

Short course

A vademecum of statistical pattern recognition and machine learning

## Inference and learning at a glance

Massimo Piccardi  
University of Technology, Sydney, Australia

© Massimo Piccardi, UTS 1

## Inference and learning

- Most papers with machine learning content have a section on “inference” and one on “learning”
- *Inference* refers to estimating variables such as classes or states, given a model
- *Learning* refers to estimating the model itself from a training set
- These definitions are somewhat loose since statistical inference technically comprises both

© Massimo Piccardi, UTS 2

## Inference and learning

- Here, we want to learn to recognise various, common problems of inference and learning “at a glance”
- Let us assume that we are given:
  - a set of parameters,  $\theta$ , defining the model;
  - a set of samples,  $\mathbf{X}$ , from the model;
  - a set of hidden variables,  $\mathbf{Y}$ , **in correspondence with  $\mathbf{X}$** , which could include, for instance, a set of classes
- We’ll intend inference as finding the “best value” for  $\mathbf{Y}$  and learning as finding the “best value” for  $\theta$

© Massimo Piccardi, UTS 3

## Preamble - 1

- Given a generic function  $f(x)$ , the following properties obviously hold:

$$\arg \max_x f(x) = \arg \max_x (f(x) \cdot k)$$

$$\arg \max_x f(x) \neq \arg \max_x (f(x) \cdot g(x))$$

- The value where the function has its maximum (argmax) is not modified by a multiplicative constant,  $k$ , but is of course modified by multiplying it by another function,  $g(x)$

© Massimo Piccardi, UTS 4

## Preamble - 2

- In the case of two generic random variables, A and B, Bayes' theorem applies:

$$p(A, B) = p(A | B)p(B) = p(B | A)p(A)$$

and the properties imply:

$$\arg \max_A p(A | B) = \arg \max_A (p(A, B) = p(A | B)p(B))$$

$$\arg \max_A p(B | A) \neq \arg \max_A (p(A, B) = p(B | A)p(A))$$

© Massimo Piccardi, UTS 5

## #1

$$Y^* = \arg \max_Y p(Y | X, \theta)$$

- Inference: find the best values for Y, given X and  $\theta$ . If Y are classes, it is also classification
- Would this problem have the same solution?

$$Y^* = \arg \max_Y p(Y, X | \theta)$$

- Yes. Please note that, by Bayes' theorem:

$$Y^* = \arg \max_Y (p(Y, X | \theta) = p(Y | X, \theta)p(X | \theta))$$

© Massimo Piccardi, UTS 6

## #2

- Would this problem have the same solution?

$$Y^* = \arg \max_Y p(X | Y, \theta)$$

- No. Please note that, by Bayes' theorem:

$$Y^* = \arg \max_Y (p(Y, X | \theta) = p(X | Y, \theta)p(Y | \theta))$$

This time, the two terms to maximise differ by a function, not a constant. If  $Y$  are classes, we can call the above *maximum likelihood classification*

© Massimo Piccardi, UTS 7

## #3

$$\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta} p(Y, X | \theta)$$

- Learning: maximum (joint) likelihood estimation (MLE). The hidden variables/classes are assumed known (supervised learning)
- Would this problem have the same solution?

$$\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta} p(X | Y, \theta)$$

- In principle, no, because it differs by a  $p(Y|\theta)$  factor. In practice, yes, since  $p(Y|\theta)$  depends on a different subset of parameters than  $p(X|Y,\theta)$

© Massimo Piccardi, UTS 8

## #4

$$\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta} p(Y | X, \theta)$$

- Learning: maximum conditional likelihood estimation (MCLE). The hidden variables/classes are again assumed known (supervised learning)

## #5

$$\theta^*, Y^* = \arg \max_{\theta, Y} p(Y, X | \theta)$$

- Again, joint MLE. This time the hidden variables/classes are assumed unknown (unsupervised learning), and we find the best. Therefore, this is **joint learning and inference**. Usually, the  $Y^*$  are discarded after learning and only the  $\theta$  are retained for inference on future samples

## #6

$$\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta} p(X | \theta)$$

- Again, MLE. This time the hidden variables/classes are again assumed unknown (unsupervised learning), and we have marginalised them. This case is sometimes called **maximum incomplete data** (i.e. measurements only) **likelihood**. NB: the resulting  $\theta$  would differ from the previous case!
- Marginalisation:

$$p(X | \theta) = \int_Y p(Y, X | \theta) dY$$

© Massimo Piccardi, UTS 11

## #7

$$\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta} p(\theta | X, Y)$$

- Learning: this time the parameters are treated as a random variable! This is universally known as **maximum-a-posteriori estimation (MAPE)** (not to be confused with MAP inference!)

© Massimo Piccardi, UTS 12

## #8

$$\theta^*, Y^* = \arg \max_{\theta, Y} p(\theta, Y | X)$$

- MAPE, unsupervised, joint learning and inference

$$\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta} \left( p(\theta | X) = \int_Y p(\theta, Y | X) dY \right)$$

- MAPE, unsupervised, again, learning with Y marginalised

## #9

$$Y^* = \arg \max_Y \left( p(Y | X) = \int_{\theta} p(\theta, Y | X) d\theta \right)$$

- A more sophisticated inference, where we average over models (Bayesian treatment of the parameters)

## Conclusions

- Overall, these problems differ based on:
  - if we target  $\theta$ ,  $Y$  or **both** in the maximisation (learning, inference or both)
  - if we assume the non-target variables to be **known or unknown** (the samples,  $X$ , are always assumed known)
  - if we assign the variables with a **probability**, or they are just conditioning values
  - if we **maximise or marginalise** the variables we do not know and are not interested in
- Proportionality constants do not affect the maximisation