Homework 4 STOR 767: Theory Part Due November 12, 2020

Student Name: Leo Li (PID: 730031954)

Instructions

- Edit this LATEX file with your solutions and generate a PDF file from it. Upload **both** the tex and the pdf file to Sakai.
- Use proper fonts for a clear presentation:
 x for an observed value; X for a random variable; X for a vector; X for a matrix.
- You are allowed to work with other students but homework should be in your own
 words. Identical solutions will receive a 0 in grade and will be investigated.
- 1. Consider the Gaussian mixture model for clustering with latent $Z \sim Multinomial(1, (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_K))$ and $X|Z = j \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_j, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j), \forall j = 1, \dots, K$. Develop the E-step and M-step for the parameters $\eta_j, \boldsymbol{\mu}_j, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j$'s.

SOLUTION.

In this question, we would like to derive the EM algorithm to obtain the parameters in the Gaussian mixture model for clustering. We start by letting $Y = (X_1, Z_1), \dots, (X_n, Z_n)$ be the full data, and $Y_{obs} = X_1, \dots, X_n$ be the observed data. The full data likelihood function is derived as,

$$L_n = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \prod_{j=1}^{K} \eta_j^{I(Z_i=j)} P_{\mu_j, \Sigma_j}(X_i)^{I(Z_i=j)}.$$

Then the log-likelihood function is derived as,

$$l_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^K I(Z_i = j) (\log(\eta_j) + \log(P_{\mu_j, \Sigma_j}(X_i))).$$

We also initialize $\psi^{(0)} = (\eta_1^{(0)}, \dots, \eta_K^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_1^{(0)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mu}_K^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{(0)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_K^{(0)})$, and for $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, the E-step and M-step are developed as follow:

• E-step:

We calculate the conditional expectation of the full data log-likelihood function given the observed data and $\psi^{(t)}$:

$$E[l_n(Y; \psi)|Y_{obs}, \psi^{(t)}] = E[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^K I(Z_i = j)(\log(\eta_j) + \log(P_{\mu_j, \Sigma_j}(X_i)))|\{X_i\}_1^n, \psi^{(t)}]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^K \gamma_{ij}^{(t)}(\log(\eta_j) + \log(P_{\mu_j, \Sigma_j}(X_i))),$$

where,

$$\begin{split} \gamma_{ij}^{(t)} &= E[I(Z_i = j) | \{ \boldsymbol{X}_i \}_1^n, \psi^{(t)}] \\ &= E[I(Z_i = j) | \boldsymbol{X}_i, \psi^{(t)}] \\ &= P(Z_i = j | \boldsymbol{X}_i, \psi^{(t)}) \\ &= \frac{P(\boldsymbol{X}_i | Z_i = j, \psi^{(t)}) P(Z_i = j | \psi^{(t)})}{P(\boldsymbol{X}_i | \psi^{(t)})} \\ &= \frac{\eta_j^{(t)} P_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_j^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j^{(t)}}(\boldsymbol{X}_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \eta_j^{(t)} P_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_i^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j^{(t)}}(\boldsymbol{X}_i)}. \end{split}$$

• M-step

At the M-step, we would like to maximize the conditional expectation that we obtained in the E-step to find new estimates for the parameters. Specifically, we would like to obtain the updated estimate $\psi^{(t+1)}$ such that,

$$\psi^{(t+1)} = argmax_{\psi} E[\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{K} I(Z_i = j)(\log(\eta_j) + \log(P_{\mu_j, \Sigma_j}(X_i))) | \{X_i\}_1^n, \psi^{(t)}]$$

$$= argmax_{\psi} \{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{K} \gamma_{ij}^{(t)}(\log(\eta_j) + \log(P_{\mu_j, \Sigma_j}(X_i))) \}.$$

Then, we can find the estimate $\mu_j^{(t+1)}$ by differentiating the objective function and setting the derivative to zero,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_j} \{ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^K \gamma_{ij}^{(t)} (\log(\eta_j) + \log(P_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_j, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j}(\boldsymbol{X}_i))) \} = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{ij}^{(t)} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j^- (\boldsymbol{X}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j) = \mathbf{0}.$$

By solving the above equation, we have that,

$$\mu_j^{(t+1)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{ij}^{(t)} X_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{ij}^{(t)}}.$$

Similarly, we can find the estimate $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{j}^{(t+1)}$ by using the same technique,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{\Sigma}_{j}^{-}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{K} \gamma_{ij}^{(t)} (\log(\eta_{j}) + \log(P_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{j}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{j}}(\boldsymbol{X}_{i}))) \right\}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_{ij}^{(t)} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{j} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_{ij}^{(t)} (\boldsymbol{X}_{i} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{j}) (\boldsymbol{X}_{i} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{j})^{T}$$

$$= \mathbf{0}.$$

By solving the above equations and using the invariance property, we have that,

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{j}^{(t+1)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_{ij}^{(t)} (\boldsymbol{X}_{i} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{j}^{(t+1)}) (\boldsymbol{X}_{i} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{j}^{(t+1)})^{T}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_{ij}^{(t)}}.$$

Finally, to find the estimate $\eta_j^{(t+1)}$, we would need to maximize the objective function with respect to η_j subject to the constraint such that,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{K} \eta_j^{(t+1)} = 1$$

By using the Lagrange Multiplier, we have that,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_j} \{ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^K \gamma_{ij}^{(t)} (\log(\eta_j) + \log(P_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_j, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j}(\boldsymbol{X}_i))) \} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\gamma_{ij}^{(t)}}{\eta_j} = \lambda,$$

so that,

$$\eta_j = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\gamma_{ij}^{(t)}}{\lambda},$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^K \eta_j^{(t+1)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^K \gamma_{ij}^{(t)}}{\lambda} = \frac{n}{\lambda} = 1,$$

$$\lambda = n.$$

Therefore, the estimate $\eta_j^{(t+1)}$ is obtained by solving

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\gamma_{ij}^{(t)}}{\eta_j} = n,$$

which leads to,

$$\eta_j^{(t+1)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{ij}^{(t)}.$$

To sum up, at the M-step, we have that,

$$\begin{split} \eta_j^{(t+1)} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{ij}^{(t)}, \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}_j^{(t+1)} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{ij}^{(t)} \boldsymbol{X}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{ij}^{(t)}}, \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j^{(t+1)} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{ij}^{(t)} (\boldsymbol{X}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j^{(t+1)}) (\boldsymbol{X}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j^{(t+1)})^T}{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{ij}^{(t)}}. \end{split}$$

2. Consider the Gaussian graphical model $X \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mu, \Sigma)$ with precision matrix $\Theta = \Sigma^{-1}$. Show that $\Theta_{jk} = 0$ if and only if $X_j \perp X_k | \{X_1, \dots, X_d\} \setminus \{X_j, X_k\}$.

Proof.

For the Gaussian graphical model $X \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$, if we partition the random vector X into two components, $X_A \in \mathbb{R}^a$ and $X_B \in \mathbb{R}^b$ such that a + b = d, and let $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ be partitioned accordingly, i.e.,

$$oldsymbol{\mu} = egin{bmatrix} oldsymbol{\mu}_A \ oldsymbol{\mu}_B \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$oldsymbol{\Sigma} = egin{bmatrix} oldsymbol{\Sigma}_{A,A} & oldsymbol{\Sigma}_{A,B} \ oldsymbol{\Sigma}_{B,A} & oldsymbol{\Sigma}_{B,B} \end{bmatrix},$$

then,

- The marginal distribution of X_A is $N(\mu_A, \Sigma_{A,A})$.
- The conditional distribution of $X_A|X_B = x_B$ is $N(\mu_{A|B}, \Sigma_{A|B})$, where

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{A|B} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_A + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{A,B} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{B|B}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{x}_B - \boldsymbol{\mu}_B),$$

$$\Sigma_{A|B} = \Sigma_{A,A} - \Sigma_{A,B} \Sigma_{B,B}^{-1} \Sigma_{B,A}.$$

Now, we can start by proving the following claim:

- Claim: Under the setting of $X \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$, for $j, k \in \{1, ..., d\}$ with $j \neq k$, we have that, $X_j \perp \!\!\! \perp X_k$ if and only if $\sigma_{jk} = 0$, where X_j and X_k are j^{th} and k^{th} components of \boldsymbol{X} , and σ_{jk} is the $(j, k)^{th}$ element of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$.
- **Proof:** We know that the marginal distribution of $(X_j, X_k)^T$ is $N((\mu_j, \mu_k)^T, \Sigma_{\{j,k\}})$, where,

$$oldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\{j,k\}} = egin{bmatrix} \sigma_{jj} & \sigma_{jk} \ \sigma_{kj} & \sigma_{kk} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then the marginal distribution of X_j is $N(\mu_j, \sigma_{jj})$, and the conditional distribution of $X_j | X_k = x_k$ is,

$$N(\mu_j + \sigma_{jk}\sigma_{kk}^{-1}(x_k - \mu_k), \sigma_{jj} - \sigma_{jk}\sigma_{kk}^{-1}\sigma_{kj}).$$

Then, $X_j \perp X_k$ if and only if the marginal distribution of X_j , $f_{X_j}(x_j)$, equals to the conditional distribution of $X_j|X_k = x_k$, $f_{X_j|X_k = x_k}(x_j)$ (by the definition of independence), which happens if and only if $\sigma_{jk} = 0$ (both directions are very obvious), as desired.

Once we have proved the above claim, we move onto the original statement that we would like to prove. Then we have that,

- $X_j \perp \!\!\! \perp X_k | \{X_1, \ldots, X_d\} \setminus \{X_j, X_k\}$ if and only if the conditional covariance matrix, $\Sigma_{\{j,k\} | [d] \setminus \{j,k\}}$, is diagonal (by the claim that we have proved earlier).
- $\Sigma_{\{j,k\}|[d]\setminus\{j,k\}}$ is diagonal if and only if its inverse, $\Sigma_{\{j,k\}|[d]\setminus\{j,k\}}^{-1}$, is diagonal (because the inverse of a non-singular diagonal matrix is also diagonal).
- $\Sigma_{\{j,k\}|[d]\setminus\{j,k\}}^{-1} = \Theta_{\{j,k\}}$, where

$$\Theta_{\{j,k\}} = \begin{bmatrix} \Theta_{jj} & \Theta_{jk} \\ \Theta_{kj} & \Theta_{kk} \end{bmatrix}$$

(this can be verified by deriving the inverse of block matrix).

• $\Theta_{\{j,k\}}$ is diagonal matrix is equivalent to $\Theta_{jk}=0$.

Therefore, $\Theta_{jk} = 0$ if and only if $X_j \perp X_k | \{X_1, \dots, X_d\} \setminus \{X_j, X_k\}$, as desired.