Vele Tosevski

1002174657

CSC 411

March 27, 2019

HW6 Write-Up

$$\frac{P_{\alpha r} + 1}{1 \cdot \sum_{i \ge 1}^{N} \sum_{k \le N}^{K} r_{k}^{(i)}} \left[\log P_{r} \left(\frac{2(i)^{2} - k}{2} \right) + \log P_{r} \left(\frac{2(i)^{2} - k}{2} \right) \right] + \log P_{r} \left(\frac{2(i)^{2} - k}{2} \right) + \log P_{r} \left(\frac{2(i)^$$

$$\nabla f(a_{u}) = \frac{1}{\pi_{u}} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} u_{i}^{(i)} \right) + \omega - 1 \right] \\
g(a_{u}) = 1 - \sum_{d=1}^{K} \pi_{d} \quad \text{since} \quad \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \pi_{d}^{(i)} \right) + \omega - 1 \\
\nabla g(\pi_{u}) = -1 \\
\nabla g(\pi_{u}) = -$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{k(i)}} = \frac{1 - \alpha - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \zeta_{k(i)}}{\kappa(1 - \alpha) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \zeta_{k(i)}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{k(i)}} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{k(i)}} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \zeta_{k(i)} \right] \right] \right] \right] \right]$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{k,j}} \left(\mathcal{C} \right) = \underbrace{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i,j}}}_{i=1} r_{k}^{(i)} \left[\underbrace{\frac{\chi_{j}^{(i)}}{\partial u_{i,j}}}_{i=1} + c_{j} \frac{-\chi_{j}^{(i)}}{1 - \theta_{k,j}} \right] = \underbrace{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i,j}}}_{i=1} r_{k}^{(i)} \left[\underbrace{\frac{\chi_{j}^{(i)}}{\partial u_{i,j}}}_{1 - \theta_{k,j}} + \underbrace{\frac{\chi_{j}^{(i)}}{1 - \theta_{k,j}}}_{1 - \theta_{k,j}} \right]$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{k_{i}j}} \otimes = \frac{\alpha - 1}{\theta_{k_{i}j}} + \frac{1 - b}{1 - \theta_{k_{i}j}}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{k_{i}j}} \otimes = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{k_{i}j}} \otimes + \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{k_{$$

$$\frac{\partial u_{ij}}{\partial x_{ij}} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i)}{(1 - x_{j}^{(i)})} - 1 + b \right\} = (1 - \partial u_{ij}) \left[\sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i) x_{j}^{(i)} + \alpha - 1 \right]$$

$$\frac{\partial u_{ij}}{\partial x_{ij}} \left[\frac{\sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i)}{x_{j}^{(i)}} - \frac{\sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i) x_{j}^{(i)}}{x_{j}^{(i)}} - 1 + b + \sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i) x_{j}^{(i)} + \alpha - 1 \right] = \sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i) x_{j}^{(i)} + \alpha - 1$$

$$\frac{\partial u_{ij}}{\partial x_{ij}} \left[\frac{\sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i)}{x_{i}^{(i)}} + \alpha + b - 2 \right] = \sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i) x_{j}^{(i)} + \alpha - 1$$

$$\frac{\partial u_{ij}}{\partial x_{i}^{(i)}} \left[\frac{\sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i)}{x_{i}^{(i)}} + \alpha + b - 2 \right] = \sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i) x_{j}^{(i)} + \alpha - 1$$

$$\frac{\partial u_{ij}}{\partial x_{i}^{(i)}} \left[\frac{\sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i)}{x_{i}^{(i)}} + \alpha + b - 2 \right] = \sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i) x_{j}^{(i)} + \alpha - 1$$

$$\frac{\partial u_{ij}}{\partial x_{i}^{(i)}} \left[\frac{\sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i)}{x_{i}^{(i)}} + \alpha + b - 2 \right] = \sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i) x_{j}^{(i)} + \alpha - 1$$

$$\frac{\partial u_{ij}}{\partial x_{i}^{(i)}} \left[\frac{\sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i)}{x_{i}^{(i)}} + \alpha + b - 2 \right] = \sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i) x_{j}^{(i)} + \alpha - 1$$

$$\frac{\partial u_{ij}}{\partial x_{i}^{(i)}} \left[\frac{\sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i)}{x_{i}^{(i)}} + \alpha + b - 2 \right] = \sum_{i \neq i}^{N} r_{i}(i) x_{j}^{(i)} + \alpha - 1$$

Code in mixture.py

Part 1 output \rightarrow

pi[0] 0.085

pi[1] 0.13

 $theta[0,\,239]\;0.6427106227106232$

 $theta [3,\,298]\ 0.46573612495845823$

The theta update seems OK.

The pi update seems OK.

3. In mixture.py

Part 2 output \rightarrow

R[0, 2] 0.17488951492117286 R[1, 0] 0.6885376761092291

P[0, 183] 0.6516151998131036

P[2, 628] 0.4740801724913303

The E-step seems OK.

Part 3

- 1. Images that have not appeared in the training set often will be given a probability of zero. That is due to the nature of the normal distribution. If a certain pixel is always 0 in the training set then if it is 1 in the test set, due to the normal distribution, it will be assigned a probability of 0 and the M-step will not match it to a correct cluster.
- 2. The part 2 model has partial observations so intuitively, it should perform better at every step.
- 3. If you sample from the distribution, you will get 1 and 8 and equal amount of times since the distribution should be equally likely for both of them. The model is only saying that it is easier to pick a 1 than an 8, not that it is more likely, so the answer is no.