

Practical Session 11

Clustering

1 K-medians

Problem 1: Consider a modified version of the K -means objective, where we use L_1 distance instead.

$$J(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K z_{ik} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k\|_1$$

This variation of the algorithm is called K -medians. Derive the Lloyd's algorithm for this model.

1. Updating the cluster assignments z_{ik} is the same as for the K -means algorithm:

$$z_{ik}^{new} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = \arg \min_j \|\mathbf{x}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j\|_1 \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

2. The updates for $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k$'s should solve

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_k^{new} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_k} \sum_{i=1}^N z_{ik} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k\|_1$$

The objective for each single centroid $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k$ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} J(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_k) &= \sum_{i=1}^N z_{ik} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k\|_1 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N z_{ik} \sum_{d=1}^D |x_{id} - \mu_{kd}| \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, this is a convex function of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k$, as it is a sum of piecewise linear functions. We can actually solve for each μ_{kd} separately, as they do not interact in the objective, by finding the roots of the derivatives.

Observe, that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu_{kd}} |x_{id} - \mu_{kd}| = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mu_{kd} > x_{id} \\ -1 & \text{if } \mu_{kd} < x_{id} \\ 0 & \text{if } \mu_{kd} = x_{id}. \end{cases}$$

(Note: actually the absolute value function is not differentiable at 0, so the derivative is undefined. A rigorous treatment of this problem would require us to use subgradients (see

https://web.stanford.edu/class/ee364b/lectures/subgradients_notes.pdf), but just "pretending" that the gradient is 0 suffices for our purpose.)

Hence, the derivative of the entire objective is

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu_{kd}} J(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) &= \sum_{i=1}^N z_{ik} |x_{id} - \mu_{kd}| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N z_{ik} \mathbb{I}[x_{id} < \mu_{kd}] - \sum_{i=1}^N z_{ik} \mathbb{I}[x_{id} > \mu_{kd}] \stackrel{!}{=} 0\end{aligned}$$

The first sum represents "number of points \mathbf{x}_i assigned to class k , such that $x_{id} < \mu_{kd}$ ". Each of these sums represents the number of points in class k , that are located to the left (right) of the given value of μ_{kd} . Because we want to set the gradient to zero, we are looking for such a μ_{kd} , that along the axis d exactly $N_k/2$ points are to left of it, and another $N_k/2$ points are to the right (where $N_k = \sum_{i=1}^N z_{ik}$). This is exactly the definition of a *median*.

Therefore, the optimal update is given as

$$\mu_{kd} = \text{median} \{x_{id}, \text{ such that } z_{ik} = 1\}$$

2 Gaussian mixture model

Problem 2: Derive the E step update for Gaussian mixture model.

See discussion surrounding Eq. (9.13) in Bishop.

Problem 3: Derive the M step update for Gaussian mixture model.

Bishop: Section 9.2.2.

Also, Problems 2 & 3 from Practical 4 solve the same task.

3 Expectation Maximization algorithm

Problem 4: Consider a mixture model where the components are given by independent Bernoulli variables. This is useful when modelling, e.g., binary images, where each of the D dimensions of the image \mathbf{x} corresponds to a different pixel that is either black or white. More formally, we have

$$p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z} = k) = \prod_{d=1}^D \theta_{kd}^{x_d} (1 - \theta_{kd})^{1-x_d}.$$

That is, for a given mixture index $z = k$, we have a product of independent Bernoullis, where θ_{kd} denotes the Bernoulli parameter for component k at pixel d .

Derive the EM algorithm for the parameters $\theta = \{\theta_{kd} \mid k = 1, \dots, K, d = 1, \dots, D\}$ of a mixture of Bernoullis.

Assume here for simplicity, that the distribution of components $p(z)$ is uniform: $p(z) = \prod_{k=1}^K \pi_k^{z_k} = \prod_{k=1}^K \left(\frac{1}{K}\right)^{z_k}$.

Using our uniformity assumption, we have

$$p(z|\mathbf{x}, \theta) \propto p(\mathbf{x}|z, \theta).$$

so we obtain the responsibilities as

$$r_{nk}(\theta) = \frac{p(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}|z = k, \theta)}{\sum_{j=1}^K p(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}|z = j, \theta)}.$$

(which is the E-step) .

It remains to derive the M-step. Similiar to mixture of Gaussians:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{p(z|\mathcal{D}, \theta^{(t)})}[\ln p(\mathcal{D}, z|\theta)] &= \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K r_{nk}(\theta^{(t)}) \ln \left(\frac{1}{K} \prod_{d=1}^D \theta_{kd}^{x_d^{(n)}} (1 - \theta_{kd})^{1-x_d^{(n)}} \right) \\ &= C + \underbrace{\sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K r_{nk}(\theta^{(t)}) \sum_{d=1}^D \left(x_d^{(n)} \ln \theta_{kd} + (1 - x_d^{(n)}) \ln(1 - \theta_{kd}) \right)}_{=: \mathcal{L}_n} \end{aligned}$$

The constant C is independent of θ and hence irrelevant for further optimization.

We now need to take derivatives w.r.t. θ . We observe that the θ_{kd} do not interfere nonlinearly, i.e., we can handle the gradients individually:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_n}{\partial \theta_{k', d'}} &= \sum_{k=1}^K r_{nk}(\theta^{(t)}) \sum_{d=1}^D \left(x_d^{(n)} \frac{\partial \ln \theta_{kd}}{\partial \theta_{k', d'}} + (1 - x_d^{(n)}) \frac{\partial \ln(1 - \theta_{kd})}{\partial \theta_{k', d'}} \right) \quad \text{lots of zeros} \\ &= r_{nk'}(\theta^{(t)}) \left(\frac{x_{d'}^{(n)}}{\theta_{k', d'}} - \frac{1 - x_{d'}^{(n)}}{1 - \theta_{k', d'}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Setting this to zero, we obtain the optimal update in a similar fashion as in the standard Bernoulli MLE:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_{p(z|\mathcal{D}, \theta^{(t)})}[\ln p(\mathcal{D}, z|\theta)]}{\partial \theta_{kd}} &= \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_n}{\partial \theta_{kd}} = \sum_{n=1}^N r_{nk}(\theta^{(t)}) \left(\frac{x_d^{(n)}}{\theta_{kd}} - \frac{1 - x_d^{(n)}}{1 - \theta_{kd}} \right) \stackrel{!}{=} 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow \theta_{kd} &= \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N r_{nk}(\theta^{(t)}) x_d^{(n)}}{\sum_{n=1}^N r_{nk}(\theta^{(t)})} \end{aligned}$$