

Home

Questions

Tags

Users

Unanswered

Likelihood vs. Probability

Asked 6 years, 11 months agoActive 5 years, 4 months agoViewed 3k times

I have difficulties with *Likelihoods*. I do understand Bayes' Theorem

$$p(A|B, \mathcal{H}) = \frac{p(B|A, \mathcal{H})p(A|\mathcal{H})}{p(B|\mathcal{H})}$$

which can be directly deduced from applying $p(A, B) = p(B) \cdot p(A|B) = p(A)p(B|A) = p(B, A)$. Thus in my interpretation, the $p(\cdot)$ functions in Bayes Theorem are somehow all probabilities, either marginal or conditional. So I have actually thought that Likelihood as a concept was more of a frequentist view of the inverse probability.

However, I have now repeatedly seen statements in *Bayesianists'* books that say that the likelihood is not a probability distribution. Reading MacKay's book yesterday, I stumbled over the following statement

"[...] it is important to note that the terms likelihood and probability are not synonyms. The quantity $P(n_b|u, N)$ is a function of both n_B and u . For fixed u , $P(n_b|u, N)$ defines a probability over n_B , for fixed n_B , $P(n_B|u, N)$ defines the likelihood of u ."

- I understand this as follows: $p(A|B)$ is a probability of A under given B , thus a function probability : $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. But considering a given value $a \in A$ and evaluating $p(A = a|B)$'s dependency on different $b \in B$'s we are actually using a different function $L : B \rightarrow [0, 1]$.
- Is this interpretation correct?
- Can one then say that maximum likelihood methods could be motivated by the Bayesian theorem, where the prior is chosen to be constant?

probabilitylikelihood

ShareCiteEditFollowFlag

asked Apr 4 '14 at 5:51

wirrbel525314

- 1 As an element of answer, I advice you the answer with links of Stephane Laurent in mathoverflow.net/questions/10971/.... Hope it helps. – [peuhp](#) Apr 4 '14 at 7:34

Add a comment

Start a bounty

1 Answer

ActiveOldestVotes

I think maybe the best way to explain the notion of likelihood is to consider a concrete example. Suppose I have a sample of IID observations drawn from a Bernoulli distribution with unknown probability of success p : $X_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, so the joint probability mass function of the sample is

$$\Pr[\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{x} \mid p] = \prod_{i=1}^n p^{x_i} (1 - p)^{1-x_i}.$$

This expression also characterizes the likelihood of p , given an observed sample $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$:

$$L(p \mid \boldsymbol{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n p^{x_i} (1 - p)^{1-x_i}.$$

But if we think of p as a random variable, this likelihood is not a density:

$$\int_{p=0}^1 L(p \mid \boldsymbol{x}) dp \neq 1.$$

It is, however, *proportional* to a probability density, which is why we say it is a likelihood of p being a particular value given the sample—it represents, in some sense, the relative plausibility of p being some value for the observations we made.

For instance, suppose $n = 5$ and the sample was $\boldsymbol{x} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 1)$. Intuitively we would conclude that p is more likely to be closer to 1 than to 0, because we observed more ones. Indeed, we have

$$L(p \mid \boldsymbol{x}) = p^4 (1 - p).$$

If we plot this function on $p \in [0, 1]$, we can see how the likelihood confirms our intuition. Of course, we do not know the true value of p —it could have been $p = 0.25$ rather than $p = 0.8$, but the likelihood function tells us that the former is much less likely than the latter. But if we want to determine a *probability* that p lies in a certain interval, we have to normalize the likelihood: since $\int_{p=0}^1 p^4 (1 - p) dp = \frac{1}{30}$, it follows that in order to get a *posterior density* for p , we must multiply by 30:

$$f_p(p \mid \boldsymbol{x}) = 30 p^4 (1 - p).$$

In fact, this posterior is a beta distribution with parameters $a = 5$, $b = 2$. Now the areas under the density correspond to probabilities.

So, what we have essentially done here is applied Bayes' rule:

$$f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{f_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{x} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{f_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{x})}.$$

Here, $f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is a *prior* distribution on the parameter(s) $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, the numerator is the likelihood $L(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \boldsymbol{x}) = f_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{x} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = f_{\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ which is also the joint distribution of $\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}$, and the denominator is the marginal (unconditional) density of \boldsymbol{X} , obtained by integrating the joint distribution with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ to find the normalizing constant that makes the likelihood a probability density with respect to the parameter(s). In our numerical example, we implicitly took the prior for $f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$ to be uniform on $[0, 1]$. It can be shown that, for a Bernoulli sample, if the prior is $\text{Beta}(a, b)$, the posterior for $f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$ is also Beta, but with parameters $a^* = a + \sum x_i$, $b^* = b + n - \sum x_i$. We call such a prior *conjugate* (and refer to this as a Bernoulli-Beta conjugate pair).

ShareCiteEditFollowFlag

edited Nov 5 '15 at 9:24












Felipe12

answered Apr 4 '14 at 7:52

heropup4,60611221

Add a comment

Your Answer

B \mathcal{I} 

☐ Community wiki

Post Your Answer

Not the answer you're looking for? Browse other questions tagged [probability](#) [likelihood](#) or [ask your own question](#).

Ask Question

Featured on Meta

- State of the Stack Q1 2021 Blog Post
- Should we replace the "data set request" with distinct "this is an off-topic..."

Related

- 29 Wikipedia entry on likelihood seems ambiguous
- 2 On the relation between conditional distribution and likelihood
- 2 How to calculate likelihood from Bayes' theorem without the normalisation?
- 13 A Measure Theoretic Formulation of Bayes' Theorem
- 1 Likelihood in Bayes theorem vs in MLE

Hot Network Questions

- Блин, everyone?
- Ancient temple booby traps designed for dragons
- New DM on House Rules, concerning Nat20 & Rule of Cool
- Hello, Permutations!
- I don't understand why it is necessary to use a trigger on an oscilloscope for data acquisition
- Idiom similar to "if the shoe fits"
- Why does water weaken ion ion attractions?
- Can a Lan Adapter cause a whole home network to crash?
- How can I draw the trefoil knot in 3D co-ordinates in Latex using these parametric equations?
- How to change some numbers in a font?
- This ISS trash deployment looks more like 2 feet than 2 inches per second, was it too fast or are these articles incorrect?
- Retaining permissions when copying a folder
- Is a comment aligned with the element being commented a good practice?
- Why might radios not be effective in a post-apocalyptic world?
- Sun as water pump in underpressure water power circle
- Using TikZ to draw a relation
- Term to describe paradox where those with less subject matter expertise can sometimes make better teachers?
- Self-Replicating Numbers
- n-th Fibonacci number with memoization
- Word for the animal providing motive power for a vehicle?
- How did James Potter get his Invisibility Cloak?
- Recommendations for OR video channels (YouTube etc)
- Does either 'messy' or 'untidy' necessarily imply 'dirty'?
- How long would it take for inbreeding issues to arise for a family that practiced inbreeding?

Question feed

CROSS VALIDATED

Tour
Help
Chat
Contact
Feedback
Mobile
Disable Responsiveness

COMPANY

Stack Overflow
For Teams
Advertise With Us
Hire a Developer
Developer Jobs
About
Press
Legal
Privacy Policy
Terms of Service
Cookie Settings
Cookie Policy

STACK EXCHANGE NETWORK

Technology
Life / Arts
Culture / Recreation
Science
Other

Blog Facebook Twitter LinkedIn Instagram