

# Discrete Combinatorial Optimisation in MAP Estimation

Tran The Truyen  
thetruyen.tran@postgrad.curtin.edu.au

April 27, 2008

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Problem Statement</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Applications</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1	Pattern Recognition . . . . .	1
2.2	Markov Random Fields . . . . .	2
<b>3</b>	<b>State-of-the-Arts</b>	<b>3</b>

## 1 Problem Statement

Given  $N$  discrete variables  $x_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, S\}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be the set of pair of indices  $(i, j)$  where  $i \neq j$ . We want to find the set of optimal solutions as follows

$$(x_1^*, x_2^*, \dots, x_N^*) = \arg \min_{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N} \left( \sum_{i \in [1, N]} g_i(x_i) + \sum_{(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}} f_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \right) \quad (1)$$

The RHS is often referred to as *energy*, a term borrowed from physical science. This equation is also known as *Maximum A Posteriori* (MAP) estimation, for the reason we will explain in Section 2.2.

## 2 Applications

### 2.1 Pattern Recognition

This problem has a wide application in pattern recognition (e.g. see [13, 5, 9, 12, 15, 3, 7, 10]). For example, given an image  $y$  of size  $H \times W$ . Thus  $N = H \times W$  is the number of pixels in the image. The set  $\mathcal{E}$  includes all pairs of adjacent

pixels in a grid. We want to give each pixel a label in the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, S\}$ . Let  $x_i$  be a discrete variable that represents the label of the pixel  $y_i$ . The function  $g_i(x_i)$  is now extended to include  $y_i$  as the input, i.e.  $g_i(x_i, y_i)$  but this will not change the nature of Equation 1. The function  $f_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$  is to encode the dependency between adjacent labels. An example of this dependency is

$$f_{ij}(x_i, x_j) = \delta(x_i, x_j)$$

where  $\delta(x_i, x_j)$  is the Kronecker function, i.e.  $\delta(x_i, x_j) = 1$  if  $x_i = x_j$  and 0 otherwise. Sometimes, we may limit  $f_{ij}$  to the class of *metric* functions, i.e.

$$f_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \leq f_{ik}(x_i, x_k) + f_{kj}(x_k, x_j) \quad (2)$$

for any  $k \neq i, j$ ;  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$ .

## 2.2 Markov Random Fields

Markov Random Fields are popular tool for modelling spatial stochastic processes (e.g. see [1, 8]). The joint variable  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$  is modelled as a random variable with the following distribution

$$\Pr(x) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \quad (3)$$

where  $Z = \sum_{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N} \prod_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$  is the normalisation term, i.e.  $\sum_x \Pr(x) = 1$ . This is called the *prior* distribution. Often, the label  $x_i$  is known as the state that generates the observation  $y_i$ . The generation is modelled in a distribution  $\Pr(y_i|x_i)$ . The common question is that given  $y$ , we want to find the assignment of  $x$  that is most explained by  $y$ , i.e.

$$x^* = \arg \max_x \Pr(x|y)$$

$\Pr(x|y)$  is called the *posterior* distribution because it is computed *after* seeing  $y$  while the original  $\Pr(x)$  is computed *before* seeing  $y$ .

By probability theory, we have the Bayes rule

$$\Pr(x|y) = \frac{1}{\Pr(y)} \Pr(y|x) \Pr(x)$$

so

$$x^* = \arg \max_x \Pr(y|x) \Pr(x) \quad (4)$$

since  $\Pr(y)$  does not depend on  $x$ . The common assumption made in MRFs is that

$$\Pr(y|x) = \prod_i \Pr(y_i|x_i) \quad (5)$$

Substituting (3,5) into (4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} x^* &= \arg \max_x \prod_i \Pr(y_i|x_i) \prod_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \\ &= \arg \min_x \left( \sum_i -\log \Pr(y_i|x_i) + \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} -\log \psi_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \right) \end{aligned}$$

where we have ignore  $Z$  because it does not depend on  $x$ . This clearly has the form of Equation 1.

### 3 State-of-the-Arts

There are number of solutions for this combinatorial problem (e.g. see [14] for an evaluation). The most well-known methods are:

- Iterated Conditional Mode [2]: this is a local greedy search method. Thus it is sensitive to initialisation and is often trapped in local minima.
- Simulated Annealing [6, 4]: this is guaranteed to find the optimal solution, but is often too slow in practice.
- Belief Propagation, also known as Max-Product algorithm: this is originated from Artificial Intelligence [11], often yields good solutions but may not converge.
- Graph-cuts [3]: this is currently the best family of algorithms for problems with metric functions  $f_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$  (see Equation 2).

### References

- [1] Julian Besag. Spatial interaction and the statistical analysis of lattice systems (with discussions). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 36:192–236, 1974.
- [2] Julian Besag. On the statistical analysis of dirty pictures. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B*, 48(3):259–302, 1986.
- [3] Yuri Boykov, Olga Veksler, and Ramin Zabih. Fast approximate energy minimization via graph cuts. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (PAMI)*, 23(11):1222–1239, 2001.
- [4] S. Geman and D. Geman. Stochastic relaxation, Gibbs distributions, and the Bayesian restoration of images. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (PAMI)*, 6(6):721–742, 1984.
- [5] Jason K. Johnson, Dmitry Malioutov, and Alan S. Willsky. Lagrangian relaxation for MAP estimation in graphical models. In *45th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control and Computing*, September 2007.

- [6] S. Kirkpatrick, C. D. Gelatt Jr., and M. P. Vecchi. Optimization by simulated annealing. *Science*, 220(4598):671–680, May 1983.
- [7] Vladimir Kolmogorov. Convergent tree-reweighted message passing for energy minimization. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (PAMI)*, 28(10):1568–1583, Oct 2006.
- [8] S.L. Lauritzen. *Graphical Models*. Oxford Science Publications, 1996.
- [9] M. Leordeanu and M. Hebert. Efficient MAP approximation for dense energy functions. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Machine learning (ICML)*, pages 545–552. ACM Press New York, NY, USA, 2006.
- [10] Talya Meltzer, Chen Yanover, and Yair Weiss. Globally optimal solutions for energy minimization in stereo vision using reweighted belief propagation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 428–435, 2005.
- [11] J. Pearl. *Probabilistic Reasoning in Intelligent Systems: Networks of Plausible Inference*. Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco, CA, 1988.
- [12] P. Ravikumar and J. Lafferty. Quadratic programming relaxations for metric labeling and Markov random field MAP estimation. In *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning (ICML)*, pages 737–744. ACM Press New York, NY, USA, 2006.
- [13] Jian Sun, Nan-Ning Zheng, and Heung-Yeung Shum. Stereo matching using belief propagation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (PAMI)*, 25(7):787–800, Jul 2003.
- [14] R. Szeliski, R. Zabih, D. Scharstein, O. Veksler, V. Kolmogorov, A. Agarwala, M. Tappen, and C. Rother. A comparative study of energy minimization methods for Markov random fields. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, number 3952 in Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 16–29, 2006.
- [15] M. J. Wainwright, T. S. Jaakkola, and A. S. Willsky. Map estimation via agreement on (hyper)trees: Message-passing and linear-programming approaches. Technical Report UCB/CSD-03-1269, UC Berkeley CS Division, August 2003.