Clustering and Latent Variable Models

Mengye Ren

(Slides credit to David Rosenberg, He He, et al.)

NYU

Dec 3, 2024

Lecture Slides

K-means Clustering

Unsupervised learning

Goal Discover interesting *structure* in the data.

Unsupervised learning

Goal	Discover interesting *structure* in the data.
Formulation	Density estimation: $p(x;\theta)$ (often with *latent* variables).

Unsupervised learning

Goal Discover interesting *structure* in the data.

Formulation Density estimation: $p(x;\theta)$ (often with *latent* variables).

Examples

- Discover *clusters*: cluster data into groups.
- Discover *factors*: project high-dimensional data to a small number of "meaningful" dimensions, i.e. dimensionality reduction.
- Discover *graph structures*: learn joint distribution of correlated variables, i.e. graphical models.

Example: Old Faithful Geyser



- Looks like two clusters.
- How to find these clusters algorithmically?

k-Means: By Example

- Standardize the data.
- Choose two cluster centers.



From Bishop's *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, Figure 9.1(a).

k-means: by example

- Assign each point to closest center.



From Bishop's *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, Figure 9.1(b).

k-means: by example

- Compute new cluster centers.



From Bishop's *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, Figure 9.1(c).

k-means: by example

- Assign points to closest center.



From Bishop's *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, Figure 9.1(d).

k-means: by example

- Compute cluster centers.



From Bishop's *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, Figure 9.1(e).

k-means: by example

- Iterate until convergence.



From Bishop's *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, Figure 9.1(i).

Suboptimal Local Minimum

- The clustering for $k = 3$ below is a local minimum, but suboptimal:



From Sontag's DS-GA 1003, 2014, Lecture 8.

Formalize k-Means

- Dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ where $\mathcal{X} = \mathrm{R}^d$.

Formalize k-Means

- Dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ where $\mathcal{X} = \mathrm{R}^d$.
- Goal: Partition data $\mathcal{D}$ into k disjoint sets $C_1, \ldots, C_k$.

Formalize k-Means

- Dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ where $\mathcal{X} = \mathrm{R}^d$.
- Goal: Partition data $\mathcal{D}$ into k disjoint sets $C_1, \ldots, C_k$.
- Let $c_i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ be the cluster assignment of x_i.

Formalize k-Means

- Dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ where $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$.
- Goal: Partition data $\mathcal{D}$ into k disjoint sets $C_1, \ldots, C_k$.
- Let $c_i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ be the cluster assignment of x_i.
- The **centroid** of C_i is defined to be

Formalize k-Means

- Dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ where $\mathcal{X} = \mathrm{R}^d$.
- Goal: Partition data $\mathcal{D}$ into k disjoint sets $C_1, \ldots, C_k$.
- Let $c_i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ be the cluster assignment of x_i.
- The **centroid** of C_i is defined to be
- The k-means objective is to minimize the distance between each example and its cluster centroid:

k-Means: Algorithm

1. Initialize: Randomly choose initial centroids $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

k-Means: Algorithm

1. Initialize: Randomly choose initial centroids $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
2. Repeat until convergence (i.e. c_i doesn't change anymore):

k-Means: Algorithm

1. Initialize: Randomly choose initial centroids $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k \in \mathrm{R}^d$.
2. Repeat until convergence (i.e. c_i doesn't change anymore):
    1. For all i, set

$$c_i \leftarrow \arg\min_j \|x_i - \mu_j\|^2. \tag{1}$$

k-Means: Algorithm

1. Initialize: Randomly choose initial centroids $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k \in R^d$.
2. Repeat until convergence (i.e. c_i doesn't change anymore):
   1. For all i, set
   $$c_i \leftarrow \arg\min_j \|x_i - \mu_j\|^2. \tag{1}$$
   2. For all j, set
   $$\mu_j \leftarrow \frac{1}{|C_j|} \sum_{x \in C_j} x. \tag{2}$$

k-Means: Algorithm

1. Initialize: Randomly choose initial centroids $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k \in R^d$.
2. Repeat until convergence (i.e. c_i doesn't change anymore):
   1. For all i, set
   $$c_i \leftarrow \arg\min_j \|x_i - \mu_j\|^2. \tag{1}$$
   2. For all j, set
   $$\mu_j \leftarrow \frac{1}{|C_j|} \sum_{x \in C_j} x. \tag{2}$$

- Recall the objective: $J(c, \mu) = \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i - \mu_{c_i}\|^2$.

k-Means: Algorithm

1. Initialize: Randomly choose initial centroids $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k \in R^d$.
2. Repeat until convergence (i.e. c_i doesn't change anymore):
   1. For all i, set
   $$c_i \leftarrow \arg\min_j \|x_i - \mu_j\|^2. \qquad \text{Minimize } J \text{ w.r.t. } c \text{ while fixing } \mu \tag{1}$$
   2. For all j, set
   $$\mu_j \leftarrow \frac{1}{|C_j|} \sum_{x \in C_j} x. \tag{2}$$

- Recall the objective: $J(c, \mu) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x_i - \mu_{c_i}\|^2$.

k-Means: Algorithm

1. Initialize: Randomly choose initial centroids $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k \in R^d$.
2. Repeat until convergence (i.e. c_i doesn't change anymore):
    1. For all i, set
    $$c_i \leftarrow \arg\min_j \|x_i - \mu_j\|^2. \qquad \text{Minimize } J \text{ w.r.t. } c \text{ while fixing } \mu \tag{1}$$
    2. For all j, set
    $$\mu_j \leftarrow \frac{1}{|C_j|} \sum_{x \in C_j} x. \qquad \text{Minimze } J \text{ w.r.t. } \mu \text{ while fixing } c. \tag{2}$$

- Recall the objective: $J(c, \mu) = \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i - \mu_{c_i}\|^2$.

Avoid bad local minima

k-means converges to a local minimum.

- J is non-convex, thus no guarantee to converging to the global minimum.

Avoid getting stuck with bad local minima:

- Re-run with random initial centroids.

Avoid bad local minima

k-means converges to a local minimum.

- J is non-convex, thus no guarantee to converging to the global minimum.

Avoid getting stuck with bad local minima:

- Re-run with random initial centroids.
- k-**means++**: choose initial centroids that spread over all data points.

Avoid bad local minima

k-means converges to a local minimum.

- J is non-convex, thus no guarantee to converging to the global minimum.

Avoid getting stuck with bad local minima:

- Re-run with random initial centroids.
- k-**means++**: choose initial centroids that spread over all data points.
  - Randomly choose the first centroid from the data points $\mathcal{D}$.

Avoid bad local minima

k-means converges to a local minimum.

- J is non-convex, thus no guarantee to converging to the global minimum.

Avoid getting stuck with bad local minima:

- Re-run with random initial centroids.
- k-**means++**: choose initial centroids that spread over all data points.
  - Randomly choose the first centroid from the data points $\mathcal{D}$.
  - Sequentially choose subsequent centroids from points that are farther away from current centroids:

Avoid bad local minima

k-means converges to a local minimum.

- J is non-convex, thus no guarantee to converging to the global minimum.

Avoid getting stuck with bad local minima:

- Re-run with random initial centroids.
- k-**means++**: choose initial centroids that spread over all data points.
  - Randomly choose the first centroid from the data points $\mathcal{D}$.
  - Sequentially choose subsequent centroids from points that are farther away from current centroids:
    - Compute distance between each x_i and the closest already chosen centroids.

Avoid bad local minima

k-means converges to a local minimum.

- J is non-convex, thus no guarantee to converging to the global minimum.

Avoid getting stuck with bad local minima:

- Re-run with random initial centroids.
- k-**means++**: choose initial centroids that spread over all data points.
    - Randomly choose the first centroid from the data points $\mathcal{D}$.
    - Sequentially choose subsequent centroids from points that are farther away from current centroids:
        - Compute distance between each x_i and the closest already chosen centroids.
        - Randomly choose next centroid with probability proportional to the computed distance squared.

Summary

We've seen

- Clustering—an unsupervised learning problem that aims to discover group assignments.
- k-means:
  - Algorithm: alternating between assigning points to clusters and computing cluster centroids.
  - Objective: minmizing some loss function by coordinate descent.
  - Converge to a local minimum.

Summary

We've seen

- Clustering—an unsupervised learning problem that aims to discover group assignments.
- k-means:
  - Algorithm: alternating between assigning points to clusters and computing cluster centroids.
  - Objective: minmizing some loss function by coordinate descent.
  - Converge to a local minimum.

Next, probabilistic model of clustering.

- A generative model of x.
- Maximum likelihood estimation.

Gaussian Mixture Models

Gaussian mixture model (GMM)

Generative story of GMM with k mixture components:

Gaussian mixture model (GMM)

Generative story of GMM with k mixture components:

Probability density of x:

- Sum over (marginalize) the **latent variable** z.

Identifiability Issues for GMM

- Suppose we have found parameters

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cluster probabilities :} \quad & \pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k) \\
\text{Cluster means :} \quad & \mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k) \\
\text{Cluster covariance matrices:} \quad & \Sigma = (\Sigma_1, \ldots \Sigma_k)
\end{aligned}$$

  that are at a local minimum.

Identifiability Issues for GMM

- Suppose we have found parameters

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cluster probabilities}: \quad & \pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k) \\
\text{Cluster means}: \quad & \mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k) \\
\text{Cluster covariance matrices}: \quad & \Sigma = (\Sigma_1, \ldots \Sigma_k)
\end{aligned}$$

  that are at a local minimum.

- What happens if we shuffle the clusters? e.g. Switch the labels for clusters 1 and 2.

Identifiability Issues for GMM

- Suppose we have found parameters

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cluster probabilities}: \quad & \pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k) \\ \text{Cluster means}: \quad & \mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k) \\ \text{Cluster covariance matrices}: \quad & \Sigma = (\Sigma_1, \ldots \Sigma_k) \end{aligned}$$

  that are at a local minimum.

- What happens if we shuffle the clusters? e.g. Switch the labels for clusters 1 and 2.
- We'll get the same likelihood. How many such equivalent settings are there?

Identifiability Issues for GMM

- Suppose we have found parameters

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cluster probabilities :} \quad & \pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k) \\ \text{Cluster means :} \quad & \mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k) \\ \text{Cluster covariance matrices:} \quad & \Sigma = (\Sigma_1, \ldots \Sigma_k) \end{aligned}$$

  that are at a local minimum.

- What happens if we shuffle the clusters? e.g. Switch the labels for clusters 1 and 2.
- We'll get the same likelihood. How many such equivalent settings are there?
- Assuming all clusters are distinct, there are $k!$ equivalent solutions.

Learning GMMs

How to learn the parameters π_k, μ_k, Σ_k?

Learning GMMs

How to learn the parameters π_k, μ_k, Σ_k?

- MLE (also called maximize marginal likelihood).

- Log likelihood of data:

Learning GMMs

How to learn the parameters π_k, μ_k, Σ_k?

- MLE (also called maximize marginal likelihood).
- Log likelihood of data:
- Cannot push log into the sum... z and x are coupled.
- No closed-form solution for GMM—try to compute the gradient yourself!

Gradient Descent / SGD for GMM

- What about running gradient descent or SGD on

$$J(\pi, \mu, \Sigma) = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log\left\{\sum_{z=1}^{k} \pi_z \mathcal{N}(x_i \mid \mu_z, \Sigma_z)\right\}?$$

Gradient Descent / SGD for GMM

- What about running gradient descent or SGD on

$$J(\pi, \mu, \Sigma) = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \left\{ \sum_{z=1}^{k} \pi_z \mathcal{N}(x_i \mid \mu_z, \Sigma_z) \right\}?$$

- Can be done, in principle – but need to be clever about it.

Gradient Descent / SGD for GMM

- What about running gradient descent or SGD on

$$J(\pi, \mu, \Sigma) = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log\left\{\sum_{z=1}^{k} \pi_z \mathcal{N}(x_i \mid \mu_z, \Sigma_z)\right\}?$$

- Can be done, in principle – but need to be clever about it.
- For example, each covariance matrix $\Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_k$ has to be positive semidefinite.

Gradient Descent / SGD for GMM

- What about running gradient descent or SGD on

$$J(\pi, \mu, \Sigma) \quad = \quad -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \left\{ \sum_{z=1}^{k} \pi_z \mathcal{N}(x_i \mid \mu_z, \Sigma_z) \right\}?$$

- Can be done, in principle – but need to be clever about it.
- For example, each covariance matrix $\Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_k$ has to be positive semidefinite.
- How to maintain that constraint?

Gradient Descent / SGD for GMM

- What about running gradient descent or SGD on

$$J(\pi, \mu, \Sigma) \quad = \quad -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \left\{ \sum_{z=1}^{k} \pi_z \mathcal{N}(x_i \mid \mu_z, \Sigma_z) \right\} ?$$

- Can be done, in principle – but need to be clever about it.
- For example, each covariance matrix $\Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_k$ has to be positive semidefinite.
- How to maintain that constraint?
  - Rewrite $\Sigma_i = M_i M_i^T$, where M_i is an unconstrained matrix.

Gradient Descent / SGD for GMM

- What about running gradient descent or SGD on

$$J(\pi, \mu, \Sigma) = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \left\{ \sum_{z=1}^{k} \pi_z \mathcal{N}(x_i \mid \mu_z, \Sigma_z) \right\}?$$

- Can be done, in principle – but need to be clever about it.
- For example, each covariance matrix $\Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_k$ has to be positive semidefinite.
- How to maintain that constraint?
    - Rewrite $\Sigma_i = M_i M_i^T$, where M_i is an unconstrained matrix.
    - Then Σ_i is positive semidefinite.

Gradient Descent / SGD for GMM

- What about running gradient descent or SGD on

$$J(\pi, \mu, \Sigma) \quad = \quad -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log\left\{\sum_{z=1}^{k} \pi_z \mathcal{N}(x_i \mid \mu_z, \Sigma_z)\right\}?$$

- Can be done, in principle – but need to be clever about it.
- For example, each covariance matrix $\Sigma_1, \ldots, \Sigma_k$ has to be positive semidefinite.
- How to maintain that constraint?
  - Rewrite $\Sigma_i = M_i M_i^T$, where M_i is an unconstrained matrix.
  - Then Σ_i is positive semidefinite.

Learning GMMs: observable case

Suppose we observe cluster assignments z. Then MLE is easy:

$$n_z = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}[z_i = z] \qquad \text{\# examples in each cluster} \tag{3}$$

(6)

Learning GMMs: observable case

Suppose we observe cluster assignments z. Then MLE is easy:

$$n_z = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}[z_i = z] \qquad \text{\# examples in each cluster} \tag{3}$$

$$\hat{\pi}(z) = \frac{n_z}{n} \qquad \text{fraction of examples in each cluster} \tag{4}$$

$$\tag{6}$$

Learning GMMs: observable case

Suppose we observe cluster assignments z. Then MLE is easy:

$$n_z = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}[z_i = z] \qquad \text{\# examples in each cluster} \tag{3}$$

$$\hat{\pi}(z) = \frac{n_z}{n} \qquad \text{fraction of examples in each cluster} \tag{4}$$

$$\hat{\mu}_z = \frac{1}{n_z} \sum_{i:z_i=z} x_i \qquad \text{empirical cluster mean} \tag{5}$$

$$\tag{6}$$

Learning GMMs: observable case

Suppose we observe cluster assignments z. Then MLE is easy:

$$n_z = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}[z_i = z] \qquad \text{\# examples in each cluster} \tag{3}$$

$$\hat{\pi}(z) = \frac{n_z}{n} \qquad \text{fraction of examples in each cluster} \tag{4}$$

$$\hat{\mu}_z = \frac{1}{n_z} \sum_{i:z_i=z} x_i \qquad \text{empirical cluster mean} \tag{5}$$

$$\hat{\Sigma}_z = \frac{1}{n_z} \sum_{i:z_i=z} (x_i - \hat{\mu}_z)(x_i - \hat{\mu}_z)^T . \qquad \text{empirical cluster covariance} \tag{6}$$

Learning GMMs: inference

The inference problem: observe x, want to know z.

Learning GMMs: inference

The inference problem: observe x, want to know z.

- $p(z \mid x)$ is a *soft assignment*.
- If we know the parameters μ, Σ, π, this would be easy to compute.

EM for GMM

Let's compute the cluster assignments and the parameters iteratively.

Let's compute the cluster assignments and the parameters iteratively.

The expectation-minimization (EM) algorithm:

1. Initialize parameters μ, Σ, π randomly.
2. Run until convergence:

EM for GMM

Let's compute the cluster assignments and the parameters iteratively.

The expectation-minimization (EM) algorithm:

1. Initialize parameters μ, Σ, π randomly.
2. Run until convergence:
    1. E-step: fill in latent variables by inference.
        - compute soft assignments $p(z \mid x_i)$ for all i.

EM for GMM

Let's compute the cluster assignments and the parameters iteratively.

The expectation-minimization (EM) algorithm:

1. Initialize parameters μ, Σ, π randomly.
2. Run until convergence:
    1. E-step: fill in latent variables by inference.
        - compute soft assignments $p(z \mid x_i)$ for all i.
    2. M-step: standard MLE for μ, Σ, π given "observed" variables.
        - Equivalent to MLE in the observable case on data weighted by $p(z \mid x_i)$.

M-step for GMM

- Let $p(z \mid x)$ be the soft assignments:

$$\gamma_i^j = \frac{\pi_j^{\text{old}} \mathcal{N}\left(x_i \mid \mu_j^{\text{old}}, \Sigma_j^{\text{old}}\right)}{\sum_{c=1}^{k} \pi_c^{\text{old}} \mathcal{N}\left(x_i \mid \mu_c^{\text{old}}, \Sigma_c^{\text{old}}\right)}.$$

- Exercise: show that

$$\begin{aligned}
n_z &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_i^z \\
\mu_z^{\text{new}} &= \frac{1}{n_z} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_i^z x_i \\
\Sigma_z^{\text{new}} &= \frac{1}{n_z} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_i^z \left(x_i - \mu_z^{\text{new}}\right)\left(x_i - \mu_z^{\text{new}}\right)^T \\
\pi_z^{\text{new}} &= \frac{n_z}{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

EM for GMM

- Initialization



From Bishop's *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, Figure 9.8.

EM for GMM

- First soft assignment:



From Bishop's *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, Figure 9.8.

EM for GMM

- First soft assignment:



From Bishop's *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, Figure 9.8.

EM for GMM

- After 5 rounds of EM:



From Bishop's *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, Figure 9.8.

EM for GMM

- After 20 rounds of EM:



From Bishop's *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, Figure 9.8.

EM for GMM: Summary

- EM is a general algorithm for learning latent variable models.
- *Key idea*: if data was fully observed, then MLE is easy.
  - E-step: fill in latent variables by computing $p(z \mid x, \theta)$.
  - M-step: standard MLE given fully observed data.
- Simpler and more efficient than gradient methods.
- Can prove that EM monotonically improves the likelihood and converges to a local minimum.
- k-means is a special case of EM for GMM with *hard assignments*, also called hard-EM.

Latent Variable Models

General Latent Variable Model

- Two sets of random variables: z and x.
- z consists of unobserved **hidden variables**.
- x consists of **observed variables**.

General Latent Variable Model

- Two sets of random variables: z and x.
- z consists of unobserved **hidden variables**.
- x consists of **observed variables**.
- Joint probability model parameterized by $\theta \in \Theta$:

$$p(x, z \mid \theta)$$

General Latent Variable Model

- Two sets of random variables: z and x.
- z consists of unobserved **hidden variables**.
- x consists of **observed variables**.
- Joint probability model parameterized by $\theta \in \Theta$:

$$p(x, z \mid \theta)$$

Definition

A **latent variable model** is a probability model for which certain variables are never observed.

General Latent Variable Model

- Two sets of random variables: z and x.
- z consists of unobserved **hidden variables**.
- x consists of **observed variables**.
- Joint probability model parameterized by $\theta \in \Theta$:

$$p(x, z \mid \theta)$$

Definition

A **latent variable model** is a probability model for which certain variables are never observed.

e.g. The Gaussian mixture model is a latent variable model.

Complete and Incomplete Data

- Suppose we observe some data $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.

Complete and Incomplete Data

- Suppose we observe some data $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.
- To simplify notation, take x to represent the entire dataset

$$x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n),$$

and z to represent the corresponding unobserved variables

$$z = (z_1, \ldots, z_n).$$

- An observation of x is called an **incomplete data set**.
- An observation (x, z) is called a **complete data set**.

Our Objectives

- **Learning problem**: Given incomplete dataset x, find MLE

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg\max_{\theta} p(x \mid \theta).$$

Our Objectives

- **Learning problem**: Given incomplete dataset x, find MLE

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg\max_{\theta} p(x \mid \theta).$$

- **Inference problem**: Given x, find conditional distribution over z:

$$p\left(z \mid x, \theta\right).$$

Our Objectives

- **Learning problem**: Given incomplete dataset x, find MLE

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg\max_{\theta} p(x \mid \theta).$$

- **Inference problem**: Given x, find conditional distribution over z:

$$p(z \mid x, \theta).$$

- For Gaussian mixture model, learning is hard, inference is easy.
- For more complicated models, inference can also be hard.

Log-Likelihood and Terminology

- Note that

$$\underset{\theta}{\arg\max}\, p(x \mid \theta) = \underset{\theta}{\arg\max}\, [\log p(x \mid \theta)] \,.$$

Log-Likelihood and Terminology

- Note that
$$\arg\max_{\theta} p(x \mid \theta) = \arg\max_{\theta} \left[\log p(x \mid \theta)\right].$$
- Often easier to work with this "**log-likelihood**".

Log-Likelihood and Terminology

- Note that
$$\arg\max_{\theta} p(x \mid \theta) = \arg\max_{\theta} \left[\log p(x \mid \theta)\right].$$
- Often easier to work with this "**log-likelihood**".
- We often call $p(x)$ the **marginal likelihood**,
  - because it is $p(x, z)$ with z "marginalized out":
$$p(x) = \sum_{z} p(x, z)$$

Log-Likelihood and Terminology

- Note that
$$\arg\max_\theta p(x \mid \theta) = \arg\max_\theta \left[\log p(x \mid \theta)\right].$$
- Often easier to work with this "**log-likelihood**".
- We often call $p(x)$ the **marginal likelihood**,
  - because it is $p(x, z)$ with z "marginalized out":
$$p(x) = \sum_z p(x, z)$$
- We often call $p(x, z)$ the **joint**. (for "joint distribution")

Log-Likelihood and Terminology

- Note that
$$\arg\max_{\theta} p(x \mid \theta) = \arg\max_{\theta} \left[\log p(x \mid \theta)\right].$$
- Often easier to work with this "**log-likelihood**".
- We often call $p(x)$ the **marginal likelihood**,
  - because it is $p(x, z)$ with z "marginalized out":
$$p(x) = \sum_{z} p(x, z)$$
- We often call $p(x, z)$ the **joint**. (for "joint distribution")
- Similarly, $\log p(x)$ is the **marginal log-likelihood**.

EM Algorithm

Intuition

Problem: marginal log-likelihood $\log p(x;\theta)$ is hard to optimize (observing only x)

Intuition

Problem: marginal log-likelihood $\log p(x;\theta)$ is hard to optimize (observing only x)

Observation: complete data log-likelihood $\log p(x,z;\theta)$ is easy to optimize (observing both x and z)

Intuition

Problem: marginal log-likelihood $\log p(x; \theta)$ is hard to optimize (observing only x)

Observation: complete data log-likelihood $\log p(x, z; \theta)$ is easy to optimize (observing both x and z)

Idea: guess a distribution of the latent variables $q(z)$ (soft assignments)

Intuition

Problem: marginal log-likelihood $\log p(x;\theta)$ is hard to optimize (observing only x)

Observation: complete data log-likelihood $\log p(x,z;\theta)$ is easy to optimize (observing both x and z)

Idea: guess a distribution of the latent variables $q(z)$ (soft assignments)

Maximize the **expected complete data log-likelihood**:

$$\max_{\theta} \sum_{z\in\mathcal{Z}} q(z) \log p(x,z;\theta)$$

Intuition

Problem: marginal log-likelihood $\log p(x;\theta)$ is hard to optimize (observing only x)

Observation: complete data log-likelihood $\log p(x,z;\theta)$ is easy to optimize (observing both x and z)

Idea: guess a distribution of the latent variables $q(z)$ (soft assignments)

Maximize the **expected complete data log-likelihood**:

$$\max_{\theta} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} q(z) \log p(x,z;\theta)$$

EM assumption: the expected complete data log-likelihood is easy to optimize

Why should this work?

Math Prerequisites

Jensen's Inequality

Theorem (Jensen's Inequality)

*If $f : \mathrm{R} \to \mathrm{R}$ is a **convex** function, and x is a random variable, then*

$$\mathbb{E}f(x) \geqslant f(\mathbb{E}x).$$

Jensen's Inequality

Theorem (Jensen's Inequality)

If $f : \mathrm{R} \to \mathrm{R}$ is a ***convex*** *function, and x is a random variable, then*

$$\mathbb{E}f(x) \geqslant f(\mathbb{E}x).$$

Moreover, if f is ***strictly convex****, then equality implies that $x = \mathbb{E}x$ with probability 1 (i.e. x is a constant).*

Jensen's Inequality

Theorem (Jensen's Inequality)

If $f : \mathrm{R} \to \mathrm{R}$ is a ***convex*** *function, and x is a random variable, then*

$$\mathbb{E}f(x) \geqslant f(\mathbb{E}x).$$

Moreover, if f is ***strictly convex****, then equality implies that $x = \mathbb{E}x$ with probability 1 (i.e. x is a constant).*

- e.g. $f(x) = x^2$ is convex. So $\mathbb{E}x^2 \geqslant (\mathbb{E}x)^2$. Thus

$$\mathrm{Var}(x) = \mathbb{E}x^2 - (\mathbb{E}x)^2 \geqslant 0.$$

Kullback-Leibler Divergence

- Let $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ be probability mass functions (PMFs) on $\mathcal{X}$.
- How can we measure how "different" p and q are?

Kullback-Leibler Divergence

- Let $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ be probability mass functions (PMFs) on $\mathcal{X}$.
- How can we measure how "different" p and q are?
- The **Kullback-Leibler** or **"KL" Divergence** is defined by

$$\mathrm{KL}(p\|q) \quad = \quad \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} p(x)\log\frac{p(x)}{q(x)}.$$

(Assumes $q(x)=0$ implies $p(x)=0$.)

Kullback-Leibler Divergence

- Let $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ be probability mass functions (PMFs) on $\mathcal{X}$.
- How can we measure how "different" p and q are?
- The **Kullback-Leibler** or **"KL" Divergence** is defined by

$$\mathrm{KL}(p\|q) = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} p(x)\log\frac{p(x)}{q(x)}.$$

  (Assumes $q(x)=0$ implies $p(x)=0$.)

- Can also write this as

$$\mathrm{KL}(p\|q) = \mathbb{E}_{x\sim p}\log\frac{p(x)}{q(x)}.$$

Gibbs Inequality ($\mathbf{KL}(p\|q) \geqslant 0$ and $\mathbf{KL}(p\|p) = 0$)

Theorem (Gibbs Inequality)

Let $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ be PMFs on $\mathcal{X}$. Then

$$KL(p\|q) \geqslant 0,$$

with equality iff $p(x) = q(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Gibbs Inequality ($\mathbf{KL}(p\|q) \geqslant 0$ and $\mathbf{KL}(p\|p) = 0$)

Theorem (Gibbs Inequality)

Let $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ be PMFs on $\mathcal{X}$. Then

$$KL(p\|q) \geqslant 0,$$

with equality iff $p(x) = q(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

- KL divergence measures the "distance" between distributions.

Gibbs Inequality ($\mathbf{KL}(p\|q) \geqslant 0$ and $\mathbf{KL}(p\|p) = 0$)

Theorem (Gibbs Inequality)

Let $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ be PMFs on $\mathcal{X}$. Then

$$KL(p\|q) \geqslant 0,$$

with equality iff $p(x) = q(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

- KL divergence measures the "distance" between distributions.
- Note:
  - KL divergence **not a metric**.
  - KL divergence is **not symmetric**.

Gibbs Inequality: Proof

$$\mathrm{KL}(p\|q) = \mathbb{E}_p\left[-\log\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right)\right]$$

Gibbs Inequality: Proof

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{KL}(p\|q) &= \mathbb{E}_p\left[-\log\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right)\right] \\
&\geqslant -\log\left[\mathbb{E}_p\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right)\right] \qquad \text{(Jensen's)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Gibbs Inequality: Proof

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{KL}(p\|q) &= \mathbb{E}_p\left[-\log\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right)\right] \\
&\geqslant -\log\left[\mathbb{E}_p\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right)\right] \qquad \text{(Jensen's)} \\
&= -\log\left[\sum_{\{x|p(x)>0\}} p(x)\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Gibbs Inequality: Proof

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{KL}(p\|q) &= \mathbb{E}_p\left[-\log\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right)\right] \\
&\geqslant -\log\left[\mathbb{E}_p\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right)\right] \qquad \text{(Jensen's)} \\
&= -\log\left[\sum_{\{x|p(x)>0\}} p(x)\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right] \\
&= -\log\left[\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} q(x)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Gibbs Inequality: Proof

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{KL}(p\|q) &= \mathbb{E}_p\left[-\log\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right)\right] \\
&\geqslant -\log\left[\mathbb{E}_p\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right)\right] \qquad \text{(Jensen's)} \\
&= -\log\left[\sum_{\{x|p(x)>0\}} p(x)\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right] \\
&= -\log\left[\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} q(x)\right] \\
&= -\log 1 = 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Gibbs Inequality: Proof

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{KL}(p\|q) &= \mathbb{E}_p\left[-\log\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right)\right] \\
&\geqslant -\log\left[\mathbb{E}_p\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right)\right] \qquad \text{(Jensen's)} \\
&= -\log\left[\sum_{\{x|p(x)>0\}} p(x)\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right] \\
&= -\log\left[\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} q(x)\right] \\
&= -\log 1 = 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

- Since $-\log$ is strictly convex, we have strict equality iff $q(x)/p(x)$ is a constant, which implies $q = p$.

The ELBO: Family of Lower Bounds on $\log p(x \mid \theta)$

The Maximum Likelihood Estimator

Lower bound of the marginal log-likelihood

MLE, EM, and the ELBO

- The MLE is defined as a maximum over θ:

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \underset{\theta}{\arg\max} \left[\log p(x \mid \theta)\right].$$

MLE, EM, and the ELBO

- The MLE is defined as a maximum over θ:

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg\max_{\theta} \left[\log p(x \mid \theta) \right].$$

- For any PMF $q(z)$, we have a lower bound on the marginal log-likelihood

$$\log p(x \mid \theta) \geqslant \mathcal{L}(q, \theta).$$

MLE, EM, and the ELBO

- The MLE is defined as a maximum over θ:

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \underset{\theta}{\arg\max} \left[\log p(x \mid \theta)\right].$$

- For any PMF $q(z)$, we have a lower bound on the marginal log-likelihood

$$\log p(x \mid \theta) \geqslant \mathcal{L}(q, \theta).$$

- In EM algorithm, we maximize the lower bound (ELBO) over θ and q:

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{EM}} \approx \underset{\theta}{\arg\max} \left[\max_q \mathcal{L}(q, \theta)\right]$$

MLE, EM, and the ELBO

- The MLE is defined as a maximum over θ:

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg\max_{\theta} \left[\log p(x \mid \theta)\right].$$

- For any PMF $q(z)$, we have a lower bound on the marginal log-likelihood

$$\log p(x \mid \theta) \geqslant \mathcal{L}(q, \theta).$$

- In EM algorithm, we maximize the lower bound (ELBO) over θ and q:

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{EM}} \approx \arg\max_{\theta} \left[\max_{q} \mathcal{L}(q, \theta)\right]$$

- In EM algorithm, q ranges over all distributions on z.

EM: Coordinate Ascent on Lower Bound

- Choose sequence of q's and θ's by "**coordinate ascent**" on $\mathcal{L}(q, \theta)$.

EM: Coordinate Ascent on Lower Bound

- Choose sequence of q's and θ's by "**coordinate ascent**" on $\mathcal{L}(q, \theta)$.
- EM Algorithm (high level):
  1. Choose initial θ^{old}.
  2. Let $q^* = \arg\max_q \mathcal{L}(q, \theta^{\text{old}})$

EM: Coordinate Ascent on Lower Bound

- Choose sequence of q's and θ's by "**coordinate ascent**" on $\mathcal{L}(q,\theta)$.
- EM Algorithm (high level):
  1. Choose initial θ^{old}.
  2. Let $q^* = \arg\max_q \mathcal{L}(q, \theta^{\text{old}})$
  3. Let $\theta^{\text{new}} = \arg\max_\theta \mathcal{L}(q^*, \theta)$.

EM: Coordinate Ascent on Lower Bound

- Choose sequence of q's and θ's by "**coordinate ascent**" on $\mathcal{L}(q, \theta)$.
- EM Algorithm (high level):
  1. Choose initial θ^{old}.
  2. Let $q^* = \arg\max_q \mathcal{L}(q, \theta^{\text{old}})$
  3. Let $\theta^{\text{new}} = \arg\max_\theta \mathcal{L}(q^*, \theta)$.
  4. Go to step 2, until converged.
- Will show: $p(x \mid \theta^{\textbf{new}}) \geqslant p(x \mid \theta^{\textbf{old}})$
- **Get sequence of θ's with monotonically increasing likelihood.**

EM: Coordinate Ascent on Lower Bound



1. Start at θ^{old}.

From Bishop's *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, Figure 9.14.

EM: Coordinate Ascent on Lower Bound



1. Start at θ^{old}.
2. Find q giving best lower bound at $\theta^{\text{old}} \Longrightarrow \mathcal{L}(q, \theta)$.

From Bishop's *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, Figure 9.14.

EM: Coordinate Ascent on Lower Bound



1. Start at θ^{old}.
2. Find q giving best lower bound at $\theta^{\text{old}} \implies \mathcal{L}(q,\theta)$.
3. $\theta^{\text{new}} = \arg\max_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(q,\theta)$.

From Bishop's *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, Figure 9.14.

Is ELBO a "good" lowerbound?

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}(q,\theta) &= \sum_{z\in\mathcal{Z}} q(z)\log\frac{p(x,z\mid\theta)}{q(z)} \\
&= \sum_{z\in\mathcal{Z}} q(z)\log\frac{p(z\mid x,\theta)p(x\mid\theta)}{q(z)} \\
&= -\sum_{z\in\mathcal{Z}} q(z)\log\frac{q(z)}{p(z\mid x,\theta)} + \sum_{z\in\mathcal{Z}} q(z)\log p(x\mid\theta) \\
&= -\mathrm{KL}\left(q(z)\|p(z\mid x,\theta)\right) + \underbrace{\log p(x\mid\theta)}_{\text{evidence}}
\end{aligned}$$

- **KL divergence**: measures “distance” between two distributions (not symmetric!)
- $\mathrm{KL}\left(q\|p\right) \geqslant 0$ with equality iff $q(z) = p(z\mid x)$.
- ELBO $=$ evidence - KL $\leqslant$ evidence

Maximizing over q for fixed θ.

- Find q maximizing

$$\mathcal{L}(q,\theta) = -\mathrm{KL}[q(z), p(z \mid x, \theta)] + \log p(x \mid \theta)$$

Maximizing over q for fixed θ.

- Find q maximizing

$$\mathcal{L}(q,\theta) = -\mathrm{KL}[q(z), p(z \mid x,\theta)] + \underbrace{\log p(x \mid \theta)}_{\text{no } q \text{ here}}$$

Maximizing over q for fixed θ.

- Find q maximizing

$$\mathcal{L}(q,\theta) \quad = \quad -\mathrm{KL}[q(z), p(z \mid x,\theta)] + \underbrace{\log p(x \mid \theta)}_{\text{no } q \text{ here}}$$

- Recall $\mathrm{KL}(p \| q) \geqslant 0$, and $\mathrm{KL}(p \| p) = 0$.

Maximizing over q for fixed θ.

- Find q maximizing

$$\mathcal{L}(q,\theta) \quad = \quad -\mathrm{KL}[q(z), p(z \mid x,\theta)] + \underbrace{\log p(x \mid \theta)}_{\text{no } q \text{ here}}$$

- Recall $\mathrm{KL}(p\|q) \geqslant 0$, and $\mathrm{KL}(p\|p) = 0$.
- Best q is $q^*(z) = p(z \mid x,\theta)$ and

Maximizing over q for fixed θ.

- Find q maximizing

$$\mathcal{L}(q,\theta) = -\mathrm{KL}[q(z), p(z \mid x,\theta)] + \underbrace{\log p(x \mid \theta)}_{\text{no } q \text{ here}}$$

- Recall $\mathrm{KL}(p\|q) \geqslant 0$, and $\mathrm{KL}(p\|p) = 0$.

- Best q is $q^*(z) = p(z \mid x,\theta)$ and

$$\mathcal{L}(q^*,\theta) = -\underbrace{\mathrm{KL}[p(z \mid x,\theta), p(z \mid x,\theta)]}_{=0} + \log p(x \mid \theta)$$

Maximizing over q for fixed θ.

- Find q maximizing

$$\mathcal{L}(q,\theta) = -\mathrm{KL}[q(z), p(z \mid x,\theta)] + \underbrace{\log p(x \mid \theta)}_{\text{no } q \text{ here}}$$

- Recall $\mathrm{KL}(p\|q) \geqslant 0$, and $\mathrm{KL}(p\|p) = 0$.
- Best q is $q^*(z) = p(z \mid x,\theta)$ and

$$\mathcal{L}(q^*,\theta) = -\underbrace{\mathrm{KL}[p(z \mid x,\theta), p(z \mid x,\theta)]}_{=0} + \log p(x \mid \theta)$$

- Summary:

$$\log p(x \mid \theta) = \sup_q \mathcal{L}(q,\theta) \qquad \forall\theta$$

- For any θ, **sup is attained** at $q(z) = p(z \mid x,\theta)$.

Marginal Log-Likelihood **IS** the Supremum over Lower Bounds

Summary

Latent variable models: clustering, latent structure, missing lables etc.

Parameter estimation: maximum marginal log-likelihood

Challenge: directly maximize the **evidence** $\log p(x; \theta)$ is hard

Solution: maximize the **evidence lower bound**:

$$\text{ELBO} = \mathcal{L}(q, \theta) = -\text{KL}\left(q(z) \| p(z \mid x; \theta)\right) + \log p(x; \theta)$$

Why does it work?

$$q^*(z) = p(z \mid x; \theta) \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta$$
$$\mathcal{L}(q^*, \theta^*) = \max_\theta \log p(x; \theta)$$

EM algorithm

Coordinate ascent on $\mathcal{L}(q, \theta)$

1. Random initialization: $\theta^{\text{old}} \leftarrow \theta_0$
2. Repeat until convergence
   1. $q(z) \leftarrow \arg\max_q \mathcal{L}(q, \theta^{\text{old}})$

      Expectation (the E-step): $$q^*(z) = p(z \mid x; \theta^{\text{old}})$$ $$J(\theta) = \mathcal{L}(q^*, \theta)$$

   2. $\theta^{\text{new}} \leftarrow \arg\max_\theta \mathcal{L}(q^*, \theta)$

      Maximization (the M-step): $$\theta^{\text{new}} \leftarrow \arg\max_\theta J(\theta)$$

EM Algorithm

1. **Expectation Step**
   - Let $q^*(z) = p(z \mid x, \theta^{\text{old}})$. [$q^*$ gives best lower bound at θ^{old}]

EM Algorithm

1. **Expectation Step**
   - Let $q^*(z) = p(z \mid x, \theta^{\text{old}})$. [$q^*$ gives best lower bound at θ^{old}]
   - Let

$$J(\theta) := \mathcal{L}(q^*, \theta) = \underbrace{\sum_z q^*(z) \log\left(\frac{p(x, z \mid \theta)}{q^*(z)}\right)}_{\textbf{expectation} \text{ w.r.t. } z \sim q^*(z)}$$

EM Algorithm

1. **Expectation Step**
   - Let $q^*(z) = p(z \mid x, \theta^{\text{old}})$. [$q^*$ gives best lower bound at θ^{old}]
   - Let

$$J(\theta) := \mathcal{L}(q^*, \theta) = \underbrace{\sum_z q^*(z) \log\left(\frac{p(x, z \mid \theta)}{q^*(z)}\right)}_{\textbf{expectation} \text{ w.r.t. } z \sim q^*(z)}$$

2. **Maximization Step**

$$\theta^{\text{new}} = \arg\max_\theta J(\theta).$$

EM Algorithm

1. **Expectation Step**
   - Let $q^*(z) = p(z \mid x, \theta^{\text{old}})$. [$q^*$ gives best lower bound at θ^{old}]
   - Let

$$J(\theta) := \mathcal{L}(q^*, \theta) = \underbrace{\sum_z q^*(z) \log\left(\frac{p(x, z \mid \theta)}{q^*(z)}\right)}_{\textbf{expectation}\text{ w.r.t. } z \sim q^*(z)}$$

2. **Maximization Step**

$$\theta^{\text{new}} = \arg\max_{\theta} J(\theta).$$

[Equivalent to maximizing expected complete log-likelihood.]

EM Algorithm

1. **Expectation Step**
   - Let $q^*(z) = p(z \mid x, \theta^{\text{old}})$. [$q^*$ gives best lower bound at θ^{old}]
   - Let

$$J(\theta) := \mathcal{L}(q^*, \theta) = \underbrace{\sum_z q^*(z) \log\left(\frac{p(x, z \mid \theta)}{q^*(z)}\right)}_{\textbf{expectation} \text{ w.r.t. } z \sim q^*(z)}$$

2. **Maximization Step**

$$\theta^{\text{new}} = \underset{\theta}{\arg\max}\, J(\theta).$$

[Equivalent to maximizing expected complete log-likelihood.]

EM puts no constraint on q in the E-step and assumes the M-step is easy. In general, both steps can be hard.

Monotonically increasing likelihood



Exercise: prove that EM increases the marginal likelihood monotonically

$$\log p(x; \theta^{\text{new}}) \geqslant \log p(x; \theta^{\text{old}}) \; .$$

Does EM converge to a global maximum?

Variations on EM

EM Gives Us Two New Problems

- The "E" Step: Computing

$$J(\theta) := \mathcal{L}(q^*, \theta) = \sum_z q^*(z) \log\left(\frac{p(x, z \mid \theta)}{q^*(z)}\right)$$

EM Gives Us Two New Problems

- The "E" Step: Computing

$$J(\theta) := \mathcal{L}(q^*, \theta) = \sum_z q^*(z) \log\left(\frac{p(x, z \mid \theta)}{q^*(z)}\right)$$

- The "M" Step: Computing

$$\theta^{\text{new}} = \arg\max_\theta J(\theta).$$

EM Gives Us Two New Problems

- The "E" Step: Computing

$$J(\theta) := \mathcal{L}(q^*, \theta) = \sum_z q^*(z) \log\left(\frac{p(x, z \mid \theta)}{q^*(z)}\right)$$

- The "M" Step: Computing

$$\theta^{\text{new}} = \arg\max_{\theta} J(\theta).$$

EM Gives Us Two New Problems

- The "E" Step: Computing

$$J(\theta) := \mathcal{L}(q^*, \theta) = \sum_z q^*(z) \log\left(\frac{p(x, z \mid \theta)}{q^*(z)}\right)$$

- The "M" Step: Computing

$$\theta^{\text{new}} = \arg\max_\theta J(\theta).$$

- Either of these can be too hard to do in practice.

Generalized EM (GEM)

- Addresses the problem of a difficult "M" step.

Generalized EM (GEM)

- Addresses the problem of a difficult "M" step.
- Rather than finding
$$\theta^{\text{new}} = \arg\max_{\theta} J(\theta),$$
find **any** θ^{new} for which
$$J(\theta^{\text{new}}) > J(\theta^{\text{old}}).$$

Generalized EM (GEM)

- Addresses the problem of a difficult "M" step.
- Rather than finding

$$\theta^{\text{new}} = \arg\max_{\theta} J(\theta),$$

  find **any** θ^{new} for which

$$J(\theta^{\text{new}}) > J(\theta^{\text{old}}).$$

- Can use a standard nonlinear optimization strategy
  - e.g. take a gradient step on J.

Generalized EM (GEM)

- Addresses the problem of a difficult "M" step.
- Rather than finding
$$\theta^{\text{new}} = \arg\max_{\theta} J(\theta),$$
find **any** θ^{new} for which
$$J(\theta^{\text{new}}) > J(\theta^{\text{old}}).$$
- Can use a standard nonlinear optimization strategy
    - e.g. take a gradient step on J.
- We still get monotonically increasing likelihood.

EM and More General Variational Methods

- Suppose "E" step is difficult:
  - Hard to take expectation w.r.t. $q^*(z) = p(z \mid x, \theta^{\text{old}})$.

- Suppose "E" step is difficult:
    - Hard to take expectation w.r.t. $q^*(z) = p(z \mid x, \theta^{\text{old}})$.
- Solution: Restrict to distributions $\mathcal{Q}$ that are easy to work with.

EM and More General Variational Methods

- Suppose "E" step is difficult:
  - Hard to take expectation w.r.t. $q^*(z) = p(z \mid x, \theta^{\text{old}})$.
- Solution: Restrict to distributions $\mathcal{Q}$ that are easy to work with.
- Lower bound now looser:

$$q^* = \underset{q \in \mathcal{Q}}{\arg\min} \, \mathrm{KL}[q(z), p(z \mid x, \theta^{\text{old}})]$$

Deep Latent Variable Models

- Neural network is a flexible function class to represent transformation between random variables $e.g., q(z)$.



Deep Latent Variable Models

- Neural network is a flexible function class to represent transformation between random variables $e.g., q(z)$.
- In neural networks, the hidden activations do not have probabilistic interpretation as they are not random variables.



Deep Latent Variable Models

- Neural network is a flexible function class to represent transformation between random variables $e.g., q(z)$.
- In neural networks, the hidden activations do not have probabilistic interpretation as they are not random variables.
- What if we let the hidden represent some learned latent code?



Variational Autoencoders (VAE) [1]

- An autoencoder (AE) is a neural network that reconstructs the same input.



[1] Diederik P Kingma, Max Welling. Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes. ICLR 2014.

Variational Autoencoders (VAE) [1]

- An autoencoder (AE) is a neural network that reconstructs the same input.
- The first half is an encoder, from input to latent. The second half is a decoder.



[1] Diederik P Kingma, Max Welling. Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes. ICLR 2014.

Variational Autoencoders (VAE) [1]

- An autoencoder (AE) is a neural network that reconstructs the same input.
- The first half is an encoder, from input to latent. The second half is a decoder.
- How to make q a probability distribution?



[1] Diederik P Kingma, Max Welling. Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes. ICLR 2014.

Reparameterization Trick

- Let's assume that $q(z|x)$ is a Gaussian distribution.



Reparameterization Trick

- Let's assume that $q(z|x)$ is a Gaussian distribution.
- Instead of letting the neural network to output a stochastic variable, we can let it predict deterministically the distribution parameters μ and σ.



Reparameterization Trick

- Let's assume that $q(z|x)$ is a Gaussian distribution.
- Instead of letting the neural network to output a stochastic variable, we can let it predict deterministically the distribution parameters μ and σ.
- A stochastic z can be sampled from $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$: $z = \mu + \sigma \cdot \epsilon$, where $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.



Variational Lower Bound

- Encoder q weights: ϕ; Decoder p weights: θ.

Variational Lower Bound

- Encoder q weights: ϕ; Decoder p weights: θ.
- Now maximize ELBO:

$$ \tag{10} $$

Variational Lower Bound

- Encoder q weights: ϕ; Decoder p weights: θ.
- Now maximize ELBO:

$$L(q;\phi,\theta) = \sum_z q(z) \log \frac{p_\theta(x,z)}{q_\phi(z|x)} \tag{7}$$

$$\tag{10}$$

Variational Lower Bound

- Encoder q weights: ϕ; Decoder p weights: θ.
- Now maximize ELBO:

$$
\begin{aligned}
L(q;\phi,\theta) &= \sum_z q(z)\log\frac{p_\theta(x,z)}{q_\phi(z|x)} && (7)\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q}[-\log q_\phi(z|x)+\log p_\theta(x,z)] && (8)\\
& && (10)
\end{aligned}
$$

Variational Lower Bound

- Encoder q weights: ϕ; Decoder p weights: θ.
- Now maximize ELBO:

$$
\begin{align}
L(q;\phi,\theta) &= \sum_z q(z)\log\frac{p_\theta(x,z)}{q_\phi(z|x)} \tag{7}\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q}[-\log q_\phi(z|x) + \log p_\theta(x,z)] \tag{8}\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q}[-\log q_\phi(z|x) + \log p_\theta(x|z) + \log p_\theta(z)] \tag{9}\\
& \tag{10}
\end{align}
$$

Variational Lower Bound

- Encoder q weights: ϕ; Decoder p weights: θ.
- Now maximize ELBO:

$$
\begin{aligned}
L(q;\phi,\theta) &= \sum_z q(z)\log\frac{p_\theta(x,z)}{q_\phi(z|x)} && (7)\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q}[-\log q_\phi(z|x) + \log p_\theta(x,z)] && (8)\\
&= \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q}[-\log q_\phi(z|x) + \log p_\theta(x|z) + \log p_\theta(z)] && (9)\\
&= \underbrace{-KL(q_\phi(z|x)||p_\theta(z))}_{\text{Divergence between } q \text{ and the prior distribution}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{z\sim q}(\log p_\theta(x|z))}_{\text{Reconstruction based on } z} && (10)
\end{aligned}
$$

Stochastic Gradient

- The loss function needs to take expectation over q:

$$L(q;\phi,\theta) = -KL(q_\phi(z|x)||p_\theta(z)) + \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q}(\log p_\theta(x|z))$$



Stochastic Gradient

- The loss function needs to take expectation over q:

$$L(q;\phi,\theta) = -KL(q_\phi(z|x)||p_\theta(z)) + \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q}(\log p_\theta(x|z))$$

- Turns out we just need to have a Monte Carlo sample size of 1:
  - For each x, sample one z from $q(z|x)$.



Stochastic Gradient

- The loss function needs to take expectation over q:

$$L(q;\phi,\theta) = -KL(q_\phi(z|x)||p_\theta(z)) + \mathbb{E}_{z\sim q}(\log p_\theta(x|z))$$

- Turns out we just need to have a Monte Carlo sample size of 1:
  - For each x, sample one z from $q(z|x)$.

- Backprop through reparameterization.



Learned Manifold



Today's Summary

- Motivation: Unsupervised learning

Today's Summary

- Motivation: Unsupervised learning
- K-means: A simple algorithm for discovering clusters

Today's Summary

- Motivation: Unsupervised learning
- K-means: A simple algorithm for discovering clusters
- Making k-means probabilistic: Gaussian mixture models

Today's Summary

- Motivation: Unsupervised learning
- K-means: A simple algorithm for discovering clusters
- Making k-means probabilistic: Gaussian mixture models
- More generally: Latent variable models

Today's Summary

- Motivation: Unsupervised learning
- K-means: A simple algorithm for discovering clusters
- Making k-means probabilistic: Gaussian mixture models
- More generally: Latent variable models
- Learning of latent variable models: EM

Today's Summary

- Motivation: Unsupervised learning
- K-means: A simple algorithm for discovering clusters
- Making k-means probabilistic: Gaussian mixture models
- More generally: Latent variable models
- Learning of latent variable models: EM
- Underlying principle: Maximizing ELBO

Today's Summary

- Motivation: Unsupervised learning
- K-means: A simple algorithm for discovering clusters
- Making k-means probabilistic: Gaussian mixture models
- More generally: Latent variable models
- Learning of latent variable models: EM
- Underlying principle: Maximizing ELBO
- VAE: Introducing variational inference to neural networks. A classic starting example for deep generative modeling.

Conclusion and Outlook

Acknowledgement

- Most content developed by David Rosenberg (now at Bloomberg).
- Later adapted by He He, Tal Linzen, and others.

Acknowledgement

- Most content developed by David Rosenberg (now at Bloomberg).
- Later adapted by He He, Tal Linzen, and others.
- This is a very challenging grad-level course.
- Congrats, you are almost done.

Next Lecture: Project Presentation

- Dec 10, in-person presentations.
- 22 groups, 120mins.
- Aim for **3 mins** per group, hard stop at 4 mins, and 1 min max for Q&A.
- Send your slides in PDF with your group number by Dec 9 11:59pm (via Google form).

Models

Linear Perceptron, conditional probability models, SVMs

Models

Linear	Perceptron, conditional probability models, SVMs
Non-linear	Kernelized models, trees, basis function models, neural nets

Models

Linear Perceptron, conditional probability models, SVMs

Non-linear Kernelized models, trees, basis function models, neural nets

How to choose the model family?

- Trade-offs:
  - approximation error and estimation error (bias and variance),
  - accuracy and efficiency (during both training and inference).

Models

Linear	Perceptron, conditional probability models, SVMs
Non-linear	Kernelized models, trees, basis function models, neural nets

How to choose the model family?

- Trade-offs:
  - approximation error and estimation error (bias and variance),
  - accuracy and efficiency (during both training and inference).
- Start from the task requirements, e.g. amount of data, computation resource
- The best lesson is to practice!

Objectives

Loss functions How far off a prediction is from the target, e.g. 0-1 loss, margin-based loss, squared loss.

Objectives

Loss functions How far off a prediction is from the target, e.g. 0-1 loss, margin-based loss, squared loss.

Risk Expected loss - but expectation over what?

Objectives

Loss functions How far off a prediction is from the target, e.g. 0-1 loss, margin-based loss, squared loss.

Risk Expected loss - but expectation over what?

- Frequentist approach: expectation over data.
  - Empirical risk minimization, i.e. average loss on the training data.
  - Regularization: balance estimation error and generalization error.

Objectives

Loss functions How far off a prediction is from the target, e.g. 0-1 loss, margin-based loss, squared loss.

Risk Expected loss - but expectation over what?

- Frequentist approach: expectation over data.
  - Empirical risk minimization, i.e. average loss on the training data.
  - Regularization: balance estimation error and generalization error.
- Bayesian approach: expectation over parameters.
  - Posterior: prior belief updated by observed data.
  - Bayes action minimizes the posterior risk.

Algorithms

Learning Find model parameters—often an optimization problem.

- (Stocahstic) (sub)gradient descent
- Functional gradient descent (gradient boosting)
- Convex vs non-convex objectives

Inference Answer questions given a learned model.

- Bayesian inference: compute various quantities given the posterior.
- Dynamic programming: compute $\arg\max$ in structured prediction.

Do We Still Need ML?

- Deep Learning (DL) has been overwhelmingly popular in the past few years.

Do We Still Need ML?

- Deep Learning (DL) has been overwhelmingly popular in the past few years.
- Many ML methods are considered out-dated.

Do We Still Need ML?

- Deep Learning (DL) has been overwhelmingly popular in the past few years.
- Many ML methods are considered out-dated.
- However, DL is not necessarily good for all types of data (data availability, data quality, data modality etc.). Classic methods may also have their sweet spots.

Do We Still Need ML?

- Deep Learning (DL) has been overwhelmingly popular in the past few years.
- Many ML methods are considered out-dated.
- However, DL is not necessarily good for all types of data (data availability, data quality, data modality etc.). Classic methods may also have their sweet spots.
- Classic ML sheds new insight into understand DL.

Do We Still Need ML?

- Deep Learning (DL) has been overwhelmingly popular in the past few years.
- Many ML methods are considered out-dated.
- However, DL is not necessarily good for all types of data (data availability, data quality, data modality etc.). Classic methods may also have their sweet spots.
- Classic ML sheds new insight into understand DL.
- Classic ML lays down foundation when we innovate in DL algorithms.

Other ML Related Advanced Courses in CS/DS

- Bayesian Machine Learning(Andrew Wilson)
- Computer Vision (Saining Xie)
- Deep Learning (Yann LeCun)
- Deep Reinforcement Learning (Lerrel Pinto)
- Enbodied Learning and Vision (Mengye Ren)
- Foundations of Deep Learning Theory (Matus Telgarsky)
- Inference and Representation (Joan Bruna)
- Learning with Large Language and Vision Models (Saining Xie)
- Mathematics of Deep Learning (Joan Bruna)
- Natural Language Processing (He He)