## Bayesian Networks Part 1
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## Goals for the lecture

you should understand the following concepts

- the Bayesian network representation
- inference by enumeration
- the parameter learning task for Bayes nets
- the structure learning task for Bayes nets
- maximum likelihood estimation
- Laplace estimates
- m-estimates


## Bayesian network example

- Consider the following 5 binary random variables:
$B=$ a burglary occurs at your house
$E=$ an earthquake occurs at your house
$A=$ the alarm goes off
$J=$ John calls to report the alarm
$M=$ Mary calls to report the alarm
- Suppose we want to answer queries like what is $P(B \mid M, J)$ ?


## Bayesian network example



## Bayesian network example



## Bayesian networks

- a BN consists of a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) and a set of conditional probability distributions
- in the DAG
- each node denotes random a variable
- each edge from $X$ to $Y$ represents that $X$ directly influences $Y$
- formally: each variable $X$ is independent of its nondescendants given its parents
- each node $X$ has a conditional probability distribution (CPD) representing $P(X \mid \operatorname{Parents}(X)$ )


## Bayesian networks

- using the chain rule, a joint probability distribution can be expressed as

$$
P\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)=P\left(X_{1}\right) \prod_{i=2}^{n} P\left(X_{i} \mid X_{1}, \ldots, X_{i-1}\right)
$$

- a BN provides a compact representation of a joint probability distribution

$$
P\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)=P\left(X_{1}\right) \prod_{i=2}^{n} P\left(X_{i} \mid \operatorname{Parents}\left(X_{i}\right)\right)
$$

## Bayesian networks



- a standard representation of the joint distribution for the Alarm example has $2^{5}=32$ parameters
- the BN representation of this distribution has 20 parameters


## Bayesian networks

- consider a case with 10 binary random variables
- How many parameters does a BN with the following graph structure have?

- How many parameters does the standard table representation of the joint distribution have?


## Advantages of Bayesian network representation(

- Captures independence and conditional independence where they exist
- Encodes the relevant portion of the full joint among variables where dependencies exist
- Uses a graphical representation which lends insight into the complexity of inference


## The inference task in Bayesian networks

Given: values for some variables in the network (evidence), and a set of query variables
Do: compute the posterior distribution over the query variables

- variables that are neither evidence variables nor query variables are hidden variables
- the BN representation is flexible enough that any set can be the evidence variables and any set can be the query variables


## Inference by enumeration

- let $a$ denote $\boldsymbol{A}=$ true, and $\neg a$ denote $\boldsymbol{A}=$ false
- suppose we're given the query: $P(b \mid j, m)$
"probability the house is being burglarized given that John and Mary both called"
- from the graph structure we can first compute:


$$
P(b, j, m)=\sum_{e, \neg e a, \neg a} \sum_{\substack{ \\\text { sum over possible } \\ \text { values for } E \text { and } A \\ \text { variables }(e, \neg e, a, \neg a)}}
$$

## Inference by enumeration

$$
\begin{aligned}
P(b, j, m) & =\sum_{e, \neg e a, \neg a} \sum_{e, ~} P(b) P(E) P(A \mid b, E) P(j \mid A) P(m \mid A) \\
& =P(b) \sum_{e, \neg a, \neg a} \sum P(E) P(A \mid b, E) P(j \mid A) P(m \mid A)
\end{aligned}
$$



## Inference by enumeration

- now do equivalent calculation for $P(\neg b, j, m)$
- and determine $P(b \mid j, m)$

$$
P(b \mid j, m)=\frac{P(b, j, m)}{P(j, m)}=\frac{P(b, j, m)}{P(b, j, m)+P(\neg b, j, m)}
$$

## Comments on BN inference

- inference by enumeration is an exact method (i.e. it computes the exact answer to a given query)
- it requires summing over a joint distribution whose size is exponential in the number of variables
- in many cases we can do exact inference efficiently in large networks
- key insight: save computation by pushing sums inward
- in general, the Bayes net inference problem is NP-hard
- there are also methods for approximate inference - these get an answer which is "close"
- in general, the approximate inference problem is NP-hard also, but approximate methods work well for many real-world problems


## The parameter learning task

- Given: a set of training instances, the graph structure of a BN

| B | E | A | J | M |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f | $f$ | $f$ | $t$ | $f$ |
| f | t | f | $f$ | $f$ |
| f | $f$ | $t$ | $f$ | $t$ |
|  |  | $\ldots$ |  |  |



- Do: infer the parameters of the CPDs


## The structure learning task

- Given: a set of training instances

| B | E | A | J | M |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f | f | f | t | f |
| f | t | f | f | f |
| f | f | t | f | t |
|  |  | $\ldots$ |  |  |

- Do: infer the graph structure (and perhaps the parameters of the CPDs too)


## Parameter learning and MLE

- maximum likelihood estimation (MLE)
- given a model structure (e.g. a Bayes net graph) $G$ and a set of data $D$
- set the model parameters $\theta$ to maximize $P(D \mid G, \theta)$
- i.e. make the data $D$ look as likely as possible under the model $P(D \mid G, \theta)$


## Maximum likelihood estimation

consider trying to estimate the parameter $\theta$ (probability of heads) of a biased coin from a sequence of flips

$$
\boldsymbol{x}=\{1,1,1,0,1,0,0,1,0,1\}
$$

the likelihood function for $\theta$ is given by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
L\left(\theta: x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) & =\theta^{x_{1}}(1-\theta)^{1-x_{1}} \cdots \theta^{x_{n}}(1-\theta)^{1-x_{n}} \\
& =\theta^{\sum^{x_{i}}}(1-\theta)^{n-\sum_{x_{i}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

for $h$ heads in $n$ flips the MLE is $h / n$





## MLE in a Bayes net

$$
\begin{aligned}
L(\theta: D, G)=P(D \mid G, \theta) & =\prod_{d \in D} P\left(x_{1}^{(d)}, x_{2}^{(d)}, \ldots, x_{n}^{(d)}\right) \\
& =\prod_{d \in D} \prod_{i} P\left(x_{i}^{(d)} \mid \operatorname{Parents}\left(x_{i}^{(d)}\right)\right) \\
& =\prod_{i}\left(\prod_{d \in D} P\left(x_{i}^{(d)} \mid \operatorname{Parents}\left(x_{i}^{(d)}\right)\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

independent parameter learning problem for each CPD

## Maximum likelihood estimation

now consider estimating the CPD parameters for $B$ and $J$ in the alarm network given the following data set


| $B$ | $E$ | $A$ | $J$ | $M$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f | f | f | t | f |
| f | t | f | f | f |
| f | f | f | t | t |
| t | f | f | f | t |
| f | f | t | t | f |
| f | f | t | f | t |
| f | f | t | t | t |
| f | f | t | t | t |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P(b)=\frac{1}{8}=0.125 \\
& P(\neg b)=\frac{7}{8}=0.875 \\
& P(j \mid a)=\frac{3}{4}=0.75 \\
& P(\neg j \mid a)=\frac{1}{4}=0.25 \\
& P(j \mid \neg a)=\frac{2}{4}=0.5 \\
& P(\neg j \mid \neg a)=\frac{2}{4}=0.5
\end{aligned}
$$

## Maximum likelihood estimation

suppose instead, our data set was this...


## Maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimation (©)

- instead of estimating parameters strictly from the data, we could start with some prior belief for each
- for example, we could use Laplace estimates

$$
P(X=x)=\frac{n_{x}+1}{\sum_{v \in \operatorname{Values}(X)}\left(n_{v}+1\right)} \text { pseudocounts }
$$



- where $n_{v}$ represents the number of occurrences of value $v$


## Maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimation

a more general form: m-estimates

$$
P(X=x)=\frac{n_{x}+\tilde{p}_{x} m}{\left(\sum_{v \in \operatorname{Values}(X)} n_{v}\right)+m} \text { prior probability of value } x
$$

## M-estimates example

now let's estimate parameters for $B$ using $m=4$ and $p_{b}=0.25$

| $B$ | $E$ | $A$ | $J$ | $M$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f | f | f | t | f |
| f | t | f | f | f |
| f | f | f | t | t |
| f | f | f | f | t |
| f | f | t | t | f |
| f | f | t | f | t |
| f | f | t | t | t |
| f | f | t | t | t |

$$
P(b)=\frac{0+0.25 \times 4}{8+4}=\frac{1}{12}=0.08 \quad P(\neg b)=\frac{8+0.75 \times 4}{8+4}=\frac{11}{12}=0.92
$$
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