



**KTH Computer Science
and Communication**

Implementation of “The Train” problem

Statistical Methods in Applied Computer Science, DD2447
Final Project

JIM HOLMSTRÖM JIMHO@KTH.SE

Teacher: Jens Lagergren

Contents

1	The Problem	1
1.1	problemformulation	1
2	Implementation	3
3	Results & Discussion	5

Chapter 1

The Problem

1.1 Problem formulation ¹

G is undirected and all vertices has degree 3. At each vertex the edges are labeled 0,L, and R (an edge can have different labels at different vertices). So a vertex is a switch. Start positions and switch settings have uniform priors.

A switch setting is a function $\sigma : V(G) \rightarrow \{L, R\}$, which has the natural interpretation. By a position we mean a pair (v, e) , where $v \in V(G)$ and $e \in E(G)$, with the interpretation that the train has passed v and exited through e .

(We leave out G and instead have G implicit for all distributions and expressions.)

Below we give a DP algorithm for $p(s, O|\sigma)$. We will estimate $p(\sigma|O)$ using MCMC and then $p(s|O)$ using:

$$p(s|O) = \sum_{\sigma} p(s, \sigma|O) = \sum_{\sigma} p(s|\sigma, O)p(\sigma|O) = \sum_{\sigma} \frac{p(s, O|\sigma)p(\sigma|O)}{p(O|\sigma)} \quad (1.1)$$

The probability p is 0.05. Given $G, \sigma, s \in V(G)$ (s is a stop position), $O \in \{L, R, 0\}^T$ (observed switch signals), we can compute $p(s, O|\sigma)$ using DP and in each step compute the probability of going from some position s' to s in t steps and observing $O_{1:t} = \{o_i\}_{i=1}^t$ when the switch settings are σ . By doing this for all stop positions s and then summing out the stop position, we obtain $p(O|\sigma)$ in time $\mathcal{O}(N^2T)$, where $N = |V(G)|$.

The states in our HMM are positions. The transition probabilities are always 1, i.e., given how we enter a vertex it is uniquely determined how we exit (since switches are fixed). Also, when passing a switch the correct direction of the label of the position is emitted with probability $1 - p$ and any different direction is emitted with probability $p/2$.

¹ This formulation has some minor differences but it should still be equivalent with the original one.

CHAPTER 1. THE PROBLEM

Let $c(s, t)$ be computed as below (we want $c(s, t)$ to be the probability of going from some position s' to $s = (v, e)$ in t steps and observing $O_{1:t}$). Let $f = (u, v)$ and $g = (w, v)$ be the two edges that are incident with v but different from e .

$$c(s, t) = \begin{cases} 1/N, & t = 0 \\ [c((u, f), t-1) + c((w, g), t-1)] (1-p) & e = 0 \wedge o_t = 0 \\ [c((u, f), t-1) + c((w, g), t-1)] p & e = 0 \wedge o_t \neq 0 \\ [c((u, f), t-1)] (1-p) & e = L \wedge o_t = L \wedge f = 0 \\ [c((u, f), t-1)] p & e = L \wedge o_t \neq L \wedge f = 0 \\ [c((u, f), t-1)] (1-p) & e = R \wedge o_t = R \wedge f = 0 \\ [c((u, f), t-1)] p & e = R \wedge o_t \neq R \wedge f = 0 \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

Chapter 2

Implementation

The underlying model for this problem is a HMM *HMM *First step The first marginalization in (1.1) is to get fixed σ and thereby fixed transition probabilities inside the $\sum \sigma$ to make the sub-problem tractable, the downside to this is that we get $|\{L, R\}^N| = \mathcal{O}(2^N)$ summations which is intractable. This will later be approximated to overcome the intractability with a Markov chain Monte Carlo method. *Second step Factor out the $\sigma|O$ distribution to set it up for MCMC. *Third step

*MCMC *basic basic MCMC abstract theory *MCMC used for estimating $Ef(\sigma)$ without the intractable process of going through all σ . *why is $Ef(\sigma) = \sum f(\sigma)p(\sigma) = \sum_{sampled} f(\sigma)/N$ *how it relates to our problem **sigma* graph with the weights $Q(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma}')$ which have 2^N states and $(2^N)^2$ connections note about being too vast to search through (dim-devil) *different algorithms for implementing MCMC *compare the different ones shortly (what they assume or need for example) *explain why we chose it *how we chose Q what are the requirements for it *hamming distance measure and picking close ones (as we should accordingly) *why hamming? a more natural distance for switch settings than say euclidean or such. *step size $(\delta) = 1$ (tuning parameter) *abstractly relate to the graph (what is this type of graph called?) *describe the marginalization over states in $p(\sigma|o)$ and why we need to do it

Chapter 3

Results & Discussion

*MCMC *convergence analysis *trace plot *autocorrelation? *test different distributions for step size. *step-size effect *to small step size => autocorrelation high (slow convergence) *to big step size => low acceptance rate