Kemeny, Knapp, and Snell (2nd edition).