

# Unimodality as an extension of Monotonicity in Gaussian Processes

**Author**

AALTO UNIVERSITY

EMAILID@AALTO.FI

## Abstract

*Dummy abstract!!* In probability theory and statistics, a Gaussian process is a stochastic process (a collection of random variables indexed by time or space), such that every finite collection of those random variables has a multivariate normal distribution, i.e. every finite linear combination of them is normally distributed. The distribution of a Gaussian process is the joint distribution of all those (infinitely many) random variables, and as such, it is a distribution over functions with a continuous domain, e.g. time or space. A machine-learning algorithm that involves a Gaussian process uses lazy learning and a measure of the similarity between points (the kernel function) to predict the value for an unseen point from training data. The prediction is not just an estimate for that point, but also has uncertainty information it is a one-dimensional Gaussian distribution (which is the marginal distribution at that point)[1, 3].

**Keywords:** Gaussian Processes, Informative Priors, Unimodality

## 1. Introduction

Gaussian processes are probabilistic models which offer a non parameteric fully bayesian framework for learning a regression task. The prior information is usually encoded within the choice of the mean and covariance functions along with the hyperparameters of these function. The prior choice of monotonicity constraint was shown to be enforcable with the use of psuedo inputs, Gaussian process derivatives and using a sigmoidal link function to enforce the derivatives are of a given sign. [2]. In this project we try extend the monotonicity constraint enforce a unimodality constraint.

## 2. Related Works

### 2.1 Gaussian Processes

We can model a Gaussian process regression as a stochastic process with input  $X$ , evaluating to the underlying latent function  $f$ , to which the noise variance is added to form the observed output  $Y$ .

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}) &\sim p(\mathbf{Y}|f)p(f|\mathbf{X}) \\ &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2\mathbf{I})\mathcal{N}(m(\mathbf{X}), k(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X})) \\ &\sim \mathcal{N}(m(\mathbf{X}), k(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}) + \sigma^2\mathbf{I})\end{aligned}$$

To make predictions  $f^*$  for new input points  $X^*$  we have the following joint distribution,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Y} \\ f^* \end{bmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N} \left( 0, \begin{bmatrix} K(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}) & K(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}^*) \\ K(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{X}) & K(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{X}^*) \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

The conditional distribution of the prediction follows the normal form,

$$f^* | \mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{X}, f \sim \mathcal{N} \left( K(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{X}) (K(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}) + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{Y}, \right. \\ \left. K(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{X}^*) - K(\mathbf{X}^*, \mathbf{X}) (K(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}) + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} K(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}^*) \right)$$

## 2.2 Gaussian Process derivatives

Differentiation is a linear operator due to which the derivative of a GP also remains gaussian. The derivative information can be hence be incorporated into the GP model. The RBF covariance function incorporating the derivative information is has the form,

$$\begin{aligned} Cov[f^{(i)}, f^{(j)}] &= \eta^2 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{d=1}^D \rho_d^{-2} (x_d^{(i)} - x_d^{(j)})^2 \right) \\ Cov \left[ \frac{\partial f^{(i)}}{\partial x_g^{(i)}}, f^{(j)} \right] &= \eta^2 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{d=1}^D \rho_d^{-2} (x_d^{(i)} - x_d^{(j)})^2 \right) \left( -\rho_g^{-2} (x_g^{(i)} - x_g^{(j)}) \right) \\ Cov \left[ \frac{\partial f^{(i)}}{\partial x_g^{(i)}}, \frac{\partial f^{(j)}}{\partial x_h^{(j)}} \right] &= \eta^2 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{d=1}^D \rho_d^{-2} (x_d^{(i)} - x_d^{(j)})^2 \right) \\ &\quad \rho_g^{-2} \left( \delta_{gh} - \rho_h^{-2} (x_h^{(i)} - x_h^{(j)}) (x_g^{(i)} - x_g^{(j)}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

## 2.3 Monotonicity using derivative information

Using the derivative information we can enforce a monotonicity constraint by using sigmoidal likelihood for the derivative observations. A set of  $M$  points ( $\mathbf{X}_\partial$ ) over the input space are chosen and monotonicity constraint is enforced over those points instead of evaluating the derivative over the whole input space.

$$p \left( \begin{bmatrix} f \\ f_\partial \end{bmatrix} \middle| \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Y} \\ \mathbf{Y}_\partial \end{bmatrix} \right) = \frac{1}{C} p \left( \begin{bmatrix} f \\ f_\partial \end{bmatrix} \middle| \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X} \\ \mathbf{X}_\partial \end{bmatrix} \right) p(\mathbf{Y} | f) p(\mathbf{Y}_\partial | f_\partial)$$

The last probability terms acts as the derviative likelihood driving function values without monotonicity to a low probability. The new derivative has the form,

$$p(\mathbf{Y}_\partial | f_\partial) = \prod_{i=1}^M \phi \left( m f_\partial^{(i)} \frac{1}{v} \right)$$

where  $M$  is the number of psuedo derivative points,  $\phi$  is a sigmoidal probability function,  $m$  is the sign of the derivative that we are trying to enforce and the parameter  $v$  controls the steepness of the sigmoidal function.

### 3. Unimodality constraint using Monotonicity

Using monotonicity constraints shown above, we can model unimodality by modeling a latent parameter symbolizing the mode and changing the enforced sign of the derivative across it. For our experiments we performed three models enforcing unimodality and compared it against the normal GP model. Three methods for enforce unimodality are were designed as shown below.

#### 3.1 Using a linear function to model the sign of derivative

Using a linear line parameterized by the slope and intercept parameters to model the derivative information.

### References

- [1] Carl Edward Rasmussen and Christopher K. I. Williams. *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning (Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning)*. The MIT Press, 2006.
- [2] Jaakko Riihimäki and Aki Vehtari. Gaussian processes with monotonicity information. 9:645–652, 01 2010.
- [3] Ercan Solak, Roderick Murray-Smith, W.E. Leithead, Douglas Leith, and C.E. Rasmussen. Derivative observations in gaussian process models of dynamic systems. 16, 02 2003.