# CS 1675: Intro to Machine Learning Probabilistic Graphical Models

Prof. Adriana Kovashka University of Pittsburgh November 27, 2018

- Motivation for probabilistic graphical models
- Directed models: Bayesian networks
- Undirected models: Markov random fields (briefly)
- Directed models for sequence classification: Hidden Markov models

#### Probabilities: Example Use

#### **Apples and Oranges**



# Marginal, Joint, Conditional



**Marginal Probability** 

$$p(X = x_i) = \frac{c_i}{N}.$$

Joint Probability

$$p(X = x_i, Y = y_j) = \frac{n_{ij}}{N}$$

**Conditional Probability** 

$$p(Y = y_j | X = x_i) = \frac{n_{ij}}{c_i}$$

#### Sum and Product Rules



Sum Rule  $p(X = x_i) = \frac{c_i}{N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{L} n_{ij}$   $= \sum_{i=1}^{L} p(X = x_i, Y = y_j)$ 

**Product Rule** 

$$p(X = x_i, Y = y_j) = \frac{n_{ij}}{N} = \frac{n_{ij}}{c_i} \cdot \frac{c_i}{N}$$
$$= p(Y = y_j | X = x_i) p(X = x_i)$$

#### Marginal: P satisfies $(X \perp Y)$ if and only if P(X=x,Y=y) = P(X=x) P(Y=y), $\forall x \in Val(X), y \in Val(Y)$

#### Conditional: *P* satisfies $(X \perp Y \mid Z)$ if and only if P(X,Y|Z) = P(X|Z) P(Y|Z), $\forall x \in Val(X), y \in Val(Y), z \in Val(Z)$

#### Bayes' Theorem

$$p(Y|X) = \frac{p(X|Y)p(Y)}{p(X)}$$

$$p(X) = \sum_{Y} p(X|Y)p(Y)$$

# Probabilistic Graphical Models

- It is sometimes desirable to have not only a prediction y given features x, but a measure of confidence P(y | x)
- Let **x** be a d-dim vector, each dim can take 2 values
- For each such vector **x**, y=1 or y=0
- We need statistics about how frequently y=1 occurs with each of 2<sup>d</sup> possible feature vectors  $\rightarrow 2^d$ parameters to estimate
- Thus we require an unrealistic amount of data to estimate parameters (probabilities); graphical models allow simplifying assumptions

#### A simple alternative: Naïve Bayes

- Assume all features are independent given the class i.e. P(x|y) = Π<sub>d</sub> P(x<sub>d</sub>|y)
- Model P( $x_d=1|y=1$ ) and P( $x_d=1|y=0$ ), for all  $d \rightarrow 2d$  parameters (as opposed to  $2^d$ )
- Then use Bayes rule to compute  $P(y|x) = P(x|y) P(y) / Z = \Pi_d P(x_d|y) P(y) / Z$
- Where Z is a normalizing constant

#### Naïve Bayes example



If J=1	Prob W=1	Prob B=1	Prob C=1	Prob R=1
True	0.8	0.2	0.7	0.5
False	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.4

# Advantages of Graphical Models

- If no assumption of independence is made, must estimate an exponential number of parameters
- If we assume all variables independent, efficient training and inference possible, but assumption too strong
- Graphical models use graphs over random variables to specify variable dependencies (relationships)
  - Allows for less restrictive independence assumptions while limiting the number of parameters that must be estimated
  - Allows some interpretability
  - **Bayesian networks**: **Directed** acyclic graphs indicate causal structure
  - Markov networks: Undirected graphs capture general dependencies

#### **Bayesian Networks**

- Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG)
- Nodes are random variables
- Edges indicate causal influences



# **Conditional Probability Tables**

- Each node has a conditional probability table (CPT) that gives the probability of each of its values given every possible combination of values for its parents
  - Roots of the DAG that have no parents are given prior probabilities



#### Aside: Naïve Bayes version



#### **CPT** Comments

- Probability of false not given since rows must add to 1
- Example requires 10 parameters rather than 2<sup>5</sup>–
   1=31 for specifying the full joint distribution
- Number of parameters in the CPT for a node is exponential in the number of parents

- Given known values for some evidence variables, determine the posterior probability of some query variables
- Example: Given that John calls, what is the probability that there is a Burglary?



John calls 90% of the time there is an Alarm and the Alarm detects 94% of Burglaries so people generally think it should be fairly high.

However, this ignores the prior probability of John calling.

#### **Bayes Net Inference**

• Example: Given that John calls, what is the probability that there is a Burglary?



John also calls 5% of the time when there is no Alarm. So over 1,000 days we expect 1 Burglary and John will probably call. However, he will also call with a false report 50 times on average. So the call is about 50 times more likely a false report: P(Burglary | JohnCalls) ≈ 0.02

#### Bayes Nets (not yet useful)

• No independence encoded



$$p(x_1, \dots, x_K) = p(x_K | x_1, \dots, x_{K-1}) \dots p(x_2 | x_1) p(x_1)$$

p(a, b, c) = p(c|a, b)p(a, b) = p(c|a, b)p(b|a)p(a)

# **Bayes Nets (formulation)**

• More interesting: Some independences encoded



#### **Conditional Independence**

 $\boldsymbol{a}$  is independent of  $\boldsymbol{b}$  given  $\boldsymbol{c}$ 

p(a|b,c) = p(a|c)

Equivalently 
$$p(a,b|c) = p(a|b,c)p(b|c)$$
  
=  $p(a|c)p(b|c)$ 

Notation  $a \perp b \mid c$ 



p(a, b, c) = p(a|c)p(b|c)p(c)

 $p(a,b) = \sum_{c} p(a|c)p(b|c)p(c)$ 

 $a \not\!\!\perp b \mid \emptyset$ 

Node *c* is "tail to tail" for path from *a* to *b*: **No independence** of *a* and *b* follows from this path



$$p(a, b, c) = p(a|c)p(b|c)p(c)$$

$$p(a, b|c) = \frac{p(a, b, c)}{p(c)}$$

$$= p(a|c)p(b|c)$$

$$a \perp b \mid c$$

Node *c* is "tail to tail" for path from *a* to *b*: Observing *c* blocks the path thus making *a* and *b* **conditionally independent** 



p(a, b, c) = p(a)p(c|a)p(b|c)

$$p(a,b) = p(a) \sum_{c} p(c|a)p(b|c) = p(a)p(b|a)$$

$$a \not \perp b \mid \emptyset \qquad \qquad \begin{array}{l} \Sigma_{c} p(c|a) p(b|c) = \\ \Sigma_{c} p(c|a) p(b|c, a) = // \text{ next slide} \\ \Sigma_{c} p(b, c|a) = \end{array}$$

p(b|a)

Node *c* is "head to tail" for path from *a* to *b*: **No independence** of *a* and *b* follows from this path





Node *c* is "head to tail" for path from *a* to *b*: Observing *c* blocks the path thus making *a* and *b* **conditionally independent** 



p(a, b, c) = p(a)p(b)p(c|a, b)p(a, b) = p(a)p(b) $a \perp\!\!\!\perp b \mid \emptyset$ 

Node *c* is **"head to head"** for path from *a* to *b*: <u>Unobserved</u> *c* blocks the path thus making *a* and *b* **independent** 

Note: this is the opposite of Example 1, with c unobserved.



Node *c* is **"head to head"** for path from *a* to *b*: <u>Observing</u> *c* **unblocks** the path thus making *a* and *b* **conditionally dependent** 

Note: this is the opposite of Example 1, with c observed.

#### Example: "Am I out of fuel?"



 $p(G=1|B=1,F=1) \ = \ 0.8$ 

$$p(G = 1 | B = 1, F = 0) = 0.2$$

$$p(G=1|B=0,F=1) = 0.2$$

$$p(G=1|B=0, F=0) = 0.1$$

- B = Battery (0=flat, 1=fully charged)
- F = Fuel Tank (0=empty, 1=full)
- G = Fuel Gauge Reading (0=empty, 1=full)

p(B=1) = 0.9

$$p(F=1) = 0.9$$

and hence

$$p(F=0) = 0.1$$

# Example: "Am I out of fuel?"

$$p(G=0|F=0) = \sum_{B \in \{0,1\}} p(G=0|B,F=0)p(B) = 0.81$$

p(F=0) = 0.1

$$p(G=0) = \sum_{B \in \{0,1\}} \sum_{F \in \{0,1\}} p(G=0|B,F) p(B) p(F) = 0.315$$



$$p(F = 0|G = 0) = \frac{p(G = 0|F = 0)p(F = 0)}{p(G = 0)}$$
  
\$\approx 0.257\$

Probability of an empty tank increased by observing G = 0.

#### Example: "Am I out of fuel?"



$$p(F = 0|G = 0, B = 0) = \frac{p(G = 0|B = 0, F = 0)p(F = 0)}{\sum_{F \in \{0,1\}} p(G = 0|B = 0, F)p(F)}$$
  
\$\approx 0.111\$

Probability of an empty tank reduced by observing B = 0. This is referred to as "explaining away".

#### **D**-separation

- A, B, and C are non-intersecting subsets of nodes in a directed graph.
- $\bullet$  A path from A to B is blocked if it contains a node such that either
  - a) the arrows on the path meet either head-to-tail or tailto-tail at the node, and the node is in the set *C*, or
  - b) the arrows meet head-to-head at the node, and neither the node, nor any of its descendants, are in the set *C*.
- If all paths from A to B are blocked, A is said to be d-separated from B by C.
- If A is d-separated from B by C, the joint distribution over all variables in the graph satisfies  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp B \mid C$ .

#### **D**-separation: Example



#### Naïve Bayes



Conditioned on the class z, the distributions of the input variables  $x_1$ , ...,  $x_D$  are independent.

Are the  $x_1, ..., x_D$  marginally independent?

#### Bayes Nets vs. Markov Nets

- Bayes nets represent a subclass of joint distributions that capture non-cyclic *causal* dependencies between variables.
- A Markov net can represent any joint distribution.

# **Cliques and Maximal Cliques**



# Joint Distribution for a Markov Net

- The distribution of a Markov net is described in terms of a set of **potential functions**,  $\psi_c$ , for each clique C in the graph.
- For each joint assignment of values to the variables in clique C,  $\psi_c$  assigns a non-negative real value that represents the compatibility of these values.

#### Joint Distribution for a Markov Net

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{C} \psi_C(\mathbf{x}_C)$$

where  $\psi_C(\mathbf{x}_C)$  is the potential over clique C and

$$Z = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \prod_{C} \psi_C(\mathbf{x}_C)$$

is the normalization coefficient; note: MK-state variables  $\rightarrow K^M$  terms in Z.

Energies and the Boltzmann distribution

$$\psi_C(\mathbf{x}_C) = \exp\left\{-E(\mathbf{x}_C)\right\}$$
### Illustration: Image De-Noising



**Original Image** 

Noisy Image

# Illustration: Image De-Noising



$$p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp\{-E(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\}$$
$$E(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = h \sum x_i - \beta \sum x_i$$

$$\frac{h\sum_{i} x_{i} - \beta \sum_{\{i,j\}} x_{i}x_{j}}{-\eta \sum_{i} x_{i}y_{i}}$$

Prior

Pixels are like their neighbors

Pixels of noisy and noise-free images are related

## Illustration: Image De-Noising



Noisy Image

Restored Image (ICM)

# Aside: Graphical vs other models

- Some graphical models are generative i.e. model p(x) not just p(y|x)
- Consider relationships of the features
- Somewhat interpretable
- We'll also discuss one model appropriate for sequence classification (e.g. weather)

Classifying Connected Samples (Sequences)

- Standard classification problem assumes individual cases are disconnected and independent (i.i.d.: independently and identically distributed).
- Many problems do not satisfy this assumption and involve making many connected decisions which are mutually dependent.

### Markov Chains

- A finite state machine with probabilistic state transitions.
- Makes Markov assumption that next state only depends on the current state and independent of previous history.

#### Markov Chains

• General joint probability distribution:

$$p(\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{x}_N) = \prod_{n=1}^N p(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{x}_{n-1})$$

• First-order Markov chain:



#### Markov Chains

• Second-order Markov chain:

$$p(\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{x}_N) = p(\mathbf{x}_1)p(\mathbf{x}_2|\mathbf{x}_1)\prod_{n=3}^N p(\mathbf{x}_n|\mathbf{x}_{n-1},\mathbf{x}_{n-2})$$



#### Hidden Markov Models

- Latent variables (z) satisfy Markov property
- Observed variables/predictions (x) do not
- Example: **x** = words, **z** = parts of speech



### Example: Part Of Speech Tagging

• Annotate each word in a sentence with a part-of-speech marker.

John saw the saw and decided to take it to the table. NNP VBD DT NN CC VBD TO VB PRP IN DT NN

### **English Parts of Speech**

- Noun (person, place or thing)
  - Singular (NN): dog, fork
  - Plural (NNS): dogs, forks
  - Proper (NNP, NNPS): John, Springfields
  - Personal pronoun (PRP): I, you, he, she, it
  - Wh-pronoun (WP): who, what
- Verb (actions and processes)
  - Base, infinitive (VB): eat
  - Past tense (VBD): ate
  - Gerund (VBG): eating
  - Past participle (VBN): eaten
  - Non  $3^{rd}$  person singular present tense (VBP): eat
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular present tense: (VBZ): eats
  - Modal (MD): should, can
  - To (TO): to (to eat)

### English Parts of Speech (cont.)

- Adjective (modify nouns)
  - Basic (JJ): red, tall
  - Comparative (JJR): redder, taller
  - Superlative (JJS): reddest, tallest
- Adverb (modify verbs)
  - Basic (RB): quickly
  - Comparative (RBR): quicker
  - Superlative (RBS): quickest
- Preposition (IN): on, in, by, to, with
- Determiner:
  - Basic (DT) a, an, the
  - WH-determiner (WDT): which, that
- Coordinating Conjunction (CC): and, but, or,
- Particle (RP): off (took off), up (put up)

## Ambiguity in POS Tagging

- "Like" can be a verb or a preposition
  - I like/VBP candy.
  - Time flies like/IN an arrow.
- "Around" can be a preposition, particle, or adverb
  - I bought it at the shop around/IN the corner.
  - I never got around/RP to getting a car.
  - A new Prius costs around/RB \$25K.
- Context from other words can help classify

## Aside: Why talking about HMMs

- A probabilistic graphical model
- Introduce sequence classification, nice way to model dynamical processes
- Introduce dealing with latent variables (not observed during training)

### First Attempt: Markov Model

- No hidden variables
- Assume all POS are annotated by a human
- We can then reason about transitions between POS
- Goal: tag (classify) all words in a sentence with their POS

#### Sample Markov Model for POS



#### Sample Markov Model for POS



### Hidden Markov Models

- Probabilistic generative model for sequences.
- Assume an underlying set of *hidden* (unobserved) states in which the model can be (e.g. parts of speech, abbreviated POS).
- Assume probabilistic transitions between states over time (e.g. transition from POS to another POS as sequence is generated).
- Assume probabilistic generation of tokens from states (e.g. words generated per POS).
- Advantages of using hidden (un-annotated) variables?

#### Sample HMM for POS























#### Formal Definition of an HMM

- A set of N + 2 states  $S = \{s_0, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N, s_F\}$ 
  - Distinguished start state:  $s_0$
  - Distinguished final state:  $s_{\rm F}$
- A set of *M* possible observations  $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_M\}$
- A state transition probability distribution  $A = \{a_{ij}\}$

$$a_{ij} = P(q_{t+1} = s_j | q_t = s_i)$$
  $1 \le i, j \le N$  and  $i = 0, j = F$   
 $\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ij} + a_{iF} = 1$   $0 \le i \le N$ 

Observation probability distribution for each state *j* B={b<sub>j</sub>(k)} b<sub>j</sub>(k) = P(v<sub>k</sub> at t | q<sub>t</sub> = s<sub>j</sub>) 1≤ j ≤ N 1≤ k ≤ M
Total parameter set λ={A,B}

Ray Mooney

### Example

- States = weather (hot/cold)
- Observations = number of ice-creams eaten



**Figure 9.3** A hidden Markov model for relating numbers of ice creams eaten by Jason (the observations) to the weather (H or C, the hidden variables).

### Three Useful HMM Tasks

- Compute observation likelihood: How likely is a given sequence of words, regardless of how they might be POS-tagged?
- Estimate most likely *state* sequence: What is the most likely underlying sequence of tags for the observed sequence of words?
- Maximum likelihood training: Estimate transition/emission probabilities given training data (not discussed in this class)

### HMM: Observation Likelihood

- Given a sequence of observations, *O*, and a model with a set of parameters,  $\lambda$ , what is the probability that this observation was generated by this model:  $P(O|\lambda)$ ?
- Allows HMM to be used as a language model: Assigns a probability to each string saying how likely that string is to be generated by the language.
- Example uses:
  - Sequence Classification
  - Most Likely Sequence

### Sequence Classification

- Assume an HMM is available for each category (i.e. language or word).
- What is the most likely category for a given observation sequence, i.e. which category's HMM is most likely to have generated it?
- Used in speech recognition to find most likely word model to have generated a given sound or phoneme sequence.



## Most Likely Sequence

- Of two or more possible sequences, which one was most likely generated by a given model?
- Used to score alternative word sequence interpretations in speech recognition.



#### HMM: Observation Likelihood Naïve Solution

- Consider all possible state sequences, Q, of length T that the model could have traversed in generating the given observation sequence.
- Compute
  - the probability of a given state sequence from A, and
  - multiply it by the probabilities (from *B*) of generating each of the given observations in each of the corresponding states in this sequence,
  - to get  $P(O,Q/\lambda) = P(O/Q,\lambda) P(Q/\lambda)$ .
- Sum this over all possible state sequences to get  $P(O|\lambda)$ .
- Computationally complex: O(*TN*<sup>*T*</sup>).
# Example

- States = weather (hot/cold), observations = number of ice-creams eaten
- What is the probability of observing {3, 1, 3}?



**Figure 9.3** A hidden Markov model for relating numbers of ice creams eaten by Jason (the observations) to the weather (H or C, the hidden variables).

# Example

• What is the probability of observing {3, 1, 3} and the state sequence being {hot, hot, cold}?

$$P(O,Q) = P(O|Q) \times P(Q) = \prod_{i=1}^{T} P(o_i|q_i) \times \prod_{i=1}^{T} P(q_i|q_{i-1})$$

 $P(3 \ 1 \ 3, \text{hot hot cold}) = \frac{P(\text{hot}|\text{start}) \times P(\text{hot}|\text{hot}) \times P(\text{cold}|\text{hot})}{\times P(3|\text{hot}) \times P(1|\text{hot}) \times P(3|\text{cold})}$ 

• What is the probability of observing {3, 1, 3}?

$$P(O) = \sum_{Q} P(O,Q) = \sum_{Q} P(O|Q)P(Q)$$

 $P(3 1 3) = P(3 1 3, \text{cold cold cold}) + P(3 1 3, \text{cold cold hot}) + \dots$ 

#### HMM: Observation Likelihood Efficient Solution

- Due to the Markov assumption, the probability of being in any state at any given time *t* only relies on the probability of being in each of the possible states at time *t*-1.
- Forward Algorithm: Uses dynamic programming to exploit this fact to efficiently compute observation likelihood in  $O(TN^2)$  time.
  - Compute a *forward trellis* that compactly and implicitly encodes information about all possible state paths.

#### Forward Probabilities

Let α<sub>t</sub>(j) be the probability of being in state j after seeing the first t observations (by summing over all initial paths leading to j).

$$\alpha_t(j) = P(o_1, o_2, ..., o_t, q_t = s_j | \lambda)$$

# Forward Step



- Consider all possible ways of getting to s<sub>j</sub> at time t by coming from all possible states s<sub>i</sub> and determine probability of each.
- Sum these to get the total probability of being in state s<sub>j</sub> at time t while accounting for the first t -1 observations.
- Then multiply by the probability of actually observing  $o_t$  in  $s_i$ .

#### Forward Trellis



• Continue forward in time until reaching final time point, and sum probability of ending in final state.

**Computing the Forward Probabilities** 

Initialization

$$\alpha_1(j) = a_{0j}b_j(o_1) \quad 1 \le j \le N$$

Recursion

$$\alpha_t(j) = \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_{t-1}(i)a_{ij}\right] b_j(o_t) \quad 1 \le j \le N, \quad 1 < t \le T$$

Termination

$$P(O \mid \lambda) = \alpha_{T+1}(s_F) = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_T(i) a_{iF}$$

**Example**  $\alpha_t(j) = \left[\sum_{t=1}^N \alpha_{t-1}(i) a_{ij}\right]$  $|b_j(o_t)|$ *i*=1



# Forward Computational Complexity

- Requires only O(*TN*<sup>2</sup>) time to compute the probability of an observed sequence given a model.
- Exploits the fact that all state sequences must merge into one of the *N* possible states at any point in time and the Markov assumption that only the last state effects the next one.

### Three Useful HMM Tasks

- Compute observation likelihood: How likely is a given sequence of words, regardless of how they might be POS-tagged?
- Estimate most likely *state* sequence: What is the most likely underlying sequence of tags for the observed sequence of words?
- Maximum likelihood training: Estimate transition/emission probabilities given training data (not discussed in this class)

### Most Likely State Sequence (Decoding)















- Given an observation sequence, O, and a model,  $\lambda$ , what is the most likely state sequence,  $Q=q_1,q_2,\ldots,q_T$ , that generated this sequence from this model?
- Used for sequence labeling, assuming each state corresponds to a tag, it determines the globally best assignment of tags to all tokens in a sequence using a principled approach grounded in probability theory.



#### HMM: Most Likely State Sequence Efficient Solution

- Could use naïve algorithm, examining every possible state sequence of length *T*.
- Dynamic Programming can also be used to exploit the Markov assumption and efficiently determine the most likely state sequence for a given observation and model.
- Standard procedure is called the Viterbi algorithm (Viterbi, 1967) and also has O(*TN*<sup>2</sup>) time complexity.

### Viterbi Scores

 Recursively compute the probability of the *most likely* subsequence of states that accounts for the first *t* observations and ends in state s<sub>i</sub>.

$$v_t(j) = \max_{q_0, q_1, \dots, q_{t-1}} P(q_0, q_1, \dots, q_{t-1}, o_1, \dots, o_t, q_t = s_j | \lambda)$$

- Also record "backpointers" that subsequently allow backtracing the most probable state sequence.
  - *bt<sub>t</sub>(j)* stores the state at time *t*-1 that maximizes the probability that system was in state *s<sub>j</sub>* at time *t* (given the observed sequence).

#### Computing the Viterbi Scores

Initialization

$$v_1(j) = a_{0j}b_j(o_1) \quad 1 \le j \le N$$

• Recursion

$$v_t(j) = \max_{i=1}^{N} v_{t-1}(i) a_{ij} b_j(o_t) \quad 1 \le j \le N, \ 1 < t \le T$$

• Termination

$$P^* = v_{T+1}(s_F) = \max_{i=1}^N v_T(i)a_{iF}$$

### Analogous to Forward algorithm except take *max* instead of sum

Ray Mooney

#### Computing the Viterbi Backpointers

Initialization

$$bt_1(j) = s_0 \quad 1 \le j \le N$$

• Recursion

$$bt_{t}(j) = \operatorname*{argmax}_{i=1} v_{t-1}(i)a_{ij}b_{j}(o_{t}) \quad 1 \le j \le N, \ 1 \le t \le T$$

• Termination

 $q_T^* = bt_{T+1}(s_F) = \underset{i=1}{\operatorname{argmax}} v_T(i)a_{iF}$ Final state in the most probable state sequence. Follow backpointers to initial state to construct full sequence.

Ray Mooney

#### Viterbi Backpointers



#### Viterbi Backtrace



Most likely Sequence:  $s_0 s_N s_1 s_2 \dots s_2 s_F$ 

### HMM Learning

- **Supervised Learning**: All training sequences are completely labeled (tagged).
- **Unsupervised Learning**: All training sequences are unlabelled (but generally know the number of tags, i.e. states).

#### **Supervised Parameter Estimation**

• Estimate state transition probabilities based on tag bigram and unigram statistics in the labeled data.

$$a_{ij} = \frac{C(q_t = s_i, q_{t+1} = s_j)}{C(q_t = s_i)}$$

• Estimate the observation probabilities based on tag/word co-occurrence statistics in the labeled data.

$$b_{j}(k) = \frac{C(q_{i} = s_{j}, o_{i} = v_{k})}{C(q_{i} = s_{j})}$$

• Use appropriate smoothing if training data is sparse.

# Maximum Likelihood Training

- Given an observation sequence, O, what set of parameters,  $\lambda$ , for a given model maximizes the probability that this data was generated from this model (P( $O | \lambda$ ))?
- Used to train an HMM model and properly induce its parameters from a set of training data.
- Only need to have an unannotated observation sequence (or set of sequences) generated from the model. Does not need to know the correct state sequence(s) for the observation sequence(s). In this sense, it is unsupervised.

#### HMM: Maximum Likelihood Training Efficient Solution

- There is no known efficient algorithm for finding the parameters,  $\lambda$ , that truly maximizes  $P(O|\lambda)$ .
- However, using iterative re-estimation, the Baum-Welch algorithm (a.k.a. forward-backward), a version of a standard statistical procedure called Expectation Maximization (EM), is able to locally maximize  $P(O|\lambda)$ .
- Recall: K-means (also an example of EM)

#### Sketch of Baum-Welch (EM) Algorithm for Training HMMs

Assume an HMM with N states. Randomly set its parameters  $\lambda = (A,B)$ (making sure they represent legal distributions) Until convergence (i.e.  $\lambda$  no longer changes) do: E Step: Use the forward/backward procedure to determine the probability of various possible state sequences for generating the training data M Step: Use these probability estimates to re-estimate values for all of the parameters  $\lambda$