# MACHINE LEARNING

Probabilistic classification - generative models

Corso di Laurea Magistrale in Informatica

Università di Roma Tor Vergata

Prof. Giorgio Gambosi

a.a. 2023-2024



# **GENERATIVE MODELS**

- Classes are modeled by suitable conditional distributions  $p(\mathbf{x}|C_k)$  (language models in the previous case): it is possible to sample from such distributions to generate random documents statistically equivalent to the documents in the collection used to derive the model.
- Bayes' rule allows to derive  $p(C_k|\mathbf{x})$  given such models (and the prior distributions  $p(C_k)$  of classes)
- We may derive the parameters of  $p(\mathbf{x}|C_k)$  and  $p(C_k)$  from the dataset, for example through maximum likelihood estimation
- Classification is performed by comparing  $p(C_k|\mathbf{x})$  for all classes

### **DERIVING POSTERIOR PROBABILITIES**

• Let us consider the binary classification case and observe that

$$p(C_1|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{x}|C_1)p(C_1)}{p(\mathbf{x}|C_1)p(C_1) + p(\mathbf{x}|C_2)p(C_2)} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{p(\mathbf{x}|C_2)p(C_2)}{p(\mathbf{x}|C_1)p(C_1)}}$$

• Let us define

$$a = \log \frac{p(\mathbf{x}|\mathsf{C}_1)p(\mathsf{C}_1)}{p(\mathbf{x}|\mathsf{C}_2)p(\mathsf{C}_2)} = \log \frac{p(\mathsf{C}_1|\mathbf{x})}{p(\mathsf{C}_2|\mathbf{x})}$$

that is, *a* is the log of the ratio between the posterior probabilities (log odds)

• We obtain that

$$p(C_1|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-a}} = \sigma(a)$$
  $p(C_2|\mathbf{x}) = 1 - \frac{1}{1+e^{-a}} = \frac{1}{1+e^{a}}$ 

•  $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$  is the logistic function or (sigmoid)

### SIGMOID



Useful properties of the sigmoid

- $\sigma(-\mathbf{x}) = 1 \sigma(\mathbf{x})$   $\frac{d\sigma(\mathbf{x})}{d\mathbf{x}} = \sigma(\mathbf{x})(1 \sigma(\mathbf{x}))$

#### **DERIVING POSTERIOR PROBABILITIES**

• In the case K > 2, the general formula holds

$$p(C_k|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{x}|C_k)p(C_k)}{\sum_j p(\mathbf{x}|C_j)p(C_j)}$$

• Let us define, for each  $k = 1, \ldots, K$ 

$$a_k(\mathbf{x}) = \log(p(\mathbf{x}|C_k)p(C_k)) = \log p(\mathbf{x}|C_k) + \log p(C_k)$$

• Then, we may write

$$p(C_k|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{e^{a_k}}{\sum_j e^{a_j}} = s(a_k)$$

• s(x) is the softmax function (or normalized exponential) and it can be seen as an extension of the sigmoid to the case K > 2 and as a smoothed version of the maximum

In Gaussian discriminant analysis (GDA) all class conditional distributions  $p(\mathbf{x}|C_k)$  are assumed gaussians. This implies that the corresponding posterior distributions  $p(C_k|\mathbf{x})$  can be easily derived.

#### Hypothesis

All distributions  $p(\mathbf{x}|C_k)$  have same covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ , of size  $D \times D$ . Then,

$$p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{C}_{k}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2} |\mathbf{\Sigma}|^{1/2}} exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_{k})^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_{k})\right)$$

# **BINARY CASE**

If K = 2,

 $p(C_1|\mathbf{x}) = \sigma(a(\mathbf{x}))$ 

where

$$\begin{split} a(\mathbf{x}) &= \log \frac{p(\mathbf{x}|\mathcal{C}_1)p(\mathcal{C}_1)}{p(\mathbf{x}|\mathcal{C}_2)p(\mathcal{C}_2)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2^{\mathsf{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_2 - \mathbf{x}^{\mathsf{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2^{\mathsf{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1^{\mathsf{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \mathbf{x}^{\mathsf{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1^{\mathsf{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{x}) + \log \frac{p(\mathcal{C}_1)}{p(\mathcal{C}_2)} \end{split}$$

### **BINARY CASE**

Observe that the results of all products involving  $\Sigma^{-1}$  are scalar, hence, in particular

 $\mathbf{x}^{\mathsf{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \boldsymbol{\mu}_1^{\mathsf{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}$  $\mathbf{x}^{\mathsf{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 = \boldsymbol{\mu}_2^{\mathsf{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x}$ 

Then,

$$\boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_2^{\mathsf{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1^{\mathsf{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) + (\boldsymbol{\mu}_1^{\mathsf{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2^{\mathsf{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}) \mathbf{x} + \log \frac{p(\mathcal{C}_1)}{p(\mathcal{C}_2)} = \mathbf{w}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{w}_0$$

with

$$\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)$$
$$\mathbf{w}_0 = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2^\mathsf{T} \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1^\mathsf{T} \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) + \log \frac{p(\mathcal{C}_1)}{p(\mathcal{C}_2)}$$

 $p(C_1|\mathbf{x}) = \sigma(\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{w}_0)$  is computed by applying a non-linear function to a linear combination of the features (generalized linear model)

Prof. Giorgio Gambosi

## EXAMPLE



Left, the class conditional distributions  $p(\mathbf{x}|C_1)$ ,  $p(\mathbf{x}|C_2)$ , gaussians with D = 2. Right the posterior distribution of  $C_1$ ,  $p(C_1|\mathbf{x})$  with sigmoidal slope.

#### **DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION**

The discriminant function can be obtained by the condition  $p(C_1|\mathbf{x}) = p(C_2|\mathbf{x})$ , that is,  $\sigma(a(\mathbf{x})) = \sigma(-a(\mathbf{x}))$ . This is equivalent to  $a(\mathbf{x}) = -a(\mathbf{x})$  and to  $a(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ . As a consequence, it results

$$\mathbf{w}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{w}_0 = 0$$

or

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)\mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_2^{\mathsf{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_2 - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1^{\mathsf{T}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_1) + \log \frac{\boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{C}_2)}{\boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{C}_1)} = 0$$

Simple case:  $\Sigma = \lambda I$  (that is,  $\sigma_{ii} = \lambda$  for i = 1, ..., d). In this case, the discriminant function is

$$2(\mu_2 - \mu_1)\mathbf{x} + ||\mu_1||^2 - ||\mu_2||^2 + 2\lambda \log \frac{p(C_2)}{p(C_1)} = 0$$

#### **MULTIPLE CLASSES**

In this case, we refer to the softmax function:

 $p(C_k|\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{s}(a_k(\mathbf{x}))$ 

where  $a_k(\mathbf{x}) = \log(p(\mathbf{x}|C_k)p(C_k))$ . By the above considerations, it easily turns out that

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{k}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \boldsymbol{\mu}_{k}^{\mathsf{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{k}^{\mathsf{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{k} \right) + \log \boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{C}_{k}) - \frac{\boldsymbol{d}}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \log |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}| = \mathbf{w}_{k}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{w}_{0k}$$

Again,  $p(C_k|\mathbf{x}) = \sigma(\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{w}_0)$  is computed by applying a non-linear function to a linear combination of the features (generalized linear model)

#### **MULTIPLE CLASSES**

Decision boundaries corresponding to the case when there are two classes  $C_j$ ,  $C_k$  such that the corresponding posterior probabilities are equal, and larger than the probability of any other class. That is,

 $p(C_k|\mathbf{x}) = p(C_j|\mathbf{x})$   $p(C_i|\mathbf{x}) < p(C_k|\mathbf{x})$   $i \neq j, k$  $e^{a_k(\mathbf{x})} = e^{a_j(\mathbf{x})}$   $e^{a_i(\mathbf{x})} < e^{a^k(\mathbf{x})}$   $i \neq j, k$  $a_k(\mathbf{x}) = a_j(\mathbf{x})$   $a_i(\mathbf{x}) < a^k(\mathbf{x})$   $i \neq j, k$ 

As shown, this implies that boundaries are linear.

hence

that is,

The class conditional distributions  $p(\mathbf{x}|C_k)$  are gaussians with different covariance matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{a}(\mathbf{x}) &= \log \frac{\boldsymbol{p}(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{C}_1)\boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{C}_1)}{\boldsymbol{p}(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{C}_2)\boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{C}_2)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \left( \mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2 \right)^{\mathsf{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) - \left( \mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1 \right)^{\mathsf{T}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2|}{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1|} + \log \frac{\boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{C}_1)}{\boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{C}_2)} \end{aligned}$$

By applying the same considerations, the decision boundary turns out to be

$$\left( (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^\mathsf{T} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) - (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\mathsf{T} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) \right) + \log \frac{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2|}{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1|} + 2\log \frac{p(\mathsf{C}_1)}{p(\mathsf{C}_2)} = 0$$

Classes are separated by a (at most) quadratic surface.

# **GENERAL COVARIANCE, MULTIPLE CLASSE**

It can be proved that boundary surfaces are at most quadratic. Example

Left: 3 classes, modeled by gaussians with different covariance matrices. Right: posterior distribution of classes, with boundary surfaces.



The class conditional distributions  $p(\mathbf{x}|C_k)$  can be derived from the training set by maximum likelihood estimation.

For the sake of simplicity, assume K = 2 and both classes share the same  $\Sigma$ .

It is then necessary to estimate  $\mu_1, \mu_2, \Sigma$ , and  $\pi = p(C_1)$  (clearly,  $p(C_2) = 1 - \pi$ ).

Training set T: includes *n* elements  $(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{t}_i)$ , with

$$\mathbf{t}_i = \left\{egin{array}{ccc} 0 & \mathsf{se} \ \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathsf{C}_2 \ 1 & \mathsf{se} \ \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathsf{C}_1 \end{array}
ight.$$

If  $\mathbf{x} \in C_1$ , then  $p(\mathbf{x}, C_1) = p(\mathbf{x}|C_1)p(C_1) = \pi \cdot \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ If  $\mathbf{x} \in C_2$ ,  $p(\mathbf{x}, C_2) = p(\mathbf{x}|C_2)p(C_2) = (1 - \pi) \cdot \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ 

The likelihood of the training set  ${\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}}$  is

$$L(\pi, \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \boldsymbol{\Sigma} | \mathcal{T}) = \prod_{i=1}^n (\pi \cdot \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_i | \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}))^{\mathsf{t}_i} ((1-\pi) \cdot \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_i | \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}))^{1-\mathsf{t}_i}$$

The corresponding log likelihood is

$$l(\pi, \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \boldsymbol{\Sigma} | \mathcal{T}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left( t_i \log \pi + t_i \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_i | \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})) \right) + \sum_{i=1}^n \left( (1 - t_i) \log(1 - \pi) + (1 - t_i) \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_i | \boldsymbol{\mu}_2, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})) \right)$$

Its derivative wrt  $\pi$  is

$$\frac{\partial l}{\partial \pi} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( t_i \log \pi + (1 - t_i) \log(1 - \pi) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{t_i}{\pi} - \frac{(1 - t_i)}{1 - \pi} \right) = \frac{n_1}{\pi} - \frac{n_2}{1 - \pi}$$

which is equal to 0 for

$$\pi = \frac{n_1}{n}$$

The maximum wrt  $\mu_1$  (and  $\mu_2$ ) is obtained by computing the gradient

$$\frac{\partial l}{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_1} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_1} \sum_{i=1}^n t_i \log(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_i | \boldsymbol{\mu}_1, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})) = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n t_i (\mathbf{x}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)$$

As a consequence, we have  $\frac{\partial l}{\partial \mu_1} = 0$  for

$$\sum_{i=1}^n t_i \mathbf{x}_i = \sum_{i=1}^n t_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_1$$

hence, for

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_1 = \frac{1}{\boldsymbol{n}_1} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \boldsymbol{C}_1} \mathbf{x}_i$$

Similarly, 
$$\frac{\partial l}{\partial \mu_2} = 0$$
 for

Maximizing the log-likelihood wrt  $\Sigma$  provides

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \frac{n_1}{n} \mathbf{S}_1 + \frac{n_2}{n} \mathbf{S}_2$$

where

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{S}_1 &= \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{C}_1} (\mathbf{x}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1) (\mathbf{x}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_1)^\mathsf{T} \\ \mathbf{S}_2 &= \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{C}_2} (\mathbf{x}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2) (\mathbf{x}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_2)^\mathsf{T} \end{split}$$

# **GDA: DISCRETE FEATURES**

- In the case of *d* discrete (for example, binary) features we may apply the Naive Bayes hypothesis (independence of features, given the class)
- Then, we may assume that, for any class Ck, the value of the *i*-th feature is sampled from a Bernoulli distribution of parameter pki; by the conditional independence hypothesis, it results into

$$p(\mathbf{x}|C_k) = \prod_{i=1}^d p_{ki}^{x_i} (1-p_{ki})^{1-x}$$

where  $p_{ki} = p(x_i = 1 | C_k)$  could be estimated by ML, as in the case of language models

• Functions  $a_k(\mathbf{x})$  can then be defined as:

$$a_k(\mathbf{x}) = \log(p(\mathbf{x}|C_k)p(C_k)) = \sum_{i=1}^{D} (x_i \log p_{ki} + (1-x_i)\log(1-p_{ki})) + \log p(C_k)$$

These are still linear functions on **x**.

The same considerations can be done in the case of non binary features, where, for any class C<sub>k</sub>, we may assume the value of the *i*-th feature is sampled from a distribution on a suitable domain (e.g. Poisson in the case of count data)