

Problem 2: Gaussian Mixture Model and EM (10pts+5pts Bonus)

In class, we applied EM to learn Gaussian Mixture Models (GMMs) and showed the M-Step without a proof. Now, it is time that you prove it.

Consider a GMM with the following PDF of \mathbf{x}_i :

$$p(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_{j=1}^k \pi_j N(\mathbf{x}_i | \mu_j, \Sigma_j) = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\pi_j}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^d |\Sigma_j|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x}_i - \mu_j)^T \Sigma_j^{-1} (\mathbf{x}_i - \mu_j) \right)$$

$|\Sigma_j| = (\sigma_j^2)^d \cdot \mathbf{I}$
 $-\frac{1}{2\sigma_j^2} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mu_j\|_2^2$

where k is the number of Gaussian components, d is dimension of a data point \mathbf{x}_i and N is the usual Gaussian pdf ($|\Sigma|$ in the pdf denotes the determinant of matrix Σ). This GMM has k tuples of model parameters $\{(\mu_j, \Sigma_j, \pi_j)\}_{j=1}^k$, where the parameters represent the mean vector, covariance matrix, and component weight of the j -th Gaussian component. For simplicity, we further assume that all components are isotropic Gaussian, i.e., $\Sigma_j = \sigma_j^2 \mathbf{I}$. $\Sigma_j^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sigma_j^2} \mathbf{I}$

2.1 (10 pts) Find the MLE of the expected complete log-likelihood. Equivalently, find the optimal solution to the following optimization problem.

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi_j, \mu_j, \Sigma_j} \quad & \sum_i \sum_j \gamma_{ij} \ln \pi_j + \sum_i \sum_j \gamma_{ij} \ln N(\mathbf{x}_i | \mu_j, \Sigma_j) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \pi_j \geq 0 \\ & \sum_{j=1}^k \pi_j = 1 \end{aligned}$$

where γ_{ij} is the posterior of latent variables computed from the E-Step.

You can use the following fact: Given $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{R}^+$, the solution to the following optimization problem over q_1, \dots, q_k :

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{argmax}_{q_j} \quad & \sum_{j=1}^k a_j \ln q_j, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & q_j \geq 0, \\ & \sum_{j=1}^k q_j = 1. \end{aligned}$$

$a_j = \sum_i \gamma_{ij}$

is given by:

$$q_j^* = \frac{a_j}{\sum_{k'} a_{k'}}$$

To find π_1, \dots, π_k , we simply solve

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi} \quad & \sum_j \sum_i \gamma_{ij} \ln \pi_j. \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \pi_j \geq 0 \\ & \sum_{j=1}^k \pi_j = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (2 \text{ points})$$

The solution is

$$\pi_j^* = \frac{\sum_i \gamma_{ij}}{\sum_j \sum_i \gamma_{ij}} = \frac{\sum_i \gamma_{ij}}{\sum_i 1} = \frac{\sum_i \gamma_{ij}}{n}. \quad (1 \text{ points})$$

To find μ_j and σ_j , we solve for each j

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{argmax}_{\mu_j, \sigma_j} \sum_i \gamma_{ij} \ln N(\mathbf{x}_i | \mu_j, \sigma_j) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\mu_j, \sigma_j} \sum_i \gamma_{ij} \ln \left[\frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_j)^d} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma_j^2} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mu_j\|^2 \right) \right] \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\mu_j, \sigma_j} \sum_i \gamma_{ij} \left(\underbrace{-d \ln \sigma_j}_{\frac{1}{\sigma_j}} - \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mu_j\|^2}{2\sigma_j^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

(3 points)

$\arg \min_{\mu_j} \sum_i \gamma_{ij} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mu_j\|^2$
 $\frac{1}{\sigma_j^2} \rightarrow \frac{-2}{\sigma_j^3}$

First we set the derivative w.r.t. μ_j to 0:

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_j^2} \sum_i \gamma_{ij} (\mathbf{x}_i - \mu_j) = 0,$$

which gives

$$\mu_j^* = \frac{\sum_i \gamma_{ij} \mathbf{x}_i}{\sum_i \gamma_{ij}} \quad (2 \text{ points})$$

Next we set the derivative w.r.t. σ_j to 0:

$$\sum_i \gamma_{ij} \left(-\frac{d}{\sigma_j} + \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mu_j\|^2}{\sigma_j^3} \right) = 0.$$

Solving for σ_j gives

$$(\sigma_j^*)^2 = \frac{\sum_i \gamma_{ij} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mu_j^*\|^2}{d \sum_i \gamma_{ij}}. \quad (2 \text{ points})$$

2.2 (Bonus) (5 pts) The posterior probability of z in GMM can be seen as a *soft* assignment to the clusters; in contrast, k -means assign each data point to one cluster at each iteration (*hard* assignment). Show that if we set $\{\sigma_j, \pi_j\}_{j=1}^k$ in a particular way in the GMM model, then the cluster assignments given by the GMM reduce in the limit to the k -means clusters assignment (where the cluster centers $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^k$ remain the same for both the models). To verify your answer, you should derive $p(z_i = j | \mathbf{x}_i)$ for your choice.

Set all $\sigma_j = \sigma \rightarrow 0$ and $\pi_j = \frac{1}{k}$, we have

$$p(\mathbf{x}_i, z_i = j) \propto \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma_j^2} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mu_j\|^2 \right),$$

where constant terms are ignored.

(2 points)

The posterior then becomes

$$p(z_i = j | \mathbf{x}_i) = \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \frac{\pi_j \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mu_j\|^2 \right\}}{\sum_j \pi_j \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mu_j\|^2 \right\}} \rightarrow \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j = \arg_c \min \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mu_c\|^2 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(3 points)

$$\frac{\pi_j}{\sum_j \pi_j} = 1$$