

Motivation for Probabilistic Reasoning

* Modeling of uncertainty

- Inherent randomness (e.g. radioactive decay)

- Gross statistical dependencies of complex deterministic world

* Probability as guardian of common sense reasoning

* Many empirical successes:

- Natural language, speech, robotics, bioinformatics.

↓
(e.g. coin toss)

Review

* Discrete random variable X

Domain of possible values $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$

Ex: month M , $\{m_1 = \text{Jan}, m_2 = \text{Feb}, \dots, m_{12} = \text{Dec}\}$

* Unconditional (or prior) probability $\Rightarrow P(X=x)$

* Basic axioms

$$(i) P(X=x) \geq 0$$

$$(ii) \sum_i P(X=x_i) = 1$$

$$(iii) P(X=x_i \text{ or } X=x_j) = P(X=x_i) + P(X=x_j) \text{ if } x_i \neq x_j$$

Probs add for union of mutually exclusive events

* Conditional probabilities

$P(X=x_i | Y=y_j)$ - Probability that $X=x_i$
given $Y=y_j$

In general : $P(X=x_i | Y=y_j) \neq P(X=x_i)$

Ex: Dependent random variables

Weather W $\{w_1 = \text{sunny}, w_2 = \text{rainy}\}$

$$P(W = \text{sunny}) = 0.9$$

$$P(W = \text{sunny} | M = \text{Aug}) = 0.97$$

$$P(W = \text{sunny} | M = \text{Jan}) = 0.83$$

Ex: Independent random variables (Marginally independent)

Day of week D $\{d_1 = \text{sun}, d_2 = \text{mon}, \dots, d_7 = \text{sat}\}$

$$P(W = \text{sunny}) \neq$$

$$P(W = \text{sunny}) = 0.9$$

$$P(W = \text{sunny} | D = \text{sunday}) = 0.9$$

$$P(W = \text{sunny} | D = \text{Saturday}) = 0.9$$

Ex: Conditionally independent random variables

Binary $\{0, 1\}$ random variable

R = is it raining?

W = is the sidewalk wet?

U = people using umbrellas?

$P(W=1) < P(W=1 | U=1) \Rightarrow W$ and U are not (marginally) independent

$P(W=1 | R=1) = P(W=1 | R=1, U=1)$ W and U are conditionally independent given R .
Assuming above is true for all possible values of W, R and U

Ex: Conditionally dependent random variables

End of lecture

* Also true

$$(i) P(X=x_i | Y=y_j) \geq 0$$

$$(ii) \sum_i P(X=x_i | Y=y_j) = 1 \quad \text{Note: sum over } i, \text{ not } j$$

* Joint probabilities

$P(X=x_i, Y=y_j)$ - Probability that $X=x_i$ and $Y=y_j$

* Product rule

For all values of i, j

$$\begin{aligned} P(X=x_i, Y=y_j) &= P(X=x_i) \cdot P(Y=y_j | X=x_i) \\ &= P(Y=y_j) \cdot P(X=x_i | Y=y_j) \end{aligned}$$

* Marginalization

$$P(X=x_i) = \sum_j P(X=x_i, Y=y_j)$$

$$P(X=x_i, Y=y_j) = \sum_k P(X=x_i, Y=y_j, Z=z_k)$$

* Note: In general, easier to ~~elicit~~ conditional probability from experts than joint probabilities

* shorthand notation:

(1) Implied universality

$$P(X, Y) = P(X) \cdot P(Y|X) = P(Y) \cdot P(X|Y)$$

↳ prod rule in short hand notation

(e) Implied assignment

$$P(x,y,z) = P(X=x, Y=y, Z=z)$$

* Generalized Product Rule

$$P(A, B, C, D, \dots) = P(A) \cdot P(B|A) \cdot P(C|A, B) \cdot P(D|A, B, C) \cdots$$

* Bayes Rule

$$P(X|Y) = \frac{P(Y|X) \cdot P(X)}{P(Y)}$$

* Bayes rule - Conditioned on additional event Z

$$P(X|Y, Z) = \frac{P(Y|X, Z) \cdot P(X|Z)}{P(Y|Z)}$$

Alarm example

* Binary random variables

B - is there a burglary

E - is there an earthquake

A - does the alarm go off.

* Joint distribution.

$$P(B, E, A) = P(B) \cdot P(E|B) \cdot P(A|B, E)$$

* Prior knowledge about world

Burglaries are rare $P(B=1) = 0.001$

Earthquakes are rare $P(E=1|B=0) = 0.002$

$P(E=1|B=1) = 0.002$

Implies Burglaries and Earthquakes are independent

Assumption: Burglaries & earthquakes are independent

$$P(E|B) = P(E) \text{ or } P(B|E) = P(B)$$

B	E	$P(A B, E)$
0	0	0.001
1	0	0.94
0	1	0.29
1	1	0.95

Probs of complimentary events are easy to compute: $P(B=0) = 1 - P(B=1)$
 $P(A=0|B, E) = 1 - P(A=1|B, E)$

Inference

Do rules of probability capture common sense reasoning?

Let's compare the following:

$$\textcircled{1} \quad P(B=1) = 0.001$$

$$\textcircled{2} \quad P(B=1|A=1) = ?$$

$$\textcircled{3} \quad P(B=1|A=1, E=1) = ?$$

$$\textcircled{2} \quad P(B=1|A=1) = \frac{P(A=1|B=1) \cdot P(B=1)}{P(A=1)}$$

0.001

$$\text{Numerator: } P(A=1|B=1) = \sum_e P(A=1|E=e|B=1) \quad \begin{matrix} \text{conditional} \\ \text{marginalization} \end{matrix}$$

$$= \sum_e P(E=e|B=1) \cdot P(A=1|E=e, B=1) \quad \begin{matrix} \text{Prob rule} \end{matrix}$$

$$= \sum_e P(E=e) \cdot P(A=1 | E=e, B=1) \quad \begin{matrix} \text{marginally} \\ \text{independent} \end{matrix}$$

$$P(A=1 | B=1) = P(E=0) \cdot P(A=1 | E=0, B=1) + P(E=1) \cdot P(A=1 | E=1, B=1)$$

substituting values

$$P(A=1 | B=1) = 0.94002$$

Denominator:

$$P(A=1) = \sum_{b,e} P(B=b, E=e, A=1) \quad \text{marginalization.}$$

$$= \sum_{b,e} P(B=b) \cdot P(E=e | B=b) \cdot P(A=1 | E=e, B=b) \quad \text{prod rule}$$

$$= \sum_{b,e} P(B=b) \cdot P(E=e) \cdot P(A=1 | E=e, B=b) \quad \begin{matrix} \text{marginally} \\ \text{independent} \end{matrix}$$

substituting values and sum over 4 terms

$$P(A=1) = 0.00252$$

$$P(B=1 | A=1) = \frac{P(A=1 | B=1) \cdot P(B=1)}{P(A=1)}$$

$$= \frac{0.94002 \times 0.001}{0.00252} = 0.37$$

We have

$$P(B=1) = 0.001$$

$$P(B=1 | A=1) = 0.37$$

agrees with common sense

(3) Last term:

$$P(B=1 | A=1, E=1) = \frac{P(A=1 | B=1, E=1) \cdot P(B=1 | E=1)}{P(A=1 | E=1)}$$

0.95 0.001
↑ ↗
conditional Bayes rule

$$P(B=1 | E=1) = P(B=1) = 0.001$$

↳ independent

Denominator:

Similar to calculating $P(A=1 | B=1)$

$$P(A=1 | E=1) = \sum_b P(A=1, B=b | E=1)$$

marginalization

$$= \sum_b P(B=b | E=1) \cdot P(A=1 | B=b, E=1)$$

prod rule

$$= \sum_b P(B=b) \cdot P(A=1 | B=b, E=1)$$

marginal independence

Substitute and sum

$$P(A=1 | E=1) = 0.29066$$

$$P(B=1 | A=1, E=1) = \frac{0.95 \times 0.001}{0.29066} = 0.0033$$

Compare:

$$\begin{aligned} P(B=1) &= 0.001 \\ P(B=1 | A=1) &= 0.37 \uparrow \\ P(B=1 | A=1, E=1) &= 0.0033 \downarrow \end{aligned}$$

Example of
non-monotonic
reasoning



Pattern of reasoning known as "Explaining away"
Earthquake explains away the alarm,
thereby diminishing our belief in burglary.

Ex: Conditional dependence

$P(B) = P(B|E)$ \rightarrow marginal independence
(B is independent of E)

$P(B|A) \neq P(B|E, A)$

\hookrightarrow conditional dependence

B and E are conditionally dependent
given A.