

6985

Assignment 2

NAME: PRATIK MISHRA

ROLL: 14493

Ques 1:

We know that, the KL divergence is non-negative.

$$\text{i.e., } KL(q||p) = - \int q(y) \log \left(\frac{p(y|x)}{q(y)} \right) dy \geq 0$$

Now, in the above expression, let

$$q(y) = p(y_*|y)$$

$$\text{and } \frac{p(y_*|\hat{\theta})}{p(y_*|y)} = \frac{p(y_*|\hat{\theta})}{p(y_*|y)}$$

Then,

$$KL(q||p) = - \int p(y_*|y) \log \left(\frac{p(y_*|\hat{\theta})}{p(y_*|y)} \right) dy_*$$

$$= - \int p(y_*|y) \log(p(y_*|\hat{\theta})) dy_*$$

$$+ \int p(y_*|y) \log(p(y_*|y)) dy_*$$

$$= E(\ell(y_*, \mu_1)) - E(\ell(y_*, \mu_2)) \geq 0$$

$$\text{Hence, } E(\ell(y_*, \mu_2)) \leq E(\ell(y_*, \mu_1))$$

Ex 2

$$\text{Gamma}(X|a, b) = \frac{b^a}{\Gamma(a)} x^{a-1} e^{-bx}$$

In order to approximate this distribution with a normal distribution using Laplace approximation, we need to find the point where $\text{Gamma}(x|a, b)$ attains its maximum and set that point as the mean of the Normal distribution.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dx} \text{Gamma}(X|a, b) &= \frac{b^a}{\Gamma(a)} (a-1) x^{a-2} e^{-bx} \\ &= \frac{b^a}{\Gamma(a)} x^{a-1} e^{-bx} \end{aligned}$$

equating it with zero, we get

$$(a-1) x^{a-2} e^{-bx} = x^{a-1} e^{-bx}$$

$$\Rightarrow x = \frac{a-1}{b}$$

Hence, mean of the Normal distribution = $\frac{a-1}{b}$

So the same maximum value at ~~the~~ ~~max~~ $x = \frac{a-1}{b}$

$$\frac{b^a}{\Gamma(a)} \left(\frac{a-1}{b}\right)^{a-1} e^{-(a-1)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma} \rightarrow \text{standard deviation of Normal distribution}$$

$$\Rightarrow \sigma = \frac{\Gamma(a)}{\sqrt{2\pi} b} \left(\frac{e}{a-1}\right)^{a-1}$$

so, $N(x | \frac{a-1}{b}) = \frac{\Gamma^2(a)}{2\pi b^2} \left(\frac{e}{a-1}\right)^{2a-2}$ is the
Laplace approximation for Gamma $(x|a,b)$

• Mean of Gamma $(x|a,b) = a/b$

Variance of Gamma $(x|a,b) = a/b^2$

Thus, Normal approximation with same mean &
variance as Gamma distribution would be:

$$N(x | a/b, a/b^2)$$

For the 2 approximations to be roughly same,
we must have,

$$\frac{a-1}{b} \approx \frac{a}{b} \Rightarrow b \rightarrow \infty$$

hence, for large values of b , we can have
the 2 approximations as roughly same

also, equating the variance, we have,

$$\frac{\Gamma^2(a)}{2\pi b^2} \left(\frac{e}{a-1}\right)^{2a-2} \approx \frac{a}{b^2}$$

$$\Rightarrow \Gamma(a) \approx \sqrt{2\pi a} \left(a/e\right)^{a-1}$$

These 2 conditions would ensure the
2 approximations being roughly equal.

Ques 3

$$P(\mu|x, \beta) = \frac{P(x|\mu, \beta) \cdot P(\mu)}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P(x|\mu, \beta) \cdot P(\mu) d\mu}$$

$$\propto N(\mu, \beta^{-1}) \cdot N(\mu_0, s_0)$$

Because of the property of conjugacy.

$$P(\mu|x, \beta) = N\left(\frac{\frac{\mu_0}{s_0} + \frac{x}{\beta^{-1}}}{\frac{1}{s_0} + \frac{1}{\beta^{-1}}}, \left(\frac{1}{s_0} + \frac{1}{\beta^{-1}}\right)^{-1}\right)$$

$$= N\left(\frac{\mu_0 + s_0 \beta x}{1 + s_0 \beta}, \frac{s_0}{1 + s_0 \beta}\right)$$

Also,

$$P(\beta|x, \mu) = \frac{P(x|\mu, \beta) \cdot P(\beta)}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P(x|\mu, \beta) \cdot P(\beta) d\beta}$$

$$\propto N(\mu, \beta^{-1}) \cdot \text{Gamma}(a, b)$$

Because of the property of conjugacy,

$$P(\beta|x, \mu) = \text{Gamma}\left(a + \frac{1}{2}, b + \frac{x - \mu}{2}\right)$$

ques 4

$$p(\mu, \tau | \mu_0, \lambda_0, \nu_0, \beta_0) = \frac{\beta_0^{d_0} \sqrt{\lambda_0}}{\Gamma(d_0) \sqrt{2\pi}} \tau^{d_0-1} \exp(-\beta_0 \tau) \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda_0 \tau (\mu + \nu_0)^2}{2}\right)$$

$$= \frac{\tau^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{\beta_0^{d_0} \sqrt{\lambda_0}}{\Gamma(d_0)} \exp\left(-\beta_0 \tau - \frac{\lambda_0 \tau}{2} \mu^2 - \frac{\lambda_0 \nu_0^2}{2} \tau + \lambda_0 \tau \mu \nu_0 + d_0 \log \tau\right)$$

$$= \frac{\tau^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\beta_0 \tau - \frac{\lambda_0 \tau}{2} \mu^2 - \frac{\lambda_0 \tau \nu_0^2}{2} + \lambda_0 \tau \mu \nu_0 + d_0 \log \tau - \log(\Gamma(d_0)) + d_0 \log(\beta_0) + \frac{1}{2} \log(\lambda_0)\right)$$

Thus, \bullet

Sufficient statistics are:

$$\phi(x) = [\tau, \tau \mu^2, \tau \mu, \log \tau]^T$$

Natural parameters are:

$$\theta = \left[-\beta_0 - \frac{\lambda_0 \nu_0^2}{2}, -\frac{\lambda_0}{2}, \lambda_0 \nu_0, d_0 \right]^T$$

Log partition function:

$$A(\theta) = -\log(\Gamma(d_0)) + d_0 \log \beta_0 + \frac{1}{2} \log(\lambda_0)$$

Sub 5

The model with $k=3$ seems to best ~~explain~~ explain the data because the model with $k=3$ is more confident about the mean as compared to models with $k=1$ and 2 . This is visible in the graphs where we can see how close the curves for mean, mean + 2SD, mean - 2SD are in the 3 models.

A new point x^* should ~~be~~ be added in the region $[-4, -3]$ because in this region, the models are least confident about ~~the~~ the mean as is visible in the plots of the mean for the 3 models.