

## MCMC methods

A simple technique is to introduce a random walk, so

$$\mathbf{w}_{i+1} = \mathbf{w}_i + \epsilon$$

where  $\epsilon$  is zero mean spherical Gaussian and has small variance. Obviously the sequence  $\mathbf{w}_i$  does not have the required distribution. However, we can use the *Metropolis algorithm*, which does *not* accept all the steps in the random walk:

1. If  $p(\mathbf{w}_{i+1}|\mathbf{y}) > p(\mathbf{w}_i|\mathbf{y})$  then accept the step.
2. Else accept the step with probability  $\frac{p(\mathbf{w}_{i+1}|\mathbf{y})}{p(\mathbf{w}_i|\mathbf{y})}$ .

In practice, the Metropolis algorithm has several shortcomings, and a great deal of research exists on improved methods, see:

*R. Neal, "Probabilistic inference using Markov chain Monte Carlo methods," University of Toronto, Department of Computer Science Technical Report CRG-TR-93-1, 1993.*

## Approximate inference for Bayesian networks

MCMC methods also provide a method for performing *approximate inference* in *Bayesian networks*.

Say a system can be in a state  $\mathbf{s}$  and moves from state to state in discrete time steps according to a probabilistic transition

$$\Pr(\mathbf{s} \rightarrow \mathbf{s}')$$

Let  $\pi_t(\mathbf{s})$  be the probability distribution for the state after  $t$  steps, so

$$\pi_{t+1}(\mathbf{s}') = \sum_{\mathbf{s}} \Pr(\mathbf{s} \rightarrow \mathbf{s}') \pi_t(\mathbf{s})$$

If at some point we obtain  $\pi_{t+1}(\mathbf{s}) = \pi_t(\mathbf{s})$  for all  $\mathbf{s}$  then we have reached a *stationary distribution*  $\pi$ . In this case

$$\forall \mathbf{s}' \pi(\mathbf{s}') = \sum_{\mathbf{s}} \Pr(\mathbf{s} \rightarrow \mathbf{s}') \pi(\mathbf{s})$$

There is exactly one stationary distribution for a given  $\Pr(\mathbf{s} \rightarrow \mathbf{s}')$  provided the latter obeys some simple conditions.

## Approximate inference for Bayesian networks

The condition of *detailed balance*

$$\forall s, s' \pi(s) \Pr(s \rightarrow s') = \pi(s') \Pr(s' \rightarrow s)$$

is sufficient to provide a  $\pi$  that is a stationary distribution. To see this simply sum:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_s \pi(s) \Pr(s \rightarrow s') &= \sum_s \pi(s') \Pr(s' \rightarrow s) \\ &= \pi(s') \underbrace{\sum_s \Pr(s' \rightarrow s)}_{=1} \\ &= \pi(s') \end{aligned}$$

If all this is looking a little familiar, it's because we now have an excellent application for the material in *Mathematical Methods for Computer Science*. That course used the alternative term *local balance*.

## Approximate inference for Bayesian networks

Recalling once again the basic equation for performing probabilistic inference

$$\Pr(Q|e) = \frac{1}{Z} \Pr(Q \wedge e) = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\mathbf{u}} \Pr(Q, \mathbf{u}, e)$$

where

- $Q$  is the query variable.
- $e$  is the evidence.
- $\mathbf{u}$  are the unobserved variables.
- $1/Z$  normalises the distribution.

We are going to consider obtaining samples from the distribution  $\Pr(Q, \mathbf{U}|e)$ .

## Approximate inference for Bayesian networks

The evidence is fixed. Let the *state* of our system be a specific set of values for the *query variable and the unobserved variables*

$$\mathbf{s} = (q, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n+1})$$

and define  $\bar{s}_i$  to be the state vector *with  $s_i$  removed*

$$\bar{s}_i = (s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}, s_{i+1}, \dots, s_{n+1})$$

To move from  $\mathbf{s}$  to  $\mathbf{s}'$  we replace one of its elements, say  $s_i$ , with a new value  $s'_i$  sampled according to

$$s'_i \sim \Pr(S_i | \bar{s}_i, e)$$

This has detailed balance, and has  $\Pr(Q, U | e)$  as its stationary distribution.

## Approximate inference for Bayesian networks

To see that  $\Pr(Q, U|e)$  is the stationary distribution

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(\mathbf{s})\Pr(\mathbf{s} \rightarrow \mathbf{s}') &= \Pr(\mathbf{s}|e)\Pr(s'_i|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i, e) \\ &= \Pr(s_i, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_i|e)\Pr(s'_i|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i, e) \\ &= \Pr(s_i|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i, e)\Pr(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i|e)\Pr(s'_i|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i, e) \\ &= \Pr(s_i|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i, e)\Pr(s'_i, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_i|e) \\ &= \Pr(\mathbf{s}' \rightarrow \mathbf{s})\pi(\mathbf{s}')\end{aligned}$$

As a further simplification, sampling from  $\Pr(S_i|\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i, e)$  is equivalent to sampling  $S_i$  conditional on its parents, children and children's parents.

## Approximate inference for Bayesian networks

*So:*

- We successively sample the query variable and the unobserved variables, conditional on their parents, children and children's parents.
- This gives us a sequence  $\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2, \dots$  which has been sampled according to  $\Pr(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{U}|\mathbf{e})$ .

Finally, note that as

$$\Pr(\mathbf{Q}|\mathbf{e}) = \sum_{\mathbf{u}} \Pr(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{u}|\mathbf{e})$$

we can just ignore the values obtained for the unobserved variables. This gives us  $\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots$  with

$$\mathbf{q}_i \sim \Pr(\mathbf{Q}|\mathbf{e})$$

## Approximate inference for Bayesian networks

To see that the final step works, consider what happens when we estimate the expected value of some function of  $Q$ .

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[f(Q)] &= \sum_{\mathbf{q}} f(\mathbf{q})\Pr(\mathbf{q}|e) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{q}} f(\mathbf{q}) \sum_{\mathbf{u}} \Pr(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}|e) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \sum_{\mathbf{u}} f(\mathbf{q})\Pr(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}|e)\end{aligned}$$

so sampling using  $\Pr(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{u}|e)$  and ignoring the values for  $\mathbf{u}$  obtained works exactly as required.