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For simplicity we assume 1-dim (scalar) features $x$ as far we can

In previous two lectures:

$$
\text { posterior }=\frac{\text { likelihood } \times \text { prior }}{\text { evidence }}
$$

In practice:

- uknown quantities
- estimate from training data $\mathcal{T}=\left\{\left(x_{1}, s_{1}\right),\left(x_{2}, s_{2}\right), \ldots\left(x_{1}, s_{1}\right)\right\}$

| $s / x$ | 5 g | 10 g | 15 g | 20 g | 25 g | $\sum$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 1 CZK | 15 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{2 8}$ |
| 2 CZK | 7 | 13 | 16 | 6 | 1 | $\mathbf{4 3}$ |
| 5 CZK | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 15 | $\mathbf{2 9}$ |
| $\sum$ | 22 | 24 | 21 | 17 | 16 | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

- What if $x=17$ ? Interpolate somehow?
- Two weighting devices $A, B . x_{A}=16, x_{B}=19$ what to do?


## Problem: tossing coing, is it fair, how is the $P$ (head)?

Probability (density/distribution) estimation from samples
Try to draw the density function, guessing from the samples The data $x$ inded scalar - the quasi 2D plot is for visualisation, only the $x$-axis matters. Think about weight feature.
We drop the class index.
About normalization - think about assigning 1 to the max and 0 to min
Training data (for one of the class): $\mathcal{T}=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, \ldots, x_{1000}\right\}$


- Range normalized $<0,1>$
- Analysis per class (for each class separately).


## Probability density/distribution



## Estimation methods

## Parametric

- Distribution is a function with (a few) parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}=\left(\theta_{1}, \theta_{2}, \ldots, \theta_{D}\right)$
- Example: the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}\left(x \mid \mu, \sigma^{2}\right)$.

Non-parametric

- Function of many parameters.
- But parameters disappear from estimation methods.
- Examples: K-nearest neighbours, histogram, Parzen window.


## Tossing coin. Likelihood

Tossed $2 \times$, two heads $\mathcal{T}=\{\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}\}$.
We assume iid.

$$
P\left(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} \mid p_{H}=0.5\right)=
$$

iid - independent (one toss does not influence the other), identically (the same coin) distributed.
Think about difference between $P\left(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H} \mid p_{H}\right)$ vs $P\left(p_{H} \mid \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}\right)$.
Likelihood $\mathcal{L}$ is not a probability, why?
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Tossing coin, Maximum likelihood estimate
Log the whole product and $\partial p_{H}$, and at the end,

$$
p_{H}=\frac{\sum x_{n}}{N}
$$

Bernoulli distribution is a special case of Binomial distribution for $n=1$.

$$
\mathcal{L}\left(p_{H} \mid \mathcal{T}\right)=p\left(\mathcal{T} \mid p_{H}\right)=\prod_{i=1}^{N} p\left(x_{n} \mid p_{H}\right)=\prod_{i=1}^{N} p_{H}^{x_{n}}\left(1-p_{H}\right)^{1-x_{n}}
$$

## (Bernoulli distribution)

What is the best $p_{H}$ ?

## Maximum Likelihood (ML)

Observations $\mathcal{T}=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, \ldots, x_{N}\right\}$; known parametric form of the likelihood function $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta})=p(\mathcal{T} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})$.

Maximum likelihood estimate:

$$
\boldsymbol{\theta}=\underset{\boldsymbol{\theta}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta})=\underset{\boldsymbol{\theta}}{\operatorname{argmax}} p(\mathcal{T} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})
$$

We assume independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) samples $x$ in $\mathcal{T}$.

$$
\boldsymbol{\theta}=\underset{\boldsymbol{\theta}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \prod_{i=1}^{N} p\left(x_{i} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}\right)
$$

We can do log-likelihood (logarithm is an increasing function).
$p(\mathcal{T} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})$ likelihood that the data $\mathcal{T}$ were generated by the density/distribution function with parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. If parameters are correct they will do larger probabilites (hence the max) compared to the wrong ones
Independent - we can use the product of individual probabilies Identically - from the same distribution

Derivation on the blackboard, or by yourself. You can also logarithm the whole thing.

$$
\mu_{M L}=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_{i}
$$

$$
\mathcal{N}(x \mid \mu, \sigma)=\frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2 \pi}} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2 \sigma^{2}}(x-\mu)^{2}\right]
$$

$$
p\left(\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{N}\right\} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}\right)=\prod_{i=1}^{N} p\left(x_{i} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}\right)
$$

$$
p(\mathcal{T} \mid \mu, \sigma)=\frac{1}{\sigma^{N} \sqrt{(2 \pi)^{N}}} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2 \sigma^{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(x_{i}-\mu\right)^{2}\right]
$$

We are looking for an extremum of $p(\mathcal{T} \mid \mu, \sigma)$

## Why the Normal distribution

## Central Limit Theorem

$$
X=X_{A}+X_{B}+X_{C}
$$

$X_{A, B, C}$ random variables with uniform distributions

## Does ML solve it all?

- Tossing coing, $\mathcal{T}=\{\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{T}, \mathrm{T}\}$
- What the ML estimate of $p_{H}$ ?
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## Does ML solve it all?

- Tossing coing, $\mathcal{T}=\{T, T, T\}$
- What the ML estimate of $p_{H}$ ?
- Would you believe it?
-What is missing?
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## (Conjugate) Prior:

$p\left(p_{H} \mid a, b\right) \sim p_{H}^{a}\left(1-p_{H}\right)^{b}$


Conjugate because the likelihood and the prior have the same form. The prior $p\left(p_{H} \mid a, b\right)$ is actually the Beta distribution, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Beta_distribution

## Using the prior

$$
\begin{gathered}
p\left(h, N \mid p_{H}\right) \sim p_{H}^{h}\left(1-p_{H}\right)^{N-h} \\
p\left(p_{H} \mid a, b\right) \sim p_{H}^{a}\left(1-p_{H}\right)^{b}
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
p\left(p_{H} \mid h, N\right) \sim p\left(h, N \mid p_{H}\right) p\left(p_{H}\right) \sim p_{H}^{h+a}\left(1-p_{H}\right)^{N-h+b}
$$

Looking for extremum

$$
\frac{\partial p\left(p_{H} \mid h, N\right)}{\partial p_{H}}=0
$$

yields

$$
p_{H}=\frac{h+a}{N+a+b}
$$

Hyperparamaters $a, b$ as regularization

## Maximimum aposteriori estimate

See the map.m demo.


## Estimation methods

## Parametric

- Distribution is a function with (a few) parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}=\left(\theta_{1}, \theta_{2}, \ldots, \theta_{D}\right)$
- Example: the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}\left(x \mid \mu, \sigma^{2}\right)$.


## Estimation methods

Non-parametric

- Function of many parameters.
- But parameters disappear from estimation methods.
- Examples: K-nearest neighbours, histogram, Parzen window.


## Histogram as piecewise constant density estimate

Histogram with $B$ bins.
For a given $B$, the parameters of this piecewise-constant function are the heights $d_{1}, d_{2}, \ldots, d_{B}$ of the individual bins. This function is denoted $p\left(x \mid\left\{d_{1}, d_{2}, \ldots, d_{B}\right\}\right)$.


For the given number of bins $B, d_{1}, d_{2}, \ldots, d_{B}$ must conform to the constraint that the area under the function must sum up to one,
bin width
$1=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p\left(x \mid\left\{d_{1}, d_{2}, \ldots, d_{B}\right\}\right) \mathrm{d} x=\sum_{i=1}^{B} \int_{\frac{i-1}{B}}^{\frac{i}{B}} d_{i} \mathrm{~d} x=\sum_{i=1}^{B} d_{i} w=\sum_{i=1}^{B} \frac{d_{i}}{B}$.

## Finding $d_{i}$ using ML
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## Finding $d_{i}$ using ML

$$
L(\mathcal{T})=p(\mathcal{T} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta})=\prod_{i=1}^{N} p\left(x_{i} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}\right)=\prod_{j=1}^{B} \overbrace{\left(\prod_{k=1}^{N_{j}} d_{j}\right)}^{\text {points in } j \text {-th bin }}=\prod_{j=1}^{B} d_{j}^{N_{j}} .
$$

Maximization task:

$$
\ell(\mathcal{T})=\sum_{j=1}^{B} N_{j} \log d_{j} \rightarrow \max , \quad \text { subject to } \frac{1}{B} \sum_{j=1}^{B} d_{j}=1
$$

$$
\text { Lagrangian: } \sum_{j=1}^{B} N_{j} \log d_{j}+\lambda\left(\frac{1}{B} \sum_{j=1}^{B} d_{j}-1\right)
$$

## Finding $d_{i}$ using ML

$$
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$$
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$$
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$$
\frac{N_{j}}{d_{j}}+\frac{\lambda}{B}=0 \Rightarrow \frac{d_{j}}{N_{j}}=\text { const. } \Rightarrow d_{j}=B \frac{N_{j}}{N}
$$

## Different number of bins



## K-Nearest neighbors density estimates

Find $K$ neighbors, the density estimate is then $p \sim 1 / V$ where $V$ is the volume of a minimum cell containing $K \mathrm{NNs}$.


## Maximum likelihood estimation

$$
\ell(w)=\ln .
$$

## after some derivation, ..., weighted average
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w=\frac{x_{A} \sigma_{A}^{-2}+x_{B} \sigma_{B}^{-2}}{\sigma_{A}^{-2}+\sigma_{B}^{-2}}
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(Back to the coin example) Two weighting devices $A, B$ with some $\sigma_{A}, \sigma_{B}$ measure $x_{A}=16, x_{B}=19$.
What is the ML estimate of the weight $w$ ?

- Devices independent:

$$
\mathcal{L}(w)=p\left(x_{A}, x_{B} \mid w\right)=p\left(x_{A} \mid w\right) p\left(x_{B} \mid w\right)
$$
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## - Sensors Gaussian:

$$
\mathcal{L}(w)=\frac{1}{\sigma_{A} \sqrt{2 \pi}} \exp \left[-\frac{\left(x_{A}-w\right)^{2}}{2 \sigma_{A}^{2}}\right] \times \frac{1}{\sigma_{B} \sqrt{2 \pi}} \exp \left[-\frac{\left(x_{B}-w\right)^{2}}{2 \sigma_{B}^{2}}\right]
$$
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