# CS 512, Spring 2014

## **Assignment 1**

Shan Sikdar

Due Monday January 27th

### 1 (\*) 2.1

Verify 
$$\sum\limits_{x=0}^{1}p(x|\mu)=1$$
 Proof.  $\sum\limits_{x=0}^{1}p(x|\mu)=p(x=0|\mu)+p(x=1|\mu)=\mu+1-\mu=1$ 

Verify: 
$$\mathbb{E}[x]=\mu$$
 Proof.  $\mathbb{E}[x]=\sum\limits_{x}x \;\; p(x|\mu)=1*\mu+0*(1-\mu)=\mu$ 

Verify 
$$var[x] = \mu(1 - \mu)$$
  
Proof.  
 $var(x) = \mathbb{E}[(x - E[x])^2]$   
 $= (1 - \mu)(0 - \mu)^2 + \mu(1 - \mu)^2$   
 $= (1 - \mu)(\mu)^2 + \mu(1 - \mu)^2$   
 $= \mu - \mu^2 = \mu(1 - \mu)$ 

Show entropy of H[x] of a Bernoulli distributed random variable x is given

by : 
$$H[x] = -\mu \ln \mu - (1 - \mu) \ln (1 - \mu)$$
  
By definition of entropy:  $H[x] = -\sum_{x} p(x|\mu) \ln [p(x|\mu)]$   
 $= -[(1 - \mu) \ln (1 - \mu) + (\mu \ln \mu)] = -\mu \ln \mu - (1 - \mu) \ln (1 - \mu)$ 

#### 2 2.2

Show that the distribution (2.261) is normalized and evaluate its mean, variance, and entropy.

Show normalized: 
$$\sum x = -1, 1 \ p(x|\mu) = 1$$
 proof.

$$\sum_{x=-1,1} p(x|\mu) = \frac{(1-\mu)^1}{2} \frac{(1+\mu)^0}{2} + \frac{(1-\mu)^0}{2} \frac{(1+\mu)^1}{2} = \frac{(1-\mu)}{2} + \frac{(1+\mu)}{2} = \frac{2}{2} = 1$$

Evaluate its mean:

$$= \sum_{x} f(x) \ p(x) = (-1)(\frac{(1-\mu)}{2}) + (1)(\frac{(1+\mu)}{2}) = \frac{2\mu}{2} = \mu$$

Evaluate its Variance:

$$var[x] = \mathbb{E}[x^2] - \mathbb{E}[x]^2 = (-1)^2(\frac{1-\mu}{2}) + (1)^2(\frac{1+\mu}{2}) + \mu^2 = 1 - \mu^2$$

Evaluate its Entropy:

$$H[x] = -\sum_{x} p(x|\mu) \ln[p(x|\mu)] = -[((\frac{1-\mu}{2}) \ln((\frac{1-\mu}{2})) + ((\frac{1+\mu}{2}) \ln((\frac{1+\mu}{2})))] = -((\frac{1-\mu}{2}) \ln((\frac{1-\mu}{2})) - ((\frac{1+\mu}{2}) \ln((\frac{1+\mu}{2})))$$

### 3 2.7

Show that the posterior mean value of x lies between the prior mean and the maximum likelihood estimate for  $\mu$ . To do this show the posterior mean can be written as  $\lambda$  times the prior mean plus  $(1 - \lambda)$  times the maximum likelihood estimate where  $0 \le \lambda \le 1$ .

From 2.15 the mean of the prior is  $\frac{a}{a+b}$ From 2.20 the mean of the posterior is  $\frac{m+a}{m+a+l+b}$ From class the maximum likelihood estimate is  $\frac{m}{m+l}$ 

So want to show  $\lambda(\frac{a}{a+b})+(1-\lambda)(\frac{m}{m+l})=\frac{a+m}{a+b+l+m}$  where  $0\leq\lambda\leq1$ . So solve for  $\lambda$  and argue its range is  $0\leq\lambda\leq1$ :

$$\begin{split} \lambda \big(\frac{a}{a+b}\big) + \big(1-\lambda\big) \big(\frac{m}{m+l}\big) &= \frac{a+m}{a+b+l+m} \\ \big(\frac{a\lambda}{a+b}\big) + \big(\frac{m-m\lambda}{m+l}\big) &= \frac{a+m}{a+b+l+m} \\ \frac{(m+l)(a\lambda) + (m-m\lambda)(a+b)}{(a+b)(m+l)} &= \frac{a+m}{a+b+l+m} \\ \frac{a\lambda l + am + bm - b\lambda m}{(a+b)(m+l)} &= \frac{a+m}{a+b+l+m} \end{split}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \frac{a\lambda l - b\lambda m}{(a+b)(m+l)} + \frac{am+bm}{(a+b)(m+l)} = \frac{a+m}{a+b+l+m} \\ \frac{a\lambda l - b\lambda m}{(a+b)(m+l)} + \frac{m}{(m+l)} = \frac{a+m}{a+b+l+m} \\ \frac{a\lambda l - b\lambda m}{(a+b)(m+l)} = \frac{a+m}{a+b+l+m} - \frac{m}{(m+l)} \\ \frac{a\lambda l - b\lambda m}{(a+b)(m+l)} = \frac{a+m}{a+b+l+m} - \frac{m}{(m+l)} \\ \frac{a\lambda l - b\lambda m}{(a+b)(m+l)} = \frac{(a+m)(m+l)}{(a+b+l+m)(m+l)} - \frac{m(a+b+l+m)}{(a+b+l+m)(m+l)} \\ \frac{a\lambda l - b\lambda m}{(a+b)(m+l)} = \frac{(al-bm)}{(a+b+l+m)(m+l)} \\ \frac{a\lambda l - b\lambda m}{(a+b)(m+l)} = \frac{(al-bm)}{(a+b+l+m)(m+l)} \\ \lambda = \frac{(al-bm)(a+b)(m+l)}{(al-bm)(a+b+l+m)(m+l)} \\ \lambda = \frac{(a+b)}{(a+b+l+m)} \\ \lambda = \frac{1}{1+\frac{l+m}{a+b}} \\ \lambda = \frac{1}{1+\frac{l+m}{a+b}} \end{array}$$

All variables in this equation are greater than 0. If  $\frac{l+m}{a+b}$  gets larger,  $\lambda$  will tend to 0. If  $\frac{l+m}{a+b}$  gets smaller, lambda will tend to 0. So  $0 \le \lambda \le 1$ 

#### 4 2.8

```
Prove \mathbb{E}[x] = \mathbb{E}_y[\mathbb{E}_x[x|y]] and var[x] = \mathbb{E}_y[var_x[x|y]] + var_y[\mathbb{E}_x[x|y]]

E[x] = \int_x p(x) \ x \ dx

= \int_x \int_y p(x|y) \ p(y) \ x \ dy \ dx (using product rule)

= \int_y \int_x p(x|y) \ p(y) \ x \ dx \ dy

= \int_y p(y) \int_x p(x|y) \ x \ dx \ dy

= \int_y p(y) \ E_x[x|y] \ dy

= E_y[E[x|y]]

Prove: var[x] = \mathbb{E}_y[var_x[x|y]] + var_y[\mathbb{E}_x[x|y]]

var[x] = \mathbb{E}[x^2] - \mathbb{E}[x]^2

= \mathbb{E}_y[\mathbb{E}_x[x^2|y]] - \mathbb{E}_y[\mathbb{E}_x[x|y]]^2

= \mathbb{E}_y[\mathbb{E}_x[x^2|y]] - \mathbb{E}_y[\mathbb{E}_x[x|y]^2] + \mathbb{E}_y[\mathbb{E}_x[x|y]^2] - \mathbb{E}_y[\mathbb{E}_x[x|y]]^2

= \mathbb{E}_y[\mathbb{E}_x[x^2|y]] - \mathbb{E}_y[\mathbb{E}_x[x|y]^2] + var_y[\mathbb{E}_x[x|y]]

Since Expectation is a linear operator:

= \mathbb{E}_y[\mathbb{E}_x[x^2|y] - \mathbb{E}_x[x|y]^2] + var_y[\mathbb{E}_x[x|y]]

= \mathbb{E}_y[var_x[x|y]] + var_y[\mathbb{E}_x[x|y]]
```

#### 5 2.27

Let x and z be two independent random vectors, so that p(x,z) = p(x)p(z).

Show that the mean of their sum y = x + z is given by the sum of the means of each of the variables separately.

Proof: Let 
$$x = [x_1, ..., x_n]$$
 and  $z = [z_1, ..., z_n]$  then:

$$\frac{x_1 + x_2 + \ldots + x_n}{n} + \frac{z_1 + z_2 + \ldots + z_n}{n} = \frac{(x_1 + z_1) + (x_2 + z_2) + \ldots + (x_n + z_n)}{n} = \frac{y_1 + y_2 + \ldots + y_n}{n}$$

Show that the covariance atrix of y is given by the sum of the covariance matrices x and z.

Proof: Using formula 2.63:

$$\begin{aligned} &cov[y] = \mathbb{E}[(y - E[y])(y - E[y])^T] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[((x + z) - E[(x + z)])((x + z)) - E[(x + z)])^T] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(x - E[x] + z - E[x])(x - E[x] + z - E[x])^T] = \mathbb{E}[((x - E[x]) + (z - E[x]))((x - E[x])^T + (z - E[x])^T)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(x - E[x])(x - E[x])^T + (z - E[x])(x - E[x])^T + (z - E[x])(z - E[x])^T] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(x - E[x])(x - E[x])^T] + \mathbb{E}[(x - E[x])(z - E[x])^T] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(x - E[x])(x - E[x])^T] + \mathbb{E}[(z - E[x])(z - E[x])^T)] \\ &= cov[x] + cov[z] + cov[x, z] + cov[z, x] \\ &= cov[x] + cov[y] \end{aligned}$$

#### Facts I used:

- (1) x,z independent, E is a linear operator
- (2)  $(A+B)^T = A^T + B^T$
- (3) Since x and z are independent, the covariance matrices with respect to each other will be 0.

Confirm that this result agrees with that of excercise 1.10.

You can consider one variable to be a vector with one element so the first proof shows that 1.28 holds. In the single variable case, covariance reduces to just normal varince so 1.29 holds.