7 LATE HOURS

1 Class-Conditional Densities for Binary Data [25 Points]

Problem A [5 points]: Parameters of Full Model with Factorizing

Solution A.:
Problem I A. We will start by factorizing p(x) y and we let $\Theta_{x,c} = P(X_j X_j, y, y, y, y, z)$ Thus, we can factorize as $H(\Theta_{x,c})$ We want to Stare every $\Theta_{x,j,c}$, x is blung and P dimensional as stated. There are C classes to mutiply these by so we get a total complexity
of O(3°C')

Problem B [5 points]: Parameters of Full Model without Factorizing

0	12 121 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
5	We still need to store the estimates of all
	the guaranters on this case so the complexity
- 012, go 1 dt 40 5 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	the parameters in this case so the complexity. 15 the same as the air where we factorize, O(20C)

Problem C [2 points]: Naive Bayes vs. Full Model for Small N

Solution C.: If the training set is small, then Naive Bayes is better to use than Full Bayes. This is because Full Bayes assumes that the x of the input are dependent on each other. This will cause Full Bayes to overfit the data as there are so many possible dependencies it has to learn. This will cause convergence to an unideal local minimum or no convergence which will lead to high error. Naive Bayes assumes the x are independent so it won't run into these problems. Thus, Naive Bayes will have lower test error.

Problem D [2 points]: Naive Bayes vs. Full Model for Large N

Solution D.: For large N Full Bayes is better because there is enough data such that the model can be trained fully and it won't overfit. Naive Bayes won't perform as well because its independence assuption won't allow it to pick up on the real patterns in the data. Because Full Bayes will be able to capture the dependencies in the input and there is enough data for those to be captured, Full Bayes will have lower test error.

Problem E [11 points]: Computational Complexity of Making a Prediction Using Naive Bayes vs Full Model

E the naive buyes for a single fest case in the case where we have all the parameters alrealy	Solution E.:
wormy about its $P(x) = \xi P(y, x)$ and we need wormy about its $P(x) = \xi P(y, x)$ and we need to go through all classes and all fewfores which its c*D. For the time complexity of the full Model we have a similar softwaltern except we convert a have a similar softwaltern except we convert a Q -bit rectar which takes $O(D)$ but we end up Q -bit rectar which takes $O(D)$ but we end up Q -bit rectar which takes $O(D)$ but Q of Q of Q	computed we get $O(CD)$ because all we need to computed we get $O(CD)$ because all we need warry about its $P(x) = \xi P(y, x)$ and we need to go through all classes and all fewfores which is C^*D . For the time compliably of the full Model we have a similar solvabor except we covert a have a similar solvabor except we covert a

2 Sequence Prediction [75 Points]

Problem A [10 points]: Max-Probability State Sequences for 6 Trained HMMs

```
Solution A.:
Emission Sequence Max Probability State Sequence
25421
91232367534
5452674261527433
7226213164512267255
9247120602352051010255241
                  Emission Sequence Max Probability State Sequence
                  50622
4687981156
315833657775062
21310222515963505015
5503199452571274006320025
58535
1546566636
538436858181213
13240338308444514688
3111664434441382533632626
```

Problem B [17 points]: Probability of Emission Sequence for 6 Trained HMMs

	Probability of Emitting Sequence
	Probability of Emitting Sequence 14.53%-08.5
File #1: Emission Sequence ###################################	Probability of Emitting Sequence
77550 7224523677 505767442426747 72134131645536112267 4733667771450051060253041	innan koo bability of Eritting Saguanasananan 1 181e - 94 2 930 - 97 3 8 197 - 26 3 - 197 - 26 3 - 24e - 24
File #2: Emission Sequence	Probability of Emitting Sequence
60622 4687981156 815833657775062 21310222515963505015 6503199452571274006320025	нини на прави на при
File #3: Emission Sequence	Probability of Emitting Sequence
######################################	нини Probability of Eriting Sequence 1 732e — Файний принцинации принцип 9 - 285e — РУ 1 - 285e — РУ 1 - 285e — 22
File #4: Emission Sequence	Probability of Emitting Sequence
######################################	innan Probability of Eritting Sequences 1-14te-04 hannanananananananananan 3-35e 04 4-740c-18 5-6-18-22
File #5: Emission Sequence	Probability of Emitting Sequence
68535 6546566636 638436858181213 1324933838844514688	нини проводії ty of Eriting Sequence 1 3220—96 2 820—97 4 6230—18 1 4 6230—18 1 4 620—18
Anaconda Prompt Emission Seguence	Probability of Emitting Sequence
######################################	4 5376-65 1 628e-11 4 348e-15 3 366-24
File #1: Emission Sequence ### #################################	Probability of Emitting Sequence
Pile Hi: Enission Sequence Hunter Huntunkhunukhunukhun Pile Huntunkhunukhunukhun Pile Huntunkhunukhun Pile Huntunkhunukhun Pile Huntunkhunukhunukhun Pile Historia Pile Hi	Probability of Emitting Sequence
P.15 H.15 Ender S. O. Sequence Hanning	######################################
Pile Hi: Ends: John Sequence Hiller Hiller Hiller Hiller Fried Hiller Hiller Hiller Hiller Fried H	######################################
Pais Hais Sequence Hanning Han	Probability of Emitting Sequence 2.0332-09 2.4776-130 3.740-24 Probability of Emitting Sequence 1.1816-11 2.1316-11 3.710-24 Probability of Emitting Sequence 1.1816-11 2.1316-13 3.730-25 1.1976-25 1.1976-25
Pais Hais Sequence Hanning Han	Probability of Emitting Sequence 2.0332-09 2.4776-130 3.740-24 Probability of Emitting Sequence 1.1816-11 2.1316-11 3.710-24 Probability of Emitting Sequence 1.1816-11 2.1316-13 3.730-25 1.1976-25 1.1976-25
Pais Has Endes on Sequence Hanning Han	######################################

Problem C [10 points]: Learned State Transition and Output Emission Matrices of Supervised Hidden Markov Model

```
| Individual | Ind
```

Problem D [15 points]: Learned State Transition and Output Emission Matrices of Unsupervised Hidden Markov Model

Problem E [5 points]: Compare 2C and 2D

Solution E.: The matrices from C, the supervised case, providesa more accurate representation of Ron's moods and how they affect his music choices. One simple reason C is more accurate is becuase it is supervised. A supervised HMM, given a sufficient amount of data will trivially be more accurate than an unsupervised HMM. Furthermore, the matrices from D has much more variance than the matrices from C. This is probably a bad sign. As we look closer we see that the probability of staying in state 0 or 2 in D is very small whereas all the values along the diagonal in C are reasonably big. This should not be the case because peoples' mood should tend to stay the same. There definetly shouldn't be a mood which you exit immediately, that's not really a mood. Furthermore, there really shouldn't be very small values in the transition matrix at all because there should be a reasonably big ¿.01 chance to get to a mood from any other mood. It shouldn't be almost impossible to get to a mood from a different mood. In C this is true, in D it isn't. Looking at the observation matrix we also see near 0 values in the D observation matrix and not in C. 0 values don't really make sense because you can listen to all sorts of music in all different moods. For example, Marvin's Room by Drake, a sad song, is good even when you're happy. To improve D we could get more data because unsupervised HMM will only get better with more data.

Problem F [5 points]: Generating Emission Sequences

```
Solution F.:
 34336532252334525233
41012601162262631160
41133225062632063152
65206006331511123326
```

Problem G [3 points]: Sparsity of Trained *A* and *O* Matrices

Solution G.: Both of the matrices are very sparse. This makes sense because some transitions will be very unlikely like if one state is prepositions and one is adjectives. Each state has one or two likely transitions. The sparsity means there is a consistent transition from certain states to others. For example state 2 almost always goes to state one. Looking at the wordcloud we see these are adjectives and nouns respectively. This clearly makes sense.

Problem H [5 points]: Hidden States vs. Sample Emission Sentences from HMM

Solution H.: As the number of hidden states increases the sentences become more and more coherent. The special case when there is one hidden state, we are essentially choosing states at random. This is because all the states are within the one hidden state. In general, as the number of hidden states increases, the training data liklihood increases. This is because the number of parameters increases. If the max training likelihood is desired you should have one hidden state for each observation.

Problem I [5 points]: Analyzing Visualization of State

Solution I.: State 2 represents adjectives. This differs from other states because it's the only one that contains mostly adjectives. We can see that it trasitions to nouns almost all of the time. United, executive, judicial, as well as many numbers such as one, two, and thirty are in this word cloud.