Mixtures



Gilles de Hollander January 25, 2017 Machine Learning Reading Group





Given an initial set of k means $m_1^{(1)}, \dots, m_k^{(1)}$ (see below), the algorithm proceeds by alternating between two steps:^[5]

Assignment step: Assign each observation to the cluster whose mean yields the least within-cluster sum of squares (WCSS). Since the sum of squares is the squared Euclidean distance, this is intuitively the "nearest" mean.^[6] (Mathematically, this means partitioning the observations according to the Voronoi diagram generated by the means).

$$S_{i}^{(t)} = ig\{x_{p}: ig\|x_{p}-m_{i}^{(t)}ig\|^{2} \leq ig\|x_{p}-m_{j}^{(t)}ig\|^{2} \ orall j, 1 \leq j \leq kig\},$$

where each x_p is assigned to exactly one $S^{(t)}$, even if it could be assigned to two or more of them.

Update step: Calculate the new means to be the centroids of the observations in the new clusters.

$$m_i^{(t+1)} = rac{1}{|S_i^{(t)}|} \sum_{x_i \in S_i^{(t)}} x_j \; .$$

1. Begin with the disjoint clustering having level L(0) = 0 and sequence number m = 0. 2. Find the least dissimilar pair of clusters in the current clustering, say pair (r), (s), according to

$$d[(r),(s)] = min d[(i),(j)]$$

where the minimum is over all pairs of clusters in the current clustering.

3. Increment the sequence number : m = m + 1. Merge clusters (r) and (s) into a single cluster to form the next clustering m. Set the level of this clustering to

L(m) = d[(r),(s)]

4. Update the proximity matrix, D, by deleting the rows and columns corresponding to clusters (r) and (s) and adding a row and column corresponding to the newly formed cluster. The proximity between the new cluster, denoted (r,s) and old cluster (k) is defined in this way:

d[(k), (r,s)] = min d[(k), (r)], d[(k), (s)]5. If all objects are in one cluster, stop. Else, go to step 2.

- Divide data over clusters minimising some quantity:
 - Distance of data points to cluster center
 - Dissimilarity of data points within cluster
- Many forms of distance (Euclidian, Manhattan, ...)
- "Algorithmic" approach

- Generative Probabilistic Model
 - "Generative Story"
 - Interpretable parameters
 - Likelihood function
 - Maximum Likelihood apparatus
 - Bayesian apparatus





A mixture distribution is a convex combination

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} p_j f_j(x), \qquad p_j \ge 0, \qquad \sum_{j=1}^{k} p_j = 1,$$



How to fit a mixture model?

- Maximum Likelihood
- Bayesian

Identifiability issues

• A parametric family of distributions is said to be identifiable if any two parameter sets define the same probability law on Y, if and only if they are identical.

Identifiability issues

- Label switching
- Overfitting

Label Switching



 $p\mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \sigma_1) + (1-p)\mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \sigma_2) = (1-p)\mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \sigma_2) + p\mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \sigma_1)$

Label Switching



 $p\mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \sigma_1) + (1-p)\mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \sigma_2) = (1-p)\mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \sigma_2) + p\mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \sigma_1)$

K! labeling orderings (1, 2, 6, 24, 120, 720...!)

Overfitting



Overfitting



(Weight of third component is 0.)

Overfitting



Parameters of 2nd and 3rd component are identical

Larry Wasserman

• "I have decided that mixtures, like tequila, are inherently evil and should be avoided at all costs."



Formal constraints

- Parameters of every component have to be different
 - (How different)
 - (At least one? Or all?)
- Ordering of components is based on parameter values
 - e.g., The component with the smallest mean is component number 1, etc.
 - (What if two components have same mean, but different stand deviations)

Andrew Gelman

a mixture model can be a "beast" (as Larry puts it), but this beast can be tamed with a good prior distribution.



Latent variables

| | x | | |
|---|-----------|--|--|
| 0 | 4.247966 | | |
| 1 | 3.180180 | | |
| 2 | 7.912461 | | |
| 3 | 7.291698 | | |
| 4 | 5.474827 | | |
| 5 | 1.708631 | | |
| 6 | 5.608130 | | |
| 7 | 3.913172 | | |
| 8 | 5.513004 | | |
| 9 | -0.935138 | | |
| | | | |

Latent variables

| | x | z1 | z2 |
|---|-----------|-------|-------|
| 0 | 4.247966 | False | True |
| 1 | 3.180180 | False | True |
| 2 | 7.912461 | True | False |
| 3 | 7.291698 | False | True |
| 4 | 5.474827 | True | False |
| 5 | 1.708631 | True | False |
| 6 | 5.608130 | False | True |
| 7 | 3.913172 | True | False |
| 8 | 5.513004 | True | False |
| 9 | -0.935138 | False | True |
| | | | |

Linear summation of Gaussians

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \pi_k \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k).$$



Marginalising over Possible values of z

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{z}} p(\mathbf{z}) p(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{z})$$



$$\ln p(\mathbf{X}|\boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \ln \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{K} \pi_k \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_n | \boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k) \right\}.$$
 (9.14)

No closed-form solution for maximum *Expectation maximisation*(Generic optimisation)

Expectation maximisation

- Expectation maximisation
- set parameters to some initial estimate
- Repeat until convergence:
 - E
 - Assume certain cluster parameters
 - Find out "responsibilities" of every data point for every cluster
 - M
 - Set parameters of distributions to ML estimates, weighted by responsibilities of datapoints

Expectation maximisation





Expectation maximisation

- Guaranteed to increase likelihood after every step by 0 or more
- (Find local minima)

Other methods

- Optimisation
 - SIMPLEX
 - Differential evolution
 - Particle swarm
 - •

Problems with ML

- "Wrong"
- No use of prior information
- More susceptible to singularities



Bayesian perspective

- Use of priors
 - Loc and scale parameters
 - Normal/halfnormal/ cauchy
 - Weights
 - Dirichlet



Find posterior

- MCMC sampling methods
 - Gibbs (Geman & Geman, 1984)
 - Metropolis-Hasting (Hastings, 1970)
 - NUTS (Hoffman et al., 2014)
 - DE-MCMC (Ter Braak, 2006)

Find posterior

- Still hard:
 - Label switching
 - Local maxima
 - Irregular likelihood function

How many clusters?

- Model comparison problem
 - BIC/AIC/DIC
 - Cross-validation
 - Bayes Factors (Marin & Robert, 2013)













Goal of a Mixture model

- Marin & Robert (2013): two goals of mixture models
 - Clustering perspective
 - Semiparametric perspective

Conclusion

- Mixture models offer a class of models that can describe data coming from multiple distributions
- Their likelihood functions come with some additional challenges
- Parameters can be estimated using both ML and Bayesian techniques.
- There is a bag of tricks to find out "the" number of clusters, given a model specification.

Infomercial









Sagittal slice 736 (3.41mm)





Friday 27th January, 16:00 G-1.<something>