

Assignment 5

Probabilistic and Unsupervised Learning

Maneesh Sahani & Yee Whye Teh

Due: Fri December 16, 2011

Note: all assignments for this course are to be handed in to the Gatsby Unit, **not** to the CS department. Assignments are due at the **beginning** of the lecture or tutorial on the due date. Late assignments (included those handed in later on the due day) will be penalised. If you are unable to attend, you may hand in your assignment to either lecturer or TA prior to the due time, or to Barry Fong in the Alexandra House 4th floor reception. Do not leave them with anyone else.

Please attempt the first questions before the bonus ones. This is a programming assignment and might require more time to understand the accompanying code and to debug, so please **START EARLY**.

1. [35 points] Deriving Gibbs Sampling for LDA.

In this question we derive two Gibbs sampling algorithms for latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA). Recall LDA is a topic model—multiple mixture models with shared components—with the following conditional probabilities:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_d | \alpha \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha, \dots, \alpha) \quad (1)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\phi}_k | \beta \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\beta, \dots, \beta) \quad (2)$$

$$z_{id} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_d \sim \text{Discrete}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_d) \quad (3)$$

$$x_{id} | z_{id}, \boldsymbol{\phi}_{z_{id}} \sim \text{Discrete}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{z_{id}}) \quad (4)$$

$$(5)$$

Assume our data consists of D documents, a vocabulary of size W , and we model with K topics. Let $A_{dk} = \sum_i \delta(z_{id} = k)$ be the number of z_{id} variables taking on value k in document d , and $B_{kw} = \sum_d \sum_i \delta(x_{id} = w) \delta(z_{id} = k)$ be the number of times word w is assigned to topic k . Let N_d be the total number of words in document d and let $M_k = \sum_w B_{kw}$ be the total number of words assigned to topic k .

- Write down the joint probability over the observed data and latent variables, expressing the joint probability in terms of the counts N_d , M_k , A_{dk} , and B_{kw} . [5 points]
- Derive the Gibbs sampling updates for all the latent variables $\{z_{id}\}$ and parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_d$ and $\boldsymbol{\phi}_k$. [10 points]
- Integrate out the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_d$'s and $\boldsymbol{\phi}_k$'s from the joint probability in (a), resulting in a joint probability over only the z_{id} topic assignment variables and x_{id} observed variables. Again this expression should relate to z_{id} 's and x_{id} 's only through the counts N_d , M_k , A_{dk} , and B_{kw} . [5 points]
- Derive the Gibbs sampling updates for z_{id} with all parameters integrated out. This is called **collapsed Gibbs sampling**. You will need the the following identity of the Gamma function: $\Gamma(1+x) = x\Gamma(x)$ for $x > 0$. [10 points]
- What hyperpriors would you give to α and β . Propose and derive a sampling update for α and β ? [5 points]

2. [65 points] **Decrypting Messages with MCMC.** You are given a passage of English text that has been encrypted by remapping each symbol to a (usually) different one. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} a &\rightarrow s \\ b &\rightarrow ! \\ \langle \text{space} \rangle &\rightarrow v \\ \dots &\dots \dots \end{aligned}$$

Thus a text like ‘a boy...’ might be encrypted by ‘sv!op...’. Assume that each symbol is mapped to a unique symbol. The file **symbols.txt** gives the list of symbols, one per line (note second line is $\langle \text{space} \rangle$). The file **message.txt** gives the encrypted message.

Decoding the message by brute force is impossible, since there are 53 symbols thus $53!$ permutations. Instead you will set up a Metropolis-Hastings Markov chain to find modes on the space of permutations.

We model English text, say $s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n$ where s_i are symbols, as a Markov chain, where a symbol give the previous symbol is independent of all past symbols:

$$p(s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n) = p(s_1) \prod_{i=2}^n p(s_i | s_{i-1})$$

- (a) Learn some statistics of the English language. In particular, download a large text, say *War and Peace*, from the web and estimate symbol probabilities $p(s) = \phi(s)$ and transition probabilities $p(s|t) = \psi(s, t)$. You may ignore the initial symbol probabilities in the following. Give formulas for the ML estimate of these probabilities as functions of counts of numbers of occurrences of symbols and pairs of symbols. Compute and report these estimated probabilities in a table. [6 marks]
- (b) The state of the system consists of the permutation among the symbols. Let $\sigma(s)$ be the symbol which symbol s is encrypted as, e.g. $\sigma(a) = s$ and $\sigma(b) = !$ above. We assume a uniform prior distribution over permutations. Are the latent variables $\sigma(s)$ for different symbols s independent? Let $e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n$ be an encrypted English text. Write down the joint probability of $e_1 e_2 \cdots e_n$ and $s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n$ given σ . [6 marks]
- (c) We shall use a Metropolis-Hastings (MH) sampler. The proposal is to pick two symbols and swap the symbols with which these two symbols are encrypted with. What are the proposal distributions and acceptance probabilities? [10 marks]
- (d) Implement the MH sampler, and run it on the included encrypted text. Report the current decryption of the first 60 symbols after every 100 iterations. Your Markov chain should hopefully converge to give you a fairly sensible message. (Hint: it may help to initialize your chain intelligently and to try multiple times; if you do, please describe what you did). [30 marks]
- (e) Is the chain mentioned above necessarily ergodic? If so, give a proof; if not, explain and describe how you can fix it so that it is ergodic. Hint: some $\psi(s, t)$ values can be zero. [5 marks]
- (f) Discuss variations on the decoder. For instance, will symbol probabilities alone be sufficient? If we use a second order Markov chain for English text, what problems might we encounter? Will it work if two symbols can be mapped to the same symbol? Will it work for Chinese with > 10000 symbols? [8 marks]

3. **[Bonus 60 points] Implementing Gibbs sampling for LDA.** Take a look at the accompanying code, which sets up a framework in which you will implement both the standard and collapsed Gibbs sampling inference for LDA. Read the README which lays out the MATLAB variables used.

- (a) Implement both standard and collapsed Gibbs sampline updates, and the log joint probabilities in question 1(a), 1(c) above. The files you need to edit are `stdgibbs_logjoint`, `stdgibbs_update`, `colgibbs_logjoint`, `colgibbs_update`. Debug your code by running `toyexample`. Show sample plots produced by `toyexample`, and attach and document the MATLAB code that you wrote. [20 points]
- (b) Based upon the plots of log predictive and joint probabilities produced by `toyexample`, how many iterations do you think are required for burn-in? Discarding the burn-in iterations, compute and plot the autocorrelations of the log predictive and joint probabilities for both Gibbs samplers. You will need to run `toyexample` for a larger number of iterations to reduce the noise in the autocorrelation. Based upon the autocorrelations how many samples do you think will be need to have a representative set of samples from the posterior? Describe what you did and justify your answers with one or two sentences. [10 points]
- (c) Based on the computed autocorrelations, which of the two Gibbs samplers do you think converge faster, or do they converge at about the same rate? If they differ, why do you think this might be the case? Justify your answers. [5 points]
- (d) Try varying α , β and K . What effects do these have on the posterior and predictive performance of the model? Justify your answers. [5 points]

Topic modelling of NIPS papers. Now that we have code for LDA, we can try our hands on finding the topics at a major machine learning conference (NIPS). In the provided code there is a file `nips.data` which contains preprocessed data. The vocabulary is given in `nips.vocab`.

- (e) The data in `nips.data` is probably too big so that our MATLAB implementation will be too slow. We will try to reduce the data set to a more tractable size, by removing words from the vocabulary. Come up with a metric for how informative/relevant/topical a vocabulary word is. You may want to experiment and try multiple metrics, and make sure that keywords like “Bayesian”, “graphical”, “Gaussian”, “support”, “vector”, “kernel”, “representation”, “regression”, “classification” etc have high metric. Report on your experiences, and use your metric to prune the data set to just the top few hundred words (say 500, or lower if the implementation is still too slow). You may find it useful to read up on `tf-idf` on wikipedia. [10 points]
- (f) Now run LDA on the reduced NIPS data, using one of the Gibbs samplers you have just written. You will need to experiment with various settings of α , β and K until the topics discovered looks “reasonable”. Describe the topics you found. How do the topics change (qualitatively) as α , β and K are varied? [10 points]