Incomplete Data Analysis

V. Inácio de Carvalho & M. de Carvalho

University of Edinburgh















→ The EM algorithm was proposed by Dempster, Laird, and Rubin in their seminal paper published in JRSS B in 1977 (although similar ideas had appeared earlier) and it is one of the great success stories of statistics over the past 40 years.

Maximum Likelihood from Incomplete Data via the EM Algorithm

By A. P. Dempster, N. M. Laird and D. B. Rubin

Harvard University and Educational Testing Service

[Read before the ROYAL STATISTICAL SOCIETY at a meeting organized by the RESEARCH SECTION on Wednesday, December 8th, 1976, Professor S. D. SILVEY in the Chair]

SUMMARY

A broadly applicable algorithm for computing maximum likelihood estimates from incomplete data is presented at various levels of generality. Theory showing the monotone behaviour of the likelihood and convergence of the algorithm is derived. Many examples are sketched, including missing value situations, applications to grouped, censored or truncated data, finite mixture models, variance component estimation, hyperparameter estimation, iteratively reweighted least squares and factor analysis.

Keywords: MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD; INCOMPLETE DATA; EM ALGORITHM; POSTERIOR MODE



Context

- → The EM algorithm has been the first choice of most researchers seeking maximum likelihood estimates in a model that involves incomplete data or that can be structured in such a way (e.g., through latent variables).
- → At the time of writing these notes (21/10/2020), the number of citations of the article on Google Scholar exceeds 60 000.

Context

- → The EM algorithm is most useful when maximisation from the complete data likelihood is easy wile maximisation based on the observed data likelihood is difficult.
- \hookrightarrow Starting from an initial value $\theta^{(0)}$ inside the parameter space Θ , the EM algorithm consists of an expectation (E) step and a maximisation (M) step within each iteration.
- The condition for the EM algorithm to be valid, in its basic form, is ignorability and hence MAR data.

Expectation step

- \hookrightarrow We denote the observed data log likelihood by $\log L(\theta \mid \mathbf{y}_{obs})$ and the complete data log likelihood by $\log L(\theta \mid \mathbf{y}_{obs}, \mathbf{y}_{mis})$.
- \hookrightarrow At iteration (t+1) of the iterative procedure, the E-step calculates the conditional expectation, with respect to the missing observations, of the complete data log-likelihood given the observed data and the estimate of θ from iteration t, $\theta^{(t)}$, that is,

$$\begin{split} Q(\theta \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}) &= E_{\mathsf{Y}_{\mathsf{mis}}}[\log L(\theta \mid \mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{obs}}, \mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{mis}}) \mid \mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{obs}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}] \\ &= E_{\mathsf{Y}_{\mathsf{mis}}}[\log f(\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{obs}}, \mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{mis}} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{obs}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}] \\ &= \int \log f(\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{obs}}, \mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{mis}} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) f(\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{mis}} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{obs}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{mis}}. \end{split}$$

Maximisation step

 \hookrightarrow In the M-step, we obtain $\theta^{(t+1)}$, the value of θ that maximises $Q(\theta \mid \theta^{(t)})$. That is,

$$oldsymbol{ heta}^{(t+1)} = rg \max_{oldsymbol{ heta}} Q(oldsymbol{ heta} \mid oldsymbol{ heta}^{(t)}),$$

this implies that $Q(\theta^{(t+1)} \mid \theta^{(t)}) > Q(\theta \mid \theta^{(t)})$, for all $\theta \in \Theta$.

- → The E and M steps are repeated until some convergence criterion is met.
- \hookrightarrow One possible criterion is

$$D(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}) < \varepsilon, \qquad D(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\rho} |u_i - v_i|.$$



Toy example

- → To understand the EM basic setup, let us consider a trivial example (Givens and Hoeting, 2012, p. 99).
- \hookrightarrow Let $Y_1, Y_2 \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Exp}(\theta)$. Remember that $f(y; \theta) = \theta e^{-\theta y}, y \ge 0$, and $\theta > 0$.
- \hookrightarrow Suppose that $y_1 = 5$ and y_2 is missing. That is, $\mathbf{y}_{obs} = \{y_1\}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{mis} = \{y_2\}$.

$$L(\theta \mid y_1, y_2) = f(y_1; \theta) f(y_2; \theta) = \theta^2 e^{-\theta(y_1 + y_2)}.$$

$$\log L(\theta \mid y_1, y_2) = 2 \log \theta - \theta y_1 - \theta y_2.$$

Toy example

 \hookrightarrow For the E-step at iteration t+1 we need to calculate the expectation, with respect to what is missing, Y_2 , of the above complete data log likelihood, given what is observed Y_1 and the current estimate of θ . $\theta^{(t)}$, that is

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\theta \mid \theta^{(t)}) &= E_{Y_2}[\log L(\theta \mid y_1, y_2) \mid y_1, \theta^{(t)}] \\ &= E[2 \log \theta - \theta y_1 - \theta Y_2 \mid y_1, \theta^{(t)}] \\ &= 2 \log \theta - 5\theta - \theta E[Y_2 \mid y_1, \theta^{(t)}]. \end{aligned}$$

- $\hookrightarrow \text{ Now, since } Y_2 \sim \text{Exp}(\theta) \text{, then } E[Y_2] = \tfrac{1}{\theta} \text{, and so } E[Y_2 \mid y_1, \theta^{(t)}] = E[Y_2 \mid \theta^{(t)}] = \tfrac{1}{\theta^{(t)}}.$
- → Replacing, we get

$$Q(\theta \mid \theta^{(t)}) = 2 \log \theta - 5\theta - \frac{\theta}{\theta^{(t)}}.$$



Toy example

- \hookrightarrow For the M-step, we maximise $Q(\theta \mid \theta^{(t)})$ with respect to θ .

$$\frac{\mathsf{d}}{\mathsf{d}\theta}Q(\theta\mid\theta^{(t)})=\frac{2}{\theta}-5-\frac{1}{\theta^{(t)}}.$$

 \hookrightarrow So,

$$\frac{d}{d\theta}Q(\theta \mid \theta^{(t)}) = 0 \Rightarrow \frac{2}{\theta} - 5 - \frac{1}{\theta^{(t)}} = 0$$
$$\Rightarrow \theta^{(t+1)} = \frac{2\theta^{(t)}}{5\theta^{(t)} + 1},$$

which can be solved iteratively.

 \hookrightarrow Note that here the E and M steps do not need to be re-derived at each iteration: iterative application of the updating formula starting from some initial value provides estimates that converge to $\hat{\theta} = 0.2$.

Properties of the EM algorithm

→ Each iteration of the EM algorithm, leads to an observed likelihood that is greater than or equal to the previous observed likelihood

$$\log L(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{obs}}) \ge \log L(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{obs}}),$$

that is, EM iterates always improve the estimate in the sense that each iterate is more likely than its predecessors.

→ It is possible for the iterates to converge to a local mode and it is always wise to start the
algorithm with several very different initial values, especially if we do not have a clear idea
about the behaviour (e.g., the number of modes) of the likelihood being maximised.

Generalised EM

- \hookrightarrow With the GEM algorithm, $\theta^{(t+1)}$ is chosen not to globally maximise $Q(\theta \mid \theta^{(t)})$ but rather to ensure that $Q(\theta^{(t+1)} \mid \theta^{(t)}) > Q(\theta^{(t)} \mid \theta^{(t)})$.

Genetic linkage model: Rao (1973), Dempster, Laird, and Rubin (1977)

- → This example has been used on numerous occasions to illustrate the EM algorithm, including the original article by Dempster, Laird, and Rubin (1977).
- \hookrightarrow Suppose that 197 animals are distributed into 4 categories, so that the observed data are

$$y = (y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4) = (125, 18, 20, 34),$$

and y is postulated to have arisen from a multinomial distribution with cell probabilities

$$(\rho_1,\rho_2,\rho_3,\rho_4) = \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\theta}{4}, \frac{1}{4}(1-\theta), \frac{1}{4}(1-\theta), \frac{\theta}{4}\right),$$

for some $\theta \in (0,1)$ unknown.

 \hookrightarrow The goal is to estimate θ .

Genetic linkage model: Rao (1973), Dempster, Laird, and Rubin (1977)

$$\begin{split} L(\theta \mid y) &= \frac{(y_1 + y_2 + y_3 + y_4)!}{y_1! y_2! y_3! y_4!} p_1^{y_1} p_2^{y_2} p_3^{y_3} p_4^{y_4} \\ &\propto \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\theta}{4}\right)^{y_1} \left(\frac{1}{4}(1 - \theta)\right)^{y_2 + y_3} \left(\frac{\theta}{4}\right)^{y_4} \\ &\propto (2 + \theta)^{y_1} (1 - \theta)^{y_2 + y_3} \theta^{y_4}. \end{split}$$

- → To maximise this likelihood there is no need to use iterative methods. We can find the mle analytically. Suggestion: try it by yourself!
- → However, for illustration purposes, we will use the EM algorithm.

Genetic linkage model: Rao (1973), Dempster, Laird, and Rubin (1977)

- \hookrightarrow To this end, let us suppose that the first cell is divided into tow sub cells with probabilities 1/2 and $\theta/4$, respectively.
- \hookrightarrow Let z and $y_1 z$ be the number of observations (=animals) that fall into the first and second sub cells, respectively. Note that z is unobserved/missing/latent.
- \hookrightarrow The random vector $(Z, Y_1 Z, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4)$ has multinomial distribution with probabilities

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\theta}{4}, \frac{1}{4}(1-\theta), \frac{1}{4}(1-\theta), \frac{\theta}{4}\right)$$
.

 \hookrightarrow Let (y, z) form the hypothetical complete data. The likelihood of the complete data is

$$\label{eq:loss_loss} L(\theta \mid y,z) \propto \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^z \left(\frac{\theta}{4}\right)^{y_1-z+y_4} \left(\frac{1}{4}(1-\theta)\right)^{y_2+y_3}.$$

Genetic linkage model: Rao (1973), Dempster, Laird, and Rubin (1977)

$$\log L(\theta \mid y, z) = (y_1 - z + y_4) \log \theta + (y_2 + y_3) \log(1 - \theta).$$

 \hookrightarrow Let $\theta^{(t)}$ be the current estimate of θ , in the E-step we compute

$$Q(\theta \mid \theta^{(t)}) = E_Z[\log L(\theta \mid y, z) \mid y, \theta^{(t)}]$$

= $(y_1 - E[Z \mid y, \theta^{(t)}] + y_4) \log \theta + (y_2 + y_3) \log(1 - \theta).$

→ Now, by construction

$$Z \mid Y_1 = y_1 \sim \text{Binomial}\left(y_1, \frac{1/2}{1/2 + \theta/4}\right),$$

implying that

$$E[Z] = y_1 \times \frac{1/2}{1/2 + \theta/4}.$$



Genetic linkage model: Rao (1973), Dempster, Laird, and Rubin (1977)

→ Hence,

$$E[Z \mid y, \theta^{(t)}] = E[Z \mid y_1, \theta^{(t)}] = y_1 \times \frac{1/2}{1/2 + \theta^{(t)}/4} = z^{(t)}.$$

 \hookrightarrow So,

$$Q(\theta \mid \theta^{(t)}) = (y_1 - z^{(t)} + y_4) \log \theta + (y_2 + y_3) \log(1 - \theta).$$

→ For the M-step,

$$\frac{d}{d\theta}Q(\theta \mid \theta^{(t)}) = 0 \Rightarrow (y_1 - z^{(t)} + y_4)\frac{1}{\theta} - (y_2 + y_3)\frac{1}{1 - \theta} = 0$$
$$\Rightarrow \theta^{(t+1)} = \frac{y_1 - z^{(t)} + y_4}{n - z^{(t)}},$$

 $n = y_1 + y_2 + y_3 + y_4$, which can be solved iteratively.



Incomplete univariate (normal) data

- \hookrightarrow Let us assume that the data $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ comes from a normal random sample with mean μ (unknown) and variance σ^2 (known).
- \hookrightarrow Further suppose that, possibly after reordering, only the first m observations (y_1,\ldots,y_m) are observed, with the remainder n-m observations (y_{m+1},\ldots,y_n) being missing. Assume also that the missing data mechanism is ignorable.
- \hookrightarrow We have that $\mathbf{y}_{\text{obs}} = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{\text{mis}} = \{y_{m+1}, \dots, y_n\}$.

Incomplete univariate (normal) data

$$\log L(\mu \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{obs}}, \mathbf{y}_{\text{mis}}) = -\frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{n}{2} \log \sigma^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} (y_i - \mu)^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=m+1}^{n} (y_i - \mu)^2.$$

 \hookrightarrow At iteration t + 1, the E step is given by

$$\begin{split} Q(\mu \mid \mu^{(t)}) &= E \mathbf{Y}_{\mathsf{mis}} \left[-\frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{n}{2} \log \sigma^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^m (y_i - \mu)^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=m+1}^n (y_i - \mu)^2 \mid \mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{obs}}, \mu^{(t)} \right] \\ &= -\frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{n}{2} \log \sigma^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^m (y_i - \mu)^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} E \mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{mis}} \left[\sum_{i=m+1}^n (y_i - \mu)^2 \mid \mu^{(t)} \right] \end{split}$$

Incomplete univariate (normal) data

- \hookrightarrow Let us work with the expectation term and bear in mind that $E[Y] = \mu$ and $E[Y^2] = \mu^2 + \sigma^2$.

$$E_{\mathbf{Y}_{mis}}\left[\sum_{i=m+1}^{n}(y_{i}-\mu)^{2}\mid\mu^{(t)}\right]=(n-m)\left\{(\mu^{(t)})^{2}+(\sigma^{(t)})^{2}\right\}-2(n-m)\mu\mu^{(t)}+(n-m)\mu^{2}.$$

→ Therefore

$$Q(\mu \mid \mu^{(t)}) = -\frac{n}{2}\log(2\pi) - \frac{n}{2}\log\sigma^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\sum_{i=1}^{m}(y_i - \mu)^2$$
$$-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}\left[(n-m)\left\{(\mu^{(t)})^2 + \sigma^2\right\} - 2(n-m)\mu\mu^{(t)} + (n-m)\mu^2\right]$$



Incomplete univariate (normal) data

 \hookrightarrow We can now proceed to the M step and we have that

$$\frac{d}{d\mu}Q(\mu \mid \mu^{(t)}) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} (y_i - \mu) + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} (n - m)\mu^{(t)} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mu(n - m).$$

→ Then

$$\frac{d}{d\mu}Q(\mu \mid \mu^{(t)}) = 0 \Rightarrow \mu^{(t+1)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i + (n-m)\mu^{(t)}}{n}.$$

 \hookrightarrow As for the toy example, the E and M steps fo not need to be re-derived at each iteration.