Non-Gaussian likelihoods for Gaussian Processes

Alan Saul

University of Sheffield

Outline

- Motivation
- Laplace approximation
- KL method
- Expectation Propagation
- Comparing approximations

GP regression

Model the observations, $\mathbf{y}$, as a distorted version of the process, $\mathbf{f}$,

$$\mathbf{y}_i \sim \mathcal{N}\left(f(\mathbf{x}_i), \sigma^2\right)$$

f is a non-linear function, in our case we assume it is latent, and is assigned a Gaussian process prior.



GP regression setting

So far we have assumed that the latent values, $\mathbf{f}$, have been corrupted by Gaussian noise. Everything remains analytically tractable.

Gaussian Prior: $$\mathbf{f} \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{K_{ff}}) = p(\mathbf{f})$$

Gaussian likelihood: $$\mathbf{y} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{f}, \sigma^2\mathbf{I}\right) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p(\mathbf{y}_i|\mathbf{f}_i)$$

Gaussian posterior: $$p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y}) \propto \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{f}, \sigma^2\mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{K_{ff}}\right)$$

Likelihood

- $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{f})$ is the probability of the observed data, if we know the latent function values $\mathbf{f}$.
- Can also be seen as the likelihood that the latent function values, $\mathbf{f}$, would give rise to some observed data, $\mathbf{y}$.
- So far assumed that the distortion of the underlying latent function, $\mathbf{f}$, that gives rise to the observed data, $\mathbf{y}$, is independent and Gaussianly distributed.
- This is often not the case, count data, binary data, etc.

Binary example

- Binary outcomes for $\mathbf{y}_i$, $\mathbf{y}_i \in [0, 1]$.
- Model the probability of $\mathbf{y}_i = 1$ with transformation of GP.
- Probability of 1 must be between 0 and 1, thus use squashing transformation, $\lambda(\mathbf{f}_i) = \Phi(\mathbf{f}_i)$.

$$\mathbf{y}_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{with probability } \lambda(\mathbf{f}_i). \\ 0, & \text{with probability } 1 - \lambda(\mathbf{f}_i). \end{cases}$$





Count data example

- Non-negative and discrete values only for $\mathbf{y}_i$, $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{N}$.
- Model the *rate* or *intensity*, λ, of events with a transformation of a Gaussian process.
- Rate parameter must remain positive, use transformation to maintain positiveness $\lambda(\mathbf{f}_i) = \exp(\mathbf{f}_i)$ or $\lambda(\mathbf{f}_i) = \mathbf{f}_i^2$

$$\mathbf{y}_i \sim \text{Poisson}(\mathbf{y}_i|\lambda_i = \lambda(\mathbf{f}_i)) \qquad \text{Poisson}(\mathbf{y}_i|\lambda_i) = \frac{\lambda_i^{\mathbf{y}_i}}{!\mathbf{y}_i} e^{-\lambda_i}$$



Non-Gaussian posteriors

- Exact computation of posterior is no longer analytically tractable due to non-conjugate Gaussian process prior to non-Gaussian likelihood, $p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{f})$.

$$p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{f}) \prod_{i=1}^{n} p(\mathbf{y}_i|\mathbf{f}_i)}{\int p(\mathbf{f}) \prod_{i=1}^{n} p(\mathbf{y}_i|\mathbf{f}_i)\, d\mathbf{f}}$$

- Various methods to make a Gaussian approximation, $q(\mathbf{f}) \approx p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})$.
- Allows simple predictions

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{f}^*|\mathbf{y}) &= \int p(\mathbf{f}^*|\mathbf{f}) p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{f} \\ &\approx \int p(\mathbf{f}^*|\mathbf{f}) q(\mathbf{f}) d\mathbf{f} \end{aligned}$$

Laplace approximation

- Find the mode of the true log posterior, via Newton's method.
- Use second order Taylor expansion around this modal value.
  - i.e obtain curvature at this point.
- Form Gaussian approximation setting the mean equal to the posterior mode, $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$, and matching the curvature.
- $p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y}) \approx q(\mathbf{f}|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{C}) = \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{f}|\hat{\mathbf{f}}, (\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{ff}}^{-1} + \boldsymbol{W})^{-1}\right)$
- $\boldsymbol{W} \triangleq -\frac{d^2 \log p(\mathbf{y}|\hat{\mathbf{f}})}{d\hat{\mathbf{f}}^2}$.
- For factorizing likelihoods (most), $\boldsymbol{W}$ is diagonal.

Visualization of Laplace



Visualization of Laplace



Visualization of Laplace



Visualization of Laplace



Visualization of Laplace



Visualization of Laplace



Visualization of Laplace



Visualization of Laplace



Visualization of Laplace



Visualization of Laplace



Visualization of Laplace



KL-method

- Make a Gaussian approximation, $q(\mathbf{f}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{f}|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{C})$, as similar possible to true posterior, $p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})$.
- Treat $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{C}$ as variational parameters, effecting quality of approximation.
- Define a divergence measure between two distributions, KL divergence, $\mathrm{KL}\left(q(\mathbf{f}) \,||\, p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})\right)$.
- Minimize this divergence between the two distributions (Nickisch and Rasmussen, 2008).

KL divergence

- General for any two distributions $q(\mathbf{x})$ and $p(\mathbf{x})$.
- $\mathrm{KL}\left(q(\mathbf{x}) \| p(\mathbf{x})\right)$ is the average additional amount of information required to specify the values of $\mathbf{x}$ as a result of using an approximate distribution $q(\mathbf{x})$ instead of the true distribution, $p(\mathbf{x})$.
- $\mathrm{KL}\left(q(\mathbf{x}) \| p(\mathbf{x})\right) = \left\langle \log \frac{q(\mathbf{x})}{p(\mathbf{x})} \right\rangle_{q(\mathbf{x})}$
- Always 0 or positive, not symmetric.
- Lets look at how it changes with response to changes in the approximating distribution.

KL varying mean



KL varying mean



KL varying mean



KL varying mean



KL varying mean



KL varying variance



KL varying variance



KL varying variance



KL varying variance



KL varying variance



KL-method derivation

- Assume Gaussian approximate posterior, $q(\mathbf{f}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{f}|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{C})$.
- True posterior using Bayes rule, $p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{f})p(\mathbf{f})}{p(\mathbf{y})}$.
- Cannot compute the KL divergence as we cannot compute the true posterior, $p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{KL}\left(q(\mathbf{f}) \,||\, p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})\right) &= \left\langle \log \frac{q(\mathbf{f})}{p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})} \right\rangle_{q(\mathbf{f})} \\
&= \left\langle \log \frac{q(\mathbf{f})}{p(\mathbf{f})} - \log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{f}) + \log p(\mathbf{y}) \right\rangle_{q(\mathbf{f})} \\
&= \mathrm{KL}\left(q(\mathbf{f}) \,||\, p(\mathbf{f})\right) - \left\langle \log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{f}) \right\rangle_{q(\mathbf{f})} + \log p(\mathbf{y}) \\
\log p(\mathbf{y}) &= \left\langle \log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{f}) \right\rangle_{q(\mathbf{f})} - \mathrm{KL}\left(q(\mathbf{f}) \,||\, p(\mathbf{f})\right) + \mathrm{KL}\left(q(\mathbf{f}) \,||\, p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

KL-method derivation

$$\begin{aligned}\log p(\mathbf{y}) &= \left\langle \log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{f}) \right\rangle_{q(\mathbf{f})} - \mathrm{KL}\left(q(\mathbf{f}) \,\|\, p(\mathbf{f})\right) + \mathrm{KL}\left(q(\mathbf{f}) \,\|\, p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})\right) \\ &\geq \left\langle \log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{f}) \right\rangle_{q(\mathbf{f})} - \mathrm{KL}\left(q(\mathbf{f}) \,\|\, p(\mathbf{f})\right)\end{aligned}$$

- Tractable terms give lower bound on $\log p(\mathbf{y})$ as $\mathrm{KL}\left(q(\mathbf{f}) \,\|\, p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})\right)$ always positive.
- Adjust variational parameters $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{C}$ to make tractable terms as large as possible, thus $\mathrm{KL}\left(q(\mathbf{f}) \,\|\, p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})\right)$ as small as possible.
- $\left\langle \log p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{f}) \right\rangle_{q(\mathbf{f})}$ with factorizing likelihood can be done with a series of n 1 dimensional integrals.
- In practice, can reduce the number of variational parameters by reparameterizing $\boldsymbol{C} = (\mathbf{K_{ff}} - 2\Lambda)^{-1}$ by noting that the bound is constant in off diagonal terms of $\boldsymbol{C}$.

Expectation Propagation

$$p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y}) \propto p(\mathbf{f}) \prod_{i=1}^{n} p(\mathbf{y}_i|\mathbf{f}_i)$$

$$q(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y}) \triangleq \frac{1}{Z_{ep}} p(\mathbf{f}) \prod_{i=1}^{n} t_i(\mathbf{f}_i|\tilde{Z}_i, \tilde{\mu}_i, \tilde{\sigma}_i^2) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{f}|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$$

$$t_i \triangleq \tilde{Z}_i \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{f}_i|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_i^2\right)$$

- Individual likelihood terms, $p(\mathbf{y}_i|\mathbf{f}_i)$, replaced by independent local likelihoods, t_i.
- Uses an iterative algorithm to update t_i's.

Expectation Propagation

1. From the current posterior, $q(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})$, leave out one of the local likelihoods, t_i, then marginalize out $\mathbf{f}_{j\neq i}$, giving rise to the *cavity distribution*, $q_{-i}(\mathbf{f}_i)$.
2. Combine cavity distribution, $q_{-i}(\mathbf{f}_i)$, with exact likelihood contribution, $p(\mathbf{y}_i|\mathbf{f}_i)$, giving non-Gaussian un-normalized distribution, $\hat{q}(\mathbf{f}_i) \triangleq p(\mathbf{y}_i|\mathbf{f}_i)q_{-i}(\mathbf{f}_i)$.
3. Choose a un-normalized Gaussian approximation to this distribution, $\mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{f}_i|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i, \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_i^2\right)\hat{Z}_i$, by finding moments of $\hat{q}(\mathbf{f}_i)$.
4. Replace parameters of t_i with those that produce the same moments as this approximation.
5. Choose another i and start again. Repeat to convergence.

Expectation Propagation - in math

Step 1. First choose a marginal, i, to focus on, then

$$q(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y}) \propto p(\mathbf{f}) \prod_{j=1}^{n} t_j(\mathbf{f}_j) \rightarrow \frac{p(\mathbf{f}) \prod_{j=1}^{n} t_j(\mathbf{f}_j)}{t_i(\mathbf{f}_i)} \rightarrow p(\mathbf{f}) \prod_{j \neq i}^{n} t_j(\mathbf{f}_j)$$

$$\rightarrow \int p(\mathbf{f}) \prod_{j \neq i} t_j(\mathbf{f}_j) \, d\mathbf{f}_{j \neq i} \triangleq q_{-i}(\mathbf{f}_i)$$

Step 2. $p(\mathbf{y}_i|\mathbf{f}_i) q_{-i}(\mathbf{f}_i) \triangleq \hat{q}(\mathbf{f}_i)$

Step 3. $\hat{q}(\mathbf{f}_i) \approx \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{f}_i|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i, \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_i^2\right) \hat{Z}_i$

Step 4: Compute parameters of $t_i(\mathbf{f}_i|\tilde{Z}_i, \tilde{\mu}_i, \tilde{\sigma}_i^2)$ making moments of $q(\mathbf{f}_i)$ match those of $\hat{Z}_i \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{f}_i|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i, \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_i^2\right)$.

Comparing posterior approximations





- Gaussian prior between two function values $\{\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2\}$, at $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2\}$ respectively.
- Bernoulli likelihood, $\mathbf{y}_1 = 1$ and $\mathbf{y}_2 = 1$.

Comparing posterior approximations



- True posterior is non-Gaussian.
- Laplace approximates with a Gaussian at the mode of the posterior.

Comparing posterior approximations



- True posterior is non-Gaussian.
- KL approximate with a Gaussian that has minimal KL divergence, $\mathrm{KL}\left(q(\mathbf{f}) \,\|\, p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})\right)$.
- This leads to distributions that avoid regions in which $p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})$ is small.
- It has a large penality for assigning density where there is none.

Comparing posterior approximations



- True posterior is non-Gaussian.
- EP tends to try and put density where $p(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{y})$ is large
- Cares less about assigning density density where there is none. Contrasts to KL method.

Comparing posterior marginal approximations



- Laplace: Poor approximation.
- KL: Avoids assigning density to areas where there is none, at the expense of areas where there is some (right tail).
- EP: Assigns density to areas with density, at the expense of areas where there is none (left tail).

Pros - Cons - When - Laplace

Laplace approximation

- Pros
  - Very fast.
- Cons
  - Poor approximation if the mode does not well describe the posterior, for example Bernoulli likelihood (probit).
- When
  - When the posterior *is* well characterized by its mode, for example Poisson.

Pros - Cons - When - KL

KL method

- Pros
  - Principled in that it we are directly optimizing a measure of divergence between an approximation and true distribution.
  - Can be relatively quick, and lends it self to sparse approximations (Hensman et al., 2015).
- Cons
  - Requires factorizing likelihoods to avoid n dimensional integral.
- When
  - Laplace approximation poor or likelihood is not Bernoulli.

Pros - Cons - When - EP

EP method

- Pros
  - Very effective for certain likelihoods (classification).
- Cons
  - Slow though possible to extend to sparse case.
  - Convergence issues for certain likelihoods.
  - Must be able to match moments.
- When
  - Binary data (Nickisch and Rasmussen, 2008; Kuß, 2006), perhaps with truncated likelihood (censored data) (Vanhatalo et al., 2015).

Pros - Cons - When - MCMC

MCMC methods

- Pros
  - Theoretical limit gives true distribution
- Cons
  - Can be slow when data is large.
- When
  - If time is not an issue, but exact accuracy is.
  - If you are unsure whether a different approximation is appropriate, can be used as a “ground truth”

Questions

Thanks for listening.

Any questions?

References I

Hensman, J., Matthews, A. G. D. G., and Ghahramani, Z. (2015). Scalable variational gaussian process classification. In *In 18th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1–9, San Diego, California, USA.

Kuß, M. (2006). *Gaussian Process Models for Robust Regression, Classification, and Reinforcement Learning*. PhD thesis, TU Darmstadt.

Nickisch, H. and Rasmussen, C. E. (2008). Approximations for Binary Gaussian Process Classification. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9:2035–2078.

Vanhatalo, J., Riihimaki, J., Hartikainen, J., Jylanki, P., Tolvanen, V., and Vehtari, A. (2015). Gpstuff. `http://mloss.org/software/view/451/`.