

**Bayesuvius,**  
a small visual dictionary of Bayesian Networks

Robert R. Tucci  
[www.ar-tiste.xyz](http://www.ar-tiste.xyz)

January 30, 2021



Figure 1: View of Mount Vesuvius from Pompeii



Figure 2: Mount Vesuvius and Bay of Naples

# Contents

0.1	linear regression, ordinary least squares . . . . .	8
0.1.1	LR, assuming $x^\sigma$ are non-random . . . . .	8
0.1.2	LR, assuming $x^\sigma$ are random and i.i.d. . . . .	11
<b>Foreword</b>		<b>12</b>
<b>Navigating the ocean of Judea Pearl's Books</b>		<b>13</b>
<b>Notational Conventions and Preliminaries</b>		<b>14</b>
0.2	Some abbreviations frequently used throughout this book. . . . .	14
0.3	$\mathcal{N}(!a)$ . . . . .	14
0.4	One hot . . . . .	14
0.5	Special sets . . . . .	14
0.6	Kronecker delta function . . . . .	15
0.7	Dirac delta function . . . . .	15
0.8	Indicator function (aka Truth function) . . . . .	15
0.9	Underlined letters to indicate random variables . . . . .	15
0.10	Probability distributions . . . . .	15
0.11	Discretization of continuous probability distributions . . . . .	16
0.12	Samples, i.i.d. variables . . . . .	16
0.13	Normal Distribution . . . . .	17
0.14	Uniform Distribution . . . . .	17
0.15	Sigmoid and logit functions . . . . .	17
0.16	Expected Value and Variance . . . . .	17
0.17	Conditional Expected Value . . . . .	18
0.18	Law of Total Variance . . . . .	18
0.19	Notation for covariances . . . . .	19
0.20	Linear regression, Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) . . . . .	20
0.20.1	LR, assuming $x^\sigma$ are non-random . . . . .	21
0.20.2	LR, assuming $x^\sigma$ are random and i.i.d. . . . .	23
0.21	Short Summary of Boolean Algebra. . . . .	24
0.22	Entropy, Kullback-Liebler divergence . . . . .	25
0.23	Definition of various entropies used in Shannon Information Theory . . . . .	25

<b>Definition of a Bayesian Network</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>1 ARACNE-structure learning</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>2 Backdoor Adjustment</b>	<b>32</b>
2.1 Examples . . . . .	33
<b>3 Back Propagation (Automatic Differentiation)</b>	<b>36</b>
3.1 General Theory . . . . .	36
3.1.1 Jacobians . . . . .	36
3.1.2 bnets for function composition, forward propagation and back propagation .	36
3.2 Application to Neural Networks . . . . .	38
3.2.1 Absorbing $b_i^\lambda$ into $w_{i j}$ . . . . .	38
3.2.2 bnets for function composition, forward propagation and back propagation for NN . . . . .	39
3.3 General bnets instead of Markov chains induced by layered structure of NNs . . . .	42
<b>4 Basic Curve Fitting Using Gradient Descent</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>5 Bell and Clauser-Horne Inequalities in Quantum Mechanics</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>6 Binary Decision Diagrams</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>7 Chow-Liu Trees and Tree Augmented Naive Bayes (TAN)</b>	<b>50</b>
7.1 Chow-Liu Trees . . . . .	50
7.2 Tree Augmented Naive Bayes (TAN) . . . . .	54
<b>8 Counterfactual Reasoning</b>	<b>56</b>
8.1 The 3 Rungs of Causal AI . . . . .	56
8.2 Two kinds of intervention operators . . . . .	56
8.3 Do operator for DEN diagrams . . . . .	57
8.4 Mediation Analysis . . . . .	60
<b>9 Decision Trees</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>10 Digital Circuits</b>	<b>66</b>
10.1 Mapping any dcircuit to a bnet . . . . .	67
10.1.1 Option A of Fig.10.2 . . . . .	67
10.1.2 Option B of Fig.10.2 . . . . .	67
<b>11 Do-Calculus</b>	<b>68</b>
11.1 Parent Adjustment . . . . .	71
11.2 3 Rules of do-calculus . . . . .	72
11.3 Backdoor Adjustment . . . . .	72

11.4 Front Door Adjustment . . . . .	74
<b>12 D-Separation</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>13 Dynamic Bayesian Networks</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>14 Expectation Maximization</b>	<b>82</b>
14.1 The EM algorithm: . . . . .	83
14.1.1 Motivation . . . . .	84
14.2 Minorize-Maximize (MM) algorithms . . . . .	84
14.3 Examples . . . . .	86
14.3.1 Gaussian mixture . . . . .	86
14.3.2 Blood Genotypes and Phenotypes . . . . .	87
14.3.3 Missing Data/Imputation . . . . .	88
<b>15 Front-door Adjustment</b>	<b>89</b>
15.1 Examples . . . . .	90
<b>16 Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs)</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>17 Gaussian Nodes with Linear Dependence on Parents</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>18 Hidden Markov Model</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>19 Influence Diagrams &amp; Utility Nodes</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>20 Instrumental Inequality and beyond</b>	<b>105</b>
20.1 I-inequality . . . . .	105
20.1.1 I-inequality for binary $z, d, y$ . . . . .	107
20.2 Bounds on Effect of IV on treatment outcome $y$ . . . . .	107
<b>21 Instrumental Variables</b>	<b>110</b>
21.1 $\delta$ with unmeasured confounder . . . . .	110
21.2 $\delta$ (with unmeasured confounder) can be inferred via IV . . . . .	111
21.3 More general bnets with IVs . . . . .	112
21.4 Instrumental Inequality . . . . .	112
<b>22 Junction Tree Algorithm</b>	<b>114</b>
<b>23 Kalman Filter</b>	<b>115</b>
23.1 Problem . . . . .	116
23.2 Solution . . . . .	116

<b>24 Linear and Logistic Regression</b>	<b>118</b>
24.1 Generalization to $x$ with multiple components(features)	120
24.2 Alternative $V(b, m)$ for logistic regression	120
<b>25 Linear Deterministic Bnets with External Noise</b>	<b>122</b>
25.1 Example of LDEN diagram	122
25.2 Fully Connected LDEN diagrams	123
25.2.1 Fully connected LDEN diagram with $nx = 2$	124
25.2.2 Fully connected LDEN diagram with $nx = 3$	124
25.2.3 Fully connected LDEN diagram with arbitrary $nx$	125
25.3 Non-linear DEN diagrams	126
<b>26 Markov Blankets</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>27 Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)</b>	<b>130</b>
27.1 Inverse Cumulative Sampling	130
27.2 Rejection Sampling	132
27.3 Metropolis-Hastings Sampling	133
27.4 Gibbs Sampling	136
27.5 Importance Sampling	137
<b>28 Markov Chains</b>	<b>139</b>
<b>29 Message Passing (Belief Propagation)</b>	<b>140</b>
29.1 Distributed Soldier Counting	140
29.2 Spring Systems	142
29.3 BP for Markov Chains	142
29.4 BP Algorithm for Polytrees	149
29.4.1 How BP algo for polytrees reduces to the BP algo for Markov chains	153
29.5 Derivation of BP Algorithm for Polytrees	153
29.6 Example of BP algo for a Tree	157
29.7 Bipartite bnets	161
29.8 BP for bipartite bnets (BP-BB)	163
29.8.1 BP-BB and general BP agree on Markov chains	165
29.8.2 BP-BB and general BP agree on tree bnets.	167
29.9 BP-BB and sum-product decomposition	168
<b>30 Missing Data, Imputation</b>	<b>170</b>
30.1 Imputation via EM	171
30.2 Imputation via MCMC	174
30.3 Multiple Imputations	175
<b>31 Monty Hall Problem</b>	<b>176</b>

<b>32 Naive Bayes</b>	<b>178</b>
<b>33 Neural Networks</b>	<b>179</b>
33.1 Activation Functions $\mathcal{A}_i^\lambda : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$	180
33.2 Weight optimization via supervised training and gradient descent	182
33.3 Non-dense layers	184
33.4 Autoencoder NN	185
<b>34 Noisy-OR gate</b>	<b>186</b>
34.1 3 ways to interpret the parameters $\pi_i$	187
<b>35 Non-negative Matrix Factorization</b>	<b>190</b>
35.1 Bnet interpretation	190
35.2 Simplest recursive algorithm	191
<b>36 Observational Equivalence of DAGs</b>	<b>192</b>
36.1 Examples	192
<b>37 Potential Outcomes</b>	<b>195</b>
37.1 $G$ and $G_{den}$ , bnets, the starting point bnets	196
37.2 $G_{do+}$ bnet	198
37.3 $G_{im+}$ bnet	199
37.4 Translation Dictionary	201
37.5 $\mathcal{Y}_{d \tilde{d}}$ differences (aka treatment effects)	202
37.6 Ignorability	203
37.7 Hypothesis testing for sharp null	204
37.8 Matching Strata	206
37.8.1 1-1 strata-match	206
37.8.2 Exact and approximate strata-match	207
37.8.3 Positivity	208
37.9 Propensity Score	208
<b>38 Program evaluation and review technique (PERT)</b>	<b>211</b>
38.1 Example	213
<b>39 Recurrent Neural Networks</b>	<b>216</b>
39.1 Language Sequence Modeling	219
39.2 Other types of RNN	220
39.2.1 Long Short Term Memory (LSTM) unit (1997)	221
39.2.2 Gated Recurrence Unit (GRU) (2014)	223

<b>40 Reinforcement Learning (RL)</b>	<b>225</b>
40.1 Exact RL bnet . . . . .	228
40.2 Actor-Critic RL bnet . . . . .	230
40.3 Q function learning RL bnet . . . . .	232
<b>41 Reliability Box Diagrams and Fault Tree Diagrams</b>	<b>234</b>
41.1 Minimal Cut Sets . . . . .	241
<b>42 Restricted Boltzmann Machines</b>	<b>242</b>
<b>43 Scoring the Nodes of a Learned Bnet</b>	<b>244</b>
43.1 Probability Distributions and Special Functions . . . . .	245
43.2 Single node with no parents . . . . .	246
43.3 Multiple nodes with any number of parents . . . . .	248
43.4 Bayesian Scores . . . . .	250
43.5 Information Theoretic scores . . . . .	251
<b>44 Simpson's Paradox</b>	<b>252</b>
44.1 Pearl Causality . . . . .	254
44.2 Numerical Example . . . . .	255
<b>45 Structure and Parameter Learning for Bnets</b>	<b>256</b>
45.1 Overview . . . . .	256
45.2 Score based SL algorithms . . . . .	258
45.3 Constraint based SL algorithms . . . . .	258
45.4 Pseudo-code for some bnet learning algorithms . . . . .	260
<b>46 Turbo Codes</b>	<b>262</b>
46.1 Decoding Algorithm . . . . .	265
46.2 Message Passing Interpretation of Decoding Algorithm . . . . .	267
<b>47 Variational Bayesian Approximation</b>	<b>268</b>
47.1 Free Energy $\mathcal{F}(\vec{x})$ . . . . .	270
<b>48 Zero Information Transmission (Graphoid Axioms)</b>	<b>273</b>
48.1 Consequences of Eq.(48.2) . . . . .	273
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>276</b>



# Foreword

Welcome to Bayesuvius! a proto-book uploaded to github.

A different Bayesian network is discussed in each chapter. Each chapter title is the name of a B net. Chapter titles are in alphabetical order.

This is a volcano in its early stages. First version uploaded to a github repo called Bayesuvius on June 24, 2020. First version only covers 2 B nets (Linear Regression and GAN). I will add more chapters periodically. Remember, this is a moonlighting effort so I can't do it all at once.

For any questions about notation, please go to Notational Conventions section.

Requests and advice are welcomed.

Thanks for reading this

Robert R. Tucci

[www.ar-tiste.xyz](http://www.ar-tiste.xyz)

# Navigating the ocean of Judea Pearl's Books

Many of the greatest ideas in the bnet field were invented by Judea Pearl and his collaborators. Thus, this book is heavily indebted to those great scientists. Those ideas have had no clearer and more generous expositor than Judea Pearl himself.

Pearl has written 4 books that I have used in writing Bayesuivus. His 1988 book Ref.[21] dates back to his pre-causal period. That book I used to learn about topics such as d-separation, belief propagation, Markov-blankets, and noisy-ORs. 3 other books that he wrote later, in his causal period, are:

1. In 2000 (1st ed.), and 2013 (2nd ed.), Pearl published what is so far his most technical and exhaustive book on the subject of causality, Ref.[22].
2. In 2016, he released together with Glymour and Jewell, a less advanced “primer” on causality, Ref.[24].
3. In 2018, he released together with Mackenzie his lovely “The Book of Why”, Ref.[25].

Those 3 books I used to learn about causality topics such as do-calculus, backdoor and front-door adjustments, linear deterministic bnets with exogenous noise, and counterfactuals.

# Notational Conventions and Preliminaries

## 0.1 Some abbreviations frequently used throughout this book.

- bnet= B net= Bayesian Network
- CPT = Conditional Probabilities Table, same as TPM
- DAG = Directed Acyclic Graph
- i.i.d.= independent identically distributed.
- TPM= Transition Probability Matrix, same as CPT

## 0.2 $\mathcal{N}(!a)$

$\mathcal{N}(!a)$  will denote a normalization constant that does not depend on  $a$ . For example,  $P(x) = \mathcal{N}(!x)e^{-x}$  where  $\int_0^\infty dx P(x) = 1$ .

## 0.3 One hot

A **one hot** vector of zeros and ones is a vector with all entries zero with the exception of a single entry which is one. A **one cold** vector has all entries equal to one with the exception of a single entry which is zero. For example, if  $x^n = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$  and  $x_i = \delta(i, 0)$  then  $x^n$  is one hot.

## 0.4 Special sets

Define  $\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$  to be the integers, real numbers and complex numbers, respectively.

For  $a < b$ , define  $I_{\mathbb{Z}}$  to be the integers in the interval  $I$ , where  $I = [a, b], [a, b), (a, b], (a, b)$  (i.e,  $I$  can be closed or open on either side).

$A_{>0} = \{k \in A : k > 0\}$  for  $A = \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R}$ .

## 0.5 Kronecker delta function

For  $x, y$  in discrete set  $S$ ,

$$\delta(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y \\ 0 & \text{if } x \neq y \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

## 0.6 Dirac delta function

For  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx \delta(x - y) f(x) = f(y) \quad (2)$$

## 0.7 Indicator function (aka Truth function)

$$\mathbb{1}(\mathcal{S}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathcal{S} \text{ is true} \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathcal{S} \text{ is false} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

For example,  $\delta(x, y) = \mathbb{1}(x = y)$ .

## 0.8 Underlined letters to indicate random variables

Random variables will be indicated by underlined letters and their values by non-underlined letters. Each node of a bnet will be labelled by a random variable. Thus,  $\underline{x} = x$  means that node  $\underline{x}$  is in state  $x$ .

It is more conventional to use an upper case letter to indicate a random variable and a lower case letter for its state. Thus,  $X = x$  means that random variable  $X$  is in state  $x$ . However, we have opted in this book to avoid that notation, because we often want to define certain lower case letters to be random variables or, conversely, define certain upper case letters to be non-random variables.

## 0.9 Probability distributions

$P_{\underline{x}}(x) = P(\underline{x} = x) = P(x)$  is the probability that random variable  $\underline{x}$  equals  $x \in S_{\underline{x}}$ .  $S_{\underline{x}}$  is the set of states (i.e., values) that  $\underline{x}$  can assume and  $n_{\underline{x}} = |S_{\underline{x}}|$  is the size (aka cardinality) of that set. Hence,

$$\sum_{x \in S_{\underline{x}}} P_{\underline{x}}(x) = 1 \quad (4)$$

---

$$P_{\underline{x}, \underline{y}}(x, y) = P(\underline{x} = x, \underline{y} = y) = P(x, y) \quad (5)$$

$$P_{\underline{x}|\underline{y}}(x|y) = P(\underline{x} = x | \underline{y} = y) = P(x|y) = \frac{P(x, y)}{P(y)} \quad (6)$$

## 0.10 Discretization of continuous probability distributions

The TPM of a node of a bnet can be either a discrete or a continuous probability distribution. To go from continuous to discrete, one replaces integrals over states of a node by sums over new states, and Dirac delta functions by Kronecker delta functions. More precisely, consider a function  $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Express  $[a, b]$  as a union of small, disjoint (except for one point) closed sub-intervals (bins) of length  $\Delta x$ . Name one point in each bin to be the representative of that bin, and let  $S_{\underline{x}}$  be the set of all the bin representatives. This is called discretization or binning. Then

$$\frac{1}{(b-a)} \int_{[a,b]} dx f(x) \rightarrow \frac{\Delta x}{(b-a)} \sum_{x \in S_{\underline{x}}} f(x) = \frac{1}{n_{\underline{x}}} \sum_{x \in S_{\underline{x}}} f(x) . \quad (7)$$

Both sides of last equation are 1 when  $f(x) = 1$ . Furthermore, if  $y \in S_{\underline{x}}$ , then

$$\int_{[a,b]} dx \delta(x-y) f(x) = f(y) \rightarrow \sum_{x \in S_{\underline{x}}} \delta(x,y) f(x) = f(y) . \quad (8)$$

## 0.11 Samples, i.i.d. variables

$$\vec{x} = (x[0], x[1], x[2] \dots, x[nsam(\vec{x}) - 1]) = x[:] \quad (9)$$

$nsam(\vec{x})$  is the number of samples of  $\vec{x}$ .  $\underline{x}[\sigma] \in S_{\underline{x}}$  are i.i.d. (independent identically distributed) samples with

$$x[\sigma] \sim P_{\underline{x}} \text{ (i.e. } P_{\underline{x}[\sigma]} = P_{\underline{x}}) \quad (10)$$

$$P(\underline{x} = x) = \frac{1}{nsam(\vec{x})} \sum_{\sigma} \mathbb{1}(x[\sigma] = x) \quad (11)$$

Hence, for any  $f : S_{\underline{x}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\sum_x P(\underline{x} = x) f(x) = \frac{1}{nsam(\vec{x})} \sum_{\sigma} f(x[\sigma]) \quad (12)$$

If we use two sampled variables, say  $\vec{x}$  and  $\vec{y}$ , in a given bnet, their number of samples  $nsam(\vec{x})$  and  $nsam(\vec{y})$  need not be equal.

---


$$P(\vec{x}) = \prod_{\sigma} P(x[\sigma]) \quad (13)$$

$$\sum_{\vec{x}} = \prod_{\sigma} \sum_{x[\sigma]} \quad (14)$$

$$\partial_{\vec{x}} = [\partial_{x[0]}, \partial_{x[1]}, \partial_{x[2]}, \dots, \partial_{x[nsam(\vec{x})-1]}] \quad (15)$$


---

$$P(\vec{x}) \approx \left[ \prod_x P(x)^{P(x)} \right]^{nsam(\vec{x})} \quad (16)$$

$$= e^{nsam(\vec{x}) \sum_x P(x) \ln P(x)} \quad (17)$$

$$= e^{-nsam(\vec{x}) H(P_{\underline{x}})} \quad (18)$$

## 0.12 Normal Distribution

For  $x, \mu, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\sigma > 0$

$$\mathcal{N}(x; \mu, \sigma^2) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)^2} \quad (19)$$

## 0.13 Uniform Distribution

For  $a < b$ ,  $x \in [a, b]$

$$\mathcal{U}(x; a, b) = \frac{1}{b-a} \quad (20)$$

## 0.14 Sigmoid and logit functions

The sigmoid function  $\text{sig}:\mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is defined by

$$\text{sig}(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x}} \quad (21)$$

$\text{sig}()$  is monotonically increasing with  $\text{sig}(-\infty) = 0$  and  $\text{sig}(+\infty) = 1$ .

The logit or log-odds function  $\text{logit}:[0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by

$$\text{logit}(p) = \ln \frac{p}{1-p} \quad (22)$$

$\text{logit}()$  is the inverse of  $\text{sig}()$ :

$$\text{logit}[\text{sig}(x)] = x \quad (23)$$

## 0.15 Expected Value and Variance

Given a random variable  $\underline{x}$  with states  $S_{\underline{x}}$  and a function  $f : S_{\underline{x}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , define

$$E_{\underline{x}}[f(\underline{x})] = E_{x \sim P(x)}[f(x)] = \sum_x P(x) f(x) \quad (24)$$

$$\text{Var}_{\underline{x}}[f(\underline{x})] = E_{\underline{x}}[(f(\underline{x}) - E_{\underline{x}}[f(\underline{x})])^2] \quad (25)$$

$$= E_{\underline{x}}[f(\underline{x})^2] - (E_{\underline{x}}[f(\underline{x})])^2 \quad (26)$$

$$E[\underline{x}] = E_{\underline{x}}[\underline{x}] \quad (27)$$

$$\text{Var}[\underline{x}] = \text{Var}_{\underline{x}}[\underline{x}] \quad (28)$$

## 0.16 Conditional Expected Value

Given a random variable  $\underline{x}$  with states  $S_{\underline{x}}$ , a random variable  $\underline{y}$  with states  $S_{\underline{y}}$ , and a function  $f : S_{\underline{x}} \times S_{\underline{y}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , define

$$E_{\underline{x}|\underline{y}}[f(\underline{x}, \underline{y})] = \sum_x P(x|\underline{y})f(x, \underline{y}) , \quad (29)$$

$$E_{\underline{x}|\underline{y}=\underline{y}}[f(\underline{x}, \underline{y})] = E_{\underline{x}|\underline{y}}[f(\underline{x}, \underline{y})] = \sum_x P(x|\underline{y})f(x, \underline{y}) . \quad (30)$$

Note that

$$E_{\underline{y}}[E_{\underline{x}|\underline{y}}[f(\underline{x}, \underline{y})]] = \sum_{x,y} P(x|\underline{y})P(\underline{y})f(x, \underline{y}) \quad (31)$$

$$= \sum_{x,y} P(x, \underline{y})f(x, \underline{y}) \quad (32)$$

$$= E_{\underline{x}, \underline{y}}[f(\underline{x}, \underline{y})] . \quad (33)$$

## 0.17 Law of Total Variance

**Claim 1** Suppose  $P : S_{\underline{x}} \times S_{\underline{y}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a probability distribution. Suppose  $f : S_{\underline{x}} \times S_{\underline{y}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $f = f(x, y)$ . Then

$$\text{Var}_{\underline{x}, \underline{y}}(f) = E_{\underline{y}}[\text{Var}_{\underline{x}|\underline{y}}(f)] + \text{Var}_{\underline{y}}(E_{\underline{x}|\underline{y}}[f]) . \quad (34)$$

In particular,

$$\text{Var}_{\underline{x}}(x) = E_{\underline{y}}[\text{Var}_{\underline{x}|\underline{y}}(x)] + \text{Var}_{\underline{y}}(E_{\underline{x}|\underline{y}}[x]) . \quad (35)$$

**proof:**

Let

$$A = \sum_y P(y) \left( \sum_x P(x|\underline{y})f \right)^2 . \quad (36)$$

Then

$$Var_{\underline{x}, \underline{y}}(f) = \sum_{x,y} P(x,y) f^2 - \left( \sum_{x,y} P(x,y) f \right)^2 \quad (37)$$

$$= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sum_{x,y} P(x,y) f^2 - A \\ + \left( A - \left( \sum_{x,y} P(x,y) f \right)^2 \right) \end{array} \right. \quad (38)$$

$$E_{\underline{y}}[Var_{\underline{x}|\underline{y}}(f)] = \sum_y P(y) \left( \sum_x P(x|y) f^2 - \left( \sum_x P(x|y) f \right)^2 \right) \quad (39)$$

$$= \sum_{x,y} P(x,y) f^2 - A \quad (40)$$

$$Var_{\underline{y}}(E_{\underline{x}|\underline{y}}[f]) = \sum_y P(y) \left( \sum_x P(x|y) f \right)^2 - \left( \sum_y P(y) \sum_x P(x|y) f \right)^2 \quad (41)$$

$$= A - \left( \sum_{x,y} P(x,y) f \right)^2 \quad (42)$$

**QED**

## 0.18 Notation for covariances

Consider two random variables  $\underline{x}, \underline{y}$ .

- Mean value of  $\underline{x}$

$$\langle \underline{x} \rangle = E_{\underline{x}}[\underline{x}] \quad (43)$$

- Signed distance of  $\underline{x}$  to its mean value

$$\Delta \underline{x} = \underline{x} - \langle \underline{x} \rangle \quad (44)$$

- Covariance of  $(\underline{x}, \underline{y})$

$$Cov(\underline{x}, \underline{y}) = \langle \underline{x}, \underline{y} \rangle = \langle \Delta \underline{x} \Delta \underline{y} \rangle = \langle \underline{x} \underline{y} \rangle - \langle \underline{x} \rangle \langle \underline{y} \rangle \quad (45)$$

$\langle \underline{x}, \underline{y} \rangle$  is bilinear.



- Variance of  $\underline{x}$

$$Var(\underline{x}) = \langle \underline{x}, \underline{x} \rangle \quad (46)$$

- Standard deviation or  $\underline{x}$

$$\sigma_{\underline{x}} = \sqrt{\langle \underline{x}, \underline{x} \rangle} \quad (47)$$

- Correlation of  $(\underline{x}, \underline{y})$

$$\rho_{\underline{x}, \underline{y}} = \frac{\langle \underline{x}, \underline{y} \rangle}{\sqrt{\langle \underline{x}, \underline{x} \rangle \langle \underline{y}, \underline{y} \rangle}} \quad (48)$$

## 0.19 Linear regression, Ordinary Least Squares (OLS)

Wikipedia articles

### 1. Linear Regression (LR)

- linear regression, Ref.[56]
- simple linear regression, Ref.[69]
- errors in variable, Ref.[43]

### 2. Least squares (LS)

- least squares, Ref.[55]
- ordinary least squares (OLS), Ref.[66]

In LR, the **dependent variables**  $y$  equal a linear combination of some **independent variables**  $x$  plus some external noise variables  $\epsilon$  called the **residuals**.

Below, we consider two types of LR:

1. LR in which the independent variables are non-random.
2. LR in which the independent variables are random and i.i.d.

Once one assumes that certain variables are random, a “model” (i.e., a bnet) for the random variables must be specified.

For LR of type 2, there is randomness in  $y$  coming from the randomness in  $x$  and in the residuals. For LR of type 1, there is randomness in  $y$  too, but it is comes from the residuals only.

OLS provides a cost function which when minimized, yields LR. The term OLS is often used to refer to LR of type 1.

### 0.19.1 LR, assuming $x^\sigma$ are non-random

Let

$\sigma \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, nsam - 1\}$  : sample index  
 $y_\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ : dependent variables  
 $x_{\sigma j} \in \mathbb{R}$ : independent variables  
 $\epsilon_\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ : residuals  
 $\beta_0, \beta_j$ : real coefficients

$$y_\sigma = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n x_{\sigma j} \beta_j + \epsilon_\sigma \quad (49)$$

If we define

$$x_{\sigma 0} = 1 \quad (50)$$

for all  $\sigma$ , then

$$y_\sigma = \sum_{j=0}^n x_{\sigma j} \beta_j + \epsilon_\sigma . \quad (51)$$

If  $y$  and  $\epsilon$  are  $nsam \times 1$  column vectors and  $\beta$  is an  $(n + 1) \times 1$  column vector, then can write previous equation in matrix form as:

$$y = X\beta + \epsilon . \quad (52)$$

Define

$$\wedge = X(X^T X)^{-1} X^T , \quad \vee = 1 - \wedge \quad (53)$$

A square matrix  $M$  is symmetric if  $M^T = M$  and is idempotent if  $M^2 = M$ .  $\wedge$  is symmetric and idempotent and so is  $\vee$ . Note that  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$  also satisfy:

$$\wedge X = X , \quad \vee X = 0 . \quad (54)$$

One has

$$\beta = (X^T X)^{-1} X^T (y - \epsilon) . \quad (55)$$

Define

$$\hat{\beta} = (X^T X)^{-1} X^T y = B y , \quad (56a)$$

$$\hat{y} = X \hat{\beta} = \wedge y , \quad (56b)$$

and

$$\hat{\epsilon} = y - X \hat{\beta} = y - \hat{y} = (1 - \wedge) y = \vee y . \quad (56c)$$

$\wedge$  is called the **hat matrix**, because it gives  $y$  a hat.

Given any function  $f = f(y, X, \epsilon)$  and a scalar factor  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ , suppose  $f(\xi y, \xi X, \xi \epsilon) = \xi^{\mathcal{O}} f(y, X, \epsilon)$ . Then we will say that  $f(\cdot)$  is of **order  $\mathcal{O}$  under  $\xi$  scaling**. Note that  $y, X, \epsilon, \hat{y}, \hat{\epsilon}$  are all of order 1 under scaling, whereas  $\beta, \hat{\beta}, \wedge, \vee$  are all of order 0 under scaling. Thus, the estimator variables (i.e, those with a hat) scale the same way as the variables without a hat that they are estimating. And the projection matrices  $\wedge, \vee$  are invariant ( $\mathcal{O} = 0$ ) under scaling.

Fig.4 illustrates that  $y$  can be expressed as a sum of 2 estimators:

$$y = \underbrace{\hat{y}}_{\wedge y} + \underbrace{\hat{\epsilon}}_{\vee y} . \quad (57)$$




Figure 3: Decomposition of  $y$  into sum of two estimators,  $\hat{y}$  and  $\hat{\epsilon}$ .

---

**model dependent results:**

Assume  $\epsilon$  are random over  $\sigma$  so

$$E_{\sigma}[\underline{\epsilon}] = \langle \underline{\epsilon} \rangle = 0 \quad (58)$$

Assume  $X$  and  $\beta$  are not random. This makes  $\underline{y} = X\beta + \underline{\epsilon}$  and  $\underline{\hat{\beta}} = (X^T X)^{-1} X^T \underline{y}$  random. One finds that

$$\langle \underline{y} \rangle = X\beta \quad (59)$$

$$\langle \underline{\hat{y}} \rangle = \wedge \langle \underline{y} \rangle = \langle \underline{y} \rangle \quad (60a)$$

$$\langle \underline{\hat{\epsilon}} \rangle = \vee \langle \underline{y} \rangle = 0 \quad (60b)$$

$$\langle \underline{\hat{\beta}} \rangle = \beta \quad (60c)$$

So far, we have assumed a zero mean value for  $\epsilon$ . Next, assume **“homoscedasticity” (HS)**, which means that

$$\langle \underline{\epsilon}, \underline{\epsilon}^T \rangle = \xi^2 I_{nsam} \quad (60d)$$

where  $\xi \geq 0$ ,  $nsam = \sum_{\sigma}$  and  $I_{nsam}$  is the  $nsam \times nsam$  identity matrix. It follows that

$$\langle \underline{y}, \underline{y}^T \rangle = \langle \underline{\epsilon}, \underline{\epsilon}^T \rangle = \xi^2 I_{nsam} , \quad (61)$$

$$\langle \hat{\underline{\epsilon}}, \hat{\underline{\epsilon}}^T \rangle = \vee \langle \underline{y}, \underline{y}^T \rangle \vee^T = \xi^2 \vee , \quad (62)$$

$$\langle \hat{\underline{y}}, \hat{\underline{y}}^T \rangle = \wedge \langle \underline{y}, \underline{y}^T \rangle \wedge^T = \xi^2 \wedge \quad (63)$$

and

$$\langle \hat{\underline{\beta}}, \hat{\underline{\beta}}^T \rangle = B \langle \underline{y}, \underline{y}^T \rangle B^T = \xi^2 (X^T X)^{-1} . \quad (64)$$

The goodness of fit for this model is often measured using the **coefficient of determination**  $R^2$ .  $R^2$  is defined by

$$R^2 = \frac{\| \underline{\hat{y}} - \langle \underline{\hat{y}} \rangle \|^2}{\| \underline{y} - \langle \underline{y} \rangle \|^2} = \frac{\text{tr} \langle \underline{\hat{y}}, \underline{\hat{y}}^T \rangle}{\text{tr} \langle \underline{y}, \underline{y}^T \rangle} \quad (65)$$

If HS holds, then  $R^2$  reduces to

$$R^2 = \frac{\text{tr} \wedge}{n \text{sam}} . \quad (66)$$

### 0.19.2 LR, assuming $x^\sigma$ are random and i.i.d.

Let

$\underline{y}$  = true value  
 $\underline{\hat{y}}$  = estimator  
 $\underline{\epsilon}$  = residual

$$\underline{\hat{y}} = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j \underline{x}_j \quad (67)$$

$$\underline{y} = \underline{\hat{y}} + \underline{\epsilon} \quad (68)$$

Assume

$$\langle \underline{\epsilon} \rangle = 0 \quad (69)$$

and

$$\langle \underline{x}_j, \underline{\epsilon} \rangle = 0 \quad (70)$$

for all  $j$ .

For  $k = 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$\langle \underline{x}_k, \underline{y} \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j \langle \underline{x}_k, \underline{x}_j \rangle . \quad (71)$$

Let  $\underline{x}^n$  and  $\beta^n$  be column vectors. Then

$$\langle \underline{x}^n, \underline{y} \rangle = \langle \underline{x}^n, (\underline{x}^n)^T \rangle \beta^n , \quad (72)$$

$$\beta^n = \langle \underline{x}^n, (\underline{x}^n)^T \rangle^{-1} \langle \underline{x}^n, \underline{y} \rangle . \quad (73)$$

$$\beta_0 = \langle \underline{y} \rangle - (\beta^n)^T \langle \underline{x}^n \rangle \quad (74)$$

## 0.20 Short Summary of Boolean Algebra.

See Ref.[38] for more info about this topic.

Suppose  $x, y, z \in \{0, 1\}$ . Define

$$x \text{ or } y = x \vee y = x + y - xy , \quad (75)$$

$$x \text{ and } y = x \wedge y = xy , \quad (76)$$

and

$$\text{not } x = \bar{x} = 1 - x , \quad (77)$$

where we are using normal addition and multiplication on the right hand sides.<sup>1</sup>

Associativity	$x \vee (y \vee z) = (x \vee y) \vee z$ $x \wedge (y \wedge z) = (x \wedge y) \wedge z$
Commutativity	$x \vee y = y \vee x$ $x \wedge y = y \wedge x$
Distributivity	$x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z)$ $x \vee (y \wedge z) = (x \vee y) \wedge (x \vee z)$
Identity	$x \vee 0 = x$ $x \wedge 1 = x$
Annihilator	$x \wedge 0 = 0$ $x \vee 1 = 1$
Idempotence	$x \vee x = x$ $x \wedge x = x$
Absorption	$x \wedge (x \vee y) = x$ $x \vee (x \wedge y) = x$
Complementation	$x \wedge \bar{x} = 0$ $x \vee \bar{x} = 1$
Double negation	$\overline{(\bar{x})} = x$
De Morgan Laws	$\bar{x} \wedge \bar{y} = \overline{(x \vee y)}$ $\bar{x} \vee \bar{y} = \overline{(x \wedge y)}$

Table 1: Boolean Algebra Identities

---

<sup>1</sup>Note the difference between  $\vee$  and modulus 2 addition  $\oplus$ . For  $\oplus$  (aka XOR):  $x \oplus y = x + y - 2xy$ .

Actually, since  $x \wedge y = xy$ , we can omit writing the symbol  $\wedge$ . The symbol  $\wedge$  is useful to exhibit the symmetry of the identities, and to remark about the analogous identities for sets, where  $\wedge$  becomes intersection  $\cap$  and  $\vee$  becomes union  $\cup$ . However, for practical calculations,  $\wedge$  is an unnecessary nuisance.

Since  $x \in \{0, 1\}$ ,

$$P(\bar{x}) = 1 - P(x) . \quad (78)$$

Clearly, from analyzing the simple event space  $(x, y) \in \{0, 1\}^2$ ,

$$P(x \vee y) = P(x) + P(y) - P(x \wedge y) . \quad (79)$$

## 0.21 Entropy, Kullback-Liebler divergence

For probability distributions  $p(x), q(x)$  of  $x \in S_x$

- Entropy:

$$H(p) = - \sum_x p(x) \ln p(x) \geq 0 \quad (80)$$

- Kullback-Liebler divergence:

$$D_{KL}(p \parallel q) = \sum_x p(x) \ln \frac{p(x)}{q(x)} \geq 0 \quad (81)$$

- Cross entropy:

$$CE(p \rightarrow q) = - \sum_x p(x) \ln q(x) \quad (82)$$

$$= H(p) + D_{KL}(p \parallel q) \quad (83)$$

## 0.22 Definition of various entropies used in Shannon Information Theory

- (plain) Entropy of  $\underline{x}$

$$H(\underline{x}) = - \sum_x P(x) \ln P(x) \quad (84)$$

This quantity measures the spread of  $P_{\underline{x}}$ .

- Conditional Entropy of  $\underline{y}$  given  $\underline{x}$

$$H(\underline{y}|\underline{x}) = - \sum_{x,y} P(x,y) \ln P(y|x) \quad (85)$$

$$= H(\underline{y}, \underline{x}) - H(\underline{x}) \quad (86)$$

This quantity measures the conditional spread of  $\underline{y}$  given  $\underline{x}$ .

- **Mutual Information (MI) of  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$**

$$H(\underline{y} : \underline{x}) = \sum_{x,y} P(x,y) \ln \frac{P(x,y)}{P(x)P(y)} \quad (87)$$

$$= H(\underline{x}) + H(\underline{y}) - H(\underline{y}, \underline{x}) \quad (88)$$

This quantity measures the correlation between  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$ .

- **Conditional Mutual Information (CMI)<sup>2</sup> of  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$  given  $\underline{\lambda}$**

$$H(\underline{y} : \underline{x}|\underline{\lambda}) = \sum_{x,y,\lambda} P(x,y,\lambda) \ln \frac{P(x,y|\lambda)}{P(x|\lambda)P(y|\lambda)} \quad (89)$$

$$= H(\underline{x}|\underline{\lambda}) + H(\underline{y}|\underline{\lambda}) - H(\underline{y}, \underline{x}|\underline{\lambda}) \quad (90)$$

This quantity measures the conditional correlation of  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$  given  $\underline{\lambda}$ .

- **Kullback-Liebler Divergence from  $P_{\underline{x}}$  to  $P_{\underline{y}}$ .**

Assume random variables  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$  have the same set of states  $S_{\underline{x}} = S_{\underline{y}}$ . Then

$$D_{KL}(P_{\underline{x}} \parallel P_{\underline{y}}) = \sum_x P_{\underline{x}}(x) \ln \frac{P_{\underline{x}}(x)}{P_{\underline{y}}(x)} \quad (91)$$

This measures a non-symmetric distance between the probability distributions  $P_{\underline{x}}$  and  $P_{\underline{y}}$ .  $D_{KL}(P_{\underline{x}} \parallel P_{\underline{y}})$  is non-negative and equals zero iff  $P_{\underline{x}} = P_{\underline{y}}$ .

---

<sup>2</sup>CMI can be read as “see me”.

# Definition of a Bayesian Network

A **directed graph**  $G = (V, E)$  consists of two sets,  $V$  and  $E$ .  $V$  contains the **vertices (nodes)** and  $E$  contains the **edges (arrows)**. An arrow  $a \rightarrow b$  is an ordered pair  $(a, b)$  where  $a, b \in V$ .

The **parents** of a node  $x$  are those nodes  $a$  such that there are arrows  $a \rightarrow x$ . The **children** of a node  $x$  are those nodes  $b$  such that there are arrows  $x \rightarrow b$ . A **root node** is a node with no parents. A **leaf node** is a node with no children. The **neighbors** of a node  $x$  is the set of parents and children of  $x$ .

A **path** is a set of nodes that are connected by arrows, so that all nodes have 1 or 2 neighbors, but only two nodes (**open path**) or zero nodes (**closed path**) have only one neighbor. A **directed path** is a path in which all the arrows point in the same direction. A **loop** is a closed path; i.e., a path in which all nodes have exactly 2 neighbors. A **cycle** is a directed loop. A **Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG)** is a directed graph that has no cycles.

A **fully connected directed graph** is a directed graph in which every node has all other nodes as neighbors. Figs.5 and 6 show 2 different ways of drawing the same directed graph, a fully connected graph with 4 nodes. Note that a convenient way to label the nodes of a fully connected directed graph with  $N$  nodes is to point arrows from  $\underline{x}_k$  to  $\underline{x}_j$  where  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$  and  $k = j - 1, j - 2, \dots, 0$ .




Figure 4: Fully connected directed graph with 4 nodes, drawn as a line.




Figure 5: Fully connected directed graph with 4 nodes, drawn as a square.

A **connected graph** is a graph for which there is no way of separating the nodes into two sets so that there is no arrow from one set to the other. A **tree** is a directed graph in which all nodes have a single parent except for a single node called the “root” node which has no parents. A **polytree** is a DAG with no loops.

---



A **Bayesian network (bnet)** consists of a DAG and a **Transition Probability Matrix (TPM)** associated with each node of the graph. A TPM is often called a **Conditional Probability Table (CPT)**. The **structure** of a bnet is its DAG alone, sans the TPMs. The **skeleton** of a bnet is the undirected graph beneath the bnet's DAG.

In this book, random variables are indicated by underlined letters and their values by non-underlined letters. Each node of a bnet is labelled by a random variable. Thus,  $\underline{x} = x$  means that node  $\underline{x}$  is in state  $x$ .

---

**Some sets of nodes associated with each node  $\underline{a}$  of a bnet**

- $ch(\underline{a}) = \text{children of } \underline{a}$ .
- $pa(\underline{a}) = \text{parents of } \underline{a}$ .
- $nb(\underline{a}) = pa(\underline{a}) \cup ch(\underline{a}) = \text{neighbors of } \underline{a}$ .
- $de(\underline{a}) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} ch^n(\underline{a}) = ch(\underline{a}) \cup ch \circ ch(\underline{a}) \cup \dots$ , descendants of  $\underline{a}$ .
- $an(\underline{a}) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} pa^n(\underline{a}) = pa(\underline{a}) \cup pa \circ pa(\underline{a}) \cup \dots$ , ancestors of  $\underline{a}$ .

---

In this book, we will use  $\underline{a}$  to indicate a **multi-node (node set, node array)**  $\underline{a} = (\underline{a}_j)_{j=0,1,\dots,na-1}$ . We will often treat multinodes as if they were sets, and combine them with the usual set operators. For instance, for two multinodes  $\underline{a}$  and  $\underline{b}$ , we define  $\underline{a} \cup \underline{b}$ ,  $\underline{a} \cap \underline{b}$ ,  $\underline{a} - \underline{b}$  and  $\underline{a} \subset \underline{b}$  in the obvious way. We will indicate a singleton set (single node multi-node)  $\underline{a} = \{\underline{a}\}$  simply by  $\underline{a} = \underline{a}$ . For instance,  $\underline{a} - \underline{b} = \underline{a} - \{\underline{b}\}$ .

---

The TPM of a node  $\underline{x}$  of a bnet is a matrix of probabilities  $P(\underline{x} = x | pa(\underline{x}) = \underline{a})$ .

A bnet with nodes  $\underline{x}$  represents a probability distribution

$$P(x.) = \prod_j P(\underline{x}_j = x_j | (\underline{x}_k = x_k)_{k:\underline{x}_k \in pa(\underline{x}_j)}) . \quad (92)$$

Note that for a fully connected bnet with  $N$  nodes, Eq.(118) becomes

$$P(x.) = \prod_{j=0}^{N-1} P(x_j | (x_k)_{k=j-1,j-2,\dots,0}) . \quad (93)$$

For example, if  $N = 4$ , Eq.(119) becomes

$$P(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) = P(x_3 | x_2, x_1, x_0) P(x_2 | x_1, x_0) P(x_1 | x_0) P(x_0) . \quad (94)$$

We see that Eq.(119) is just the chain rule for conditional probabilities.

Given an arbitrarily large dataset of samples for the random variables  $(\underline{x}_i)_{i=0,1,\dots,N-1}$ , there may be several bnets (differing perhaps in the direction of some arrows) that fit the data well. However, according to Pearl's causality theory, only one of these bnets is used by Nature. I like to refer to that single one as the **causally correct (CC) Bayesian network**.<sup>3</sup> In this book,

---

<sup>3</sup> The uniqueness of a CC bnet can be taken to be an implicit axiom of causality theory. Alternatively, instead of assuming uniqueness, one can assume that out of all CC bnets that fit the data well, one can find the "best" one. Here the definition of "best" is not unique and depends on a non-unique figure of merit defined in terms of Pearl do interventions.

whenever we speak of causal issues, we will assume, often without mentioning it, that the CC bnet is being used.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>We won't use the term "causal bnet" in this book. Pearl defines a causal bnet to be a CC bnet that is also a "SCM" (i.e., a bnet whose internal nodes are deterministic and external ones are probabilistic.)

# Chapter 1

## ARACNE-structure learning

This chapter is based on Ref.[13].

The ARACNE algo is an algo for learning the structure of a bnet from data. The algo considers data samples for  $n$  random variables  $(x_i)_{i=0,1,\dots,n-1}$ , and estimates the mutual information  $MI_{i,j} = H(\underline{x}_i : \underline{x}_j)$  between every pair of nodes. The set  $UG$  is initialized to contain all the edges of a fully connected undirected graph. Next the algo removes from  $UG$  every edge with  $MI_{i,j} < \epsilon$  for some threshold  $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ . Then the algo examines every triplet of edges in  $UG$ , and marks for removal the edge of the triplet with the smallest MI. Finally, the algo removes from  $UG$  all edges marked for removal. Each triplet is analyzed irrespective of whether its edges have been marked for removal when considering a prior triplet. Thus the network constructed by the algorithm is independent of the order in which the triplets are examined. Some of the unoriented edges in  $UG$  can be given an orientation using the same techniques used to orient edges in constraint based structure learning (see Chapter 45).

Ref.[13] incorrectly claims that removing the smaller of 3 MI's is “an application” of the Data Processing Inequality (DPI) of Shannon Information Theory. See Chapter 28 for more info about DPI. Note that DPI is only valid for a Markov chain, and not all triplets of random variables are in a Markov chain. Removing the smaller of 3 numbers does not require DPI.




Figure 1.1: An example where the ARACNE algo gives a Chow-Liu tree. (a) Fully connected undirected graph with weights  $MI_{i,j}$  along the edges. (b) All 4 possible triplets of edges with nonzero weights. Edges marked for removal have their weights printed in red.(c) Final structure.

Fig.1.1 gives an example of the application of the ARACNE algo.

See Chapter 7 on Chow-Liu trees (CLT). A CLT is just a maximum spanning tree where the weights are mutual informations  $MI_{i,j}$  estimated from data.

Sometimes, the outcome of the ARACNE algo is a CLT. For example, Fig.1.1 (a) was considered in Chapter 7 on CLTs, and the CLT algo also gave Fig.1.1 (c) as the final structure.

According to Ref.[13], the ARACNE algo sometimes yields a polytree (i.e., a connected graph with no loops). It may even yield a structure with loops. Hence, it does not always yield a CLT.

By breaking all cliques (i.e., fully connected subgraphs) with 3 edges and 3 nodes, ARACNE breaks all cliques with 3 or more nodes. However, cliques are not uncommon in Nature, especially 3 node cliques. Cliques become less likely in Nature the bigger the number of nodes they have *after* 3. Therefore, a nice generalization of ARACNE would be to list all 4 node cliques, and break each of them by eliminating their edge with the smallest MI. This will have the effect of breaking all cliques with 4 or more nodes but keeping 3 node cliques. One could also break some, not all, of the 3 node cliques, by consecutively removing the clique-breaking-edge with the smallest MI of all edges of all 3 node cliques. Let  $\beta$  stand for banned clique number of nodes. Then the current ARACNE has  $\beta = 3$ . We are suggesting that a  $\beta$  of 4 might be more likely to occur in Nature.

# Chapter 2

## Backdoor Adjustment

The backdoor (BD) adjustment theorem is proven in Chapter 11 from the rules of do-calculus. The goal of this chapter is to give examples of the use of that theorem. We will restate the theorem in this chapter, sans proof. There is no need to understand the theorem's proof in order to use it. However, you will need to skim Chapter 11 in order to familiarize yourself with the notation used to state the theorem. This chapter also assumes that you are comfortable with the rules for checking for d-separation. Those rules are covered in Chapter 12.

Suppose that we have access to data that allows us to estimate a probability distribution  $P(x., y., z.)$ . Hence, the variables  $\underline{x.}$ ,  $\underline{y.}$ ,  $\underline{z.}$  are ALL the observed (i.e, not hidden). Then we say that the backdoor  $\underline{z.}$  satisfies the **backdoor adjustment criterion** relative to  $(\underline{x.}, \underline{y.})$  if

1. All backdoor paths from  $\underline{x.}$  to  $\underline{y.}$  are blocked by  $\underline{z.}$ .
2.  $\underline{z.} \cap de(\underline{x.}) = \emptyset$ .

### Claim 2 Backdoor Adjustment Theorem

*If  $\underline{z.}$  satisfies the backdoor criterion relative to  $(\underline{x.}, \underline{y.})$ , then*

$$P(y.|_{\rho} x. = x.) = \sum_{z.} P(y.|x., z.)P(z.) \quad (2.1)$$

$$= \sum_{z.} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \underline{z.} = z. \\ \searrow \\ \underline{x.} = x. \longrightarrow \underline{y.} \end{array} \right\} \quad (2.2)$$

**proof:** See Chapter 11

**QED**

## 2.1 Examples

1.



BD criterion satisfied if  $\underline{x}. = \underline{x}, \underline{y}. = \underline{y}, \underline{z}. = \emptyset$ . No adjustment necessary.

$$P(y|\rho \underline{x} = x) = P(y|x) \quad (2.4)$$


---

2.



BD criterion satisfied if  $\underline{x}. = \underline{x}, \underline{y}. = \underline{y}, \underline{z}. = \underline{z}$ .

Note that here the backdoor formula adjusts the parents of  $\underline{x}$ .

---

3.



BD criterion satisfied if  $\underline{x}. = \underline{x}, \underline{y}. = \underline{y}, \underline{z}. = \underline{z}$ .

---

4.



BD criterion is impossible to satisfy if  $\underline{x}. = \underline{x}, \underline{y}. = \underline{y}$ . However, the front-door criterion can be satisfied. See Chapter 15.

---

5.



BD criterion satisfied if  $\underline{x}. = \underline{x}, \underline{y}. = \underline{y}, \underline{z}. = \underline{z}$ . Note that here the backdoor formula cannot adjust the single parent  $\underline{w}$  of  $\underline{x}$  because it is hidden, but we are able to block the backdoor path by conditioning on  $\underline{z}$  instead.

---

6.



Conditioning on  $\underline{z}$  blocks backdoor path  $\underline{x} - \underline{z} - \underline{y}$ , but opens path  $\underline{x} - \underline{e} - \underline{z} - \underline{a} - \underline{y}$  because  $\underline{z}$  is a collider for that path. That path is blocked if we also condition on  $\underline{a}$ , which is possible because  $\underline{a}$  is observed. In conclusion, the BD criterion is satisfied if  $\underline{x}_\cdot = \underline{x}$ ,  $\underline{y}_\cdot = \underline{y}$  and  $\underline{z}_\cdot = (\underline{z}, \underline{a})$ .

Conditioning on the parents of  $\underline{x}$  is often enough to block all backdoor paths. However, sometimes some of the parents are unobserved and one must condition on other nodes that are not parents of  $\underline{x}$  in order to satisfy the BD criterion.

---

7.



No need to control anything because only possible backdoor path is blocked by collider  $\underline{w}$ . Hence,

$$P(y|\rho\underline{x} = x) = P(y|x) . \quad (2.11)$$

However, if for some reason we want to control  $\underline{t}$ , we can do so. We can't control  $\underline{w}$  though, because  $\underline{w} \in de(\underline{x})$ . Thus, the BD criterion is satisfied if  $\underline{x}_\cdot = \underline{x}$ ,  $\underline{y}_\cdot = \underline{y}$  and  $\underline{z}_\cdot = \underline{t}$ . Therefore,

$$P(y|\rho\underline{x} = x) = \sum_t P(y|x, t)P(t) . \quad (2.12)$$



---

8. Discuss reasons why multiple possible sets  $\underline{z}_\cdot$  that satisfy the BD criterion can be advantageous.

- Can evaluate  $P(y|\rho\underline{x}_\cdot = x_\cdot)$  multiple ways and compare the results. This is a test that the causal bnet is correct.
  - It might be easier or less expensive to get data for some  $\underline{z}_\cdot$  more than for others.
- 

9. (Taken from online course notes Ref.[8])

Consider the bnet



If  $\underline{x} = \underline{x}_1$  and  $\underline{y} = \underline{x}_5$ , find all possible adjustment multinodes  $\underline{z}$ . that satisfy the BD criterion.  
 Ans:

- |                     |                                      |                                      |   |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| • $\emptyset$       | • $\underline{x}_4$                  | • $\underline{x}_2, \underline{x}_3$ | • $\underline{x}_2, \underline{x}_3, \underline{x}_4$ |
| • $\underline{x}_2$ | • $\underline{x}_2, \underline{x}_4$ | • $\underline{x}_3, \underline{x}_4$ |   |

Add  $\underline{x}_7$  to each of the previous 7 possible  $\underline{z}$ .. This gives a total of 14 possible adjustment multinodes  $\underline{z}$ ..



# Chapter 3

## Back Propagation (Automatic Differentiation)

### 3.1 General Theory

#### 3.1.1 Jacobians

Suppose  $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_f}$  and

$$y = f(x) . \quad (3.1)$$

Then the Jacobian  $\frac{\partial y}{\partial x}$  is defined as the matrix with entries<sup>1</sup>

$$\left[ \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} \right]_{i,j} = \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial x_j} . \quad (3.2)$$

Jacobian of function composition. Suppose  $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_f}$ ,  $g : \mathbb{R}^{n_f} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_g}$ . If

$$y = g \circ f(x) , \quad (3.3)$$

then

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial g}{\partial f} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} . \quad (3.4)$$

Right hand side of last equation is a product of two matrices so order of matrices is important.

#### 3.1.2 bnets for function composition, forward propagation and back propagation

Let

$$y = f^4 \circ f^3 \circ f^2 \circ f^1(x) . \quad (3.5)$$

---

<sup>1</sup> Mnemonic for remembering order of indices:  $i$  in numerator/ $j$  in denominator becomes index  $i/j$  of Jacobian matrix.

$$\underline{f^4} \longleftarrow \underline{f^3} \longleftarrow \underline{f^2} \longleftarrow \underline{f^1} \longleftarrow \underline{f^0}$$

(a) Composition

$$\underline{\frac{\partial f^4}{\partial x}} \longleftarrow \underline{\frac{\partial f^3}{\partial x}} \longleftarrow \underline{\frac{\partial f^2}{\partial x}} \longleftarrow \underline{\frac{\partial f^1}{\partial x}} \longleftarrow \underline{1}$$

(b) Forward-p

$$\underline{1} \longrightarrow \underline{\frac{\partial y}{\partial f^3}} \longrightarrow \underline{\frac{\partial y}{\partial f^2}} \longrightarrow \underline{\frac{\partial y}{\partial f^1}} \longrightarrow \underline{\frac{\partial y}{\partial f^0}}$$

(c) Back-p

Figure 3.1: bnets for function composition, forward propagation and back propagation for  $nf = 5$  nodes.

This function composition chain can be represented by the bnet Fig.3.1(a) with TPMs

$$P(f^\mu | f^{\mu-1}) = \mathbb{1}(f^\mu = f^\mu(f^{\mu-1})) \quad (3.6)$$

for  $\mu = 1, 2, 3, 4$ .

Note that

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial y}{\partial f^3} \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial f^2} \left[ \frac{\partial f^2}{\partial f^1} \frac{\partial f^1}{\partial x} \right] \quad (3.7)$$

$$= \frac{\partial y}{\partial f^3} \left[ \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial f^2} \frac{\partial f^2}{\partial x} \right] \quad (3.8)$$

$$= \left[ \frac{\partial y}{\partial f^3} \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial x} \right] \quad (3.9)$$

$$= \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} . \quad (3.10)$$

This forward propagation can be represented by the bnet Fig.3.1(b) with node TPMs

$$P\left(\frac{\partial f^{\mu+1}}{\partial x} \mid \frac{\partial f^\mu}{\partial x}\right) = \mathbb{1}\left(\frac{\partial f^{\mu+1}}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial f^{\mu+1}}{\partial f^\mu} \frac{\partial f^\mu}{\partial x}\right) \quad (3.11)$$

for  $\mu = 1, 2, 3$ .

Note that

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial x} = \left[ \frac{\partial y}{\partial f^3} \frac{\partial f^3}{\partial f^2} \right] \frac{\partial f^2}{\partial f^1} \frac{\partial f^1}{\partial x} \quad (3.12)$$

$$= \left[ \frac{\partial y}{\partial f^2} \frac{\partial f^2}{\partial f^1} \right] \frac{\partial f^1}{\partial x} \quad (3.13)$$

$$= \left[ \frac{\partial y}{\partial f^1} \frac{\partial f^1}{\partial x} \right] \quad (3.14)$$

$$= \frac{\partial y}{\partial x} . \quad (3.15)$$

This back propagation can be represented by the bnet Fig.3.1(c) with node TPMs

$$P\left(\frac{\partial y}{\partial f^\mu} \mid \frac{\partial y}{\partial f^{\mu+1}}\right) = \mathbb{1}\left(\frac{\partial y}{\partial f^\mu} = \frac{\partial y}{\partial f^{\mu+1}} \frac{\partial f^{\mu+1}}{\partial f^\mu}\right) \quad (3.16)$$

for  $\mu = 2, 1, 0$ .

$\frac{\partial f^{\mu+1}}{\partial f^\mu}$  is a Jacobian matrix so the order of multiplication matters. In forward prop, it pre-multiplies, and in back prop it post-multiplies.

## 3.2 Application to Neural Networks

### 3.2.1 Absorbing $b_i^\lambda$ into $w_{i|j}$ .




Figure 3.2: Nodes  $\underline{h}_0^0, \underline{h}_0^1, \underline{Y}_0$  are all set to 1. They allow us to absorb  $b_i^\lambda$  into the first column of  $w_{i|j}^\lambda$ .

Below are, printed in blue, the TPMs for the nodes of a NN bnet, as given in Chapter 33. For all hidden layers  $\lambda = 0, 1, \dots, \Lambda - 2$ ,

$$P(h_i^\lambda \mid h_i^{\lambda-1}) = \delta \left( h_i^\lambda, \mathcal{A}_i^\lambda \left( \sum_j w_{i|j}^\lambda h_j^{\lambda-1} + b_i^\lambda \right) \right) \quad (3.17)$$

for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, nh(\lambda) - 1$ . For the output visible layer  $\lambda = \Lambda - 1$ :

$$P(Y_i | h_{\cdot}^{\Lambda-2}) = \delta \left( Y_i, \mathcal{A}_i^{\Lambda-1} \left( \sum_j w_{i|j}^{\Lambda-1} h_j^{\Lambda-2} + b_i^{\Lambda-1} \right) \right) \quad (3.18)$$

for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, ny - 1$ .

For each  $\lambda$ , replace the matrix  $w_{\cdot|\cdot}^\lambda$  by the augmented matrix  $[b^\lambda, w_{\cdot|\cdot}^\lambda]$  so that the new  $w_{\cdot|\cdot}^\lambda$  satisfies

$$w_{i|0}^\lambda = b_i^\lambda \quad (3.19)$$

Let the nodes  $\underline{h}_0^\lambda$  for all  $\lambda$  and  $\underline{Y}_0$  be root nodes (so no arrows pointing into them). For each  $\lambda$ , draw arrows from  $\underline{h}_0^\lambda$  to all other nodes in that same layer. Draw arrows from  $\underline{Y}_0$  to all other nodes in that same layer.

After performing the above steps, the TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes of the NN bnet are as follows:

For all hidden layers  $\lambda = 0, 1, \dots, \Lambda - 2$ ,

$$P(h_0^\lambda) = \delta(h_0^\lambda, 1) , \quad (3.20)$$

and

$$P(h_i^\lambda | h_{\cdot}^{\lambda-1}, h_0^\lambda = 1) = \delta \left( h_i^\lambda, \mathcal{A}_i^\lambda \left( \sum_j w_{i|j}^\lambda h_j^{\lambda-1} \right) \right) \quad (3.21)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, nh(\lambda) - 1$ . For the output visible layer  $\lambda = \Lambda - 1$ :

$$P(Y_0) = \delta(Y_0, 1) , \quad (3.22)$$

and

$$P(Y_i | h_{\cdot}^{\Lambda-2}, Y_0 = 1) = \delta \left( Y_i, \mathcal{A}_i^{\Lambda-1} \left( \sum_j w_{i|j}^{\Lambda-1} h_j^{\Lambda-2} \right) \right) \quad (3.23)$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, ny - 1$ .

### 3.2.2 bnets for function composition, forward propagation and back propagation for NN

From here on, we will rename  $y$  above by  $Y = \hat{y}$  and consider samples  $y[i]$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, nsam - 1$ . The Error (aka loss or cost function) is

$$\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{nsam} \sum_{\sigma=0}^{nsam-1} \sum_{i=0}^{ny-1} |Y_i - y_i[\sigma]|^2 \quad (3.24)$$

$$\underline{\mathcal{A}^3} \longleftarrow \underline{\mathcal{B}^3} \longleftarrow \underline{\mathcal{A}^2} \longleftarrow \underline{\mathcal{B}^2} \longleftarrow \underline{\mathcal{A}^1} \longleftarrow \underline{\mathcal{B}^1} \longleftarrow \underline{\mathcal{A}^0} \longleftarrow \underline{\mathcal{B}^0} \longleftarrow \underline{x}$$

(a)

$$\underline{\frac{\partial \mathcal{A}^3}{\partial x}} \longleftarrow \underline{\frac{\partial \mathcal{B}^3}{\partial x}} \longleftarrow \underline{\frac{\partial \mathcal{A}^2}{\partial x}} \longleftarrow \underline{\frac{\partial \mathcal{B}^2}{\partial x}} \longleftarrow \underline{\frac{\partial \mathcal{A}^1}{\partial x}} \longleftarrow \underline{\frac{\partial \mathcal{B}^1}{\partial x}} \longleftarrow \underline{\frac{\partial \mathcal{A}^0}{\partial x}} \longleftarrow \underline{\frac{\partial \mathcal{B}^0}{\partial x}} \longleftarrow \underline{1}$$

(b)

$$\underline{1} \longrightarrow \underline{\frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{B}^3}} \longrightarrow \underline{\frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{A}^2}} \longrightarrow \underline{\frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{B}^2}} \longrightarrow \underline{\frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{A}^1}} \longrightarrow \underline{\frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{B}^1}} \longrightarrow \underline{\frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{A}^0}} \longrightarrow \underline{\frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{B}^0}} \longrightarrow \underline{\frac{\partial Y}{\partial x}}$$

(c)

Figure 3.3: bnets for (a) function composition, (b) forward propagation and (c) back propagation for a neural net with 4 layers (3 hidden and output visible).

To perform simple gradient descent, one uses:

$$(w_{i|j}^\lambda)' = w_{i|j}^\lambda - \eta \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial w_{i|j}^\lambda} . \quad (3.25)$$

One has

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial w_{i|j}^\lambda} = \frac{1}{nsam} \sum_{\sigma=0}^{nsam-1} \sum_{i=0}^{ny-1} 2(Y_i - y_i[\sigma]) \frac{\partial Y}{\partial w_{i|j}^\lambda} . \quad (3.26)$$

Define  $\mathcal{B}_i^\lambda$  thus

$$\mathcal{B}_i^\lambda(h^{\lambda-1}) = \sum_j w_{i|j}^\lambda h_j^{\lambda-1} . \quad (3.27)$$

Then

$$\frac{\partial Y}{\partial w_{i|j}^\lambda} = \frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{B}_i^\lambda} \frac{\partial \mathcal{B}_i^\lambda}{\partial w_{i|j}^\lambda} \quad (3.28)$$

$$= \frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{B}_i^\lambda} h_j^{\lambda-1} \quad (3.29)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial w_{i|j}^\lambda} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^\lambda} \frac{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^\lambda}{\partial w_{i|j}^\lambda} \quad (3.30)$$

$$= \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^\lambda} h_j^{\lambda-1}. \quad (3.31)$$

This suggest that we can calculate the derivatives of the error  $\mathcal{E}$  with respect to the weights  $w_{i|j}^\lambda$  in two stages, using an intermediate quantity  $\delta_j^\lambda$ :

$$\begin{cases} \delta_j^\lambda = \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^\lambda} \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial w_{i|j}^\lambda} = \delta_j^\lambda h_j^{\lambda-1} \end{cases} \quad (3.32)$$

To apply what we learned in the earlier General Theory section of this chapter, consider a NN with 4 layers (3 hidden, and the output visible one). Define the functions  $f_i$  as follows:

$$f_i^0 = x_i \quad (3.33)$$

$$\text{Layer 0: } f_i^1 = \mathcal{B}_i^0(x_i), \quad f_i^2 = \mathcal{A}_i^0(\mathcal{B}_i^0) \quad (3.34)$$

$$\text{Layer 1: } f_i^3 = \mathcal{B}_i^1(\mathcal{A}_i^0), \quad f_i^4 = \mathcal{A}_i^1(\mathcal{B}_i^1) \quad (3.35)$$

$$\text{Layer 2: } f_i^5 = \mathcal{B}_i^2(\mathcal{A}_i^1), \quad f_i^6 = \mathcal{A}_i^2(\mathcal{B}_i^2) \quad (3.36)$$

$$\text{Layer 3: } f_i^7 = \mathcal{B}_i^3(\mathcal{A}_i^2), \quad f_i^8 = \mathcal{A}_i^3(\mathcal{B}_i^3) \quad (3.37)$$

See Fig.3.3. The TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes of the bnet (c) for back propagation, are:

$$P\left(\frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{B}^\lambda} \mid \frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{B}^{\lambda+1}}\right) = \mathbb{I}\left(\frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{B}^\lambda} = \frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{B}^{\lambda+1}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{B}^{\lambda+1}}{\partial \mathcal{A}^\lambda} \frac{\partial \mathcal{A}^\lambda}{\partial \mathcal{B}^\lambda}\right). \quad (3.38)$$

One has

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{A}_i^\lambda}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^\lambda} = D\mathcal{A}_i^\lambda(\mathcal{B}_i^\lambda) \delta(i, j) \quad (3.39)$$

where  $D\mathcal{A}_i^\lambda(z)$  is the derivative of  $\mathcal{A}_i^\lambda(z)$ .

From Eq.(3.27)

$$\mathcal{B}_i^{\lambda+1}(\mathcal{A}^\lambda) = \sum_j w_{i|j}^{\lambda+1} \mathcal{A}_j^\lambda \quad (3.40)$$

so

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{B}_i^{\lambda+1}}{\partial \mathcal{A}_j^\lambda} = w_{i|j}^{\lambda+1}. \quad (3.41)$$

Therefore, Eq.(3.38) implies

$$P(\frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^\lambda} \mid \frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^{\lambda+1}}) = \mathbb{1}(\frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^\lambda} = \sum_i \frac{\partial Y}{\partial \mathcal{B}_i^{\lambda+1}} D\mathcal{A}_j^\lambda(\mathcal{B}_j^\lambda) w_{i|j}^{\lambda+1}), \quad (3.42)$$

$$P(\frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^\lambda} \mid \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^{\lambda+1}}) = \mathbb{1}(\frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^\lambda} = \sum_i \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \mathcal{B}_i^{\lambda+1}} D\mathcal{A}_j^\lambda(\mathcal{B}_j^\lambda) w_{i|j}^{\lambda+1}), \quad (3.43)$$

$$\boxed{P(\delta_j^\lambda \mid \delta_j^{\lambda+1}) = \mathbb{1}(\delta_j^\lambda = \sum_i \delta_i^{\lambda+1} D\mathcal{A}_j^\lambda(\mathcal{B}_j^\lambda) w_{i|j}^{\lambda+1})}. \quad (3.44)$$

First delta of iteration, belonging to output layer  $\lambda = \Lambda - 1$ :

$$\delta_j^{\Lambda-1} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \mathcal{B}_j^{\Lambda-1}} \quad (3.45)$$

$$= \frac{1}{nsam} \sum_{\sigma=0}^{nsam-1} \sum_{i=0}^{ny-1} 2(Y_i - y_i[\sigma]) D\mathcal{A}_i^{\Lambda-1}(\mathcal{B}_i^{\Lambda-1}) \delta(i, j) \quad (3.46)$$

$$= \frac{1}{nsam} \sum_{\sigma=0}^{nsam-1} 2(Y_j - y_j[\sigma]) D\mathcal{A}_j^{\Lambda-1}(\mathcal{B}_j^{\Lambda-1}) \quad (3.47)$$

Cute expression for derivative of sigmoid function:

$$D\text{sig}(x) = \text{sig}(x)(1 - \text{sig}(x)) \quad (3.48)$$

### 3.3 General bnets instead of Markov chains induced by layered structure of NNs

$$P(\delta_{\underline{x}} \mid (\delta_{\underline{a}})_{\underline{a} \in ch(\underline{x})}) = \mathbb{1}(\delta_{\underline{x}} = \sum_{\underline{a} \in ch(\underline{x})} \delta_{\underline{a}} D\mathcal{A}_{\underline{x}}(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{x}})) w_{\underline{a}|\underline{x}} \quad (3.49)$$

Reverse arrows of original bnet and define the TPM of nodes of “time reversed” bnet by

$$\boxed{P(\delta_{\underline{x}} \mid (\delta_{\underline{a}})_{\underline{a} \in pa(\underline{x})}) = \mathbb{1}(\delta_{\underline{x}} = \sum_{\underline{a} \in pa(\underline{x})} \delta_{\underline{a}} D\mathcal{A}_{\underline{x}}(\mathcal{B}_{\underline{x}})) w_{\underline{x}|\underline{a}}^T} \quad (3.50)$$

# Chapter 4

## Basic Curve Fitting Using Gradient Descent



Figure 4.1: Basic curve fitting bnet.

Samples  $(x[\sigma], y[\sigma]) \in S_{\underline{x}} \times S_{\underline{y}}$  are given.  $nsam(\vec{x}) = nsam(\vec{y})$ .

Estimator function  $\hat{y}(x; \phi)$  for  $x \in S_{\underline{x}}$  and  $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$  is given.

Let

$$P_{\underline{x}, \underline{y}}(x, y) = \frac{1}{nsam(\vec{x})} \sum_{\sigma} \mathbb{1}(x = x[\sigma], y = y[\sigma]) . \quad (4.1)$$

Let

$$\mathcal{E}(\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \phi) = \frac{1}{nsam(\vec{y})} \sum_{\sigma} |y[\sigma] - \hat{y}(x[\sigma]; \phi)|^2 \quad (4.2)$$

$\mathcal{E}$  is called the mean square error.

Best fit is parameters  $\phi^*$  such that

$$\phi^* = \underset{\phi}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathcal{E}(\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \phi) . \quad (4.3)$$

The node TPMs for the basic curve fitting bnet Fig.4.1 are printed below in blue.

$$P(\phi) = \text{given} . \quad (4.4)$$



The first time it is used,  $\phi$  is arbitrary. After the first time, it is determined by previous stage.

$$P(\vec{x}) = \prod_{\sigma} P_{\underline{x}}(x[\sigma]) \quad (4.5)$$

$$P(\vec{y}|\vec{x}) = \prod_{\sigma} P_{\underline{y}|\underline{x}}(y[\sigma] | x[\sigma]) \quad (4.6)$$

$$P(\hat{y}[\sigma]|\phi, \vec{x}) = \delta(\hat{y}[\sigma], \hat{y}(x[\sigma]; \phi)) \quad (4.7)$$

$$P(\mathcal{E}|\vec{\hat{y}}, \vec{y}) = \delta(\mathcal{E}, \frac{1}{nsam(\vec{x})} \sum_{\sigma} |y[\sigma] - \hat{y}[\sigma]|^2) . \quad (4.8)$$

$$P(\phi'|\phi, \mathcal{E}) = \delta(\phi', \phi - \eta \partial_{\phi} \mathcal{E}) \quad (4.9)$$

$\eta > 0$  is the descent rate. If  $\Delta\phi = \phi' - \phi = -\eta \frac{\partial \mathcal{E}}{\partial \phi}$ , then  $\Delta\mathcal{E} = \frac{-1}{\eta} (\Delta\phi)^2 < 0$  so this will minimize the error  $\mathcal{E}$ . This is called “gradient descent”.

## Chapter 5

# Bell and Clauser-Horne Inequalities in Quantum Mechanics




Figure 5.1: bnet used to discuss Bell and Clauser-Horne inequalities in Quantum Mechanics.

I wrote an article about this in 2008 for my blog “Quantum Bayesian Networks”. See Ref.[32].

# Chapter 6

## Binary Decision Diagrams




Figure 6.1: Binary decision tree and truth table for the function  $f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \bar{x}_1(x_2 + \bar{x}_3) + x_1x_2$




Figure 6.2: BDD for the function  $f$  of Fig.6.1.

This chapter is based on Wikipedia article Ref.[37].

Binary Decision Diagrams (BDDs) can be understood as a special case of Decision Trees (dtrees). We will assume that the reader has read Chapter 9 on dtrees before reading this chapter.

Both Figs.6.1 and 6.2 were taken from the aforementioned Wikipedia article. They give a simple example of a function  $f : \{0, 1\}^3 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  represented in Fig.6.1 as a **binary decision tree** and in Fig.6.2 as a **binary decision diagram (BDD)**. The goal of this chapter is to find for each of those figures a bnet with the same graph structure.

We begin by noting that the function  $f : \{0, 1\}^3 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is a special case of a probability distribution  $P : \{0, 1\}^3 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ . In fact, if we restrict  $P$  to be deterministic, then  $P_{det} : \{0, 1\}^3 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  has the same domain and range as  $f$ . Henceforth, we will refer to  $f(x_1, x_2, x_3)$  as  $P(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ , keeping in mind that we are restricting our attention to deterministic probability distributions.


If we apply the chain rule for conditional probabilities to  $P(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ , we get

$$P(x_1, x_2, x_3) = P(x_3|x_1, x_2)P(x_2|x_1)P(x_1), \quad (6.1)$$

which can be represented by the bnet:



But in Chapter 9, we learned how to represent the bnet of Eq.(6.2) as the bnet tree Eq.(6.3). In that tree, the nodes pose questions with 3 possible answers 0, 1, *null*. In Eq.(6.3),  $x_2|a?$  stands for “what is  $x_2$  if  $x_1 = a$ ?” and  $x_3|a, b?$  stands for “what is  $x_3$  if  $x_1 = a, x_2 = b$ ?”.



The node TPMs, printed in blue, for the bnet of Eq.(6.3) are as follows. If  $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \{0, 1, null\}$  and  $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$ , then

$$P(\underline{x_1?} = x_1) = \begin{cases} P_{x_1}(x_1) & \text{if } x_1 \in \{0, 1\} \\ 0 & \text{if } x_1 = null \end{cases} \quad (6.4)$$

$$P(\underline{x_2|a?} = x_2 \mid \underline{x_1?} = x_1) = \begin{cases} P_{x_2|x_1}(x_2|a) & \text{if } x_1 = a \\ \mathbb{1}(x_2 = null) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6.5)$$


$$P(\underline{x_3|a, b? = x_3} \mid \underline{x_2|b? = x_2}) = \begin{cases} P_{\underline{x_3|\underline{x_1}, \underline{x_2}}}(x_3|a, b) & \text{if } (x_1, x_2) = (a, b) \\ \mathbb{1}(x_3 = null) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6.6)$$

The bnet shown in Eq.(6.3) contains the same info and has the same graph structure as the binary decision tree Fig.6.1. As when we were converting dtrees to their image bnets, the info in the endpoint nodes of Fig.6.1 is implicit in the node TPMs of the image bnet Eq.(6.3). If one wants to make the endpoint node info more explicit in the image bnet, one can add it to the descriptors of the state names of the leaf nodes of the image bnet. For example, one can add descriptors “gives  $f = 0$ ” or “gives  $f = 1$ ” to the “0” or “1” states of those leaf nodes.

The BDD shown in Fig.6.2 emphasizes the fact that

$$P(x_1, x_2, x_3 | x_1 = 1) = P(x_2 | x_1 = 1) = x_2 . \quad (6.7)$$

The BDD of Fig.6.2 corresponds to the bnet of Eq.(6.8).




---

What happens if we consider an  $f$  for which  $P(x_3|x_1, x_2) = P(x_3|x_2)$  so that one of the arcs of the fully connected bnet Eq.(6.2) is unnecessary? In that case,


$$P(x_1, x_2, x_3) = P(x_3|x_2)P(x_2|x_1)P(x_1) , \quad (6.9)$$

which can be represented by the Markov chain bnet:



Following the prescriptions of Chapter 9, we can represent the bnet of Eq.(6.10) as the bnet

tree Eq.(6.11). In that tree, the nodes pose questions with 3 possible answers 0, 1, *null*.



# Chapter 7

## Chow-Liu Trees and Tree Augmented Naive Bayes (TAN)

This chapter is mostly based on chapter 8 of Pearl's 1988 book Ref.[21]. See also Ref.[40] and references therein.

This chapter uses various Shannon Information Theory entropies. Our notation for these entropies is described in Chapter chapter 0.1.2 on Notational Conventions.

### 7.1 Chow-Liu Trees

Chow-Liu trees refers to an algorithm for finding a bnet tree that fits an a priori given probability distribution as closely as possible.

Consider a bnet with  $n$  nodes  $\underline{x}^n = (\underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_{n-1})$  such that  $\underline{x}_i \in S_{\underline{x}_i}$  for all  $i$ . Let its total probability distribution be  $P_{\underline{x}^n}$ . For simplicity, we will abbreviate  $P_{\underline{x}^n}$  by  $P$ . Hence

$$P(x^n) = P_{\underline{x}^n}(x^n) . \quad (7.1)$$

Suppose we want to fit  $P_{\underline{x}^n}$  by a tree bnet with nodes  $\underline{t}^n = (\underline{t}_0, \underline{t}_1, \dots, \underline{t}_{n-1})$  such that  $\underline{t}_i \in S_{\underline{t}_i} = S_{\underline{x}_i}$  for all  $i$ . For simplicity, we will abbreviate  $P_{\underline{t}^n}$  by  $P_T$ . Hence

$$P_T(x^n) = P_{\underline{t}^n}(x^n) . \quad (7.2)$$

Throughout this chapter, let  $V = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ , the set of vertices. Suppose  $\mu$  is a function  $\mu : V \rightarrow V$  such that  $\mu(i) < i$ . Let  $T_\mu = \{\underline{t}_{\mu(i)} \rightarrow \underline{t}_i : i \in V - \{0\}\}$ . Then  $T_\mu$  is a tree that spans ( i.e., it includes all nodes)  $\underline{t}^n$ . Its root node is  $\underline{t}_0$ , because  $\underline{t}_0$  has no parents. All other nodes  $\underline{t}_i$  have exactly one parent, namely  $\underline{t}_{\mu(i)}$ . Let  $P_T$ , the total probability distribution for the tree, be parameterized by the function  $\mu$  as follows:

$$P_T(x^n) = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} P_T(x_i | x_{\mu(i)}) , \quad (7.3)$$

where, for the root node 0,  $P_T(x_0 | x_{\mu(0)}) = P_T(x_0)$ .

**Claim 3**  $D_{KL}(P \parallel P_T)$  is minimized over all probability distributions  $P_T$  that are expressible as Eq.(7.3) iff

$$P_T(x_i|x_{\mu(i)}) = P(x_i|x_{\mu(i)}) \quad (7.4)$$

for all  $i$ , and

$$\sum_i H(\underline{x}_i : \underline{x}_{\mu(i)}) \quad (7.5)$$

is maximized over all  $\mu$ .

**proof:**

$$D_{KL}(P \parallel P_T) = \sum_{x^n} P(x^n) \ln \frac{P(x^n)}{P_T(x^n)} \quad (7.6)$$

$$= - \sum_{x^n} \sum_i P(x^n) \ln P_T(x_i|x_{\mu(i)}) + \sum_i P(x^n) \ln P(x^n) \quad (7.7)$$

$$= - \sum_i \sum_{x_i, x_{\mu(i)}} P(x_i, x_{\mu(i)}) \ln P_T(x_i|x_{\mu(i)}) - H(\underline{x}^n) \quad (7.8)$$

$$= - \sum_i \sum_{x_{\mu(i)}} P(x_{\mu(i)}) \left[ \sum_{x_i} P(x_i|x_{\mu(i)}) \ln P_T(x_i|x_{\mu(i)}) \right] - H(\underline{x}^n) . \quad (7.9)$$

Now note that

$$\sum_{x_i} P(x_i|x_{\mu(i)}) \ln \frac{P(x_i|x_{\mu(i)})}{P_T(x_i|x_{\mu(i)})} \geq 0 \quad (7.10)$$

and this inequality becomes an equality iff

$$P(x_i|x_{\mu(i)}) = P_T(x_i|x_{\mu(i)}) . \quad (7.11)$$

Therefore

$$D_{KL}(P \parallel P_T) \geq - \sum_i \sum_{x_{\mu(i)}} P(x_{\mu(i)}) \underbrace{\left[ \sum_{x_i} P(x_i|x_{\mu(i)}) \ln P(x_i|x_{\mu(i)}) \right]}_{=H(\underline{x}_i|\underline{x}_{\mu(i)})=H(\underline{x}_i:\underline{x}_{\mu(i)})-H(\underline{x}_i)} - H(\underline{x}^n) , \quad (7.12)$$

and this inequality becomes an equality iff Eq.(7.11) is satisfied.

Note from the last equation that

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\mu} D_{KL}(P \parallel P_T) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mu} \sum_i H(\underline{x}_i : \underline{x}_{\mu(i)}) . \quad (7.13)$$

**QED**



**Claim 4**

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\mu} H(\underline{x}^n) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mu} \sum_i H(\underline{x}_i : \underline{x}_{\mu(i)}) \quad (7.14)$$

**proof:**

$$H(\underline{x}^n) = - \sum_{\underline{x}^n} P(\underline{x}^n) \sum_i \ln P(x_i | x_{\mu(i)}) \quad (7.15)$$

$$= - \sum_i \sum_{x_i, x_{\mu(i)}} P(x_i, x_{\mu(i)}) \ln P(x_i | x_{\mu(i)}) \quad (7.16)$$

$$= - \sum_i \sum_{x_i, x_{\mu(i)}} P(x_i, x_{\mu(i)}) \left[ \ln \frac{P(x_i | x_{\mu(i)})}{P(x_i)} + \ln P(x_i) \right] \quad (7.17)$$

$$= - \sum_i [H(\underline{x}_i : \underline{x}_{\mu(i)}) - H(\underline{x}_i)] \quad (7.18)$$

$$= \sum_i H(\underline{x}_i) - \sum_i H(\underline{x}_i : \underline{x}_{\mu(i)}) \quad (7.19)$$

**QED**

The meaning of Claims 3 and 4 is as follows. If  $D_{KL}(P \parallel P_T)$  is minimized over all  $P_T$ , then

1.  $P_T$  inherits its TPM's from  $P$ , and
2.  $P_T$  gets its structure, which is being parameterized by the function  $\mu$ , by maximizing the score given by

$$\text{score} = \sum_i H(\underline{x}_i : \underline{x}_{\mu(i)}) . \quad (7.20)$$

(mutual information  $H(\underline{a} : \underline{b})$  measures correlation between  $\underline{a}$  and  $\underline{b}$ ). Maximizing the score is the same as minimizing the entropy  $H(\underline{x}^n)$  over all the structures  $\mu$ . (i.e., finding least complex structure).

So far, we have studied the properties of those probability distributions  $P_T$  for a tree bnet that best approximates an a priori given probability distribution  $P$ , but we haven't yet described how to build a Chow-Liu tree based on empirical data. Next we give Chow-Liu's algorithm for doing so.

#### 1. Find MST using Kruskal's algorithm<sup>1</sup>. (see Fig.7.1)

Calculate weights  $w_{i,j} = H(\underline{x}_i : \underline{x}_j)$  for all  $i, j \in V$  and store them in a dictionary  $D$  that

---

<sup>1</sup>Kruskal's algorithm is one several famous algorithms (Prim's algo is another one) for finding an MST (maximum or minimum spanning tree). An MST algorithm takes an undirected graph with weights along its edges as input. It then finds a tree subgraph (i.e., subset of the edges of the graph with no loops) that (1) spans the graph (i.e., includes every vertex of the graph) and (2) maximizes (or minimizes) the sum of weights among all possible tree subgraphs. For more information, see Ref[60] and references therein, or any other of numerous explanations of MST in the Internet.

maps edges to weights.

Order  $D$  by weight size.

Let  $T$  be a list of the edges in the tree. Initialize  $T$  to empty.

Repeat this until  $T$  has  $n - 1$  elements:

Remove largest weight  $w$  from  $D$  and corresponding edge  $e$ .

Add  $e$  to  $T$  if  $\{e\} \cup T$  has no loops. Otherwise discard  $e$  and  $w$ .

**2. Give directions to edges in  $T$ . (see Fig.7.2)**

Let  $DT$  be a list of directed edges. Initialize  $DT$  to empty.

Choose any node as root node.

Point arrows along edges in  $T$ , away from root node.

Add new arrows to  $DT$ .

Repeat this until  $DT$  has  $n - 1$  elements:

Point arrows along edges in  $T$ , away from leaf nodes of current  $DT$ .

Add new arrows to  $DT$ .




Figure 7.1: Example of finding MST (maximum spanning tree)




Figure 7.2: Example of giving directions to edges of spanning tree.

Nodes in a Chow-Liu tree can be rated in terms of their relative importance. Here are 2 possible metrics for measuring the importance of a node  $\underline{a}$ :

$$N_{nb}(\underline{a}) = \text{number of neighbors of } \underline{a} \quad (7.21)$$

$$\text{traffic}(\underline{a}) = \sum_{\underline{n} \in nb(\underline{a})} H(\underline{a} : \underline{n}) \quad (7.22)$$

For example, to get a tree with low depth, one can choose as the root node the node which has largest  $N_{nb}$ , and if there are several with the same largest  $N_{nb}$ , choose out of those the one with the largest traffic.

## 7.2 Tree Augmented Naive Bayes (TAN)

Recall from Chapter 32 that a Naive Bayes bnet consists of a class node  $\underline{c}$  with  $n$  children nodes  $\underline{x}^n$ , called the feature nodes. A Tree Augmented Naive Bayes (TAN) bnet is a Naive Bayes bnet with a tree grafted onto it like a chimera. More precisely, one starts with a Naive Bayes bnet and adds arrows between the feature nodes. The arrows are added in such a way that the TAN bnet sans node  $\underline{c}$  constitutes a tree. It's not the most well motivated bnet in human history, but at least it adds a bit of correlation between the feature nodes of the Naive Bayes bnet. Those nodes are independent at fixed  $\underline{c}$  in the Naive Bayes bnet, but are no longer so in the TAN bnet. See Figs.7.3 and 7.4 for an example of a TAN bnet.




Figure 7.3: bnet for Naive Bayes with 4 feature nodes and another bnet for a tree made of the same feature nodes.




Figure 7.4: TAN bnet constructed by merging Naive Bayes bnet and tree bnet of Fig.7.3.

The total probability distribution  $P_{TAN}$  for a TAN bnet can be parameterized as follows.

$$P_{TAN}(x^n, c) = P_{TAN}(c) \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} P_{TAN}(x_i | x_{\mu(i)}, c) . \quad (7.23)$$

As with Chow Liu trees, we can attempt to find a TAN bnet whose total probability  $P_{TAN} = P_{\underline{t}^n, \underline{c}}$  best approximates an a priori given probability distribution  $P = P_{\underline{x}^n, \underline{c}}$ .

Note that

**Claim 5**

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\mu} H(\underline{x}^n, \underline{c}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mu} \sum_i H(x_i : x_{\mu(i)} | \underline{c}) \quad (7.24)$$

**proof:**

$$H(\underline{x}^n, \underline{c}) = - \sum_{x^n, c} P(x^n, c) \left[ \ln P(c) + \sum_i \ln P(x_i | x_{\mu(i)}, c) \right] \quad (7.25)$$

$$= - \sum_{x^n, c} P(x^n, c) \left[ \ln P(c) + \sum_i \ln \left( \frac{P(x_i, x_{\mu(i)} | c)}{P(x_i | c) P(x_{\mu(i)} | c)} P(x_i | c) \right) \right] \quad (7.26)$$

$$= \sum_i H(\underline{x}_i, \underline{c}) - \sum_i H(\underline{x}_i : \underline{x}_{\mu(i)} | \underline{c}) \quad (7.27)$$

**QED**

Following the same line of reasoning that we followed for Chow-Liu trees, we conclude that: If  $D_{KL}(P \parallel P_{TAN})$  is minimized over all  $P_{TAN}$ , then

1.  $P_{TAN}$  inherits its TPM's from  $P$ , and
2.  $P_{TAN}$  gets its structure, which is being parameterized by the function  $\mu$ , by maximizing the score defined by

$$\text{score} = \sum_i H(\underline{x}_i : \underline{x}_{\mu(i)} | \underline{c}) \quad (7.28)$$

One can build a TAN bnet from empirical data as follows:

Calculate a Chow-Liu Tree for each  $c \in S_{\underline{c}}$ . For each of those trees, create a TAN bnet, and calculate its score given by Eq.(7.28). Keep the TAN bnet with the largest score.

# Chapter 8

## Counterfactual Reasoning

This chapter is mostly based on Ref.[23], a 2019 review of causality by Pearl.

This chapter assumes that the reader has read Chapter 11 on do-calculus and Chapter 25 on LDEN (linear deterministic systems with external noise).

### 8.1 The 3 Rungs of Causal AI

According to Judea Pearl, there are 3 rungs in the ladder of causal AI. These are (as I see them):

1. **Observing Dumbly:** Collecting data and fitting curves to it, without any plan designed to investigate Nature’s causal connections.
2. **Doing causal experiments:** Doing experiments consciously designed to elucidate Nature’s causal connections. Even cats do this!, but current AI doesn’t.
3. **Imagining counterfactual situations, Analogizing:** Imagining gedanken experiments to further understand Nature’s causal connections, and to decide what future courses of action are more likely to succeed, even if there is zero direct data for those courses of action. Making predictions based on zero direct data is a very Bayesian concern, well out of the purview of frequentists. Nevertheless, humans do such “analogizing” all the time to great advantage. It becomes possible if there is some indirect but similar data that can be transported (transplanted, applied) to the situation of interest.

Chapter 29 on message passing is about rung 1. Chapter 11 on do-calculus is about rung 2. This chapter is dedicated to rung 3.

### 8.2 Two kinds of intervention operators

In Chapter 11, we introduced a **do operator**  $\rho_{\underline{x}=x}$  ( this is our notation for what Pearl symbolizes by  $do(\underline{x}) = x$ ). The study of counterfactuals requires that we introduce a new kind of intervention operator that we will call an **imagine operator** and denote by  $\kappa_{\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{a}}(x)$ .

The 2 types of intervention operators are defined graphically in Fig.8.1.

- The do operator  $\rho_{\underline{x}=5}$  (called  $\rho$  because it turns  $\underline{x}$  into a root node) amputates the incoming arrows of node  $\underline{x}$  and sets the TPM of the new root node  $\underline{x}$  to a delta function  $\delta(x, 5)$  (or some state of  $\underline{x}$  other than 5). Sometimes it is convenient, rather than calling the new node  $\underline{x}$  like the old one, to call it by the new name  $\rho\underline{x}$ .
- The imagine operator  $\kappa_{\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{b}}(5)$  (called  $\kappa$  because it creates konstant nodes) operates on arrows unlike the  $\rho$  operator which operates on nodes.  $\kappa_{\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{b}}(5)$  deletes arrow  $\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{b}$  and creates a new root node  $\underline{x}'$  and a new arrow  $\underline{x}' \rightarrow \underline{b}$ . The TPM of the new node  $\underline{x}'$  is a delta function  $\delta(x', 5)$  (or some state of  $\underline{x}$  other than 5). Sometimes it is convenient, rather than calling the new node  $\underline{x}'$ , to call it by the more explicit name  $\kappa_{\underline{b}}\underline{x}$ .

Now that we have both a do and an imagine operator, we realize, as Pearl did long ago, that we can create a **do-imagine-calculus** whose objective is to express probabilities such as  $P(\underline{y} | \rho_{\underline{r}} = r, \kappa_{\underline{b}\underline{s}} = s, t)$  in terms of observable probabilities that do not contain any do or imagine operators in them. As with do-calculus, this reduction is not always possible, and we say a probability is **identifiable** if it can be reduced in that manner. Such a do-imagine-calculus has already been developed by Pearl and collaborators, but we won't discuss it in this chapter (perhaps we will discuss it in a future one).




Figure 8.1: Action of “do” operator  $\rho_{\underline{x}=5}$  on node  $\underline{x}$  and of “imagine” operator  $\kappa_{\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{b}}(5)$  on arrow  $\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{b}$ .

### 8.3 Do operator for DEN diagrams

By the end of this chapter, the two kinds of intervention operators will be applied to DEN diagrams. Let us begin that journey by showing in this section how to apply the already familiar do operator to DEN diagrams.

Recall that the structural equations for a linear DEN, as given by Eq.(25.21) of Chapter 25, are:

$$\underline{x} = A\underline{x} + \underline{u} . \quad (8.1)$$

Therefore,

$$\underline{x} = (1 - A)^{-1} \underline{u} \quad (8.2)$$

which can be represented for both linear and non-linear DEN diagrams by:

$$\underline{x}_i = x_i(\underline{u}) \quad (8.3)$$

If now we apply the operator  $\rho_{\underline{a}=a}$  to the diagram described by the structural equations Eqs.8.1, we get the following new structural equations:

$$\underline{x}_i^* = \begin{cases} \sum_{j < i} A_{i|j} \underline{x}_j^* + \underline{u}_i & \text{if } \underline{x}_i \neq \underline{a} \\ a & \text{if } \underline{x}_i = \underline{a} \end{cases} , \quad (8.4)$$

where we are calling  $\underline{x}_i^*$  the nodes of the DEN diagram post intervention.

Eqs.(8.4) can be expressed in matrix notation as follows. Define  $\pi_{\underline{a}}$  to be the  $nx \times nx$  matrix with all entries equal to zero except for the  $(i_0, i_0)$  entry, which is 1. And define  $e_{\underline{a}}$  to be the column vector with all entries zero except for the  $i_0$ 'th one, which is 1. Here  $i_0$  is defined so that  $\underline{x}_{i_0} = \underline{a}$ . In other words,  $\pi_{\underline{a}}$  and  $e_{\underline{a}}$  are defined by

$$(\pi_{\underline{a}})_{i,j} = \mathbb{1}(i = j, \underline{a} = \underline{x}_i) \quad (8.5)$$

and

$$(e_{\underline{a}})_i = \mathbb{1}(\underline{a} = \underline{x}_i) , \quad (8.6)$$

for  $i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, nx - 1\}$ . Next define

$$\pi_{! \underline{a}} = 1 - \pi_{\underline{a}} , \quad (8.7)$$

$$A^* = \pi_{! \underline{a}} A , \quad (8.8)$$

and

$$\underline{u}_{! \underline{a}} = \pi_{! \underline{a}} \underline{u} . \quad (8.9)$$

The effect of pre-multiplying the matrix  $A$  and the column vector  $\underline{u}$  by  $\pi_{! \underline{a}}$  is to leave all rows intact except for the  $i_0$  row, which is set to zero. Here  $i_0$  is defined by  $\underline{a} = \underline{x}_{i_0}$ . Finally, using all of the variables just defined, we can express the structural equations of the linear DEN diagram, post intervention, as

$$\underline{x}^* = A^* \underline{x}^* + \underline{u}_{! \underline{a}} + a e_{\underline{a}} . \quad (8.10)$$

Thus,

$$\underline{x}^* = (1 - A^*)^{-1}(\underline{u}_{!a} + ae_a) . \quad (8.11)$$

which can be represented for both linear and non-linear DEN diagrams by:

$$\underline{x}_i^* = x_i^*(\underline{u}_{!a}, a) . \quad (8.12)$$

For any bnet,

$$P(\underline{y} = y | \underline{x} = x) = P_G(\underline{y} = y | \underline{x} = x) \quad (8.13)$$

$$P(\underline{y} = y | \rho \underline{x} = x) = P_{\rho \underline{x} = x G}(\underline{y} = y) \quad (8.14)$$

**Claim 6** *For a non-linear DEN diagram,*

$$P(y | \rho \underline{x} = x) = E [\delta[y, y(\underline{u}_{!x}, x)]] . \quad (8.15)$$

**proof:**

$$P(\underline{y} = y | \rho \underline{x} = x) = P_{\rho \underline{x} = x G}(\underline{y} = y) \quad (8.16)$$

$$= \sum_{\underline{u}_{!x}} P(\underline{u}_{!x}) P_{\rho \underline{x} = x G}(\underline{y} = y | \underline{u}_{!x}) \quad (8.17)$$

$$= \sum_{\underline{u}_{!x}} P(\underline{u}_{!x}) \delta[y, y(\underline{u}_{!x}, x)] \quad (8.18)$$

$$= E_{\underline{u}_{!x}} [\delta[y, y(\underline{u}_{!x}, x)]] \quad (8.19)$$

$$= E[\delta[y, y(\underline{u}_{!x}, x)]] \quad (8.20)$$

**QED**

**Claim 7** *For a nonlinear DEN diagram,*

$$E[y | \rho \underline{x} = x] = E[y(\underline{u}_{!x}, x)] . \quad (8.21)$$

**proof:**

$$E[y | \rho \underline{x} = x] = \sum_y y P(\underline{y} = y | \rho \underline{x} = x) \quad (8.22)$$

$$= \sum_y y E[\delta[y, y(\underline{u}_{!x}, x)]] \quad (8.23)$$

$$= E[y(\underline{u}_{!x}, x)] \quad (8.24)$$



**QED**

For any bnet

$$P(y|\rho_{\underline{x}} = x, z) = \frac{P(y, z|\rho_{\underline{x}} = x)}{P(z|\rho_{\underline{x}} = x)} = P_{\rho_{\underline{x}}=xG}(y|x, z) \quad (8.25)$$

For a nonlinear DEN diagram,

$$P(y, z|\rho_{\underline{x}} = x) = \sum_{u_{\underline{x}}} P(u_{\underline{x}}) \delta[y, y(u_{\underline{x}}, x)] \delta[z, z(u_{\underline{x}}, x)] \quad (8.26)$$

$$P(z|\rho_{\underline{x}} = x) = \sum_{u_{\underline{x}}} P(u_{\underline{x}}) \delta[z, z(u_{\underline{x}}, x)] . \quad (8.27)$$

## 8.4 Mediation Analysis

In the previous section, we applied the do operator to DEN diagrams. Mediation analysis is a nice example which applies both do and imagine operators to DEN diagrams.




Figure 8.2: Graphs  $G$  and  $G^*$  are used to discuss mediation. In graph  $G$ , the exogenous variables are independent, whereas in graph  $G^*$  they are not.

The term “mediation analysis” refers to the analysis of the DEN diagram  $G$  in Fig.8.2. In that diagram, node  $\underline{t}$  influences node  $\underline{y}$  both directly and via the mediator node  $\underline{m}$ . The structural equations for that diagram are of the form:

$$\underline{t} = \underline{u}_t \quad (8.28a)$$

$$\underline{m} = f_m(\underline{t}, \underline{u}_m) \quad (8.28b)$$

$$\underline{y} = f_y(\underline{t}, \underline{m}, \underline{u}_y) . \quad (8.28c)$$

Thus,

$$\underline{y} = f_y(u_t, f_m(u_t, u_m), u_y) . \quad (8.29)$$




Figure 8.3: Graph  $G$  of Fig.8.2 after applying do operator  $\rho_{\underline{t}=5}$  and imagine operator  $\kappa_{\underline{t} \rightarrow \underline{m}}(5)$ .

If we apply  $\rho_{\underline{t}=5}G$  to Eqs.(8.28), we get

$$\underline{t} = 5 \quad (8.30a)$$

$$\underline{m} = f_{\underline{m}}(\underline{t}, \underline{u}_{\underline{m}}) \quad (8.30b)$$

$$\underline{y} = f_{\underline{y}}(\underline{t}, \underline{m}, \underline{u}_{\underline{y}}) . \quad (8.30c)$$

Eqs.8.30 are represented graphically in Fig.8.3. We will often denote the random variable  $\underline{y}$  in Eqs.(8.30) by the more explicit symbol  $\underline{y}_{\rho_{\underline{t}=5}G}$ . Pearl often refers to this  $\underline{y}$  by the less explicit symbol  $Y_5$  or  $Y_5(u)$  where  $Y = \underline{y}$  and  $u = (u_{\underline{m}}, u_{\underline{y}}) = u_{\underline{t}}$ .

If we apply  $\kappa_{\underline{t} \rightarrow \underline{m}}(5)G$  to Eqs.(8.28), we get

$$\underline{t} = \underline{u}_{\underline{t}} \quad (8.31a)$$

$$\underline{m} = f_{\underline{m}}(5, \underline{u}_{\underline{m}}) \quad (8.31b)$$

$$\underline{y} = f_{\underline{y}}(\underline{t}, \underline{m}, \underline{u}_{\underline{y}}) . \quad (8.31c)$$

Eqs.8.31 are represented graphically in Fig.8.3. We will often denote the random variable  $\underline{y}$  in Eqs.(8.31) by the more explicit symbol  $\underline{y}_{\kappa_{\underline{t} \rightarrow \underline{m}}(5)G}$ . Pearl often refers to this  $\underline{y}$  by the less explicit symbol  $Y_5$  or  $Y_5(u)$  where  $Y = \underline{y}$  and  $u = (u_{\underline{t}}, u_{\underline{m}}, u_{\underline{y}})$ .

---

Define the Total Effect (TE), and the Controlled Direct Effect (CDE) by

$$TE = E[\underline{y}_{\rho_{\underline{t}=1}G} - \underline{y}_{\rho_{\underline{t}=0}G}] \quad (8.32)$$

$$CDE(m) = E[\underline{y}_{\rho_{\underline{t}=1}\rho_{\underline{m}=m}G} - \underline{y}_{\rho_{\underline{t}=0}\rho_{\underline{m}=m}G}] \quad (8.33)$$

The two DEN diagrams  $\rho_{\underline{t}=t}G$  and  $\rho_{\underline{t}=t}\rho_{\underline{m}=m}G$  used in the definitions of  $TE$  and  $CDE$  are given in Fig.8.4.

---

Let

$$\mathcal{Y}_a^b = E[\underline{y}_{\kappa_{\underline{t} \rightarrow \underline{y}}(a)\kappa_{\underline{t} \rightarrow \underline{m}}(b)G}] \quad (8.34)$$




Figure 8.4: Graph  $G$  of Fig.8.2 after applying the do operators  $\rho_{\underline{t}=\underline{t}}$  and  $\rho_{\underline{t}=\underline{t}}\rho_{\underline{m}=\underline{m}}$ .




Figure 8.5: Graph  $G$  of Fig.8.2 after applying the imagine operator  $\kappa$  to arrows  $\underline{t} \rightarrow \underline{m}$  and  $\underline{t} \rightarrow \underline{y}$ .

Fig.8.5 shows the diagram  $\kappa_{\underline{t} \rightarrow \underline{y}}(a)\kappa_{\underline{t} \rightarrow \underline{m}}(b)G$  used in the definition of  $\mathcal{Y}_a^b$ .

Now define the Natural Direct Effect (NDE), and the Natural Indirect Effect (NIE) by

$$NDE = \mathcal{Y}_1^0 - \mathcal{Y}_0^0 \quad (8.35)$$

$$NIE(t) = \mathcal{Y}_t^1 - \mathcal{Y}_t^0. \quad (8.36)$$

Note that

$$NDE + NIE(1) = (\mathcal{Y}_1^0 - \mathcal{Y}_0^0) + (\mathcal{Y}_1^1 - \mathcal{Y}_1^0) \quad (8.37)$$

$$= \mathcal{Y}_1^1 - \mathcal{Y}_0^0 \quad (8.38)$$

$$= TE. \quad (8.39)$$

# Chapter 9

## Decision Trees




Figure 9.1: Typical decision tree.




Figure 9.2: Bnet corresponding to decision tree Fig.9.1

Fig.9.1 shows a typical decision tree (dtree). The yellow rectangles pose questions. In general, the answers to those questions can be multiple choices with more than two choices, but in Fig.9.1 we have chosen the simplest case of only two choices, true or false. The purple diamonds represent endpoints, goals, final conclusions, single states of reality, etc.

A trivial observation that is often not made in dtree educational literature is that every dtree maps into a special bnet, let's call it its “image” bnet, in a very natural way. To get the image bnet, just follow the following simple steps:

1. **Keep the yellow question nodes but reinterpret them as bnet nodes. Reinterpret the connections among the dtree question nodes as arrows pointing down from the root node.**

The image bnet nodes have 3 states, 0 = *no* and 1 = *yes* and *null*. Table 9.1 gives the node TPM  $[P(x|a)]_{x \in \{0,1,null\}, a \in \{0,1,null\}}$  where  $p_1 \in [0, 1]$  can be different for each node and is given in the info that specifies the dtree. In Table 9.1,  $a_0 = 0$  if the dtree node being replaced has input “no” and  $a_0 = 1$  if its input is “yes”.  $!a_0$  means not  $a_0$  (i.e.,  $!a_0 = 1 - a_0$ ).

2. **This method of naming the image bnet nodes is not necessary but a good practice.** Give as name to each image bnet node an abridged version of the question that labels the dtree node it is replacing. Use as a suffix to the name of a bnet node either a 0 or a 1 depending whether the dtree node it is replacing has a 0 or a 1 as input. This suffix is not necessary because its info is already encoded into which column of the node TPM has zero probability for the *null* state, but it's a redundancy which makes the bnet easier to read and understand.
3. **Erase the purple endpoint nodes and connectors to them.** The info in each endpoint node can be preserved by storing it as a descriptor (e.g., tool tip) for the output states of the leaf node that is the parent to the endpoint in the image bnet. The endpoint info can be added to the descriptor of the *no* = 0 state if the endpoint has 0 as input or to the descriptor of the *yes* = 1 state if the endpoint has 1 as input.

$P(x a)$	$a = a_0$	$a = !a_0$	$a = null$
$x = 0$	$1 - p_1$	0	0
$x = 1$	$p_1$	0	0
$x = null$	0	1	1

Table 9.1: Transition probability matrix of a node of a dtree image bnet.

Table 9.2 describes the node types commonly used in dtrees.

When drawing dtrees, some people put info like explanations and probabilities on the connectors between the nodes of the dtree. That info can all be preserved in the TPM and the descriptors of the node names and node state names of the image bnet nodes. Often, the educational literature states that dtrees are more explicit and carry more info than their image bnets, but if one follows the above prescriptions, both can carry the same info.

A deterministic node commonly used in dtrees is one that asks the question  $x < \alpha?$ . for some real number  $\alpha \in (L, U)$  and some variable  $x$  (for example,  $x$  = height of a person). For such an interval splitting node, the TPM would be as given in Table 9.3. If the interval  $[L, U]$  is binned into a number  $nbins$  of bins, then this TPM will have dimensions  $(nbins + 1) \times$  ( the number of states of the parent node).

<b>dtree node types (usual shape in parenthesis)</b>	<b>their node TPM <math>P(x a)</math> in image bnet</b>
chance node (oval)	$P(x a)$ arbitrary. random
decision node (square)	$P(x a) = \delta(x, f(a))$ where $f(\cdot)$ is a function of $a$ . deterministic
endpoint node (diamond)	no $P(x a)$
fixed node	$P(x a) = \delta(x, x_0)$ . $x_0$ does not depend on $a$ whereas for decision node it does. deterministic.

Table 9.2: dtree node types.

$P(x a)$	states of parent node with $a = a_0$	states of parent node with $a \neq a_0$	$a = null$
$[x \in bin]_{\forall bin \subset [L, \alpha]}$	1	0	0
$[x \in bin]_{\forall bin \subset [\alpha, U]}$	0	0	0
$x = null$	0	1	1

Table 9.3: Transition probability matrix for interval splitting node.

A naive Bayes bnet (see Chapter 32) consists of a single “class” node that fans out with arrows pointing to other “feature” nodes. If each leaf node of a naive Bayes bnet fans out into a set of new leaf nodes, and those new leaf nodes also fan out and so on recursively, we get a tree bnet. The bnet that arises from this recursive application of naive Bayes has the same graph structure as the image bnet of a dtree. However, it is more general because its node TPMs are more general; it has more weights (weight= parameters of node TPMs) than a dtree with the same graph.

# Chapter 10

## Digital Circuits




Figure 10.1: Typical digital circuit of NAND gates.

**Digital (logic) gate:** node with  $na$  input ports and  $nx$  output ports which represents a function

$$f : \{0, 1\}^{na} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{nx} . \quad (10.1)$$

Suppose

$a^{na} = (a_i)_{i=0,1,\dots,na-1}$  where  $a_i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,

$x^{nx} = (x_i)_{i=0,1,\dots,nx-1}$  where  $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$ .

$f$  maps  $a^{na}$  into  $x^{nx}$ .

**Digital circuit (dcircuit)** = circuit of digital gates.




Figure 10.2: 2 options for mapping dcircuit node with multiple output ports into bnet.

## 10.1 Mapping any dcircuit to a bnet

### 10.1.1 Option A of Fig.10.2

1. Replace every dcircuit gate described by Eq.(10.1) by  $nx$  bnet nodes  $\underline{x}_i$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, nx - 1$  such that

$$P(x_i | a^{na}) = \delta(x_i, f_i(a^{na})) \quad (10.2)$$

2. Replace all connectors of the dcircuit by arrows pointing in the direction of the bit flow.

### 10.1.2 Option B of Fig.10.2

1. Replace every dcircuit gate described by Eq.(10.1) with one bnet node called  $\underline{x}^{nx}$  and, if  $nx > 0$ ,  $nx$  “marginalizer nodes”  $\underline{m}_i$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, nx - 1$ , such that

$$P(x^{nx} | a^{na}) = \delta(x^{nx}, f(a^{na})) , \quad (10.3)$$

and

$$P(m_i | x^{nx}) = \delta(m_i, x_i) . \quad (10.4)$$

2. Replace all connectors of the dcircuit by arrows pointing in the direction of the bit flow.

---

Options A and B don't work for digital circuits with feedback loops such as flip-flops. Those could probably be modeled with dynamical bnets.



# Chapter 11

## Do-Calculus

The do-calculus and associated ideas were invented by Judea Pearl and collaborators. This chapter is based on Judea Pearl's books. (See chapter 0.1.2).

When doing do-calculus, it is convenient to separate the nodes of a bnet into 2 types: **visible (observed)**, and **non-visible (not observed, latent, hidden)**, depending on whether data describing the state of that node is available (visible) or not (non-visible). In this chapter, hidden nodes will be indicated in a bnet diagram by either: (1) enclosing their random variable in a box (as if it were inside a black box) or (2) making the arrows coming out of them dashed. Accordingly, the 3 diagrams in Fig.11.1 all mean the same thing.

A **confounder node**  $\underline{c}$  for nodes  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$  is a root node with arrows pointing from it to both  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$ . Thus,  $\underline{c}$  acts as a common cause of  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$ . The node  $\underline{c}$  in Fig.11.1) is an **unobserved confounder node**.

In this book, we will refer to a path all of whose nodes are observed as an **opath**.




Figure 11.1: These 3 diagrams are equivalent. They mean that node  $\underline{c}$  is hidden. Node  $\underline{c}$  is implicit in the middle diagram.

Define an operator  $\rho_{\underline{x}}$  that acts on a node  $\underline{x}$  of a bnet to delete all the arrows entering  $\underline{x}$ , thus converting  $\underline{x}$  into a new node  $\rho_{\underline{x}}$  that is a root node. Define an analogous operator  $\lambda_{\underline{x}}$  that acts on a node  $\underline{x}$  of a bnet to delete all the arrows leaving  $\underline{x}$ , thus converting  $\underline{x}$  into a new node  $\lambda_{\underline{x}}$  that is a leaf node.  $\rho_{\underline{x}}$  and  $\lambda_{\underline{x}}$  are depicted in Fig.11.2.

If you don't know yet what we mean by a multi-node  $\underline{a}$ ., see Chapter chapter 0.23

Given a bnet  $G$ , we define as follows the operators  $\rho_{\underline{a}}$  and  $\lambda_{\underline{a}}$  for a multi-node  $\underline{a}$ ..

$$\rho_{\underline{a}}.G = \left[ \prod_j \rho_{\underline{a}_j} \right] G, \quad \lambda_{\underline{a}}.G = \left[ \prod_j \lambda_{\underline{a}_j} \right] G. \quad (11.1)$$



Figure 11.2: The operator  $\rho_{\underline{x}}$  converts node  $\underline{x}$  into a root node  $\rho_{\underline{x}}$ . The operator  $\lambda_{\underline{x}}$  converts node  $\underline{x}$  into a leaf node  $\lambda_{\underline{x}}$ .

Consider a bnet whose totality of nodes is labeled  $\underline{X}..$  Recall that

$$P(X.) = \prod_j P(X_j | (X_k)_{k: \underline{X}_k \in pa(\underline{X}_j)}) . \quad (11.2)$$

Define an operator  $\rho$  that acts as follows<sup>1</sup>: Let  $X. - a. = (X_k)_{k: \underline{X}_k \notin \underline{a}.}$

$$P(X. - a. | \rho \underline{a}. = a.) = \mathcal{N}(! (X. - a.)) \frac{P(X.)}{\prod_{j: \underline{X}_j \in \underline{a}.} P(X_j | (X_k)_{k: \underline{X}_k \in pa(\underline{X}_j)})} \quad (11.3)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(! (X. - a.)) \prod_{j: \underline{X}_j \notin \underline{a}.} P(X_j | (X_k)_{k: \underline{X}_k \in pa(\underline{X}_j)}) \quad (11.4)$$

$$\neq P(X. - a. | \underline{a}. = a.) . \quad (11.5)$$

Also,

$$P(X. - a., \rho \underline{a}. = a'.) = P(X. - a. | \rho \underline{a}. = a.) \delta(a', a.) . \quad (11.6)$$

In words, we replace the TPM for multinode  $\underline{a}. by a deterministic prior distribution.$

For instance, for the bnet

$$\underline{x} \longrightarrow \underline{y} \quad (11.7)$$

with

$$P(x, y) = P(y|x)P(x) , \quad (11.8)$$

one has

$$P(y | \rho \underline{x} = x) = P(y|x) \quad (11.9)$$

and

$$P(x | \rho \underline{y} = y) = P(x) . \quad (11.10)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>As usual,  $\mathcal{N}(!x)$  denotes a constant that is independent of  $x$ .

This means that  $\underline{x}$  causes  $\underline{y}$  and  $\underline{y}$  does not cause  $\underline{x}$ .  
For the bnet

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \underline{c} & \\ & \downarrow & \searrow \\ \underline{x} & \longrightarrow & \underline{y} \end{array} \quad (11.11)$$

with

$$P(x, y, c) = P(y|x, c)P(x|c)P(c) , \quad (11.12)$$

one has

$$P(y, c|\rho\underline{x} = x) = P(y|x, c)P(c) . \quad (11.13)$$

Hence,

$$P(y|\rho\underline{x} = x) = \sum_c P(y|x, c)P(c) . \quad (11.14)$$

This is called **adjusting the parents of  $\underline{x}$** .

For  $\underline{b} \subset \underline{X} - \underline{a}$ ., define

$$P(b|\rho\underline{a} = a.) = \sum_{X.-a.-b.} P(X.-a.|\rho\underline{a} = a.) , \quad (11.15)$$

and for  $\underline{s} \subset \underline{X} - \underline{a} - \underline{b}$ ., define

$$P(b|\rho\underline{a} = a., s.) = \frac{P(b., s.|\rho\underline{a} = a.)}{P(s.|\rho\underline{a} = a.)} . \quad (11.16)$$

$P(b|\rho\underline{a} = a., s.)$  is usually denoted instead by  $P(b|do(\underline{a} = a.), s.)$ . I prefer to use  $\rho$  instead of  $do()$  to remind me that it generates root nodes. I'll still call  $\rho$  a **do operator**.

In  $P(y|\rho\underline{x} = x)$ , node  $\underline{x}$  is turned into a root node. This guarantees that there is no confounding node connecting  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$ . Such confounding nodes are unwelcomed when calculating causal effects between the 2 variables  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$  because they introduce non-causal correlations between the two. This is also what happens in a **Randomized Clinical Trial (RCT)**. In a RCT with treatment  $\underline{x}$ , the value of  $\underline{x}$  for each patient is determined by a coin toss, effectively turning  $\underline{x}$  into a root node. Hence, the do operator mimics a RCT.

$P(b|\rho\underline{a} = a., s.)$  is said to be **identifiable** (i.e., calculable) if it can be expressed in terms of probability distributions that only depend on observed variables and that have no do operators in them. For example,  $P(y|\rho\underline{x} = x)$  is identifiable for the bnet

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \underline{z} & \\ & \downarrow & \searrow \\ \underline{x} & \longrightarrow & \underline{y} \end{array} \quad (11.17)$$

but it is non-identifiable for the bnet



For  $\underline{x}, \underline{y} \in \{0, 1\}$ , the **average controlled effect (ACE)** is defined as

$$ACE = P(y = 1 | \rho \underline{x} = 1) - P(y = 1 | \rho \underline{x} = 0) \quad (11.19)$$

and the **Risk Difference (RD)** as

$$RD = P(y = 1 | \underline{x} = 1) - P(y = 1 | \underline{x} = 0) . \quad (11.20)$$

## 11.1 Parent Adjustment

Suppose that  $\underline{x}, \underline{y}, \underline{z}$  are disjoint multinodes and their union equals the totality of all nodes of a bnet. Suppose we have data available that allows us to estimate  $P(x., y., z.)$ . Hence, all nodes of the bnet are observable. Furthermore, suppose  $\underline{z} = pa(\underline{x})$ . In other words, we are considering the bnet



Then

$$P(y., z. | \rho \underline{x} = x.) = P(y. | x., z.) P(z.) \quad (11.22)$$

so

$$P(y. | \rho \underline{x} = x.) = \sum_{z.} P(y. | x., z.) P(z.) . \quad (11.23)$$

This is called **adjusting the parents** of  $\underline{x}.$

We say that we are **adjusting or controlling a variable  $\underline{a}$**  if we condition a probability on  $\underline{a}$  and then we average that probability over  $\underline{a}$ . More generally, we can adjust a whole multinode  $\underline{a}$  together.

Later on, we will introduce a generalization of this parent adjustment called the backdoor adjustment. In a backdoor adjustment, the adjusted multinode is not necessarily the parents of  $\underline{x}.$ , and  $P(x., y., z.)$  need not represent the whole bnet.

## 11.2 3 Rules of do-calculus

Throughout this section, suppose  $\underline{a}, \underline{b}, \underline{r}, \underline{s}$  are disjoint multinodes in a bnet  $G$ .

Recall from Chapter 12 on d-separation, that  $(\underline{b} \perp_G \underline{a} | \underline{r}, \underline{s})$  means that we have established from the d-separation rules that all paths in  $G$  from  $\underline{a}$  to  $\underline{b}$  are blocked if we condition on  $\underline{r} \cup \underline{s}$ . Recall also that:

- **Rule 0:** Insertion or deletion of observations, without do operators. ( $\underline{a} = a. \leftrightarrow 1$ )  
If  $(\underline{b} \perp_G \underline{a} | \underline{r}, \underline{s})$ , then  $P(b | a., r., s.) = P(b | r., s.)$

The 3 rules of do-calculus can be presented in the same format.

- **Rule 1:** Insertion or deletion of observations ( $\underline{a} = a. \leftrightarrow 1$ )  
If  $(\underline{b} \perp \underline{a} | \underline{r}, \underline{s})$  in  $\rho_{\underline{r}} G$ , then  $P(b | a., \rho_{\underline{r}} = r., s.) = P(b | \rho_{\underline{r}} = r., s.)$ .
- **Rule 2:** Action or observation exchange ( $\rho \underline{a} = a. \leftrightarrow \underline{a} = a.$ )  
If  $(\underline{b} \perp \underline{a} | \underline{r}, \underline{s})$  in  $\lambda_{\underline{a}, \rho_{\underline{r}}} G$ , then  $P(b | \rho \underline{a} = a., \rho_{\underline{r}} = r., s.) = P(b | a., \rho_{\underline{r}} = r., s.)$ .
- **Rule 3:** Insertion and deletion of actions ( $\rho \underline{a} = a. \leftrightarrow 1$ )  
If  $(\underline{b} \perp \underline{a} | \underline{r}, \underline{s})$  in  $\rho_{\underline{a} - an(\underline{s})} \rho_{\underline{r}} G$ , then  $P(b | \rho \underline{a} = a., \rho_{\underline{r}} = r., s.) = P(b | \rho_{\underline{r}} = r., s.)$ .

These rules have been proven to be sufficient for removing all do operators from an expression for which it is possible to do so.

Next we discuss two theorems that can be proven using do-calculus: the backdoor and the front-door adjustment theorems.

The backdoor theorem adjusts one multinode and the front-door theorem adjusts two.

## 11.3 Backdoor Adjustment

See Chapter 2 for examples of the use of the backdoor adjustment theorem. In this section, we shall mainly be concerned with proving this theorem using do-calculus.

For any two disjoint multinodes  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$ , we define a **backdoor path** from  $\underline{x}$  to  $\underline{y}$  as a path from  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$  that starts with an arrow pointing into  $\underline{x}$ ,

Suppose that we have access to data that allows us to estimate a probability distribution  $P(x., y., z.)$ . Hence, the variables  $\underline{x}, \underline{y}, \underline{z}$  are ALL the observed (i.e, not hidden). Then we say that the backdoor  $\underline{z}$  satisfies the **backdoor adjustment criterion** relative to  $(\underline{x}, \underline{y})$  if

1. All backdoor paths from  $\underline{x}$  to  $\underline{y}$  are blocked by  $\underline{z}$ .
2.  $\underline{z} \cap de(\underline{x}) = \emptyset$ .

**Motivation for BD criterion:** Part 1 rules out paths from  $\underline{x}$  to  $\underline{y}$  containing a fork node (confounder) which, if not blocked by  $\underline{z}$ ., would introduce a non-causal correlation (confounder bias). Part 2 rules out a directed path from  $\underline{x}$  to  $\underline{y}$  that has a mediator node blocked by  $\underline{z}$ ., or a collider node unblocked by  $\underline{z}$ ..

**Claim 8** *Backdoor Adjustment Theorem*

*If  $\underline{z}$ ., satisfies the backdoor criterion relative to  $(\underline{x}, \underline{y})$ , then*

$$P(y. | \rho \underline{x}. = x.) = \sum_{z.} P(y. | x., z.) P(z.) \quad (11.24)$$

$$= \sum_{z.} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \underline{z}. = z. \\ \searrow \\ \underline{x}. = x. \longrightarrow \underline{y}. \end{array} \right\} \quad (11.25)$$

**proof:**

For simplicity, let us omit the dots from the multinodes. If  $z$  satisfies the backdoor criterion relative to  $(\underline{x}, \underline{y})$ , then  $\underline{x}, \underline{y}, \underline{z}$  must have the following structure.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{z} & & \\ \downarrow & \searrow & \\ \underline{x} & \longrightarrow & \underline{y} \end{array} \quad (11.26)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(y|\rho\bar{x} = x) = \\
& = \sum_m P(y|\rho\bar{x} = x, z)P(z|\rho\bar{x} = x) \\
& \quad \text{by Probability Axioms} \\
& = \sum_P (y|x, z)P(z|\rho\bar{x} = x) \\
& \quad P(y|\rho\bar{x} = x, z) \rightarrow P(y|x, z) \\
& \quad \text{by Rule 2: If } (\underline{b} \perp \underline{a} | \underline{r}, \underline{s}) \text{ in } \lambda_{\underline{a}, \rho_{\underline{r}}} G, \text{ then } P(b|\rho_{\underline{a}} = a., \rho_{\underline{r}} = r., s.) = P(b|a., \rho_{\underline{r}} = r., s.). \\
& \quad \underline{y} \perp \underline{x} | \underline{z} \text{ in } \lambda_{\underline{x}} G \quad \begin{array}{c} \underline{z} \\ \downarrow \quad \searrow \\ \underline{x} \quad \underline{y} \end{array} \\
& = \sum_z P(y|x, z)P(z) \\
& \quad P(z|\rho\bar{x} = x) \rightarrow P(z) \\
& \quad \text{by Rule 3: If } (\underline{b} \perp \underline{a} | \underline{r}, \underline{s}) \text{ in } \rho_{\underline{a}, -an(\underline{s})} \rho_{\underline{r}} G, \text{ then } P(b|\rho_{\underline{a}} = a., \rho_{\underline{r}} = r., s.) = P(b|\rho_{\underline{r}} = r., s.). \\
& \quad \underline{z} \perp \underline{x} \text{ in } \rho_{\underline{x}} G \quad \begin{array}{c} \underline{z} \\ \searrow \\ \underline{x} \longrightarrow \underline{y} \end{array}
\end{aligned} \tag{11.27}$$

**QED**

Note that the backdoor adjustment formula can be written as

$$P(y|\rho\bar{x} = x) = \sum_{z.} P(y|x., z.)P(z.) \tag{11.28}$$

$$= \sum_{z.} \frac{P(y., x., z.)}{P(x.|z.)} \tag{11.29}$$

This assumes  $P(x.|z.) \neq 0$  for all  $x., z..$  This assumption is referred to as **positivity**, and is violated if  $P(x.|z.) = \delta(x., x.(z.))$ .  $P(x.|z.)$  is called the **propensity score** of  $x.$  given  $z..$  This equation does **inverse probability weighting**. One can approximate  $P(x.|z.)$  in this equation to get an approximation to  $P(y|\rho\bar{x} = x)$ .

## 11.4 Front Door Adjustment

See Chapter 15 for examples of the use of the front-door adjustment theorem. In this section, we shall mainly be concerned with proving this theorem using do-calculus.

Suppose that we have access to data that allows us to estimate a probability distribution  $P(x., m., y.)$ . Hence, the variables  $\underline{x}., \underline{m}., \underline{y}.$  are ALL the observed (i.e., not hidden). Then we say that the front-door  $\underline{m}.$  satisfies the **front-door adjustment criterion** relative to  $(\underline{x}., \underline{y}.)$  if

1. All directed paths from  $\underline{x}.$  to  $\underline{y}.$  are intercepted by (i.e., have a node in)  $\underline{m}..$

2. All backdoor paths from  $\underline{x}.$  to  $\underline{m}.$  are blocked (by  $\emptyset$ ).
3. All backdoor paths from on  $\underline{m}.$  to  $\underline{y}.$  are blocked by  $\underline{x}.$ .

**Claim 9** *Front-Door Adjustment Theorem*

If  $\underline{m}.$  satisfies the front-door criterion relative to  $(\underline{x}., \underline{y}.)$ , and  $P(x., m.) > 0$ , then

$$P(y. | \rho \underline{x} = x.) = \sum_{m.} \underbrace{\left[ \sum_{x'.} P(y. | x'., m.) P(x'.) \right]}_{P(y. | \rho \underline{m} = m.)} \underbrace{P(m. | x.)}_{P(m. | \rho \underline{x} = x.)} \quad (11.30)$$

$$= \sum_{m., x'.} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \underline{x} = x'. \\ \searrow \\ \underline{x} = x. \longrightarrow \underline{m} = m. \longrightarrow \underline{y}. \end{array} \right\} \quad (11.31)$$

**proof:** (See also Ref.[18] for a proof of the Front-Door Adjustment Theorem without using do-calculus.)

For simplicity, let us omit the dots from the multinodes. If  $\underline{m}$  satisfies the front-door criterion relative to  $(\underline{x}, \underline{y})$ , then  $\underline{x}, \underline{m}, \underline{y}$  must have the following structure, where node  $\underline{c}$  is hidden.



Continues in next page.



$$\begin{aligned}
& P(y|\rho x = x) = \\
= & \sum_m P(y|\rho x = x, m)P(m|\rho x = x) \\
& \text{by Probability Axioms} \\
= & \sum_m P(y|\rho x = x, \rho m = m)P(m|\rho x = x) \\
& P(y|\rho x = x, m) \rightarrow P(y|\rho x = x, \rho m = m) \\
& \text{by Rule 2: If } (b. \perp a. | r., s.) \text{ in } \lambda_{\underline{a}.} \rho_{\underline{r}.} G, \text{ then } P(b. | \rho \underline{a}. = a., \rho_{\underline{r}.} = r., s.) = P(b. | a., \rho_{\underline{r}.} = r., s.). \\
& \underline{y} \perp \underline{m} | \underline{x} \text{ in } \lambda_{\underline{m}} \rho_{\underline{x}} G \quad \boxed{\underline{c}} \begin{array}{c} \searrow \\ \underline{y} \end{array} \\
& \quad \underline{x} \longrightarrow \underline{m} \\
= & \sum_m P(y|\rho x = x, \rho m = m)P(m|x) \\
& P(m|\rho x = x) \rightarrow P(m|x) \\
& \text{by Rule 2: If } (b. \perp a. | r., s.) \text{ in } \lambda_{\underline{a}.} \rho_{\underline{r}.} G, \text{ then } P(b. | \rho \underline{a}. = a., \rho_{\underline{r}.} = r., s.) = P(b. | a., \rho_{\underline{r}.} = r., s.). \\
& \underline{m} \perp \underline{x} \text{ in } \lambda_{\underline{x}} G \quad \boxed{\underline{c}} \begin{array}{cc} \swarrow & \searrow \\ \underline{x} & \underline{m} \longrightarrow \underline{y} \end{array} \\
= & \sum_m P(y|\rho m = m)P(m|x) \\
& P(y|\rho x = x, \rho m = m) \rightarrow P(y|\rho m = m) \\
& \text{by Rule 3: If } (b. \perp a. | r., s.) \text{ in } \rho_{\underline{a}. - an(\underline{s}.)} \rho_{\underline{r}.} G, \text{ then } P(b. | \rho \underline{a}. = a., \rho_{\underline{r}.} = r., s.) = P(b. | \rho_{\underline{r}.} = r., s.). \\
& \underline{y} \perp \underline{x} | \underline{m} \text{ in } \rho_{\underline{x}} \rho_{\underline{m}} G \quad \boxed{\underline{c}} \begin{array}{c} \searrow \\ \underline{y} \end{array} \\
& \quad \underline{x} \quad \underline{m} \longrightarrow \underline{y} \\
= & \sum_{x'} \sum_m P(y|\rho m = m, x')P(x'|\rho m = m)P(m|x) \\
& \text{by Probability Axioms} \\
= & \sum_{x'} \sum_m P(y|m, x')P(x'|\rho m = m)P(m|x) \\
& P(y|\rho m = m, x') \rightarrow P(y|m, x') \\
& \text{by Rule 2: If } (b. \perp a. | r., s.) \text{ in } \lambda_{\underline{a}.} \rho_{\underline{r}.} G, \text{ then } P(b. | \rho \underline{a}. = a., \rho_{\underline{r}.} = r., s.) = P(b. | a., \rho_{\underline{r}.} = r., s.). \\
& \underline{y} \perp \underline{m} | \underline{x} \text{ in } \lambda_{\underline{m}} G \quad \boxed{\underline{c}} \begin{array}{cc} \swarrow & \searrow \\ \underline{x} \longrightarrow \underline{m} & \underline{y} \end{array} \\
= & \sum_{x'} \sum_m P(y|m, x')P(x')P(m|x) \\
& P(x'|\rho m = m) \rightarrow P(x') \\
& \text{by Rule 3: If } (b. \perp a. | r., s.) \text{ in } \rho_{\underline{a}. - an(\underline{s}.)} \rho_{\underline{r}.} G, \text{ then } P(b. | \rho \underline{a}. = a., \rho_{\underline{r}.} = r., s.) = P(b. | \rho_{\underline{r}.} = r., s.). \\
& \underline{x} \perp \underline{m} \text{ in } \rho_{\underline{m}} G \quad \boxed{\underline{c}} \begin{array}{cc} \swarrow & \searrow \\ \underline{x} & \underline{m} \longrightarrow \underline{y} \end{array}
\end{aligned}$$

(11.33)

**QED**

# Chapter 12

## D-Separation

Before reading this chapter, I recommend that you read Chapter chapter 0.23 on the definition of bnets.

A path  $\gamma$  that isn't a loop can have 3 types of intermediate nodes  $\underline{x}$  ( an intermediate node of  $\gamma$  is a node in  $\gamma$  that isn't one of the two end nodes). Suppose  $\underline{a}$  and  $\underline{b}$  are the two neighbors of  $\underline{x}$ . Then the 3 possible cases are:

1. **mediator node:**  $(\underline{a} \leftarrow \underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{b})$  or  $(\underline{a} \rightarrow \underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{b})$
2. **fork node:**  $(\underline{a} \leftarrow \underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{b})$
3. **collider node:**  $(\underline{a} \rightarrow \underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{b})$

We say that a non-loop path  $\gamma$  from  $\underline{a}$  to  $\underline{b}$  (i.e., with end nodes  $\underline{a}, \underline{b}$ ) is **blocked** by a multinode  $\underline{Z}$ . if one or more of the following statements is true:

1. There is a node  $\underline{x} \in \underline{Z}$ . which is a mediator or a fork of  $\gamma$ .
2.  $\gamma$  contains a collider node  $\underline{c}$  and  $(\underline{c} \cup de(\underline{c})) \cap \underline{Z} = \emptyset$  (i.e., neither  $\underline{c}$  nor any of the descendants of  $\underline{c}$  is contained in  $\underline{Z}$ .)

This definition of a blocked path is easy to remember if one thinks of the following analogy with pipes carrying a fluid. Think of path  $\gamma$  as if it were a pipe carrying a fluid. Think of the nodes of  $\gamma$  as junctions in the pipe. If  $\underline{Z}$ . intersects  $\gamma$  at either a mediator or a fork junction, that blocks the pipe flow. A collider junction  $\underline{c}$  is like a blackhole or a huge leak. Its presence blocks passage of the fluid as long as neither  $\underline{c}$  nor any of the descendants of  $\underline{c}$  are in  $\underline{Z}$ .. If, on the other hand,  $\underline{c} \in \underline{Z}$ ., or  $\underline{c}' \in \underline{Z}$ . where  $\underline{c}' \in de(\underline{c})$ , then that acts as a complete (in the case of  $\underline{c} \in \underline{Z}$ .) or a partial (in the case of  $\underline{c}' \in \underline{Z}$ .) bridge across the blackhole.

See Fig.12.1 for some examples of paths that are blocked or not blocked by a multinode  $\underline{Z}$ ..

Given 3 disjoint multinodes  $\underline{A}, \underline{B}, \underline{Z}$ . of a graph  $G$ , we write “ $\underline{A}. \perp_G \underline{B} | \underline{Z}$ .” or say “ $\underline{A}$ . and  $\underline{B}$ . are d-separated by  $\underline{Z}$ . in  $G$ ” iff there exists no path  $\gamma$  from  $\underline{a} \in \underline{A}$ ., to  $\underline{b} \in \underline{B}$ . which is not blocked by  $\underline{Z}$ ..<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>  $\underline{Z}$ . are the nodes we are “conditioning on”. Unmeasured (i.e., hidden, unobserved) nodes cannot be conditioned on, because that would entail measuring them.




Figure 12.1: Examples of paths that are blocked or not blocked by a multinode  $\underline{Z}$ . Nodes belonging to  $\underline{Z}$  are colored red.

The minimal Markov blanket (see Chapter 26) of a node  $\underline{a}$  is the smallest multinode  $\underline{Z}$  such that  $\underline{a} \perp_G \underline{b} | \underline{Z}$  for all  $\underline{b} \notin \underline{a} \cup \underline{Z}$ .

We are finally ready to state the d-separation theorem, without proof.

A probability distribution  $P$  is **compatible with a DAG**  $G$  if  $P$  and  $G$  have the same random variables, and they can be combined to form a bnnet without contradictions; i.e., one can calculate all the TPMs from  $P$  and multiply them together to obtain  $P$  again.

**Claim 10** (*d-separation Theorem*)

Suppose  $\underline{A}, \underline{B}, \underline{Z}$  are disjoint multinodes of a DAG  $G$ .

If  $\underline{A} \perp_G \underline{B} | \underline{Z}$ , then  $P(\underline{B} | \underline{A}, \underline{Z}) = P(\underline{B} | \underline{Z})$  for all  $\underline{B}, \underline{A}, \underline{Z}$ , for all  $P$  compatible with  $G$ .

The full converse of the theorem can also be proven, but we won't be using it in this book.

Often, the right hand side of this theorem is stated as “ $\underline{A} \perp_P \underline{B} | \underline{Z}$  for all  $P$ ”. Then the theorem is stated: “If  $\underline{A} \perp_G \underline{B} | \underline{Z}$ , then  $\underline{A} \perp_P \underline{B} | \underline{Z}$  for all  $P$ .”

---

Note that the following are equivalent:

- $P(\underline{B} | \underline{A}, \underline{Z}) = P(\underline{B} | \underline{Z})$  for all  $\underline{B}, \underline{A}, \underline{Z}$ .
- $\underline{A} \perp_P \underline{B} | \underline{Z}$ .
- $H(\underline{A} : \underline{B} | \underline{Z}) = 0$  (see Chapter chapter 0.1.2 for definition of conditional mutual information (CMI))

---

**Extra stuff: mostly only for pure mathematicians**

Below, we will use the notation  $nde(\underline{a})$  to denote all nondescendants, including  $\underline{a}$  itself, of a node  $\underline{a}$  in a DAG  $G$ ; i.e., all nodes of  $G$  that are not in  $de(\underline{a}) \cup \underline{a}$ , where  $de(\underline{a})$  is defined in Chapter chapter 0.23.

Given a DAG  $G$ , define the following sets of d-separations:<sup>2</sup>

$$DS(G) = \{(\underline{A} \perp_G \underline{B} \mid \underline{Z}) : \underline{A}, \underline{B}, \underline{Z} \text{ are multinodes of } G\} . \quad (12.8)$$

$$DS_{min}(G) = \{(\underline{A} \perp_G nde(\underline{A}) \mid pa(\underline{A})) : \underline{A} \text{ is a multinode of } G\} . \quad (12.9)$$

See Chapter 36 for an example where set  $DS_{min}(G)$  is calculated for a particular DAG  $G$ .

**Claim 11** *For all DAGs  $G$ ,  $DS(G) = DS_{min}(G)$ .*

Given a probability distribution  $P$ , define the following set of conditional independencies:

$$CI(P) = \{(\underline{A} \perp_P \underline{B} \mid \underline{Z}) : \underline{A}, \underline{B}, \underline{Z} \text{ are multinodes of } P\} , \quad (12.10)$$

For a DAG  $G$  and a probability distribution  $P$  compatible with  $G$ , define a map  $\phi$  by

$$\phi : DS_{min}(G) \rightarrow CI(P) \quad (12.11)$$

$$\phi : \underline{A} \perp_G nde(\underline{A}) \mid pa(\underline{A}) \mapsto \underline{A} \perp_P nde(\underline{A}) \mid pa(\underline{A}) \quad (12.12)$$

In general, this map is 1-1 but not onto.

**Claim 12** *For a bnet with a DAG  $G$  and a total probability distribution  $P$ , the map  $\phi$  is a bijection.*

$DS(G)$  does not fully specify a DAG. DAGs with the same  $DS(G)$  are said to be **d-separation equivalent**. See Chapter 36 for more info about d-separation equivalence.

---

<sup>2</sup> Note that  $(\underline{A} \perp_G nde(\underline{A}) \mid pa(\underline{A}))$  and  $(\underline{A} \perp_G nde(\underline{A}) - pa(\underline{A}) \mid pa(\underline{A}))$  are equivalent because  $H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}, \underline{c} \mid \underline{c}) = H(\underline{a} : \underline{b} \mid \underline{c})$ .

# Chapter 13

## Dynamic Bayesian Networks




Figure 13.1: Example of a dynamic bnet. The pattern of red arrows is repeated  $T - 1$  times.

A dynamic bnet is simply a time homogeneous Markov chain (see Chapter 28) for which each node is called a **time slice**, and each time slice represents at finer resolution a sub-DAG which is the same between any 2 successive time slices. Fig.13.1 gives an example of a dynamic bnet. In Fig.13.1, we've drawn the 3 nodes of each time slice vertically, and labeled them with a superscript  $^{(t)}$ , where  $t \in \{0, 1 \dots, T - 1\}$  is the time of the slice. To fully specify the dynamic bnet of Fig.13.1, we would also have to specify the TPMs

$$\begin{aligned} &P(c^{(0)}), \\ &P(b^{(0)}) \\ &P(c^{(1)}|c^{(0)}), \\ &P(b^{(1)}|b^{(0)}, a^{(1)}) \\ &P(a^{(1)}|b^{(0)}). \end{aligned}$$

Dynamic bnets are very common in AI and Data Science. Kalman filters (Chapter 23), Hidden Markov Models (Chapter 18) and Recurrent Neural Networks (Chapter 39) are famous examples of dynamic bnets.

Bnets are acyclic; they can't have cycles (i.e, closed directed paths). Yet feedback loops are an important concept in Science. So what is the equivalent of feedback loops in the bnet world? Dynamic bnets are. Any feedback loop can be “unrolled” into a dynamic bnet.

# Chapter 14

## Expectation Maximization

This chapter is based on Refs.[44] and [73].

The Expectation Maximization (EM) algorithm is commonly used in Data Science to find the maximum over an **unknown parameter**  $\theta$  of a likelihood function

$$P(\vec{x}|\theta) = \sum_{\vec{h}} P(\vec{x}, \vec{h}|\theta) , \quad (14.1)$$

where  $\vec{x}$  denotes the **observed variables**, and  $\vec{h}$  denotes the **latent variables**. Both  $\theta$  and  $\vec{h}$  are hidden (i.e., unobserved).<sup>1</sup>




Figure 14.1: bnet for EM with  $nsam = 3$ .

The bnet for the EM algorithm is given by Fig.14.1 for  $nsam = 3$ . Later on in this chapter, we will give the node TPMs for this bnet for the special case in which  $P(x[\sigma] | \theta)$  is a mixture (i.e., weighted sum) of Gaussians.

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “unknown parameter” is mainly of frequentist origin. For Bayesians,  $\theta$  is a random variable with a delta function prior, whereas for frequentists, it is not a random variable at all, just an unknown parameter with no randomness.

Note that if we erase the  $\underline{h}[\sigma]$  nodes from Fig.14.1, we get the bnet for naive Bayes, which is used for classification into the states of  $\underline{\theta}$ . However, there is one big difference. With naive Bayes, the leaf nodes have different TPMs. Here, we will assume they are i.i.d. Naive Bayes is used for classification: i.e., given the states of the leaf nodes, we infer the state of the root node. EM is used for clustering; i.e., given many i.i.d. samples, we fit their distribution by a weighted sum of prob distributions, usually Gaussians.

Let

$\mathcal{L}$  =likelihood function.

$nsam$  = number of samples.

$\vec{x} = (x[0], x[1], \dots, x[nsam - 1])$   $x[\sigma] \in S_{\underline{x}}$  for all  $\sigma$ .

$\vec{h} = (h[0], h[1], \dots, h[nsam - 1])$   $h[\sigma] \in S_{\underline{h}}$  for all  $\sigma$ .

We assume that the samples  $(x[\sigma], h[\sigma])$  are i.i.d. for different  $\sigma$  at fixed  $\theta$ . What this means is that there are probability distributions  $P_{\underline{x}|\underline{h},\underline{\theta}}$  and  $P_{\underline{h}|\underline{\theta}}$  such that

$$P(\vec{x}, \vec{h}|\theta) = \prod_{\sigma} [P_{\underline{x}|\underline{h},\underline{\theta}}(x[\sigma] | h[\sigma], \theta) P_{\underline{h}|\underline{\theta}}(h[\sigma] | \theta)] . \quad (14.2)$$

Definition of likelihood functions:

$$\underbrace{P(\vec{x}|\theta)}_{\mathcal{L}(\theta;\vec{x})} = \sum_{\vec{h}} \underbrace{P(\vec{x}, \vec{h}|\theta)}_{\mathcal{L}(\theta;\vec{x},\vec{h})} \quad (14.3)$$

$\theta^*$  = maximum likelihood estimate of  $\theta$  (no prior  $P(\theta)$  assumed):

$$\theta^* = \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathcal{L}(\theta; \vec{x}) \quad (14.4)$$

## 14.1 The EM algorithm:

### 1. Expectation step:<sup>2</sup>

$$Q(\theta|\theta^{(t)}) = E_{\vec{h}|\vec{x},\theta^{(t)}} \ln P(\vec{x}, \vec{h}|\theta) \quad (14.5)$$

### 2. Maximization step:

$$\theta^{(t+1)} = \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmax}} Q(\theta|\theta^{(t)}) . \quad (14.6)$$

Claim:  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \theta^{(t)} = \theta^*$ .

Fig.14.2 portrays the recursive nature of the EM algo as a dynamical, recurrent bnet. For Fig.14.2, the TPMs, printed in blue, for the  $\underline{\theta}^{(t)}$  nodes for  $t = 1, 2, \dots$ , are as follows:

$$P(\theta^{(t+1)}|\vec{x}, \theta^{(t)}) = \delta(\theta^{(t+1)}, \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmax}} Q(\theta|\theta^{(t)})) . \quad (14.7)$$

---

<sup>2</sup> Note that that the right hand side of Eq.(14.5) is expressible in the form  $\sum_{\sigma} \sum_{h[\sigma]} f(x[\sigma], h[\sigma])$ .






Figure 14.2: The EM algo generates a sequence of parameter estimates  $(\theta^{(t)})_{t=0,1,2,\dots}$  that converges to the optimum (i.e., best-fit) parameter  $\theta^*$ .

### 14.1.1 Motivation

$$Q(\theta|\theta^{(t)}) = E_{\vec{h}|\vec{x},\theta^{(t)}} \ln P(\vec{x}, \vec{h}|\theta) \quad (14.8)$$

$$= E_{\vec{h}|\vec{x},\theta^{(t)}} [\ln P(\vec{h}|\vec{x}, \theta) + \ln P(\vec{x}|\theta)] \quad (14.9)$$

$$= -D_{KL} \left( P(\vec{h}|\vec{x}, \theta^{(t)}) \parallel P(\vec{h}|\vec{x}, \theta) \right) - H[P(\vec{h}|\vec{x}, \theta^{(t)})] + \ln P(\vec{x}|\theta) \quad (14.10)$$

When  $\theta^{(t)} = \theta$ , this becomes

$$Q(\theta|\theta) = -H[P(\vec{h}|\vec{x}, \theta)] + \ln P(\vec{x}|\theta) . \quad (14.11)$$

Hence,

$$\partial_{\theta} Q(\theta|\theta) = - \sum_{\vec{h}} \partial_{\theta} P(\vec{h}|\vec{x}, \theta) + \partial_{\theta} \ln P(\vec{x}|\theta) \quad (14.12)$$

$$= \partial_{\theta} \ln P(\vec{x}|\theta) \quad (14.13)$$

So if  $\theta^{(t)} \rightarrow \theta$  and  $Q(\theta|\theta)$  is max at  $\theta = \theta^*$ , then  $\ln P(\vec{x}|\theta)$  is max at  $\theta = \theta^*$  too.

For a more rigorous proof that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \theta^{(t)} = \theta^*$ , see Wikipedia article Ref.[44] and references therein.

## 14.2 Minorize-Maximize (MM) algorithms

A function  $\mu(\theta|\theta^{(t)})$  is said to minorize a target function  $\mathcal{L}(\theta)$  iff for all  $\theta$  at fixed  $\theta^{(t)}$ , it satisfies the “ $\mu \leq \mathcal{L}$  property”

$$\mu(\theta|\theta^{(t)}) \leq \mathcal{L}(\theta) , \quad (14.14)$$

and the “ $\mu = \mathcal{L}$  property”

$$\mu(\theta^{(t)}|\theta^{(t)}) = \mathcal{L}(\theta^{(t)}) . \quad (14.15)$$




Figure 14.3: Function  $\mu(\theta|\theta^{(t)})$  minorizes the function  $\mathcal{L}(\theta)$ . Note that  $\mu(\theta|\theta^{(t)})$  is always below  $\mathcal{L}(\theta)$ . “max” indicates  $\theta^{(t+1)} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta} \mu(\theta|\theta^{(t)})$ . “kiss” indicates  $\mu(\theta^{(t)}|\theta^{(t)}) = \mathcal{L}(\theta^{(t)})$ .

We **recursively maximize a minorizing function**  $\mu(\theta|\theta^{(t)})$  if we define a sequence  $(\theta^{(t)})_{t=0,1,\dots}$  as follows:

$$\theta^{(t+1)} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta} \mu(\theta|\theta^{(t)}) . \quad (14.16)$$

The sequence  $(\mathcal{L}(\theta^{(t)}))_{t=0,1,2,\dots}$  generated by recursively maximizing a minorizing function must be nondecreasing:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta^{(t+1)}) \geq \mu(\theta^{(t+1)}|\theta^{(t)}) \geq \mu(\theta^{(t)}|\theta^{(t)}) = \mathcal{L}(\theta^{(t)}) . \quad (14.17)$$

A **minorize-maximize (MM) algorithm** is any algo that specifies a minorizing function  $\mu(\theta|\theta^{(t)})$  for a particular target function  $\mathcal{L}(\theta)$ . One can also define a **majorize-minimize algo (also called MM)** by inverting the inequalities throughout.

The EM algo is an MM algo. Indeed, if we define

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \ln P(\vec{x}|\theta) \quad (14.18)$$

and

$$\mu(\theta|\theta^{(t)}) = Q(\theta|\theta^{(t)}) + H(P(\vec{h}|\vec{x}, \theta^{(t)})) , \quad (14.19)$$

then Eq.(14.10) establishes the  $\mu \leq \mathcal{L}$  and  $\mu = \mathcal{L}$  properties required of a minorizing function.

How an MM algo works is portrayed in Fig.14.3.

## 14.3 Examples

### 14.3.1 Gaussian mixture

$x[\sigma] \in \mathbb{R}^d = S_{\underline{x}}$ .  $S_{\underline{h}}$  discrete and not too large.  $n_{\underline{h}} = |S_{\underline{h}}|$  is number of Gaussians that we are going to fit the samples with.

Let

$$\theta = [w_h, \mu_h, \Sigma_h]_{h \in S_{\underline{h}}}, \quad (14.20)$$

where  $[w_h]_{h \in S_{\underline{h}}}$  is a probability distribution of weights, and where  $\mu_h \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\Sigma_h \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  are the mean value vector and covariance matrix of a  $d$ -dimensional Gaussian distribution.

The TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes of Fig.14.1, for the special case of a mixture of Gaussians, are as follows:

$$P(x[\sigma] \mid h[\sigma] \mid \theta) = \mathcal{N}_d(x[\sigma]; \mu_{h[\sigma]}, \Sigma_{h[\sigma]}) \quad (14.21)$$

$$P(h[\sigma] \mid \theta) = w_{h[\sigma]} \quad (14.22)$$

Note that

$$P(x[\sigma] \mid \theta) = \sum_h P(x[\sigma] \mid h[\sigma] = h, \theta) P(h[\sigma] = h \mid \theta) \quad (14.23)$$

$$= \sum_h w_h \mathcal{N}_d(x[\sigma]; \mu_h, \Sigma_h) \quad (14.24)$$

$$P(\vec{x}, \vec{h} \mid \theta) = \prod_{\sigma} [w_{h[\sigma]} \mathcal{N}_d(x[\sigma]; \mu_{h[\sigma]}, \Sigma_{h[\sigma]})] \quad (14.25)$$

$$= \prod_{\sigma} \prod_h [w_h \mathcal{N}_d(x[\sigma]; \mu_h, \Sigma_h)]^{\mathbb{1}(h=h[\sigma])} \quad (14.26)$$

**Old Faithful:** See Wikipedia Ref.[44] for an animated gif of a classic example of using EM to fit samples with a Gaussian mixture. Unfortunately, could not include it here because pdfLatex does not support animated gifs. The gif shows samples in a 2 dimensional space (eruption time, delay time) from the Old Faithful geyser. In that example,  $d = 2$  and  $n_{\underline{h}} = 2$ . Two clusters of points in a plane are fitted by a mixture of 2 Gaussians.

**K-means clustering** is often presented as the main competitor to EM for doing **clustering (non-supervised learning)**. In K-means clustering, the sample points are split into  $K$  mutually disjoint sets  $S_0, S_1, \dots, S_{K-1}$ . The algorithm is easy to describe:

1. Initialize by choosing at random  $K$  data points  $(\mu_k)_{k=0}^{K-1}$  called means or centroids and placing  $\mu_k$  in  $S_k$  for all  $k$ .

2. **STEP 1:** For each data point, add it to the  $S_k$  whose centroid  $\mu_k$  is closest to it.
3. **STEP 2:** Recalculate the centroids. Set  $\mu_k$  equal to the mean value of set  $S_k$ .
4. Repeat steps 1 and 2 until the centroids stop changing by much.

Step 1 is analogous to the expectation step in EM, and Step 2 to the maximization step in EM ( $\theta$  estimation versus  $\mu_k$  estimation). We won't say anything further about K-means clustering because it isn't related to bnets in any way, and this is a book about bnets. For more info about K-means clustering, see Ref.[53].

### 14.3.2 Blood Genotypes and Phenotypes

Notation:  $\underline{a} = (a[\sigma])_{\sigma=0,1,\dots,nsam-1}$ , where  $nsam$  is the number of samples. Will sometimes denote  $a[\sigma]$  by  $a^{[\sigma]}$ .

Suppose  $\underline{x} = (\underline{x}_0)$  (i.e., just one component)

$\vec{h} = (\vec{h}_0)$  (i.e., just one component)

$\underline{h}[\sigma] \in S_h = \{AA, AO, BB, BO, OO, AB\}$  (the 6 blood genotypes)

$\underline{x}[\sigma] \in S_x = \{A, B, O, AB\}$  (the 4 blood phenotypes)




Figure 14.4: bnet for blood phenotypes  $x[\sigma]$  and genotypes  $h[\sigma]$ .

For the bnet of Fig.14.4, the TPMs, printed in blue, are:

$$P(h^{[\sigma]}|\theta) = \begin{array}{c|c} & \hline & AA \quad p_A^2 \\ & AO \quad 2p_A p_O \\ & BB \quad p_B^2 \\ & BO \quad 2p_B p_O \\ & OO \quad p_O^2 \\ & AB \quad 2p_A p_B \end{array}, \quad (14.27)$$

where  $p_A + p_B + p_O = 1$ .

$$P(x^{[\sigma]} | h^{[\sigma]}, \theta) = \begin{array}{c|cccccc} & AA & AO & BB & BO & OO & AB \\ \hline A & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ B & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ O & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ AB & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array} \quad (14.28)$$

$$\theta = (p_A, p_B) \quad (14.29)$$

Multiplying the TPMs in Eqs.(14.27 and (14.28), we get

$$P(x^{[\sigma]} | \theta) = \begin{array}{c|c} & \hline A & p_A^2 + 2p_A p_O (= \pi_A) \\ B & p_B^2 + 2p_B p_O (= \pi_B) \\ O & p_O^2 (= \pi_O) \\ AB & 2p_A p_B (= \pi_{AB}) \end{array} \quad (14.30)$$

Note that

$$P(\vec{x}|\theta) = \prod_{\sigma} P(x^{[\sigma]}|\theta) \quad (14.31)$$

$$= (\pi_A)^{N_A} (\pi_B)^{N_B} (\pi_O)^{N_O} (\pi_{AB})^{N_{AB}} , \quad (14.32)$$

where  $N_x$  for  $x \in S_{\underline{x}} = \{A, B, O, AB\}$  are the counts from the data. We can get estimates for the parameters  $p_A$  and  $p_B$  right here without doing EM. Just note that

$$\hat{\pi}_x = \frac{N_x}{N_+} \quad (14.33)$$

for  $x \in S_{\underline{x}}$ , where  $N_+ = \sum_x N_x$ . Eqs.(14.33) give 4 quadratic equations that can be solved for the parameters  $p_A, p_B$  in terms of the observed counts  $N_x$  for  $x \in S_{\underline{x}}$ .

If, instead, you want to find the optimum parameters  $p_A, p_B$  using EM, note that

$$Q(\theta|\theta^{(t)}) = \sum_{\vec{h}} P(\vec{h}|\theta^{(t)}) \ln P(\vec{x}, \vec{h}|\theta) \quad (14.34)$$

$$= \sum_{\vec{h}} \left[ \prod_{\sigma} P(h^{[\sigma]}|\theta^{(t)}) \right] \ln \left[ \prod_{\sigma} P(x^{[\sigma]}, h^{[\sigma]}|\theta) \right] \quad (14.35)$$

$$= \sum_{\sigma} \sum_{h^{[\sigma]}} P(h^{[\sigma]}|\theta^{(t)}) \ln P(x^{[\sigma]}, h^{[\sigma]}|\theta) \quad (14.36)$$

$$= \sum_{\sigma} \sum_{h^{[\sigma]}} P(h^{[\sigma]}|\theta^{(t)}) [\ln P(x^{[\sigma]}|h^{[\sigma]}, \theta) + \ln P(h^{[\sigma]}|\theta)] \quad (14.37)$$

$$= nsam \sum_{h^{[\sigma]}} P(h^{[\sigma]}|\theta^{(t)}) \ln P(h^{[\sigma]}|\theta) . \quad (14.38)$$

### 14.3.3 Missing Data/Imputation

The previous example on blood genotypes and phenotypes assumed no missing data in compiling the counts  $N_x$ . But what if there is missing data? Can one still apply the EM algo in that case? Yes! See Chapter 30.

# Chapter 15

## Front-door Adjustment

The front-door (FD) adjustment theorem is proven in Chapter 11 from the rules of do-calculus. The goal of this chapter is to give examples of the use of that theorem. We will restate the theorem in this chapter, sans proof. There is no need to understand the theorem's proof in order to use it. However, you will need to skim Chapter 11 in order to familiarize yourself with the notation used to state the theorem. This chapter also assumes that you are comfortable with the rules for checking for d-separation. Those rules are covered in Chapter 12.

Suppose that we have access to data that allows us to estimate a probability distribution  $P(x., m., y.)$ . Hence, the variables  $\underline{x.}, \underline{m.}, \underline{y.}$  are ALL the observed (i.e, not hidden). Then we say that the front-door  $\underline{m.}$  satisfies the **front-door adjustment criterion** relative to  $(\underline{x.}, \underline{y.})$  if

1. All directed paths from  $\underline{x.}$  to  $\underline{y.}$  are intercepted by (i.e., have a node in)  $\underline{m.}$ .
2. All backdoor paths from  $\underline{x.}$  to  $\underline{m.}$  are blocked (by  $\emptyset$ ).
3. All backdoor paths from on  $\underline{m.}$  to  $\underline{y.}$  are blocked by  $\underline{x.}$ .

**Claim 13** *Front-Door Adjustment Theorem*

*If  $\underline{m.}$  satisfies the front-door criterion relative to  $(\underline{x.}, \underline{y.})$ , and  $P(x., m.) > 0$ , then*

$$P(y. | \rho \underline{x.} = x.) = \sum_{m.} \underbrace{\left[ \sum_{x'.} P(y. | x'. , m.) P(x'.) \right]}_{P(y. | \rho \underline{m.} = m.)} \underbrace{P(m. | x.)}_{P(m. | \rho \underline{x.} = x.)} \quad (15.1)$$

$$= \sum_{m., x'.} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \underline{x.} = x'. \\ \searrow \\ \underline{x.} = x. \longrightarrow \underline{m.} = m. \longrightarrow \underline{y.} \end{array} \right\} \quad (15.2)$$

**proof:** See Chapter 11

**QED**

## 15.1 Examples

1.



If  $\underline{x} = x, \underline{m} = m$  and  $\underline{y} = y$ , then the FD criterion is satisfied. Can't satisfy backdoor criterion because  $\underline{z}$  must be observed so can't block backdoor path  $\underline{x} - \underline{c} - \underline{y}$ .

---

2.



If  $\underline{x} = x, \underline{m} = m$  and  $\underline{y} = y$ , then the FD criterion is satisfied. Can't satisfy backdoor criterion because to block backdoor path  $\underline{x} - \underline{c} - \underline{y}$ , need to condition on  $\underline{c}$  (i.e., need  $\underline{c} \in \underline{z}$ .) but if this is true, then long path  $\underline{x} - \underline{w}_1 - \underline{z}_1 - \underline{c} - \underline{z}_2 - \underline{w}_2 - \underline{y}$  becomes unblocked.

# Chapter 16

## Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs)




Figure 16.1: Generative Adversarial Network (GAN)

Original GAN, Ref.[7](2014).

Generator  $G$  (counterfeiter) generates samples  $\vec{f}$  of fake money and submits them to Discriminator  $D$  (Treasury agent).  $D$  also gets samples  $\vec{r}$  of real money.  $D$  submits verdict  $V \in [0, 1]$ .  $G$  depends on parameter  $\theta_G$  and  $D$  on parameter  $\theta_D$ . Verdict  $V$  and initial  $\theta_G, \theta_D$  are used to get new parameters  $\theta'_G, \theta'_D$ . Process is repeated (Dynamical Bayesian Network) until saddle point in





Figure 16.2: Discriminator node  $\underline{V}$  in Fig.16.1 can be split into 3 nodes  $\underline{\vec{c}}$ ,  $\underline{\vec{d}}$  and  $\underline{V}$ .

$V(\theta_G, \theta_D)$  is reached.  $D$  makes  $G$  better and vice versa. Zero-sum game between  $D$  and  $G$ .

Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the domain of  $D(\cdot, \theta_D)$ . Assume that for any  $x \in \mathcal{D}$ ,

$$0 \leq D(x, \theta_D) \leq 1 . \quad (16.1)$$

For any  $S \subset \mathcal{D}$ , define

$$\sum_{x \in S} D(x, \theta_D) = \lambda(S, \theta_D) . \quad (16.2)$$

In general,  $G(\cdot, \theta_G)$  need not be real valued.

Assume that for every  $u \in S_{\underline{u}}$ ,  $G(u, \theta_G) = f \in S_{\underline{f}} \subset \mathcal{D}$ . Define

$$\overline{D}(f, \theta_D) = 1 - D(f, \theta_D) . \quad (16.3)$$

Note that

$$0 \leq \overline{D}(f, \theta_D) \leq 1 . \quad (16.4)$$

Define:

$$V(\theta_G, \theta_D) = \sum_r P(r) \ln D(r, \theta_D) + \sum_u P(u) \ln \overline{D}(G(u, \theta_G), \theta_D) . \quad (16.5)$$

We want the first variation of  $V(\theta_G, \theta_D)$  to vanish.

$$\delta V(\theta_G, \theta_D) = 0 . \quad (16.6)$$

This implies

$$\partial_{\theta_G} V(\theta_G, \theta_D) = \partial_{\theta_D} V(\theta_G, \theta_D) = 0 \quad (16.7)$$

and

$$V_{opt} = \min_{\theta_G} \max_{\theta_D} V(\theta_G, \theta_D) . \quad (16.8)$$

Node TPMs for Figs.16.1 and 16.2 are given next in blue:

$$P(\theta_G) = \text{given} \quad (16.9)$$

$$P(\theta_D) = \text{given} \quad (16.10)$$

$$P(\vec{u}) = \prod_i P(u[i]) \quad (\text{usually uniform distribution}) \quad (16.11)$$

$$P(\vec{r}) = \prod_i P(r[i]) \quad (16.12)$$

$$P(f[i] \mid \vec{u}, \theta_G) = \delta[f[i], G(u[i], \theta_G)] \quad (16.13)$$

$$P(c[i] \mid \vec{f}, \theta_D) = \delta(c[i], \overline{D}(f[i], \theta_D)) \quad (16.14)$$

$$P(d[j] \mid \vec{r}, \theta_D) = \delta(d[j], D(r[j], \theta_D)) \quad (16.15)$$

$$P(V \mid \vec{d}, \vec{c}) = \delta(V, \frac{1}{N} \ln \prod_{i,j} (c[i] d[j])) \quad (16.16)$$

where  $N = nsam(\vec{r}) nsam(\vec{u})$ .

Let  $\eta_G, \eta_D > 0$ . Maximize  $V$  wrt  $\theta_D$ , and minimize it wrt  $\theta_G$ .

$$P(\theta'_G \mid V, \theta_G) = \delta(\theta'_G, \theta_G - \eta_G \partial_{\theta_G} V) \quad (16.17)$$

$$P(\theta'_D \mid V, \theta_D) = \delta(\theta'_D, \theta_D + \eta_D \partial_{\theta_D} V) \quad (16.18)$$



Figure 16.3: GAN, Constraining Bayesian Network

Constraining B net given in Fig.16.3. It adds 2 new nodes, namely  $\vec{U}$  and  $\vec{R}$ , to the bnet of Fig.16.1. The purpose of these 2 barren (childrenless) nodes is to constrain certain functions to be probability distributions.

Node TPMs for the 2 new nodes given next in blue.

$$P(U[i] | \theta_G) = \frac{\overline{D}(G(U[i], \theta_G), \theta_D))}{\overline{\lambda}(\theta_G, \theta_D)} \quad (16.19)$$

where  $S_{\underline{U}[i]} = S_{\underline{u}}$  and  $\overline{\lambda}(\theta_G, \theta_D) = \sum_u \overline{D}(G(u, \theta_G), \theta_D)$ .

$$P(R[i] | \theta_G, \theta_D) = \frac{D(R[i], \theta_D)}{\lambda(\theta_D)} \quad (16.20)$$

where  $S_{\underline{R}[i]} = S_{\underline{r}}$  and  $\lambda(\theta_D) = \sum_r D(r, \theta_D)$ .

$$P(V | \vec{u}, \vec{r}) = \delta(V, \frac{1}{N} \ln \prod_{i,j} (P(R[i] = r[i] | \theta_G, \theta_D) P(U[i] = u[j] | \theta_G))) \quad (16.21)$$

where  $N = nsam(\vec{r})nsam(\vec{u})$ .

$\mathcal{L}$  = likelihood

$$\mathcal{L} = P(\vec{r}, \vec{u} | \theta_G, \theta_D) \quad (16.22)$$

$$= \prod_{i,j} \left[ \frac{D(r[i], \theta_D)}{\lambda(\theta_D)} \frac{\overline{D}(G(u[j], \theta_G), \theta_D))}{\overline{\lambda}(\theta_G, \theta_D)} \right] \quad (16.23)$$

$$\ln \mathcal{L} = N[V(\theta_G, \theta_D) - \ln \lambda(\theta_D) - \ln \bar{\lambda}(\theta_G, \theta_D)] \quad (16.24)$$

# Chapter 17

## Gaussian Nodes with Linear Dependence on Parents

Bnet nodes that have a Gaussian TPM with a linear dependence on their parent nodes (GLP) are a very popular way of modeling continuous nodes of bnets. A convenient aspect of them is that their parents can be discrete or continuous nodes, and their children can be discrete or continuous nodes too. Also, they can be learned easily from the data because their parameters can be expressed in terms of two node covariances. For these reasons, they are commonly used when doing structure learning of bnets with continuous nodes (see Chapter 45).




Figure 17.1: GLP node  $\underline{y}$  with 3 parent nodes  $\underline{x}^3 = (\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2, \underline{x}_3)$ .

Recall our notation for a Gaussian distribution:

$$\mathcal{N}(x; \mu, \sigma^2) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{\frac{-(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}}, \quad (17.1)$$

where  $x, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\sigma > 0$ .

A GLP node  $\underline{y}$  with  $n$  parents  $\underline{x}^n = (\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2, \dots, \underline{x}_n)$  has the following TPM:

$$P(y|x^n) = \mathcal{N}(y; \beta_0 + \beta^{nT} x^n, \sigma^2) \quad (17.2)$$

where  $y, \beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\sigma^2 > 0$ , and where  $\underline{x}^n, \beta^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$  are \*\*column vectors\*\*. The  $T$  in  $\beta^{nT}$  stands for transpose. Any  $\underline{x}_i$  can have a discrete set of states as long as they are real valued and ordinal (ordered by size). Fig.17.1 shows a diagrammatic representation of a GPL node with 3 parents.

Note that as  $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ , a GLP node becomes deterministic. In fact, it becomes a neural net node with a linear activation function.

An equivalent way of defining a GLP node  $\underline{y}$  is in terms of a random variable equation expressing  $\underline{y}$  as a hyperplane function of the parents  $\underline{x}^n$  plus a Gaussian noise variable. Define an estimator  $\hat{\underline{y}}$  of a “true value”  $\underline{y}$  by

$$\hat{\underline{y}} = \beta_0 + \beta^{nT} \underline{x}^n \quad (17.3a)$$

and

$$\underline{y} = \hat{\underline{y}} + \underline{\epsilon} \quad (17.3b)$$

where the residual  $\underline{\epsilon}$  satisfies

$$P(\underline{\epsilon}) = \mathcal{N}(\underline{\epsilon}; 0, \sigma^2) \quad (17.3c)$$

and

$$\langle \underline{x}^n, \underline{\epsilon} \rangle = 0. \quad (17.3d)$$

The notation  $\langle \underline{x}, \underline{y} \rangle$  for the covariance of random variables  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$  is explained in Chapter chapter 0.1.2.

**Claim 14** *The parameters of a GLP node can be expressed in terms of 2-node covariances. Specifically,*

$$\beta^n = \langle \underline{x}^n, \underline{x}^{nT} \rangle^{-1} \langle \underline{y}, \underline{x}^n \rangle \quad (17.4)$$

$$\beta_0 = \langle \underline{y} \rangle - \beta^{nT} \langle \underline{x}^n \rangle \quad (17.5)$$

$$\sigma^2 = \langle \underline{y}, \underline{y} \rangle - \beta^{nT} \langle \underline{x}^n, \underline{y} \rangle \quad (17.6)$$

**proof:**

Note that  $\langle \underline{x}^n, \underline{x}^{nT} \rangle^T = \langle \underline{x}^n, \underline{x}^{nT} \rangle$  and  $\langle \underline{y}, \underline{x}^{nT} \rangle^T = \langle \underline{y}, \underline{x}^n \rangle$ .

$$\langle \underline{y}, \underline{x}^{nT} \rangle = \beta^{nT} \langle \underline{x}^n, \underline{x}^{nT} \rangle \quad (17.7)$$

$$\langle \underline{y}, \underline{x}^n \rangle = \langle \underline{x}^n, \underline{x}^{nT} \rangle \beta^n \quad (17.8)$$

$$\beta^n = \langle \underline{x}^n, \underline{x}^{nT} \rangle^{-1} \langle \underline{y}, \underline{x}^n \rangle \quad (17.9)$$

$$\langle \underline{y} \rangle = \beta_0 + \beta^{nT} \langle \underline{x}^n \rangle \quad (17.10)$$

$$\langle \underline{y}, \underline{y} \rangle = \langle \beta_0 + \beta^{nT} \underline{x}^n + \epsilon, \underline{y} \rangle \quad (17.11)$$

$$= \beta^{nT} \langle \underline{x}^n, \underline{y} \rangle + \sigma^2 \quad (17.12)$$

**QED**

---

Let D=Discrete, GLP=Gaussian with Linear dependence in Parents

The following arrows are possible in a bnnet.

- $GLP \leftarrow GLP$
- $GLP \leftarrow D$

Pass to GLP a separate set of regression coefficients  $\beta_0, \beta^n$  and variance  $\sigma^2$  for each state of D. If D is called  $\underline{d}$ , let

$$P(y|(x^n)_d, d) = \mathcal{N}(y; (\beta_0)_d + (\beta^{nT})_d (x^n)_d, \sigma_d^2) \quad (17.13)$$

for each  $d \in S_d$ .

- $D \leftarrow GLP$

If D expects a continuous parent, no need to preprocess GLP output. If D expects a discrete parent, break the interval  $[a, b]$  that contains most of the range of the GPL node into sub-intervals and assign a discrete label to each subinterval.

- $D \leftarrow D$

# Chapter 18

## Hidden Markov Model

A Hidden Markov Model (HMM) is a generalization of a Kalman Filter (KF). KFs are discussed in Chapter 23. The bnets of HHMs and KFs bnets are the same. The only difference is that a KF assumes special node TPMs.

See Wikipedia article Ref.[48] to learn about the history and many uses of HMMs. This chapter is based on Ref.[17].



Figure 18.1: HMM bnet with  $n = 4$ .

Suppose

$\underline{v}^n = (\underline{v}_0, \underline{v}_1, \dots, \underline{v}_{n-1})$  are  $n$  visible nodes that are measured, and

$\underline{x}^n = (\underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_{n-1})$  are the  $n$  hidden, unmeasurable state nodes of a system that is being monitored.

For the bnet of Fig.18.1, one has

$$P(\underline{x}^n, \underline{v}^n) = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} P(x_i | x_{i-1}) P(v_i | x_i) , \quad (18.1)$$

where  $x_{-1} = 0$ .

Let  $x_{<i} = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})$ .

For  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ , define

$\mathcal{F}_i$ =future measurements probability

$$\mathcal{F}_i(x_i) = P(v_{>i} | x_i) \quad (18.2)$$



$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_i$  = past and present measurements probability

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_i(x_i) = P(v_{<i}, v_i, x_i) \quad (18.3)$$

$\lambda_i$  = present measurement probability

$$\lambda_i(x_i) = P(v_i|x_i) \quad (18.4)$$

$\mathcal{F}_i$ ,  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_i$  and  $\lambda_i$  can be represented graphically as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}_i(x_i) = \frac{1}{P(x_i)} \sum_{x_{>i}} \quad \begin{array}{c} x_i \longrightarrow x_{>i} \\ \downarrow \\ v_{>i} \end{array} \quad (18.5)$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_i(x_i) = \sum_{x_{<i}} \quad \begin{array}{c} x_{<i} \longrightarrow x_i \\ \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\ v_{<i} \quad v_i \end{array} \quad (18.6)$$

$$\lambda_i(x_i) = \frac{1}{P(x_i)} \quad \begin{array}{c} x_i \\ \downarrow \\ v_i \end{array} \quad (18.7)$$

**Claim 15** For  $i \geq 0$ ,

$$P(x_i, v^n) = \overline{\mathcal{F}}_i(x_i) \mathcal{F}_i(x_i) . \quad (18.8)$$

For  $i > 0$ ,

$$P(x_{i-1}, x_i, v^n) = \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{i-1}(x_{i-1}) \lambda_i(x_i) P(x_i|x_{i-1}) \mathcal{F}_i(x_i) . \quad (18.9)$$

**proof:**

$$P(x_i, v^n) = \sum_{x_{<i}} \sum_{x_{>i}} P(x^n, v^n) \quad (18.10)$$

$$= \sum_{x_{<i}} \sum_{x_{>i}} P(x^n, v^n | x_i) P(x_i) \quad (18.11)$$

$$= \sum_{x_{<i}} \sum_{x_{>i}} P(x_{<i}, v_{<i}, v_i | x_i) P(x_{>i}, v_{>i} | x_i) P(x_i) \quad (18.12)$$

$$= P(v_{<i}, v_i | x_i) P(v_{>i} | x_i) P(x_i) \quad (18.13)$$

$$= \overline{\mathcal{F}}_i(x_i) \mathcal{F}_i(x_i) \quad (18.14)$$

$$P(x_{i-1}, x_i, v^n) = \sum_{x_{<i-1}} \sum_{x_{>i}} P(x^n, v^n) \quad (18.15)$$

$$= \sum_{x_{<i-1}} \sum_{x_{>i}} P(x^n, v^n | x_{i-1}, x_i) P(x_{i-1}, x_i) \quad (18.16)$$

$$= \sum_{x_{<i-1}} \sum_{x_{>i}} P(x_{<i-1}, v_{<i-1}, v_{i-1} | x_{i-1}) P(v_i | x_i) P(x_{i-1}, x_i) P(x_{>i}, v_{>i} | x_i) \quad (18.17)$$

$$= P(v_{<i-1}, v_{i-1} | x_{i-1}) P(v_i | x_i) P(x_{i-1}, x_i) P(v_{>i} | x_i) \quad (18.18)$$

$$= \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{i-1}(x_{i-1}) \lambda_i(x_i) P(x_i | x_{i-1}) \mathcal{F}_i(x_i) \quad (18.19)$$

**QED**

**Claim 16** For  $i > 0$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_i$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_i$  can be calculated recursively as follows:

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_i(x_i) = \sum_{x_{i-1}} \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{i-1}(x_{i-1}) \lambda_i(x_i) P(x_i | x_{i-1}) \quad (18.20)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{i-1}(x_{i-1}) = \sum_{x_i} \lambda_i(x_i) P(x_i | x_{i-1}) \mathcal{F}_i(x_i) \quad (18.21)$$

**proof:**

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_i(x_i) \mathcal{F}_i(x_i) = P(x_i, v^n) \quad (18.22)$$

$$= \sum_{x_{i-1}} P(x_{i-1}, x_i, v^n) \quad (18.23)$$

$$= \sum_{x_{i-1}} \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{i-1}(x_{i-1}) \lambda_i(x_i) P(x_i | x_{i-1}) \mathcal{F}_i(x_i) \quad (18.24)$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{i-1}(x_{i-1}) \mathcal{F}_{i-1}(x_{i-1}) = P(x_{i-1}, v^n) \quad (18.25)$$

$$= \sum_{x_i} P(x_{i-1}, x_i, v^n) \quad (18.26)$$

$$= \sum_{x_i} \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{i-1}(x_{i-1}) \lambda_i(x_i) P(x_i | x_{i-1}) \mathcal{F}_i(x_i) \quad (18.27)$$

**QED**

**Claim 17**

$$P(x_i | x_{i-1}, v^n) = \frac{\lambda_i(x_i) \mathcal{F}_i(x_i)}{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{i-1}(x_{i-1})} P(x_i | x_{i-1}) \quad (18.28)$$

$$P(x_{i-1} | x_i, v^n) = \frac{\lambda_i(x_i) \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{i-1}(x_{i-1})}{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_i(x_i)} P(x_i | x_{i-1}) \quad (18.29)$$

**proof:**

$$P(x_i|x_{i-1}, v^n) = \frac{P(x_{i-1}, x_i, v^n)}{P(x_{i-1}, v^n)} \quad (18.30)$$

$$= \frac{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{i-1}(x_{i-1})\lambda_i(x_i)P(x_i|x_{i-1})\mathcal{F}_i(x_i)}{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{i-1}(x_{i-1})\mathcal{F}_{i-1}(x_{i-1})} \quad (18.31)$$

Analogous proof for Eq.(18.29).

**QED**

# Chapter 19

## Influence Diagrams & Utility Nodes

Influence diagrams are just arbitrary bnets enhanced with a new kind of node called an utility node. The rest of this brief chapter will be devoted to discussing utility nodes.

Suppose  $U(x)$  is a deterministic function  $U : S_{\underline{x}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  called the **utility function**. Then the **expected utility** is defined as

$$E_{\underline{U}}[\underline{U}] = \sum_U P(U)U \quad (19.1)$$

$$= \sum_x \sum_U \underbrace{P(U|x)}_{\delta[U, U(x)]} P(x)U \quad (19.2)$$

$$= \sum_x P(x)U(x) . \quad (19.3)$$

An **utility node** can be understood as a node composed of 3 simpler bnet nodes. This is illustrated in Fig.19.1.




Figure 19.1: An utility node can be understood as a node composed of 3 simpler bnet nodes.

The TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes of Fig.19.1, are as follows:

$$P(U|pa(U)) = \delta[U, U(pa(U))] , \quad (19.4)$$

where if  $U : S_{\underline{x}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , then  $\underline{x} = pa(\underline{U})$ .

$$P(u|pa(U)) = \delta[u, U(pa(U))] \quad (19.5)$$

Node  $\underline{\mu}_u$  calculates the expected value (mean value) of  $\underline{u}$ :

$$P(\mu_u) = \delta(\mu_u, E_{\underline{u}}[\underline{u}]) \quad (19.6)$$

Node  $\underline{\sigma}_u$  calculates the standard deviation of  $\underline{u}$ :

$$P(\sigma_u) = \delta(\sigma_u, \sqrt{E_{\underline{u}}[(\underline{u} - E_{\underline{u}}[\underline{u}])^2]}) \quad (19.7)$$

Note that in order to calculate expected values, it is necessary that  $\underline{U}, \underline{u} \in \mathbb{R}$ . Note that nodes  $\underline{u}$ ,  $\underline{\mu}_u$ ,  $\underline{\sigma}_u$  must all 3 have access to the TPM  $P(U|pa(U))$  of node  $\underline{U}$ . In fact, in order to calculate  $E_{\underline{u}}[\cdot]$ , it is necessary for nodes  $\underline{\mu}_u$  and  $\underline{\sigma}_u$  to have access not just to  $P(U|pa(U))$  but also to  $P(pa(U))$ .

See Fig.19.2. An influence diagram may have multiple utility nodes ( $\underline{U}_1$  and  $\underline{U}_2$  in Fig.19.2). Then one can define a merging utility node  $\underline{U}$  that sums the values of all the other utility nodes.



Figure 19.2: An influence diagram may have multiple utility nodes, say  $\underline{U}_1$  and  $\underline{U}_2$ . Then one can define an utility node  $\underline{U} = \underline{U}_1 + \underline{U}_2$ .

For the node  $\underline{U}$  of Fig.19.2,

$$P(U|U_1, U_2) = \delta(U, U_1 + U_2) \quad (19.8)$$

# Chapter 20

## Instrumental Inequality and beyond

This chapter is based on Refs. [4] and [19].

Instrumental Variables (IVs) are discussed in Chapter 21. This chapter will discuss the original Instrumental inequality (I-inequality) discovered by Pearl, and other related inequalities. The I-inequality arises in bnets that use an IV. The I-inequality bounds the effect that an IV  $\underline{z}$  can have on the outcome  $\underline{y}$  of a treatment  $\underline{d} \rightarrow \underline{y}$ . Since there is a path  $\underline{z} \rightarrow \underline{d} \rightarrow \underline{y}$ , the treatment dose  $\underline{d}$  acts as a mediator between the IV  $\underline{z}$  and the treatment outcome  $\underline{y}$ . The I-inequality is reminiscent of the data processing inequality  $H(\underline{z} : \underline{y}) \leq H(\underline{d} : \underline{y})$  which is valid for a simple Markov chain bnet  $\underline{z} \rightarrow \underline{d} \rightarrow \underline{y}$ . The data processing inequality is saying that the endpoint  $\underline{y}$  receives more information from  $\underline{d}$  than from  $\underline{z}$ . This is reasonable, since  $\underline{y}$  is “closer” to  $\underline{d}$  than to  $\underline{z}$ .

### 20.1 I-inequality




Figure 20.1: In bnet  $G$ , an IV  $\underline{z}$  acts on a treatment  $\underline{d} \rightarrow \underline{y}$ . Bnet  $\tilde{G}$  is obtained by applying an imagine operator to arrow  $\underline{d} \rightarrow \underline{y}$  of bnet  $G$ .

**Claim 18** *The TPMs for the bnet  $G$  in Fig.20.1 satisfy*

$$\max_d \sum_y \max_z P(d, y|z) \leq 1 \quad (20.1)$$

**proof:**

Below, any probability that alludes to a value  $\tilde{d}$  refers to bnet  $\tilde{G}$ . Otherwise, if it doesn't allude to  $\tilde{d}$ , then it refers to  $G$  (or to  $\tilde{G}$ , since the TPMs of  $\tilde{G}$  are defined from those of  $G$  in a consistent manner.)

$G$  satisfies

$$P(d, y|z) = \sum_u P(u)P(y|u, d)P(d|u, z) , \quad (20.2)$$

and  $\tilde{G}$  satisfies

$$P(d, y|z, \tilde{d}) = \sum_u P(u)P(y|u, \tilde{d})P(d|u, z) . \quad (20.3)$$

Note that Eqs.(20.2) and (20.3) imply that

$$P(d, y|z, d) = P(d, y|z) \quad (20.4)$$

and that

$$\boxed{P(\tilde{d}, y|z, \tilde{d}) \leq \sum_d P(d, y|z, \tilde{d}) = P(y|\tilde{d})} . \quad (20.5)$$

Thus,

$$\max_{\tilde{d}} \sum_y \max_z P(\tilde{d}, y|z, \tilde{d}) \leq \max_{\tilde{d}} \sum_y \max_z P(y|\tilde{d}) \quad (20.6)$$

$$\leq \max_{\tilde{d}} \sum_y P(y|\tilde{d}) \quad (20.7)$$

$$\leq \max_{\tilde{d}} 1 \quad (20.8)$$

$$\leq 1 \quad (20.9)$$

**QED**

As pointed out in Ref.[4] from which I learned the above proof, the above proof is highly generalizable.

Fig.20.2 gives a graphical representation of the boxed Eq.(20.5) which is crucial to the proof. And here is a meta-description of the steps in the proof:

1. Use imagine operator to create a non-negative matrix  $M_{d,\tilde{d}}$ .
2. Use fact that row or column sum of  $M_{d,\tilde{d}}$  is larger than diagonal element in sum:  $\sum_d M_{d,\tilde{d}} \geq M_{\tilde{d},\tilde{d}}$ .




Figure 20.2: Graphical representation of the boxed equation Eq.(20.5).

$$P(d = 1, y|z) = \begin{array}{c} z = 0 \quad z = 1 \\ \begin{array}{c|c} y = 0 & \begin{array}{c} a \\ b \end{array} \\ \hline y = 1 & \begin{array}{c} c \\ d \end{array} \end{array} \end{array}$$

$$a + d \leq 1$$

$$b + c \leq 1$$

Figure 20.3: I-inequality for binary  $\underline{z}, \underline{d}, \underline{y}$ . The same picture except with  $d = 0$  is also true.

### 20.1.1 I-inequality for binary $\underline{z}, \underline{d}, \underline{y}$

It is enlightening to write down the I-inequality for the special case that  $\underline{z}, \underline{d}, \underline{y}$  are binary.

In the binary case, the I-inequality implies 4 different inequalities. These are as follows. One gets two inequalities by setting  $d = 1$  in the next 2 equations.

$$\sum_{y=0}^1 \sum_{z=0}^1 \mathbb{1}(y = z) P(d, y|z) , \quad (20.10a)$$

$$\sum_{y=0}^1 \sum_{z=0}^1 \mathbb{1}(y \neq z) P(d, y|z) . \quad (20.10b)$$

One gets an additional 2 inequalities by setting  $d = 0$  in Eqs.(20.10). These 4 inequalities are illustrated in Fig.20.3.

What do they mean? That at fixed  $\underline{d}$ , the correlation between  $\underline{z}$  and  $\underline{y}$  is limited.

## 20.2 Bounds on Effect of IV on treatment outcome $\underline{y}$

In this section, we will assume that random variables  $\underline{z}, \underline{d}, \underline{y}$  are binary. Just as with the binary case of the I-inequality, we will find an inequality for each value of  $\underline{d} \in \{0, 1\}$ .






Figure 20.4: Bnet  $\mathcal{G}$  is obtained from the bnet  $G$  in Fig.20.1 by adding to  $G$  an arrow from the IV  $\underline{z}$  to the treatment outcome  $\underline{y}$ . Bnet  $\mathcal{G}_{do}$  is obtained by applying a do operator to node  $\underline{d}$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Bnet  $\mathcal{G}_{im}$  is obtained by applying an imagine operator to arrow  $\underline{d} \rightarrow \underline{y}$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

Below, we will use the following 3 shorthand notations:

$$P_{y|z}(d) = P(d, y|z) , \quad (20.11)$$

$$P_{|z}(d) = \sum_y P(d, y|z) , \quad (20.12)$$

and

$$\pi_{|z}(d) = 1 - P_{|z}(d) . \quad (20.13)$$

For the bnet  $\mathcal{G}_{do}$  in Fig.20.4, define the IV effect at fixed  $\rho\underline{d} = \tilde{d}$  by

$$IVE(\tilde{d}) = P(y = 1|z = 1, \rho\underline{d} = \tilde{d}) - P(y = 1|z = 0, \rho\underline{d} = \tilde{d}) . \quad (20.14)$$

**Claim 19** *The TPMs for the bnet  $\mathcal{G}_{do}$  in Fig.20.4 satisfy*

$$\pi_{|0}(d) \leq [IVE(d) - \{P_{1|1}(d) - P_{1|0}(d)\}] \leq \pi_{|1}(d) \quad (20.15)$$

**proof:**

$$P(y|z, \rho\underline{d} = \tilde{d}) = \sum_u P(u)P(y|u, z, \tilde{d}) \quad (20.16)$$

$$= \sum_u P(u) \sum_d P(d, y|u, z, \tilde{d}) \quad (20.17)$$

$$\geq \sum_u P(u)P(\tilde{d}, y|u, z, \tilde{d}) \quad (20.18)$$

$$= \sum_u P(u)P(\tilde{d}, y|u, z) \quad (20.19)$$

$$= P_{y|z}(\tilde{d}) \quad (20.20)$$

Next note that  $P(d, y|z, \tilde{d}) \geq 0$ , and  $\sum_{d,y} P(d, y|z, \tilde{d}) = 1$ . If we write a table for  $P(d, y|z, \tilde{d})$  at fixed  $z, \tilde{d}$  with row and column indices  $(d, y)$ , then a partial sum of the entries of that table must be  $\leq 1$ :

$$\sum_{d \neq \tilde{d}} P(d, y|z, \tilde{d}) + \underbrace{\sum_{y'} P(\tilde{d}, y'|z, \tilde{d})}_{P_{|z}(\tilde{d})} \leq 1 . \quad (20.21)$$

Using the definitions of  $P_{|z}$  and  $\pi_{|z}$ , we can rewrite the last equation as

$$\sum_{d \neq \tilde{d}} P(d, y|z, \tilde{d}) \leq \pi_{|z}(\tilde{d}) . \quad (20.22)$$

Next note that

$$P(y|z, \rho \underline{d} = \tilde{d}) = \sum_u P(u) P(y|u, z, \tilde{d}) \quad (20.23)$$

$$= \sum_u P(u) \sum_d P(d, y|u, z, \tilde{d}) \quad (20.24)$$

$$= P(\tilde{d}, y|z, \tilde{d}) + \sum_{d \neq \tilde{d}} P(d, y|z, \tilde{d}) \quad (20.25)$$

$$= P_{y|z}(\tilde{d}) + \sum_{d \neq \tilde{d}} P(d, y|z, \tilde{d}) \quad (20.26)$$

$$\leq P_{y|z}(\tilde{d}) + \pi_{|z}(\tilde{d}) . \quad (20.27)$$

Hence,

$$P_{y|z}(\tilde{d}) \leq P(y|z, \rho \underline{d} = \tilde{d}) \leq P_{y|z}(\tilde{d}) + \pi_{|z} \quad (20.28)$$

$$P_{1|1}(\tilde{d}) \leq P(y = 1|z = 1, \rho \underline{d} = \tilde{d}) \leq P_{1|1}(\tilde{d}) + \pi_{|1} \quad (20.29)$$

$$-P_{1|0}(\tilde{d}) - \pi_{|0} \leq -P(y = 1|z = 0, \rho \underline{d} = \tilde{d}) \leq -P_{1|0}(\tilde{d}) \quad (20.30)$$

**QED**

# Chapter 21

## Instrumental Variables

This chapter is based on Refs.[3] and [50].

The theory of potential outcomes (PO) discussed in Chapter 37 assumes that confounders can be ignored by conditioning on them. However, there are cases when that is not possible, as when there are some unmeasured (i.e., unobserved, hidden) confounder nodes in the bnet, because one can only condition on observed random variables, by definition. So what if confounders can't be ignored? Are we then precluded from using PO theory? Not necessarily. It might still be possible to use PO theory if one can find a suitable instrumental variable (IV) for the problem.

IVs were actually invented by Sewall Wright and his father Philip Wright long before PO theory was invented by Rubin. The reason why IVs save PO theory is greatly clarified by using Pearl causal DAGs and his d-separation theorem (see Chapter 12).

Most of the discussion in this chapter is limited to LDEN (linear deterministic bnets with external noise). These are discussed in Chapter 25. However, as will become obvious to the reader, IVs are also applicable and useful in general bnet modeling.

### 21.1 $\delta$ with unmeasured confounder

In this section, we explain using LDENs why unmeasured confounders prejudice PO calculations.




Figure 21.1: An LDEN bnet. The direct path  $\underline{d} \rightarrow \underline{y}$  is confounded by a hidden variable  $\underline{h}$ .

Consider the LDEN bnet of Fig.21.1, For some  $\delta, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\underline{y} = \delta \underline{d} + \underbrace{\mu \underline{h} + \underline{u}_y}_{\underline{n}_y} . \quad (21.1)$$

If  $\langle \underline{n}_y, \underline{d} \rangle = 0$ , then

$$\langle \underline{y}, \underline{d} \rangle = \delta_0 \langle \underline{d}, \underline{d} \rangle , \quad (21.2)$$

whereas if  $\langle \underline{n}_y, \underline{d} \rangle \neq 0$ , then

$$\langle \underline{y}, \underline{d} \rangle = \delta_1 \langle \underline{d}, \underline{d} \rangle + \langle \underline{n}_y, \underline{d} \rangle . \quad (21.3)$$

Therefore,

$$\delta_0 = \frac{\langle \underline{y}, \underline{d} \rangle}{\langle \underline{d}, \underline{d} \rangle} , \quad (21.4)$$

$$\delta_1 = \underbrace{\frac{\langle \underline{y}, \underline{d} \rangle}{\langle \underline{d}, \underline{d} \rangle}}_{\delta_0} - \frac{\langle \underline{n}_y, \underline{d} \rangle}{\langle \underline{d}, \underline{d} \rangle} . \quad (21.5)$$

If we assume no confounders and there is one, this gives the difference between the estimate  $\delta_1$  of  $\delta$  for the truth, versus the naive estimate  $\delta_0$ .

If the confounder  $\underline{h}$  had been measured, then we would calculate the covariances at fixed  $\underline{n}_y$ , and the conditional covariance  $\langle \underline{n}_y, \underline{d} \rangle_{|\underline{n}_y} = 0$

## 21.2 $\delta$ (with unmeasured confounder) can be inferred via IV




Figure 21.2: Two LDEN bnets. The direct path  $\underline{d} \rightarrow \underline{y}$  is confounded by a hidden variable  $\underline{h}$ , but by using the IV  $\underline{A}$ , we are still able to identify (i.e. calculate)  $\delta$ .

Now consider the two LDEN bnets shown in Fig.21.2. Note that there are no arrows  $\underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{y}$  or  $\underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{h}$ . Note that node  $\underline{d}$  is a collider in the path  $\underline{A} - \underline{d} - \underline{h} - \underline{y}$ , Therefore, the only unblocked path from  $\underline{A}$  to  $\underline{y}$  in  $G$  is  $\underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{d} \rightarrow \underline{y}$  and that path has been removed in  $G_{im+}$ . These observations are encapsulated in the following statements.

$$\underline{d} \perp_G \underline{y} = \text{false}, \quad \underline{A} \perp_G \underline{y} = \text{false} . \quad (21.6)$$

$$\underline{d} \perp_{G_{im+}} \underline{y} = \text{false}, \quad \underline{A} \perp_{G_{im+}} \underline{y} = \text{true} . \quad (21.7)$$

The following is true for  $G$ :

$$\underline{y} = \delta \underline{d} + \underbrace{\mu \underline{h} + \underline{u}_y}_{\underline{n}_y} \quad (21.8)$$

$$\underline{d} = \alpha \underline{A} + \underbrace{\nu \underline{h} + \underline{u}_d}_{\underline{n}_d} . \quad (21.9)$$

Since  $\langle \underline{n}_y, \underline{A} \rangle = \langle \underline{n}_d, \underline{A} \rangle = 0$  is true in  $G$ , we have

$$\langle \underline{y}, \underline{A} \rangle = \delta \langle \underline{d}, \underline{A} \rangle \quad (21.10)$$

and

$$\langle \underline{d}, \underline{A} \rangle = \alpha \langle \underline{A}, \underline{A} \rangle . \quad (21.11)$$

Note that  $\langle \underline{y}, \underline{A} \rangle = \delta = 0$  for  $G_{im+}$  but not for  $G$ , so we are speaking about  $G$  from here on. It follows that

$$\alpha = \frac{\langle \underline{d}, \underline{A} \rangle}{\langle \underline{A}, \underline{A} \rangle} \quad (21.12)$$

and

$$\delta = \frac{\langle \underline{y}, \underline{A} \rangle}{\langle \underline{d}, \underline{A} \rangle} \quad (21.13)$$

$$= \frac{\langle \underline{y}, \underline{A} \rangle}{\langle \underline{A}, \underline{A} \rangle} \frac{\langle \underline{A}, \underline{A} \rangle}{\langle \underline{d}, \underline{A} \rangle} \quad (21.14)$$

$$= \frac{\langle \underline{y}, \underline{A} \rangle}{\langle \underline{A}, \underline{A} \rangle} \frac{1}{\alpha} \quad (21.15)$$

$$= \frac{\langle \underline{y}, \alpha \underline{A} \rangle}{\langle \alpha \underline{A}, \alpha \underline{A} \rangle} . \quad (21.16)$$

## 21.3 More general bnets with IVs

Figs.21.3 and 21.4 are examples of other bnets for which the effect  $\delta$  is identifiable thanks to the IV  $\underline{A}$ .

## 21.4 Instrumental Inequality

Pearl's instrumental inequality and related inequalities are discussed in Chapter 20.




Figure 21.3: The 2 paths in  $G_{im+}$  from IV variable  $\underline{A}$  to  $\underline{y}$  are blocked by colliders  $\underline{v}$  and  $\underline{d}$ . Thus,  $\underline{d} \perp_{G_{im+}} \underline{y} = \text{false}$ ,  $\underline{A} \perp_{G_{im+}} \underline{y} = \text{true}$




Figure 21.4: There are 2 paths in  $G_{im+}$  from IV variable  $\underline{A}$  to  $\underline{y}$ . One is blocked by the collider  $\underline{d}$  and the other can be blocked by conditioning on  $\underline{v}$ . Thus,  $\underline{d} \perp_{G_{im+}} \underline{y} | \underline{v} = \text{false}$ ,  $\underline{A} \perp_{G_{im+}} \underline{y} | \underline{v} = \text{true}$

# Chapter 22

## Junction Tree Algorithm

The Junction Tree (JT) algorithm is an algo for evaluating exact marginals of a bnet, including cases in which some nodes are fixed to a single state. (fixed nodes are called the a priori evidence.)

The JT algo starts by clustering the loops of a bnet into bigger nodes so as to transform the bnet into a polytree bnet. Then it applies Pearl Belief Propagation (see Chapter 29) to the ensuing polytree. The first breakthrough paper to achieve this agenda in full was Ref.[10] by Lauritzen, and Spiegelhalter in 1988. See the Wikipedia article Ref.[52] for more info and references on the JT algorithm.

I won't describe the JT algo any further here, because it would take too long for this brief book to give a complete treatment of it, including the mathematical proofs. If all you want to do is to code the JT algo, without delving into the mathematical theorems and proofs behind it, I strongly recommend Ref.[9]. Ref.[9] is an excellent cookbook for programmers of the JT algo. My open source program QuantumFog (see Ref.[33]) implements the JT algo in Python, following the recipe of Ref.[9].

# Chapter 23

## Kalman Filter

A Kalman Filter is a special case of a Hidden Markov Model. HMMs are discussed in Chapter 18.




Figure 23.1: Kalman Filter bnnet with  $T = 4$ .

Let  $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots, T - 1$ .

$\underline{x}_t \in S_{\underline{x}}$  are random variables that represent the hidden (unobserved) true state of the system.

$\underline{z}_t \in S_{\underline{z}}$  are random variables that represent the measured (observed) state of the system.

The Kalman Filter bnnet Fig.23.1 has the following node TPMs, printed in blue:

$$P(\underline{x}_t | \underline{x}_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}(\underline{x}_t; F_t \underline{x}_{t-1} + B_t u_t, Q_t) , \quad (23.1)$$

where  $F_t, Q_t, B_t, u_t$  are given.  $P(\underline{x}_t | \underline{x}_{t-1})$  becomes  $P(\underline{x}_t)$  for  $t = 0$ .

$$P(\underline{z}_t | \underline{x}_t) = \mathcal{N}(\underline{z}_t; H_t \underline{x}_t, R_t) , \quad (23.2)$$

where  $H_t, R_t$  are given.

Define

$$\underline{Z}_t = (\underline{z}_{t'})_{t' \leq t} . \quad (23.3)$$

Define  $\hat{x}_t$  and  $P_t$  by

$$P(\underline{x}_t | \underline{Z}_t) = \mathcal{N}(\underline{x}_t; \hat{x}_t, P_t) . \quad (23.4)$$



## 23.1 Problem

Find  $\hat{x}_t$  and  $P_t$  in terms of

1. current (at time  $t$ ) given values of  $F, Q, H, R, B, u$
2. current (at time  $t$ ) observed value of  $z$
3. prior (previous) value (at time  $t - 1$ ) of  $\hat{x}$  and  $P$ .

See Fig.23.2. For that figure,

$$P(\hat{x}_t, P_t | z_t, \hat{x}_{t-1}, P_{t-1}) = \delta(\hat{x}_t, ?) \delta(P_t, ?) . \quad (23.5)$$




Figure 23.2: Kalman Filter bnnet with deterministic nodes for  $\hat{x}_t, P_t$ .

## 23.2 Solution

Solution copied from Wikipedia Ref.[54].

Define  $\eta_{t|t} = \eta_t$  for  $\eta = \hat{x}, P$ .

- **Predict**

Predicted (a priori) state estimate

$$\hat{x}_{t|t-1} = F_t \hat{x}_{t-1|t-1} + B_t u_t \quad (23.6)$$

Predicted (a priori) estimate covariance

$$P_{t|t-1} = F_t P_{t-1|t-1} F_t^\top + Q_t \quad (23.7)$$

- **Update**

Innovation (or measurement pre-fit residual)

$$\tilde{y}_{t|t-1} = z_t - H_t \hat{x}_{t|t-1} \quad (23.8)$$

Innovation (or pre-fit residual) covariance

$$S_t = H_t P_{t|t-1} H_t^\top + R_t \quad (23.9)$$

Optimal Kalman gain

$$K_t = P_{t|t-1} H_t^\top S_t^{-1} \quad (23.10)$$

Updated (a posteriori) state estimate

$$\hat{x}_{t|t} = \hat{x}_{t|t-1} + K_t \tilde{y}_t \quad (23.11)$$

Updated (a posteriori) estimate covariance

$$P_{t|t} = (I - K_t H_t) P_{t|t-1} \quad (23.12)$$

Measurement post-fit residual

$$\tilde{y}_{t|t} = z_t - H_t \hat{x}_{t|t} \quad (23.13)$$

# Chapter 24

## Linear and Logistic Regression



Figure 24.1: Linear Regression




Figure 24.2: B net of Fig.24.1 with new  $\vec{Y}$  node.

Estimators  $\hat{y}$  for linear and logistic regression.

- **Linear Regression:**  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ . Note  $\hat{y} \in \mathbb{R}$ .  $(x, \hat{y}(x))$  is the graph of a straight line with y-intercept  $b$  and slope  $m$ .

$$\hat{y}(x; b, m) = b + mx \quad (24.1)$$

- **Logistic Regression:**  $y \in \{0, 1\}$ . Note  $\hat{y} \in [0, 1]$ .  $(x, \hat{y}(x))$  is the graph of a sigmoid. Often in literature,  $b, m$  are replaced by  $\beta_0, \beta_1$ .

$$\hat{y}(x; b, m) = \text{sig}(b + mx) \quad (24.2)$$

Define

$$V(b, m) = \sum_{x, y} P(x, y) |y - \hat{y}(x; b, m)|^2 . \quad (24.3)$$

We want to minimize  $V(b, m)$  (called a cost or loss function) wrt  $b$  and  $m$ .

Node TPMs of B net of Fig.24.1 given next in blue.

$$P(b, m) = \text{given} \quad (24.4)$$

The first time it is used,  $(b, m)$  is arbitrary. After the first time, it is determined by previous stage.

Let

$$P_{\underline{x}, \underline{y}}(x, y) = \frac{1}{nsam(\vec{x})} \sum_{\sigma} \mathbb{1}(x = x[\sigma], y = y[\sigma]) . \quad (24.5)$$

$$P(\vec{x}) = \prod_{\sigma} P(x[\sigma]) \quad (24.6)$$

$$P(\vec{y}|\vec{x}) = \prod_{\sigma} P(y[\sigma] | x[\sigma]) \quad (24.7)$$

$$P(\vec{\hat{y}}|\vec{x}, b, m) = \prod_{\sigma} \delta(\hat{y}[\sigma], \hat{y}(x[\sigma], b, m)) \quad (24.8)$$

$$P(V|\vec{\hat{y}}, \vec{y}) = \delta(V, \frac{1}{nsam(\vec{x})} \sum_{\sigma} |y[\sigma] - \hat{y}[\sigma]|^2) \quad (24.9)$$

Let  $\eta_b, \eta_m > 0$ . For  $x = b, m$ , if  $x' - x = \Delta x = -\eta \frac{\partial V}{\partial x}$ , then  $\Delta V \approx \frac{-1}{\eta} (\Delta x)^2 \leq 0$  for  $\eta > 0$ . This is called “gradient descent”.

$$P(b'|V, b) = \delta(b', b - \eta_b \partial_b V) \quad (24.10)$$

$$P(m'|V, m) = \delta(m', m - \eta_m \partial_m V) \quad (24.11)$$

## 24.1 Generalization to $x$ with multiple components(features)

Suppose that for each sample  $\sigma$ , instead of  $x[\sigma]$  being a scalar, it has  $n$  components called features:

$$x[\sigma] = (x_0[\sigma], x_1[\sigma], x_2[\sigma], \dots, x_{n-1}[\sigma]) . \quad (24.12)$$

Slope  $m$  is replaced by weights

$$w = (w_0, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{n-1}) , \quad (24.13)$$

and the product of 2 scalars  $mx[\sigma]$  is replaced by the inner vector product  $w^T x[\sigma]$ .

## 24.2 Alternative $V(b, m)$ for logistic regression

For logistic regression, since  $y[\sigma] \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $\hat{y}[\sigma] \in [0, 1]$  are both in the interval  $[0, 1]$ , they can be interpreted as probabilities. Define probability distributions  $p[\sigma](x)$  and  $\hat{p}[\sigma](x)$  for  $x \in \{0, 1\}$  by

$$p[\sigma](1) = y[\sigma], \quad p[\sigma](0) = 1 - y[\sigma] \quad (24.14)$$

$$\hat{p}[\sigma](1) = \hat{y}[\sigma], \quad \hat{p}[\sigma](0) = 1 - \hat{y}[\sigma] \quad (24.15)$$

Then for logistic regression, the following 2 cost functions  $V(b, m)$  can be used as alternatives to the cost function Eq.(24.3) previously given.

$$V(b, m) = \frac{1}{nsam(\vec{x})} \sum_{\sigma} D_{KL}(p[\sigma] \parallel \hat{p}[\sigma]) \quad (24.16)$$

and

$$V(b, m) = \frac{1}{nsam(\vec{x})} \sum_{\sigma} CE(p[\sigma] \rightarrow \hat{p}[\sigma]) \quad (24.17)$$

$$= \frac{-1}{nsam(\vec{x})} \sum_{\sigma} \{y[\sigma] \ln \hat{y}[\sigma] + (1 - y[\sigma]) \ln(1 - \hat{y}[\sigma])\} \quad (24.18)$$

$$= \frac{-1}{nsam(\vec{x})} \sum_{\sigma} \ln \{ \hat{y}[\sigma]^{y[\sigma]} (1 - \hat{y}[\sigma])^{(1-y[\sigma])} \} \quad (24.19)$$

$$= \frac{-1}{nsam(\vec{x})} \sum_{\sigma} \ln P(\underline{Y} = y[\sigma] \mid \hat{y} = \hat{y}[\sigma]) \quad (24.20)$$

$$= - \sum_{x, y} P(x, y) \ln P(\underline{Y} = y \mid \hat{y} = \hat{y}(x, b, m)) \quad (24.21)$$

Above, we used

$$P(\underline{Y} = Y \mid \hat{y}) = \hat{y}^Y [1 - \hat{y}]^{1-Y} \quad (24.22)$$

for  $Y \in S_{\underline{Y}} = \{0, 1\}$ . (Bernoulli distribution).

There is no node corresponding to  $\underline{Y}$  in the B net of Fig.24.1. Fig.24.2 shows a new B net that has a new node called  $\vec{\underline{Y}}$  compared to the B net of Fig.24.1. One defines the TPMs for all nodes of Fig.24.2 except  $\vec{\underline{Y}}$  and  $\underline{V}$  the same as for Fig.24.1. For  $\vec{\underline{Y}}$  and  $\underline{V}$ , one defines

$$P(Y[\sigma] | \hat{y}) = P(\underline{Y} = Y[\sigma] | \hat{y}[\sigma]) \quad (24.23)$$

$$P(V | \vec{Y}, \vec{y}) = \delta(V, \frac{-1}{nsam(\vec{x})} \ln \mathcal{L}) , \quad (24.24)$$

where  $\mathcal{L} = \prod_{\sigma} P(\underline{Y} = y[\sigma] | \hat{y}[\sigma])$ =likelihood.

# Chapter 25

## Linear Deterministic Bnets with External Noise

In this chapter, we will consider bnets which were referred to, prior to the invention of bnets, as: Sewall Wright's **Path Analysis (PA)** and **linear Structural Equations Models (SEM)**. Judea Pearl in his books calls them **linear Structural Causal Models (SCM)**, because they are very convenient for doing causal analysis. We will refer to them as linear Deterministic with External Noise (LDEN) diagrams. This chapter is devoted to LDEN diagrams, except that we will say a few words about non-linear DEN diagrams at the end.

A **DEN diagram** is a special kind of bnet. To build a DEN diagram, start with a deterministic bnet  $G$ . The deterministic nodes of  $G$  are called the **endogenous (internal) variables**. Now make a bigger bnet  $\bar{G}$  called a DEN diagram by adding to each node  $\underline{a}$  of  $G$  a non-deterministic root node  $\underline{u}_{\underline{a}}$  pointing into  $\underline{a}$  only. The nodes  $\underline{u}_{\underline{a}}$  are called the **exogenous (external) variables**. The exogenous variables make their children noisy. They are assumed to be unobserved and their TPMs are prior probability distributions. Since they are root nodes, they are mutually independent. When we draw a DEN diagram, we will never draw the exogenous nodes, leaving them implicit.

A **linear DEN diagram (LDEN)** is a DEN diagram whose deterministic nodes have a TPM that is a linear function of the states of the parent nodes.

### 25.1 Example of LDEN diagram

The TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes of the LDEN diagram Fig.25.1, are as follows.

$$P(y|w, z, \underline{u}_{\underline{y}}) = \mathbb{1}(y = \epsilon w + \delta z + \underline{u}_{\underline{y}}) \quad (25.1)$$

$$P(w|x, z, \underline{u}_{\underline{w}}) = \mathbb{1}(w = \beta x + \gamma z + \underline{u}_{\underline{w}}) \quad (25.2)$$

$$P(z|x, \underline{u}_{\underline{z}}) = \mathbb{1}(z = \alpha x + \underline{u}_{\underline{z}}) \quad (25.3)$$




Figure 25.1: Example of a LDEN diagram wherein  $\underline{x}$  splits into two nodes  $\underline{z}$  and  $\underline{w}$ , then merges into node  $\underline{y}$ . There is also an arrow  $\underline{z} \rightarrow \underline{w}$ . Exogenous nodes are not shown. The Greek letters represent real numbers.

$$P(x|u_{\underline{x}}) = \mathbb{1}(x = u_{\underline{x}}) \quad (25.4)$$

Hence,

$$y = \epsilon w + \delta z + u_{\underline{y}} \quad (25.5)$$

$$= \epsilon(\beta x + \gamma z + u_{\underline{w}}) + \delta z + u_{\underline{y}} \quad (25.6)$$

$$= (\epsilon\gamma + \delta)z + \epsilon\beta x + \epsilon u_{\underline{w}} + u_{\underline{y}} \quad (25.7)$$

$$= (\epsilon\gamma + \delta)z + \epsilon\beta u_{\underline{x}} + \epsilon u_{\underline{w}} + u_{\underline{y}} . \quad (25.8)$$

Therefore

$$\left( \frac{\partial y}{\partial z} \right)_{u_{\cdot} - u_{\underline{z}}} = \epsilon\gamma + \delta , \quad (25.9)$$

where the partial derivative holds fixed all exogenous variables except  $u_{\underline{z}}$ . Note that this partial derivative is a sum of terms, and that each of those terms represents a different directed path from  $\underline{z}$  to  $\underline{y}(\underline{z})$ . This is a general property of LDEN diagrams.

## 25.2 Fully Connected LDEN diagrams

The bnets that will be considered in this section will all be fully connected. Fully connected bnets are defined in Chapter chapter 0.23. This section uses the notation  $\langle \underline{x}, \underline{y} \rangle$  for the covariance of any two random variables  $\underline{x}, \underline{y}$ . This  $\langle \underline{x}, \underline{y} \rangle$  notation is defined in the Notational Conventions Chapter chapter 0.1.2.

Consider a LDEN diagram with deterministic nodes  $\underline{x}_{\cdot} = (\underline{x}_k)_{k=0,1,\dots,nx-1}$  and corresponding exogenous nodes  $\underline{u}_{\cdot} = (\underline{u}_k)_{k=0,1,\dots,nx-1}$ . Assume  $\langle \underline{u}_i, \underline{u}_j \rangle = 0$  if  $i \neq j$ . The strength of each connection  $\underline{x}_i \rightarrow \underline{x}_j$  of the LDEN diagram is measured by a **structural coefficient**  $\alpha_{j|i} \in \mathbb{R}$ . Some of the  $\alpha_{j|i}$  may be zero, in which case the corresponding arrow  $i \rightarrow j$  would not be drawn.



### 25.2.1 Fully connected LDEN diagram with $nx = 2$




Figure 25.2: Fully connected LDEN diagram with two  $\underline{x}_j$  nodes (exogenous nodes  $\underline{u}_j$  not shown).

Consider the LDEN diagram of Fig.25.2. This diagram represents the following **structural equations**:

$$\underline{x}_0 = \underline{u}_0 \quad (25.10a)$$

$$\underline{x}_1 = \alpha_{1|0}\underline{x}_0 + \underline{u}_1 . \quad (25.10b)$$

Eqs.25.10 constitute a system of 2 linear equations in 2 unknowns (the  $\underline{x}$ 's) so we can solve for the  $\underline{x}$ 's in terms of the  $\alpha$ 's and  $\underline{u}$ 's.

Note also that

$$\langle \underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_0 \rangle = \alpha_{1|0} \langle \underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_0 \rangle . \quad (25.11)$$

Thus,  $\alpha_{1|0}$  can be estimated from the covariances  $\langle \underline{x}_i, \underline{x}_j \rangle$ .

### 25.2.2 Fully connected LDEN diagram with $nx = 3$




Figure 25.3: Fully connected LDEN diagram with three  $\underline{x}_j$  nodes (exogenous nodes  $\underline{u}_j$  not shown).

Consider the LDEN diagram of Fig.25.3. This diagram represents the following **structural equations**:

$$\underline{x}_0 = \underline{u}_0 \quad (25.12a)$$

$$\underline{x}_1 = \alpha_{1|0}\underline{x}_0 + \underline{u}_1 \quad (25.12b)$$

$$\underline{x}_2 = \alpha_{2|0}\underline{x}_0 + \alpha_{2|1}\underline{x}_1 + \underline{u}_2 . \quad (25.12c)$$

Eqs.25.12 constitute a system of 3 linear equations in 3 unknowns (the  $\underline{x}$ 's) so we can solve for the  $\underline{x}$ 's in terms of the  $\alpha$ 's and  $\underline{u}$ 's.

Note also that

$$\langle \underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_0 \rangle = \alpha_{1|0} \langle \underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_0 \rangle \quad (25.13a)$$

$$\langle \underline{x}_2, \underline{x}_0 \rangle = \alpha_{2|0} \langle \underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_0 \rangle + \alpha_{2|1} \langle \underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_0 \rangle \quad (25.13b)$$

$$\langle \underline{x}_2, \underline{x}_1 \rangle = \alpha_{2|0} \langle \underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_1 \rangle + \alpha_{2|1} \langle \underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_1 \rangle \quad (25.13c)$$

Eqs.25.13 constitute a system of 3 linear equations in 3 unknowns (the  $\alpha$ 's) so we can solve solve for the  $\alpha$ 's in terms of covariances  $\langle \underline{x}_i, \underline{x}_j \rangle$ . This gives an estimate for the  $\alpha$ 's.

### 25.2.3 Fully connected LDEN diagram with arbitrary $nx$

Let  $\underline{x} = (x_i)_{i=0,1,\dots,nx-1}$  and  $\underline{x}_{<i} = (x_k)_{k=0,1,\dots,i-1}$ . Consider a fully connected LDEN diagram with deterministic nodes labeled  $\underline{x}_i$ . The  $\underline{x}_i$  labels are assumed to be in **topological order** (i.e., the parents of node  $\underline{x}_i$  are  $\underline{x}_{<i}$ ). Let the TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes  $\underline{x}$ . of the LDEN diagram, be

$$P(x_i | x_{<i}, u_i) = \mathbb{1}(x_i = \sum_{k<i} \alpha_{i|k} x_k + u_i) , \quad (25.14)$$

for some parameters  $\alpha_{i|k} \in \mathbb{R}$ . The exogenous nodes  $\underline{u}$ . are assumed to be independent so

$$P(u.) = \prod_i P(u_i) \quad (25.15)$$

and

$$\langle \underline{u}_i, \underline{u}_j \rangle = 0 \text{ if } i \neq j . \quad (25.16)$$

Note that

$$P(x.) = \sum_{u.} P(u.) \prod_i P(x_i | x_{<i}, u_i) \quad (25.17)$$

$$= E_{\underline{u}.} [\prod_i P(x_i | x_{<i}, u_i)] . \quad (25.18)$$

In terms of random variables, this system is described by the following **structural equations**:

$$\underline{x}_i = \sum_{k<i} \alpha_{i|k} \underline{x}_k + \underline{u}_i . \quad (25.19)$$

The structural equations can be written in matrix form as follows. Define a strictly lower triangular matrix  $A$  with the connection strengths  $\alpha_{i|k} \in \mathbb{R}$  as entries. For example, for  $nx = 4$ ,

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \alpha_{1|0} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \alpha_{2|0} & \alpha_{2|1} & 0 & 0 \\ \alpha_{3|0} & \alpha_{3|1} & \alpha_{3|2} & 0 \end{bmatrix} . \quad (25.20)$$

If we now represent the multinodes  $\underline{x}$ . and  $\underline{u}$ . as column vectors  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{u}$ , we get

$$\underline{x} = A\underline{x} + \underline{u} . \quad (25.21)$$

Note that

$$\underline{x} = (1 - A)^{-1}\underline{u} . \quad (25.22)$$

Therefore,

$$\underline{x}_i = f_i(\underline{u}_{\leq i}) . \quad (25.23)$$

Therefore, if  $i > j$ ,

$$\langle \underline{u}_i, \underline{x}_j \rangle = \langle \underline{u}_i, f_j(\underline{u}_{\leq j}) \rangle = 0 . \quad (25.24)$$

Thus, if  $i > j$ ,

$$\langle \underline{x}_i, \underline{x}_j \rangle = \sum_{k < i} \alpha_{i|k} \langle \underline{x}_k, \underline{x}_j \rangle + \langle \underline{u}_i, \underline{x}_j \rangle \quad (25.25)$$

$$= \sum_{k < i} \alpha_{i|k} \langle \underline{x}_k, \underline{x}_j \rangle . \quad (25.26)$$

In matrix notation, Eq.(25.26) becomes

$$\langle \underline{x}, \underline{x}^T \rangle_L = A[\langle \underline{x}, \underline{x}^T \rangle_L + \langle \underline{x}, \underline{x}^T \rangle_D] \quad (25.27)$$

where we are using  $\langle \underline{x}, \underline{x}^T \rangle_{i,j} = \langle \underline{x}_i, \underline{x}_j \rangle$  and denoting the strictly lower triangular part and diagonal part of a matrix  $M$  by  $M_L$  and  $M_D$ . Thus,

$$A = \langle \underline{x}, \underline{x}^T \rangle_L [\langle \underline{x}, \underline{x}^T \rangle_L + \langle \underline{x}, \underline{x}^T \rangle_D]^{-1} . \quad (25.28)$$

This gives an estimate for the  $\alpha$ 's in terms of the covariances  $\langle \underline{x}_i, \underline{x}_j \rangle$ .

## 25.3 Non-linear DEN diagrams

This chapter is dedicated to linear DEN diagrams. This implicitly assumes that the deterministic nodes  $\underline{x}$ . of the DEN diagram have an interval of real values as their possible states. A trivial but very useful generalization of linear DEN diagrams is to replace Eq.(25.14) for the TPMs of the deterministic nodes of the diagram by

$$P(x_i | x_{<i}, u_i) = \mathbb{1}(x_i = f_i(x_{<i}, u_i)) , \quad (25.29)$$

with structural equations

$$\underline{x}_i = f_i(\underline{x}_{<i}, \underline{u}_i) , \quad (25.30)$$

for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, nx - 1$ . Here the  $f_i$  are possibly non-linear functions that depend the states  $x_{<i}$  and  $u_i$  of nodes  $\underline{x}_{<i}$  and  $\underline{u}_i$ . If a node  $\underline{x}_i$  has no arrows entering it (i.e., is a root node), then

$$P(x_i|x_{<i}, u_i) = P(x_i) = \delta(x_i, a) \quad (25.31)$$

and

$$\underline{x}_i = a \quad (25.32)$$

for some  $a \in S_{\underline{x}_i}$ .

With this generalization, we can make any  $f_i()$  represent a continuous probability distribution such as a Gaussian, or a discrete-valued Boolean function such as an OR gate.

Eqs.(25.29) and (25.30) are the TPMs and structural equations for a fully connected, non-linear DEN diagram. For a non-fully connected diagram,

- replace the multinode  $x_{<i}$  by a subset of itself, in Eqs.(25.29) and (25.30) , and
- delete the corresponding arrows from the graph.

# Chapter 26

## Markov Blankets

This chapter is based on the Wikipedia article, Ref.[58]. Markov blankets and Markov boundaries of bnets were apparently invented by Judea Pearl. His 1988 book Ref.[21], instead of a research paper, is usually given as the original reference.




Figure 26.1: In a bnet, the minimal Markov blanket, aka Markov boundary, of node  $\underline{a}$ .

We will treat vectors of random variables as if they were sets when using the  $\in$ ,  $\subset$  and  $-$  operations. For example, if  $\underline{x} = (\underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2, \underline{x}_3)$  and  $\underline{b} = (\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2)$ , then  $\underline{x}_1 \in \underline{b} \subset \underline{x}$  and  $\underline{x} - \underline{b} = (\underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_3)$ .

Below,  $H(\underline{a} : \underline{b} | \underline{c})$  denotes the conditional mutual information of random variables  $\underline{a}$  and  $\underline{b}$  conditioned on random variable  $\underline{c}$ .  $H(\underline{a} : \underline{b} | \underline{c})$  is used in Shannon Information Theory, where it is defined by

$$H(\underline{a} : \underline{b} | \underline{c}) = \sum_{a,b,c} P(a,b,c) \ln \frac{P(a,b|c)}{P(a|c)P(b|c)} . \quad (26.1)$$

$H(\underline{a} : \underline{b} | \underline{c}) = 0$  iff  $\underline{a}$  and  $\underline{b}$  are independent (uncorrelated) when  $\underline{c}$  is held fixed.

Suppose  $\underline{a} \in \underline{X}$ ,  $\underline{B} \subset \underline{X}$ , but  $\underline{a} \notin \underline{B}$ . Then  $\underline{B}$  is a Markov blanket of  $\underline{a}$  if

$$H(\underline{a} : \underline{X} - \underline{a} | \underline{B}) = 0 . \quad (26.2)$$

In other words, one may assume that  $\underline{a}$  depends on  $\underline{B}$  only, and is independent of all random variables in  $\underline{X} - (\underline{a} \cup \underline{B})$ .

The minimal Markov blanket is called the Markov boundary.

In a bnet, the Markov boundary of a node  $\underline{a}$ , contains:

1. the parents of  $\underline{a}$ ,
2. the children of  $\underline{a}$ ,
3. the parents, other than  $\underline{a}$ , of the children of  $\underline{a}$ .

This is illustrated in Fig.26.1.

# Chapter 27

## Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)

Monte Carlo methods are methods for using random number generation to sample probability distributions. The subject of Monte Carlo methods has many branches, as you can see from its Wikipedia category list, Ref.[61]. MCMC (Markov Chain Monte Carlo) is just one of those branches, albeit a major one. Metropolis-Hastings (MH) sampling is a very important MCMC method. Gibbs sampling is a special case of MH sampling. This chapter covers both, MH and Gibbs sampling. It also covers a few other types of sampling.

Throughout this chapter, we use  $P_{\underline{x}} : S_{\underline{x}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  to denote the target probability distribution that we wish to obtain samples from.

### 27.1 Inverse Cumulative Sampling

For more info about this topic and some original references, see Ref.[51].

This is one of the simplest methods for obtaining samples from a probability distribution  $P_{\underline{x}}$ , but it requires knowledge of the inverse cumulative distribution of  $P_{\underline{x}}$ , which is often not available.

The **cumulative distribution** function is defined by:

$$CUM_{\underline{x}}(x) = P(\underline{x} < x) = \int_{x' < x} dx' P_{\underline{x}}(x') . \quad (27.1)$$

Note that

$$P_{\underline{x}}(x) = \frac{d}{dx} CUM_{\underline{x}}(x) . \quad (27.2)$$




Figure 27.1: bnet for Inverse Cumulative Sampling

For  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$ , let  
 $\underline{u}^{(t)} \in [0, 1]$  = random variable, uniformly distributed over  $[0, 1]$ .  
 $\underline{\vec{x}}^{(t)} = (\underline{x}^{(t)}[\sigma])_{\sigma=0,1,\dots,nsam(t)-1}$  where  $\underline{x}^{(t)}[\sigma] \in S_{\underline{x}}$  for all  $\sigma$ . Vector of samples collected up to time  $t$ .

The TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes of bnet Fig.27.1, are:

$$P(u^{(t)}) = 1 \quad (27.3)$$

$$P(\vec{x}^{(t)} | \vec{x}^{(t-1)}, u^{(t)}) = \delta(\vec{x}^{(t)}, [\vec{x}^{(t-1)}, CUM_{\underline{x}}^{-1}(u^{(t)})]) \quad (27.4)$$

---

## Motivation




Figure 27.2: Motivation for Inverse Cumulative Sampling.

See Fig.27.2.

Note that if  $\underline{u}$  is uniformly distributed over the interval  $[0, 1]$  and  $a \in [0, 1]$ , then

$$P(\underline{u} < a) = a . \quad (27.5)$$

Thus

$$P(CUM_{\underline{x}}^{-1}(\underline{u}) < x) = P(\underline{u} < CUM_{\underline{x}}(x)) \quad (27.6)$$

$$= CUM_{\underline{x}}(x) . \quad (27.7)$$

Therefore,

$$dP(CUM_{\underline{x}}^{-1}(\underline{u}) < x) = P_{\underline{x}}(x)dx . \quad (27.8)$$



## 27.2 Rejection Sampling

For more info about this topic and some original references, see Ref.[68].

This method samples from a “candidates” probability distribution  $P_{\underline{c}} : S_{\underline{x}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , in cases where sampling directly from the target probability distribution  $P_{\underline{x}} : S_{\underline{x}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is not possible.



Figure 27.3: bnet for Rejection Sampling

For  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$ , let

$\underline{u}^{(t)} \in [0, 1]$  = random variable, uniformly distributed over  $[0, 1]$ .

$\underline{a}^{(t)} \in \{0, 1\}$  = accept candidate? (no=0, yes=1)

$\underline{c}^{(t)} \in S_{\underline{x}}$  = sample that is a candidate for being accepted

$\vec{x}^{(t)} = (\underline{x}^{(t)}[\sigma])_{\sigma=0,1,\dots,nsam(t)-1}$  where  $\underline{x}^{(t)}[\sigma] \in S_{\underline{x}}$  for all  $\sigma$ . Vector of samples collected up to time  $t$ .

This algorithm requires a priori definition of a candidate probability distribution  $P_{\underline{c}} : S_{\underline{x}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$P_{\underline{x}}(x) < \beta P_{\underline{c}}(x) \quad (27.9)$$

for all  $x \in S_{\underline{x}}$ , for some  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ .

The TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes of bnet Fig.27.3, are:

$$P(\underline{u}^{(t)} = u) = 1 \quad (27.10)$$

$$P(\underline{c}^{(t)} = c) = P_{\underline{c}}(c) \quad (27.11)$$

$$P(\underline{a}^{(t)} = a | \underline{c}^{(t)} = c, \underline{u}^{(t)} = u) = \begin{cases} \delta(a, 0) & \text{if } u\beta P_{\underline{c}}(c) \geq P_{\underline{x}}(c) \\ \delta(a, 1) & \text{if } u\beta P_{\underline{c}}(c) < P_{\underline{x}}(c) \end{cases} \quad (27.12)$$

$$P(\vec{x}^{(t)} | \vec{x}^{(t-1)}, \underline{a}^{(t)} = a, \underline{c}^{(t)} = c) = \begin{cases} \delta(\vec{x}^{(t)}, \vec{x}^{(t-1)}) & \text{if } a = 0 \\ \delta(\vec{x}^{(t)}, [\vec{x}^{(t-1)}, c]) & \text{if } a = 1 \end{cases} \quad (27.13)$$

This last equation is only defined for  $t > 0$ . For  $t = 0$ , the left hand side reduces to  $P(\vec{x}^{(0)})$  which must be specified a priori.

### Motivation




Figure 27.4: Motivation for Rejection Sampling.

See Fig.27.4.

## 27.3 Metropolis-Hastings Sampling

For more info about this topic and some original references, see Refs.[1] and [59].

An advantage of this method is that it can sample unnormalized probability distributions  $(\text{constant})P_{\underline{x}}$  because it only uses ratios of  $P_{\underline{x}}$  at two different points. Another advantage of this method is that it scales much better than other sampling methods as the number of dimensions of the sampled variable  $\underline{x}$  increases.

This method produces samples that take a finite amount of time to reach steady state. The samples are also theoretically correlated instead of being i.i.d. as one desires. To mitigate for the steady state problem, one discards an initial set of samples (the “burn-in” period). To mitigate for the correlation problem, one calculates the autocorrelation between the samples and keeps only samples separated by a time interval after which the samples cease to be autocorrelated to a good approximation.




Figure 27.5: bnet for Metropolis-Hastings Sampling

For  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$ , let  
 $\underline{u}^{(t)} \in [0, 1]$  = random variable, uniformly distributed over  $[0, 1]$ .  
 $\underline{a}^{(t)} \in \{0, 1\}$  = accept candidate? (no=0, yes=1)  
 $\underline{c}^{(t)} \in S_{\underline{x}}$  = sample that is a candidate for being accepted  
 $\underline{m}^{(t)} \in S_{\underline{x}}$  = memory of last accepted sample  
 $\vec{x}^{(t)} = (\underline{x}^{(t)}[\sigma])_{\sigma=0,1,\dots,nsam(t)-1}$  where  $\underline{x}^{(t)}[\sigma] \in S_{\underline{x}}$  for all  $\sigma$ . Vector of samples collected up to time  $t$ .

A **proposal TPM**  $P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}} : S_{\underline{x}}^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$  must be specified a priori for this algorithm. The TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes of bnet Fig.27.5, are:

$$P(\underline{u}^{(t)} = u) = 1 \quad (27.14)$$

$$P(\underline{c}^{(t)} = c | \underline{m}^{(t)} = m) = P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}(c|m) \quad (27.15)$$

$$P(\underline{a}^{(t)} = a | \underline{c}^{(t)} = c, \underline{u}^{(t)} = u, \underline{m}^{(t)} = m) = \begin{cases} \delta(a, 0) & \text{if } u \geq \alpha(c|m) \\ \delta(a, 1) & \text{if } u < \alpha(c|m) \end{cases} \quad (27.16)$$

where the **acceptance probability**  $\alpha$  is defined as

$$\alpha(c|m) = \min \left( 1, \frac{P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}(m|c)P_{\underline{x}}(c)}{P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}(c|m)P_{\underline{x}}(m)} \right). \quad (27.17)$$

Note that if the proposal distribution is symmetric, then

$$\alpha(c|m) = \min \left( 1, \frac{P_{\underline{x}}(c)}{P_{\underline{x}}(m)} \right). \quad (27.18)$$

$$P(\vec{x}^{(t)} | \vec{x}^{(t-1)}, \underline{a}^{(t)} = a, \underline{c}^{(t)} = c) = \begin{cases} \delta(\vec{x}^{(t)}, \vec{x}^{(t-1)}) & \text{if } a = 0 \\ \delta(\vec{x}^{(t)}, [\vec{x}^{(t-1)}, c]) & \text{if } a = 1 \end{cases} \quad (27.19)$$

This last equation is only defined for  $t > 0$ . For  $t = 0$ , the left hand side reduces to  $P(\vec{x}^{(0)})$  which must be specified a priori.

$$P(\underline{m}^{(t)} = m | \vec{x}^{(t)}) = \delta(m, \text{last component of } \vec{x}^{(t)}). \quad (27.20)$$

This last equation is only defined for  $t > 0$ . For  $t = 0$ , the left hand side reduces to  $P(\underline{m}^{(0)} = m)$  which must be specified a priori.

---

### Motivation

See Fig.27.6.

Consider a time homogeneous (its TPM is the same for all times) Markov chain with TPM  $P(x'|x) = [T]_{x',x}$ . Its **stationary distribution**, if it exists, is defined as

$$\pi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T^n \pi_0. \quad (27.21)$$




Figure 27.6: Motivation for Metropolis-Hastings Sampling.

Suppose the prob distribution  $P_{\underline{x}}(x)$  that we wish to sample from satisfies

$$P_{\underline{x}}(x) = \pi(x) . \quad (27.22)$$

**Reversibility (detailed balance):** For all  $x, x' \in S_{\underline{x}}$ ,

$$P(x'|x)\pi(x) = P(x|x')\pi(x') . \quad (27.23)$$

Detailed balance is a sufficient (although not necessary) condition for a unique stationary prob distribution  $\pi$  to exist.<sup>1</sup>

Let

$$P(x'|x) = P(\underline{a} = 1|x', x)P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}(x'|x) + \delta(x, x')P(\underline{a} = 0|x) , \quad (27.24)$$

where

$$P(\underline{a} = 0|x) = \sum_{x'} P(\underline{a} = 0|x', x)P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}(x'|x) . \quad (27.25)$$

**Claim 20** *If*

$$P(\underline{a} = 1|x', x) = \alpha(x'|x) , \quad (27.26)$$

*then detailed balance is satisfied.*

**proof:** Assume  $x \neq x'$ .

---

<sup>1</sup> As explained lucidly in Ref.[1], besides detailed balance, 2 other properties must also be satisfied by the Markov chain, irreducibility and aperiodicity. However, because of how it is constructed, the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm automatically produces a Markov chain that has those 2 properties.

$$P(x'|x)P(x) = P(\underline{a} = 1|x', x)P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}(x'|x)P_{\underline{x}}(x) \quad (27.27)$$

$$= \min \left( 1, \frac{P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}(x|x')P_{\underline{x}}(x')}{P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}(x'|x)P_{\underline{x}}(x)} \right) P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}(x'|x)P_{\underline{x}}(x) \quad (27.28)$$

$$= \min (P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}(x'|x)P_{\underline{x}}(x), P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}(x|x')P_{\underline{x}}(x')) \quad (27.29)$$

$$= P(x|x')P(x') \quad (27.30)$$

**QED**

## 27.4 Gibbs Sampling

For more info about this topic and some original references, see Ref.[47].

Gibbs sampling is a special case of Metropolis-Hastings sampling. Gibbs sampling is ideally suited for application to a bnet, because it is stated in terms of the conditional prob distributions of  $N$  random variables, and conditional prob distributions are part of the definition of a bnet.

Consider a bnet with nodes  $\underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_{N-1}$

Identify the random variable  $\underline{x} = (\underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_{N-1})$  with the random variable  $\underline{x}$  used in Metropolis-Hastings sampling. For Gibbs sampling, we use the following proposal distribution:

$$P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}(c|m) = \prod_{j=0}^{N-1} P(c_j | [m_i]_{i \neq j}) . \quad (27.31)$$

Eq.(27.31) can be simplified using Markov Blankets (see Chapter 26) to the following:

$$P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}(c|m) = \prod_{j=0}^{N-1} P(c_j | [m_i : \forall i \ni \underline{x}_i \in MB(\underline{x}_j)]) , \quad (27.32)$$

where, for any node  $\underline{a}$ , we denote its Markov blanket by  $MB(\underline{a})$ .

An alternative proposal distribution that leads to much faster convergence is as follows. The idea is to make the components  $c_j^{(t)}$  of candidate sample  $c^{(t)}$  depend on the previous components  $(c_i^{(t)})_{i < j}$ . See the bnet Fig.27.7. The TPM for the nodes of that bnet are

$$P(\underline{c}_j^{(t)} = c_j | (\underline{c}_i^{(t)})_{i < j} = (c_i)_{i < j}, \underline{m}^{(t-1)} = m) = P(c_j | (c_i)_{i < j}, (m_i)_{i > j}) \quad (27.33)$$

for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ . This implies

$$P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}(\underline{c}^{(t)} = c | \underline{m}^{(t-1)} = m) = \prod_{j=0}^{N-1} P(c_j | (c_i)_{i < j}, (m_i)_{i > j}) . \quad (27.34)$$



Figure 27.7: In Gibbs sampling, the proposal distribution  $P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}$  can be defined by making the components  $c_j^{(t)}$  of candidate sample  $c^{(t)}$  depend on the previous components  $(c_i^{(t)})_{i < j}$ .

As before, we can condition only on the Markov blanket of each node  $\underline{x}_j$ .

$$P_{\underline{c}|\underline{x}}(\underline{c}^{(t)} = c | \underline{m}^{(t-1)} = m) = \prod_{j=0}^{N-1} P(c_j | (c_i)_{i < j}, (m_i)_{i > j}, \text{ use only } c_i \text{ and } m_i \ni \underline{x}_i \in MB(\underline{x}_j)) . \quad (27.35)$$

## 27.5 Importance Sampling

For more info about this topic and some original references, see Ref.[49].

Suppose random variables  $\underline{x}[\sigma] \in S_{\underline{x}}$  for  $\sigma = 0, 1, \dots, nsam - 1$  are i.i.d. with probability distribution  $P_{\underline{x}}$ . Then

$$E_{\underline{x}}[f(x)] \approx \frac{1}{nsam} \sum_{\sigma=0}^{nsam-1} f(x[\sigma]) \quad (27.36)$$

for any  $f : S_{\underline{x}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Sometimes, instead of using i.i.d. samples  $\underline{x}[\sigma] \in S_{\underline{x}}$  where  $\underline{x}[\sigma] \sim P_{\underline{x}}$ , we wish to use i.i.d. samples  $\underline{y}[\sigma] \in S_{\underline{x}}$  where  $\underline{y}[\sigma] \sim P_{\underline{y}}$ .

$$E_{\underline{x}}[f(\underline{x})] = \sum_{\underline{x}} P_{\underline{x}}(\underline{x}) f(\underline{x}) \quad (27.37)$$

$$= \sum_{\underline{x}} P_{\underline{y}}(\underline{x}) \frac{P_{\underline{x}}(\underline{x})}{P_{\underline{y}}(\underline{x})} f(\underline{x}) \quad (27.38)$$

$$= E_{\underline{y}}\left[\frac{P_{\underline{x}}(\underline{y})}{P_{\underline{y}}(\underline{y})} f(\underline{y})\right] \quad (27.39)$$

Sampling from  $P_{\underline{y}}(y)$  instead of  $P_{\underline{x}}(x)$  might reduce (or increase) variance for a particular  $f : S_{\underline{x}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

$$Var_{\underline{x}}[f(x)] = E_{\underline{x}}[(f(x))^2] - (E_{\underline{x}}[f(x)])^2 \quad (27.40)$$

$$Var_{\underline{y}}[\frac{P_{\underline{x}}(y)}{P_{\underline{y}}(y)}f(y)] = E_{\underline{y}}[(\frac{P_{\underline{x}}(y)}{P_{\underline{y}}(y)}f(y))^2] - (E_{\underline{y}}[\frac{P_{\underline{x}}(y)}{P_{\underline{y}}(y)}f(y)])^2 \quad (27.41)$$

$$= E_{\underline{x}}[\frac{P_{\underline{x}}(x)}{P_{\underline{y}}(x)}(f(x))^2] - (E_{\underline{x}}[f(x)])^2 \quad (27.42)$$

# Chapter 28

## Markov Chains

A Markov Chain is simply a bnet with the graph structure of a chain. For example, Fig.28.1 shows a chain with  $n = 4$  nodes.

$$\underline{x}_0 \longrightarrow \underline{x}_1 \longrightarrow \underline{x}_2 \longrightarrow \underline{x}_3$$

Figure 28.1: Markov chain with  $n = 4$  nodes.

Because of its graph structure, the TPM of each node only depends on the state of the previous node:

$$P(x_t | (x_a)_{a \neq t}) = P(x_t | x_{t-1}) , \quad (28.1)$$

where  $(x_a)_{a \neq t}$  are all the nodes except  $x_t$  itself and  $t = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$ .

If there exists a single TPM  $P_{\underline{x}_1 | \underline{x}_0}$  such that

$$P(x_t | x_{t-1}) = P_{\underline{x}_1 | \underline{x}_0}(x_t | x_{t-1}) \quad (28.2)$$

for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$ , then we say that the Markov chain is **time homogeneous**.

**Claim 21** (*Data Processing Inequality (DPI)*)

Consider a Markov chain  $\underline{x}_0 \rightarrow \underline{x}_1 \cdots \rightarrow \underline{x}_{n-1}$ . Suppose  $0 \leq a < m < b \leq n - 1$ . Then

$$H(\underline{x}_a : \underline{x}_b) \leq \min[H(\underline{x}_a : \underline{x}_m), H(\underline{x}_m : \underline{x}_b)] \quad (28.3)$$

See Ref.[41] for references where the DPI is proven. This inequality confirms our intuitive expectations that the information transmitted (i.e., the mutual information(MI)) from  $\underline{a}$  to  $\underline{b}$  (or vice versa since MI is symmetric) is smaller or equal to the one transmitted from  $\underline{a}$  to  $\underline{m}$  or from  $\underline{m}$  to  $\underline{b}$  because  $\underline{a}$  and  $\underline{b}$  are “farther apart” and “some info can get lost during transmission through the mediator node  $\underline{m}$ ”.



# Chapter 29

## Message Passing (Belief Propagation)

Belief Propagation was first proposed in 1982 Ref.[20] by Judea Pearl to simplify the exact evaluation of the probability of one node conditioned on other nodes of a bnet (exact inference). It gives exact results for trees and polytrees (i.e. bnets with a single connected component and no loops). For bnets with loops, it gives approximate results (loopy belief propagation), and it has been generalized to the junction tree algorithm (see Chapter 22) which can do exact inference for general bnets with loops. The basic idea behind the junction tree algorithm is to eliminate loops by clustering them into single nodes.

In his book Ref.[21], Pearl explains two types of Message Passing (i.e., distributed computing in a bnet). In Chapter 4, he discusses one type of MP which he calls Belief Propagation (BP) or Belief Updating. In Chapter 5, he introduces a second type of MP which he calls Belief Revision, but which I prefer to call Explanation Optimization (EO). This chapter will be devoted to BP only.

This chapter is mostly based on chapter 4 of Ref.[21] by Pearl. Refs.[35], and [15] were also helpful in writing this chapter.

### 29.1 Distributed Soldier Counting

Consider a group of soldiers marching single file. Fig.29.1 shows several methods by which a member of the group can obtain a count of the soldiers without breaking the line to do global operations. This can be done in a distributed fashion, with every soldier doing only local operations (i.e., each soldier can only send messages to either the soldier in front or the one in back). Such distributed soldier counting is a rudimentary type of BP. In the next section, we will generalize this BP for soldiers to BP for a Markov chain.




Figure 29.1: Distributed soldier counting (This example comes from Chapter 4 of Ref.[21]). Green dots indicate the beginning and red dots the end of a count. Only first soldier can calculate total count in (a). Only third soldier can calculate total count in (b,c). All soldiers can calculate the total count in (d,e). One starting point in (a,b,e). Two ends as starting points in (c,d).

## 29.2 Spring Systems




Figure 29.2: Spring system. Point masses connected by springs.

See Ref.[71] for an introduction to spring systems. Ideal springs between the point mass nodes would not be sufficient. One would have to add damping to the springs so as to reach an equilibrium. Time dependent forces (loads) pointing into or out of the page, applied to the point masses, would generate signals that would propagate like BP messages.

## 29.3 BP for Markov Chains




Figure 29.3: 3 node Markov chain  $\epsilon^+ \leftarrow x \leftarrow \epsilon^-$ . The  $\pi$  messages (probability functions) travel downstream (i.e., they carry info in the direction of the graph arrows, towards the future) and are indicated by a dashed arrow or by a left double arrow  $\Leftarrow$ . The  $\lambda$  messages (likelihood functions) travel upstream (i.e., they carry info opposite to direction of the graph arrows, towards the past) and are indicated by a dotted arrow or by a right double arrow  $\Rightarrow$ .  $\epsilon^+$  stands for future evidence and  $\epsilon^-$  for past evidence.

Consider the 3 node Markov chain  $\underline{\epsilon}^+ \leftarrow \underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{\epsilon}^-$  shown in Fig.29.3. Define<sup>1</sup>

$$\pi_{\underline{\epsilon}^+ \leftarrow \underline{x}}(x) = P(x|\epsilon^-) \text{ (past of } \underline{x}) \quad (29.1)$$

$$\lambda_{\underline{\epsilon}^+ \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x) = P(\epsilon^+|x) \text{ (future of } \underline{x}) \quad (29.2)$$

$$\pi_{\underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{\epsilon}^-}(\epsilon^-) = P(\epsilon^-) = \delta(\epsilon^-, \epsilon_0^-) \text{ (past of } \underline{\epsilon}^-) \quad (29.3)$$

$$\lambda_{\underline{x} \Rightarrow \underline{\epsilon}^-}(\epsilon^-) = P(\epsilon^+|\epsilon^-) \text{ (future of } \underline{\epsilon}^-) . \quad (29.4)$$

Furthermore, define the Belief BEL in  $x$  to be

$$BEL_{\underline{x}}(x) = P(x|\epsilon) , \quad (29.5)$$

where

$$\underline{\epsilon} = \underline{\epsilon}^+ \cup \underline{\epsilon}^- . \quad (29.6)$$

It follows that

$$BEL_{\underline{x}}(x) = P(x|\epsilon^+, \epsilon^-) = \quad (29.7)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!x)P(\epsilon^+, x, \epsilon^-) \quad (29.8)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!x)P(\epsilon^+|x)P(x|\epsilon^-) \quad (29.9)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!x)\lambda_{\underline{\epsilon}^+ \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x)\pi_{\underline{\epsilon}^+ \leftarrow \underline{x}}(x) . \quad (29.10)$$

Note that Bayes rule would affirm that<sup>2</sup>

$$P(x|\epsilon^+) = \mathcal{N}(!x) \underbrace{P(\epsilon^+|x)}_{\lambda_{\underline{\epsilon}^+ \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x)} P(x) . \quad (29.11)$$

Thus, Eq.(29.10) is like a 2-sided Janus Bayes rule.

Note that the  $\pi$  messages and  $\lambda$  messages propagate independently of each other, via the TPM  $P(x|\epsilon^-)$ :

$$\underbrace{\pi_{\underline{\epsilon}^+ \leftarrow \underline{x}}(x)}_{P(x|\epsilon_0^-)} = \sum_{\epsilon^-} P(x|\epsilon^-) \underbrace{\pi_{\underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{\epsilon}^-}(\epsilon^-)}_{\delta(\epsilon^-, \epsilon_0^-)} \quad (29.12a)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>The pattern behind these definitions, in case it eludes you, is as follows: the  $\pi$ 's always carry information about the past and the  $\lambda$ 's about the future. But the past or future of what? Of the argument of the function. Out of the two random variables in the subscript of the function, the one on the right hand side of the subscript, the one which is adjacent but beneath the argument, is always the argument.

<sup>2</sup>As usual in this book,  $\mathcal{N}(!x)$  means a constant that is independent of  $x$ .

$$\underbrace{\lambda_{\underline{x} \Rightarrow \underline{\epsilon}^-}(\underline{\epsilon}^-)}_{P(\underline{\epsilon}^+ | \underline{\epsilon}^-)} = \sum_x P(x | \underline{\epsilon}^-) \underbrace{\lambda_{\underline{\epsilon}^+ \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x)}_{P(\underline{\epsilon}^+ | x)} \quad (29.12b)$$

Eqs.(29.12) suggest that we define an edge bnet for the  $\pi$  and  $\lambda$  messages (these messages live in the edges between the nodes  $\underline{\epsilon}^+, \underline{x}, \underline{\epsilon}^-$ ). Such an edge bnet, shown in Fig.29.4, is complementary to bnet for the nodes themselves. We will call it the **BP 2-track bnet** for the bnet Fig.29.3, because it has two “tracks”, one for  $\pi$  messages and another for  $\lambda$  ones. The TPMs, shown in blue, for the nodes of bnet Fig.29.4, are as follows:




Figure 29.4: BP 2-track bnet for the bnet Fig.29.3.

$$P(\pi_{\underline{x} \Leftarrow \underline{\epsilon}^-}) = \prod_{\underline{\epsilon}^-} \mathbb{1}(\pi_{\underline{x} \Leftarrow \underline{\epsilon}^-}(\underline{\epsilon}^-) = P(\underline{\epsilon}^-)) \quad (29.13)$$

$$P(\pi_{\underline{\epsilon}^+ \Leftarrow \underline{x}} | \pi_{\underline{x} \Leftarrow \underline{\epsilon}^-}) = \prod_x \mathbb{1} \left( \pi_{\underline{\epsilon}^+ \Leftarrow \underline{x}}(x) = \sum_{\underline{\epsilon}^-} P(x | \underline{\epsilon}^-) \pi_{\underline{x} \Leftarrow \underline{\epsilon}^-}(\underline{\epsilon}^-) \right) \quad (29.14)$$

$$P(B_{\underline{x}} | \pi_{\underline{\epsilon}^+ \Leftarrow \underline{x}}, \lambda_{\underline{\epsilon}^+ \Rightarrow \underline{x}}) = \prod_x \mathbb{1}(B_{\underline{x}}(x) = BEL_{\underline{x}}(x)) \quad (29.15)$$

$$P(\lambda_{\underline{\epsilon}^+ \Rightarrow \underline{x}}) = \prod_x \mathbb{1}(\lambda_{\underline{\epsilon}^+ \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x) = P(\underline{\epsilon}^+ | x)) \quad (29.16)$$

$$P(\lambda_{\underline{x} \Rightarrow \underline{\epsilon}^-} | \lambda_{\underline{\epsilon}^+ \Rightarrow \underline{x}}) = \prod_{\underline{\epsilon}^-} \mathbb{1} \left( \lambda_{\underline{x} \Rightarrow \underline{\epsilon}^-}(\underline{\epsilon}^-) = \sum_x P(x | \underline{\epsilon}^-) \lambda_{\underline{\epsilon}^+ \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x) \right) \quad (29.17)$$

---

So far in this section, we have considered Markov chains with 3 nodes. Before concluding our discussion of BP for Markov chains, let us consider BP for a slightly longer chain. Let us consider the 5 node Markov chain  $\underline{\epsilon}^+ \leftarrow \underline{b} \leftarrow \underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{a} \leftarrow \underline{\epsilon}^-$  shown in Fig.29.5. We have already dealt with




Figure 29.5: 5 node Markov chain

the end nodes of a Markov chain in the 3 node Markov chain example above, so in the 5 node case, let us focus on the internal (i.e., not at an end) node  $\underline{x}$  and its neighbors  $\underline{a}$  and  $\underline{b}$ . Define

$$\pi_{\underline{b} \leftarrow \underline{x}}(x) = P(x|\epsilon^-) \text{ (past of } \underline{x}) , \quad (29.18)$$

$$\lambda_{\underline{b} \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x) = P(\epsilon^+|x) \text{ (future of } \underline{x}) , \quad (29.19)$$

$$\pi_{\underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{a}}(a) = P(a|\epsilon^-) \text{ (past of } \underline{a}) \quad (29.20)$$

and

$$\lambda_{\underline{x} \Rightarrow \underline{a}}(a) = P(\epsilon^+|a) \text{ (future of } \underline{a}) . \quad (29.21)$$

Define the Belief BEL in  $x$  to be

$$BEL_{\underline{x}}(x) = P(x|\epsilon) , \quad (29.22)$$

where

$$\underline{\epsilon} = \underline{\epsilon}^+ \cup \underline{\epsilon}^- . \quad (29.23)$$

Then

$$BEL_{\underline{x}}(x) = \mathcal{N}(!x)P(\epsilon^+|x)P(x|\epsilon^-) \quad (29.24)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!x)\lambda_{\underline{b} \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x)\pi_{\underline{b} \leftarrow \underline{x}}(x) . \quad (29.25)$$

In analogy with the case of BP for a 3 node Markov chain, we can define the bnet Fig.29.6, which we refer to as the **BP 2-track bnet** for Fig.29.5. The TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes of bnet Fig.29.6, are as follows:

$$P(\pi_{\underline{b} \leftarrow \underline{x}}|\pi_{\underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{a}}) = \prod_x \mathbb{1} \left( \pi_{\underline{b} \leftarrow \underline{x}}(x) = \sum_a P(x|a)\pi_{\underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{a}}(a) \right) \quad (29.26)$$

$$P(B_{\underline{x}}|\pi_{\underline{b} \leftarrow \underline{x}}, \lambda_{\underline{b} \Rightarrow \underline{x}}) = \prod_x \mathbb{1} (B_{\underline{x}}(x) = BEL_{\underline{x}}(x)) \quad (29.27)$$




Figure 29.6: BP 2-track bnet for the bnet Fig.29.5.

$$P(\lambda_{x \Rightarrow a} | \lambda_{b \Rightarrow x}) = \prod_a \mathbb{1} \left( \lambda_{x \Rightarrow a}(a) = \sum_x P(x|a) \lambda_{b \Rightarrow x}(x) \right) \quad (29.28)$$

Let us represent the Markov chain of Fig.29.5 by  $\underline{x}_{nx-1} \leftarrow \dots, \underline{x}_2 \leftarrow \underline{x}_1 \leftarrow \underline{x}_0$  where  $nx = 5$ . For any node  $\underline{x}_i$  with parent  $\underline{px}_i = \underline{x}_{i-1}$  and child  $\underline{cx}_i = \underline{x}_{i+1}$ , define the **memory matrix**  $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}$  for node  $\underline{x}_i$  as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i} = [\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^+, \mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^-], \quad (29.29)$$

where  $+$  =future,  $-$  =past, and

$$\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^+ = \begin{bmatrix} \pi_{\underline{cx}_i \leftarrow \underline{x}_i}(\cdot) \\ \lambda_{\underline{cx}_i \Rightarrow \underline{x}_i}(\cdot) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^- = \begin{bmatrix} \pi_{\underline{x}_i \leftarrow \underline{px}_i}(\cdot) \\ \lambda_{\underline{x}_i \Rightarrow \underline{px}_i}(\cdot) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (29.30)$$

Note that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^- = \mathcal{M}_{\underline{px}_i}^+ \quad (29.31)$$

for all nodes  $\underline{x}_i$ . We will refer to Eqs.(29.31) as the **memory overlap conditions**.

We will also use a permuted version of the memory matrix

$$\mathcal{M}'_{\underline{x}_i} = [\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{OUT}, \mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{IN}], \quad (29.32)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{OUT} = \begin{bmatrix} \pi_{\underline{cx}_i \leftarrow \underline{x}_i}(\cdot) \\ \lambda_{\underline{x}_i \Rightarrow \underline{px}_i}(\cdot) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{IN} = \begin{bmatrix} \pi_{\underline{x}_i \leftarrow \underline{px}_i}(\cdot) \\ \lambda_{\underline{cx}_i \Rightarrow \underline{x}_i}(\cdot) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (29.33)$$

$$\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{\epsilon^+} \leftarrow \underline{\mathcal{M}}_b \leftarrow \underline{\mathcal{M}}_x \leftarrow \underline{\mathcal{M}}_a \leftarrow \underline{\mathcal{M}}_{\epsilon^-}$$

Figure 29.7: BP Memory Bnet for the bnet Fig.29.5.

Unfortunately, 2-track bnets cannot be generalized in any obvious way from Markov chains to more complicated DAGs. An alternative to 2-track bnets that still carries message info in its nodes, are memory bnets. An **BP memory bnet** is a bnet which takes each node of an original bnet and adds a local memory to it. More specifically, it keeps the DAG but replaces each node  $\underline{x}_i$  by a memory  $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{x_i}$ . Fig.29.7 shows the memory bnet for the bnet Fig.29.5. The TPM, printed in blue, for the node  $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{x_i}$  of the memory bnet Fig.29.7, is as follows

$$P(\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i} | \mathcal{M}_{\underline{n} \in nb(\underline{x}_i)}) = AB, \quad (29.34)$$

where

$$A = \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^- = \mathcal{M}_{\underline{px}_i}^+), \quad (29.35)$$

and

$$B = \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{OUT} = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{IN})). \quad (29.36)$$

The function  $\mathcal{C}$ , which we will call the **BP local computation**, maps  $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{IN}$  into  $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{OUT}$ . More explicitly,  $\mathcal{C}$  is defined so that

$$B = \underbrace{P(\pi_{b \leftarrow x} | \pi_{x \leftarrow a})}_{B_\pi} \underbrace{P(\lambda_{x \rightarrow a} | \lambda_{b \rightarrow x})}_{B_\pi}, \quad (29.37)$$

where  $B_\pi$  and  $B_\lambda$  are given by Eqs.(29.26) and (29.28), respectively.

The BP memory bnet Fig. 29.7 is a deterministic bnet. A deterministic bnet is basically just a coupled system of equations (CSE) for some unknowns  $x_i$ . A CSE per se does not include with it a method for solving for the  $x_i$ . Such methods are not unique. For example, for the distributed soldier counting problem, the various methods that we described for counting soldiers are just different methods for solving the same CSE. One can describe a method for solving a CSE using a dynamic bnet.<sup>3</sup> To solve the CSE represented by the memory bnet Fig.29.7, we will use the dynamic bnet Fig.29.8. Henceforth, we will refer to Fig.29.8 as an **BP dynamic bnet** for Fig.29.7.

Next, we will explain the meaning of Fig.29.8. Fig.29.8 is a step by step recipe (i.e., algorithm) for solving a SCE, where the unknowns are memory matrices. Each step encoded in Fig.29.8 corresponds to a specific message sending event, where the messages are sent along the edges of the Markov chain Fig.29.5. These message sending events are portrayed in chronological order in Fig.29.9. In that figure,  $\pi$  messages are indicated by dashed red arrows, and  $\lambda$  messages by dotted red arrows. These steps, or message sending events, lead to an updating of the memory matrices that we are solving for. Each step propagates information between the memory nodes. In the usual Pearl BP algo, the evidence nodes initiate the BP chain of message passing events. These events continue until the memory matrices reach an equilibrium and the SCE is solved.

---

<sup>3</sup> The term dynamic bnet was used in Chapter 13 to mean a time inhomogeneous Markov chain, but here we are stretching its meaning to include Markov chains that aren't time inhomogeneous.






Figure 29.8: BP dynamic bnet for the bnet Fig.29.7.




Figure 29.9: Steps encoded in the bnet Fig.29.8. Note the similarity of this figure to Fig.29.1 (d) for soldier counting.

To use bnet Fig.29.8, we need to specify the **initial conditions** (i.e., the value of  $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{(0)}$  for all  $i$ ). For that, one can use

$$\pi_{\underline{p}\underline{x}_0 \Leftarrow \underline{x}_0}^{(0)} = P(x_0) , \quad (29.38)$$

$$\lambda_{\underline{c}\underline{x}_i \Rightarrow \underline{x}_{nx-1}}^{(0)}(x_{nx-1}) = \delta(x_{nx-1}, x'_{nx-1}) . \quad (29.39)$$

All other  $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{(0)}$  entries for all  $i$  can be set to 1.

The TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes of Fig.29.8, can all be summarized by

$$P(\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{(t)} | \mathcal{M}_{\underline{n} \in nb(\underline{x}_i)}^{(t-1)}, \mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{(t-1)}) = AB, \quad (29.40)$$

where

$$A = \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{(t)-} = \mathcal{M}_{\underline{px}_i}^{(t-1)+}) & \text{if input from } \underline{px}_i \\ \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{(t)+} = \mathcal{M}_{\underline{cx}_i}^{(t-1)-}) & \text{if input from } \underline{cx}_i \end{cases}, \quad (29.41)$$

and

$$B = \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{(t)OUT} = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{(t)IN})) . \quad (29.42)$$

The function  $\mathcal{C}$ , which we will call the **BP local computation**, maps  $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{(t)IN}$  into  $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}_i}^{(t)OUT}$ . More explicitly,  $\mathcal{C}$  is defined so that

$$B = B_\pi B_\lambda \quad (29.43)$$

where

$$B_\pi = \prod_x \mathbb{1} \left( \underbrace{\pi_{\underline{b} \leftarrow \underline{x}}^{(t)}(x)}_{OUT} = \sum_a P(x|a) \underbrace{\pi_{\underline{x} \leftarrow a}^{(t)}(a)}_{IN} \right) \quad (29.44)$$

and

$$B_\lambda = \prod_a \mathbb{1} \left( \underbrace{\lambda_{\underline{x} \Rightarrow a}^{(t)}(a)}_{OUT} = \sum_x P(x|a) \underbrace{\lambda_{\underline{b} \Rightarrow \underline{x}}^{(t)}(x)}_{IN} \right) . \quad (29.45)$$

The basic idea behind Eq.(29.42), which we will call the **memory updating equation**, is simple: the memory overlap conditions translate the information from time  $t-1$  to  $t$ , and then the local computation translates  $IN$  to  $OUT$  at fixed time  $t$ .

## 29.4 BP Algorithm for Polytrees

Consider Fig.29.10, which illustrates a bnet node  $\underline{x}$  receiving and sending messages to its neighbors. The  $\pi$  messages (probability functions) travel downstream (i.e., they carry info in the direction of the graph arrows, towards the future) and are indicated by a dashed arrow or by a left double arrow  $\leftarrow$ . The  $\lambda$  messages (likelihood functions) travel upstream (i.e., they carry info opposite to direction of the graph arrows, towards the past) and are indicated by a dotted arrow or by a right double arrow  $\Rightarrow$ .

Note that argument  $arg$  of the  $\pi(arg)$  and  $\lambda(arg)$  functions is always the same as the letter in the subscript that is closest to the argument.

Note that in Fig.29.10, we indicate messages that travel “downstream” (resp., “upstream”), by arrows with dashed (resp., dotted) lines as shafts. Mnemonic: think of the shaft as a velocity vector field for the message. You travel faster when you swim downstream as opposed to upstream.

$pa(\underline{x})$  = parents of node  $\underline{x}$   
 $ch(\underline{x})$  = children of node  $\underline{x}$   
 $nb(\underline{x}) = pa(\underline{x}) \cup ch(\underline{x})$  = neighbors of node  $\underline{x}$




Figure 29.10: Node  $\underline{x}$  receiving and sending messages to its neighbors. (neighbors= parents and children).

We define a **memory matrix**  $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}}$  for node  $\underline{x}$  as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}} = [\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}}^+, \mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}}^-] , \quad (29.46)$$

where  $+$  =future,  $-$  =past, and

$$\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}}^+ = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} \pi_{\underline{b} \leftarrow \underline{x}}(\cdot) & \lambda_{\underline{b} \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(\cdot) \end{array} \right]_{\underline{b} \in ch(\underline{x})} = [\mathcal{M}_{\underline{b}, \underline{x}}^+]_{\underline{b} \in ch(\underline{x})} , \quad (29.47)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}}^- = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \pi_{\underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{a}}(\cdot) \\ \lambda_{\underline{x} \Rightarrow \underline{a}}(\cdot) \end{array} \right]_{\underline{a} \in pa(\underline{x})} = [\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}, \underline{a}}^-]_{\underline{a} \in pa(\underline{x})} . \quad (29.48)$$

Note that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}, \underline{a}}^- = \mathcal{M}_{\underline{a}, \underline{x}}^+ \quad (29.49)$$

for every arrow  $\underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{a}$ . We will refer to Eqs.(29.49) as the **memory overlap conditions**.

We will also use a permuted version of the memory matrix

$$\mathcal{M}'_{\underline{x}} = [\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}}^{OUT}, \mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}}^{IN}] , \quad (29.50)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}}^{OUT} = \left( \begin{array}{c} [\pi_{\underline{b} \leftarrow \underline{x}}(\cdot)]_{\underline{b} \in ch(\underline{x})} \\ [\lambda_{\underline{x} \Rightarrow \underline{a}}(\cdot)]_{\underline{a} \in pa(\underline{x})} \end{array} \right) = [\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}, \underline{n}}^{OUT}]_{\underline{n} \in nb(\underline{x})} , \quad (29.51)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}}^{IN} = \left( \begin{array}{c} [\pi_{\underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{a}}(\cdot)]_{\underline{a} \in pa(\underline{x})} \\ [\lambda_{\underline{b} \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(\cdot)]_{\underline{b} \in ch(\underline{x})} \end{array} \right) = [\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}, \underline{n}}^{IN}]_{\underline{n} \in nb(\underline{x})} . \quad (29.52)$$

For times  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$ , we calculate  $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}}^{(t)}$  in two steps: first we calculate  $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}}^{(t)IN}$  from earlier memories at time  $t - 1$ , then we calculate  $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}}^{(t)OUT}$ :




Figure 29.11: Subgraph of a bnet showing two cases (RULE 1 and RULE 2) of message info flow. The yellow node is a gossip monger. It receives messages from all the green nodes, and then it relays a joint message to the red node. Union of green nodes and the red node = full neighborhood of yellow node. There are two possible cases: the red node is either a parent or a child of the yellow one. As usual, we use arrows with dashed (resp., dotted) shafts for downstream (resp., upstream) messages. Blue boxes indicate Markov chain case.

An **evidence node** is a node whose TPM is a delta function set to a particular state of the node. We will assume, without loss of generality, that all evidence nodes are leaf nodes. If that is not the case, any evidence node  $\underline{e}$  that is not a leaf node, can be given a new companion leaf node  $\underline{l}$  connected to  $\underline{e}$  by an arrow  $\underline{l} \leftarrow \underline{e}$ , and such that  $\underline{l}$  has a delta function TPM.

1. **Calculating  $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}}^{(t)IN}$  from signals received from  $\underline{n} \in nb(\underline{x})$ , sent at earlier time  $t - 1$ :**

Set

$$\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}, \underline{a}}^{(t)-} |_{\pi} = \mathcal{M}_{\underline{a}, \underline{x}}^{(t-1)+} |_{\pi} , \quad (29.53)$$

for all  $\underline{a} \in pa(\underline{x})$ , and

$$\mathcal{M}_{\underline{b}, \underline{x}}^{(t)+} |_{\lambda} = \mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}, \underline{b}}^{(t-1)-} |_{\lambda} , \quad (29.54)$$

for all  $\underline{b} \in ch(\underline{x})$ . By  $X|_{\lambda}$  (resp.,  $X|_{\pi}$ ) we mean the  $\lambda$  (resp.,  $\pi$ ) component of  $X$ .

2. Calculating  $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}}^{(t)OUT}$  from already calculated  $\mathcal{M}_{\underline{x}}^{(t)IN}$ :

Let  $\underline{a}^{na} = (\underline{a}_i)_{i=0,1,\dots,na-1}$  denote the parents of  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{b}^{nb} = (\underline{b}_i)_{i=0,1,\dots,nb-1}$  its children.

Define

$$\pi_{\underline{x}}(x) = \sum_{\underline{a}^{na}} P(x|\underline{a}^{na}) \prod_i \pi_{\underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{a}_i}(a_i) \quad (29.55)$$

$$= E_{\underline{a}^{na}}[P(x|\underline{a}^{na})] \quad (29.56)$$

(boundary case: if  $\underline{x}$  is a root node, use  $\pi_{\underline{x}}(x) = P(x)$ .) and

$$\lambda_{\underline{x}}(x) = \prod_i \lambda_{\underline{b}_i \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x) . \quad (29.57)$$

(boundary case: if  $\underline{x}$  is a leaf node, use  $\lambda_{\underline{x}}(x) = 1$ .)

• **RULE 1: (red parent)**

From the  $\lambda_{\underline{x} \Rightarrow \underline{a}}$  panel of Fig.29.11, we get

$$\underbrace{\lambda_{\underline{x} \Rightarrow \underline{a}_i}(a_i)}_{OUT} = \mathcal{N}(!a_i) \sum_x \left[ \underbrace{\lambda_{\underline{x}}(x)}_{IN} \sum_{(a_k)_{k \neq i}} \left( P(x|\underline{a}^{na}) \prod_{k \neq i} \underbrace{\pi_{\underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{a}_k}(a_k)}_{IN} \right) \right] \quad (29.58)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!a_i) \sum_x [\lambda_{\underline{x}}(x) E_{(\underline{a}_k)_{k \neq i}}[P(x|\underline{a}^{na})]] \quad (29.59)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!a_i) E_{(\underline{a}_k)_{k \neq i}} E_{\underline{x}|\underline{a}^{na}} \lambda_{\underline{x}}(x) \quad (29.60)$$

(boundary case: if  $\underline{x}$  is a root node, use  $\lambda_{\underline{x} \Rightarrow \underline{a}_i}(a_i) = \mathcal{N}(!a_i)$ .)

• **RULE 2: (red child)**

From the  $\pi_{\underline{b} \leftarrow \underline{x}}$  panel of Fig.29.11, we get

$$\underbrace{\pi_{\underline{b}_i \leftarrow \underline{x}}(x)}_{OUT} = \mathcal{N}(!x) \underbrace{\pi_{\underline{x}}(x)}_{IN} \prod_{k \neq i} \underbrace{\lambda_{\underline{b}_k \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x)}_{IN} \quad (29.61)$$

(boundary case: if  $\underline{x}$  is a leaf node, use  $\pi_{\underline{b}_i \leftarrow \underline{x}}(x) = \mathcal{N}(!x) \pi_{\underline{x}}(x)$ .)

In the above equations, if the range set of a product is empty, then define the product as 1; i.e.,

$\prod_{k \in \emptyset} F(k) = 1$ .

**Claim:** Define

$$BEL^{(t)}(x) = \mathcal{N}(!x) \lambda_{\underline{x}}^{(t)}(x) \pi_{\underline{x}}^{(t)}(x) . \quad (29.62)$$

Then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} BEL^{(t)}(x) = P(x|\epsilon) . \quad (29.63)$$

This says that the belief in  $\underline{x} = x$  converges to  $P(x|\epsilon)$  and it equals the product of messages received from all parents and children of  $\underline{x} = x$ .

### 29.4.1 How BP algo for polytrees reduces to the BP algo for Markov chains

It is instructive to see how the BP algo for polytrees reduces to BP algo for Markov chains.

For a Markov chain, node  $\underline{x}$  has a single parent (i.e., ancestor)  $\underline{a}$  and a single child  $\underline{b}$ .

Therefore, Eqs.(29.55) and (29.57) reduce to

$$\pi_{\underline{x}}(x) = \sum_a P(x|a) \pi_{\underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{a}}(a) \quad (29.64)$$

and

$$\lambda_{\underline{x}}(x) = \lambda_{\underline{b} \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x) . \quad (29.65)$$

RULE 1 given by Eq.(29.58) reduces to

$$\lambda_{\underline{x} \Rightarrow \underline{a}}(a) = \mathcal{N}(!a) \sum_x \lambda_{\underline{x}}(x) P(x|a) \quad (29.66)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!a) \sum_x \lambda_{\underline{b} \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x) P(x|a) \quad (29.67)$$

RULE 2 given by Eq.(29.61) reduces to

$$\pi_{\underline{b} \leftarrow \underline{x}}(x) = \mathcal{N}(!x) \pi_{\underline{x}}(x) \quad (29.68)$$

$$= \sum_a P(x|a) \pi_{\underline{x} \leftarrow \underline{a}}(a) . \quad (29.69)$$

## 29.5 Derivation of BP Algorithm for Polytrees

This derivation is taken from the 1988 book Ref.[21] by Judea Pearl, where it is presented very lucidly. We only made some minor changes in notation.

---

### Notation

The BP algorithm yields an expansion for  $P(x|\epsilon)$ .

$\underline{x}$  = the focus node, arbitrary node of bnet that we are focusing on to calculate its  $P(x|\epsilon)$ .

$(\underline{a}_i)_{i=0,1,\dots,na-1}$  = parent nodes (mnemonic: a=ancestor) of  $\underline{x}$

$(\underline{b}_i)_{i=0,1,\dots,nb-1}$  = children nodes of  $\underline{x}$ .

$\underline{\epsilon}$  = set of nodes for which there is evidence; that is,  $\underline{\epsilon} = \epsilon$ , so the state of these nodes is fixed.

$\underline{\epsilon}_x^- = \underline{\epsilon} \cap an(x)$  (evidence in past of  $\underline{x}$ )<sup>4</sup>

$\underline{\epsilon}_{xa_i}^- = \underline{\epsilon}_x^- \cap an(a_i)$ .

Note that  $\underline{\epsilon}_x^- = \cup_i \underline{\epsilon}_{xa_i}^-$

$\underline{\epsilon}_x^+ = \underline{\epsilon} \cap [de(x) \cup \underline{x}]$  (evidence in future of  $\underline{x}$ )

$\underline{\epsilon}_{xb_i}^+ = \underline{\epsilon}_x^+ \cap [de(b_i) \cup \underline{b}_i]$ .

Note that  $\underline{\epsilon}_x^+ = \cup_i \underline{\epsilon}_{xb_i}^+$

Note that  $\underline{\epsilon} = \underline{\epsilon}_x^+ \cup \underline{\epsilon}_x^-$

$$\pi_{\underline{x}}(x) = P(x|\underline{\epsilon}_x^-) \quad (29.70)$$

$$\pi_{\underline{x} \Leftarrow a_i}(a_i) = P(a_i|\underline{\epsilon}_{xa_i}^-) \quad (29.71)$$

$$\pi_{b_i \Leftarrow \underline{x}}(x) = P(x|\underline{\epsilon}_{xb_i}^-) \quad (29.72)$$

$$\lambda_{\underline{x}}(x) = P(\underline{\epsilon}_x^+|x) \quad (29.73)$$

$$\lambda_{b_i \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x) = P(\underline{\epsilon}_{xb_i}^+|x) \quad (29.74)$$

$$\lambda_{\underline{x} \Rightarrow a_i}(a_i) = P(\underline{\epsilon}_{xa_i}^+|a_i) \quad (29.75)$$

---

**Expansions of  $\lambda_{\underline{x}}(x)$  and  $\pi_{\underline{x}}(x)$  into products of single node messages.**

---

$$\underbrace{P(x|\underline{\epsilon}_x^-)}_{\pi_{\underline{x}}(x)} = P(x|\cup_i \underline{\epsilon}_{xa_i}^-) \quad (29.76)$$

$$= \sum_{a^{na}} P(x|a^{na}) P(a^{na}|\cup_i \underline{\epsilon}_{xa_i}^-) \quad (29.77)$$

$$= \sum_{a^{na}} P(x|a^{na}) \prod_i \underbrace{P(a_i|\underline{\epsilon}_{xa_i}^-)}_{\pi_{\underline{x} \Leftarrow a_i}(a_i)} \quad (29.78)$$

$$\underbrace{P(\underline{\epsilon}_x^+|x)}_{\lambda_{\underline{x}}(x)} = \prod_i \underbrace{P(\underline{\epsilon}_{xb_i}^+|x)}_{\lambda_{b_i \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x)} \quad (29.79)$$

---

Note that past and future evidences  $\underline{\epsilon}_x^-$  and  $\underline{\epsilon}_x^+$  that are causally connected to  $\underline{x}$  are conditionally independent at fixed  $\underline{x}$ :

$$P(\underline{\epsilon}_x^+, \underline{\epsilon}_x^-|x) = P(\underline{\epsilon}_x^+|x) P(\underline{\epsilon}_x^-|x) . \quad (29.80)$$

---

<sup>4</sup> Careful: Chapter 4 of Ref.[21] uses  $-$  indicate the future and  $+$  to indicate the past. This is the opposite of our notation.

This observation is key to the proof of the following claim:

**Claim 22**

$$P(x|\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+, \epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-) = P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+|x)P(x|\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-) \frac{1}{P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+|\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-)} \quad (29.81)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!x)P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+|x)P(x|\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-) \quad (29.82)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!x) (\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+ \leftarrow x \leftarrow \epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-) \quad (29.83)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!x)\lambda_{\underline{x}}(x)\pi_{\underline{x}}(x) \quad (29.84)$$

**proof:**

$$P(x|\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+, \epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-) = P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+, \epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-|x) \frac{P(x)}{P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+, \epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-)} \quad (29.85)$$

$$= P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+|x)P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-|x) \frac{P(x)}{P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+, \epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-)} \quad (29.86)$$

$$= P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+|x)P(x|\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-) \frac{P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-)}{P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+, \epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-)} \quad (29.87)$$

$$= P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+|x)P(x|\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-) \frac{1}{P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+|\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-)} \quad (29.88)$$

**QED**

Next we prove BP rules 1 and 2.

- **RULE 1 (red parent)**




Figure 29.12: This figure is used in the derivation of the BP RULE 1.

Note that



$$\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+ \cup \bigcup_{k \neq i} \epsilon_{\underline{x}a_k}^- = (\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+ \cup \epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-) - \epsilon_{\underline{x}a_i}^- \quad (29.89)$$

$$= \epsilon_{\underline{x}a_i}^+ \quad (29.90)$$

Let  $y = (a_k)_{k \neq i}$  and  $\epsilon_{\underline{y}}^- = (\epsilon_{\underline{x}a_k}^-)_{k \neq i}$ .

$$\underbrace{P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}a_i}^+ | a_i)}_{\lambda_{\underline{x} \Rightarrow a_i}(a_i)} = P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+, \epsilon_{\underline{y}}^- | a_i) \quad (29.91)$$

$$= \sum_x \sum_y P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+, \epsilon_{\underline{y}}^- | x, y) P(x, y | a_i) \quad (29.92)$$

$$= \sum_x \sum_y P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+ | x) P(\epsilon_{\underline{y}}^- | y) P(x | y, a_i) P(y | a_i) \quad (29.93)$$

$$= P(\epsilon_{\underline{y}}^-) \sum_x \sum_y P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+ | x) \frac{P(y | \epsilon_{\underline{y}}^-)}{P(y)} P(x | y, a_i) \underbrace{P(y | a_i)}_{=P(y)} \quad (29.94)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!a_i) \sum_x \sum_y P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+ | x) P(x | \underbrace{y, a_i}_{a^{na}}) P(y | \epsilon_{\underline{y}}^-) \quad (29.95)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!a_i) \sum_x \underbrace{P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+ | x)}_{\lambda_{\underline{x}}(x)} \sum_{(a_k)_{k \neq i}} P(x | a^{na}) \prod_{k \neq i} \underbrace{P(a_k | \epsilon_{\underline{x}a_k}^-)}_{\pi_{\underline{x} \Leftarrow a_k}(a_k)} \quad (29.96)$$

• **RULE 2 (red child)**




Figure 29.13: This figure is used in the derivation of the BP RULE 2.

Note that

$$(\cup_{k \neq i} \epsilon_{\underline{x}b_k}^+) \cup \epsilon_{\underline{x}}^- = (\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^+ \cup \epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-) - \epsilon_{\underline{x}b_i}^+ \quad (29.97)$$

$$= \epsilon_{\underline{x}b_i}^- \quad (29.98)$$

$$\underbrace{P(x|\epsilon_{\underline{x}b_i}^-)}_{\pi_{\underline{b}_i \leftarrow \underline{x}}(x)} = P(x|(\epsilon_{\underline{x}b_k}^+)_{k \neq i}, \epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-) \quad (29.99)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!x) P((\epsilon_{\underline{x}b_k}^+)_{k \neq i} | x) P(x|\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-) \quad (29.100)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!x) \left( \prod_{k \neq i} \underbrace{P(\epsilon_{\underline{x}b_k}^+ | x)}_{\lambda_{\underline{b}_k \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x)} \right) \underbrace{P(x|\epsilon_{\underline{x}}^-)}_{\pi_{\underline{x}}(x)} \quad (29.101)$$

## 29.6 Example of BP algo for a Tree

In this section, we describe how to apply the BP algo to the tree bnet Fig.29.14. In Fig.29.14, if we replace each integer  $i$  by the random variable  $\underline{A}_i$ , we get an **original bnet**, and if we replace each  $i$  by  $\underline{M}_{\underline{A}_i}$ , we get the **BP memory bnet** of the original bnet. In Fig.29.14, the fushia nodes are evidence nodes and the green ones aren't.

We want to solve for the memory matrices of the memory bnet. To do so, we use the **BP dynamic bnet** Fig.29.15. The steps encoded in the dynamic bnet are shown in Fig.29.16. Fig.29.16 has frames in chronological order, showing the direction of travel of the  $\pi$  &  $\lambda$  information. This sequence of frames also indicates the order in which we solve for the entries of the memory matrices. The information first emanates from the evidence nodes. It propagates generally upstream, although some nodes can generate downstream flow. Some of the info reaches the root node and is reflected there. The root node is the only one that is capable of reflection (i.e., instant output along an arrow, in response to input along that arrow). Eventually, all info reaches the leaf nodes via downstream propagation and is absorbed there.




Figure 29.14: Example tree bnet used to illustrate BP.




Figure 29.15: BP dynamic bnet for the bnet Fig.29.14.




Figure 29.16: Steps encoded in the bnet Fig. 29.15.

## 29.7 Bipartite bnets

By a **bipartite bnet** we will mean a bnet in which all nodes are either root nodes (parentless) or leaf nodes (childless). BP simplifies when dealing with bipartite bnets. In this section, we will explain how it simplifies. But before doing so, let us explain how the following two types of diagrams can be replaced by equivalent bipartite bnets:

- Factor Graphs
- Tree bnets

---

Consider a product  $g = \prod_{\alpha} f_{\alpha}$  of scalar functions  $f_{\alpha} : S_{\underline{x}_0} \times S_{\underline{x}_1} \times \dots \times S_{\underline{x}_{nx-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for  $\alpha = 0, 1, \dots, nf - 1$ . For instance, consider  $g : S_{\underline{x}_0} \times S_{\underline{x}_1} \times S_{\underline{x}_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by:

$$g(x_0, x_1, x_2) = f_0(x_0)f_1(x_0, x_1)f_2(x_0, x_1)f_3(x_1, x_2). \quad (29.102)$$

The **factor graph** for this function  $g$  is given by Fig.29.17.




Figure 29.17: Factor graph for function  $g$  defined by Eq.(29.102).




Figure 29.18: Bipartite bnet corresponding to factor graph Fig.29.17.

One can map any factor graph (the “source”) to a special bipartite bnet (the “image”), as follows. Replace each  $x_i$  by  $\underline{x}_i \in S_{\underline{x}_i}$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, nx - 1$  and each  $f_{\alpha}$  by  $\underline{f}_{\alpha}$  for  $\alpha = 0, 1, \dots, nf - 1$ . Then replace the connections (edges) of the factor graph by arrows from  $\underline{x}_i$  to  $\underline{f}_{\alpha}$ . For example, Fig.29.18 is the image bipartite bnet of the source factor graph Fig.29.17.

Let  $\underline{x}^{nx} = (\underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_{nx-1})$  and  $\underline{f}^{nf} = (\underline{f}_0, \underline{f}_1, \dots, \underline{f}_{nf-1})$ . Let<sup>5</sup>  $f_{\alpha} \in \{0, 1\}$  for all  $\alpha$ , and  $y_{\alpha} = f_{\alpha}(x_{nb(\underline{f}_{\alpha})})$ . Here we are using  $nb(\underline{f}_{\alpha})$  to denote the neighborhood of node  $\underline{f}_{\alpha}$  in the image

---

<sup>5</sup> Note that we are using  $f_{\alpha}$  to denote both a function  $f_{\alpha}(\cdot)$  and a boolean value. Which one we mean will be clear from context.  $f_{\alpha}$  could also be used to denote, besides a function and a boolean value, the real number  $y_{\alpha} = f_{\alpha}(x_{nb(\underline{f}_{\alpha})})$ . However, we won't be using it that third way in this chapter.

bipartite bnet, and we are using  $x_S$  to denote  $(x_i)_{i \in S}$ . Without loss of generality, we will assume that  $y_\alpha \in [0, 1]$  for all  $\alpha$ . Then we define the node TPMs, printed in blue, for the image bipartite bnet, as follows.

$$P(f_\alpha | x_{nx(\underline{f}_\alpha)}) = y_\alpha \delta(f_\alpha, 1) + [1 - y_\alpha] \delta(f_\alpha, 0) \quad (29.103)$$

for  $\alpha = 0, 1, \dots, nf - 1$  and

$$P_{\underline{x}_i}(x_i) = \text{arbitrary prior} \quad (29.104)$$

for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, nx - 1$ .

Note that

$$P(f^{nf} = 1^{nf} | x^{nx}) = \prod_{\alpha} f_\alpha(x_{nb(\underline{f}_\alpha)}) . \quad (29.105)$$

---

A **tree bnet** is a bnet for which all nodes have exactly one parent except for the apex root node which has none. A tree bnet is very much like the filing system in a computer.

One can map a tree bnet (the “source”) into an equivalent bipartite bnet (the “image”) as follows. Replace each arrow

$$\underline{x} \longrightarrow \underline{y} \quad (29.106)$$

of the tree bnet by

$$\underline{x} \longrightarrow \underline{P_{y|x}} \longleftarrow \underline{y} . \quad (29.107)$$

For example, the tree bnet Fig.29.19 has the image bipartite bnet given by Fig.29.20. The bnet Fig.29.21 is just a different way of drawing the bnet Fig.29.20.




Figure 29.19: Example of a tree bnet.

The node TPMs, printed in blue, for the image bipartite bnet Fig.29.20, are as follows. We express the TPMs of the image bnet in terms of the TPMs of the source bnet Fig.29.19. Let

$$P(P_{y|x} | x, y) = P_{y|x}(y|x) \delta(P_{y|x}, 1) + (1 - P_{y|x}(y|x)) \delta(P_{y|x}, 0) \quad (29.108)$$




Figure 29.20: Bipartite bnet corresponding to tree bnet Fig.29.19.




Figure 29.21: Different way of drawing the bnet Fig.29.20.

for all the leaf nodes  $\underline{P}_{\underline{y}|\underline{x}} \in \{0, 1\}$  of the image bipartite bnet. Also, let

$$P_{\underline{y}}(y) = \text{arbitrary prior} \quad (29.109)$$

for all the root nodes  $\underline{y}$  of the image bipartite bnet except when  $\underline{y}$  corresponds to the root node  $\underline{A}$  of the source tree bnet. In that exceptional case,

$$P_{\underline{y}}(y) = P_{\underline{A}}(y) . \quad (29.110)$$

## 29.8 BP for bipartite bnets (BP-BB)

For a bipartite bnet as defined above, with root nodes  $\underline{x}_i$  and leaf nodes  $\underline{f}_{\alpha}$ , let

$$nb(i) = \{\alpha : \underline{f}_{\alpha} \in nb(\underline{x}_i)\} , \quad (29.111)$$

$$nb(\alpha) = \{i : \underline{x}_i \in nb(\underline{f}_{\alpha})\} , \quad (29.112)$$



$$m_{\alpha \Leftarrow i}(x_i) = \pi_{\underline{f}_\alpha \Leftarrow \underline{x}_i}(x_i) , \quad (29.113)$$

$$m_{\alpha \Rightarrow i}(x_i) = \lambda_{\underline{f}_\alpha \Rightarrow \underline{x}_i}(x_i) , \quad (29.114)$$




Figure 29.22: Fig.29.11 becomes this figure for the special case of a bipartite bnet. Union of green nodes and the red node = full neighborhood of yellow node. There are two possible cases: the red node is either a parent or a child of the yellow node.

Next we will show how to find  $m_{\alpha \Leftarrow i}^{(t)}$  and  $m_{\alpha \Rightarrow i}^{(t)}$  from  $m_{\alpha \Leftarrow i}^{(t-1)}$  and  $m_{\alpha \Rightarrow i}^{(t-1)}$ .

1. **Traversing an  $x$  (i.e., root) node.**

See the  $m_{f_2 \Leftarrow x_2}$  panel of Fig.29.22.

For  $i = 0, 1, \dots, nx - 1$ , if  $\alpha \in nb(i)$ , then,

$$m_{\alpha \Leftarrow i}^{(t)}(x_i) = \prod_{\beta \in nb(i) - \alpha} m_{\beta \Rightarrow i}^{(t-1)}(x_i) , \quad (29.115)$$

whereas if  $\alpha \notin nb(i)$

$$m_{\alpha \Leftarrow i}^{(t)}(x_i) = m_{\alpha \Leftarrow i}^{(t-1)}(x_i) . \quad (29.116)$$

2. **Traversing an  $f$  (i.e., leaf) node.**

See the  $m_{f_2 \Rightarrow x_2}$  panel of Fig.29.22.

For  $\alpha = 0, 1, \dots, nf - 1$ , if  $i \in nb(\alpha)$ , then

$$m_{\alpha \Rightarrow i}^{(t)}(x_i) = \sum_{(x_k)_{k \in nb(\alpha) - i}} f_\alpha(x_{nb(\alpha)}) \prod_{k \in nb(\alpha) - i} m_{\alpha \Leftarrow k}^{(t-1)}(x_k) \quad (29.117)$$

$$= E_{(x_k)_{k \in nb(\alpha) - i}}^{(t-1)} [f_\alpha(x_{nb(\alpha)})] , \quad (29.118)$$

whereas if  $i \notin nb(\alpha)$

$$m_{\alpha \Rightarrow i}^{(t)}(x_i) = m_{\alpha \Rightarrow i}^{(t-1)}(x_i) . \quad (29.119)$$

In the above equations, if the range set of a product is empty, then define the product as 1; i.e.,  $\prod_{k \in \emptyset} F(k) = 1$ .

**Claim:**

$$P(x_i|\epsilon) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{N}(!x_i) \prod_{\alpha \in nb(i)} m_{\alpha \Rightarrow i}^{(t)}(x_i) \quad (29.120)$$

and

$$P(x_{nb(\alpha)}|\epsilon) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{N}(!x_{nb(\alpha)}) f_{\alpha}(x_{nb(\alpha)}) \prod_{k \in nb(\alpha)} m_{\alpha \Leftarrow k}^{(t)}(x_k) . \quad (29.121)$$

### 29.8.1 BP-BB and general BP agree on Markov chains

It is instructive to compare the belief values (i.e.,  $P(x_i|\epsilon)$ ) obtained by applying the general (i.e., polytree) BP and BP-BB algorithms to a Markov chain. Next we show that both algorithms yield the same belief values.




Figure 29.23: Traversing a root node of a Markov chain (a) Propagation towards left (i.e., towards future). (b) Propagation towards right (i.e., towards past).

Consider the BP-BB rule for traversing a root node. When traveling towards the left as in Fig.29.23 (a), it implies that

$$m_{\alpha \Rightarrow 2}(x_2) = m_{\beta \Leftarrow 2}(x_2) , \quad (29.122)$$

and when traveling towards the right as in Fig.29.23 (b), it implies that

$$m_{\beta \Rightarrow 2}(x_2) = m_{\alpha \Leftarrow 2}(x_2) . \quad (29.123)$$

Now consider the BP-BB rule for traversing a leaf node. When traveling to the left as in Fig.29.24 (a), it implies that

$$\underbrace{m_{\alpha \Rightarrow 2}(x_2)}_{\lambda} = \sum_{x_1} P(x_2|x_1) \underbrace{m_{\alpha \Leftarrow 1}(x_1)}_{\pi} . \quad (29.124)$$

One can rewrite the left and right hand sides (LHS, RHS) of Eq.(29.124) as follows

$$RHS = \sum_{x_1} P(x_2|x_1) \pi_{\alpha \Leftarrow 1}(x_1) , \quad (29.125)$$




Figure 29.24: Traversing a leaf node of a Markov chain (a)Propagation towards left (i.e., towards future). (b)Propagation towards right (i.e., towards past).

and

$$LHS = m_{\alpha \Rightarrow 2}(x_2) = m_{\beta \Leftarrow 2}(x_2) = \pi_{\beta \Leftarrow 2}(x_2) , \quad (29.126)$$

Therefore

$$\pi_{\beta \Leftarrow 2}(x_2) \sum_{x_1} P(x_2|x_1) \pi_{\alpha \Leftarrow 1}(x_1) . \quad (29.127)$$

Once again, consider the BP-BB rule for traversing a leaf node. When traveling to the right as in Fig.29.24 (b), it implies that

$$\underbrace{m_{\alpha \Rightarrow 1}(x_1)}_{\lambda} = \sum_{x_2} P(x_2|x_1) \underbrace{m_{\alpha \Leftarrow 2}(x_2)}_{\pi} . \quad (29.128)$$

One can rewrite the left and right hand sides (LHS, RHS) of Eq.(29.128) as follows

$$RHS = = \sum_{x_2} P(x_2|x_1) \pi_{\alpha \Leftarrow 2}(x_2) \quad (29.129)$$

$$= \sum_{x_2} P(x_2|x_1) \lambda_{\beta \Rightarrow 2}(x_2) , \quad (29.130)$$

and

$$LHS = \lambda_{\alpha \Rightarrow 1}(x_1) . \quad (29.131)$$

Therefore,

$$\lambda_{\alpha \Rightarrow 1}(x_1) = \sum_{x_2} P(x_2|x_1) \lambda_{\beta \Rightarrow 2}(x_2) . \quad (29.132)$$

Finally, note that Eq.(29.120) becomes

$$P(x_2|\epsilon) = \mathcal{N}(!x_2) m_{\beta \Rightarrow 2}(x_2) m_{\alpha \Rightarrow 2}(x_2) \quad (29.133)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!x_2) m_{\alpha \Leftarrow 2}(x_2) m_{\alpha \Rightarrow 2}(x_2) \quad (29.134)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!x_2) \pi_{\alpha \Leftarrow 2}(x_2) \lambda_{\alpha \Rightarrow 2}(x_2) \quad (29.135)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!x_2) P(x_2|\epsilon^-) P(x_2|\epsilon^+) \quad (29.136)$$

and Eq.(29.121) becomes

$$P(x_2, x_1) = \mathcal{N}(!x_2, !x_1)P(x_2|x_1)m_{\alpha\leftarrow 1}(x_1)m_{\alpha\leftarrow 2}(x_2) \quad (29.137)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!x_2, !x_1)P(x_2|x_1)\pi_{\alpha\leftarrow 1}(x_1)\pi_{\alpha\leftarrow 2}(x_2) . \quad (29.138)$$

### 29.8.2 BP-BB and general BP agree on tree bnets.

It is instructive to compare the belief values (i.e.,  $P(x_i|\epsilon)$ ) obtained by applying the general (i.e., polytree) BP and BP-BB algorithms to a tree bnet. Next we show that both algorithms yield the same belief values.




Figure 29.25: Subgraph of a tree bnet. This is the same as Fig.29.11, except that here the yellow node has a single parent because this is a subgraph of a tree bnet, not of an arbitrary bnet like Fig.29.11. The subgraph has been converted to a subgraph of a bipartite bnet by inserting a collider leaf node, labeled by a Greek letter, at the center of each edge of the tree bnet. Red arrows indicate the direction of message info flow.

Applying to the left panel of Fig.29.25 the BP-BB rule for traversing a root node, we get

$$m_{\alpha\leftarrow \underline{x}}(x) = \prod_i m_{\beta_i \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x) . \quad (29.139)$$

Applying to the left panel of Fig.29.25 the BP-BB rule for traversing a leaf node, we get

$$m_{\alpha \Rightarrow \underline{a}}(a) = \mathcal{N}(!a) \sum_x m_{\alpha\leftarrow \underline{x}}(x)P(x|a) . \quad (29.140)$$

Combining Eqs.(29.139) and (29.140), we get

$$m_{\alpha \Rightarrow \underline{a}}(a) = \mathcal{N}(!a) \sum_x P(x|a) \prod_i m_{\beta_i \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x) , \quad (29.141)$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\lambda_{\underline{x} \Rightarrow \underline{a}}(a) = \mathcal{N}(!a) \sum_x P(x|a) \underbrace{\prod_i \lambda_{\underline{b}_i \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x)}_{\lambda_{\underline{x}}(x)} . \quad (29.142)$$

Eq.29.142 is just RULE 1 for general BP.

Applying to the right panel of Fig.29.25 the BP-BB rule for traversing a root node, we get

$$m_{\beta_i \Leftarrow \underline{x}}(x) = \mathcal{N}(!x) m_{\alpha \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x) \prod_{k \neq i} m_{\beta_k \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x) \quad (29.143)$$

Applying to the right panel of Fig.29.25 the BP-BB rule for traversing a leaf node, we get

$$m_{\alpha \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x) = \sum_a P(x|a) m_{\alpha \Leftarrow a}(a) \quad (29.144)$$

$$= \sum_a P(x|a) \pi_{\underline{x} \Leftarrow a}(a) \quad (29.145)$$

$$= \pi_{\underline{x}}(x) . \quad (29.146)$$

Combining Eqs.(29.143) and (29.146), we get

$$\pi_{\underline{b}_i \Leftarrow \underline{x}}(x) = \mathcal{N}(!x) \pi_{\underline{x}}(x) \prod_{k \neq i} \lambda_{\underline{b}_k \Rightarrow \underline{x}}(x) . \quad (29.147)$$

Eq.(29.147) is just RULE 2 of general BP.

## 29.9 BP-BB and sum-product decomposition

BP-BB yields what is often referred to as a **sum-product decomposition**. I don't like that name because it is unnecessarily confusing, and it fails to convey the recursive nature<sup>6</sup> of the decomposition. I prefer to call it a **recursive sum of products (RSOP) decomposition**, and will call it so henceforth in this chapter.

Expressing the marginals of a bnet as RSOPs, which is what BP does, reduces the complexity of the calculation. (i.e., the total number of additions and multiplications that need to be performed)

---

<sup>6</sup> By “recursive nature”, we mean bootstrapped definitions that lead to nested sums. The recursive nature of BP is evident from RULES 1 and 2 that define  $\lambda$ 's and  $\pi$ 's in terms of other  $\lambda$ 's and  $\pi$ 's.

That makes using the BP algo very advantageous. For instance, consider a Markov chain  $\underline{x}_{n-1} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow \underline{x}_1 \leftarrow \underline{x}_0$ , where  $x_i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  for all  $i$ . Note that if we calculate  $P(x_{n-1})$  as follows

$$P(x_{n-1}) = \left[ \sum_{x_{n-2}} P(x_{n-1}|x_{n-2}) \dots \left[ \sum_{x_1} P(x_2|x_1) \left[ \sum_{x_0} P(x_1|x_0)P(x_0) \right] \right] \dots \right] , \quad (29.148)$$

we need to perform  $2(n-1)$  additions and  $3(n-1)$  multiplications. On the other hand, if we calculate  $P(x_{n-1})$  as follows

$$P(x_{n-1}) = \sum_{x_{n-2}} \dots \sum_{x_1} \sum_{x_0} P(x_{n-1}|x_{n-2}) \dots P(x_2|x_1)P(x_1|x_0)P(x_0) , \quad (29.149)$$

we need to perform  $3^n - 1$  additions and  $3^n(n-1)$  multiplications.

# Chapter 30

## Missing Data, Imputation

This chapter assumes that the reader has read some parts of Chapter 14 on the Expectation Maximization (EM) algo and Chapter 27 on Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC).

	$h_0$	$x_0$	$x_1$	$x_2$	
1	NA	0	1	1	(0,0,0)
2	NA	0	0	0	(0,0,0)
3	NA	1	1	0	(0,0,0)
4	NA	0		0	(1,0,1)
		0		1	
		1	1	0	
		1		1	
5	NA	0	0	1	(0,1,0)
6	NA	0	0	1	(0,0,0)

Table 30.1: **Left Table:** Dataset with  $nsam = 6$  and some missing entries, for 4 binary variables  $h_0, x_0, x_1, x_2$ . NA=not available. The  $h_0$  column is completely missing because  $h_0$  is an unobserved latent variable. **Right Table:** All possibilities for  $x_i = NA$  cells of left table have been enumerated. A new column labeled  $m$  has been added.  $m_i = \mathbb{1}(x_i \text{ is missing})$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2$ .

Suppose that you have compiled a **dataset**  $\vec{x} = (x[\sigma])_{\sigma=0,1,\dots,nsam-1}$  where  $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{nx-1})$  from a study or survey. It consists of  $nsam$  number of samples (sample= row), and  $nx$  columns (each column is a different feature, or observation). Suppose that some of the cells in this matrix are empty. Throwing away all the incomplete rows is okay if the number of incomplete rows is much smaller than  $nsam$ . If not, throwing them away would throw away a substantial amount of information contained in all the filled cells in those incomplete rows, plus it might bias your dataset. This chapter deals with how to fill those empty cells with plausible fake data. A fancy name for this process is **imputation**. There is no unique way of fabricating fake data, but some fakes are better than others by some metrics. This chapter will consider two popular ways (EM and MCMC) of filling those empty cells with their “most likely” values based on the cells of the dataset that aren’t missing, and also based on some bnet model that is expected to describe well the dataset.

Notation:  $\vec{a} = (a[\sigma])_{\sigma=0,1,\dots,nsam-1}$ , where  $nsam$  is the number of samples. Will sometimes denote  $a[\sigma]$  by  $a^{[\sigma]}$ .

For concreteness, we will apply the concepts of this chapter to the dataset with missing data given by Table 30.1.

## 30.1 Imputation via EM

We begin by augmenting Fig.14.1 (the first figure in Chapter 14) by adding to it a new node  $\vec{m}$  called the **missingness variable**. Recall that node  $\theta$  represents the **unknown parameters**, node  $\vec{x}$  represents the **observed variables**, and node  $\vec{h}$  represents the **latent variables**. Both  $\theta$  and  $\vec{h}$  are hidden (i.e., unobserved). Fig.30.1 shows 3 popular ways of connecting node  $\vec{m}$  to the other nodes in the graph Fig.14.1.




Figure 30.1: The left bnet is seldom assumed. The middle bnet is referred to as the MAR (missing at random) assumption. The right bnet is referred to as the not-MAR (NMAR) assumption.

From Fig.30.1, we have

$$P(\vec{m}|\vec{x}, \vec{h}, \theta) = \begin{cases} P(\vec{m}|\theta) & \text{Seldom assumed. Called missing-CAR (MCAR)} \\ P(\vec{m}|\vec{x}, \theta) & \text{MAR} \\ P(\vec{m}|\vec{x}, \vec{h}, \theta) & \text{not-MAR (NMAR)} \end{cases} . \quad (30.1)$$

For doing imputation via EM, we connect node  $\vec{m}$  as shown in the middle bnet (called MAR) of Fig.30.1.

For the example of Table 30.1, we have variables  $\vec{m}, \vec{x}$  and  $\vec{h}$  whose values range over the following sets:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{x} &= (\vec{x}_0, \vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2) \\ \vec{h} &= (\vec{h}_0) \\ \vec{h}_0[\sigma] &\in \{0, 1\}, \\ \vec{x}_i[\sigma] &\in \{0, 1\} \text{ for } i = 0, 1, 2, \\ \vec{m}_i[\sigma] &\in \{0, 1\} \text{ for } i = 0, 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

For concreteness, we will assume that the Markov chain  $\vec{m}[\sigma] \leftarrow \vec{x}[\sigma] \leftarrow \vec{h}[\sigma]$  has a finer grained DAG structure given by Fig.30.3. where we will omit the dashed arrows. If one doesn't want to assume that the data can be fitted well by the bnet of Fig.30.3 without the dashed arrows, one can include those arrows too, at the expense of more unknown parameters (i.e., degrees of






Figure 30.2: MAR bnet with  $nsam = 3$ .




Figure 30.3: Our example for imputation via EM assumes this bnet between nodes  $\underline{m}[\sigma], \underline{x}[\sigma], \underline{h}[\sigma]$ .

freedom) to be lumped into  $\theta$ . We will parameterize the TPMs corresponding to Fig.30.3 using a Categorical Distribution for each column of the TPMs. We will thus assume that the bnet of Fig.30.3 has the following TPMs, printed in blue.

$$P(h_0^{[\sigma]}|\theta) = \begin{array}{c|c} & 1 - \theta_0 \\ \hline 1 & \theta_0 \end{array} \quad (30.2)$$

$$P(x_0^{[\sigma]}|\theta) = \begin{array}{c|c} & 1 - \theta_1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 - \theta_1 \\ 1 & \theta_1 \end{array} \quad (30.3)$$

$$P(x_1^{[\sigma]} | x_0^{[\sigma]}, h^{[\sigma]}, \theta) = \begin{array}{c|cccc} & 00 & 01 & 10 & 11 \\ \hline 0 & 1 - \theta_2 & 1 - \theta_3 & 1 - \theta_4 & 1 - \theta_5 \\ 1 & \theta_2 & \theta_3 & \theta_4 & \theta_5 \end{array} \quad (30.4)$$

$$P(x_2^{[\sigma]} | x_1^{[\sigma]}, x_0^{[\sigma]}, \theta) = \frac{1}{nsam} \begin{array}{c|cccc} & 00 & 01 & 10 & 11 \\ \hline 0 & 1 - \theta_6 & 1 - \theta_7 & 1 - \theta_8 & 1 - \theta_9 \\ 1 & \theta_6 & \theta_7 & \theta_8 & \theta_9 \end{array} \quad (30.5)$$

$$P(m^{[\sigma]} | x^{[\sigma]}, \theta) = \frac{1}{nsam} P((x_i)_{\forall i \ni m_i=1} | (x_i)_{\forall i \ni m_i=0}, \theta) \quad (30.6)$$

Eq.(30.6) can be illustrated as follows. In Table 30.2, we added a  $P(m)$  column to Table 30.1.

	$h_0$	$x_0$	$x_1$	$x_2$	$m$	$P(m)$
1	NA	0	1	1	(0,0,0)	$\frac{1}{nsam}$
2	NA	0	0	0	(0,0,0)	$\frac{1}{nsam}$
3	NA	1	1	0	(0,0,0)	$\frac{1}{nsam}$
4	NA	0		0	(1,0,1)	$\frac{1}{nsam} P(x_0 = 0, x_2 = 0   x_1 = 1, \theta)$
		0	1	1		$\frac{1}{nsam} P(x_0 = 0, x_2 = 1   x_1 = 1, \theta)$
		1		0		$\frac{1}{nsam} P(x_0 = 1, x_2 = 0   x_1 = 1, \theta)$
		1		1		$\frac{1}{nsam} P(x_0 = 1, x_2 = 1   x_1 = 1, \theta)$
5	NA	0	0	1	(0,1,0)	$\frac{1}{nsam} P(x_1 = 0   x_0 = 0, x_2 = 1, \theta)$
			1			$\frac{1}{nsam} P(x_1 = 1   x_0 = 0, x_2 = 1, \theta)$
6	NA	0	0	1	(0,0,0)	$\frac{1}{nsam}$

Table 30.2:  $P(m)$  column added to Table 30.1. Note that  $\sum_m P(m) = 1$ .

$$\theta = (\theta_i)_{i=0,1,\dots,9} \quad (30.7)$$

$$P(m^{[\sigma]}, x^{[\sigma]}, h^{[\sigma]} | \theta) = P(m^{[\sigma]} | x^{[\sigma]}, \theta) P(x^{[\sigma]} | h^{[\sigma]}, \theta) P(h^{[\sigma]} | \theta) \quad (30.8)$$

$$P(x^{[\sigma]} | h^{[\sigma]}, \theta) = P(x_2^{[\sigma]} | x_1^{[\sigma]}, x_0^{[\sigma]}, \theta) P(x_1^{[\sigma]} | x_0^{[\sigma]}, h^{[\sigma]}, \theta) P(x_0^{[\sigma]} | \theta) \quad (30.9)$$

$$P(x_1^{[\sigma]} | x_0^{[\sigma]}, \theta) = \sum_h P(x_1^{[\sigma]} | x_0^{[\sigma]}, h^{[\sigma]}, \theta) P(h^{[\sigma]} | \theta) \quad (30.10)$$

$$P(x^{[\sigma]} | \theta) = P(x_2^{[\sigma]} | x_1^{[\sigma]}, x_0^{[\sigma]}, \theta) P(x_1^{[\sigma]} | x_0^{[\sigma]}, \theta) P(x_0^{[\sigma]} | \theta) \quad (30.11)$$

$$Q(\theta|\theta^{(t)}) = \sum_{\vec{m}, \vec{h}} P(\vec{m}, \vec{h} | \vec{x}, \theta^{(t)}) \ln P(\vec{m}, \vec{x}, \vec{h} | \theta) \quad (30.12)$$

$$= \sum_{\vec{m}, \vec{h}} \left[ \prod_{\sigma} P(m^{[\sigma]}, h^{[\sigma]} | x^{[\sigma]}, \theta^{(t)}) \right] \ln \left[ \prod_{\sigma} P(m^{[\sigma]}, x^{[\sigma]}, h^{[\sigma]} | \theta) \right] \quad (30.13)$$

$$= \sum_{\sigma} \sum_{m^{[\sigma]}, h^{[\sigma]}} P(m^{[\sigma]}, h^{[\sigma]} | x^{[\sigma]}, \theta^{(t)}) \ln P(m^{[\sigma]}, x^{[\sigma]}, h^{[\sigma]} | \theta) \quad (30.14)$$

$$= \sum_{\sigma} \sum_{m^{[\sigma]}, h^{[\sigma]}} \frac{P(m^{[\sigma]}, h^{[\sigma]}, x^{[\sigma]} | \theta^{(t)})}{P(x^{[\sigma]} | \theta^{(t)})} \ln P(m^{[\sigma]}, x^{[\sigma]}, h^{[\sigma]} | \theta) \quad (30.15)$$

Once you find optimal parameters  $\theta^*$  by recursing this  $Q(\theta|\theta^{(t)})$ , you can evaluate numerically the  $P(m)$  column of Table 30.2. In Table 30.2, out of the 4 sub-rows for row 4, choose the one with the highest probability. Similarly, out of the 2 sub-rows for row 5, choose the one with the highest probability.

## 30.2 Imputation via MCMC

A simple and popular way to do imputation via MCMC is described in Ref.[30]. It goes as follows.  
Let

$$\underline{H}[\sigma] = (\underline{h}[\sigma], \underline{m}[\sigma]) \quad (30.16)$$

for  $\sigma = 0, 1, \dots, nsam - 1$ . Initialize  $\theta^{(0)}$  to a random value within the allowed ranges. Do the following 2 steps, for  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$ , where  $T$  is large enough that  $\theta^{(t)}$  has reached a steady value that is independent of  $\theta^{(0)}$ . To do the sampling, use a standard sampling technique such as Gibbs sampling.

- **STEP 1:** For  $\sigma = 0, 1, \dots, nsam - 1$ , find a sample

$$(H^{[\sigma]})^{(t+1)} \sim P(H^{[\sigma]} | x^{[\sigma]}, \theta^{(t)}) . \quad (30.17a)$$

- **STEP 2:** Find a sample

$$\theta^{(t+1)} \sim P^{(t+1)}(\theta) \quad (30.17b)$$

where

$$P^{(t+1)}(\theta) = \mathcal{N}(!\theta) P(\vec{x}, \vec{H}^{(t+1)} | \theta) \quad (30.17c)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!\theta) \prod_{\sigma} P(x^{[\sigma]}, (H^{[\sigma]})^{(t+1)} | \theta) . \quad (30.17d)$$

Fig.30.4 illustrates this two step recursive process using a bnet.



Figure 30.4: bnet illustrating Eqs.(30.17) for doing imputation via MCMC. The **same** node  $\underline{x}$  appears twice to make the graph clearer.

### 30.3 Multiple Imputations

**Multiple imputations** means calculating  $\theta^*$  (i.e., the optimum  $\theta$ ) and the concomitant dataset  $\vec{x}^*, \vec{H}^*$ , via any method (such as EM or MCMC), a large number of times, starting from different, randomly chosen  $\theta^{(0)}$  initial parameters. Then calculating the average and the variance of  $\theta^*, \vec{x}^*, \vec{H}^*$  and functions thereof.

# Chapter 31

## Monty Hall Problem




Figure 31.1: Monty Hall Problem.

Mr. Monty Hall, host of the game show “Lets Make a Deal”, hides a car behind one of three doors and a goat behind each of the other two. The contestant picks Door No. 1, but before opening it, Mr. Hall opens Door No. 2 to reveal a goat. Should the contestant stick with No. 1 or switch to No. 3?

The Monty Hall problem can be modeled by the bnet Fig.31.1, where

- $\underline{c}$ = the door behind which the car actually is.
- $\underline{y}$ = the door opened by you (the contestant), on your first selection.
- $\underline{m}$ = the door opened by Monty (game host)

We label the doors 1,2,3 so  $S_{\underline{c}} = S_{\underline{y}} = S_{\underline{m}} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ .

Node matrices printed in blue:

$$P(c) = \frac{1}{3} \text{ for all } c \quad (31.1)$$

$$P(y) = \frac{1}{3} \text{ for all } y \quad (31.2)$$

$$P(m|c, y) = \mathbb{1}(m \neq c) \left[ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}(y = c) + \mathbb{1}(y \neq c) \mathbb{1}(m \neq y) \right] \quad (31.3)$$

It's easy to show that the above node probabilities imply that

$$P(c = 1|m = 2, y = 1) = \frac{1}{3} \quad (31.4)$$

$$P(c = 3|m = 2, y = 1) = \frac{2}{3} \quad (31.5)$$

So you are twice as likely to win if you switch your final selection to be the door which is neither your first choice nor Monty's choice.

The way I justify this to myself is: Monty gives you a piece of information. If you don't switch your choice, you are wasting that info, whereas if you switch, you are using the info.

# Chapter 32

## Naive Bayes



Figure 32.1: bnet for Naive Bayes with 4 features

Class node  $\underline{c} \in S_{\underline{c}}$ .  $|S_{\underline{c}}| = n_{\underline{c}}$  = number of classes.

Feature nodes  $\underline{x}_i \in S_{\underline{x}_i}$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, F - 1$ .  $F$  = number of features.

Define

$$x. = [x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{F-1}] . \quad (32.1)$$

For the bnet of Fig.32.1,

$$P(c, x.) = P(c) \prod_{i=0}^{F-1} P(x_i | c) . \quad (32.2)$$

Given  $x.$  values, find most likely class  $c \in S_{\underline{c}}$ .

Maximum a Posteriori (MAP) estimate:

$$c^* = \operatorname{argmax}_c P(c | x.) \quad (32.3)$$

$$= \operatorname{argmax}_c \frac{P(c, x.)}{P(x.)} \quad (32.4)$$

$$= \operatorname{argmax}_c P(c, x.) . \quad (32.5)$$

# Chapter 33

## Neural Networks

In this chapter, we discuss Neural Networks (NNs) of the feedforward kind, which is the most popular kind. In their plain, vanilla form, NNs only have deterministic nodes. But the nodes of a bnet can be deterministic too, because the TPM of a node can reduce to a delta function. Hence, NNs should be expressible as bnets. We will confirm this in this chapter.

Henceforth in this chapter, if we replace an index of an indexed quantity by a dot, it will mean the collection of the indexed quantity for all values of that index. For example,  $\underline{x}$ . will mean the array of  $x_i$  for all  $i$ .



Figure 33.1: Neural Network (feed forward) with 4 layers: input layer  $\underline{x}$ ., 2 hidden layers  $\underline{h}^0$ .,  $\underline{h}^1$ . and output layer  $\underline{Y}$ .

Consider Fig.33.1.

$\underline{x}_i \in \{0, 1\}$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, nx - 1$  is the **input layer**.

$\underline{h}_i^\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, nh(\lambda) - 1$  is the  **$\lambda$ -th hidden layer**.  $\lambda = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \Lambda - 2$ . A NN is said to be **deep** if  $\Lambda > 2$ ; i.e., if it has more than one hidden layer.

$\underline{Y}_i \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, ny - 1$  is the **output layer**. We use a upper case y here because in the training phase, we will use pairs  $(x.[\sigma], y.[\sigma])$  where  $y_i[\sigma] \in \{0, 1\}$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, ny - 1$ .  $Y = \hat{y}$  is an estimate of  $y$ . Note that lower case y is either 0 or 1, but upper case y may be any



real. Often, the activation functions are chosen so that  $Y \in [0, 1]$ .

The number of nodes in each layer and the number of layers are arbitrary. Fig.33.1 is fully connected (aka dense), meaning that every node of a layer is impinged arrow coming from every node of the preceding layer. Later on in this chapter, we will discuss non-dense layers.

Let  $w_{i|j}^\lambda, b_i^\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  be given, for  $i \in [0, nh(\lambda))_{\mathbb{Z}}$ ,  $j \in [0, nh(\lambda - 1))_{\mathbb{Z}}$ , and  $\lambda \in [0, \Lambda)_{\mathbb{Z}}$ .

These are the TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes of the bnet Fig.33.1:

$$P(x_i \mid x_{i-1}, x_{i-1}, \dots, x_0) = \text{given} \quad (33.1)$$

$$P(h_i^\lambda \mid h_i^{\lambda-1}) = \delta \left( h_i^\lambda, \mathcal{A}_i^\lambda \left( \sum_j w_{i|j}^\lambda h_j^{\lambda-1} + b_i^\lambda \right) \right), \quad (33.2)$$

where  $P(h_i^0 \mid h^{-1}) = P(h_i^0 \mid x)$ .

$$P(Y_i \mid h_i^{\Lambda-2}) = \delta \left( Y_i, \mathcal{A}_i^{\Lambda-1} \left( \sum_j w_{i|j}^{\Lambda-1} h_j^{\Lambda-2} + b_i^{\Lambda-1} \right) \right). \quad (33.3)$$

### 33.1 Activation Functions $\mathcal{A}_i^\lambda : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

Activation functions must be nonlinear.

- **Step function (Perceptron)**

$$\mathcal{A}(x) = \mathbb{1}(x > 0) \quad (33.4)$$

Zero for  $x \leq 0$ , one for  $x > 0$ .

- **Sigmoid function**

$$\mathcal{A}(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x}} = \text{sig}(x) \quad (33.5)$$

Smooth, monotonically increasing function.  $\text{sig}(-\infty) = 0, \text{sig}(0) = 0.5, \text{sig}(\infty) = 1$ .

$$\text{sig}(x) + \text{sig}(-x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x}} + \frac{1}{1 + e^x} \quad (33.6)$$

$$= \frac{2 + e^x + e^{-x}}{2 + e^x + e^{-x}} \quad (33.7)$$

$$= 1 \quad (33.8)$$

- **Hyperbolic tangent**

$$\mathcal{A}(x) = \tanh(x) = \frac{e^x - e^{-x}}{e^x + e^{-x}} \quad (33.9)$$

Smooth, monotonically increasing function.  $\tanh(-\infty) = -1, \tanh(0) = 0, \tanh(\infty) = 1$ .

Odd function:

$$\tanh(-x) = -\tanh(x) \quad (33.10)$$

Whereas  $\text{sig}(x) \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\tanh(x) \in [-1, 1]$ .

- **ReLU (Rectified Linear Unit)**

$$\mathcal{A}(x) = x \mathbb{1}(x > 0) = \max(0, x) . \quad (33.11)$$

Compare this to the step function.

- **Swish**

$$\mathcal{A}(x) = x \text{sig}(x) \quad (33.12)$$

- **Softmax**

$$\mathcal{A}(x_i|x.) = \frac{e^{x_i}}{\sum_i e^{x_i}} \quad (33.13)$$

It's called softmax because if we approximate the exponentials, both in the numerator and denominator of Eq.(33.13), by the largest one, we get

$$\mathcal{A}(x_i|x.) \approx \mathbb{1}(x_i = \max_k x_k) . \quad (33.14)$$

The softmax definition implies that the bnet nodes within a softmax layer are fully connected by arrows to form a "clique".

For 2 nodes  $x_0, x_1$ ,

$$\mathcal{A}(x_0|x.) = \frac{e^{x_0}}{e^{x_0} + e^{x_1}} \quad (33.15)$$

$$= \text{sig}(x_0 - x_1) , \quad (33.16)$$

$$\mathcal{A}(x_1|x.) = \text{sig}(x_1 - x_0) . \quad (33.17)$$

## 33.2 Weight optimization via supervised training and gradient descent

The bnet of Fig.33.1 is used for classification of a single data point  $x$ . It assumes that the weights  $w_{i|j}^\lambda, b_i^\lambda$  are given.

To find the optimum weights via supervised training and gradient descent, one uses the bnet Fig.33.2.

In Fig.33.2, the nodes in Fig.33.1 become sampling space vectors. For example,  $\underline{x}$  becomes  $\vec{x}$ , where the components of  $\vec{x}$  in sampling space are  $\underline{x}[\sigma] \in \{0, 1\}^{n_x}$  for  $\sigma = 0, 1, \dots, nsam(\vec{x}) - 1$ .

$nsam(\vec{x})$  is the number of samples used to calculate the gradient during each **stage (aka iteration)** of Fig.33.2. We will also refer to  $nsam(\vec{x})$  as the **mini-batch size**. A **mini-batch** is a subset of the training data set.

To train a bnet with a data set (d-set), the standard procedure is to split the d-set into 3 parts:

1. **training d-set**,
2. **testing1 d-set**, for tuning of hyperparameters like  $nsam(\vec{x})$ ,  $\Lambda$ , and  $nunh(i)$  for each  $i$ .
3. **testing2 d-set**, for measuring how well the model tuned with the testing1 d-set performs.

The training d-set is itself split into mini-batches. An **epoch** is a pass through all the training d-set.

Define

$$W_{i|j}^\lambda = [w_{i|j}^\lambda, b_i^\lambda] . \quad (33.18)$$

These are the TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes of the bnet Fig.33.2:

$$P(x.[\sigma]) = \text{given} . \quad (33.19)$$

$$P(y.[\sigma] \mid x.[\sigma]) = \text{given} . \quad (33.20)$$

$$P(h_i^\lambda[\sigma] \mid h_i^{\lambda-1}[\sigma]) = \delta \left( h_i^\lambda[\sigma], \mathcal{A}_i^\lambda \left( \sum_j w_{i|j}^\lambda h_j^{\lambda-1}[\sigma] + b_i^\lambda \right) \right) \quad (33.21)$$

$$P(Y_i[\sigma] \mid h_i^{\Lambda-2}[\sigma]) = \delta \left( Y_i[\sigma], \mathcal{A}_i^{\Lambda-1} \left( \sum_j w_{i|j}^{\Lambda-1} h_j^{\Lambda-2}[\sigma] + b_i^{\Lambda-1} \right) \right) \quad (33.22)$$

$$P(W_{i|j}) = \text{given} \quad (33.23)$$




Figure 33.2: bnet for finding optimum weights of the bnet Fig.33.1 via supervised training and gradient descent.

The first time it is used,  $W_{i|j}$  is arbitrary. After the first time, it is determined by previous stage.

$$P(W_{i|j}^\lambda | W_{i|j}) = \delta(W_{i|j}^\lambda, (W_{i|j})^\lambda) \quad (33.24)$$

$$P(\mathcal{E} | \vec{y}, \vec{Y}) = \frac{1}{nsam(\vec{x})} \sum_{\sigma} \sum_i d(y_i[\sigma], Y_i[\sigma]) , \quad (33.25)$$

where

$$d(y, Y) = |y - Y|^2 . \quad (33.26)$$

If  $y, Y \in [0, 1]$ , one can use this instead

$$d(y, Y) = XE(y \rightarrow Y) = -y \ln Y - (1 - y) \ln(1 - Y) . \quad (33.27)$$

$$P((W')_{i|j}^\lambda | \mathcal{E}, W_{i|j}) = \delta((W')_{i|j}^\lambda, W_{i|j}^\lambda - \eta \partial_{W_{i|j}^\lambda} \mathcal{E}) \quad (33.28)$$

$\eta > 0$  is called the learning rate. This method of minimizing the error  $\mathcal{E}$  is called gradient descent.  $W' - W = \Delta W = -\eta \partial_W \mathcal{E}$  so  $\Delta \mathcal{E} = \frac{-1}{\eta} (\Delta W)^2 < 0$ .

### 33.3 Non-dense layers

The TPM for a non-dense layer is of the form:

$$P(h_i^\lambda[\sigma] \mid h^{\lambda-1}[\sigma]) = \delta(h_i^\lambda[\sigma], H_i^\lambda[\sigma]) , \quad (33.29)$$

where  $H_i^\lambda[\sigma]$  will be specified below for each type of non-dense layer.

- **Dropout Layer**

The dropout layer was invented in Ref.[29]. To dropout nodes from a fixed layer  $\lambda$ : For all  $i$  of layer  $\lambda$ , define a new node  $\underline{r}_i^\lambda$  with an arrow  $\underline{r}_i^\lambda \rightarrow \underline{h}_i^\lambda$ . For  $r \in \{0, 1\}$ , and some  $p \in (0, 1)$ , define

$$P(r_i^\lambda = r) = [p]^r [1 - p]^{1-r} \text{ (Bernoulli dist.)} . \quad (33.30)$$

Now one has

$$P(h_i^\lambda[\sigma] \mid h^{\lambda-1}[\sigma], r_i^\lambda) = \delta(h_i^\lambda[\sigma], H_i^\lambda[\sigma]) , \quad (33.31)$$

where

$$H_i^\lambda[\sigma] = \mathcal{A}_i^\lambda(r_i^\lambda \sum_j w_{i|j}^\lambda h_j^{\lambda-1}[\sigma] + b_i^\lambda) . \quad (33.32)$$

This reduces overfitting. Overfitting might occur if the weights follow too closely several similar minibatches. This dropout procedure adds a random component to each minibatch making groups of similar minibatches less likely.

The random  $\underline{r}_i^\lambda$  nodes that induce dropout are only used in the training bnet Fig.33.2, not in the classification bnet Fig.33.1. We prefer to remove the  $\underline{r}_i^\lambda$  stochasticity from classification and for Fig.33.1 to act as an average over sampling space of Fig.33.2. Therefore, if weights  $w_{i|j}^\lambda$  are obtained for a dropout layer  $\lambda$  in Fig.33.2, then that layer is used in Fig.33.1 with no  $\underline{r}_i^\lambda$  nodes but with weights  $\langle r_i^\lambda \rangle w_{i|j}^\lambda = p w_{i|j}^\lambda$ .

Note that dropout adds non-deterministic nodes to a NN, which in their vanilla form only have deterministic nodes.

- **Convolutional Layer**

- 1-dim

Filter function  $\mathcal{F} : \{0, 1, \dots, nf - 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

$\sigma$ =stride length

For  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, nh(\lambda) - 1\}$ , let

$$H_i^\lambda[\sigma] = \sum_{j=0}^{nf-1} h_{j+i\sigma}^{\lambda-1}[\sigma] \mathcal{F}(j) . \quad (33.33)$$

For the indices not to go out of bounds in Eq.(33.33), we must have

$$nh(\lambda - 1) - 1 = nf - 1 + (nh(\lambda) - 1)\sigma \quad (33.34)$$

so

$$nh(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\sigma} [nf - 1 + (nh(\lambda) - 1)\sigma] + 1 . \quad (33.35)$$

- 2-dim

$h_i^\lambda[\sigma]$  becomes  $h_{(i,j)}^\lambda[\sigma]$ . Do 1-dim convolution along both  $i$  and  $j$  axes.

- **Pooling Layers (MaxPool, AvgPool)**

Here each node  $i$  of layer  $\lambda$  is impinged by arrows from a subset  $Pool(i)$  of the set of all nodes of the previous layer  $\lambda - 1$ . Partition set  $\{0, 1, \dots, nh(\lambda - 1) - 1\}$  into  $nh(\lambda)$  mutually disjoint, nonempty sets called  $Pool(i)$ , where  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, nh(\lambda) - 1\}$ .

- AvgPool

$$H_i^\lambda[\sigma] = \frac{1}{size(Pool(i))} \sum_{j \in Pool(i)} h_j^{\lambda-1}[\sigma] \quad (33.36)$$

- MaxPool

$$H_i^\lambda[\sigma] = \max_{j \in Pool(i)} h_j^{\lambda-1}[\sigma] \quad (33.37)$$

## 33.4 Autoencoder NN

If the sequence

$$nx, nh(0), nh(1), \dots, nh(\Lambda - 2), ny \quad (33.38)$$

first decreases monotonically up to layer  $\lambda_{min}$ , then increases monotonically until  $ny = nx$ , then the NN is called an **autoencoder NN**. Autoencoders are useful for unsupervised learning and feature reduction. In this case,  $Y$  estimates  $x$ . The layers before layer  $\lambda_{min}$  are called the **encoder**, and those after  $\lambda_{min}$  are called the **decoder**. Layer  $\lambda_{min}$  is called the **code**.

# Chapter 34

## Noisy-OR gate

The Noisy-OR gate was first proposed by Judea Pearl in his 1988 book Ref.[21].



Figure 34.1: Noisy-OR gate  $\underline{y} \in \{0, 1\}$  with  $n = 3$ , Boolean inputs  $(\underline{x}_i)_{i=0,1,2}$  and parameters  $\underline{\lambda}, (\underline{\pi})_{i=0,1,2}$ .

Let

$\underline{\lambda} \in [0, 1]$  = **gate leakage**.

$y \in \{0, 1\}$  = gate output

$\underline{x}^n = (\underline{x}_i)_{i=0,1,\dots,n-1}$ , where  $\underline{x}_i \in \{0, 1\}$  are gate inputs.

$\underline{\pi}^n = (\underline{\pi}_i)_{i=0,1,\dots,n-1}$ , where  $\underline{\pi}_i \in [0, 1]$  are gate parameters.

The TPM, printed in blue, for the Noisy-OR gate  $\underline{y}$  shown in Fig.34.1, is

$$P(y = 1 | x^n, \lambda, \pi^n) = 1 - (1 - \lambda) \prod_i [1 - \pi_i x_i] \quad (34.1)$$

$$P(y = 0 | x^n, \lambda, \pi^n) = 1 - P(y = 1 | x^n, \lambda, \pi^n) \quad (34.2)$$

Note that if  $\lambda = 0$  and  $\pi_i = 1$  for all  $i$ , then this becomes a deterministic OR-gate. Indeed,

$$P(y = 1 | x^n, \lambda = 0, \pi^n = 1^n) = 1 - \prod_i [1 - x_i] = \vee_{i=0}^{n-1} x_i, \quad (34.3)$$

so

$$P(y|x^n, \lambda = 0, \pi^n = 1^n) = \delta(y, \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} x_i) . \quad (34.4)$$

### 34.1 3 ways to interpret the parameters $\pi_i$

1. Note that if  $\lambda = 0$  and  $x^n$  is one hot (i.e.,  $x^n = e_i^n$ , where  $e_i^n$  is the vector with all components zero except for the  $i$ -th component which equals 1), then

$$P(y = 1|x^n = e_i^n, \lambda = 0, \pi^n) = 1 - [1 - \pi_i] = \pi_i . \quad (34.5)$$

This gives an interpretation to the parameters  $\pi_i$ .




Figure 34.2: Fig.34.1 after replacing parameters  $(\pi_i)_{i=0,1,2}$  by hidden nodes  $(h_i)_{i=0,1,2}$ .

2. Another way of interpreting the parameters  $\pi_i$  is to associate each of them with a hidden variable  $h_i \in \{0, 1\}$  whose average equals  $\pi_i$ . More precisely, consider Fig.34.2.

Let  $\underline{x}_i, \underline{h}_i, \underline{A}_i, \underline{y} \in \{0, 1\}$ .

The TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes of the bnet Fig.34.2, are as follows:

$$P(h_i) = \pi_i \delta(h_i, 1) + (1 - \pi_i) \delta(h_i, 0) \quad (34.6)$$

$$P(A_i|h_i, x_i) = \delta(A_i, h_i \wedge x_i) = \delta(A_i, h_i x_i) \quad (34.7)$$

$$P(y = 1|A^n) = 1 - (1 - \lambda) \bigwedge_{i=0}^{n-1} \overline{A_i} \quad (34.8)$$

$$= 1 - (1 - \lambda) \prod_i (1 - A_i) \quad (34.9)$$



$$P(y = 0|A^n) = 1 - P(y = 1|A^n) \quad (34.10)$$

Note that

$$P(y = 1|x^n, \lambda) = \sum_{h^n} \sum_{A^n} \left[ 1 - (1 - \lambda) \prod_i (1 - A_i) \right] \left[ \prod_i \delta(A_i, h_i x_i) \right] P(h^n) \quad (34.11)$$

$$= E_{\underline{h}^n} \left[ \left[ 1 - (1 - \lambda) \prod_i (1 - h_i x_i) \right] \right]. \quad (34.12)$$

But

$$E_{\underline{h}_i} [h_i x_i] = \sum_{h_i=0,1} P(h_i) h_i x_i = \pi_i x_i \quad (34.13)$$

so

$$P(y = 1|x^n, \lambda) = 1 - (1 - \lambda) \prod_i (1 - \pi_i x_i). \quad (34.14)$$



Figure 34.3: Fig.34.2 after replacing the hidden nodes  $(h_i)_{i=0,1,2}$  by vectors of samples  $(\vec{h}_i)_{i=0,1,2}$ .

3. Another way to interpret the parameters  $\pi_i$  is to associate each of them with a vector of samples  $\vec{h}_i$  whose average is  $\pi_i$ . More precisely, consider Fig.34.3.

Suppose  $\underline{h}_i \in \{0, 1\}$  and define

$$P_{\underline{h}_i}(h_i) = \pi_i \delta(h_i, 1) + (1 - \pi_i) \delta(h_i, 0). \quad (34.15)$$

Suppose  $\vec{h}_i = (h_i[\sigma])_{s=0,1,\dots,nsam-1}$  and the Boolean samples  $\underline{h}_i[\sigma] \in \{0, 1\}$  are i.i.d. with  $\underline{h}_i[\sigma] \sim P_{\underline{h}_i}$  for all  $\sigma$ .

Note that for each  $i$ , an estimate  $\hat{P}_{\underline{h}_i}(h_i)$  of  $P_{\underline{h}_i}(h_i)$  can be obtained from the vector of samples  $\vec{\underline{h}}_i$  as follows:

$$\hat{P}_{\underline{h}_i}(h_i) = \frac{1}{nsam} \sum_{\sigma=0}^{nsam-1} \mathbb{1}(h_i[\sigma] = h_i) . \quad (34.16)$$

Let  $\underline{x}_i, \underline{h}_i[\sigma], \underline{A}_i, \underline{y} \in \{0, 1\}$ .

The TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes of the bnet Fig.34.3, are as follows:

$$P(\vec{\underline{h}}_i) = \prod_{\sigma=0}^{nsam-1} P_{\underline{h}}(h_i[\sigma]) \quad (34.17)$$

$$P(A_i \mid \vec{\underline{h}}_i, x_i) = \delta(A_i, \frac{1}{nsam} \sum_{\sigma} h_i[\sigma] \wedge x_i) \quad (34.18)$$

$$= \delta(A_i, \pi_i x_i) \quad (34.19)$$

$$P(y = 1 | A^n) = 1 - (1 - \lambda) \wedge_{i=0}^{n-1} \overline{A}_i \quad (34.20)$$

$$= 1 - (1 - \lambda) \prod_i (1 - A_i) \quad (34.21)$$

$$P(y = 0 | A^n) = 1 - P(y = 1 | A^n) \quad (34.22)$$

Note that

$$P(y = 1 | x^n, \lambda, \vec{\underline{h}}^n) = \sum_{A^n} \left[ 1 - (1 - \lambda) \prod_i (1 - A_i) \right] \prod_i \delta(A_i, \pi_i x_i) \quad (34.23)$$

$$= 1 - (1 - \lambda) \prod_i (1 - \pi_i x_i) . \quad (34.24)$$

# Chapter 35

## Non-negative Matrix Factorization

Based on Ref.[65].

Given matrix  $V$ , factor it into product of two matrices

$$V = WH, \quad (35.1)$$

where all 3 matrices have non-negative entries.

$V \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{nv \times na}$ : visible info matrix

$W \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{nv \times nh}$ : weight info matrix

$H \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{nh \times na}$ : hidden info matrix

Usually,  $nv > nh < na$  so compression of information (aka dimensional reduction, clustering)

### 35.1 Bnet interpretation

Express node  $\underline{v}$  as a chain of two nodes.

$$\underline{v} \longleftarrow \underline{a} \quad = \quad \underline{w} \longleftarrow \underline{h} \longleftarrow \underline{a}$$

Figure 35.1: B net interpretation of non-negative matrix factorization.

Node TPMs, printed in blue, for Fig.35.1.

$$P(\underline{v} = w | a) = \frac{V_{w,a}}{\sum_w V_{w,a}} \quad (35.2)$$

$$P(w | h) = \frac{W_{w,h}}{\sum_w W_{w,h}} \quad (35.3)$$

$$P(h | a) = \frac{\sum_w W_{w,h} V_{w,a}}{\sum_w V_{w,a}} \quad (35.4)$$

## 35.2 Simplest recursive algorithm

Initialize: Choose  $nh$ . Choose  $W^{(0)}$  and  $H^{(0)}$  that have non-negative entries.

Update: For  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ , do

$$H_{i,j}^{(n+1)} \leftarrow H_{i,j}^{(n)} \frac{[(W^{(n)})^T V]_{i,j}}{[(W^{(n)})^T \underbrace{W^{(n)} H^{(n)}}_{\approx V}]_{i,j}} \quad (35.5)$$

and

$$W_{i,j}^{(n+1)} \leftarrow W_{i,j}^{(n)} \frac{[V(H^{(n+1)})^T]_{i,j}}{[\underbrace{W^{(n)} H^{(n+1)}}_{\approx V} (H^{(n+1)})^T]_{i,j}} . \quad (35.6)$$

After each step, record error defined by

$$\mathcal{E}^{(n)} = \| V - W^{(n)} H^{(n)} \|_2 . \quad (35.7)$$

Using 2-norm, aka Frobenius matrix norm. Continue until reach acceptable error.

Can also use Kullback-Lieber divergence for error:

$$\mathcal{E} = \sum_a P(a) D_{KL}(P(\underline{v} = w|a) \parallel \sum_h P(w|h) P(h|a)) , \quad (35.8)$$

for some arbitrary choice of prior  $P(a)$ . For example, can choose  $P(a)$  uniform.

# Chapter 36

## Observational Equivalence of DAGs

This chapter is based on Chapter 1 of Ref.[22] and on a blog post by Bruno Gonçalves (Ref.[6]).

A probability distribution  $P$  is **compatible with a DAG**  $G$  if  $P$  and  $G$  have the same random variables, and they can be combined to form a bnets without contradictions; i.e., one can calculate all the TPMs from  $P$  and multiply them together to obtain  $P$  again. Let

$$\mathcal{P}(G) = \{P : P \text{ is compatible with } G\} . \quad (36.1)$$

**Two DAGs**  $G$  and  $G'$  are **observationally equivalent (OE)** if  $\mathcal{P}(G) = \mathcal{P}(G')$ . Hence, any total probability distribution that is compatible with one of them is compatible with the other. For example,  $\underline{a} \rightarrow \underline{b}$  and  $\underline{a} \leftarrow \underline{b}$  are OE because

$$P(a|b)P(b) = P(a, b) = P(b|a)P(a) . \quad (36.2)$$

We'll say two bnets are OE if their DAGs are OE.

Two DAGs  $G$  and  $G'$  are **d-separation equivalent** if  $DS(G) = DS(G')$ . See Chapter 12 for definition of  $DS(G)$ .

**Claim 23** *Two DAGs are OE iff their DAGs are d-separation equivalent.*

The **skeleton** of a DAG is its underlying undirected graph.

A **v-structure** in a DAG consists of two arrows converging to a node and such that their tails are not connected by a third arrow. Fig.36.1 shows in red all the v-structures of a particular DAG.

**Claim 24** *Observational Equivalence Theorem (by Verma and Pearl, 1990)*

*Two DAGs are OE iff they have the same skeletons and the same v-structures.*

### 36.1 Examples

The 3 DAGs in Fig.36.2 are OE. They form an equivalence class of OE DAGs that represent the same probability distribution. This equivalence class of DAGs can be represented by the partially directed graph Fig.36.3. These 3 DAGs can be proven to be OE in the following 3 ways:




Figure 36.1: Example showing in red all v-structures of a particular DAG.




Figure 36.2: These 3 DAGs are observationally equivalent (OE).

1. Write the generic probability distributions represented by the 3 DAGs, and show that they are equal, as we did in Eq.36.2. That is the low brow way of proving OE.
2. Use d-separation (see Chapter 12). Consider DAG (a) first. Rename the nodes as  $\underline{z}_j$  with  $j = 1, 2, \dots$  so that the names are in topological order (i.e., so that the parents of  $\underline{z}_j$  have indices that are smaller than  $j$ ). The node names  $\underline{x}_j$  of DAG (a) are already in topological order, so we skip this step for DAG (a). Now write down its total probability distribution and notice which parents of a fully connected DAG were omitted.

$$P(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5) = \underbrace{P(x_5|x_4)}_{x_3, x_2, x_1 \text{ omitted}} \underbrace{P(x_4|x_3, x_2)}_{x_1 \text{ omitted}} \underbrace{P(x_3|x_1)}_{x_2 \text{ omitted}} P(x_2|x_1)P(x_1) \quad (36.3)$$

The observations of which parents were omitted can be stated in d-separation lingo as the following 3 orthogonality relations:<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Normally, if we had changed from the original node names to the  $\underline{z}_j$  node names, these orthogonality relations



Figure 36.3: This partially directed graph represents the 3 DAGs in Fig.36.2.

$$\underline{x}_3 \perp_P \underline{x}_2 \quad | \quad \underline{x}_1 \tag{36.4a}$$

$$\underline{x}_4 \perp_P \underline{x}_1 \quad | \quad \underline{x}_2, \underline{x}_3 \tag{36.4b}$$

$$\underline{x}_5 \perp_P (\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2, \underline{x}_3) \quad | \quad \underline{x}_4 . \tag{36.4c}$$

Going through the same procedure for the other 2 DAGs yields, for each of them, an equivalent set of 3 orthogonality equations.<sup>2</sup>

This is enough to conclude that the 3 DAGs of Fig.36.2 are OE.

Note that Eqs.(36.4) encompass all that there is to say about the observability of DAG (a). These 3 equations can be checked empirically to assess how well the DAG fits the data. For example, one can do OLS (ordinary least squares) regression  $x_5 \sim x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4$  on the data, i.e., try to fit  $x_5 = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^4 \beta_i x_i$  to the data, and find that, to a good approximation,  $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$ .

3. Use the OE Theorem. All three DAGs have the same skeleton, and the same single v-structure  $\underline{x}_2 \rightarrow \underline{x}_4 \leftarrow \underline{x}_3$ .

---

would first be stated in terms of the  $\tau_j$  names, and we could translate them so that they were stated in terms of the original node names. But for DAG (a) there was no need to use the  $\tau_j$  names.

<sup>2</sup> The  $\underline{x}_j$  node names are no longer in topological order for DAGs (b) and (c) so for them you should go through the intermediate step of renaming the nodes  $\tau_j$ , and then, after obtaining the orthogonality relations in terms of the  $\tau_j$  names, translating them back to the original  $\underline{x}_j$  names.

# Chapter 37

## Potential Outcomes

This chapter is based on Ref.[3], a book by Stephen Cunningham entitled “Causal inference: the mixtape”.

The theory of potential outcomes (PO) was for the most part invented in a seminal 1974 paper by Donald B. Rubin. Rubin has also made important extensions to PO theory since 1974. However, he refuses to use Pearl’s causal DAGs to discuss PO theory. Pearl has shown that PO theory can be substantially clarified and extended by using the language of causal DAGs. The d-separation theorem that we discuss in Chapter 12 is especially useful in this regard.

In this chapter, we stress the connection of PO theory to bnets, and, in particular, to the do and imagine operators defined in Chapter 8. Hence, before reading this chapter, the reader is expected to have at least skimmed Chapter 8, so that he/she understands the definition of do and imagine operators.

$\sigma$	$\underline{d}^\sigma$	$y^\sigma$	$(1 - \underline{d}^\sigma)y^\sigma$	$\underline{d}^\sigma y^\sigma$
Andy	1	10	.	10
Ben	1	5	.	5
Chad	1	16	.	16
Daniel	1	3	.	3
Edith	0	5	5	.
Frank	0	7	7	.
George	0	8	8	.
Hank	0	10	10	.

Table 37.1: Dataset describing whether individual  $\sigma$  took a treatment dose ( $d^\sigma = 1$ ) or didn’t ( $d^\sigma = 0$ ). The treatment outcome is measured by the real number  $y^\sigma$ .

Suppose a **population of individuals**  $\sigma = 0, 1, 2, \dots, nsam - 1$  is given ( $d^\sigma = 1$ ) or not given ( $d^\sigma = 0$ ) a **treatment drug dose**  $d^\sigma$ , and that the **treatment outcome (i.e., response)** is measured by a real number  $y^\sigma$ . Table 37.1 gives a possible dataset for this scenario. As you can see from that table, each individual either takes a drug dose or doesn’t, but not both. PO theory can be viewed as a **missing data (MD) problem**. MD problems are discussed in Chapter 30. However, the PO MD problem is much more specialized than the generic MD problems discussed



in Chapter 30. In the PO MD problem, we can fill in the blank cells by matching each individual that took the drug with another *similar* individual that didn't. We will have much more to say about this matching strategy later in this chapter.

One can define similar individuals as individuals that have the same value for  $nx$  features  $x^\sigma = (x_i^\sigma)_{i=0,1,\dots,nx-1}$ . One can add to Table 37.1  $nx$  extra columns giving the value of the feature vector  $x^\sigma$  for each individual. Members of a population with the same  $x^\sigma$  are referred to as a **subpopulation or stratum (ie., layer)**.

In a **randomized clinical trial (RCT)**, the effect of the variable  $x^\sigma$  on the value of  $d^\sigma$  is eliminated by randomizing the population and therefore making the effect of  $x^\sigma$  average out to zero. However, there are many situations in which carrying out an RCT is not possible. PO theory is a way of predicting the result of an RCT in situations where doing a real RCT is not physically possible.

In this chapter,  $x^\sigma$  will be called the confounders. Implicit throughout this chapter is the assumption that there are **no unmeasured confounders**. Because if there are some unmeasured confounders, those can send secret messages that influence the value that  $d^\sigma$  takes. This would ruin the predictions of someone trying to predict the results of an RCT without being privy to those secret messages. When there are **some unmeasured confounders**, it might still be possible to predict the effect of an RCT. This might be possible using instrumental variables. See Chapter 21 for a discussion of **instrumental variables**.

### 37.1 $G$ and $G_{den}$ , bnets, the starting point bnets




Figure 37.1: Bnets  $G$  and  $G_{den}$  are our starting point in discussing PO theory.  $G$  is for a single individual  $\sigma$  of the population. Bnet  $G_{den}$  is the DEN counterpart to  $G$ . DEN (Deterministic with External Noise) bnets are discussed in Chapter 25.

In this chapter, we will abbreviate  $\underline{X}[\sigma] = \underline{X}^\sigma$  for  $X \in \{d, x, y\}$  and for  $\sigma = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, nsam - 1\}$ .

For each individual (aka unit, sample)  $\sigma = 0, 1, 2, \dots, nsam - 1$ , let:

$\underline{d}^\sigma \in \{0, 1\}$ : treatment discrete drug dose, 1 if treated and 0 if untreated

$\underline{y}^\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ : treatment potential outcome

$\underline{x}^\sigma$ : column vector of treatment confounders (aka covariates, because they are often used as covariates (i.e., independent variables) in linear regression.)

Consider bnets  $G$  and  $G_{den}$  in Fig.37.1.  $G$  reflects the language used in Ref.[3] to discuss PO theory. And  $G_{den}$  reflects the language that Judea Pearl prefers to use to discuss PO theory. Both languages are equivalent. To go from one language to the other, one need only perform the following swaps, where  $\underline{u}$  is the external noise of the DEN bnet.

$$\underline{X}^\sigma \leftrightarrow \underline{X}(\underline{u}) \text{ for } X \in \{d, x, y\}.$$

$$P(\sigma) = \frac{1}{n_{sam}} \leftrightarrow P(u)$$

$$\sum_\sigma P(\sigma)(\cdot) \leftrightarrow \sum_u P(u)(\cdot)$$

The TPMs, printed in blue, for the bnet  $G$  in Fig.37.1, are as follows:

$$P(x^\sigma) = P_{\underline{x}}(x^\sigma) \quad (37.1)$$

$$P(d^\sigma | x^\sigma) = P_{\underline{d}|\underline{x}}(d^\sigma | x^\sigma) \quad (37.2)$$

$$P(y^\sigma | x^\sigma, d^\sigma) = P_{\underline{y}|\underline{x},\underline{d}}(y^\sigma | x^\sigma, d^\sigma) \quad (37.3)$$

Now let:

$\underline{d} \in \{0, 1\}$ : treatment discrete drug dose, 1 if treated and 0 if untreated

$\underline{y} \in \mathbb{R}$ : treatment potential outcome

$\underline{x}$ : column vector of treatment confounders (aka covariates)

$\underline{u} = (\underline{u}_d, \underline{u}_x, \underline{u}_y)$ : external noise

The TPMs, printed in blue, for the bnet  $G_{den}$  in Fig.37.1, are as follows:

$$P(x | \underline{u}_x) = \mathbb{1}(x = \underline{u}_x) \quad (37.4)$$

$$P(d | x, \underline{u}_d) = \mathbb{1}(d = \underline{f}_d(x, \underline{u}_d)) \quad (37.5)$$

$$P(y | d, x, \underline{u}_y) = \mathbb{1}(y = \underline{f}_y(d, x, \underline{u}_y)) \quad (37.6)$$

If we linearize  $\underline{f}_y$  in Eq.(37.6), we get

$$\underline{y} = \delta \underline{d} + \beta \underline{x} + \underline{u}_y, \quad (37.7)$$

where  $\delta, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ . Assuming that  $\underline{x}, \underline{y} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\underline{d} \in \{0, 1\}$ , Eq.(37.7) can be plotted. The resulting plot is given in Fig.37.2. This plot is a very special case of the PO problem, but it gives a crude

idea of the “effects”  $\delta = y(1) - y(0)$  that PO theory gives estimates for. Any individual in the experiment experiences either  $y(1)$  or  $y(0)$ , but not both.




Figure 37.2: Plot of Eq.(37.7)

## 37.2 $G_{do+}$ bnet




Figure 37.3: Bnet  $G_{do} = \rho_{\underline{d}^\sigma}(\tilde{d}^\sigma)G$  is obtained by applying the do operator to node  $\underline{d}^\sigma$  of bnet  $G$ . Bnet  $G_{do+}$  is obtained by adding a prior probability distribution  $P(\tilde{d}^\sigma)$  to node  $\rho_{\underline{d}^\sigma}$  of bnet  $G_{do}$ .

Fig.37.3 shows how bnet  $G_{do}$  is obtained by applying the do operator to bnet  $G$ , and how bnet  $G_{do+}$  is obtained by adding a prior probability distribution to one of the nodes of  $G_{do}$ . In bnet  $G_{do}$ , node  $\underline{d}^\sigma$  has been stripped of all outside influences and fixed to a specific state  $\tilde{d}^\sigma$ . This is what an RCT does.

The TPMs, printed in blue, for the bnets  $G_{do}$  and  $G_{do+}$ , are as follows. Note that the TPMs for bnets  $G_{do}$  and  $G_{do+}$  are defined in terms of the TPMs of bnet  $G$ .

$$P(x^\sigma) = P_{\underline{x}}(x^\sigma) \quad (37.8)$$

$$P_{\rho_{\underline{d}}}(d) = \sum_x P_{\underline{d}|\underline{x}}(d|x)P_{\underline{x}}(x) \quad (37.9)$$

$$P(\tilde{d}^\sigma) = \begin{cases} \delta(\tilde{d}^\sigma, (\tilde{d}^\sigma)') & \text{for } G_{do} \\ P_{\rho\tilde{d}}(\tilde{d}^\sigma) & \text{for } G_{do+} \end{cases} \quad (37.10)$$

$$P(y^\sigma | x^\sigma, \tilde{d}^\sigma) = P_{\underline{y}|\underline{x},\underline{\tilde{d}}}(y^\sigma | x^\sigma, \tilde{d}^\sigma) \quad (37.11)$$

It is convenient to define the following expected values of  $\underline{y}^\sigma$  in terms of the TPMs of bnet  $G_{do+}$ :

$$\mathcal{Y}_{|\tilde{d},x} = E_\sigma E_{|\tilde{d},x,\sigma}[\underline{y}^\sigma(\tilde{d})] \rightarrow E_{|\tilde{d},x}[\underline{y}(\tilde{d})] = \sum_y y P(y|\tilde{d}, x) \quad (37.12)$$

$$\mathcal{Y}_{|\tilde{d}} = E_\sigma E_{|\tilde{d},\sigma}[\underline{y}^\sigma(\tilde{d})] \rightarrow E_{|\tilde{d}}[\underline{y}(\tilde{d})] = \sum_x \mathcal{Y}_{|\tilde{d},x} P(x) \quad (37.13)$$

$$\mathcal{Y}_{|x} = E_\sigma E_{|x,\sigma}[\underline{y}^\sigma(\tilde{d})] \rightarrow E_{|x}[\underline{y}(\tilde{d})] = \sum_{\tilde{d}} \mathcal{Y}_{|\tilde{d},x} P(\tilde{d}) \quad (37.14)$$

$$\mathcal{Y} = E_\sigma[\underline{y}^\sigma] \rightarrow E[\underline{y}] = \sum_{\tilde{d},x} \mathcal{Y}_{|\tilde{d},x} P(\tilde{d}) P(x) \quad (37.15)$$

### 37.3 $G_{im+}$ bnet




Figure 37.4: Bnet  $G_{im} = \kappa_{\underline{d}^\sigma \rightarrow \underline{y}^\sigma}(\tilde{d}^\sigma)G$  is obtained by applying the imagine operator to arrow  $\underline{d}^\sigma \rightarrow \underline{y}^\sigma$  of bnet  $G$ . Bnet  $G_{im+}$  is obtained by adding a prior probability distribution  $P(\tilde{d}^\sigma)$  to node  $\underline{\tilde{d}}^\sigma$  of bnet  $G_{im}$ .

Fig.37.4 shows how bnet  $G_{im}$  is obtained by applying an imagine operator to bnet  $G$ , and how bnet  $G_{im+}$  is obtained from bnet  $G_{im}$  by adding a prior probability distribution to one of the nodes of  $G_{im}$ .  $\underline{d} \in \{0, 1\}$  represents the dose that a patient is told to take by a doctor, and  $\tilde{d} \in \{0, 1\}$  represents the dose he actually takes. If  $\underline{d} = \tilde{d}$ , the patient is compliant, and if  $\underline{d} \neq \tilde{d}$ , he is non-compliant.

It is convenient to define  $\underline{y}^\sigma(\tilde{d}^\sigma)$  so that

$$\underline{y}^\sigma(\tilde{d}^\sigma) = \underline{y}_{G_{im}}^\sigma \quad (37.16)$$

and

$$\underline{y}^\sigma = \underline{y}^\sigma(\tilde{d}^\sigma) = \underline{y}^\sigma(1)\tilde{d}^\sigma + \underline{y}^\sigma(0)(1 - \tilde{d}^\sigma) . \quad (37.17)$$

The TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes of bnets  $G_{im}$  and  $G_{im+}$ , are as follows. Note that the TPMs for bnets  $G_{im}$  and  $G_{im+}$  are defined in terms of the TPMs of bnet  $G$ . Note that the prior  $P(\tilde{d})$  is not arbitrary; it's calculated from the TPMs of bnet  $G$ .

$$P(x^\sigma) = P_{\underline{x}}(x^\sigma) \quad (37.18)$$

$$P(d^\sigma|x^\sigma) = P_{\underline{d}|\underline{x}}(d^\sigma|x^\sigma) \quad (37.19)$$

$$\pi_{\tilde{d}} = P(\tilde{d}) = \sum_x P_{\underline{d}|\underline{x}}(\tilde{d}|x) P_{\underline{x}}(x) \quad (37.20)$$

$$P(\tilde{d}^\sigma) = \begin{cases} \delta(\tilde{d}^\sigma, (\tilde{d}^\sigma)') & \text{for } G_{im} \\ \pi_{\tilde{d}^\sigma} & \text{for } G_{im+} \end{cases} \quad (37.21)$$

$$P(y^\sigma(\tilde{d}^\sigma)|x^\sigma, \tilde{d}^\sigma) = P_{\underline{y}|\underline{x}, \underline{d}}(y^\sigma(\tilde{d}^\sigma)|x^\sigma, \tilde{d}^\sigma) \quad (37.22)$$

It is convenient to define the following expected values of  $\underline{y}^\sigma$  in terms of the TPMs of bnet  $G_{im+}$ :

$$\mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d},x} = E_\sigma E_{|d,\tilde{d},x,\sigma}[\underline{y}^\sigma(\tilde{d})] \rightarrow E_{|d,\tilde{d},x}[\underline{y}(\tilde{d})] = \sum_y y P(y|\tilde{d},x) P(d|x) \quad (37.23)$$

$$\mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d}} = E_\sigma E_{|d,\tilde{d},\sigma}[\underline{y}^\sigma(\tilde{d})] \rightarrow E_{|d,\tilde{d}}[\underline{y}(\tilde{d})] = \sum_x \mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d},x} P(x) \quad (37.24)$$

$$\mathcal{Y}_{d|x} = E_\sigma E_{|d,x,\sigma}[\underline{y}^\sigma(\tilde{d})] \rightarrow E_{|d,x}[\underline{y}(\tilde{d})] = \sum_{\tilde{d}} \mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d},x} P(\tilde{d}) \quad (37.25)$$

$$\mathcal{Y}_d = E_\sigma E_{|d,\sigma}[\underline{y}^\sigma(\tilde{d})] \rightarrow E_{|d}[\underline{y}(\tilde{d})] = \sum_{\tilde{d},x} \mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d},x} P(\tilde{d}) P(x) \quad (37.26)$$

$\mathcal{Y}_{0|0}, \mathcal{Y}_{1|1}$  are said to be **factual** (indicating compliant patients) whereas  $\mathcal{Y}_{0|1}, \mathcal{Y}_{1|0}$  are said to be **counterfactual** (indicating non-compliant patients).

## 37.4 Translation Dictionary

In standard PO notation	In our notation (for $G_{im+}$ , unless otherwise specified)
$i$ (unit, sample index)	$\sigma$
$D_i$ (treatment dose)	$\underline{d}^\sigma$
$Y_i = y_i$ (treatment outcome)	$\underline{y}^\sigma = y^\sigma$
$X_i = x_i$ (treatment confounders)	$\underline{x}^\sigma = x^\sigma$
$Y_i(\tilde{d})$	$\underline{y}^\sigma = \underline{y}^\sigma(\tilde{d})$ for $G_{im}$
$Y_i$	$\underline{y}^\sigma$ for $G_{im+}$
$E[Y_i(\tilde{d})]$	$E_\sigma[\underline{y}^\sigma(\tilde{d})] = \mathcal{Y}_{ \tilde{d}}$ for $G_{im}$
$E[Y_i D_i = d]$	$E_\sigma E_{ d,\sigma}[\underline{y}^\sigma] = \mathcal{Y}_d$
$E[Y_i(\tilde{d}) D_i = d]$	$E_\sigma E_{ d,\tilde{d},\sigma}[\underline{y}^\sigma] = \mathcal{Y}_{d \tilde{d}}$
$E[Y_i(\tilde{d}) D_i = d, X = x]$	$E_\sigma E_{ d,\tilde{d},x,\sigma}[\underline{y}^\sigma] = \mathcal{Y}_{d \tilde{d},x}$

Table 37.2: Dictionary for translating from standard PO notation of Ref.[3] to our notation.

Table 37.2 gives a dictionary for translating from the standard PO notation of Ref.[3] to our notation.  $d, \tilde{d} \in \{0, 1\}$ . PO rarely uses  $\mathcal{Y}_{|\tilde{d}}$ , so  $E[Y_i(d)]$  and  $E[Y_i|D_i = d]$  are often both used denote  $\mathcal{Y}_d$ . I find the standard PO notation confusing because it often uses  $D_i$  to represent two different nodes,  $\underline{d}^\sigma$  and  $\tilde{d}^\sigma$  in  $G_{im+}$ . This confusion becomes particularly distressing when we are told in PO notation that

$$Y_i = D_i Y_i(0) + (1 - D_i) Y_i(1) . \quad (37.27)$$

This could mean that

$$\underline{y}^\sigma = \tilde{d}^\sigma y^\sigma(1) + (1 - \tilde{d}^\sigma) \underline{y}^\sigma(0) \quad (37.28)$$

which is always true, or it could mean

$$\underline{y}^\sigma = \underline{d}^\sigma \underline{y}^\sigma(1) + (1 - \underline{d}^\sigma) \underline{y}^\sigma(0) \quad (37.29)$$

which is not necessarily true.

## 37.5 $\mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d}}$ differences (aka treatment effects)

Note the  $\mathcal{Y}_d$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_{|\tilde{d}}$  are not the same thing.

$$\mathcal{Y}_{|\tilde{d}} = \sum_d \mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d}} = \mathcal{Y}_{0|\tilde{d}} + \mathcal{Y}_{1|\tilde{d}} \quad (37.30)$$

whereas

$$\mathcal{Y}_d = \sum_{\tilde{d}} \mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d}} P(\tilde{d}) = \mathcal{Y}_{d|0} \pi_0 + \mathcal{Y}_{d|1} \pi_1 . \quad (37.31)$$

$\mathcal{Y}_{|\tilde{d}}$  is connected to the do operator as follows.

$$P(\underline{y} = y | \rho \underline{d} = \tilde{d}) = \sum_x P(y | \tilde{d}, x) P(x) \quad (37.32)$$

so

$$\mathcal{Y}_{|\tilde{d}} = \sum_y y P(\underline{y} = y | \rho \underline{d} = \tilde{d}) . \quad (37.33)$$

In particular, when  $\underline{y}$  is binary (i.e.,  $\underline{y} \in \{0, 1\}$ ), Eq.(37.33) becomes

$$\mathcal{Y}_{|\tilde{d}} = P(\underline{y} = 1 | \rho \underline{d} = \tilde{d}) . \quad (37.34)$$

It is convenient to define the following effects. Note that we use the word “**effect**” to refer to a difference of two  $\mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d}}$ .

- average controlled effect (ACE), used when doing a CRT.

$$\textcolor{red}{ACE} = \mathcal{Y}_{1|1} - \mathcal{Y}_{1|0} \quad (37.35)$$

- average treatment effect<sup>1</sup> (ATE).

$$\textcolor{red}{ATE} = \mathcal{Y}_1 - \mathcal{Y}_0 = \delta \quad (37.36)$$

- average treatment effect of the treated (ATT)

$$\textcolor{red}{ATT} = \mathcal{Y}_{1|1} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|1} \quad (37.37)$$

- average treatment effect of the untreated (ATU)

$$\textcolor{red}{ATU} = \mathcal{Y}_{1|0} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|0} \quad (37.38)$$

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that effects in which  $\tilde{d}$  varies are called “controlled”, whereas those in which  $d$  varies instead, are called simply “treatments”.  $y$  is averaged over in both cases.

- simple difference in outcomes (SDO)

$$\textcolor{red}{SDO} = \mathcal{Y}_{1|1} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|0} \quad (37.39)$$

- selection bias (SB)

$$\textcolor{red}{SB} = \mathcal{Y}_{0|1} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|0} \quad (37.40)$$

Note that some of these effects are linearly related

$$\underbrace{\mathcal{Y}_{1|1} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|0}}_{SDO} = \underbrace{(\mathcal{Y}_{1|1} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|1})}_{ATT} + \underbrace{\mathcal{Y}_{0|1} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|0}}_{SB} \quad (37.41)$$

$$\underbrace{\mathcal{Y}_1 - \mathcal{Y}_0}_{ATE} = \underbrace{(\mathcal{Y}_{1|1} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|1})}_{ATT} \pi_1 + \underbrace{(\mathcal{Y}_{1|0} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|0})}_{ATU} \pi_0 \quad (37.42)$$

$$\underbrace{\mathcal{Y}_{1|1} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|0}}_{SDO} = \underbrace{(\mathcal{Y}_{1|1} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|1})\pi_1 + (\mathcal{Y}_{1|0} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|0})\pi_0}_{ATE} \quad (37.43)$$

$$+ \underbrace{\mathcal{Y}_{0|1} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|0}}_{SB} \quad (37.44)$$

$$+ \underbrace{(\mathcal{Y}_{1|1} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|1})}_{ATT} \pi_0 \quad (37.45)$$

$$- \underbrace{(\mathcal{Y}_{1|0} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|0})}_{ATU} \pi_0 \quad (37.46)$$

## 37.6 Ignorability

Confounders are said to be **ignorable** (i.e., there is independence from confounders) if

$$\underline{y}^\sigma(\underline{\tilde{d}}^\sigma) \perp_P \underline{d}^\sigma . \quad (37.47)$$

This is satisfied by  $G_{do}$ . To prove so, check that

$$\underline{y}^\sigma(\underline{\tilde{d}}^\sigma) \perp_{G_{do}} \underline{d}^\sigma \quad (37.48)$$

and then invoke the d-separation theorem (see Chapter 12). When confounders are ignorable, we have

$$\mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d}} = \mathcal{Y}_{d|y(\tilde{d})} = \mathcal{Y}_d , \quad (37.49)$$

or, equivalently,

$$\mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d}=0} = \mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d}=1} . \quad (37.50)$$



Therefore,

$$ATE = ATT = ATU = SDO \quad (37.51a)$$

and

$$SB = 0 . \quad (37.51b)$$

Let  $\mathcal{E} \in \{ACE, ATE, ATT, ATU, SDO, SB\}$ .  $\mathcal{E}$  can be defined for a fixed stratum  $x$  by replacing  $\mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d}}$  with  $\mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d},x}$ . We will denote such an extension by  $\mathcal{E}_x$ , or, sometimes, simply by  $\mathcal{E}$ .

Confounders are said to be **conditionally ignorable** (i.e., there is conditional independence from confounders) if

$$\underline{y}^\sigma(\underline{\tilde{d}}^\sigma) \perp_P \underline{d}^\sigma | \underline{x}^\sigma . \quad (37.52)$$

This is satisfied by  $G_{im}$ . To prove this, check that

$$\underline{y}^\sigma(\underline{\tilde{d}}^\sigma) \perp_{G_{im}} \underline{d}^\sigma | \underline{x}^\sigma \quad (37.53)$$

and then invoke the d-separation theorem (see Chapter 12). When confounders are conditionally ignorable, we have

$$\mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d},x} = \mathcal{Y}_{d|y(\tilde{d}),x} = \mathcal{Y}_{d|x} , \quad (37.54)$$

or, equivalently,

$$\mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d}=0,x} = \mathcal{Y}_{d|\tilde{d}=1,x} . \quad (37.55)$$

If conditional ignorability holds, then Eqs.(37.51) are valid at fixed  $x$ .

## 37.7 Hypothesis testing for sharp null

In this section, we assume no  $x$  dependence, or else we assume that the whole discussion refers to a single stratum  $x$ . Hence, we will omit the  $x$  subscript in this section.

Assume  $\underline{d}^\sigma = \underline{\tilde{d}}^\sigma$ . In this section, we will discuss hypothesis testing between the following two opposite hypotheses:

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 : \underline{y}^\sigma(1) &= \underline{y}^\sigma(0) \quad \forall \sigma \\ H_1 &= \neg H_0 \end{aligned} \quad (37.56)$$

$H_0$  is called the **sharp null hypothesis**.

Table 37.1 becomes Table 37.3 if we fill the blank cells according to the sharp null hypothesis  $H_0$ . And Table 37.3 becomes Table 37.4 by permuting the entries of column  $\underline{d}^\sigma$ .

Define

$$N_1 = \sum_{\sigma} d^\sigma, \quad \pi_1 = \frac{N_1}{nsam} , \quad (37.57)$$

$\sigma$	$\underline{d}^\sigma$	$\underline{y}^\sigma$	$(1 - \underline{d}^\sigma)\underline{y}^\sigma$	$\underline{d}^\sigma \underline{y}^\sigma$
Andy	1	10	10	10
Ben	1	5	5	5
Chad	1	16	16	16
Daniel	1	3	3	3
Edith	0	5	5	5
Frank	0	7	7	7
George	0	8	8	8
Hank	0	10	10	10

Table 37.3: Table 37.1 with blank cells filled according to the sharp null hypothesis  $H_0$ . Note that  $\vec{d}_0 = (1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ . If  $\xi(\vec{d})$  is defined by Eq.(37.60), then  $\xi = |34 - 30|/4 = 1$

$\sigma$	$\underline{d}^\sigma$	$\underline{y}^\sigma$	$(1 - \underline{d}^\sigma)\underline{y}^\sigma$	$\underline{d}^\sigma \underline{y}^\sigma$
Andy	1	10	10	10
Ben	0	5	5	5
Chad	1	16	16	16
Daniel	1	3	3	3
Edith	0	5	5	5
Frank	1	7	7	7
George	0	8	8	8
Hank	0	10	10	10

Table 37.4: Table 37.3 after permuting the entries of column  $\underline{d}^\sigma$ . Note that  $\vec{d}_1 = (1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)$ . If  $\xi(\vec{d})$  is defined by Eq.(37.60), then  $\xi = |36 - 28|/4 = 2$

$$N_0 = \sum_{\sigma} (1 - d^\sigma) = nsam - N_1, \quad \pi_0 = \frac{N_0}{nsam}, \quad (37.58)$$

$$\vec{d} = (d^\sigma)_{\sigma=01,2,\dots,nsam-1}, \quad (37.59)$$

and

$$\xi(\vec{d}) = \left| \frac{\sum_{\sigma} d^\sigma y^\sigma}{N_1} - \frac{\sum_{\sigma} (1 - d^\sigma) y^\sigma}{N_0} \right| \rightarrow |\mathcal{Y}_1 - \mathcal{Y}_0|. \quad (37.60)$$

$\xi(\vec{d})$  is the statistic that we will use to test the sharp null hypothesis  $H_0$ . There are other possible functions  $\xi(\vec{d})$  that are commonly used to test  $H_0$ ; for example, the Kolgomorov-Smirmov statistic (see Ref.[3])

According to Tables 37.3 and 37.4,  $\xi(\vec{d}) = 1$  for the true (i.e.,  $H_0$ -satisfying) vector  $\vec{d} = \vec{d}_0$ , and  $\xi(\vec{d}) = 2$  for one possible  $H_1$ -satisfying vector  $\vec{d} = \vec{d}_1$ . Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the set of all permutations of  $\vec{d}_0$ , and define  $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by

$$F(\xi) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{\vec{d} \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{1}(\xi(\vec{d}) \leq \xi) \quad (37.61)$$

$$= E_{\vec{d}}[\mathbb{1}(\xi(\vec{d}) \leq \xi)] \quad \text{where } P(\vec{d}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \quad (37.62)$$

The function  $F(\xi)$  is monotonically increasing from  $F(-\infty) = 0$  to  $F(+\infty) = 1$  so it can be interpreted to be a cumulative distribution for  $\xi$ . Then one can define a  $p$  value for the sharp null hypothesis by

$$p = 1 - F(\xi(\vec{d}_0)) . \quad (37.63)$$

$p \in [0, 1]$  measures the likelihood that  $H_0$  is true. The smaller it is, the less likely  $H_0$  is.

Often,  $|\mathcal{D}|$  = the number of permutations of  $\vec{d}_0$ , is too large to average over all the elements of  $\mathcal{D}$ . In that case, one can use random sampling methods. For example, one can choose a  $\vec{d}$  at random from  $\mathcal{D}$ , and calculate a step function  $F_i(\xi)$  from that. Do this  $ni$  times. Then average all the  $ni$  step functions to obtain an estimate of  $F(\xi)$ .

## 37.8 Matching Strata

For a situation described by the bnet  $G_{im+}$ , we can match *similar* individuals to fill the blank cells of Table 37.1. By “similar”, we mean that they have the same or almost the same value of  $\underline{x}^\sigma$ .

### 37.8.1 1-1 strata-match

In 1-1 strata-match, we match each individual with  $d^\sigma = 1$  with exactly one individual with  $d^\sigma = 0$ .

Recall that

$$SDO = \mathcal{Y}_{1|1,x} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|0,x} \quad (37.64a)$$

$$ATT = \mathcal{Y}_{1|1,x} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|1,x} \quad (37.64b)$$

$$ATU = \mathcal{Y}_{1|0,x} - \mathcal{Y}_{0|0,x} \quad (37.64c)$$

$$ATE = ATT\pi_1 + ATU\pi_0 \quad (37.64d)$$

Note that  $\pi_0, \pi_1$  do not depend on  $x$ . This can be justified by looking at the bnet  $G_{im+}$ , for which  $\pi_{\tilde{d}} = P(\tilde{d})$  is the prior of node  $\tilde{d}$ .

Eqs.(37.64) can be estimated from the data via the following estimators. In these estimators,  $s(\sigma)$  is the single match for individual  $\sigma$ .

$$\widehat{SDO} = \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{\sigma} d^\sigma y^\sigma - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{\sigma} (1 - d^\sigma) y^\sigma \quad (37.65)$$

$$\widehat{ATT} = \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{\sigma} d^{\sigma} y^{\sigma} - \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{\sigma} d_{\sigma} y^{s(\sigma)} \quad (37.66)$$

$$= \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{\sigma} d^{\sigma} (y^{\sigma} - y^{s(\sigma)}) \quad (37.67)$$

$$\widehat{ATU} = \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{\sigma} (1 - d^{\sigma}) (y^{s(\sigma)} - y^{\sigma}) \quad (37.68)$$

$$\widehat{ATE} = \widehat{ATT} \pi_1 + \widehat{ATU} \pi_0 \quad (37.69)$$

$$= \frac{1}{nsam} [\widehat{ATT} N_1 + \widehat{ATU} N_0] \quad (37.70)$$

$$= \frac{1}{nsam} \left[ \sum_{\sigma} d^{\sigma} (y^{\sigma} - y^{s(\sigma)}) + \sum_{\sigma} (1 - d^{\sigma}) (y^{s(\sigma)} - y^{\sigma}) \right] \quad (37.71)$$

$$= \frac{1}{nsam} \sum_{\sigma} (2d^{\sigma} - 1) (y^{\sigma} - y^{s(\sigma)}) \quad (37.72)$$

### 37.8.2 Exact and approximate strata-match

It is very often the case that one can't find for a given individual  $\sigma$  another individual that has exactly the same value of  $x^{\sigma}$ . In such cases, one can discard all matchless individuals. But that would entail a loss of precious information. Instead of discarding orphans, a better way is to relax our demands and match individual  $\sigma$  with another individual  $s$  such that  $x^s$  and  $x^{\sigma}$  are very close in some metric.

More precisely, for some arbitrary parameter  $\epsilon > 0$ , and an individual  $\sigma$  with  $d^{\sigma} = 1$ , define the **strata-matching set**  $\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon}(\sigma)$  by

$$\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon}(\sigma) = \{s : d^{\sigma} = 1, d^s = 0, dist(x^{\sigma}, x^s) \leq \epsilon\} , \quad (37.73)$$

where

$$dist(x^{\sigma}, x^s) = [x^{\sigma}]^T [\Sigma]^{-1} x^s , \quad (37.74)$$

where  $\Sigma = \langle \underline{x}^{\sigma}, [\underline{x}^s]^T \rangle$ . This metric  $dist(x^{\sigma}, x^s)$  is called the **Mahalanobis distance**. We will call the case  $\epsilon = 0$  an **exact strata-match**, and the case  $\epsilon \neq 0$  an **approximate strata-match**. To do an approximate strata-match, replace  $y^{s(\sigma)}$  by  $\langle y \rangle^{\sigma}$  in the estimators given above for a 1-1 strata-match.  $\langle y \rangle^{\sigma}$  is defined by

$$\langle y \rangle^{\sigma} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon}(\sigma)|} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{M}_{\epsilon}(\sigma)} y^s . \quad (37.75)$$

Ref.[3] calculates the mean and variance of estimator  $\widehat{ATT}$ . The mean is biased, but one can define a new bias-corrected estimator.

### 37.8.3 Positivity

**Positivity** is defined as the requirement that for all layers  $x$ ,

$$0 < P(d^\sigma = 1|x^\sigma = x) < 1 \quad (37.76)$$

or, equivalently,

$$P(d^\sigma = 1|x^\sigma = x) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad P(d^\sigma = 0|x^\sigma = x) > 0 . \quad (37.77)$$

In other words, for each layer  $x$ , there is a non-zero probability of being both treated and untreated.

If positivity is violated, then for some layer  $x$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}_{0|\tilde{d},x}$  or  $\mathcal{Y}_{1|\tilde{d},x}$  is zero, so we can't calculate effect estimators such as  $\widehat{ATE}$ . If  $\widehat{ATE}$  can be calculated, one says it is identifiable (i.e., calculable). Positivity is a requirement for identifiability of  $\widehat{ATE}$ .

When  $P(d^\sigma|x^\sigma = x)$  becomes 0 or 1 for some  $x$ , the arrow  $\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{d}$  becomes deterministic for some  $x$ . This situation is the very antithesis of RCTs, wherein the influence exerted by  $\underline{x}^\sigma$  on  $\underline{d}^\sigma$  is uniformly random and therefore ignorable. Hence, it is perhaps not too surprisingly that a violation of positivity makes  $\widehat{ATE}$  non-identifiable.

## 37.9 Propensity Score

It is often the case that the discrete vector  $\underline{x}^\sigma$  has too many possible values to make matching possible. In such cases, it is convenient to map the space of vectors  $\underline{x}^\sigma$  to the real line. One very convenient choice for that map is the **propensity score**, which is defined as

$$g(x^\sigma) = P(d^\sigma = 1|x^\sigma) . \quad (37.78)$$

The propensity score is usually approximated by a sigmoid function using logistic regression<sup>2</sup>

$$g(x^\sigma) = \text{sig}(\alpha + \beta x^\sigma) \quad (37.79)$$




Figure 37.5: Bnet  $G_{ps}$  used when doing propensity scoring.

<sup>2</sup> The sigmoid function is defined in Chapter chapter 0.1.2 to be  $\text{sig}(x) = 1/(1 - e^{-x})$ .

To use the propensity score, one replaces the bnct  $G_{im+}$  by the bnct  $G_{ps}$  shown in Fig.37.5. The TPMs, printed in blue, for the 2 nodes of  $G_{ps}$  that differ from the nodes of  $G_{im+}$ , are as follows:

$$P(g^\sigma|x^\sigma) = \delta(g^\sigma, g(x^\sigma)) \quad (37.80)$$

$$P(d^\sigma|g^\sigma) = g^\sigma d^\sigma + (1 - g^\sigma)(1 - d^\sigma) \quad (37.81)$$

Note that these TPMs are self-consistent because

$$P(d|x) = \sum_g P(d|g)P(g|x) \quad (37.82)$$

$$= g(x)d + [1 - g(x)](1 - d) \quad (37.83)$$

$$= P(d = 1|x)d + [1 - P(d = 1|x)](1 - d) \quad (37.84)$$

$$= P(d|x) \quad (37.85)$$

We would like to do **propensity score strata-matching** by matching g-strata instead of x-strata. PO calculations for x-strata matching use the TPMs for  $P(d|x)$ ,  $P(x)$  and  $P(y|d, x)$ . To do g-strata matching using the same equations, but with  $x$  replaced by  $g$ , we would need to solve for  $P(d|g)$ ,  $P(g)$  and  $P(y|d, g)$  in terms of  $P(d|x)$ ,  $P(x)$  and  $P(y|d, x)$ . We solve for those next.

From the TPMs for  $G_{ps}$ , one has

$$\boxed{P(d|g) = gd + (1 - g)(1 - d)} \quad (37.86)$$

and

$$\boxed{P(g) = \sum_x \overbrace{\delta(g, g(x))}^{P(g|x)} P(x)} \quad (37.87)$$

Next, note that

$$P(y|d, g) = \sum_x P(y|d, x)P(x|g) \quad (37.88)$$

so we need to find  $P(x|g)$ . Since

$$P(x|g) = \frac{P(g|x)P(x)}{P(g)} \quad (37.89)$$

$$= \frac{\delta(g, g(x))P(x)}{P(g)} \quad (37.90)$$

we finally get

$$P(y|d, g) = \sum_x P(y|d, x) \frac{\delta(g, g(x))P(x)}{P(g)}. \quad (37.91)$$

# Chapter 38

## Program evaluation and review technique (PERT)

This chapter is based on Refs.[31] and [67].

PERT diagrams are used for scheduling a project consisting of a series of interdependent activities and estimating how long it will take to finish the project. PERT diagrams were invented by the NAVY in 1958 to manage a submarine project. Nowadays they are taught in many business and management courses.

A **PERT diagram** is a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) with the following properties. (See Fig.38.2 for an example of a PERT diagram). The nodes  $\underline{E}_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, ne$  of a PERT diagram are called **events**. The edges  $i \rightarrow j$  of a PERT diagram are called **activities**. An event represents the starting (kickoff) date of one or more activities. A PERT diagram has a single root node ( $i = 1$ , start event) and a single leaf node ( $i = ne$ , end event).

The PERT diagram user must initially provide a **Duration Times (DT) table** which gives  $(DO_{i \rightarrow j}, DP_{i \rightarrow j}, DM_{i \rightarrow j})$  for each activity  $i \rightarrow j$ , where

$DO_{i \rightarrow j}$  = optimistic duration time of activity  $i \rightarrow j$

$DP_{i \rightarrow j}$  = pessimistic duration time of activity  $i \rightarrow j$

$DM_{i \rightarrow j}$  = median duration time of activity  $i \rightarrow j$

From the DT table, one calculates:

Duration time of activity  $i \rightarrow j$

$$D_{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{1}{6}(DO_{i \rightarrow j} + DP_{i \rightarrow j} + 4DM_{i \rightarrow j}) \quad (38.1)$$

Duration Variance of activity  $i \rightarrow j$

$$V_{i \rightarrow j} = \left( \frac{DO_{i \rightarrow j} - DP_{i \rightarrow j}}{DM_{i \rightarrow j}} \right)^2 \quad (38.2)$$

Often, it is convenient to define “dummy” edges with  $D_{i \rightarrow j} = 0$ . That is perfectly fine.

Define:

$TES_i$  = Earliest start time for event  $i$

$TLS_i$  = Latest start time for event  $i$



$slack_i = TLS_i - TES_i = \text{slack for event } i$

$TEF_{i \rightarrow j} = TES_i + D_{i \rightarrow j} = \text{Earliest finish time for activity } i \rightarrow j.$

$TLF_{i \rightarrow j} = TLS_j - D_{i \rightarrow j} = \text{Latest finish time for activity } i \rightarrow j. \text{ See footnote below. }^1$

A **critical path** is a directed path (i.e., a chain of connected arrows, all pointing in the same direction) going from the start to the end node, such that slack equals zero at every node visited. In a DAG, the neighbors of a node is the union of its parent and children nodes. A critical path must also have all other nodes as neighbors; i.e, the union of the neighbors of every node in the path plus the nodes in the path itself, equals all nodes in the graph.

---

**GOAL of PERT analysis:** The main goal of PERT analysis is to find, based on the data of the DT table, the interval  $[TES_i, TLS_i]$  giving a lower and an upper bound to the starting time of each node  $i$ . Another goal is to find a critical path for the PERT diagram (which represents an entire project). By adding the  $D_{i \rightarrow j}$  of each edge of the critical path, one can get the mean value of the total duration of the entire project, and by adding the variances of each edge along the critical path, one can get an estimate of the total variance of the total duration. Knowing the mean and variance of the total duration and assuming a normal distribution, one can predict the probability that the actual duration will deviate by a certain amount from its mean.

---

To calculate the interval  $[TES_i, TLS_i]$ , one follows the following two steps.

1. Assume  $TES_1 = 0$  and solve

$$TES_i = \max_{a \in pa(i)} \underbrace{(TES_a + D_{a \rightarrow i})}_{TEF_{a \rightarrow i}} \quad (38.3)$$

for  $i \in [2, ne]$ . This recursive equation is solved by what is called “forward propagation”, wherein one moves up the list of nodes  $i$  in order of increasing  $i$  starting at  $i = 1$  with  $TES_1 = 0$ .

2. Assume  $TLS_{ne} = TES_{ne}$  and solve

$$TLS_i = \min_{b \in ch(i)} \underbrace{(TLS_b - D_{i \rightarrow b})}_{TLF_{i \rightarrow b}} \quad (38.4)$$

for  $i \in [1, ne - 1]$ . This recursive equation is solved by what is called “backward propagation”, wherein one moves down the list of nodes  $i$  in order of decreasing  $i$  starting at  $i = ne$  with  $TLS_{ne} = TES_{ne}$ .  $TES_{ne}$  is known from step 1.

Eqs.(38.3) and (38.4) are illustrated in Fig.38.1.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the popular educational literature, the edge variables  $TEF_{i \rightarrow j}$  and  $TLF_{i \rightarrow j}$  are sometimes associated with the nodes, but they are clearly edge variables. This makes things confusing. The reason this is done is that some software draws PERT diagrams as trees whereas other software draws them as DAGs. For trees, storing  $TEF_{i \rightarrow j}$  and  $TLF_{i \rightarrow j}$  in a node makes some sense but not for DAGs. You will notice that giving specific names to the variables  $TEF_{i \rightarrow j}$  and  $TLF_{i \rightarrow j}$  is unnecessary. It is possible to delete all mention of their names from this chapter without losing any details. I only declare their names in this chapter so as tell the reader what they are in case he/she hears them mentioned and wonders what they are equal to in our notation.



Figure 38.1:  $TES_i$  defined from info received from parents of  $i$  and  $TLS_i$  defined from info received from children of  $i$ .

### 38.1 Example

To illustrate PERT analysis, we end with an example. We present the example in the form of an exercise question and then provide the answer. This example comes from Ref.[31], except for part (e) about bnets, which is our own.

**Question:** For the PERT diagram of Fig.38.2, calculate the following:

- Interval  $[TES_i, TLS_i]$  for all  $i$ .
- A critical path for this PERT diagram.
- The mean and variance of the total duration of the critical path.
- The probability that the total duration will be 225 days or less.
- A bnet interpretation of this problem.

**Answer to (a)**  $[TES_i, TLS_i]$  are given by Fig.38.3.



Figure 38.2: Example of a PERT diagram. The numbers attached to the arrows are the duration times  $D_{i \rightarrow j}$  in days followed by, enclosed in parentheses, the variance  $V_{i \rightarrow j}$  of that duration. The info given in this PERT diagram was derived from a DT table in Ref.[31]. The info in this PERT diagram is sufficient for calculating  $TES_i$  and  $TLS_i$  for each node  $i$ . The results of that calculation are given in Fig.38.3.

**Answer to (b)** The critical path is given in red in Fig.38.3. Note that this path does indeed have zero slack at each node it visits and the union of its neighborhood and the path itself encompasses all nodes.



Figure 38.3: Results of calculating  $TES_i$  for all  $i$  via a forward pass, followed by calculating  $TLS_i$  for all  $i$  via a backward pass. Critical path indicated in red.

**Answer to (c)** The mean and variance of the total duration are calculated in Table 38.1.

**Answer to (d)**

$$P(\underline{x} < 225) = P\left[\frac{\underline{x} - \mu}{\sigma} \leq \frac{225 - 220}{\sqrt{7.73}}\right] \quad (38.5)$$

$$= P[\underline{z} \leq 1.80] \quad (38.6)$$

$$= 0.9641 \quad (38.7)$$

**Answer to (e)** Define 2 bnets.

1. The first PERT bnet is for calculating  $TES_i$  for all  $i$  and is given by Fig.38.4.

The node TPMs, printed in blue, for the bnet Fig.38.4 are given by (this equation is to be evaluated recursively by a forward pass through the bnet):

$$P(TES_i | (TES_a)_{a \in pa(i)}) = \delta(TES_i, \max_{a \in pa(i)} (TES_a + D_{a \rightarrow i})) \quad (38.8)$$

2. The second PERT bnet is for calculating  $TLS_i$  for all  $i$  and is given by Fig.38.5. Note that the directions of all the arrows in the PERT diagram Fig.38.2 have been reversed so Fig.38.5 is a time reversed graph.

edge $i \rightarrow j$	duration $D_{i \rightarrow j}$	variance $V_{i \rightarrow j}$
A (1 $\rightarrow$ 2)	50	2.56
D (2 $\rightarrow$ 5)	60	0.44
G (5 $\rightarrow$ 7)	30	1.78
J (7 $\rightarrow$ 8)	40	1.31
K (8 $\rightarrow$ 9)	10	0.64
L (9 $\rightarrow$ 10)	30	1.00
Total	220	7.73

Table 38.1: Calculation of mean and variance of total duration along critical path.




Figure 38.4: bnet for  $TES_i$  calculation.



Figure 38.5: bnet for  $TLS_i$  calculation.

The node TPMs, printed in blue, for the bnet Fig.38.5 are given by (this equation is to be evaluate recursively by a backward pass through the bnet):

$$P(TLS_i | (TLS_b)_{b \in pa(i)}) = \delta(TLS_i, \min_{b \in pa(i)} (TLS_b - D_{b \rightarrow i}^T)) , \quad (38.9)$$

where  $D_{i \rightarrow j}^T = D_{j \rightarrow i}$ .

# Chapter 39

## Recurrent Neural Networks

This chapter is mostly based on Ref.[16].

This chapter assumes you are familiar with the material and notation of Chapter 33 on plain Neural Nets.



Figure 39.1: Simple example of RNN with  $T = 3$

Suppose

$T$  is a positive integer.

$t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$ ,

$\underline{x}_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, numx - 1$ ,

$\underline{h}_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, numh - 1$ ,

$\underline{Y}_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, numy - 1$ ,

$W^{h|x} \in \mathbb{R}^{numh \times numx}$ ,

$W^{h|h} \in \mathbb{R}^{numh \times numh}$ ,

$W^{y|h} \in \mathbb{R}^{numy \times numh}$ ,

$b^y \in \mathbb{R}^{numy}$ ,

$b^h \in \mathbb{R}^{numh}$ .

Henceforth,  $x(\cdot)$  will mean the array of  $x(t)$  for all  $t$ .

The simplest kind of recurrent neural network (RNN) has the bnet Fig.39.1 with arbitrary  $T$ . The node TPMs, printed in blue, for this bnet, are as follows.

$$P(x(\cdot)) = \text{given} \quad (39.1)$$

$$P(x(t)) = \delta(x(t), [x(\cdot)]_t) \quad (39.2)$$

$$P(h(t) \mid h(t-1), x(t)) = \delta(h(t), \mathcal{A}(W^{h|x}x(t) + W^{h|h}h(t-1) + b^h)) , \quad (39.3)$$

where  $h(-1) = 0$ .

$$P(Y(t) \mid h(t)) = \delta(Y(t), \mathcal{A}(W^{y|h}h(t) + b^y)) \quad (39.4)$$

Define

$$W^h = [W^{h|x}, W^{h|h}, b^h] , \quad (39.5)$$

and

$$W^y = [W^{y|h}, b^y] . \quad (39.6)$$

The bnet of Fig.39.1 can be used for classification once its parameters  $W^h$  and  $W^y$  have been optimized. To optimize those parameters via gradient descent, one can use the bnet of Fig.39.2.

Let  $\sigma = 0, 1, \dots, nsam(\vec{x}) - 1$  be the labels for a minibatch of samples. The node TPMs, printed in blue, for bnet Fig.39.2, are as follows.

$$P(x(\cdot)[\sigma]) = \text{given} \quad (39.7)$$

$$P(x(t)[\sigma]) = \delta(x(t)[\sigma], [x(\cdot)]_t[\sigma]) \quad (39.8)$$

$$P(h(t)[\sigma] \mid h(t-1)[\sigma], x(t)[\sigma]) = \delta(h(t)[\sigma], \mathcal{A}(W^{h|x}x(t)[\sigma] + W^{h|h}h(t-1)[\sigma] + b^h)) \quad (39.9)$$

$$P(Y(t)[\sigma] \mid h(t-1)[\sigma]) = \delta(Y(t)[\sigma], \mathcal{A}(W^{y|h}h(t-1)[\sigma] + b^y)) \quad (39.10)$$

$$P(y(\cdot)[\sigma] \mid x(\cdot)[\sigma]) = \text{given} \quad (39.11)$$




Figure 39.2: RNN bnet used to optimize parameters  $W^h$  and  $W^y$  of RNN bnet Fig.39.1.

$$P(\mathcal{E}(t) \mid \vec{y}(\cdot), \vec{Y}(t)) = \frac{1}{nsam(\vec{x})} \sum_{\sigma} d(y(t)[\sigma], Y(t)[\sigma]) , \quad (39.12)$$

where

$$d(y, Y) = |y - Y|^2 . \quad (39.13)$$

If  $y, Y \in [0, 1]$ , one can use this instead

$$d(y, Y) = XE(y \rightarrow Y) = -y \ln Y - (1 - y) \ln(1 - Y) . \quad (39.14)$$

$$P(\mathcal{E} \mid [\mathcal{E}(t)]_{\forall t}) = \delta(\mathcal{E}, \sum_t \mathcal{E}(t)) \quad (39.15)$$

For  $a = h, y$ ,

$$P(W^a) = \text{given} . \quad (39.16)$$

The first time it is used,  $W^a$  is fairly arbitrary. Afterwards, it is determined by previous horizontal stage.

$$P((W^a)' \mid \mathcal{E}, W^a) = \delta((W^a)', W^a - \eta^a \partial_{W^a} \mathcal{E}) . \quad (39.17)$$

$\eta^a > 0$  is the learning rate for  $W^a$ .

## 39.1 Language Sequence Modeling

Figs.39.1, and 39.2 with arbitrary  $T$  can be used as follows to do Language Sequence Modeling.

For this usecase, one must train with the following TPM for node  $\vec{y}(\cdot)$ :

$$P(y(\cdot)[\sigma] \mid x(\cdot)[\sigma]) = \prod_t \mathbb{1}( y(t)[\sigma] = P(x(t)[\sigma] \mid [x(t')][\sigma]_{t' < t}) ) \quad (39.18)$$

With such training, one gets

$$P(Y(t) \mid h(t)) = \mathbb{1}( Y(t) = P(x(t) \mid [x(t')][\sigma]_{t' < t}) ) . \quad (39.19)$$

Therefore,

$$Y(0) = P(x(0)) , \quad (39.20)$$

$$Y(1) = P(x(1) \mid x(0)) , \quad (39.21)$$

$$Y(2) = P(x(2) \mid x(0), x(1)) , \quad (39.22)$$

and so on.

We can use this to:

- predict the probability of a sentence,  
example: Get  $P(x(0), x(1), x(2))$ .
- predict the most likely next word in a sentence,  
example: Get  $P(x(2) \mid x(0), x(1))$ .



- generate fake sentences.

example:

Get  $x(0) \sim P(x(0))$ .

Next get  $x(1) \sim P(x(1)|x(0))$ .

Next get  $x(2) \sim P(x(2)|x(0), x(1))$ .

## 39.2 Other types of RNN




Figure 39.3: RNN bnet of the many to many kind. This one can be used for translation.  $x(0)$  and  $x(1)$  might denote two words of an English sentence, and  $Y(2)$  and  $Y(3)$  might be their Italian translation.

Let  $\mathcal{T} = \{0, 1, \dots, T-1\}$ , and  $\mathcal{T}^x, \mathcal{T}^y \subset \mathcal{T}$ . Above, we assumed that  $\underline{x}(t)$  and  $\underline{Y}(t)$  were both defined for all  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ . More generally, they might be defined only for subsets of  $\mathcal{T}$ :  $\underline{x}(t)$  for  $t \in \mathcal{T}^x$  and  $\underline{Y}(t)$  for  $t \in \mathcal{T}^y$ . If  $|\mathcal{T}^x| = 1$  and  $|\mathcal{T}^y| > 1$ , we say the RNN bnet is of the 1 to many kind. In general, can have **1 to 1**, **1 to many**, **many to 1**, **many to many** RNN bnets.

Plain RNNs can suffer from the **vanishing or exploding gradients problem**. There are various ways to mitigate this (good choice of initial  $W^h$  and  $W^y$ , good choice of activation functions, regularization). Or by using GRU or LSTM (discussed below). **GRU and LSTM** were designed to mitigate the vanishing or exploding gradients problem. They are very popular in NLP (Natural Language Processing).

### 39.2.1 Long Short Term Memory (LSTM) unit (1997)

This section is based on Wikipedia article Ref.[57]. In this section,  $\odot$  will denote the Hadamard matrix product (elementwise product).




Figure 39.4: bnet for a Long Short Term Memory (LSTM) unit.

Let

$\underline{x}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{numx}$ : input vector to the LSTM unit

$\underline{f}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{numh}$ : forget gate's activation vector

$\underline{i}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{numh}$ : input/update gate's activation vector

$\underline{o}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{numh}$ : output gate's activation vector

$\underline{h}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{numh}$ : hidden state vector also known as output vector of the LSTM unit

$\underline{\tilde{c}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{numh}$ : cell input activation vector

$\underline{c}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{numh}$ : cell state vector

$\underline{Y}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{numy}$ : classification of  $x(t)$ .

$W \in \mathbb{R}^{numh \times numx}$ ,  $U \in \mathbb{R}^{numh \times numh}$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}^{numh}$ : weight matrices and bias vectors, parameters learned by training.

$\mathcal{W}_{y|h} \in \mathbb{R}^{numy \times numh}$ : weight matrix

Fig.39.4 is a bnet net for a LSTM unit. The node TPMs, printed in blue, for this bnet, are as follows.

$$P(f(t)|x(t), h(t-1)) = \mathbb{1}(f(t) = \text{sig}(W^{f|x}x(t) + U^{f|h}h(t-1) + b^f)) , \quad (39.23)$$

where  $h(-1) = 0$ .

$$P(i(t)|x(t), h(t-1)) = \mathbb{1}(i(t) = \text{sig}(W^{i|x}x(t) + U^{i|h}h(t-1) + b^i)) \quad (39.24)$$

$$P(o(t)|x(t), h(t-1)) = \mathbb{1}(o(t) = \text{sig}(W^{o|x}x(t) + U^{o|h}h(t-1) + b^o)) \quad (39.25)$$

$$P(\tilde{c}(t)|x(t), h(t-1)) = \mathbb{1}(\tilde{c}(t) = \tanh(W^{c|x}x(t) + U^{c|h}h(t-1) + b^c)) \quad (39.26)$$

$$P(c(t)|f(t), c(t-1), i(t), \tilde{c}(t)) = \mathbb{1}(c(t) = f(t) \odot c(t-1) + i(t) \odot \tilde{c}(t)) \quad (39.27)$$

$$P(h(t)|o(t), c(t)) = \mathbb{1}(h(t) = o(t) \odot \tanh(c(t))) \quad (39.28)$$

$$P(Y(t)|h(t)) = \mathbb{1}(Y(t) = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}^{y|h}h(t) + b^y)) \quad (39.29)$$

### 39.2.2 Gated Recurrence Unit (GRU) (2014)

This section is based on Wikipedia article Ref.[46]. In this section,  $\odot$  will denote the Hadamard matrix product (elementwise product).

GRU is a more recent (17 years later) attempt at simplifying LSTM unit.




Figure 39.5: bnet for a Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU).

Let

$\underline{x}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{numx}$ : input vector

$\underline{h}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{numh}$ : output vector

$\hat{\underline{h}}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{numh}$ : candidate activation vector

$\underline{z}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{numh}$ : update gate vector

$\underline{r}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{numh}$ : reset gate vector

$\underline{Y}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{numy}$ : classification of  $x(t)$ .

$W \in \mathbb{R}^{numh \times numx}$ ,  $U \in \mathbb{R}^{numh \times numh}$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}^{numh}$ : weight matrices and bias vectors, parameters learned by training.

$\mathcal{W}^{y|h} \in \mathbb{R}^{numy \times numh}$ : weight matrix

Fig.39.5 is a bnet net for a GRU. The node TPMs, printed in blue, for this bnet, are as follows.

$$P(\underline{z}(t)|\underline{x}(t), \underline{h}(t-1)) = \mathbb{1}(\quad \underline{z}(t) = \text{sig}(W^{z|x}\underline{x}(t) + U^{z|h}\underline{h}(t-1) + b^z) \quad) , \quad (39.30)$$

where  $\underline{h}(-1) = 0$ .

$$P(\underline{r}(t)|\underline{x}(t), \underline{h}(t-1)) = \mathbb{1}(\quad \underline{r}(t) = \text{sig}(W^{r|x}\underline{x}(t) + U^{r|h}\underline{h}(t-1) + b^r) \quad) \quad (39.31)$$

$$P(\hat{\underline{h}}(t)|\underline{x}(t), \underline{r}(t), \underline{h}(t-1)) = \mathbb{1}(\quad \hat{\underline{h}}(t) = \tanh(W^{h|x}\underline{x}(t) + U^{h|h}(\underline{r}(t) \odot \underline{h}(t-1)) + b^h) \quad) \quad (39.32)$$

$$P(h(t)|z(t), h(t-1), \hat{h}(t)) = \mathbb{1}(h(t) = (1 - z(t)) \odot h(t-1) + z(t) \odot \hat{h}(t)) \quad (39.33)$$

$$P(Y(t)|h(t)) = \mathbb{1}(Y(t) = \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{W}^{y|h}h(t) + b^y)) \quad (39.34)$$

# Chapter 40

## Reinforcement Learning (RL)



Figure 40.1: Axes for episode time and episode number.

I based this chapter on the following references. Refs.[5][11]

In RL, we consider an “agent” or robot that is learning.

Let  $T \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  be the duration time of an **episode** of learning. If  $T = \infty$ , we say that the episode has an infinite time horizon. A learning episode will evolve towards the right, for times  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T - 1$ . We will consider multiple learning episodes. The episode number will evolve from top to bottom. This is illustrated in Fig.40.1.

Let  $\underline{s}_t \in S_{\underline{s}}$  for  $t \in [0, T - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$  be random variables that record the **state** of the agent at various times  $t$ .

Let  $\underline{a}_t \in S_{\underline{a}}$  for  $t \in [0, T - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$  be random variables that record the **action** of the agent at various times  $t$ .



Figure 40.2: State-Action-Reward dynamical bnet

Let  $\underline{\theta}_t \in S_{\underline{\theta}}$  for  $t \in [0, T-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$  be random variables that record the **policy parameters** at various times  $t$ .

For  $\underline{X} \in \{\underline{s}, \underline{a}, \underline{\theta}\}$ , define  $\underline{X}$  followed by a dot to be the vector

$$\underline{X}_{\cdot} = [\underline{X}_0, \underline{X}_1, \dots, \underline{X}_{T-1}] . \quad (40.1)$$

Also let

$$\underline{X}_{\geq t} = [\underline{X}_t, \underline{X}_{t+1}, \dots, \underline{X}_{T-1}] . \quad (40.2)$$

Fig.40.2 shows the basic State-Action-Reward bnet for an agent that is learning. The TPMs for the nodes of Fig.40.2 are given in blue below:

$$P(a_t | s_t, \theta_t) = \text{given.} \quad (40.3)$$

$P(a_t | s_t, \theta_t)$  is called a **policy with parameter**  $\theta_t$ .

$$P(s_t | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) = \text{given.} \quad (40.4)$$

$P(s_t | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1})$  is called the **TPM of the model**.  $P(s_t | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1})$  reduces to  $P(s_0)$  when  $t = 0$ .

$$P(r_t | s_t, a_t) = \delta(r_t, r(s_t, a_t)) . \quad (40.5)$$

$r : S_{\underline{s}} \times S_{\underline{a}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a given **one-time reward function**.

Note that

$$P(s_{\cdot}, a_{\cdot} | \theta_{\cdot}) = \prod_{t=0}^{T-1} \{P(s_t | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) P(a_t | s_t, \theta_t)\} . \quad (40.6)$$

Define the **all times reward**  $\Sigma$  by

$$\Sigma(s_{\cdot}, a_{\cdot}) = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \gamma^t r(s_t, a_t) . \quad (40.7)$$

Here  $0 < \gamma < 1$ .  $\gamma$ , called the **discount rate**, is included to assure convergence of  $\Sigma$  when  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . If  $r(s_t, a_t) < K$  for all  $t$ , then  $\Sigma < K \frac{1}{1-\gamma}$ .

Define the **objective (i.e. goal) function**  $E\Sigma(\theta.)$  by

$$E\Sigma(\theta.) = E_{\underline{s}, \underline{a} | \theta.} \Sigma(\underline{s}, \underline{a}) = \sum_{s., a.} P(s., a. | \theta.) \Sigma(s., a.) \quad (40.8)$$

The goal of RL is to maximize the objective function over its parameters  $\theta.$ . The parameters  $\theta^*$  that maximize the objective function are the optimum strategy:

$$\theta.^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta.} E\Sigma(\theta.) \quad (40.9)$$

---

Define a **future reward** for times  $\geq t$  as:

$$\Sigma_{\geq t}((s_{t'}, a_{t'})_{t' \geq t}) = \sum_{t'=t}^{T-1} \gamma^{t'-t} r(s_{t'}, a_{t'}) \quad (40.10)$$

Define the following **expected conditional future rewards** (rewards for times  $\geq t$ , conditioned on certain quantities having given values):

$$v_t = v(s_t, a_t; \theta.) = E_{\underline{s}, \underline{a} | s_t, a_t, \theta.} [\Sigma_{\geq t}] \quad (40.11)$$

$$V_t = V(s_t; \theta.) = E_{\underline{s}, \underline{a} | s_t, \theta.} [\Sigma_{\geq t}] = E_{\underline{a} | s_t, \theta.} [v(s_t, \underline{a}; \theta.)] \quad (40.12)$$

$v$  is usually called  $Q$  in the literature. We will refer to  $Q$  as  $v$  in order to follow a convention wherein an  $\underline{a}_t$ -average changes a lower case letter to an upper case one.

We will sometimes write  $v(s_t, a_t)$  instead of  $v(s_t, a_t; \theta.)$ .

Since  $E\Sigma_{\geq t}$  only depends on  $\theta_{\geq t}$ ,  $v(s_t, a_t; \theta.) = v(s_t, a_t; \theta_{\geq t})$ , and  $V(s_t; \theta.) = V(s_t; \theta_{\geq t})$ .

Note that the objective function  $E\Sigma$  can be expressed in terms of  $v_0$  by averaging over its unaveraged parameters:

$$E\Sigma(\theta.) = E_{\underline{s}_0, \underline{a}_0 | \theta_0} v(\underline{s}_0, \underline{a}_0; \theta.) \quad (40.13)$$

Define a **one-time reward** and an **expected conditional one-time reward** as:

$$r_t = r(s_t, a_t) \quad (40.14)$$

$$R_t = R(s_t; \theta_t) = E_{\underline{a}_t | s_t, \theta_t} [r(s_t, \underline{a}_t)] \quad (40.15)$$

---

Note that

$$\Sigma_{\geq t} = r_t + \gamma r_{t+1} + \gamma^2 r_{t+2} + \dots + \gamma^{T-1-t} r_{t+(T-1-t)} \quad (40.16)$$

$$= r_t + \gamma \Sigma_{\geq t+1}; \quad (40.17)$$

If we take  $E_{\underline{s}, \underline{a} | s_t, a_t, \theta.} [\cdot]$  of both sides of Eq.(40.17), we get

$$v_t = r_t + \gamma E_{\underline{s}_{t+1}, \underline{a}_{t+1} | \theta.} [v_{t+1}] \quad (40.18)$$



If we take  $E_{\underline{s}, \underline{a} | s_t, \theta.}[\cdot]$  of both sides of Eq.(40.17), we get

$$V_t = R_t + \gamma E_{\underline{s}_{t+1} | \theta.}[V_{t+1}] . \quad (40.19)$$

Note that

$$\Delta r_t = r_t - R_t \quad (40.20)$$

$$= r_t - (V_t - \gamma E_{\underline{s}_{t+1} | \theta.}[V_{t+1}]) \quad (40.21)$$

$$= r_t + \gamma E_{\underline{s}_{t+1} | \theta.}[V_{t+1}] - V_t . \quad (40.22)$$

Define

$$\Delta v_t = v_t - V_t . \quad (40.23)$$

Note that

$$\Delta v_t = \Delta r_t . \quad (40.24)$$

Next, we will discuss 3 RL bnets

- exact RL bnet (exact, assumes policy is known)
- Actor-Critic RL bnet (approximate, assumes policy is known)
- Q function learning RL bnet (approximate, assumes policy is NOT known)

## 40.1 Exact RL bnet

An exact RL bnet is given by Fig.40.3.

Fig.40.3 is the same as Fig.40.2 but with more nodes added in order to optimize the policy parameters. Here are the TPMs, printed in blue, for the nodes not already discussed in connection to Fig.40.2.

$$P(\theta_t | \theta.) = \delta(\theta_t, (\theta.)_t) \quad (40.25)$$

$$\forall(s_t, a_t) : P(v_t(s_t, a_t) | r_t, v_{t+1}(\cdot), \theta.) = \delta(v_t(s_t, a_t), r_t + \gamma E_{\underline{s}_{t+1}, \underline{a}_{t+1} | \theta.}[v_{t+1}]) \quad (40.26)$$

$$P(\theta.' | \theta., v_0(\cdot)) = \delta(\theta.', \theta. + \alpha \partial_{\theta.} \underbrace{E_{\underline{s}_0, \underline{a}_0 | \theta_0} v(\underline{s}_0, \underline{a}_0; \theta.)}_{E\Sigma(\theta.)}) \quad (40.27)$$

$\alpha > 0$  is called the **learning rate**. This method of improving  $\theta.$  is called gradient ascent.

Concerning the gradient of the objective function, note that



Figure 40.3: Exact RL bnet.  $v_t(\cdot)$  means the array  $[v_t(s_t, a_t)]_{\forall s_t, a_t}$ . The following arrows are implicit: for all  $t$ , arrow from  $\underline{\theta} \rightarrow \underline{v}_t(\cdot)$ . We did not draw those arrows so as not to clutter the diagram.

$$\partial_{\theta_t} E\Sigma(\theta.) = \sum_{s., a.} \partial_{\theta_t} P(s., a. | \theta.) \Sigma(s., a.) \quad (40.28)$$

$$= \sum_{s., a.} P(s., a. | \theta.) \partial_{\theta_t} \ln P(s., a. | \theta.) \Sigma(s., a.) \quad (40.29)$$

$$= E_{\underline{s}, \underline{a} | \theta.} \{ \partial_{\theta_t} \ln P(a_t | s_t, \theta_t) \Sigma(s., a.) \} . \quad (40.30)$$

If we run the agent  $nsam(\vec{s}_t)$  times and obtain samples  $s_t[i], a_t[i]$  for all  $t$  and for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, nsam(\vec{s}_t) - 1$ , we can express this gradient as follows:

$$\partial_{\theta_t} E\Sigma(\theta.) \approx \frac{1}{nsam(\vec{s}_t)} \sum_i \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \partial_{\theta_t} \ln P(a_t[i] | s_t[i], \theta_t) r(s_t[i], a_t[i]) . \quad (40.31)$$

The exact RL bnet Fig.40.3 is difficult to use to calculate the optimum parameters  $\theta^*$ . The problem is that  $\underline{s}_t$  propagates towards the future and the  $\underline{v}_t(\cdot)$  propagates towards the past, so we don't have a Markov Chain with a chain link for each  $t$  (i.e., a dynamical bnet) in the episode time direction. Hence, people have come up with approximate RL bnets that are doubly dynamical (i.e., dynamical along the episode time and episode number axes.) We discuss some of those approximate RL bnets next.

## 40.2 Actor-Critic RL bnet

For the actor-critic RL bnet, we approximate Eq.(40.31) by

$$\partial_{\theta_t} E\Sigma(\theta.) \approx \frac{1}{nsam(\vec{s})} \sum_i \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \underbrace{\partial_{\theta_t} \ln P(a_t[i] | s_t[i], \theta_t)}_{Actor} \underbrace{\Delta r_t(s_t[i], a_t[i])}_{Critic} \quad (40.32)$$

The actor-critic RL bnet is given by Fig.40.4. This bnet is approximate and assumes that the policy is known. The TPMs for its nodes are given in blue below.

$$P(\theta_t) = \text{given} \quad (40.33)$$

$$P(s_t[i] | s_{t-1}[i], a_{t-1}[i]) = \text{given} \quad (40.34)$$

$$P(a_t[i] | s_t[i], \theta_t) = \text{given} \quad (40.35)$$

$$P(r_t[i] | s_t[i], a_t[i]) = \delta(r_t[i], r(s_t[i], a_t[i])) \quad (40.36)$$



Figure 40.4: Actor-Critic RL bnet.

$r : S_{\underline{s}} \times S_{\underline{a}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is given.

$$P(\Delta v_t[i] \mid s_t[i], a_t[i], s_{t+1}[i]) = \delta(\Delta v_t[i], r(s_t[i], a_t[i]) + \gamma \hat{V}(s_{t+1}[i]; \phi') - \hat{V}(s_t[i]; \phi)) . \quad (40.37)$$

$$P(\theta'.) = \delta(\theta'., \theta_t + \alpha \partial_{\theta_t} \sum_i \ln P(a_t[i] \mid s_t[i], \theta_t) \Delta v_t[i]) \quad (40.38)$$

$\hat{V}(s_t[i]; \phi)$  is obtained by curve fitting (see Chapter 4) using samples  $(s_t[i], a_t[i]) \forall t, i$  with

$$y[i] = \sum_{t'=t}^T r(s_{t'}[i], a_{t'}[i]) \quad (40.39)$$

and

$$\hat{y}[i] = \hat{V}(s_t[i]; \phi) . \quad (40.40)$$

Eq.(40.39) is an approximation because  $(s_{t'}, a_{t'})_{t' > t}$  are averaged over in the exact expression for  $V(s_t)$ .  $\hat{V}(s_{t+1}[i]; \phi')$  is obtained in the same way as  $\hat{V}(s_t[i]; \phi)$  but with  $t$  replaced by  $t + 1$  and  $\phi$  by  $\phi'$ .



Figure 40.5: Q function learning RL bnet.

### 40.3 Q function learning RL bnet

The Q-function learning RL bnet is given by Fig.40.5. This bnet is approximate and assumes that the policy is NOT known. The TPMs for its nodes are given in blue below. (Remember that  $Q = v$ ).

$$P(s_t | s_{t-1}, a_{t-1}) = \text{given} \quad (40.41)$$

$$P(a_t | s_t, v_t(\cdot)) = \delta(a_t, \underset{a}{\operatorname{argmax}} v_t(s_t, a)) \quad (40.42)$$

$$P(r_t | s_t, a_t) = \delta(r_t, r(s_t, a_t)) \quad (40.43)$$

$r : S_{\underline{s}} \times S_{\underline{a}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is given.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(s_t, a_t) : P(v_t(s_t, a_t) | v_{t-1}(\cdot)) &= \\ &= \delta(v_t(s_t, a_t), r(s_t, a_t) + \gamma \max_a E_{\underline{s}_{t+1} | s_t, a_t} v_{t-1}(\underline{s}_{t+1}, a)) \end{aligned} \quad (40.44)$$

This value for  $v_t(s_t, a_t)$  approximates  $v_t = r_t + \gamma E_{\underline{s}_{t+1}, \underline{a}_{t+1}} v_{t+1}$ .

Some people use the bnet of Fig.40.6) instead of Fig.40.5 and replace Eq.(40.44) by

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(s_t, a_t) : P(v_t(s_t, a_t) | s_{t+1}, v_{t-1}(\cdot)) &= \\ &= \delta(v_t(s_t, a_t), r(s_t, a_t) + \gamma \max_a v_{t-1}(s_{t+1}, a)) . \end{aligned} \quad (40.45)$$



Figure 40.6: Q function learning RL bnet. Same as Fig.40.5 but with new arrow passing  $s_t$  to  $Q_{t-1}$ .

# Chapter 41

## Reliability Box Diagrams and Fault Tree Diagrams

This chapter is based on Refs.[26] and [34].

In this chapter, we assume that reader is familiar with Boolean Algebra. See the Notational Conventions Chapter chapter 0.1.2 for a quick review of what we recommend that you know about Boolean Algebra to fully appreciate this chapter.



Figure 41.1: Example of rbox diagram.




Figure 41.2: An ftree diagram equivalent to Fig.41.1. It represents  $e = (\phi_1 \wedge \phi_3) \vee (\phi_2 \wedge \phi_3)$ .

Complicated devices with a large number of components such as airplanes or rockets can fail in many ways. If their performance depends on some components working in series and one of the





rbox diagrams resemble the device they are addressing whereas ftree diagrams don't. Henceforth, we will refer to this desirable property as **physical resemblance**.

As we will show below with an example, it is pretty straightforward to translate an rbox to an ftree diagram. Going the other way, translating an ftree to an rbox diagram is much more difficult.

Next we will define a new kind of bnet that we will call a failure bnet that has physical resemblance. Then we will describe a simple method of translating (i.e., mapping) any rbox diagram to a failure bnet. Then we will show how a failure bnet can be used to do all the calculations that are normally done with an rbox or an ftree diagram. In that sense, failure bnets seem to afford all the benefits of both ftree and rbox diagrams.

A **failure bnet** contains nodes of 5 types, labeled  $\underline{b}$ ,  $\underline{e}$ ,  $\underline{x}_i$ ,  $\underline{\phi}_i$ , and  $\underline{A}_i$ . All nodes have only two possible states  $S = Success = 0$ ,  $F = Failure = 1$ .

1. The bnet has a beginning node labeled  $\underline{b}$  which is always set to success. The  $\underline{b}$  node and the  $\underline{\phi}_i$  nodes are the only root nodes of the bnet.
2. The bnet has a single leaf node, the end node, labeled  $\underline{e}$ .  $\underline{e}$  is fixed. In rbox diagrams,  $\underline{e} = S$  whereas in ftree diagrams,  $\underline{e} = F$ .
3.  $\underline{x}^{nx} = (\underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_{nx-1})$ .  $\underline{x}_i \in \{S, F\}$  for all  $i$ .

Suppose  $\underline{x}_i$  has parents  $\underline{\phi}_i$  and  $\underline{a}^{na} = (\underline{a}_0, \underline{a}_1, \dots, \underline{a}_{na-1})$ . Then the TPM of node  $\underline{x}_i$  is defined to be

$$P(x_i|\phi_i, a^{na}) = \delta(x_i, \phi_i \vee \bigvee_{i=0}^{na-1} a_i) \quad (41.1)$$

4. For each node  $\underline{x}_i$ , the bnet has a "performance" root node  $\underline{\phi}_i \in \{0, 1\}$  with an arrow pointing from it to  $\underline{x}_i$  (i.e.,  $\underline{\phi}_i \rightarrow \underline{x}_i$ ). For all  $i$ ,

$$P(\phi_i) = \epsilon_i \delta(\phi_i, F) + \bar{\epsilon}_i \delta(\phi_i, S) . \quad (41.2)$$

$\epsilon_i$  is the failure probability and  $\bar{\epsilon}_i = 1 - \epsilon_i$  is the success probability. We name the failure probability  $\epsilon_i$  because it is normally very small. It is usually set to  $1 - e^{-\lambda_i t} \approx \lambda_i t$  when  $\lambda_i t \ll 1$ , where  $\lambda_i$  is the failure rate for node  $\underline{x}_i$  and  $t$  stands for time. The rblock literature usually calls  $\bar{\epsilon}_i = R_i$  the **reliability** of node  $\underline{x}_i$ , and  $\epsilon_i = (1 - R_i) = F_i$  its **unreliability**.

5. The nodes  $\underline{A}_i \in \{0, 1\}$  are simply AND gates. If  $\underline{A}_i$  has inputs  $\underline{y}^{ny} = (\underline{y}_0, \underline{y}_1, \dots, \underline{y}_{ny-1})$ , then the TPM of  $\underline{A}_i$  is

$$P(A_i|y^{ny}) = \delta(A_i, \bigwedge_{i=0}^{ny-1} y_i) . \quad (41.3)$$

An instance (instantiation) of a bnet is the bnet with all nodes set to a specific state. A **realizable instance (r-instance)** of a bnet is one which has non-zero probability.

Fig.41.3 shows how to translate any rbox diagram to a failure bnet. To illustrate this procedure, we translated the rbox diagram Fig.41.1 into the failure bnet Fig.41.4.

For the failure bnet Fig.41.4, one has:

$$\begin{aligned}
P(b) &= \mathbb{1}(b = 0) \\
P(x_1|\phi_1, b) &= \mathbb{1}(x_1 = \phi_1 \vee b) \\
P(x_2|\phi_2, x_1) &= \mathbb{1}(x_2 = \phi_2 \vee x_1) \\
P(x_3|\phi_3, b) &= \mathbb{1}(x_3 = \phi_3 \vee b) \\
P(A|x_2, x_3)e &= \mathbb{1}(x_2 \wedge x_3) \\
P(e|A) &= \mathbb{1}(e = A)
\end{aligned} \tag{41.4}$$

Therefore, all r-instances of this bnet must satisfy

$$e = (\phi_1 \vee \phi_2) \wedge \phi_3 \tag{41.5}$$

$$= (\phi_1 \wedge \phi_3) \vee (\phi_2 \wedge \phi_3) . \tag{41.6}$$

Eq.(41.6) proves that Fig.41.2 is indeed a representation of Fig.41.1.

Next, we consider r-instances of this bnet for two cases:  $e = S$  and  $e = F$ .

- **rblock analysis:**  $e = S = 0$ .

Table 41.1 shows the probability of all possible r-instances that end in success for the failure bnet Fig.41.4. (These r-instances are the main focus of rblock analysis). The first 4 of those probabilities (those with  $\phi_3 = 0$ ) sum to  $\bar{\epsilon}_3$  so the sum  $P(e = S)$  of all 5 is

$$P(e = S) = \bar{\epsilon}_3 + \bar{\epsilon}_1 \bar{\epsilon}_2 \epsilon_3 , \tag{41.7}$$

or, expressing it in reliability language in which  $\bar{\epsilon} = R$ ,

$$P(e = S) = R_3 + R_1 R_2 \bar{R}_3 . \tag{41.8}$$

- **ftree analysis:**  $e = F = 1$ .

Table 41.2 shows the probability of all possible r-instances that end in failure for the failure bnet Fig.41.4. (These r-instances are the main focus of ftree analysis). If we set  $\epsilon_i = \epsilon$  and  $\bar{\epsilon}_i \approx 1$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , then the first two of those r-instances have probabilities of *order*( $\epsilon^2$ ) and the third has probability of *order*( $\epsilon^3$ ). The two lowest order (*order*( $\epsilon^2$ )) r-instances are called the “minimal cut sets” of the ftree. We will have more to say about minimal cut sets later on. For now, just note from Eq.(41.6) that the ftree Fig.41.2 is just the result of joining together with ORs two expressions, one for each of the two minimal cut sets.

instance	probability
	$\bar{\epsilon}_1 \epsilon_2 \bar{\epsilon}_3$
	$\epsilon_1 \bar{\epsilon}_2 \bar{\epsilon}_3$
	$\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \bar{\epsilon}_3$
	$\bar{\epsilon}_1 \bar{\epsilon}_2 \bar{\epsilon}_3$
	$\bar{\epsilon}_1 \bar{\epsilon}_2 \epsilon_3$

Table 41.1: Probabilities of all possible r-instances with  $e = S = 0$  for failure bnet Fig.41.4.

instance	probability
	$\bar{\epsilon}_1 \epsilon_2 \epsilon_3$
	$\epsilon_1 \bar{\epsilon}_2 \epsilon_3$
	$\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \epsilon_3$

Table 41.2: Probabilities of all possible r-instances with  $e = F = 1$  for the failure bnet Fig.41.4.

---

**More general  $\underline{x}_i$ .**

Failure bnets can actually accommodate  $\underline{x}_i$  nodes of a more general kind than what we first stipulated. Here are some possibilities:

For any  $a^n \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , let

$$\text{len}(a^n) = \sum_i a_i \quad (41.9)$$

- **OR gate**

$$P(x_i | \phi_i, a^{na}) = \delta(x_i, \phi_i \vee \vee_j a_j) \quad (41.10)$$

$$= \delta(x_i, \phi_i \vee \mathbb{1}(\text{len}(a^{na}) > 0)) \quad (41.11)$$

- **AND gate**

$$P(x_i | \phi_i, a^{na}) = \delta(x_i, \phi_i \vee \wedge_j a_j) \quad (41.12)$$

$$= \delta(x_i, \phi_i \vee \mathbb{1}(\text{len}(a^{na}) = na)) \quad (41.13)$$

- **Fail if least  $K$  failures (less than  $K$  successes)**

$$P(x_i | \phi_i, a^{na}) = \delta(x_i, \phi_i \vee \mathbb{1}(\text{len}(a^{na}) \geq K)) \quad (41.14)$$

- **Fail if less than  $K$  failures (at least  $K$  successes)**

$$P(x_i | \phi_i, a^{na}) = \delta(x_i, \phi_i \vee \mathbb{1}(\text{len}(a^{na}) < K)) \quad (41.15)$$

- **Fail if exactly one failure**

$$P(x_i | \phi_i, a^{na}) = \delta(x_i, \phi_i \vee \mathbb{1}(\text{len}(a^{na}) = 1)) \quad (41.16)$$

This equals an XOR (exclusive OR) gate when  $na = 2$ .

- **General gate**

$$f : \{0, 1\}^{na} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$$

$$P(x_i | \phi_i, a^{na}) = \delta(x_i, \phi_i \vee f(a^{na})) \quad (41.17)$$

## 41.1 Minimal Cut Sets

Suppose  $x \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $f : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ . Then by direct evaluation, we see that

$$f(x) = [\bar{x}f(0)] \vee [xf(1)] . \quad (41.18)$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} !x &= 1 - x, \\ !^0x &= x, \\ !^1x &= !x \end{aligned} \quad (41.19)$$

Then Eq.41.18 can be rewritten as

$$f(x) = \vee_{a \in \{0,1\}} [(!^{\bar{a}}x)f(a)] . \quad (41.20)$$

Now suppose  $x^n \in \{0, 1\}^n$  and  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ . Eq.(41.20) generalizes to

$$f(x^n) = \vee_{a^n \in \{0,1\}^n} [\prod_i (!^{\bar{a}_i}x_i)f(a^n)] . \quad (41.21)$$

Eq.(41.21) is called an **ors-of-ands** normal form expansion. There is also an **ands-of-ors** normal form expansion obtained by swapping multiplication and  $\vee$  in Eq.(41.21), but we won't need it here.

A **cut set** is a set of  $\phi_i$ 's such that if they are all equal to  $F$ , then  $e = F$  for all the r-instances. A **minimal cut set** is a cut set such that there are no larger cut sets that contain it. From the failure bnet, we can always find a function  $f : \{0, 1\}^{n_x} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  such that  $e = f(\phi^{n_x})$  for all the r-instances. We did that for our example failure bnet and obtained Eq.(41.6). We can then express  $f(\phi^{n_x})$  as an ors-of-ands expansion to find all the minimal cut sets. The ands terms in that ors-of-ands expansion each gives a different minimal cut set, after some simplification. The ors-of-ands expression is not unique and it may be necessary to simplify (using the Boolean Algebra identities given in Chapter chapter 0.1.2) to remove those redundancies.

# Chapter 42

## Restricted Boltzmann Machines

In what follows, we will abbreviate "restricted Boltzmann machine" by rebo.

Let

$$v \in \{0, 1\}^{numv}$$

$$h \in \{0, 1\}^{numh}$$

$$b \in \mathbb{R}^{numv} \text{ (mnemonic, } v \text{ and } b \text{ sound the same)}$$

$$a \in \mathbb{R}^{numh}$$

$$W^{v|h} \in \mathbb{R}^{numv \times numh}$$

Energy:

$$E(v, h) = -(b^T v + a^T h + v^T W^{v|h} h) \quad (42.1)$$

Boltzmann distribution:

$$P(v, h) = \frac{e^{-E(v, h)}}{Z} \quad (42.2)$$

Partition function:

$$Z = \sum_{v, h} e^{-E(v, h)} = Z(a, b, W^{v|h}) \quad (42.3)$$

$$P(v|h) = \frac{e^{b^T v + a^T h + v^T W^{v|h} h}}{\sum_v e^{b^T v + a^T h + v^T W^{v|h} h}} \quad (42.4)$$

$$= \frac{e^{b^T v + v^T W^{v|h} h}}{\sum_v e^{b^T v + v^T W^{v|h} h}} \quad (42.5)$$

$$= \prod_i \frac{e^{v_i(b_i + \sum_j W_{i,j}^{v|h} h_j)}}{\sum_{v_i=0,1} e^{v_i(b_i + \sum_j W_{i,j}^{v|h} h_j)}} \quad (42.6)$$

$$= \prod_i P(v_i|h) \quad (42.7)$$

$$P(v_i|h) = \frac{e^{v_i(b_i + \sum_j W_{i,j}^{v|h} h_j)}}{Z_i(h)} \quad (42.8)$$



Figure 42.1: bnet for a Restricted Boltzmann Machine (rebo) with  $numv = 3$

Eq.42.8 implies that a rebo can be represented by the bnet Fig.42.1.

Let

$$x_i = b_i + \sum_j W_{ij}^{v|h} h_j . \quad (42.9)$$

Then

$$P(v_i = 1|h) = \frac{e^{x_i}}{1 + e^{x_i}} \quad (42.10)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x_i}} \quad (42.11)$$

$$= \text{sig}(x_i) . \quad (42.12)$$

One could also expand the node  $\underline{h}$  in Fig.42.1 into  $numh$  nodes. But note that  $P(h) \neq \prod_j P(h_j)$  so there would be arrows among the  $h_j$  nodes.

Note that the rebo bnet is a special case of Naive Bayes (See Chapter 32) with  $v_i, h_i \in \{0, 1\}$  and specific  $P(h)$  and  $P(v_i|h)$  node matrices.



# Chapter 43

## Scoring the Nodes of a Learned Bnet

Chapter 45 discusses how to learn a bnet from data. Many algorithms for doing this require scoring how well a particular bnet fits the data. This chapter is an introduction to such scoring.

Normally, each node of a bnet is scored separately, and then those node scores are summed to get the bnet score.

In this chapter, scores are defined so that a higher score means a better fit. By taking the negative of such a score, one can always get a score such that a lower score means a better fit.

There are 2 main types of bnet scores: Maximum Likelihood (ML) scores, and Shannon Information Theory (SIT) scores. ML scores consist of the log of a maximum likelihood function  $P(\vec{x}|\theta)$  for i.i.d. samples  $\vec{x} = (x[\sigma])_{\sigma=0,1,\dots,nsam-1}$ , where  $x[\sigma] \sim P_{\underline{x}|\theta}(x|\theta)$ :

$$\text{ML-score} = \ln(P(\vec{x}|\theta)) \quad (43.1)$$

$$= \ln \prod_{\sigma} P(x[\sigma] | \theta) \quad (43.2)$$

$$= \sum_{\sigma} \ln P(x[\sigma] | \theta) \quad (43.3)$$

$$\approx nsam \sum_x P(x|\theta) \ln P(x|\theta) \quad (43.4)$$

$$= -nsam H(P_{\underline{x}|\theta}) , \quad (43.5)$$

and SIT scores consist of a negative entropy:

$$\text{Info-score} = -H(P_{\underline{x}|\theta}) . \quad (43.6)$$

Thus, up to a factor of  $nsam$ , they are the same thing. Maximizing a log likelihood function for i.i.d. samples or minimizing the corresponding entropy, are the same thing, and they both yield a good estimate of the hidden parameters  $\theta$ .

## 43.1 Probability Distributions and Special Functions

While writing this chapter, I briefly consulted the following Wikipedia articles about the definitions and properties of certain probability distributions and special functions.

- Categorical Distribution, Ref.[39]
- Multinomial Distribution, Ref.[62]
- Dirichlet Distribution, Ref.[42]
- Multivariate Normal Distribution, Ref.[64]
- Beta function, Ref.[36]
- Multinomial Coefficients, Ref.[63]
- Gamma Function Ref.[45]

Here are a few results from those Wikipedia articles that we will use later on in this chapter. Below, we will abbreviate  $q_+ = \sum_i q_i$ , and  $q. = (q_0, q_1, \dots, q_{nq-1})$  for various quantities  $q$   
**Gamma function.** If  $n > 0$  is an integer,

$$\Gamma(n+1) = n! \quad (43.7)$$

The **multivariate Beta function** is defined by

$$B(\alpha.) = \frac{\prod_k \Gamma(\alpha_k)}{\Gamma(\alpha_+)} \quad (43.8)$$

where  $\alpha_k > 0$  for all  $k$ .

The **multinomial coefficient** is defined by

$$C(N.) = \frac{N_+!}{\prod_k N_k!} \quad (43.9)$$

where  $N_k$  are non-negative integers.

The **inverse of the multinomial coefficient** will be denoted by

$$CI(N.) = \frac{1}{C(N.)} = \frac{\prod_k N_k!}{N_+!} \quad (43.10)$$

The **Categorical Distribution** is defined by

$$Cat(x; \pi.) = \pi_x = \prod_k \pi_k^{\mathbb{1}(k=x)} \quad (43.11)$$

for  $k, x \in S_{\underline{x}}$ , where  $\pi.$  is a probability dist.(i.e.,  $\pi_k \geq 0$  for all  $k$ , and  $\pi_+ = 1$ ).

The **Multinomial Distribution** is defined by

$$Mul(N.; \pi., N) = C(N.) , \quad (43.12)$$

where  $N_k$  is a non-negative integer for all  $k$ ,  $N_+ = N$ , and  $\pi.$  is a probability dist.  $Mul()$  satisfies:

$$E[N_k] = N\pi_k . \quad (43.13)$$

The **Dirichlet Distribution** is defined by

$$Dir(\pi.; \alpha.) = \frac{1}{B(\alpha.)} \prod_k \pi_k^{\alpha_k - 1} \quad (43.14)$$

where  $\alpha_k > 0$  for all  $k$ , and  $\pi.$  is a probability dist. The  $\alpha.$  are called **concentration parameters** or **hyperparameters**.  $Dir()$  satisfies:

$$E[\pi_k] = \frac{N_k}{N_+} . \quad (43.15)$$

---

$Dir()$  is **conjugate prior** of  $Mul()$

Note that

$$Mul(N.; \pi., N) Dir(\pi.; \alpha.) = \mathcal{K}(N., \alpha.) Dir(\pi.; N. + \alpha.) , \quad (43.16)$$

where

$$\mathcal{K}(N., \alpha.) = \frac{B(N. + \alpha.)}{CI(N.)B(\alpha.)} . \quad (43.17)$$

---

$Dir()$  is replaceable by a  $Mul()$  for large concentration parameters

Note that if  $N_k$  is a positive integer and  $\alpha_k = N_k + 1$  for all  $k$ , then

$$Dir(\pi.; \alpha_k = N_k + 1) = C(N.) \prod_k \pi_k^{N_k} \quad (43.18)$$

$$= Mul(N.; \pi., N_+) . \quad (43.19)$$

## 43.2 Single node with no parents

In this section, we consider a learned bnet consisting of a single node with no parents. We will consider arbitrary learned bnets in the next section. But we start with this simplified case so as to reduce the number of indices in most quantities from 3 to 1. All the results that we derive in this section will be used in the next section after adding the extra indices. This way, we will avoid carrying the extra indices throughout the intermediate steps of many derivations.

For state  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, nk - 1\}$  of a single node  $\underline{x}$ , let

$\underline{N}_k$  = current count number (an integer, data)

$$\underline{N}. \longleftarrow \underline{\pi}. \longleftarrow \underline{\alpha}.$$

Figure 43.1: For a bnet consisting of a single node with no parents, this is a Markov chain of current counts ( $\underline{N}.$ ), TPM ( $\underline{\pi}.$ ), and prior counts ( $\underline{\alpha}.$ ) .

$\underline{\pi}.$  = a probability dist, the TPM for the node

$\underline{\alpha}_k$  = prior count number

Consider the Markov chain bnet of Fig.43.1, with the following TPMs, given in blue.

$$P(N.|\pi.) = \text{Mul}(N.; \pi., N_+) \quad (43.20)$$

$$P(\pi.|\alpha.) = \text{Dir}(\pi.; \alpha.) \quad (43.21)$$

It follows that

$$P(N., \pi.|\alpha.) = P(N.|\pi.)P(\pi.|\alpha.) \quad (43.22)$$

$$= \text{Mul}(N.; \pi., N_+) \text{Dir}(\pi.; \alpha.) \quad (43.23)$$

$$= \mathcal{K}(N., \alpha.) \text{Dir}(\pi.; N. + \alpha.) . \quad (43.24)$$

From Eq.(43.15) for the expected value of Dir(), we get

$$\hat{\pi}. = E[\underline{\pi}.] = \frac{N. + \alpha.}{N_+ + \alpha_+} . \quad (43.25)$$

Integrating both sides of Eq.(43.24) over  $\pi.$ , we find that

$$P(N.|\alpha.) = \mathcal{K}(N., \alpha.) . \quad (43.26)$$

If  $N_k \gg 1$  for all  $k$ , then the Dir() in Eq.(43.24) can be replaced by a Mul()

$$P(N., \pi.|\alpha.) \approx \mathcal{K}(N., \alpha.) \text{Mul}(N. + \alpha.; \pi., N_+ + \alpha_+) . \quad (43.27)$$

Therefore,

$$P(N.|\pi., \alpha.) = \frac{P(N., \pi.|\alpha.)}{P(N.|\alpha.)} \quad (43.28)$$

$$= \text{Mul}(N. + \alpha.; \pi., N_+ + \alpha_+) . \quad (43.29)$$

### Claim 25

$$\ln P(N.|\hat{\pi}., \alpha.) = -(N_+ + \alpha_+)H\left(\frac{N. + \alpha.}{N_+ + \alpha_+}\right) + \ln C(N. + \alpha.) \quad (43.30)$$

$$> -(N_+ + \alpha_+)H\left(\frac{N. + \alpha.}{N_+ + \alpha_+}\right) - \frac{1}{2}(nk - 1) \ln N_+ \quad (43.31)$$

**proof:**

$$\ln P(N.|\hat{\pi}., \alpha.) = \sum_k (N_k + \alpha_k) \ln \hat{\pi}_k + \ln C(N. + \alpha.) \quad (43.32)$$

$$= \sum_k (N_k + \alpha_k) \ln \frac{N_k + \alpha_k}{N_+ + \alpha_+} + \ln C(N. + \alpha.) \quad (43.33)$$

$$= -(N_+ + \alpha_+) H \left( \frac{N. + \alpha.}{N_+ + \alpha_+} \right) + \ln C(N. + \alpha.) \quad (43.34)$$

Recall Stirling's approximation of a factorial, valid for large integers  $n$ :

$$\ln n! \approx \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right) \ln n - n. \quad (43.35)$$

Assume  $N_k \gg 1$  for all  $k$ . Applying Stirling's approximation to all factorials in  $C(N)$ , we get

$$\ln C(N.) \approx (N_+ + \frac{1}{2}) \ln N_+ - N_+ - \sum_k \left[ (N_k + \frac{1}{2}) \ln N_k - N_k \right] \quad (43.36)$$

$$= (N_+ + \frac{1}{2}) \ln N_+ - \sum_k (N_k + \frac{1}{2}) \ln N_k. \quad (43.37)$$

Next assume that

$$N_k \approx \frac{N_+}{nk}. \quad (43.38)$$

Then

$$\ln C(N.) = (N_+ + \frac{1}{2}) \ln N_+ - nk \left( \frac{N_+}{nk} + \frac{1}{2} \right) [\ln N_+ - \ln nk] \quad (43.39)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2}(nk - 1) \ln N_+ + (N_+ + \frac{nk}{2}) \ln nk \quad (43.40)$$

$$> -\frac{1}{2}(nk - 1) \ln N_+. \quad (43.41)$$

**QED**

### 43.3 Multiple nodes with any number of parents

In the previous section, we considered a bnet consisting of a single node with no parents, so we only needed a single index  $k$  for the states of the single node. In this section, we consider an arbitrary

$$\underline{N}_{\cdot,\mu}^i \longleftarrow \underline{\pi}_{\cdot|\mu}^i \longleftarrow \underline{\alpha}_{\cdot,\mu}^i$$

Figure 43.2: Generalization of Fig.43.1. For a bnet with multiple nodes each of which may have multiple parents, this is a Markov chain of current counts ( $\underline{N}_{\cdot,\mu}^i$ ), TPM ( $\underline{\pi}_{\cdot|\mu}^i$ ), and prior counts ( $\underline{\alpha}_{\cdot,\mu}^i$ ) .

bnet with multiple nodes each of which may have multiple parents. Most of the results in the previous section are valid for the general case if we make the following replacements:  $\pi_{\cdot} \rightarrow \pi_{\cdot|\mu}^i$ ,  $N_{\cdot} \rightarrow N_{\cdot,\mu}^i$ ,  $\alpha_{\cdot} \rightarrow \alpha_{\cdot,\mu}^i$ . Upon this replacement, Fig.43.1 becomes Fig.43.2. The TPMs, printed in blue, of the new Markov chain, are as follows:

$$P(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i | \pi_{\cdot|\mu}^i) = \text{Mul}(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i; \pi_{\cdot|\mu}^i, N_{+, \mu}^i) \quad (43.42)$$

$$P(\pi_{\cdot|\mu}^i | \alpha_{\cdot,\mu}^i) = \text{Dir}(\pi_{\cdot|\mu}^i; \alpha_{\cdot,\mu}^i) \quad (43.43)$$

In these TPMs,

$i \in S_i = \{0, 1, \dots, ni - 1\}$  = node index

$\underline{x}_{\cdot} = (\underline{x}_i)_{i \in S_i}$  = the nodes of the learned bnet.

$k \in S_{k^i} = \{0, 1, \dots, nk^i - 1\}$  = states of node  $\underline{x}_i$

$\mu \in S_{\mu^i} = \{0, 1, \dots, n\mu^i - 1\}$  = states of parents of node  $\underline{x}_i$ .

In the previous section, we assumed a single node ( $ni = 1$ ) with no parents ( $n\mu^0 = 1$ ) so that we could drop the  $i, \mu$  indices. In this section, we eliminate that restriction.

It is convenient to define the magnitude of a bnet  $B$  to equal the sum over nodes of the number of free parameters in each TPM:

$$|B| = \sum_i (nk^i - 1)n\mu^i . \quad (43.44)$$

Suppose that we are given  $nsam$  samples  $\vec{x}_i = (\underline{x}_i[\sigma])_{\sigma=0,1,\dots,nsam-1}$  of our learned bnet. The count numbers  $N_{k,\mu}^i$  are defined in terms of those samples as follows:

$$N_{k,\mu}^i = \sum_{\sigma} \mathbb{1}(\underline{x}_i[\sigma] = k, pa(\underline{x}_i[\sigma]) = \mu) . \quad (43.45)$$

It is also convenient to defined count number ratios

$$N_{k|\mu}^i = \frac{N_{k,\mu}^i}{N_{+,\mu}^i} . \quad (43.46)$$

Note that  $N_{k,\mu}^i$  is a positive integer whereas  $N_{k|\mu}^i \in [0, 1]$ .

Let's denote the components of the TPMs by  $\pi_{k|\mu}^i$ :

$$\pi_{k|\mu}^i = P(\underline{x}_i = k \mid pa(\underline{x}_i) = \mu) \approx N_{k|\mu}^i . \quad (43.47)$$

The rest of this section lists equations that we obtained from the previous section, by adding the new indices  $i, \mu$ :

$$\mathcal{K}(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i, \alpha_{\cdot,\mu}^i) = \frac{B(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i + \alpha_{\cdot,\mu}^i)}{CI(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i)B(\alpha_{\cdot,\mu}^i)} \quad (43.48)$$

$$\hat{\pi}_{k|\mu}^i = \frac{N_{k,\mu}^i + \alpha_{k,\mu}^i}{N_{+,\mu}^i + \alpha_{+,\mu}^i} \quad (43.49)$$

$$P(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i | \alpha_{\cdot,\mu}^i) = \mathcal{K}(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i, \alpha_{\cdot,\mu}^i) \quad (43.50)$$

$$P(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i | \pi_{\cdot|\mu}^i, \alpha_{\cdot,\mu}^i) \approx \text{Mul}(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i + \alpha_{\cdot,\mu}^i; \pi_{\cdot|\mu}^i, N_{+,\mu}^i + \alpha_{+,\mu}^i) \quad (43.51)$$

**Claim 26**

$$\ln P(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i | \hat{\pi}_{\cdot|\mu}^i, \alpha_{\cdot,\mu}^i) = \sum_k (N_{k,\mu}^i + \alpha_{k,\mu}^i) \ln \left( \frac{N_{k,\mu}^i + \alpha_{k,\mu}^i}{N_{+,\mu}^i + \alpha_{+,\mu}^i} \right) + \ln C(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i + \alpha_{\cdot,\mu}^i) \quad (43.52)$$

$$> \sum_k (N_{k,\mu}^i + \alpha_{k,\mu}^i) \ln \left( \frac{N_{k,\mu}^i + \alpha_{k,\mu}^i}{N_{+,\mu}^i + \alpha_{+,\mu}^i} \right) - \frac{1}{2}(nk^i - 1) \ln N_{+,\mu}^i \quad (43.53)$$

## 43.4 Bayesian Scores

- Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)

$$\text{BIC-score} = - \sum_i \sum_{k,\mu} N_{k,\mu}^i \ln \left( \frac{N_{k,\mu}^i}{N_{+,\mu}^i} \right) + \underbrace{\left[ -\frac{|B|}{2} \ln N_{+,+}^+ \right]}_{\sum_i \sum_{\mu} \ln C(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i) \text{ would be more accurate}} \quad (43.54)$$

$$\approx \sum_i \sum_{\mu} \ln P(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i | \hat{\pi}_{\cdot|\mu}^i, \alpha_{\cdot,\mu}^i = 0) \quad (43.55)$$

- Bayesian Dirichlet (BD)

$$\text{BD-score} = \sum_i \sum_{\mu} \ln \frac{B(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i + \alpha_{\cdot,\mu}^i)}{B(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i)} \quad (43.56)$$

$$= \sum_i \sum_{\mu} \ln [CI(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i)P(N_{\cdot,\mu}^i | \alpha_{\cdot,\mu}^i)] \quad (43.57)$$

- BD equivalent (BDe)

$$\text{BDe-score} = \text{BD-score} \left( \alpha_{k,\mu}^i = \alpha' N_{k,\mu}^i \right), \quad (43.58)$$

where  $\alpha'$  is a free parameter.

- BD equivalent unified (BDeu)

$$\text{BDeu-score} = \text{BD-score} \left( \alpha_{k,\mu}^i = \frac{\alpha'}{n k^i n \mu^i} \right), \quad (43.59)$$

where  $\alpha'$  is a free parameter. The BDeu score satisfies **score equivalence**; i.e., it is the same for all DAGs in an equivalence class of observational equivalent DAGs. See Chapter 36 for more information about observational equivalence.

## 43.5 Information Theoretic scores

- Maximum likelihood

$$\text{ML-score} = \sum_i \sum_{k,\mu} N_{k,\mu}^i \ln N_{k|\mu}^i \quad (43.60)$$

$$= - \sum_i H(\underline{k}^i | \underline{\mu}^i), \quad (43.61)$$

where  $P_{\underline{k}^i | \underline{\mu}^i}(k | \mu) = N_{k|\mu}^i$  and  $P_{\underline{k}^i, \underline{\mu}^i}(k, \mu) = N_{k,\mu}^i$ .

- Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), aka Minimum Description Length (MDL)

$$\text{BIC-score} = \text{ML-score} - \frac{|B|}{2} \ln N_{+,+}^+ \quad (43.62)$$

$$\approx \sum_i \sum_{k,\mu} N_{k,\mu}^i \ln \frac{N_{k|\mu}^i}{\sqrt{N_{+,+}^+}} \quad (43.63)$$

- Akaike Information Criterion (AIC)

$$\text{AIC-score} = \text{ML-score} - |B| \quad (43.64)$$

$$\approx \sum_i \sum_{k,\mu} N_{k,\mu}^i [\ln N_{k|\mu}^i - 1] \quad (43.65)$$



# Chapter 44

## Simpson's Paradox

This chapter is based on Chapter 6 of “The Book of Why”, Ref.[25]. See also Ref.[70] and references therein.

Simpson's paradox is a recurring nightmare for all statisticians overseeing a clinical trial for a medicine. It is possible that if they leave out a certain "confounding" variable from a study, the study's conclusion on whether a medicine is effective or not, might be, without measuring that confounding variable, the opposite of what it would have been had that variable been measured.

Simpson's Paradox is greatly clarified by Judea Pearl's theory of causality. At the end of this chapter, we explain how.

Here is a simple example of Simpson's Paradox.

An equal number of patients of male and female genders are given a heart medicine or a placebo in a double blind study. Some subsequently have a heart attack. Let

$\underline{a}$  = heart attack? No=0, Yes=1

$\underline{t}$  = took medicine? No=0, Yes=1

$\underline{g}$  = gender? Female=0, Male=1



Figure 44.1: bnet for a simple example of Simpson's paradox. Here node  $\underline{g}$  is a chain junction and a mediator.

This situation can be modeled by either bnet Fig.44.1. or bnet Fig.44.2. The two bnets are probabilistically equivalent (i.e., they both represent the same probability distribution  $P(a, t, g)$ ) because

$$P(g|t)P(t) = P(g, t) = P(t|g)P(g) . \quad (44.1)$$



Figure 44.2: bnet that is probabilistically but not physically equivalent to bnet Fig.44.1. Here node  $\underline{g}$  is a fork junction and a confounder.

For the bnet Fig.44.1, one has

$$P(a, g, t) = P(a|g, t)P(g|t)P(t) . \quad (44.2)$$

Therefore,

$$P(a = 1|t) = \sum_g P(a = 1|t, g)P(g|t) = E_{\underline{g}|t}P(a = 1|t, \underline{g}) , \quad (44.3)$$

where  $E_{\underline{g}|t}$  is a conditional expected value (a kind of weighted average).

Suppose  $q_0, q_1$  are non-negative real numbers. For the vector  $\vec{q} = (q_0, q_1)$ :

Define a negative outcome (or failure or  $q_t$  increasing with  $t$ ) if  $q_0 \leq q_1$ .

Define a positive outcome (or success or  $q_t$  decreasing with  $t$ ) if  $q_0 \geq q_1$ .

Let

$$\vec{q}^g = [P(\underline{a} = 1|t, g)]_{t=0,1} \quad (44.4)$$

for  $g = 0, 1$ , and

$$\vec{q}^* = [P(\underline{a} = 1|t)]_{t=0,1} . \quad (44.5)$$




Figure 44.3:  $\vec{q}^0, \vec{q}^1$  vectors and bounding box for vector  $\vec{q}^*$ .

It is possible (see Fig.44.3 for a graphical explanation of how) to find perverse cases in which  $P(a = 1|t, g = 0)$  and  $P(a = 1|t, g = 1)$  increase with  $t$  but  $P(a = 1|t)$  decreases with  $t$ . So it is possible to conclude that the medicine is a failure for each of the two  $g$  populations considered separately, yet the medicine is a success when both populations are “amalgamated”. The lesson is that a “trend reversal” is possible upon amalgamation. Trends are not necessarily preserved when we do a weighted average of type  $E_{g|t}$ .  $E_{g|t}$  is an expected value on the random variable  $\underline{g}$  conditioned on the root random variable  $\underline{t}$ .

So far, we have proven that probabilistically, the drug can be a failure for the populations of both sexes considered separately, but a success for the aggregate population.

## 44.1 Pearl Causality

Pearl Causality would add the following two important insights to this problem:

1. bnets Fig.44.1 and Fig.44.2, although they are probabilistically equivalent, do not represent the same physical situation. In fact, only Fig.44.2 occurs in this case.
2. To decide whether the medicine is effective, we must apply a  $do()$  operator to the  $\underline{t}$  variable in Fig.44.2. The effect of that  $do()$  operator is to erase the arrow going from  $\underline{g}$  to  $\underline{t}$ . This in turn means that the average  $E_{g|t}$  in our equation for  $P(a = 1|t)$  becomes a simpler average  $E_{\underline{g}}$  which is independent of  $\underline{t}$ . But for such an average, the bounding box in Fig.44.3 degenerates to its diagonal line that connects the tips of the two vectors  $\vec{q}^0$  and  $\vec{q}^1$ . The vector  $\vec{q}^*$  must now fall on that diagonal line and must therefore also fall in the success region.

In conclusion, as Judea Pearl would say, if we ask the right question to Nature, i.e., what is  $P[a = 1|do(\underline{t} = t)]$  for  $t = 0, 1$ , we get as an answer that the aggregate population preserves rather than reverses the unanimous trend of the two gendered populations.

## 44.2 Numerical Example

$(a, t, g)$	number of patients segregated by gender	number of patients of either gender
0,0,0	19	47
0,0,1	28	
0,1,0	37	49
0,1,1	12	
1,0,0	1	13
1,0,1	12	
1,1,0	3	11
1,1,1	8	

Table 44.1: Data for numerical example of Simpson's Paradox. This fictitious data was taken directly from Table 6.4, page 210 of "The Book of Why", Ref.[25].

$$P(a|t, g) = \begin{array}{c|cccc} & 0,0 & 0,1 & 1,0 & 1,1 \\ \hline 0 & 19/20 & 28/40 & 37/40 & 12/20 \\ 1 & 1/20 & 12/40 & 3/40 & 8/20 \end{array} \quad (44.6)$$

$$P(a|t) = \begin{array}{c|cc} & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 47/60 & 49/60 \\ 1 & 13/60 & 11/60 \end{array} \quad (44.7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{P(a=1, t=1, g=0)}{\sum_a P(a, t=1, g=0)} &= P(a = 1 | t = 1, g = 0) = \frac{3}{40} \\ \frac{P(a=1, t=0, g=0)}{\sum_a P(a, t=0, g=0)} &= P(a = 1 | t = 0, g = 0) = \frac{1}{20} = \frac{2}{40} \end{aligned} \quad (44.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{P(a=1, t=1, g=1)}{\sum_a P(a, t=1, g=1)} &= P(a = 1 | t = 1, g = 1) = \frac{8}{20} = \frac{16}{40} \\ \frac{P(a=1, t=0, g=1)}{\sum_a P(a, t=0, g=1)} &= P(a = 1 | t = 0, g = 1) = \frac{12}{40} \end{aligned} \quad (44.9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sum_g P(a=1, t=1, g)}{\sum_g \sum_a P(a, t=1, g)} &= P(a = 1 | t = 1) = \frac{11}{60} \\ \frac{\sum_g P(a=1, t=0, g)}{\sum_g \sum_a P(a, t=0, g)} &= P(a = 1 | t = 0) = \frac{13}{60} \end{aligned} \quad (44.10)$$

Note that the right hand side of Eq.44.8 is higher for  $t = 1$  than for  $t = 0$ . Same trend occurs in Eqs.44.9 but is reversed in Eqs.44.10.

# Chapter 45

## Structure and Parameter Learning for Bnets

Learning a bnet from data is a computationally intensive NP-complete problem. Therefore, the best one can hope for is for heuristic algorithms that solve this problem approximately. A huge number of such algorithms have been tried and continue to be tried. Luckily, there exists a free open source software library called **bnlearn** that covers many of them. The goal of this chapter is to give a brief overview of the subject of bnet learning, after which we recommend to those readers who want to pursue this subject further, to learn **bnlearn**.

This chapter is based on the **bnlearn** website Ref.[27], and on a 2019 survey paper [28] by Scutari et al. I highly recommend looking at both. Refs. [2] and [12] were also helpful to me in understanding this subject.

**bnlearn** (Ref.[27]) (free, open source) is very comprehensive and well maintained. It is written mostly in C with an R frontend. It was developed by Marco Scutari and collaborators over a time period of more than 10 years, and is still under active development. How things stand in the field of bnet learning software reminds me of how things stand in the field of linear algebra (LA) software. Perfecting and optimizing LA software takes many years so I would not advise you to write your own LA software library starting from scratch. There is no need to do so. Instead, you can use LAPACK (free, open source), which has been perfected and expanded for decades by world experts. I view **bnlearn** as the LAPACK of bnet learning.

### 45.1 Overview

To give the reader an overview of the subject and of **bnlearn** itself, here is a highly simplified tree, compiled from the **bnlearn** website and documentation, of some of the subjects covered by **bnlearn**.

```
| Parameter Learning
|   └─ missing data
└─ Structure Learning
    └─ tree-like structures given a priori
        └─ Naive Bayes
```

- └─ Chow-Liu tree
- └─ Tree Augmented Naive Bayes (TAN)
- └─ ARACNE
- └─ score based
  - └─ algorithms
    - └─ hill climbing (HC)
    - └─ HC with random restarts
    - └─ HC with Tabu list (Tabu)
    - └─ simulated annealing
    - └─ genetic algorithms
  - └─ scoring functions
    - └─ Information Theoretic scores
    - └─ Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)
    - └─ Bayesian Dirichlet (BD) family
- └─ constraint based
  - └─ algorithms
    - └─ PC family
    - └─ Grow-Shrink (GS)
    - └─ Incremental Association Markov Blanket (IAMB) family
  - └─ conditional independence tests
    - └─ mutual information (parametric, semiparametric and permutation tests)
    - └─ shrinkage-estimator for the mutual information
- └─ hybrid
  - └─ Max-Min Hill Climbing (MMHC)
  - └─ Hybrid HPC (H2PC)
  - └─ General 2-Phase Restricted Maximization (RSMAX2)
- └─ parallel mode structure learning
- └─ node types
  - └─ all-discrete
  - └─ all-continuous
  - └─ mixed
- └─ utility functions
  - └─ model comparison and manipulation
  - └─ random data generation
  - └─ arc orientation testing
  - └─ simple and advanced plots
  - └─ parameter estimation (maximum likelihood and Bayesian)
  - └─ inference, conditional probability queries
  - └─ cross-validation
  - └─ bootstrap
  - └─ model averaging

---

Let

- PL=parameters learning (i.e, learning the TPMs)
- SL= structure learning (i.e., learning the DAG)

PL is easy, once the structure is known. PL assuming no missing data goes as follows. Using the notation of Chapter 43, define

$$\pi_{k|\mu}^i = P(\underline{x}_i = k \mid pa(\underline{x}_i) = \mu) . \quad (45.1)$$

Then  $\pi_{k|\mu}^i$  can be estimated from the data  $N_{k,\mu}^i$  using:

$$\pi_{k|\mu}^i \approx N_{k|\mu}^i = \frac{N_{k,\mu}^i}{N_{+,\mu}^i} . \quad (45.2)$$

PL described by Eq.(45.2) is only for discrete nodes with no missing data. **bnlearn** can also do PL with missing data and continuous (Gaussian linear only) nodes. See Chapter 30 on missing data and Chapter 17 on Gaussian linear nodes. SL actually does PL and SL at the same time.

There are 3 main types of SL: score based, constraint based, and hybrid. **bnlearn** can perform many algorithms of each of these 3 types of SL. It can perform most of them with either all-discrete, or all-continuous or mixed nodes. It can perform many of them in parallel mode. The 2019 survey paper Ref.[28] by Scutari et al compares the performance of many different bnet learning algorithms.

## 45.2 Score based SL algorithms

Score based SL algorithms require scoring bnets (with either all-discrete, all-continuous or mixed nodes). See Chapter 43 for an introduction to scoring bnets. The BIC score explained in that chapter is very popular and works for all-discrete, all-continuous or mixed nodes.

Score-based SL algorithms apply standard optimisation techniques. In the Hill Climbing algorithm, the current best bnet is changed slightly and then given a score that measures how well it fits the data. The bnet with the highest (=best) score so far, as well as that highest score, are stored. (Hence, this is called a greedy search). The process continues until the latest highest score stops changing. The problem with being greedy all the time is that the answer might converge to a local maximum. To mitigate this problem and allow some probability of visiting more than one local maximum, one uses a Tabu Table, random restarts, simulated annealing, genetic algorithms, etc.

## 45.3 Constraint based SL algorithms

To fully understand constraint based SL algorithms, the reader is advised to read Chapters 12 and 36 first.

Constraint based SL algorithms require estimating from the data the conditional independence  $\underline{x} \perp_P \underline{y} \mid \underline{a}$ . for any 3 disjoint multinodes  $\underline{x}, \underline{y}, \underline{a}$ . This can be done by estimating the

conditional mutual information (CMI)  $H(\underline{x} : \underline{y} | \underline{a})$ . **bnlearn** can calculate CMI and other metrics of  $\underline{x} \perp_P \underline{y} | \underline{a}$ . All these metrics are very similar; they all measure how close  $P(x|y, a)$  and  $P(x|a)$  are.

The first constraint-based SL algorithm was the Inductive Causation (IC) algorithm proposed by Pearl and Verma in 1991. Incremental improvements have been proposed since then, such as the PC family of algorithms, Grow-Shrink and the Incremental Association Markov Blanket (IAMB) family of algorithms.



## 45.4 Pseudo-code for some bnet learning algorithms

---

**Algorithm 1:** Pseudo-code for Hill Climbing algorithm
 

---

**Input** : Data  $D$ , Vertices  $V$

**Output:** a bnet  $B = (G, T)$ , where  $G = (V, E)$  is a DAG, where  $V$  are its vertices (nodes) and  $E$  are its edges (arrows).  $T$  are all its Transition Probability Matrices (TPMs)  $T = TPMs(G, D)$ .

```

 $E \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
 $T \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
 $B \leftarrow (V, E, T)$ 
 $maxscore \leftarrow -\infty$ 
// DE= all possible directed edges
 $DE = \{\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{y} \in V \times V : \underline{x} \neq \underline{y}\}$ 
 $again \leftarrow True$ 
while  $again$  do
    for all  $\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{y} \in DE$  do
        // add arrow
         $E_+ \leftarrow E \cup \{\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{y}\}$ 
        // delete arrow
         $E_- \leftarrow E - \{\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{y}\}$ 
        // reverse arrow
         $E_R \leftarrow E_- \cup \{\underline{y} \rightarrow \underline{x}\}$ 
        for  $E' = E_+, E_-, E_R$  do
            if  $E' \neq E$  and  $G' = (V, E')$  is a legal DAG then
                 $T' \leftarrow TPMs(G', D)$ 
                 $B' \leftarrow (G', T')$ 
                 $newscore = \text{BIC-score}(B')$ 
                if  $newscore > maxscore$  then
                     $B \leftarrow B'$ 
                     $maxscore \leftarrow newscore$ 
                else
                     $again \leftarrow False$ 
return  $B$ 
  
```

---

---

**Algorithm 2:** Pseudo-code for PC-Stable algorithm

---

**Input** : Data  $D$ , Vertices (nodes)  $V$ , tolerance in CMI  $\epsilon > 0$

**Output:** partially oriented acyclic graph  $G = (V, E, UE)$ , where  $V$  are the vertices (nodes),  $E$  are the oriented edges (arrows) and  $UE$  are the unoriented edges.

$E \leftarrow \emptyset$

// initialize  $UE$  to fully-connected undirected graph

$UE \leftarrow \{\underline{x} - \underline{y} \in V \times V : \underline{x} - \underline{y} = \underline{y} - \underline{x}, \underline{x} \neq \underline{y}\}$

// Shrink phase. Deletes edges from  $E$ .

for  $\lambda = 0, 1, 2, \dots, |V| - 2$  do

    for all  $\underline{x} - \underline{y} \in UE$  do

        for all  $\underline{S} = \{\underline{a} \in V : \underline{x} - \underline{a} \in UE, \underline{a} \neq \underline{x}, \underline{y}\} \ni |\underline{S}| = \lambda$  do

            if  $H(\underline{x} : \underline{y} | \underline{S}) < \epsilon$  then

                /\* If there were an arrow between  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$ , then conditioning on  $\underline{S}$  would not be enough to interrupt info transmission  $H(\underline{x} : \underline{y} | \underline{S})$  between  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$  \*/

$UE \leftarrow UE - \{\underline{x} - \underline{y}\}$

$\underline{S}(\underline{x} - \underline{y}) \leftarrow \underline{S}$

// Growth phase. Adds  $v$  structures to  $E$ .

for all  $\underline{x}, \underline{y}, \underline{a}$  such that  $\underline{x} - \underline{a} \in UE, \underline{a} - \underline{y} \in UE, \underline{x} - \underline{y} \notin UE, \underline{a} \notin \underline{S}(\underline{x} - \underline{y})$  do

    /\* If there were no collider at  $\underline{a}$ , then there would be info transmission between  $\underline{x}$  and  $\underline{y}$  \*/

$UE \leftarrow UE - \{\underline{x} - \underline{a}, \underline{a} - \underline{y}\}$

$E \leftarrow E \cup \{\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{a}, \underline{y} \rightarrow \underline{a}\}$

// Orienting edges.

again  $\leftarrow True$

size  $\leftarrow |UE|$

while again do

    for all  $\underline{x} - \underline{y} \in UE$  do

        if  $\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{y} \in E, \underline{y} - \underline{z} \in UE, \underline{x} - \underline{z} \notin UE, \nexists \underline{w} \ni \underline{w} \rightarrow \underline{y} \in E$  then

            // to avoid introducing new  $v$  structure

$UE \leftarrow UE - \{\underline{y} - \underline{z}\}$

$E \leftarrow E \cup \{\underline{y} \rightarrow \underline{z}\}$

        if  $\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{y} \in E$  and there is directed path from  $\underline{x}$  to  $\underline{y}$  in  $E$  then

            // to avoid introducing cycles

$UE \leftarrow UE - \{\underline{x} - \underline{y}\}$

$E \leftarrow E \cup \{\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{y}\}$

    newsiz  $\leftarrow |UE|$

    if size == newsiz then

        again  $\leftarrow False$

    else

        size  $\leftarrow newsiz$

return  $G = (V, E, UE)$

---

# Chapter 46

## Turbo Codes

This chapter is based on Ref.[14].

In this chapter, vectors with  $n$  components will be indicated by an  $n$  superscript. For example,  $a^n = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1})$ .

Consider an  $n$ -letter message  $u^n = (u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{n-1})$ , where for all  $i$ ,  $u_i \in \mathcal{A}$  is an element of an alphabet  $\mathcal{A}$ , and where for all  $i$ , the  $u_i$  are i.i.d.. Suppose  $u^n$  is encoded deterministically in two different ways,  $e_1(u^n)$  and  $e_2(u^n)$ . After passing through the same memoryless channel, the variables  $u^n, e_1, e_2$  become  $\tilde{u}^n, \tilde{e}_1, \tilde{e}_2$ , respectively. The letter  $u$  stands for unencoded, and  $e$  for encoded. Quantities with a tilde  $\tilde{u}^n, \tilde{e}_1, \tilde{e}_2$  occur after channel passage and are visible (measurable). Quantities without a tilde  $u^n, e_1, e_2$  are hidden (unmeasurable).

The situation just described can be represented by the bnet Fig.46.1, or by its abridged version Fig.46.2. But note that the abridged version does not show explicitly that the  $u_i$  are i.i.d. or that the channel is memoryless (i.e., that the  $u_i$  for all  $i$  pass independently through the channel).



Figure 46.1: Turbo coding B net representing a message being encoded two different ways and then the original message and the 2 encodings pass through a memoryless channel.



Figure 46.2: Abridged version of Fig.46.1.

Define

$$x = (u^n, e_1, e_2) \quad (46.1)$$

and

$$\tilde{x} = (\tilde{u}^n, \tilde{e}_1, \tilde{e}_2) . \quad (46.2)$$

Fig.46.1 implies that

$$P(x, \tilde{x}) = P(\tilde{u}^n | u^n) \left[ \prod_{r=1,2} P(\tilde{e}_r | e_r) P(e_r | u^n) \right] P(u^n) . \quad (46.3)$$

Because the  $u^n$  are i.i.d.,

$$P(u^n) = \prod_i P(u_i) . \quad (46.4)$$

Because the channel is memoryless,

$$P(\tilde{u}^n | u^n) = \prod_i P(\tilde{u}_i | u_i) . \quad (46.5)$$

Because the encoding is deterministic, we must have for  $r = 1, 2$

$$P(e_r | u^n) = \delta(e_r, e_r(u^n)) . \quad (46.6)$$

Define the belief functions

$$BEL_i = BEL_i(\underline{u}_i = a) = P(\underline{u}_i = a | \tilde{x}) . \quad (46.7)$$

The best estimate of  $u_j$  given all visible evidence  $\tilde{x}$  is

$$\hat{u}_i = \operatorname{argmax}_{u_i} BEL_i(u_i) . \quad (46.8)$$

Define the probability functions

$$\pi_i = \pi_i(u_i) = P(u_i) , \quad (46.9)$$

and the likelihood functions

$$\lambda_i = \lambda_i(u_i) = P(\tilde{u}_i|u_i) . \quad (46.10)$$

For  $r = 1, 2$ , define the Kernel functions

$$K_r = K_r(u^n) = P(\tilde{e}_r|e_r = e_r(u^n)) . \quad (46.11)$$

In this book,  $\mathcal{N}(!a)$  denotes a normalization constant that does not depend on  $a$ . Define

$$\mathcal{N}_i = \mathcal{N}(!u_i) . \quad (46.12)$$

**Claim 27**

$$BEL_i = \mathcal{N}_i \lambda_i \pi_i \mathcal{T}_i^{K_1 K_2} \left[ \prod_{j \neq i} \lambda_j \pi_j \right] , \quad (46.13)$$

where  $\mathcal{T}_i^K(\cdot)$  with  $K = K_1 K_2$  is an operator (transform) that acts on functions of  $u^n$ :

$$\mathcal{T}_i^K(\cdot) = \sum_{u^n} \delta(u_i, a) K(u^n)(\cdot) . \quad (46.14)$$

**proof:**

$$\begin{aligned} P(\underline{u}_i = a|\tilde{x}) &= \\ &= \sum_x \delta(u_i, a) P(x|\tilde{x}) \end{aligned} \quad (46.15)$$

$$= \sum_x \delta(u_i, a) \frac{P(\tilde{x}|x)P(x)}{P(\tilde{x})} \quad (46.16)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!a) \sum_x \delta(u_i, a) P(\tilde{x}|x) P(x) \quad (46.17)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!a) \sum_x \delta(u_i, a) P(u^n) \left[ \prod_{r=1,2} P(\tilde{e}_r|e_r) \delta(e_r, e_r(u^n)) \right] \prod_j P(\tilde{u}_j|u_j) \quad (46.18)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!a) \lambda_i(a) \pi_i(a) R , \quad (46.19)$$

where

$$R = \sum_{u^n} \delta(u_i, a) \left[ \prod_{r=1,2} P(\tilde{e}_r | e_r(u^n)) \right] \prod_{j \neq i} P(\tilde{u}_j | u_j) P(u_j) \quad (46.20)$$

$$= \sum_{u^n} \delta(u_i, a) \left[ \prod_{r=1,2} K_r(u^n) \right] \prod_{j \neq i} \lambda_j(u_j) \pi_j(u_j) \quad (46.21)$$

$$= \mathcal{T}_i^{K_1 K_2} \left[ \prod_{j \neq i} \lambda_j(u_j) \pi_j(u_j) \right]. \quad (46.22)$$

Hence

$$BEL_i(a) = \mathcal{N}(!a) \lambda_i(a) \pi_i(a) \mathcal{T}_i^{K_1 K_2} \left[ \prod_{j \neq i} \lambda_j(u_j) \pi_j(u_j) \right]. \quad (46.23)$$

**QED**

## 46.1 Decoding Algorithm

The Turbo algorithm for decoding the encode message is as follows. For  $m = 0$ , let

$$\pi_j^{(0)}(u_j) = \frac{1}{n_{\underline{u}_j}}. \quad (46.24)$$

Then for  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ , let

$$\pi_i^{(m)} = \mathcal{N}_i \mathcal{T}_i^{K_{m\%2}} \left[ \prod_{j \neq i} \lambda_j \pi_j^{(m-1)} \right], \quad (46.25)$$

where  $m\%2 = 1$  if  $m$  is odd and  $m\%2 = 2$  if  $m$  is even. Furthermore, for  $m > 0$ , let

$$BEL_i^{(m)} = \mathcal{N}_i \lambda_i \pi_i^{(m-1)} \pi_i^{(m)} \quad (46.26)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}_i \lambda_i \pi_i^{(m-1)} \mathcal{T}_i^{K_{m\%2}} \left[ \prod_{j \neq i} \lambda_j \pi_j^{(m-1)} \right]. \quad (46.27)$$

As  $m \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $BEL_i^{(m)}$  given by Eq.(46.27) is expected to converge to the the exact  $BEL_i$  given by Eq.(46.13).

Turbo decoding can be represented by the bnets Figs.46.3 and 46.4.

The node TPMs, printed in blue, for Fig.46.3, are given by:

$$P(d_i^{(m)} = a | \tilde{u}^n, \tilde{e}_{m\%2}) = BEL_i^{(m)}(a). \quad (46.28)$$



Figure 46.3: B net describing Turbo code generation of  $BEL_i^{(m)}(a)$  for  $m = 1, 2, \dots$



Figure 46.4: B net describing Turbo code generation of  $BEL^{n(m)}(\cdot)$  and  $\pi^{n(m)}(\cdot)$  for  $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . The following arrows were not drawn so as not to unduly clutter the diagram: Arrows pointing from node  $\underline{\lambda}^n(\cdot)$  to nodes  $\underline{\pi}^{n(m)}(\cdot)$  and  $\underline{BEL}^{n(m)}(\cdot)$  for  $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

The TPMs, printed in blue, for Fig.46.4, are given by:

$$P((\lambda^n)'(\cdot)|\tilde{u}^n) = \delta((\lambda^n)'(\cdot), \lambda^n(\cdot)) \quad (46.29)$$

$$P(\pi^{n(m)}(\cdot)|\lambda^n(\cdot), \pi^{n(m-1)}(\cdot), \tilde{e}_{m\%2}) = \prod_i \prod_{u_i} \delta(\pi_i^{(m)}(u_i), \mathcal{N}_i \mathcal{T}_i^{K_{m\%2}} [\prod_{j \neq i} \lambda_j \pi_j^{(m-1)}]) \quad (46.30)$$

$$P(BEL^{n(m)}(\cdot)|\lambda^n(\cdot), \pi^{n(m)}(\cdot), \pi^{n(m-1)}(\cdot)) = \prod_i \prod_{u_i} \delta(BEL_i(u_i), \mathcal{N}_i \lambda_i \pi_i^{(m-1)} \pi_i^{(m)}) \quad (46.31)$$

## 46.2 Message Passing Interpretation of Decoding Algorithm

Ref.[14] shows that the Turbo code decoding algo can be interpreted as an application of Message Passing. We leave all talk of Message Passing to a separate chapter, Chapter 29.



# Chapter 47

## Variational Bayesian Approximation

For more info and references about this topic, see Ref.[72].

The Variational Bayesian approximation (VBA) is an analytic (as opposed to numerical) approximation to the probability distribution  $P(h|\vec{x})$ , where  $h$  are the hidden variables and  $\vec{x}$  is the data.

More precisely, suppose  $\underline{h} \in S_{\underline{h}}$  and  $\underline{q} \in S_{\underline{h}}$  too. Suppose  $\vec{x} \in S_{\vec{x}}^{nsam}$  is a vector of  $nsam$  samples and the samples  $\underline{x}[\sigma] \in S_{\underline{x}}$  are i.i.d.. The VBA is simply an approximation  $P_{\underline{q}|\vec{x}}$  to  $P_{\underline{h}|\vec{x}}$ :

$$P_{\underline{h}|\vec{x}}(h|\vec{x}) \approx P_{\underline{q}|\vec{x}}(h|\vec{x}) \quad (47.1)$$

obtained by minimizing the Kullback-Liebler divergence  $D_{KL}(P_{\underline{q}|\vec{x}} \| P_{\underline{h}|\vec{x}})$  over all  $P_{\underline{q}|\vec{x}}$ . The minimization is usually subject to some constraints on the admissible forms of  $P_{\underline{q}|\vec{x}}$ .

$D_{KL}(Q \| P) \neq D_{KL}(P \| Q)$ ; i.e.,  $D_{KL}$  is not symmetric. So why do we use  $D_{KL}(P_{\underline{q}|\vec{x}} \| P_{\underline{h}|\vec{x}})$  instead of  $D_{KL}(P_{\underline{h}|\vec{x}} \| P_{\underline{q}|\vec{x}})$ ? Because  $D_{KL}(P_{\underline{h}|\vec{x}} \| P_{\underline{q}|\vec{x}})$  requires knowledge of  $P_{\underline{h}|\vec{x}}$ , but calculating  $P_{\underline{h}|\vec{x}}$  is what we are trying to do in the first place.




Figure 47.1: If  $P_{\underline{q}}(h)$  is Gaussian shaped and  $P_{\underline{h}}(h)$  has multiple bumps (modes) then  $D_{KL}(P_{\underline{q}} \| P_{\underline{h}})$  is minimized when  $P_{\underline{q}}$  fits one of the modes of  $P_{\underline{h}}$ . That is because  $D_{KL}(P_{\underline{q}} \| P_{\underline{h}}) = \sum_h P_{\underline{q}}(h) \ln \frac{P_{\underline{q}}(h)}{P_{\underline{h}}(h)}$  is a weighted average with weights  $P_{\underline{q}}$ , so nothing going on outside the support of  $P_{\underline{q}}$  influences much the final average.

See Fig.47.1 for some intuition on what minimizing  $D_{KL}(P_{\underline{q}|\vec{x}} \| P_{\underline{h}|\vec{x}})$  means.

Suppose  $\underline{h} = (h_0, h_1, \dots, h_{nh-1})$  and  $\underline{q} = (q_0, q_1, \dots, q_{nh-1})$  where  $\underline{h}_i \in S_{\underline{h}_i}$  and  $\underline{q}_i \in S_{\underline{h}_i}$  for




Figure 47.2:  $\underline{q}$  and  $\underline{h}$  have  $nh = 2$  mirroring components and those of  $\underline{q}$  are independent at fixed  $\underline{\vec{x}}$ .

all  $i$ . We say  $\underline{q}$  and  $\underline{h}$  have  $nh$  mirroring components and those of  $\underline{q}$  are independent at fixed  $\underline{\vec{x}}$  if

$$P_{\underline{q}|\underline{\vec{x}}}(h|\underline{\vec{x}}) = \prod_i P_{\underline{q}_i|\underline{\vec{x}}}(h_i|\underline{\vec{x}}) . \quad (47.2)$$

The bnet Fig.47.2 describes the scenario that we have in mind: The samples  $\underline{x}[\sigma]$  are i.i.d.. Each component  $\underline{h}_i$  of  $\underline{h}$  has a mirroring component  $\underline{q}_i$  in  $\underline{q}$ . The components of  $\underline{h}$  are correlated whereas those of  $\underline{q}$  are independent at fixed  $\underline{\vec{x}}$ .

**Claim 28** *If  $\underline{q}$  and  $\underline{h}$  have  $nh$  mirroring components and those of  $\underline{q}$  are independent at fixed  $\underline{\vec{x}}$  and  $D_{KL}(P_{\underline{q}|\underline{\vec{x}}} \parallel P_{\underline{h}|\underline{\vec{x}}})$  is minimum over all  $P_{\underline{q}|\underline{\vec{x}}}$ , then*

$$P_{\underline{q}_i|\underline{\vec{x}}}(q_i|\underline{\vec{x}}) = \mathcal{N}(!q_i) e^{E_{(\underline{q}_j)_{j \neq i}} [\ln P_{\underline{h}|\underline{\vec{x}}}(\underline{h}=q|\underline{\vec{x}})]} \quad (47.3)$$

$$= \mathcal{N}(!q_i) e^{E_{(\underline{q}_j)_{j \neq i}} [\ln P_{\underline{h},\underline{\vec{x}}}(\underline{h}=q,\underline{\vec{x}})]} \quad (47.4)$$

for all  $i$ .

**proof:**

Since all quantities in Eq.(47.3) are conditioned on  $\underline{\vec{x}}$ , let us omit all mention of  $\underline{\vec{x}}$  in this proof.

Let

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_1 \quad (47.5)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = D_{KL}(P_{\underline{q}} \parallel P_{\underline{h}}) \quad (47.6)$$

$$= \sum_h P_{\underline{q}}(h) \ln \frac{P_{\underline{q}}(h)}{P_{\underline{h}}(h)} \quad (47.7)$$

$$= \sum_h P_{\underline{q}}(h) \ln P_{\underline{q}}(h) - \sum_h P_{\underline{q}}(h) \ln P_{\underline{h}}(h) \quad (47.8)$$

$$= \sum_i \sum_{h_i} P_{\underline{q}_i}(h_i) \ln P_{\underline{q}_i}(h_i) - \sum_h P_{\underline{q}}(h) \ln P_{\underline{h}}(h) \quad (47.9)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = \sum_i \lambda_i \left[ \sum_{h_i} P_{\underline{q}_i}(h_i) - 1 \right]. \quad (47.10)$$

Then

$$\delta \mathcal{L} = \sum_i \sum_{h_i} \delta P_{\underline{q}_i}(h_i) \left[ \ln P_{\underline{q}_i}(h_i) + 1 + \lambda_i - \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{(h_j)_{j \neq i}} \prod_{(h_j)_{j \neq i}} \{P_{\underline{q}_j}(h_j)\} \ln P_{\underline{h}}(h) \right]. \quad (47.11)$$

Hence,

$$P_{\underline{q}_i}(h_i) = \mathcal{N}(!h_i) e^{\sum_{(h_j)_{j \neq i}} \{ \prod_{(h_j)_{j \neq i}} P_{\underline{q}_j}(h_j) \} \ln P_{\underline{h}}(h)}. \quad (47.12)$$

**QED**

Note that Eq.(47.3) yields a system of  $nh$  nonlinear equations in  $nh$  unknowns  $(P_{\underline{q}_i|\underline{x}})_{i=0,1,\dots,nh-1}$ . This system is usually solved recursively.

## 47.1 Free Energy $\mathcal{F}(\vec{x})$

To simplify the notation below, let us introduce the following abbreviations:

$$P(h|\vec{x}) = P_{\underline{h}|\underline{x}}(h|\vec{x}) \quad (47.13)$$

$$P(h, \vec{x}) = P_{\underline{h}, \underline{x}}(h, \vec{x}) \quad (47.14)$$

$$P(\vec{x}) = P_{\underline{x}}(\vec{x}) \quad (47.15)$$

Note that

$$D_{KL}(P_{\underline{q}|\underline{x}} \parallel P_{\underline{h}|\underline{x}}) = \sum_h P_{\underline{q}|\underline{x}}(h|\vec{x}) \ln \frac{P_{\underline{q}|\underline{x}}(h|\vec{x})}{P(h|\vec{x})} \quad (47.16)$$

$$= \sum_h P_{\underline{q}|\underline{x}}(h|\vec{x}) \ln \frac{P_{\underline{q}|\underline{x}}(h|\vec{x})}{P(h, \vec{x})} + \ln P(\vec{x}) \quad (47.17)$$

$$= \mathcal{F}(\vec{x}) + \ln P(\vec{x}) \quad (47.18)$$

Hence, the **Free energy**  $\mathcal{F}(\vec{x})$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}(\vec{x}) = \sum_h P_{\underline{q}|\underline{x}}(h|\vec{x}) \ln \frac{P_{\underline{q}|\underline{x}}(h|\vec{x})}{P(h, \vec{x})} \quad (47.19)$$

$$= E_{\underline{q}|\underline{x}} \left[ \ln \frac{P_{\underline{q}|\underline{x}}(q|\vec{x})}{P_{\underline{h}, \underline{x}}(q, \vec{x})} \right] . \quad (47.20)$$

The name free energy is justified because

$$\mathcal{F}(\vec{x}) = - \underbrace{\sum_h P_{\underline{q}|\underline{x}}(h|\vec{x}) \ln P_{\underline{h}, \underline{x}}(h, \vec{x})}_{U, \text{ Internal Energy}} + \underbrace{\sum_h P_{\underline{q}|\underline{x}}(h|\vec{x}) \ln P_{\underline{q}|\underline{x}}(h|\vec{x})}_{-S, \text{ minus Entropy}} . \quad (47.21)$$

It is also common to define a quantity called “ELBO” to be the negative of the free energy.

$$ELBO(\vec{x}) = -\mathcal{F}(\vec{x}) \quad (47.22)$$

ELBO stands for “Evidence Lower BOUND”. That name is justified because

$$\underbrace{\ln P_{\underline{x}}(\vec{x})}_{\text{evidence} \leq 0} = \underbrace{D_{KL}(P_{\underline{q}|\underline{x}} \parallel P_{\underline{h}|\underline{x}})}_{\geq 0} - |ELBO(\vec{x})| . \quad (47.23)$$




Figure 47.3:  $D_{KL} + \ln \frac{1}{P(\vec{x})} = \mathcal{F}$ .

Some properties of  $\mathcal{F}$  are:

- $\mathcal{F}$  is non-negative.

$$\underbrace{D_{KL}(P_{\underline{q}|\vec{x}} \parallel P_{\underline{h}|\vec{x}})}_{\geq 0} + \underbrace{\ln \frac{1}{P_{\vec{x}}(\vec{x})}}_{\geq 0} = \mathcal{F}(\vec{x}) \quad (47.24)$$

- **KL divergence is min iff  $\mathcal{F}$  is min at fixed  $P(\vec{x})$ .**

During a variation  $\delta$  that holds  $P(\vec{x})$  fixed, the KL divergence and  $\mathcal{F}$  change by the same amount:

$$\delta D_{KL}(P_{\underline{q}|\vec{x}} \parallel P_{\underline{h}|\vec{x}}) = \delta \mathcal{F}(\vec{x}) \quad (47.25)$$

# Chapter 48

## Zero Information Transmission (Graphoid Axioms)

This chapter assumes that you have read Chapter 12 on d-separation.

The following quantities play a very prominent role in the d-separation Theorem that we enunciated in Chapter 12.

- the mutual information (MI)  
(aka information transmission)  $H(\underline{a} : \underline{b})$
- the conditional mutual information (CMI)  
(aka conditional information transmission)  $H(\underline{a} : \underline{b} | \underline{c})$

MI can be viewed as the special case of CMI, when the set of variables being conditioned on is empty. Particularly prominent in d-separation discussions are probability distributions for which CMI vanishes. The goal of this chapter is to study such probability distributions.

Recall that CMI is non-negative and symmetric in its first two variables (i.e.,  $H(\underline{a} : \underline{b} | \underline{c}) = H(\underline{b} : \underline{a} | \underline{c})$ ). Another very useful property of CMI is its chain rule (easy to prove from the definition of CMI):

$$H(\underline{y} : \underline{x}^n) = \sum_i H(\underline{y} : \underline{x}_i | \underline{x}_{<i}) , \quad (48.1)$$

where  $\underline{x}^n = (\underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_{n-1})$  and  $\underline{x}_{<i} = (\underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_{i-1})$ .

A trivial but very useful consequence of the chain rule for CMI is:

$$\boxed{H(\underline{y} : \underline{x}^n) = 0 \implies H(\underline{y} : \underline{x}_i | \underline{x}_{<i}) = 0 \text{ for all } i} . \quad (48.2)$$

### 48.1 Consequences of Eq.(48.2)

Table 48.1 gives a set of statements about CMI referred to as the Graphoid Axioms in chapter 1 of Ref.[22]. See Ref.[22] to learn the history of these axioms. The purpose of this section is to prove that the graphoid axioms are all a simple consequence of Eq.(48.2).

Symmetry	$\underline{a} \perp_P \underline{b} \implies \underline{b} \perp_P \underline{a}$ $H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}) = 0 \implies H(\underline{b} : \underline{a}) = 0$
Decomposition	$\underline{a} \perp_P \underline{b}, \underline{c} \implies \underline{a} \perp_P \underline{b}$ and $\underline{a} \perp_P \underline{c}$ $H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}, \underline{c}) = 0 \implies H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}) = 0$ and $H(\underline{a} : \underline{c}) = 0$
Weak Union	$\underline{a} \perp_P \underline{b}, \underline{c} \implies \underline{a} \perp_P \underline{b} \underline{c}$ and $\underline{a} \perp_P \underline{c} \underline{b}$ $H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}, \underline{c}) = 0 \implies H(\underline{a} : \underline{b} \underline{c}) = 0$ and $H(\underline{a} : \underline{c} \underline{b}) = 0$
Contraction	$\underline{a} \perp_P \underline{b} \underline{c}$ and $\underline{a} \perp_P \underline{c} \implies \underline{a} \perp_P \underline{b}, \underline{c}$ $H(\underline{a} : \underline{b} \underline{c}) = 0$ and $H(\underline{a} : \underline{c}) = 0 \implies H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}, \underline{c}) = 0$
Intersection	$\underline{a} \perp_P \underline{b} \underline{c}, \underline{d}$ and $\underline{a} \perp_P \underline{d} \underline{c}, \underline{b} \implies \underline{a} \perp_P \underline{b}, \underline{d} \underline{c}$ $H(\underline{a} : \underline{b} \underline{c}, \underline{d}) = 0$ and $H(\underline{a} : \underline{d} \underline{c}, \underline{b}) = 0 \implies H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}, \underline{d} \underline{c}) = 0$

Table 48.1: Graphoid Axioms

**Claim 29** *Table 48.1 is true.*

**proof:**

- **Symmetry**

Follows trivially from  $H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}) = H(\underline{b} : \underline{a})$ .

- **Decomposition**

From the chain rule for CMI, we have

$$H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}, \underline{c}) = H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}|\underline{c}) + H(\underline{a} : \underline{c}) , \quad (48.3)$$

and

$$H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}, \underline{c}) = H(\underline{a} : \underline{c}|\underline{b}) + H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}) . \quad (48.4)$$

Hence,

$$H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}, \underline{c}) = 0 \quad (48.5)$$

implies

$$H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}|\underline{c}) = H(\underline{a} : \underline{c}) = 0 , \quad (48.6)$$

and

$$H(\underline{a} : \underline{c}|\underline{b}) = H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}) = 0 . \quad (48.7)$$

- **Weak Union**

Already proven in proof of Decomposition.

- **Contraction**

From chain rule for CMI, we have

$$H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}, \underline{c}) = H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}|\underline{c}) + H(\underline{a} : \underline{c}) . \quad (48.8)$$

- **Intersection**

From the chain rule for CMI, we have

$$H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}, \underline{d} | \underline{c}) = H(\underline{a} : \underline{b} | \underline{d}, \underline{c}) + H(\underline{a} : \underline{d} | \underline{c}) , \quad (48.9)$$

and

$$H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}, \underline{d} | \underline{c}) = H(\underline{a} : \underline{d} | \underline{b}, \underline{c}) + H(\underline{a} : \underline{b} | \underline{c}) . \quad (48.10)$$

Thus,

$$H(\underline{a} : \underline{b}, \underline{d} | \underline{c}) = 0 \quad (48.11)$$

implies

$$H(\underline{a} : \underline{b} | \underline{d}, \underline{c}) = H(\underline{a} : \underline{d} | \underline{c}) = 0 , \quad (48.12)$$

and

$$H(\underline{a} : \underline{d} | \underline{b}, \underline{c}) = H(\underline{a} : \underline{b} | \underline{c}) = 0 . \quad (48.13)$$

•  
**QED**



# Bibliography

- [1] Dan Bendel. Metropolis-Hastings: A comprehensive overview and proof. <https://similarweb.engineering/mcmc/>.
- [2] Alexandra M Carvalho. Scoring functions for learning Bayesian networks. [http://www.lx.it.pt/~asmc/pub/talks/09-TA/ta\\_pres.pdf](http://www.lx.it.pt/~asmc/pub/talks/09-TA/ta_pres.pdf).
- [3] Scott Cunningham. *Causal inference: The mixtape*. Yale University Press, 2021. <https://mixtape.scunning.com/index.html>.
- [4] Robin J. Evans. Graphical methods for inequality constraints in marginalized DAGs. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1209.2978>.
- [5] Charles Fox, Neil Girdhar, and Kevin Gurney. A causal Bayesian network view of reinforcement learning. <https://www.aaai.org/Papers/FLAIRS/2008/FLAIRS08-030.pdf>.
- [6] Bruno Gonçalves. Model testing and causal search. blog post <https://medium.com/data-for-science/causal-inference-part-vii-model-testing-and-causal-search-536b796f>
- [7] Ian J. Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, David Warde-Farley Bing Xu, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial networks. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1406.2661>.
- [8] Christina Heinze-Deml. Causality, spring semester 2019 at ETH Zurich. [https://stat.ethz.ch/lectures/ss19/causality.php#course\\_materials](https://stat.ethz.ch/lectures/ss19/causality.php#course_materials).
- [9] Cecil Huang and Adnan Darwiche. Inference in belief networks: A procedural guide. *International journal of approximate reasoning*, 15(3):225–263, 1996. <http://www.ar-tiste.com/Huang-Darwiche1996.pdf>.
- [10] Steffen L Lauritzen and David J Spiegelhalter. Local computations with probabilities on graphical structures and their application to expert systems. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 50(2):157–194, 1988. <http://www.eecis.udel.edu/~shatkay/Course/papers/Lauritzen1988.pdf>.
- [11] Sergey Levine. Course CS 285 at UC Berkeley, Deep reinforcement learning. <http://rail.eecs.berkeley.edu/deeprlcourse/>.

- [12] Dimitris Margaritis. Learning Bayesian network model structure from data (thesis, 2003, Carnegie Mellon Univ). <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/ADA461103>.
- [13] Adam A Margolin, Ilya Nemenman, Katia Basso, Chris Wiggins, Gustavo Stolovitzky, Riccardo Dalla Favera, and Andrea Califano. Aracne: an algorithm for the reconstruction of gene regulatory networks in a mammalian cellular context. In *BMC bioinformatics*, volume 7, page S7. Springer, 2006. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/1471-2105-7-S1-S7>.
- [14] Robert J. McEliece, David J. C. MacKay, and Jung-Fu Cheng. Turbo decoding as an instance of Pearls belief propagation algorithm. <http://authors.library.caltech.edu/6938/1/MCEieeejstc98.pdf>.
- [15] Richard E Neapolitan. *Learning Bayesian networks*. Pearson Prentice Hall, 2004.
- [16] Andrew Ng. Lecture at deeplearning.ai on recurrent neural networks. <http://www.ar-tiste.com/ng-lec-rnn.pdf>.
- [17] Gregory Nuel. Tutorial on exact belief propagation in Bayesian networks: from messages to algorithms. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1201.4724>.
- [18] Judea Pearl. Mediating instrumental variables. [https://ftp.cs.ucla.edu/pub/stat\\_ser/r210.pdf](https://ftp.cs.ucla.edu/pub/stat_ser/r210.pdf).
- [19] Judea Pearl. On the testability of causal models with latent and instrumental variables. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1302.4976>.
- [20] Judea Pearl. Reverend Bayes on inference engines: A distributed hierarchical approach. <https://www.aaai.org/Papers/AAAI/1982/AAAI82-032.pdf>, 1982.
- [21] Judea Pearl. *Probabilistic Inference in Intelligent Systems*. Morgan Kaufmann, 1988.
- [22] Judea Pearl. *Causality: Models, Reasoning, and Inference, Second Edition*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [23] Judea Pearl. Causal and counterfactual inference. *The Handbook of Rationality*, pages 1–41, 2019. [https://ftp.cs.ucla.edu/pub/stat\\_ser/r485.pdf](https://ftp.cs.ucla.edu/pub/stat_ser/r485.pdf).
- [24] Judea Pearl, Madelyn Glymour, and Nicholas P Jewell. *Causal inference in statistics: A primer*. John Wiley & Sons, 2016.
- [25] Judea Pearl and Dana Mackenzie. *The book of why: the new science of cause and effect*. Basic Books, 2018.
- [26] ReliaSoft. System analysis reference. [http://reliawiki.org/index.php/System\\_Analysis\\_Reference](http://reliawiki.org/index.php/System_Analysis_Reference).
- [27] Marco Scutari. bnlearn. <https://www.bnlearn.com/>.

- [28] Marco Scutari, Catharina Elisabeth Graafland, and José Manuel Gutiérrez. Who learns better Bayesian network structures: Accuracy and speed of structure learning algorithms. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 115:235–253, 2019. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.11908>.
- [29] Nitish Srivastava, G E Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan R Salakhutdinov. Dropout: A simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. <http://www.cs.toronto.edu/~rsalakhu/papers/srivastava14a.pdf>.
- [30] Masayoshi Takahashi. Statistical inference in missing data by MCMC and non-MCMC multiple imputation algorithms: Assessing the effects of between-imputation iterations. *Data Science Journal*, 16, 2017. <https://datascience.codata.org/articles/10.5334/dsj-2017-037/>.
- [31] theinvestorsbook.com. Pert analysis. <https://theinvestorsbook.com/pert-analysis.html>.
- [32] Robert R. Tucci. Bell’s inequalities for Bayesian statisticians. blog post in blog Quantum Bayesian Networks, <https://qbnets.wordpress.com/2008/09/19/bells-inequaties-for-bayesian-statistician/>.
- [33] Robert R. Tucci. Quantum Fog. <https://github.com/artiste-qb-net/quantum-fog>.
- [34] W. E. Vesely, F. F. Goldberg, N. H. Roberts, and D. F. Haasl. Fault tree handbook nureg-0492. <https://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/sr0492/>.
- [35] Wikipedia. Belief propagation. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Belief\\_propagation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Belief_propagation).
- [36] Wikipedia. Beta function. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Beta\\_function](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Beta_function).
- [37] Wikipedia. Binary decision diagram. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Binary\\_decision\\_diagram](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Binary_decision_diagram).
- [38] Wikipedia. Boolean algebra. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boolean\\_algebra](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boolean_algebra).
- [39] Wikipedia. Categorical distribution. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Categorical\\_distribution](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Categorical_distribution).
- [40] Wikipedia. Chow-Liu tree. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chow%E2%80%93Liu\\_tree](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chow%E2%80%93Liu_tree).
- [41] Wikipedia. Data processing inequality. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Data\\_processing\\_inequality](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Data_processing_inequality).
- [42] Wikipedia. Dirichlet distribution. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dirichlet\\_distribution](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dirichlet_distribution).
- [43] Wikipedia. Errors in variables models. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Errors-in-variables\\_models](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Errors-in-variables_models).

- [44] Wikipedia. Expectation maximization. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Expectation%E2%80%93maximization\\_algorithm](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Expectation%E2%80%93maximization_algorithm).
- [45] Wikipedia. Gamma function. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gamma\\_function](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gamma_function).
- [46] Wikipedia. Gated recurrent unit. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gated\\_recurrent\\_unit](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gated_recurrent_unit).
- [47] Wikipedia. Gibbs sampling. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gibbs\\_sampling](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gibbs_sampling).
- [48] Wikipedia. Hidden Markov model. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hidden\\_Markov\\_model](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hidden_Markov_model).
- [49] Wikipedia. Importance sampling. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Importance\\_sampling](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Importance_sampling).
- [50] Wikipedia. Instrumental variables estimation. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Instrumental\\_variables\\_estimation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Instrumental_variables_estimation).
- [51] Wikipedia. Inverse transform sampling. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inverse\\_transform\\_sampling](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inverse_transform_sampling).
- [52] Wikipedia. Junction tree algorithm. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Junction\\_tree\\_algorithm](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Junction_tree_algorithm).
- [53] Wikipedia. k-means clustering. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/K-means\\_clustering](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/K-means_clustering).
- [54] Wikipedia. Kalman filter. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kalman\\_filter](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kalman_filter).
- [55] Wikipedia. Least squares. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Least\\_squares](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Least_squares).
- [56] Wikipedia. Linear regression. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linear\\_regression](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linear_regression).
- [57] Wikipedia. Long short term memory. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Long\\_short-term\\_memory](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Long_short-term_memory).
- [58] Wikipedia. Markov blanket. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Markov\\_blanket](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Markov_blanket).
- [59] Wikipedia. Metropolis-Hastings method. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Metropolis%E2%80%93Hastings\\_algorithm](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Metropolis%E2%80%93Hastings_algorithm).
- [60] Wikipedia. Minimum spanning tree. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Minimum\\_spanning\\_tree](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Minimum_spanning_tree).
- [61] Wikipedia. Monte Carlo methods. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Monte\\_Carlo\\_methods](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Monte_Carlo_methods).
- [62] Wikipedia. Multinomial distribution. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multinomial\\_distribution](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multinomial_distribution).
- [63] Wikipedia. Multinomial theorem. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multinomial\\_theorem](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multinomial_theorem).

- [64] Wikipedia. Multivariate normal distribution. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multivariate\\_normal\\_distribution](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multivariate_normal_distribution).
- [65] Wikipedia. Non-negative matrix factorization. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non-negative\\_matrix\\_factorization](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Non-negative_matrix_factorization).
- [66] Wikipedia. Ordinary least squares. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ordinary\\_least\\_squares](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ordinary_least_squares).
- [67] Wikipedia. Program evaluation and review technique. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Program\\_evaluation\\_and\\_review\\_technique](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Program_evaluation_and_review_technique).
- [68] Wikipedia. Rejection sampling. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rejection\\_sampling](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rejection_sampling).
- [69] Wikipedia. Simple linear regression. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simple\\_linear\\_regression](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simple_linear_regression).
- [70] Wikipedia. Simpson's paradox. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simpson's\\_paradox](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simpson's_paradox).
- [71] Wikipedia. Spring system. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spring\\_system](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spring_system).
- [72] Wikipedia. Variational Bayesian methods. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Variational\\_Bayesian\\_methods](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Variational_Bayesian_methods).
- [73] Hao Wu and Zhaohui Steve Qin. course notes, BIOS731: Advanced statistical computing, 2016 Emory Univ. <http://web1.sph.emory.edu/users/hwu30/teaching/statcomp/statcomp.html>.