ml notes

Leonardo Frioli @wikilele

Intro

A bunch of stuff to know 1.1

In regression the target value is alway stated as:

 $d_i = f(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon$

where ϵ is the error (usually with 0 mean, and variance σ)

The Error is generally stated as: $R_{emp} = \frac{1}{l} \sum_{p \to 1}^{l} L(h(\mathbf{x}_p), d_p)$

$$R_{emp} = \frac{1}{l} \sum_{n \to 1}^{l} L(h(\mathbf{x}_p), d_p)$$

L will change according to the task i.e MSE $(d_p - h(\mathbf{x}_p))^2$

Inductive learning Hypotesis

Any h that approximates f well on training examples will also approximate f well on new/unseen instances

Overfitting

A learner overfits the data if:

it outputs an hypotesis $h \in H$ having true error ϵ and empirical error E, but there is another h' \in H aving E' > E and ϵ ' < ϵ (greater empirical error, but smaller true error).

True error

$$R = \int L(d, h(\mathbf{x})) \delta P(x, d)$$

- we don't know the probability distribution
- the integral is over all the data

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Recall (TP rate)} = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \\ & \text{Precision} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \end{aligned}$$

Concept Learning

2.1 A bunch of stuff to know

For binary input/ouput $|H|^{\#-instances} = 2^{2^n}$ where n is the input dimension.

Let h_j and h_k be boolean valued functions defined over X. Then h_j is more general then or equal to h_k ($h_j \ge h_k$) if and only if $\forall x \in X : (h_k(x) = 1) \to (h_j(x) = 1)$

G, of version sapce $VS_{H,D}$, summarizes all the negative up to now S, of version space $VS_{H,D}$, summarizes all the positive up to now

An unbiased learner is unable to generalize because each unobserved instance will be classified positive by precisely half the hypothesis in VS and negative by the other half:

 \forall h consistent with $x_i \in TS$, \exists h' identical to h except in x_i but identical on D (TR)

Inductive bias The inductive bias of a concept learning algorithm L is any minimal set of assertions B such that for any target concept c and corresponding training set $D_c = \langle x_p, c(x_p) \rangle$

$$\forall x_i \in X, (B \land D_c \land x_i) \vdash L(x_i, D_c)$$

Linear and K-nn models

3.1 One variable case

$$\frac{\delta E\left(\mathbf{w}\right)}{\delta w_{i}} = \frac{\delta \left(y - h_{\mathbf{w}}\left(x\right)\right)^{2}}{\delta w_{i}} = 2\left(y - h_{\mathbf{w}}\left(\mathbf{x}\right)\right) \frac{\delta \left(y - h_{\mathbf{w}}\left(x\right)\right)}{\delta w_{i}} = 2\left(y - h_{\mathbf{w}}\left(x\right)\right) \frac{\delta \left(y - \left(w_{1}x + w_{0}\right)\right)}{\delta w_{i}}$$

 w_0 derivative

$$\frac{\delta E(\mathbf{w})}{\delta w_0} = -2(y - h_{\mathbf{w}}(x)) = 0 \quad \sum_{p \to 1}^{l} -2(y_p - w_1 x_p - w_0) = 0$$

$$\sum y_p - w_1 \sum x_p - lw_0 = 0 \quad w_0 = \frac{1}{l} \sum y_p - \frac{1}{l} w_1 \sum x_p$$

 w_1 derivative

$$\frac{\delta E(\mathbf{w})}{\delta w_1} = -2(y - h_{\mathbf{w}}(x))x = 0 \quad \sum_{p \to 1}^{l} -2(y_p - w_1 x_p - w_0)x_p = 0$$

$$\sum (x_p y_p - w_1 x_p^2 - w_0 x_p) = 0 \quad \sum (x_p y_p) - w_1 \sum x_p^2 - w_0 \sum x_p = 0$$

$$w_1 \sum x_p^2 = \sum x_p y_p - \frac{1}{l} \sum x_p \sum y_p + \frac{1}{l} w_1 \sum x_p \sum y_p$$

$$w_1(\sum x_p^2 - \frac{1}{l}(\sum x_p)^2) = \sum x_p y_p - \frac{1}{l} \sum x_p \sum y_p$$

3.2 Scaling freedom property

Hyperplane equation:

$$\mathbf{w}^{T}\mathbf{x} + w_{0} = w_{1}x_{1} + w_{2}x_{2} + w_{0} = 0$$

$$x_{2} = x_{1}\frac{Kw_{1}}{Kw_{2}} - \frac{Kw_{0}}{Kw_{2}}$$

3.3 Direct Approach

$$E(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{p \to 1}^{l} (y_p - \sum_{t \to 0}^{n} w_t x_{p,t})^2 = \sum_{p \to 1}^{l} \delta_p(\mathbf{w})^2$$

For $j \to 0$ to n

$$\frac{\delta E(\mathbf{w})}{\delta w_j} = 2 \sum_{p \to 1}^{l} \delta_p(\mathbf{w}) \frac{\delta \delta_p(\mathbf{w})}{\delta w_j} =$$

$$2 \sum_{p} \delta_p(\mathbf{w}) \frac{\delta(y_p - \sum_{t \to 0}^{n} w_t x_{p,t})}{\delta w_j} = -2 \sum_{p} x_{p,j} \delta_p(\mathbf{w})$$

$$-2 \sum_{p} x_{p,j} (y_p - \sum_{t \to 0}^{n} w_t x_{p,t}) = 0$$

$$\sum_{p \to 1}^{l} x_{p,l} y_p = \sum_{p \to 1}^{l} \sum_{t \to 0}^{n} (x_{p,j} x_{p,t} w_t)$$

$$X^T y = (X^T X) w$$

3.4 Gradient descend as correction rule

$$\Delta \mathbf{w} = -\frac{\delta E(\mathbf{w})}{\delta \mathbf{w}}$$
$$\Delta w_j = \sum_{p \to 1}^{l} (x_p)(y_p - \mathbf{x}_p^T \mathbf{w})$$

If input > 0:

If error is positive \rightarrow output is too low \rightarrow increase $w_j \rightarrow$ increase output \rightarrow decrease error

If error is negative \rightarrow output is too high \rightarrow decrease $w_j \rightarrow$ decrease output \rightarrow decrease error

If input < 0:

If error is positive \to output is too low \to decrease $w_j\to$ increase output \to decrease error

Riducendo w_j é minore il peso che $input_j$ ha nella somma e di conseguenza maggiore l'ouput dato che l'input é minore di 0

If error is negative \rightarrow output is too high \rightarrow increase $w_j \rightarrow$ decrease output \rightarrow decrease error

3.5 LBE

 $h_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i \to 0}^{m} w_i \phi_i(\mathbf{x})$ Pay attention to the dimension of the input now it is m and m > n

3.6 Tikhonov and STL

Thikhonov regularization

$$E(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{p \to 1}^{l} (y_p - \mathbf{x}_p^T \mathbf{w})^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{w}\|^2$$
$$\|\mathbf{w}\|^2 = \sum_{i} w_i^2$$
$$\mathbf{w}_{new} = \mathbf{w}_{old} + \eta * \Delta \mathbf{w} - 2\lambda \mathbf{w}_{old}$$

SLT

$$\mathbf{R} \leq \mathbf{R}_{emp} + \epsilon(\frac{1}{l}, VCdim, \frac{1}{\delta})$$

- 1. Why Tikhonov can help to have a better bound on R? Because high VC-dim \Leftrightarrow high w values La regularization diminuisce/controlla i valori dei pesi, quindi la VC, quindi R come mostra la SLT
- 2. low $\lambda \to \text{flexible model} \to \text{overfitting}$ high $\lambda \to \text{rigid model} \to \text{underrfitting}$

3.
$$\frac{\delta \lambda \|\mathbf{w}\|^2}{\delta w_j} = \frac{\delta \lambda \sum w_i^2}{\delta w_j} = 2\lambda w_j$$

K-nn 3.7

$$\begin{split} i(\mathbf{x}_{new}) &= arg \ min_j \ d(\mathbf{x}_{new}, \mathbf{x}_j) \\ \text{Euclidian distance} : \ d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j) &= \sqrt{\sum_{i \to 1}^n (x_i - x_{ji})^2} = \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_j\| \end{split}$$

 $\frac{N}{k}$ effective number of parameters: if k is low $\rightarrow \frac{N}{k}$ is high \rightarrow overfitting if k is high $\rightarrow \frac{N}{k}$ is low \rightarrow underfitting where $k\rightarrow 1..N$

- variable scaling and different input ranges have high impact
- computationally expensive
- metric dependent

• Curse of Dimensionality

The volume of the problem space increases so fast that the available data becomes sparse.

In ten dimension (n = 10) we need to cover 80% of the range of each coordinate to capture 10% of data.

Estimates are no longer local.

If we want local estimates we should reduce $k \to \text{overfitting}$

• Sampling density $\alpha l^{\frac{1}{dim}}$

if 100 point are sufficient to estimate a function in \mathbb{R}^1 100¹⁰ are needed to achieve similer accuracy in \mathbb{R}^{10}

• curse of noisy (irrelevant features)

Neural Networks

4.1 Perceptron learning algorithm

$$if \ out \neq d \rightarrow \mathbf{w}_{new} = \mathbf{w}_{old} + \eta d\mathbf{x}$$

 $else \rightarrow do \ nothing$

4.2 Perceptron Convergence Theorem

The perceptron learning algorithm is guarenteed to converge (calssifying correctly all the input patterns) in a finite number of steps if the patterns are linearly separable

Two groups are **linearly separable** in a n-dimensional space if they can be separated by a (n-1)-dimensional hyperplane.

Proof.

```
We can focus only on positive patterns:

Assume (x_i, d_i) where d_i = \pm 1

Linear separable \to \exists \mathbf{w}^* solution such that d_i(\mathbf{w}^*\mathbf{x}_i) \geq \alpha

where \alpha = \min_i d_i(\mathbf{w}^*\mathbf{x}_i) > 0

given \mathbf{x}'_i = (d_i\mathbf{x}_i)

\mathbf{w}^* is a solution \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{w}^* is a solution for (\mathbf{x}'_i, +1)

if \mathbf{w}^* is a solution for \mathbf{x}_i \to d_i(\mathbf{w}^*\mathbf{x}_i) \geq \alpha \to (\mathbf{w}^*d_i\mathbf{x}_i) \geq \alpha \to 1(\mathbf{w}^*\mathbf{x}'_i) \geq \alpha \to

\mathbf{w}^* is a solution for \mathbf{x}'_i

if \mathbf{w}^* is a solution for \mathbf{x}'_i \to (\mathbf{w}^*d_i\mathbf{x}_i) \geq \alpha \to d_i(\mathbf{w}^*\mathbf{x}_i) \geq \alpha \to \mathbf{w}^* is a solution for \mathbf{x}_i

Assume \mathbf{w}(0) = 0, \eta = 1 and \beta = \max_i |\mathbf{x}_i|^2

After q misclassifications (all false negative)

\mathbf{w}(q) = \sum_{j \to 1}^q \mathbf{x}_{(i_j)}

beacuse \mathbf{w}(j) = \mathbf{w}(j-1) + \mathbf{x}_{i_j}
```

Lower bound on $\|\mathbf{w}(q)\|$

$$\mathbf{w}^* \mathbf{w}(q) = \mathbf{w}^* \sum_{j}^{q} \mathbf{x}_{i_j} \ge q\alpha$$

$$(\mathbf{w}\mathbf{v})^2 \le \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 (Cauchy - Swartz\ inequality)$$

$$\|\mathbf{w}^*\|^2 \|\mathbf{w}(q)\|^2 \ge (\mathbf{w}^* \mathbf{w}(q))^2 \ge (q\alpha)^2$$

$$\|\mathbf{w}(q)\|^2 \ge \frac{(q\alpha)^2}{\|\mathbf{w}^*\|^2}$$

Upper bound on $\|\mathbf{w}(q)\|$

$$\|\mathbf{w}(q)\|^{2} = \|\mathbf{w}(q-1) + \mathbf{x}_{i_{q}}\|^{2} = \|\mathbf{w}(q-1)\|^{2} + 2\mathbf{w}(q-1)\mathbf{x}_{i_{q}} + \|\mathbf{x}_{i_{q}}\|^{2}$$

$$2\mathbf{w}(q-1)\mathbf{x}_{i_{q}} < 0$$

$$\|\mathbf{w}(q)\|^{2} \le \|\mathbf{w}(q-1)\|^{2} + \|\mathbf{x}_{i_{q}}\|^{2}$$

$$\|\mathbf{w}(q)\|^{2} \le \sum_{j}^{q} \|\mathbf{x}_{i_{j}}\|^{2} \le q\beta$$

$$\|\mathbf{w}(q)\|^{2} \le q\beta$$

4.3 Cybenko's Theorem

A single hidden-layer network (with logistic activation functions) can approximate (arbitrarly well) every continuous function (on hyper cubes) provided enough units in the hidden layer.

$$\forall x \in hypercube, \exists h such that |f(x) - h(x)| < \epsilon$$

4.4 Sigmoid activation function

First derivative

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta x} \frac{1}{g(x)} = -\frac{g(x)'}{g(x)^2}$$
$$\frac{\delta}{\delta x} e^{f(x)} = e^{f(x)} \frac{\delta}{\delta x} f(x)$$
$$f_{\sigma}(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-ax}}$$

Assume a == 1

$$f_{\sigma}'(x) = -\frac{(1+e^{-x})'}{(1+e^{-x})^2} = \frac{e^{-x}}{(1+e^{-x})^2} = \frac{1+e^{-x}-1}{(1+e^{-x})^2} = \frac{1}{1+e^{-x}} \left[\frac{(1+e^{-x})-1}{1+e^{-x}}\right] = \frac{1}{1+e^{-x}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{1+e^{-x}}\right)$$

4.5 Δw_j

$$\frac{\delta E(\mathbf{w})}{\delta w_j} = \frac{\delta \sum_{p} \frac{1}{2} (d_p - f_{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}_p^T \mathbf{w}))^2}{\delta w_j} = \sum_{p} \left(\frac{\delta (d_p - f_{\sigma}(net))^2}{\delta net} \frac{\delta net}{\delta w_j} \right) = \sum_{p} \frac{1}{2} \left(2(d_p - f_{\sigma}(net)) \frac{(d_p - f_{\sigma}(net))}{\delta net} \frac{\mathbf{x}_p^T \mathbf{w}}{\delta w_j} \right) = \sum_{p} (d_p - f_{\sigma}(net)) (-1) \frac{f_{\sigma}(net)}{\delta net} (x_p)_j$$

4.6 NN with only linear activation functions

$$h(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j} w_{kj} (\sum_{i} w_{ij} x_i) = \sum_{i} (\sum_{j} w_{kj} w_{ij}) x_i$$

Example with two hidden units:

$$w_{k1}(w_{11}x_1 + w_{12}x_2) + w_{k2}(w_{12}x_1 + w_{22}x_2)$$
$$(w_{k1}w_{11} + w_{k2}w_{12})x_1 + (w_{k1}w_{21} + w_{k2}w_{22})x_2$$

4.7 Cascade Correlation

Derivative of absolute value

$$\frac{\delta |f(x)|}{\delta x} = sign(f(x)) \frac{\delta f(x)}{\delta x}$$

$$S = \sum_{k} |S_{k}| \quad \frac{\delta S}{\delta w_{j}} = \sum_{k} signS_{k} \frac{\delta S_{k}}{\delta w_{j}}$$

$$\frac{\delta S_{k}}{\delta w_{j}} = \frac{\delta \sum_{p} (O_{p} - mean_{p}(O))err_{k,p}}{\delta w_{j}}$$

$$err_{k,p} = E_{k,p} - mean_{p}(E_{k})$$

$$\frac{\delta \sum_{p} (O_{p} - mean_{p}(O))err_{k,p}}{\delta O_{p}} \frac{\delta O_{p}}{\delta net_{p}} \frac{\delta net_{p}}{\delta w_{j}}$$

$$err_{k,p} f'(net_{p})(I_{j})_{p} = \frac{\delta S_{k}}{\delta w_{j}}$$

Backpropagation

$$E_{TOT} = \sum_{p} E_{p}$$

$$E_{p} = \sum_{k} \frac{1}{2} (y_{k} - o_{k})^{2}$$

$$\Delta_{p} w_{ti} = -\frac{\delta E_{p}}{\delta w_{ti}} = -\frac{\delta E_{p}}{\delta net_{t}} \frac{\delta net_{t}}{\delta w_{ti}} = \delta_{t} o_{i}$$

$$\frac{\delta net_{t}}{\delta w_{ti}} = \frac{\delta \sum_{r} w_{tr} o_{r}}{\delta w_{ti}} = o_{i}$$

$$\delta_{t} = -\frac{\delta E_{p}}{\delta net_{t}} = -\frac{\delta E_{p}}{\delta o_{t}} \frac{\delta o_{t}}{\delta net_{t}}$$

$$\frac{\delta o_{t}}{\delta net_{t}} = \frac{\delta f_{t}(net_{t})}{\delta net_{t}} = f'_{t}(net_{t})$$

If t == k and k is an output unit:

$$-\frac{\delta E_p}{\delta o_k} = -\frac{\delta \frac{1}{2} \sum_r (y_r - o_r)^2}{\delta o_k} = (y_k - o_k)$$
$$\delta_k = (y_k - o_k) f_k'(net_k) = -\frac{\delta E_p}{\delta net_k}$$

If t == j and j is and hidden unit:

$$-\frac{\delta E_p}{\delta o_j} = \sum_k -\frac{\delta E_p}{\delta net_k} \frac{\delta net_k}{\delta o_j} = \sum_k \delta_k w_{kj}$$
$$\frac{\delta net_k}{\delta o_j} = \frac{\sum_r w_{kr} o_r}{\delta o_j} = w_{kj}$$
$$\delta_j = (\sum_k \delta_k w_{kj}) f_j'(net_j)$$

Since training examples provide target values t_k only for network outputs, no target values are directly available to indicate the error of the hidden units' values. Instead, the error term for hidden unit j is calculated by summing the error terms δ_k for each output unit influenced by j, weighting each of the δ_k 's by w_{kj} , the weight from hidden unit j to output unit k. This weight characterizes the degree to which hidden unit j is "responsible for" the error output uni k. [Mitchell]

SVM

6.1 Vapnik's Theorem

Let D denote the diameter of the smallest ball containing all the input vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots \mathbf{x}_n$. The set of optimal hyperplanes described by the equation

$$\mathbf{w}_o^T \mathbf{x} + b_o = 0$$

has VC dimension h bounded from above as

$$h \leq \min\{ \left\lceil \frac{D^2}{\rho^2} \right\rceil, m_0\} + 1$$

where m_0 is the dimensionality of the input space. [Haykin]

6.2 Cover's Theorem

A multidimensional space may be transformed into a new feature space where the patterns are linearly separable with high probability, provided two conditions are satisfied:

- 1. the transformation is non linear
- 2. the dimensionality of the feature space is high enough [Haykin]

6.3 SVM and curse of dimensionality

Numerical optimization in a high-dimensional space suffers from the curse of dimensionality. This computational problem is avoided by using the notion of an inner-product kernel (defined in accordance with Mercer's theorem) and solving the dual form of the constrained optimization problem formulated in the input space. [Haykin]

Bias Variance

7.1 Variance Lemma

Expected value or mean

$$\underline{Z} = E_P[Z] = \sum_{i \to 1}^n z_i P(z_i)$$

Variance

$$Var[Z] = E[(Z - \underline{Z})^2] = \sum_{i \to 1}^{n} (z_i - \underline{Z})^2 P(z_i) = [...] = E[Z^2] - \underline{Z}^2$$

We will use the form

$$E[Z^2] = \underline{Z}^2 + E[(Z - \underline{Z})^2]$$

7.2 Bias-Varince Decomposition

$$E_p[(y - h(\mathbf{x}))^2] = E_P[h(\mathbf{x})^2] + E_P[y^2] - 2E_P[y]E_P[h(\mathbf{x})]$$

 $E_P[XY] = E_P[X]E_P[Y] \Leftrightarrow X$ and Y are independent In this case y and h(x) are independent.

$$\overline{h}(\mathbf{x}) = E_P[h(\mathbf{x})]$$

$$E_P[h(\mathbf{x})^2] = E_P[(h(\mathbf{x}) - \overline{h}(\mathbf{x}))^2] + \overline{h}(\mathbf{x})^2$$

$$E_P[y] = E_P[f(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon] = f(\mathbf{x})$$

$$E_P[y^2] = E_P[(y - f(\mathbf{x}))^2] + f(\mathbf{x})^2$$
[...]
$$E_P[(h(\mathbf{x}) - \overline{h}(\mathbf{x}))^2] \quad variance$$

$$(\overline{h}(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}))^2 \quad bias^2$$

$$E_P[(y - f(\mathbf{x}))^2] \quad noise$$

Unsupervised Learning

8.1 **Quantization Error**

$$E = \sum_{i} \sum_{j} \|\mathbf{x}_{i} - \mathbf{w}_{j}\|^{2} \delta_{winner}(i, j)$$

8.2 K-means

$$\Delta \mathbf{w}_{i^*} = \eta \, \delta_{winner}(i, i^*) (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{w}_{i^*})$$

SOM8.3

Competitive stage

$$i^*(\mathbf{x}) = arg \, min_i \, \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{w}_i\|$$

Cooperative stage

$$\mathbf{w}_{i}(t+1) = \mathbf{w}_{i}(t) + \eta(t)h_{i,i*}(t)[\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{w}_{i}(t)]$$

$$h_{i,i*}(t) = exp(-\frac{\|\mathbf{r}_{i} - \mathbf{r}_{i*}\|^{2}}{2\sigma_{nh}^{2}(t)})$$
where \mathbf{r}_{i} are the coord of unit i and σ is the widht

$$h_{i,i*}(t) = exp(-\frac{\|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_{i*}\|^2}{2\sigma^2(t)})$$

Bayesian Learning

Chain Rule

$$P(x_1, ..., x_i, ..., x_n | y) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} P(x_i | x_1, ..., x_{i-1}, y))$$

$$P(x_1, x_2, x_2 | y) = P(x_1 | x_2, x_2, y) P(x_2 | x_2, y) P($$

 $P(x_1, x_2, x_3|y) = P(x_1|x_2, x_3, y)P(x_2|x_3, y)P(x_3, y)$

Marginalization

$$P(X_1 = x_1) = \sum_{x_2} P(X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2) = \sum_{x_2} P(X_1 = x_1 | X_2 = x_2) P(X_2 = x_2)$$

Bayes Rule, hypotesis $h_i \in H$, observations **d**

$$P(h_i|\mathbf{d}) = \frac{P(\mathbf{d}|h_i)P(h_i)}{P(\mathbf{d})} = \frac{P(\mathbf{d}|h_i)P(h_i)}{\sum_j P(\mathbf{d}|h_j)P(h_j)}$$

 $P(h_i)$ is the **prior** probability

 $P(\mathbf{d}|h_i)$ is the **likelihood**

 $P(\mathbf{d})$ is the **marginal** probability of \mathbf{d} (can't be computed)

 $P(h_i|\mathbf{d})$ is the **posterior** probability

Conditional Independence

$$I(X,Y|Z) \Leftrightarrow P(X,Y|Z) = P(X|Z)P(Y|Z)$$

Bayesian Learning

$$P(X|\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{d}) = \sum_{i} P(X|\mathbf{d}, h_i)P(h_i|\mathbf{d}) = \sum_{i} P(X|h_i)P(h_i|\mathbf{d})$$

MAP

$$\begin{split} h_{MAP} = \arg\max_{h \in H} & P(h|\mathbf{d}) = \arg\max_{h \in H} \frac{P(\mathbf{d}|h)P(h)}{P(\mathbf{d})} = \\ & \arg\max_{h \in H} & P(\mathbf{d}|h)P(h) \end{split}$$

ML

$$h_{ML} = arg \, max_{h \in H} P(\mathbf{d}|h)$$

Data likelihood can be computed under the assumption that observations are independently and identically distributed (i.i.d)

$$P(\mathbf{d}|h_i) = \prod_{j \to 1}^N P(d_j|h_i)$$