## Learning Under Uncertainty

$>$ We want to learn models from data.

$$
P(\text { model } \mid \text { data })=\frac{P(\text { data } \mid \text { model }) \times P(\text { model })}{P(\text { data })}
$$

$>$ The likelihood, $P$ (data $\mid$ model $)$, is the probability that this model would have produced this data.
$>$ The prior, $P($ model $)$, encodes the learning bias

## Bayesian Leaning of Probabilities

Suppose there are two outcomes $A$ and $\neg A$. We would like to learn the probability of $A$ given some data.
$>$ We can treat the probability of $A$ as a real-valued random variable on the interval $[0,1]$, called probA.

$$
P(\text { prob } A=p \mid \text { data })=\frac{P(\text { data } \mid \text { prob } A=p) \times P(\text { prob } A=p)}{P(\text { data })}
$$

$>$ Suppose the data is a sequence of $n A$ 's out of independent $m$ trials,

$$
P(\text { data } \mid \text { prob } A=p)=p^{n} \times(1-p)^{m-n}
$$

$>$ Uniform prior: $P(p r o b A=p)=1$ for all $p \in[0,1]$.

## Posterior Probabilities for Different Data



## MAP model

The maximum a posteriori probability (MAP) model is the model that maximizes $P($ model $\mid d a t a)$. That is, it maximizes:

$$
P(\text { data } \mid \text { model }) \times P(\text { model })
$$

Thus it minimizes:

$$
(-\log P(\text { data } \mid \text { model }))+(-\log P(\text { model }))
$$

which is the number of bits to send the data given the model plus the number of bits to send the model.

## Information theory overview

> A bit is a binary digit.
$>1$ bit can distinguish 2 items
$>k$ bits can distinguish $2^{k}$ items
> $n$ items can be distinguished using $\log _{2} n$ bits

- Can you do better?


## Information and Probability

Let's design a code to distinguish elements of $\{a, b, c, d\}$ with

$$
P(a)=\frac{1}{2}, P(b)=\frac{1}{4}, P(c)=\frac{1}{8}, P(d)=\frac{1}{8}
$$

Consider the code:

$$
\begin{array}{llllllll}
a & 0 & & b & 10 & c & 110 & d
\end{array}
$$

This code sometimes uses 1 bit and sometimes uses 3 bits.
On average, it uses

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P(a) \times 1+P(b) \times 2+P(c) \times 3+P(d) \times 3 \\
& \quad=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{2}{4}+\frac{3}{8}+\frac{3}{8}=1 \frac{3}{4} \text { bits } .
\end{aligned}
$$

The string aacabbda has code 00110010101110.

## Information Content

$>$ To identify $x$, you need $-\log _{2} P(x)$ bits.
$>$ If you have a distribution over a set and want to a identify a member, you need the expected number of bits:

$$
\sum_{x}-P(x) \times \log _{2} P(x)
$$

This is the information content or entropy of the distribution.

The expected number of bits it takes to describe a distribution given evidence $e$ :

$$
I(e)=\sum_{x}-P(x \mid e) \times \log _{2} P(x \mid e)
$$

## Information Gain

If you have a test that can distinguish the cases where $\alpha$ is true from the cases where $\alpha$ is false, the information gain from this test is:

$$
I(\text { true })-(P(\alpha) \times I(\alpha)+P(\neg \alpha) \times I(\neg \alpha))
$$

$>I($ true $)$ is the expected number of bits needed before the test
$>P(\alpha) \times I(\alpha)+P(\neg \alpha) \times I(\neg \alpha)$ is the expected number of bits after the test.

## Averaging Over Models

Idea: Rather than choosing the most likely model, average over all models, weighted by their posterior probabilities given the data.
$>$ If you have observed $n A$ 's out of $m$ trials
$>$ the most likely value (MAP) is $\frac{n}{m}$
$>$ the expected value is $\frac{n+1}{m+2}$

## Learning a Belief Network

$>$ If you
$\nabla$ know the structure
> have observed all of the variables
$>$ have no missing data
$>$ you can learn each conditional probability separately.

## Learning belief network example

Model


## $\rightarrow$ Probabilities

$P(A)$
$P(B)$
$P(E \mid A, B)$
$P(C \mid E)$
$P(D \mid E)$

## Learning conditional probabilities

Each conditional probability distribution can be learned separately:
$>$ For example:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P(E=t \mid A=t \wedge B=f) \\
& \quad=\frac{(\# \text { examples: } E=t \wedge A=t \wedge B=f)+m_{1}}{(\# \text { examples: } A=t \wedge B=f)+m}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $m_{1}$ and $m$ reflect our prior knowledge.
There is a problem when there are many parents to a node as then there is little data for each probability estimate.

## Unobserved Variables


$>$ What if we had only observed values for $A, B, C$ ?

| $A$ | $B$ | $C$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $t$ | $f$ | $t$ |
| $f$ | $t$ | $t$ |
| $t$ | $t$ | $f$ |
|  | $\cdots$ |  |

## EM Algorithm

Augmented Data

| $A$ | $B$ | $C$ | $H$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $t$ | $f$ | $t$ | $t$ |
| $f$ | $t$ | $t$ | $f$ |
| $t$ | $t$ | $f$ | $t$ |
|  |  | $\cdots$ |  |

## Probabilities

$P(A)$
$P(H \mid A)$
$P(B \mid H)$
$P(C \mid H)$

## EM Algorithm

$>$ Repeat the following two steps:
$>$ E-step give the expected number of data points for the unobserved variables based on the given probabilty distribution.

M-step infer the (maximun likelihood) probabilities from the data. This is the same as the full observable case.
> Start either with made-up data or made-up probabilities.
$>$ EM will converge to a local maxima.

## Example Data

| A | B | C | Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| t | t | t | 143 |
| t | t | f | 329 |
| t | f | t | 57 |
| t | f | f | 271 |
| f | t | t | 87 |
| f | t | f | 66 |
| f | f | t | 23 |
| f | f | f | 24 |

# Naive Bayesian Classifier 



## Unsupervised Learning

$>$ Given a collection of data, find natural classifications.
> This can be seen as the naive Bayesian classifier with the classification unobserved.
$>$ EM can be used to learn classification.

## Bayesian learning of decision trees

$$
P(\text { model } \mid \text { data })=\frac{P(\text { data } \mid \text { model }) \times P(\text { model })}{P(\text { data }) .}
$$

A model here is a decision tree

- We allow for decision trees with probabilities at the leaves

A bigger decision tree can always fit the data better
> $P$ (model) lets us encode a preference for smaller decision trees.

## Data for decision tree learning

| att $_{1}$ | att $_{2}$ | class | count |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| t | t | c 1 | 10 |
| t | t | c 2 | 3 |
| t | f | c 1 | 5 |
| t | f | c 2 | 12 |
| f | t | c 1 | 7 |
| f | t | c 2 | 14 |
| f | f | c 1 | 8 |
| f | f | c 2 | 1 |

## Probabilities From Experts

> Bayes rule lets us combine expert knowledge with data

$$
P(\text { model } \mid \text { data })=\frac{P(\text { data } \mid \text { model }) \times P(\text { model })}{P(\text { data })}
$$

$>$ The experts prior knowledge of the model (i.e., $P($ model $)$ ) can be expressed as a pair $\langle n, m\rangle$ that can be interpreted as though they had observed $n A$ 's out of $m$ trials.
$>$ This estimate can be combined with data.
$>$ Estimates from multiple experts can be combined together.

