

Exercise Sheet 9

Due **June 17**, 9am local time on ISIS

19. The Viterbi algorithm (70 + 30 + 15* + 15* P)

(a) *Implement* the Viterbi algorithm which computes the most likely hidden state sequence for a sequence of observations. For this, write a MATLAB function `viterbi` with signature

$$\mathbf{x} = \text{viterbi}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{\pi}, \mathbf{y}),$$

which takes the transition matrix \mathbf{A} , emission matrix \mathbf{B} , initial distribution $\mathbf{\pi}$, and the observed sequence \mathbf{y} . It outputs the MLE for the hidden state sequence \mathbf{x} .

(Pseudocode of the algorithm can be found on page 2)

(b) Perform the following experiment: for the Hidden Markov Model of sheet 9, that is,

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0,1 & 0,9 \\ 0,5 & 0,5 \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 0,2 & 0,8 \\ 0,4 & 0,6 \end{pmatrix} \quad \boldsymbol{\pi} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

generate sequences of length $\ell = 5, 10$ and 20 ; for each length generate a number of $N = 1000$ pairs of output sequences and hidden state sequences. On these sequences, for each length ℓ , compare (i) the Viterbi algorithm and (ii) the algorithm which randomly uniformly estimates a state sequence by (i) plotting for each length ℓ , and all integers $1 \leq k \leq \ell$, the relative frequency of the algorithm correctly estimating the hidden state at position k (this is three plots, one for each ℓ , and in each plot two curves), and (ii) for each length ℓ , computing the relative frequency of both algorithms succeeding in completely identifying the state sequence correctly (this is two numbers for each of the three ℓ).

Hint: if you want to do exercise (d*), and also generally, it is advised that you save the generated sequences for future use. For this, use the MATLAB command `save`.

(c*) In a Markov Model, there are often state sequences resp. distributions to which the model converges. *Prove* for the model from sheet 9 given in exercise (b) that the limit $\boldsymbol{\pi}_\infty := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \boldsymbol{\pi} \cdot \mathbf{A}^k$ exists, and it does not depend on the choice of $\boldsymbol{\pi}$. That is, *prove* that $\boldsymbol{\pi}_\infty$ is the same, no matter what the initial distribution $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is.

(d*) In your comparison in exercise (b), add the algorithm which does not estimate the outputs uniformly, but with independent probabilities $\boldsymbol{\pi}_\infty \cdot \mathbf{B}$.

Viterbi-algorithmus (cf. Rabiner, *A Tutorial on Hidden Markov Models and Selected Applications in Speech Recognition*, Proceedings of the IEEE, Vol. 77, No. 2, 1989, p. 264ff.)

Variables: n number of hidden states
 m number of possible emissions
 ℓ Length of sequence
 a_{ij} transition probabilities
 b_{ij} probability $P()$ of emitting symbol j in state i
 π_i probability to start in state i
 $y(t)$ observation at time t
 $\hat{x}(t)$ estimated state at time t
 P^* probability for $y(t)$ given $\hat{x}(t)$
 $\delta_i(t)$ “best” probability of state i at time t
 $\psi_i(t)$ “best” state i at time t

Initialization:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_i(1) &= \pi_i \cdot b_{ix(1)}, & 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ \psi_i(1) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Recursion:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_j(t) &= \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} [\delta_i(t-1) \cdot a_{ij}] \cdot b_{jx(t)}, & 2 \leq t \leq \ell, 1 \leq j \leq n \\ \psi_j(t) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{1 \leq i \leq n} [\delta_i(t-1) \cdot a_{ij}], & 2 \leq t \leq \ell, 1 \leq j \leq n.\end{aligned}$$

Termination:

$$\begin{aligned}P^* &= \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} [\delta_i(\ell)], \\ \hat{x}(T) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{1 \leq i \leq n} [\delta_i(\ell)].\end{aligned}$$

Backtracking:

$$\hat{x}(t) = \psi_{\hat{x}(t+1)}(t+1), \quad t = \ell-1, \ell-2, \dots, 1.$$