

• Plan for the lectures :

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| Philosophy
+
math | { | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interpretations of probability• Quick refresher on prob. theory
for many-dim. probability distributions |
| Statistics
(not ML) | { | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Aspects of Bayesian statistics
(parameter estimation and model comparison) |
| ML | { | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gaussian processes (formalism + applications) |

Main references :

- Sivia : "Data analysis, a Bayesian tutorial"
- Rasmussen & Williams :
"Gaussian Processes
for Machine Learning"
(Available for free online!)

A brilliant and provocative gem :

- ET Jaynes : "Probability Theory:
The Logic of Science"

Probability

- Q: How many have taken a course on prob. or statistics?
- Discussion: Discuss meaning of prob. using a coin flip or dice throw
- What does the statement $P(X) = 10\%$ mean?
- We don't know, or at least don't agree!
- Useful reference: "Interpretations of Probability",
Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy
- Bertrand Russell, 1929: "Probability is the most important concept in modern science, especially as nobody has the slightest notion of what it means."
- Two main interpretations:
 - Frequentist:
$$P(X) \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_x}{n}$$
 Prob. defined as long-run relative frequency
 - Bayesian:
$$P(X) \equiv \text{degree of belief/knowledge that } X \text{ is true}$$
 - Degree of belief \leftrightarrow subjective Bayesian
 - Degree of knowledge \leftrightarrow objective Bayesian

- Formal / deductive logic : rules for reasoning with certain statements (Boolean logic)
- Cox and others : Find rules for plausible reasoning, i.e. logic under uncertainty

↳ "Rediscovered" the usual rules of prob. theory!


- Both freq. and Bayesian definitions of prob. agree with the Kolmogorov axioms that define the mathematical properties of the function $P(X)$ → Bayesians and frequentists use the same prob. rules, disagree about the interpretation.

Kolmogorov : $0 \leq P(X) \leq 1$

P is additive :

$$P(X \cup Y) = P(X) + P(Y)$$

when $X \cap Y = \emptyset$



- Frequentists : ~~$P(\text{hypothesis} | \text{data})$~~ $P(\text{data} | \text{hypothesis})$
- Bayesians : $P(\text{hypothesis} | \text{data})$ $P(\text{data} | \text{hypothesis})$

- Subjective and objective Bayesians all happy with

$$P_{me}(X | I_1) \neq P_{you}(X | I_2)$$

- But objective Bayesians require that

$$P_{me}(X | I_1) = P_{you}(X | I_1)$$

Not required by subjective Bayesians!

- Usual rules for prob. theory does not tell us how to assign prob. in the first place, just how to relate probabilities in a consistent way! (Analogous with diff. eqs., which relate init. state to final state.)

- Objective Bayesians must introduce additional rules for assigning probabilities. Important example: "Maximum entropy"

Roughly saying: Given some information I , e.g. $X = 0.7 \pm 0.1$, choose the prob. distribution $P(x)$ that is the most uncertain but still consistent with I .

- Interpretations of prob. have important consequences:

1) Give rise to different approaches to statistics

Example: Bayesians can ask

$$P(\text{parameter value} \mid \text{data}) = ?$$

Freq. cannot ask this, since prob. of a param. value does not make sense.

- Bayesian 95% credible interval for a parameter θ :

$$[0.1, 0.3]$$

"We have a 95% degree of belief that the true value of θ is between 0.1 and 0.3"

- Frequentist 95% confidence interval for θ :

$$[0.1, 0.3]$$

"If the experiment was repeated an infinite number of times, an interval constructed with this procedure should contain the true θ value in 95% of the repetitions"

2) Are probabilities necessarily linked to randomness?

- Is anything truly random? (Metaphysics, determinism, apparent vs. true randomness)

Example: Is $P(\text{heads})$ in a coin flip necessarily 50%?

Bayesian view: No necessary link between prob. and randomness. Can simply use prob. to quantify uncertainty. (But does not imply that randomness does not exist!)

- Probabilities in science, what do they mean?

In particular: Interpretations of quantum mechanics.