

# K-MEANS, EM ALGORITHM AND VARIATIONAL METHODS

MAHESH VEMULA<sup>1</sup>

## CONTENTS

1	Introduction	2
2	Terminology	2
3	EM Algorithm	2
3.1	Jensen Inequality	3
3.2	EM Steps	3

## LIST OF FIGURES

## LIST OF TABLES

## 1 INTRODUCTION

We will closely study three well known clustering methods and understand the inter-relations between these methods.

1. K-Means
2. E-M (Expectation Maximization)
3. Variational Inference

We will then later explore these methods on some corpora based datasets.

## 2 TERMINOLOGY

Given a set of  $m$  samples  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m$ , we wish to

1. Find  $K$  clusters such that within cluster sum of squares distances is minimized.

$$J = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{x_i \in C_k} \|x_i - \mu_k\|^2 \quad (1)$$

2. Fit the parameters of a probabilistic model with  $p(x, z)$  being the joint likelihood.

K-Means algorithm solves the first step, while variational methods solve the second part. The EM algo is a special case of variational methods. We shall investigate these two algos in greater detail now.

## 3 EM ALGORITHM

The standard example when introducing EM algorithm is the Gaussian Mixture problem. The assumed model is that the samples are drawn from a mixture Gaussian distribution whose parameters are unknown.

Consider a Gaussian Mixture model of the following form

$$p_1 \mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \Sigma_1) + p_2 \mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \Sigma_2) + \dots + p_K \mathcal{N}(\mu_K, \Sigma_K) \quad (2)$$

Let us consider the following generative model for the sample dataset

1. Draw a random variable  $z_i = k$  from  $1 \dots k$ . This variable indicates from which distribution the sample will be drawn.
2. Draw a sample  $x_i$  from the  $k^{\text{th}}$  distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu_k, \Sigma_k)$

In our tasks we have to infer the parameters of the distribution (2) from the samples  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m$ . I will follow Prof Andrew Ng's exposition in deriving the EM algorithm steps.

### 3.1 Jensen Inequality

The Jensen Inequality states that if  $f$  is a **convex** function then we have

$$E[f(\mathbf{X})] \geq f[E(\mathbf{X})] \quad (3)$$

We have the converse result for a **concave** function.  $\log$  is a concave function therefore we have

$$E[\log(\mathbf{X})] \leq \log[E(\mathbf{X})] \quad (4)$$

### 3.2 EM Steps

The EM is a general recipe for solving maximum likelihood problems in the presence of hidden variables. In the context of estimating mixtures, the hidden variables  $z_i$  are the random variables that indicate from which distribution the sample was drawn.

We begin by expressing the log-likelihood of the data as follows. The parameters of estimation include the  $\Theta = \mu_i, \Sigma_i$ .

$$l(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^m \log p(\mathbf{x}_i; \Theta) \quad (5)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{z_i=1}^k \log p(\mathbf{x}_i, z_i; \Theta) \quad (6)$$

We introduced the following important trick in the form of a proposal distribution  $Q(z_i)$  as follows

$$l(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{z_i=1}^k \log p(\mathbf{x}_i, z_i; \Theta) \quad (7)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{z_i=1}^k \log \frac{Q(z_i) * p(\mathbf{x}_i, z_i; \Theta)}{Q(z_i)} \quad (8)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{z_i=1}^k \log Q(z_i) \frac{p(\mathbf{x}_i, z_i; \Theta)}{Q(z_i)} \quad (9)$$

$$(10)$$