

Department of Teleinformatics Engineering , Federal University of Ceará

Introduction to Gaussian Processes

Filipe P. de Farias, IC
filipepfarias@fisica.ufc.br

September 14, 2019

- ① Linear Regression
 - 1.1 Defining models
 - 1.2 Optimizing the parameters
 - 1.3 An uncertainty perspective

- ② Bayesian Linear Regression

- ③ Gaussian Processes
 - 3.1 Recap
 - 3.2 Change of Space
 - 3.3 Gaussian processes

Linear Regression

- If we have a set of points in a space that comes from observations of an experiment and we want to predict other points, this could be done with **curve fitting**.
- So we could define some strategy to find our model.


Strategy

- 1 Purpose a **model**, e.g. functions like exponential, polynomial and others.
- 2 Train our model with the training data set, finding the **unknown parameters** or **weights**.

Defining models

An initial curve fitting problem

- Let's take the points below generated from the function $y(x) = \sin(2\pi x)$ with addition of Gaussian noise with zero mean and 0.2 of standard deviation.



- We can express the curve with a polynomial, being the **model**

$$y(x, \mathbf{w}) = w_0x^0 + w_1x^1 + w_2x^2 + \dots + w_{M-1}x^{M-1} = \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} w_jx^j$$


- In general, we could write this **weighted sum** with any other function. In other words, we can put this in terms of $\phi_n(x) = x^n$, where ϕ could be other **basis function**.
- e.g. we could have different $y(x)$ for different basis functions, or **features**.

$$\begin{aligned} y(x, \mathbf{w}) &= w_0\phi_0(x) + w_1\phi_1(x) + w_2\phi_2(x) + \dots + w_{M-1}\phi_{M-1}(x) \\ &= w_0 \exp \left\{ -\frac{(x - \mu_0)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right\} + w_1 \exp \left\{ -\frac{(x - \mu_1)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right\} + \\ &\dots + w_{M-1} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(x - \mu_{M-1})^2}{2\sigma^2} \right\} \\ &= w_0 \sin(0 \cdot x) + w_1 \cos(1 \cdot x) + \\ &\dots + w_{M_2} \sin((M - 2) \cdot x) + w_{M-1} \cos((M - 1) \cdot x) \end{aligned}$$

- For simplicity, we'll carry this notation along.

$$\begin{aligned} y(x, \mathbf{w}) &= w_0\phi_0(x) + w_1\phi_1(x) + \dots \\ &\quad + w_{M-1}\phi_{M-1}(x) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} w_j\phi_j(x) \end{aligned}$$

- We'll evaluate ϕ for all x , and then project it in the w vector space, the **feature-space**, then our model could be formed by **non-linear** functions. But, remaining **linear on parameters**.




Optimizing the parameters





The model parameters

- The chosen model will give us some curve that is needed to adjust such that we'll **minimize its distance** to the **targets** t .
- This approach lead us to use the **least squares** to estimate the weights and minimize the **error** E .

$$E(\mathbf{w}) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \{y_n - t_n\}^2$$



Why choose a quadratic norm distance?



Why choose a quadratic norm distance?¹

- The first row figures could be used for the derivations, taking care with some **non-continuous derivatives**.
- We'll use the **quadratic norm** because its the minor integer q differentiable, and then the error measures E between the model $y(x, \mathbf{w})$ and the targets t will be euclidean.
- More, increasing the value of q , the smallests than 1 and bigger than 0 errors between the model and the targets that become irrelevant for E .

¹See Appendix ?

- Remembering that

$$y(x, \mathbf{w}) = w_0 \phi_0(x) + w_1 \phi_1(x) + w_2 \phi_2(x) + \dots + w_{M-1} \phi_{M-1}(x)$$

- We'll evaluate for all x_i values, and then put $y_n(x_i, \mathbf{w})$ in the matrix form and get

$$y_n = [\phi_0(x_n) \quad \phi_1(x_n) \quad \dots \quad \phi_{M-1}(x_n)] [w_0 \quad w_1 \quad \dots \quad w_{M-1}]^\top$$

- And then

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} y_0 \\ y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_{N-1} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{y}} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \phi_0(x_0) & \phi_1(x_0) & \dots & \phi_{M-1}(x_0) \\ \phi_0(x_1) & \phi_1(x_1) & \dots & \phi_{M-1}(x_1) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \phi_0(x_{N-1}) & \phi_1(x_{N-1}) & \dots & \phi_{M-1}(x_{N-1}) \end{bmatrix}}_{\Phi} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} w_0 \\ w_1 \\ \vdots \\ w_{N-1} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{w}}$$

where Φ is the **design matrix**.

- This represents the system $\mathbf{y} = \Phi \mathbf{w}$.

- If $E(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{t})^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{t})$ where $\mathbf{t} = [t_1 \quad t_2 \quad \dots \quad t_n]^\top$
- Then we'll have

$$\begin{aligned} E(\mathbf{w}) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{t} + \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{t} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left((\Phi \mathbf{w})^\top (\Phi \mathbf{w}) - \mathbf{t}^\top (\Phi \mathbf{w}) - (\Phi \mathbf{w})^\top \mathbf{t} + \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{t} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{w}^\top \Phi^\top \Phi \mathbf{w} - 2\mathbf{t}^\top \Phi \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{t}^\top \mathbf{t} \right) \end{aligned}$$

- In sequence, we'll try to minimize it in terms of the weights (\mathbf{w}) by

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial E(\mathbf{w})}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(2\mathbf{w}^\top \Phi^\top \Phi - 2\mathbf{t}^\top \Phi + 0 \right) \\ \mathbf{w}^\top &= \mathbf{t}^\top \Phi \left(\Phi^\top \Phi \right)^{-1} \\ \mathbf{w}^* &= \left(\Phi^\top \Phi \right)^{-1} \Phi^\top \mathbf{t} \end{aligned}$$


- Here, we've obtained the weights \mathbf{w}^* with the **best fit** of the curve.
- We could say that the model **learned** the parameters.

Why the prediction is so distant from the deterministic curve?

- A visible effect of the **increase of the complexity** of the model, is the increase of the **number of features** M .
- It's easy to see that our model start's to differ from the y and starts to interpolate the noise. We call this of **over-fitting**.
- This phenomenon illustrate a method of always search for the **best estimation of the parameters**.

Could be over-fitting a problem?

- We could **train** our model, it means evaluate \mathbf{w}^* , for only a part of our dataset.
- If the model be a good one, the error must be small when its **testing**, i.e. the error must be small when we evaluate all dataset with the \mathbf{w}^* of the trained part.
- But this in general does not occur and the **error increases**.



How to control the over-fitting?

- With the increase of the model complexity, the value of \mathbf{w}^* increases too.
- A solution could be add a **penalty term** as the norm of the weights increases.
- To control the over-fitting, we try to **regularize** the weights by adding a penalty term λ to error function, by this we force the coefficients to not reach high values.

$$\tilde{E}(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{t})^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{t}) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{w}$$


$$\Rightarrow \mathbf{w}_{\text{reg}}^* = \left(\Phi^\top \Phi + \lambda \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1} \Phi^\top \mathbf{t}$$

How to control the over-fitting?

- With the increase of the model complexity, the value of \mathbf{w}^* increases too.
- A solution could be add a **penalty term** as the norm of the weights increases.
- To control the over-fitting, we try to **regularize** the weights by adding a penalty term λ to error function, by this we force the coefficients to not reach high values.


$$\tilde{E}(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{t})^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{t}) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{w}$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathbf{w}_{\text{reg}}^* = \left(\Phi^\top \Phi + \lambda \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1} \Phi^\top \mathbf{t}$$



What if we assume not knowing the data exactly?

- Having an **uncertainty** in the measured value, we could represent it with a **probability distribution**.
- Now, each **target** could be expressed as a **random variable**.
- Its **mean** is given by $y(x, \mathbf{w})$, and the **variance** by $1/\sigma^2 = \beta$.
- β is known as **precision parameter** too.
- For this case, we'll consider the distribution being UniOrangeGaussian.



- Being the random variables independent and identically distributed, we can say that our **joint probability** is given by

$$p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, \beta) = \prod_{n=1}^N p(t_n|x_n, \mathbf{w}, \beta)$$

known as **likelihood function**.

- Our goal is, given the **parameters** \mathbf{w} , maximize the **probability** of the **targets**.
- Before, consider a property of the probability distributions

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x)dx = 1 \text{ and } p(x) \geq 0$$

- Then, to avoid computational singularity and obtain a monotonically increasing function, we apply

$$\ln(p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, \beta)) = \sum_{n=1}^N \ln(p(t_n|x_n, \mathbf{w}, \beta))$$

- From the **joint probability** of the Gaussians distributions we have

$$\begin{aligned}\ln(p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, \beta)) &= \mathcal{N}\left(t|y(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}), \beta^{-1}\right) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N -\frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi) + \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{1}{2} \ln \beta - \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\beta}{2} (t_n - y(x_n, \mathbf{w}))^2\end{aligned}$$

- If we make

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{w}} \ln(p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, \beta)) = 0$$

we'll obtain the **cost function** obtained before in the linear regression, then our assumptions are well grounded.

- With the maximization, we'll obtain the weights \mathbf{w} that **maximize** the log probability of the targets, given the parameters.
- This is called **maximum likelihood**, since we are looking for the **parameters** distribution that are more probable to had been generated the data.
- This is a initial step towards to a **Bayesian** approach.

Bayesian Linear Regression

What if we assume not knowing the data exactly?

- The principle of the Bayesian statistics is express our **degree of belief** in an event.
- This belief could be based on some **prior** knowledge about the event or personal beliefs.
- This differs from frequentist statistics, where the probability is based on the number of trials.
- Suppose a die to be thrown once

Frequentist

There's empiric evidence that similar dice thrown in past produce similar outcomes with the same frequency.




Figure: Aksu 2018

What if we assume not knowing the data exactly?

- The principle of the Bayesian statistics is express our **degree of belief** in an event.
- This belief could be based on some **prior** knowledge about the event or personal beliefs.
- This differs from frequentist statistics, where the probability is based on the number of trials.
- Suppose a die to be thrown once

Bayesian

The last argument is right, but the **belief of the observer** it's important to the statistics.




Figure: Aksu 2018

- The main idea of the Bayesian approach is put some **uncertainty** over the parameters and make **inferences**, i.e. obtain some statistics in light over the data.
- This principle is elucidated by the Bayes' Rule

$$\overbrace{p(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{t})}^{\text{posterior}} = \frac{p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{w})p(\mathbf{w})}{p(\mathbf{t})} = \frac{\overbrace{p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{w})}^{\text{likelihood}} \overbrace{p(\mathbf{w})}^{\text{prior}}}{\underbrace{\int p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{w})p(\mathbf{w})d\mathbf{w}}_{\text{marginal distribution}}}$$

where we assume some uncertainty over the parameters, i.e. a probability density function $p(\mathbf{w})$.

- We'll use the knowledge about the data with the **likelihood function** and some previous knowledge, or **prior**, that we have about the parameters to obtain the knowledge considering these two, or **posterior**.
- This is called **Bayesian Inference**.

- We can introduce the **maximum *a posteriori*** (MAP) as the direct estimator for the Bayes' Rule.
- The approach is similar to what was done by maximizing the likelihood function, but now maximizing the posterior distribution of the parameters given the data.
- We consider the **marginal distribution** $p(\mathbf{t})$ being a constant in the parameters

$$p(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) \propto p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}) p(\mathbf{w})$$

- Here, we'll consider our prior knowledge about the parameters being

$$\mathbf{w} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \alpha^{-1} \mathbf{I})$$

- We obtain by the derivative w.r.t. \mathbf{w} of the negative log that

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\beta}{2} (t_n - y(x_n, \mathbf{w}))^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{w} + \text{const.}$$

what is similar to the regularized linear regression considering $\lambda = \alpha/\beta$.

Aren't we ignoring possible solutions?

- The main idea in the Bayesian approach is that our knowledge is in the **statistics** and not in a singular value.
- With MAP we just consider the **most probable** value of a full distribution of possible values.
- In the next we'll obtain the statistics of the distributions involved in Bayes' Rule, including the posterior.
- But before, we need some tools...

Partitioned Gaussians

Be \mathbf{x} a n -dimensional vector with a Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$, then the partitioned will be

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_a \\ \mathbf{x}_b \end{pmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\mu} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\mu}_a \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}_b \end{pmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{aa} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{ab} \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{ba} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{bb} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Preserved the symmetry $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^\top = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, we say the covariance matrix is positive definite. And be the multivariate Gaussian

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \frac{1}{(\det \boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{1/2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \right\}$$

We define too, just for convenience of work, the precision matrix $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ by

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{aa} & \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{ab} \\ \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{ba} & \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{bb} \end{pmatrix} \equiv \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}$$

assuming all matrices have inverses.

Closure under linear transformations and marginalization

Being \mathbf{x}_b conditioned on \mathbf{x}_a and Gaussian distributed as

$$p(\mathbf{x}_a) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_a | \boldsymbol{\mu}_a, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_a), \quad p(\mathbf{x}_b | \mathbf{x}_a) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_b | \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}_a + \mathbf{d}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{b|a})$$

\mathbf{M} a constant matrix and \mathbf{d} a constant vector, both with the appropriate dimensions. Then conditional distribution $p(\mathbf{x}_a | \mathbf{x}_b)$ is given by

$$p(\mathbf{x}_a | \mathbf{x}_b) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_a | \boldsymbol{\mu}_{a|b}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{a|b})$$

with

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{a|b} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{a|b} \left(\mathbf{M}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{b|a}^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_b - \mathbf{d}) + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_a^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_a \right), \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{a|b} = \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_a^{-1} + \mathbf{M}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{b|a}^{-1} \mathbf{M} \right)^{-1}.$$

The marginal density of \mathbf{x}_b is given by

$$p(\mathbf{x}_b) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_b | \boldsymbol{\mu}_b, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_b)$$

with



$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_b = \mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\mu}_a + \mathbf{d}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_b = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{b|a} + \mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_a\mathbf{M}^\top.$$

Why the prediction is so distant from the deterministic curve?

Gaussian Processes


What was done until here?

- We assumed that our targets t were **i.i.d.** and given by $t = y(\mathbf{x}) + \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \beta)$.
- Our model is given by $y(\mathbf{x}) = \Phi^\top \mathbf{w}$, where Φ is the **design matrix**, and this characterizes our model as **linear in parameters**.
- The **design matrix** was defined as $\phi_{i,j} = \phi_i(\mathbf{x}_j)$.
- The **parameters** were given by $\mathbf{w} = (\Phi^\top \Phi)^{-1} \Phi^\top \mathbf{t}$.
- These **parameters** calculated at the minimum of the cost function are called **maximum likelihood**.



What was done until here?

- We put an **uncertainty** over the targets t and the parameters \mathbf{w} .
- We assumed that targets being **distributed** as $p(t|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, \beta) = \mathcal{N}(t|y(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}), \beta^{-1})$.
- By **Bayes' Rule** we obtained that $p(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}, \alpha, \beta) \propto p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}, \beta) p(\mathbf{w}|\alpha)$
- This allowed to make an **inference** to obtain a **prediction** of the parameters in the **weight-space**.



Recap

A more clear way to see what is happening...

From Bayesian inference

- We have

$$p(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}, \alpha, \beta) \propto p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, \beta)p(\mathbf{w}|\alpha)$$

- We'll change from **weight-space**

$$p(\mathbf{t}_*|\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) = \int p(\mathbf{t}_*|\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{w})p(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})d\mathbf{w}$$

- To **feature-space**

$$\begin{aligned} p(f_*|\mathbf{x}_*, \Phi, \mathbf{t}) &= \int p(f_*|\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{w})p(\mathbf{w}|\Phi, \mathbf{t})d\mathbf{w} = \int \mathbf{x}_*^\top \mathbf{w} p(\mathbf{w}|\Phi, \mathbf{t})d\mathbf{w} \\ &= \mathcal{N}\left(\beta\phi(\mathbf{x}_*)^\top \mathbf{S}_N \Phi \mathbf{t}, \phi(\mathbf{x}_*)^\top \mathbf{S}_N^{-1} \phi(\mathbf{x}_*)\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $f_* \triangleq f(\mathbf{x}_*)$ at \mathbf{x}_* and $\Phi = \Phi(\mathbf{x})$

Alternative formulation

$$f_* | \mathbf{x}_*, \Phi, \mathbf{t} \sim \mathcal{N} \left(\phi_*^\top \mathbf{S}_0 \Phi \left(K + \beta^{-2} I \right)^{-1} \mathbf{t}, \phi_*^\top \mathbf{S}_0 \phi_* - \phi_*^\top \mathbf{S}_0 \Phi \left(K + \beta^{-2} I \right)^{-1} \Phi^\top \mathbf{S}_0 \phi_* \right)$$

where $K = \Phi^\top \mathbf{S}_0 \Phi$

What is kernel?

$$f_* | \mathbf{x}_*, \Phi, \mathbf{t} \sim \mathcal{N} \left(\phi_*^\top \mathbf{S}_0 \Phi \left(K + \beta^{-2} I \right)^{-1} \mathbf{t}, \phi_*^\top \mathbf{S}_0 \phi_* - \phi_*^\top \mathbf{S}_0 \Phi \left(K + \beta^{-2} I \right)^{-1} \Phi^\top \mathbf{S}_0 \phi_* \right)$$

- We could observe the appearance of terms like $\Phi^\top \mathbf{S}_0 \Phi$, $\phi_*^\top \mathbf{S}_0 \Phi$, or $\phi_*^\top \mathbf{S}_0 \phi_*$.
- The common term between these operations is $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \phi(\mathbf{x})^\top \mathbf{S}_0 \phi(\mathbf{x}')$
- Then we define $k(\cdot, \cdot)$ as **kernel function**
- This technique is particularly valuable in situations where it is more convenient to compute the kernel than the design matrix vectors themselves.

- Previously we make the inference in the **feature-space** and then we find the function distribution.
- Now we'll make the inference directly on **function-space**.
- Let's define

Definition

*A **Gaussian process** is a collection of random variables which any finite number of them have a joint Gaussian distribution.*

Mean and covariance function

- As the Gaussian distribution, the \mathcal{GP} is characterized by its **mean function** $m(\mathbf{x})$ and its **covariance function** $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$ of a real process $f(\mathbf{x})$.
- For a Gaussian processes

$$f(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{GP}(m(\mathbf{x}), k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'))$$

- We have

$$m(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x})]$$

$$k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \mathbb{E}[(f(\mathbf{x}) - m(\mathbf{x}))(f(\mathbf{x}') - m(\mathbf{x}'))]$$

- Anil Aksu (Jan. 2018). *Decision Theory and Bayesian Analysis*.
- C.M. Bishop (2016). *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. Information Science and Statistics. Springer New York. ISBN: 9781493938438. URL: <https://books.google.com.br/books?id=kOXDtAEACAAJ>.
- P.J. Dhrymes (2013). *Mathematics for Econometrics*. SpringerLink : Bücher. Springer New York. ISBN: 9781461481454. URL: <https://books.google.com.br/books?id=HIK8BAAAQBAJ>.
- J. L. Doob (Sept. 1944). "The Elementary Gaussian Processes". In: *Ann. Math. Statist.* 15.3, pp. 229–282. DOI: 10.1214/aoms/1177731234. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177731234>.
- F.A. Graybill (2001). *Matrices with Applications in Statistics*. Duxbury Classic Series. Brooks/Cole. ISBN: 9780534401313. URL: <https://books.google.com.br/books?id=BV3CAAAACAAJ>.
- Philipp Hennig (Sept. 2013). *Animating Samples from Gaussian Distributions*. Technical Report 8. Spemannstraße, 72076 Tübingen, Germany: Max Planck Institute for Intelligent Systems.
- T.B. Schön (2011). *Manipulating the Multivariate Gaussian Density*. URL: <http://user.it.uu.se/~thosc112/pubpdf/schon12011.pdf>.