

- Unit 1: Bayes Rule, Approximate Inference, Hyperparameters
- Unit 2: Gaussian Processes, Covariance Function, Kernel
- Unit 3: GP: Regression
- Unit 4: GP: Classification
- Unit 5: Implementation: Laplace Approximation, Low Rank Methods
- Unit 6: Implementation: Low Rank Methods, Bayes Committee Machine
- Unit 7: Relevance Vector Machine: Priors on Coefficients
- Unit 8: Relevance Vector Machine: Efficient Optimization and Extensions

$\tt http://mlg.anu.edu.au/{\sim}smola/summer2002/$

Overview of Unit 7: Relvance Vector Machine

- 01: Data-Dependent Priors
- 02: Applications
- 03: Recall: Coefficient Priors
- 04: Example: Neurons
- 05: Example: Independent Sources
- 06: Example: Kernel Expansions
- 07: Convergence to Gaussian Processes
- 08: Proof
- 09: Posterior
- 10: The RVM Idea
- 11: Example: Gamma-Hyperprior
- 12: Example: Normal-Hyperprior
- 13: General Hyperpriors
- 14: More Examples
- 15: Practical Problem: Inference



Problem

We are wasting information if we ignore the training patterns in specifying our prior.

Solution: Revisiting Bayes' Rule

$$P(f|X,Y) = \frac{P(Y|f,X)P(f|X)}{P(Y|X)}$$

This means that we already have a **data dependent prior**. The problem with data-independence only arose from the standard approximation p(f|X) = p(f). Note: the same connection applies to densities.

Consequence

We need to find suitable data-dependent priors which correspond to useful priors over function spaces. If we know p(X), we obviously have

$$p(f) = \int p(f|X) p(X) dX.$$

Examples



Density Dependent Capacity

We can allow for a higher complexity function where we have a large amount of data.



Different Regimes

Data might come from N different sources, which can be distinguished solely based on x_1, \ldots, x_m . So, depending on which source, we will switch between priors $p_1(f), \ldots, p_N(f)$.



Recall: Coefficient Priors

Function Expansion

Assume that f can be expanded into a linear model of type

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \alpha_i f_i(x)$$

where $\{f_i(x)\}$ is a suitable set of functions. This could, e.g., be a kernel, i.e., m = M and $f_i = k(x_i, x)$. Note: k is arbitrary, e.g., we do not require positivity.

Factorizing Priors

Analogously to a factorizing assumption on the observations we may also assume

$$p(f) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} p(\alpha_i)$$
 where $f = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i f_i$

Motivation

The basis functions f_i correspond to independent "factors" causing the observations, e.g., neurons firing independently but rarely, image elements occurring, etc.

Examples



Brain Signals (gross oversimplification)

Neurons fire independently, and very rarely, however, we only observe the signal from several neurons at the same time, possibly several observations with different linear combinations thereof.



Cocktail Party Problem

Assume many speakers, talking (not necessarily to each other) independently. We have many microphones, what is the signal we receive on each microphone? What were the underlying signals?



Example: Kernel Expansions

Expansion

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i k(x_i, x) \text{ and } p(f) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} p(\alpha_i)$$

Rationale

- Convenient way of specifying data-dependent prior
- Increases capacity automatically where much data occurs
- Easy to optimize
- Easy to explain (linear model)
- Nice theoretical properties

Examples

$$p(\alpha) \propto \exp(-|\alpha|^p), \ p(\alpha) = \text{BesselK}(0, |\alpha|), \ p(\alpha) = \frac{1}{s_i} \alpha^{-s}, \dots$$



- Denote by α_i independent random variables (we do not require identical distributions on α_i) with **unit variance and zero mean**.
- Assume that there exists a **distribution** p(x) on \mathfrak{X} according to which a sample $\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$ is drawn.
- Assume that k(x, x') is **bounded** on $\mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{X}$.

Then the random variable y(x) given by

$$y(x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i k(x_i, x)$$

converges for $m \to \infty$ to a Gaussian process with zero mean and covariance function

$$\tilde{k}(x,x') = \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(x,\bar{x})k(x',\bar{x})p(\bar{x})d\bar{x}.$$





Normal Distribution of Linear Combinations

We need only check is that y(x) and any linear combination $\sum_j y(x_j)$ (for arbitrary $x'_j \in \mathfrak{X}$) converge to a normal distribution. By application of a theorem of Cramér, this is sufficient to prove that y(x) is distributed according to a Gaussian Process.

Computing y(x)

The random variable y(x) is a sum of m independent random variables with bounded variance (since k(x, x') is bounded on $\mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{X}$). Therefore in the limit $m \to \infty$, by virtue of the Central Limit Theorem, we have

$$y(x) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2(x))$$
 for some $\sigma^2(x) \in \mathbb{R}$

Linear Combinations For arbitrary $x'_j \in \mathcal{X}$, linear combinations of $y(x'_j)$ also have Gaussian distributions since

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{i} y(x'_{j}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_{i} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{i} k(x_{i}, x'_{j}).$$



Central Limit Theorem on Linear Combination

We may apply the Central Limit Theorem to the sum since the inner sum $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_i k(x_i, x'_j)$ is bounded for any x_i . This also implies that $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_j y(x'_j) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ for $m \to \infty$ and some $\sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}$, which proves that y(x) is distributed according to a GP.

Computing an equivalent Gaussian Process

Note that y(x) has zero mean. Thus the covariance function for finite m can be found as expectation with respect to the random variables α_i ,

$$E[y(x)y(x')] = E\left[\frac{1}{m}\sum_{i,j=1}^{m} \alpha_i \alpha_j k(x_i, x)k(x_j, x')\right] = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^{m} k(x_i, x)k(x_j, x'),$$

since the α_i are independent and have zero mean. This converges to the Riemann integral over \mathfrak{X} with the density p(x) as $m \to \infty$. Thus

$$E[y(x)y(x')] \underset{m \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(x,\bar{x})k(x',\bar{x})p(\bar{x})d\bar{x}.$$



Example: Linear Kernel

 $k(x, x') = \langle x, x' \rangle$ and coefficient-based prior. Here we have

$$\tilde{k}(x,x') = \int_{\mathcal{X}} k(x,\bar{x})k(x',\bar{x})p(\bar{x})d\bar{x} = x^{\top} \left(\int \bar{x}\bar{x}^{\top}p(\bar{x})d\bar{x}\right)x' = x^{\top} \left(\operatorname{Cov}[x]\right)x'.$$

Example: Gaussian Kernel

For a kernel $k(x, x') = \exp(-\frac{1}{2}||x - x'||^2)$ and $p(x) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\exp(-\frac{1}{2}x^2)$ we obtain for \tilde{k}

$$\tilde{k}(x,x') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \exp\left(-\frac{3}{5}(x-x')^2\right) \exp\left(-\frac{2}{5}\langle x,x'\rangle\right)$$

Note

The specific form of $p(\alpha_i)$ is irrelevant for \tilde{k} , as long as the variance is bounded (of course, this holds only in the limit).

Consequence

We can look for priors which allow for many zero coefficients α_i .



Posterior

For a kernel expansion, the posterior can be found as

$$p(\alpha|X,Y) \propto \prod_{i=1}^{m} p(y_i|f(x_i))p(\alpha_i)$$
 where $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i k(x_i,x)$.

Problem

For rather arbitrary priors, this is a difficult optimization problem. We would rather like to have a Gaussian prior . . .

Idea

Rewrite $p(\alpha)$ as $\int p(\alpha|s)p(s)ds$, i.e., by means of a Hyperparameterwhere $p(\alpha|s)$ is Gaussian (and optimize via MAP2).

Result

$$p(\alpha|X,Y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \prod_{i=1}^m p(y_i|f(x_i))p(\alpha_i|s_i)ds_1\dots ds_m$$



Example: Gamma-Hyperprior





Example: Normal-Hyperprior



Effective Prior

For the normal prior
$$p(\alpha|s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi s^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2s^2}\alpha^2\right)$$
 we have

$$p(\alpha) = \int \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi s^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2s^2}\alpha^2\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\omega^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\omega^2}s^2\right) ds \propto \text{BesselK}(0, |\omega|).$$

General Hyperpriors

Problem

How can we find a suitable hyperprior p(s) for a given $p(\alpha)$ such that

$$p(\alpha) = \int p(\alpha|s)p(s)ds = \int \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi s^2}} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2s^2}\alpha^2\right)p(s)ds$$

Solution (after Girosi, 1991)

Parameter transformation $\beta = \frac{1}{2\omega^2}$ leads to

$$p(\alpha) = \int \exp\left(-\beta\alpha\right) \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{8\pi\beta}} p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\beta}}\right)\right] d\beta$$

That is, $p(\alpha)$ is the **Laplace Transform** of $\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{8\pi\beta}}p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\beta}}\right)\right]$.

Strategy

Given $p(\alpha)$ we only need to find its **inverse** Laplace Transform $\mathcal{L}^{-1}p$ to obtain p(s).





Polynomial Priors

For
$$p(\alpha) = \exp(-|\alpha|^{-a})$$
 for $a > 1$ we have

$$\left[\mathcal{L}^{-1}p\right](s) = \frac{s^{a-1}}{\Gamma(a)} \text{ hence } p(s) = \sqrt{2\pi} \frac{2^{1-a}}{\Gamma(a)} \omega^{-2a}$$

Consequence

- We can deal quite conveniently with priors which do not lead to a lower-bounded optimization problem.
- Large a leads to priors highly peaked at 0 (hence a very sparse code).
- For a > 1.5 the variance of s is bounded, hence we get a limiting Gaussian Process.
- For more examples see Bronstein & Semendjajev, Abramovitz & Stegun, etc.

MAP2 Approximation

Instead of computing the integral over m hyperparameters, we approximate by maximizing

$$p(Y|X, Y, s) \propto \left(\int_{\alpha} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \underbrace{p(y_i|f(x_i))}_{\text{Likelihood}} \underbrace{p(\alpha_i|s_i)}_{\text{Prior}} d\alpha \right) \underbrace{p(s_i)}_{\text{Hyperprior}} d\alpha$$

Fixed Point Iteration

For given s, find new s' that approximately minimizes the first derivative of p(s|X, Y). Repeat until a (local) minimum has been obtained.

Confidence

For fixed s we use the normal distribution in Y as a measure for the confidence.