Lexical alignment: feature-rich models

EM for logistic CPDs

Wilker Aziz

April 12, 2017

Content

IBM 1-2: strong assumptions

Independence assumptions

- $P(A|M,N)$ does not depend on lexical choices
  a$_1$ cute$_2$ house$_3$ $\leftrightarrow$ uma$_1$ bela$_2$ casa$_3$

IBM 1-2: strong assumptions

Independence assumptions

- $P(A|M, N)$ does not depend on lexical choices
  a$_1$ cute$_2$ house$_3$ $\leftrightarrow$ uma$_1$ bela$_2$ casa$_3$
  a$_1$ cosy$_2$ house$_3$ $\leftrightarrow$ uma$_1$ casa$_3$ aconchegante$_2$

IBM 1-2: strong assumptions

Independence assumptions

- $P(A|M,N)$ does not depend on lexical choices
  a$_1$ cute$_2$ house$_3$ $\leftrightarrow$ uma$_1$ bela$_2$ casa$_3$
  a$_1$ cosy$_2$ house$_3$ $\leftrightarrow$ uma$_1$ casa$_3$ aconchegante$_2$
- $P(F|E)$ can only reasonably explain one-to-one alignments
  I will be leaving soon $\leftrightarrow$ vou embora em breve

IBM 1-2: strong assumptions

Independence assumptions

- $P(A|M, N)$ does not depend on lexical choices
  a$_1$ cute$_2$ house$_3$ $\leftrightarrow$ uma$_1$ bela$_2$ casa$_3$
  a$_1$ cosy$_2$ house$_3$ $\leftrightarrow$ uma$_1$ casa$_3$ aconchegante$_2$
- $P(F|E)$ can only reasonably explain one-to-one alignments
  I will be leaving soon $\leftrightarrow$ vou embora em breve

Parameterisation

- categorical events are unrelated
  prefixes/suffixes: normal, normally, abnormally, ...
  verb inflections: comer, comi, comia, comeu, ...
  gender/number: gato, gatos, gata, gatas, ...

Conditional probability distributions

CPD: condition $c \in \mathcal{C}$, outcome $o \in \mathcal{O}$, and $\theta_c \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{O}|}$

$$P(O|C = c) = \mathrm{Cat}(\theta_c) \tag{1}$$

- $P(O = o|C = c) = \theta_{c,o}$
- $0 \leq \theta_{c,o} \leq 1$
- $\sum_o \theta_{c,o} = 1$
- $O(|\mathcal{C}| \times |\mathcal{O}|)$ parameters

How bad is it for IBM model 1?

Probability tables

$$P(F|E)$$

ENGLISH ↓	FRENCH →			
	anormal	normal	normalmente	...
abnormal	0.7	0.1	0.01	...
normal	0.01	0.6	0.2	...
normally	0.001	0.25	0.65	...

- grows with size of vocabularies
- no parameter sharing

Logistic CPDs

CPD: condition $c \in \mathcal{C}$ and outcome $o \in \mathcal{O}$

$$P(O = o|C = c) = \frac{\exp(w^\top h(c, o))}{\sum_{o'} \exp(w^\top h(c, o'))} \tag{2}$$

- $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a weight vector
- $h : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{O} \to R^d$ is a feature function
- d parameters
- computing CPD requires $O(|\mathcal{C}| \times |\mathcal{O}| \times d)$ operations

How bad is it for IBM model 1?

CPDs as functions

$$h : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{F} \to R^d$$

Events ↓		Features →				
English	French	**normal** **normal**	*normal-* *normal-*	-normal -normal	ab- a-	-ly -mente
abnormal	anormal	0	0	1	1	0
	normal	0	0	1	0	0
	*normal*mente	0	1	0	0	0
normal	anormal	0	0	1	0	0
	normal	1	0	0	0	0
	*normal*mente	0	1	0	0	0
normally	anormal	0	0	1	0	0
	normal	0	1	0	0	0
	*normal*mente	0	1	0	0	1
Weights →		1.5	0.3	0.3	0.8	1.1

- computation still grows with size of vocabularies
- but far less parameters to estimate

Content

Expectation Maximisation

Coordinate ascent in $\mathcal{F}$ [Neal and Hinton, 1998]

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) \equiv \log P(X|\theta) \geq \mathbb{E}_{Q(Z|X,\psi)}\left[\log P(X, Z|\theta)\right] + H(Q) \quad (3)$$

$$\equiv \mathcal{F}(Q, \theta) \quad (4)$$

Expectation Maximisation

Coordinate ascent in $\mathcal{F}$ [Neal and Hinton, 1998]

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) \equiv \log P(X|\theta) \geq \mathbb{E}_{Q(Z|X,\psi)}\left[\log P(X,Z|\theta)\right] + H(Q) \tag{3}$$

$$\equiv \mathcal{F}(Q,\theta) \tag{4}$$

E-step: choose $Q^{(t+1)}$ that maximises $\mathcal{F}$ for fixed $\theta^{(t)}$

problem $Q^{(t+1)} = \arg\max_Q F(Q, \theta^{(t)})$

solution $Q^{(t+1)}(z|x,\psi) = P(z|x,\theta^{(t)})$

which means using the exact posterior

Expectation Maximisation

Coordinate ascent in $\mathcal{F}$ [Neal and Hinton, 1998]

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) \equiv \log P(X|\theta) \geq \mathbb{E}_{Q(Z|X,\psi)}\left[\log P(X,Z|\theta)\right] + H(Q) \tag{3}$$

$$\equiv \mathcal{F}(Q,\theta) \tag{4}$$

E-step: choose $Q^{(t+1)}$ that maximises $\mathcal{F}$ for fixed $\theta^{(t)}$

problem $Q^{(t+1)} = \arg\max_Q F(Q, \theta^{(t)})$

solution $Q^{(t+1)}(z|x,\psi) = P(z|x,\theta^{(t)})$

which means using the exact posterior

M-step: choose $\theta^{(t+1)}$ that maximises $\mathcal{F}$ for fixed $Q^{(t+1)}$

problem $\theta^{(t+1)} = \arg\max_\theta \mathcal{F}(Q^{(t+1)}, \theta)$

Gradient-based M-step for logistic CPDs

For each distribution t, with context c and outcome o

$$\theta_{t,c,o}(w) = \frac{\exp(w^\top h(t,c,o))}{\sum_{o'} \exp(w^\top h(t,c,o'))} \tag{5}$$

Gradient-based M-step for logistic CPDs

For each distribution t, with context c and outcome o

$$\theta_{t,c,o}(w) = \frac{\exp(w^\top h(t,c,o))}{\sum_{o'} \exp(w^\top h(t,c,o'))} \tag{5}$$

Expected counts

$$\mu_{t,c,o} = \mathbb{E}\left[n(t : c \to o | Z)\right] \tag{6}$$

Gradient-based M-step for logistic CPDs

For each distribution t, with context c and outcome o

$$\theta_{t,c,o}(w) = \frac{\exp(w^\top h(t,c,o))}{\sum_{o'} \exp(w^\top h(t,c,o'))} \tag{5}$$

Expected counts

$$\mu_{t,c,o} = \mathbb{E}\left[n(t : c \to o|Z)\right] \tag{6}$$

Expected complete log likelihood

$$\ell(w|\mu) = \sum_{t,c,o} \mu_{t,c,o} \log \theta_{t,c,o}(w) \tag{7}$$

Gradient-based M-step for logistic CPDs

For each distribution t, with context c and outcome o

$$\theta_{t,c,o}(w) = \frac{\exp(w^\top h(t,c,o))}{\sum_{o'} \exp(w^\top h(t,c,o'))} \tag{5}$$

Expected counts

$$\mu_{t,c,o} = \mathbb{E}\left[n(t : c \to o | Z)\right] \tag{6}$$

Expected complete log likelihood

$$\ell(w|\mu) = \sum_{t,c,o} \mu_{t,c,o} \log \theta_{t,c,o}(w) \tag{7}$$

Gradient wrt w (for fixed μ)

$$\nabla_w \ell(w|\mu) = \sum_{t,c,o} \mu_{t,c,o} \Delta_{t,c,o}(w) \tag{8}$$

$$\Delta_{t,c,o}(w) = h(t,c,o) - \sum_{o'} \theta_{t,c,o'}(w) h(t,c,o') \tag{9}$$

Content

Expectation Conjugate Gradient (ECG)

Direct marginal likelihood optimisation [Salakhutdinov et al., 2003]

$$\nabla_\theta \log P(X|\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{P(Z|X,\theta)} \left[\nabla_\theta \log P(X, Z|\theta)\right] \tag{10}$$

EM: until convergence

1. compute expected counts μ
2. repeat until convergence
   - compute $l(w|\mu)$
   - compute $\nabla\ell(w|\mu)$
   - $w \leftarrow \mathrm{climb}(w, \ell(w|\mu), \nabla\ell(w|\mu))$

ECG: until convergence

1. compute expected counts μ
2. compute $\mathcal{L}(w)$
3. compute $\nabla\ell(w|\mu)$
4. $w \leftarrow \mathrm{climb}(w, \ell(w|\mu), \nabla\ell(w|\mu))$

Content

Berg-Kirkpatrick et al. [2010]

Lexical distribution in IBM model 1

$$P(F = f|E = e) = \frac{\exp(w_{\text{lex}}^\top h_{\text{lex}}(e, f))}{\sum_{f'} \exp(w_{\text{lex}}^\top h_{\text{lex}}(e, f'))} \tag{11}$$

Features

- prefixes/suffixes
- character n-grams
- POS tags

Extension: lexicalised jump distribution

$$P(\Delta = \delta | E = e) = \frac{\exp(w_{\mathsf{dist}}^\top h_{\mathsf{dist}}(e, \delta))}{\sum_{\delta'} \exp(w_{\mathsf{dist}}^\top h_{\mathsf{dist}}(e, \delta'))} \quad (12)$$

Features

- POS tags
- suffixes/prefixes
- lemma
- jump values
- m, n, j, i (values used to compute jump)

Extension: nonlinear models

Nothing prevents us from using more expressive functions

[Kočiský et al., 2014]

- $P(O|C = c) = \mathrm{softmax}(f_\theta(c))$
- $P(O = o|C = c) = \frac{\exp(f_\theta(c,o)))}{\sum_{o'} \exp(f_\theta(c,o')))}$

where $f_\theta(\cdot)$ is a neural network with parameters θ

Features

- induce features (word-level, char-level, n-gram level)
- pre-trained embeddings

Content

Limitations

Local normalisation may be expensive
but see [Gutmann and Hyvärinen, 2012]

Limitations

Local normalisation may be expensive
but see [Gutmann and Hyvärinen, 2012]

E-step takes $O(|\mathcal{D}| \times m \times n)$

- EM: reuses expected counts
- ECG: always recomputes expected counts

References I

Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, Alexandre Bouchard-Côté, John DeNero, and Dan Klein. Painless unsupervised learning with features. In *Human Language Technologies: The 2010 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 582–590, Los Angeles, California, June 2010. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL `http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/N10-1083`.

Michael U. Gutmann and Aapo Hyvärinen. Noise-contrastive estimation of unnormalized statistical models, with applications to natural image statistics. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 13(1): 307–361, February 2012. ISSN 1532-4435. URL `http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2503308.2188396`.

References II

Tomáš Kočiský, Karl Moritz Hermann, and Phil Blunsom. Learning bilingual word representations by marginalizing alignments. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 224–229, Baltimore, Maryland, June 2014. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P14-2037.

Radford M. Neal and Geoffrey E. Hinton. *A View of the Em Algorithm that Justifies Incremental, Sparse, and other Variants*, pages 355–368. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, 1998. ISBN 978-94-011-5014-9. doi: 10.1007/978-94-011-5014-9_12. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5014-9_12.

References III

Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Sam Roweis, and Zoubin Ghahramani. Optimization with em and expectation-conjugate-gradient. In *Proceedings of the Twentieth International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML'03, pages 672–679. AAAI Press, 2003. ISBN 1-57735-189-4. URL http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=3041838.3041923.