

# CMPSCI 240: “Reasoning Under Uncertainty”

## Lecture 20x

Not-A-Prof. Phil Kirlin  
pkirlin@cs.umass.edu

April 5, 2012

## Bayesian Reasoning (Recap)

- ▶ The **maximum likelihood hypothesis** is the hypothesis that assigns the highest probability to the observed data:

$$H^{\text{ML}} = \operatorname{argmax}_i P(D | H_i)$$

- ▶ The **maximum a posteriori (MAP) hypothesis** is the hypothesis that that maximizes the posterior probability given  $D$ :

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\text{MAP}} &= \operatorname{argmax}_i P(H_i | D) \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_i \frac{P(D | H_i) P(H_i)}{P(D)} \\ &\propto \operatorname{argmax}_i P(D | H_i) P(H_i) \end{aligned}$$

- ▶  $P(H_i)$  is called the prior probability (or just prior).
- ▶  $P(H_i | D)$  is called the posterior probability.

## Independent Pieces of Data (Recap)

### Definition

If we have 2 pieces of data  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  that are **conditionally independent** given  $H_i$ , then the probability of  $D_1 \cap D_2$  given  $H_i$  is

$$\begin{aligned}P(D_1 \cap D_2 | H_i) &= P(D_1 | H_i)P(D_2 | D_1, H_i) \\ &= P(D_1 | H_i)P(D_2 | H_i)\end{aligned}$$

## Independent Pieces of Data (Recap)

### Definition

If we have 2 pieces of data  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  that are **conditionally independent** given  $H_i$ , then the probability of  $D_1 \cap D_2$  given  $H_i$  is

$$\begin{aligned}P(D_1 \cap D_2 | H_i) &= P(D_1 | H_i)P(D_2 | D_1, H_i) \\ &= P(D_1 | H_i)P(D_2 | H_i)\end{aligned}$$

If we have  **$m$  conditionally independent pieces of data**  $D_1, \dots, D_m$ , then

## Independent Pieces of Data (Recap)

### Definition

If we have 2 pieces of data  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  that are **conditionally independent** given  $H_i$ , then the probability of  $D_1 \cap D_2$  given  $H_i$  is

$$\begin{aligned}P(D_1 \cap D_2 | H_i) &= P(D_1 | H_i)P(D_2 | D_1, H_i) \\ &= P(D_1 | H_i)P(D_2 | H_i)\end{aligned}$$

If we have  **$m$  conditionally independent pieces of data**  $D_1, \dots, D_m$ , then

$$P(D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_m | H_i) = \prod_{j=1}^m P(D_j | H_i)$$

## Combining Evidence (Recap)

### Definition

If we have  $k$  disjoint, exhaustive hypotheses  $H_1, \dots, H_k$  (e.g., rainy, dry) and  $m$  **conditionally independent pieces of observed data**  $D_1, \dots, D_m$ , then the posterior probability  $P(H_i | D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_m)$  of hypothesis  $H_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, k$ ) given the observed data  $D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_m$  is:

## Combining Evidence (Recap)

### Definition

If we have  $k$  disjoint, exhaustive hypotheses  $H_1, \dots, H_k$  (e.g., rainy, dry) and  $m$  **conditionally independent pieces of observed data**  $D_1, \dots, D_m$ , then the posterior probability  $P(H_i | D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_m)$  of hypothesis  $H_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, k$ ) given the observed data  $D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_m$  is:

$$P(H_i | D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_m) = \frac{\left( \prod_{j=1}^m P(D_j | H_i) \right) P(H_i)}{P(D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_m)}$$

where

## Combining Evidence (Recap)

### Definition

If we have  $k$  disjoint, exhaustive hypotheses  $H_1, \dots, H_k$  (e.g., rainy, dry) and  $m$  **conditionally independent pieces of observed data**  $D_1, \dots, D_m$ , then the posterior probability  $P(H_i | D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_m)$  of hypothesis  $H_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, k$ ) given the observed data  $D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_m$  is:

$$P(H_i | D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_m) = \frac{\left(\prod_{j=1}^m P(D_j | H_i)\right) P(H_i)}{P(D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_m)}$$

where

$$P(D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_m) = \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\prod_{j=1}^m P(D_j | H_i)\right) P(H_i)$$

# Classification

- ▶ **Classification** is the problem of identifying which of a set of categories (called **classes**) a particular item belongs.

# Classification

- ▶ **Classification** is the problem of identifying which of a set of categories (called **classes**) a particular item belongs.
- ▶ Lots of real-world problems can be set up as classification tasks:

# Classification

- ▶ **Classification** is the problem of identifying which of a set of categories (called **classes**) a particular item belongs.
- ▶ Lots of real-world problems can be set up as classification tasks:
  - ▶ Spam filtering (classes: spam, not spam)

# Classification

- ▶ **Classification** is the problem of identifying which of a set of categories (called **classes**) a particular item belongs.
- ▶ Lots of real-world problems can be set up as classification tasks:
  - ▶ Spam filtering (classes: spam, not spam)
  - ▶ Handwriting recognition & OCR (classes: one for each letter, number, or symbol)

# Classification

- ▶ **Classification** is the problem of identifying which of a set of categories (called **classes**) a particular item belongs.
- ▶ Lots of real-world problems can be set up as classification tasks:
  - ▶ Spam filtering (classes: spam, not spam)
  - ▶ Handwriting recognition & OCR (classes: one for each letter, number, or symbol)
  - ▶ Text classification, image classification, music classification, etc.

# Classification

- ▶ **Classification** is the problem of identifying which of a set of categories (called **classes**) a particular item belongs.
- ▶ Lots of real-world problems can be set up as classification tasks:
  - ▶ Spam filtering (classes: spam, not spam)
  - ▶ Handwriting recognition & OCR (classes: one for each letter, number, or symbol)
  - ▶ Text classification, image classification, music classification, etc.
- ▶ Almost any problem where you are assigning some sort of label to items can be set up as a classification task.

# Classification

- ▶ An algorithm that does classification is called a **classifier**.  
Classifiers take some sort of item as input and output the class it thinks that item belongs to.

# Classification

- ▶ An algorithm that does classification is called a **classifier**.  
Classifiers take some sort of item as input and output the class it thinks that item belongs to.
- ▶ Lots of classifiers are based on Bayesian reasoning:

# Classification

- ▶ An algorithm that does classification is called a **classifier**.  
Classifiers take some sort of item as input and output the class it thinks that item belongs to.
- ▶ Lots of classifiers are based on Bayesian reasoning:
  - ▶ The classes become the hypotheses that are being tested.

# Classification

- ▶ An algorithm that does classification is called a **classifier**. Classifiers take some sort of item as input and output the class it thinks that item belongs to.
- ▶ Lots of classifiers are based on Bayesian reasoning:
  - ▶ The classes become the hypotheses that are being tested.
  - ▶ The item being classified is turned into a collection of data called **features**. Useful features are attributes of the item that imply a strong connection to certain classes.

# Classification

- ▶ An algorithm that does classification is called a **classifier**. Classifiers take some sort of item as input and output the class it thinks that item belongs to.
- ▶ Lots of classifiers are based on Bayesian reasoning:
  - ▶ The classes become the hypotheses that are being tested.
  - ▶ The item being classified is turned into a collection of data called **features**. Useful features are attributes of the item that imply a strong connection to certain classes.
  - ▶ The classification algorithm is typically either maximum likelihood or MAP, depending on what data we have available.

## Example: Spam Classification

- ▶ When a new email arrives, we want to label it as either spam or not spam (our two classes or hypotheses).

## Example: Spam Classification

- ▶ When a new email arrives, we want to label it as either spam or not spam (our two classes or hypotheses).
- ▶ A useful set of features might be events corresponding to whether or not certain words appear in the email:

## Example: Spam Classification

- ▶ When a new email arrives, we want to label it as either spam or not spam (our two classes or hypotheses).
- ▶ A useful set of features might be events corresponding to whether or not certain words appear in the email:
  - ▶  $F_1, F_1^c$  : “Wallach” appears/does not appear in the email

## Example: Spam Classification

- ▶ When a new email arrives, we want to label it as either spam or not spam (our two classes or hypotheses).
- ▶ A useful set of features might be events corresponding to whether or not certain words appear in the email:
  - ▶  $F_1, F_1^c$  : “Wallach” appears/does not appear in the email
  - ▶  $F_2, F_2^c$  : “viagra” appears/does not appear in the email

## Example: Spam Classification

- ▶ When a new email arrives, we want to label it as either spam or not spam (our two classes or hypotheses).
- ▶ A useful set of features might be events corresponding to whether or not certain words appear in the email:
  - ▶  $F_1, F_1^c$  : “Wallach” appears/does not appear in the email
  - ▶  $F_2, F_2^c$  : “viagra” appears/does not appear in the email
  - ▶  $F_3, F_3^c$  : “cash” appears/does not appear in the email

## Example: Spam Classification

- ▶ When a new email arrives, we want to label it as either spam or not spam (our two classes or hypotheses).
- ▶ A useful set of features might be events corresponding to whether or not certain words appear in the email:
  - ▶  $F_1, F_1^c$  : “Wallach” appears/does not appear in the email
  - ▶  $F_2, F_2^c$  : “viagra” appears/does not appear in the email
  - ▶  $F_3, F_3^c$  : “cash” appears/does not appear in the email
- ▶ Let’s say this email contains the words “Wallach” and “cash,” but not “viagra.”

## Example: Spam Classification

- ▶ When a new email arrives, we want to label it as either spam or not spam (our two classes or hypotheses).
- ▶ A useful set of features might be events corresponding to whether or not certain words appear in the email:
  - ▶  $F_1, F_1^c$  : “Wallach” appears/does not appear in the email
  - ▶  $F_2, F_2^c$  : “viagra” appears/does not appear in the email
  - ▶  $F_3, F_3^c$  : “cash” appears/does not appear in the email
- ▶ Let’s say this email contains the words “Wallach” and “cash,” but not “viagra.”
- ▶ Therefore, the features for this email are  $F_1$ ,  $F_2^c$ , and  $F_3$ .

## Example: Spam Classification

- ▶ When a new email arrives, we want to label it as either spam or not spam (our two classes or hypotheses).
- ▶ A useful set of features might be events corresponding to whether or not certain words appear in the email:
  - ▶  $F_1, F_1^c$  : “Wallach” appears/does not appear in the email
  - ▶  $F_2, F_2^c$  : “viagra” appears/does not appear in the email
  - ▶  $F_3, F_3^c$  : “cash” appears/does not appear in the email
- ▶ Let’s say this email contains the words “Wallach” and “cash,” but not “viagra.”
- ▶ Therefore, the features for this email are  $F_1$ ,  $F_2^c$ , and  $F_3$ .
- ▶ If we use the MAP rule for classification, we need to compute

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\text{MAP}} &= \underset{i}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(D | H_i) P(H_i) \\ &= \underset{i \in \{\text{spam}, \text{notspam}\}}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | H_i) P(H_i) \end{aligned}$$

## Example: Spam Classification

- ▶ When a new email arrives, we want to label it as either spam or not spam (our two classes or hypotheses).
- ▶ A useful set of features might be events corresponding to whether or not certain words appear in the email:
  - ▶  $F_1, F_1^c$  : “Wallach” appears/does not appear in the email
  - ▶  $F_2, F_2^c$  : “viagra” appears/does not appear in the email
  - ▶  $F_3, F_3^c$  : “cash” appears/does not appear in the email
- ▶ Let’s say this email contains the words “Wallach” and “cash,” but not “viagra.”
- ▶ Therefore, the features for this email are  $F_1$ ,  $F_2^c$ , and  $F_3$ .
- ▶ If we use the MAP rule for classification, we need to compute

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\text{MAP}} &= \underset{i}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(D | H_i) P(H_i) \\ &= \underset{i \in \{\text{spam}, \text{notspam}\}}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | H_i) P(H_i) \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ But where do these probabilities come from?

## Learning Probabilities From Data

- ▶ To use MAP, we need probabilities for  $P(H_i)$ ; that is,  $P(\textit{spam})$  and  $P(\textit{not spam})$ , as well as  $P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | H_i)$ .

## Learning Probabilities From Data

- ▶ To use MAP, we need probabilities for  $P(H_i)$ ; that is,  $P(\textit{spam})$  and  $P(\textit{not spam})$ , as well as  $P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | H_i)$ .
- ▶ We can estimate these probabilities if we have access to a lot of email that has already been classified as spam or not spam.

## Learning Probabilities From Data

- ▶ To use MAP, we need probabilities for  $P(H_i)$ ; that is,  $P(spam)$  and  $P(not\ spam)$ , as well as  $P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | H_i)$ .
- ▶ We can estimate these probabilities if we have access to a lot of email that has already been classified as spam or not spam.
- ▶ How can we estimate  $P(spam)$ ?

## Learning Probabilities From Data

- ▶ To use MAP, we need probabilities for  $P(H_i)$ ; that is,  $P(spam)$  and  $P(not\ spam)$ , as well as  $P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | H_i)$ .
- ▶ We can estimate these probabilities if we have access to a lot of email that has already been classified as spam or not spam.
- ▶ How can we estimate  $P(spam)$ ?
- ▶ 
$$P(spam) = \frac{\# \text{ of emails labeled as spam}}{\# \text{ of total emails}}$$

## Learning Probabilities From Data

- ▶ To use MAP, we need probabilities for  $P(H_i)$ ; that is,  $P(spam)$  and  $P(not\ spam)$ , as well as  $P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | H_i)$ .
- ▶ We can estimate these probabilities if we have access to a lot of email that has already been classified as spam or not spam.
- ▶ How can we estimate  $P(spam)$ ?
- ▶ 
$$P(spam) = \frac{\# \text{ of emails labeled as spam}}{\# \text{ of total emails}}$$
- ▶ How can we estimate  $P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | spam)$ ?

# Learning Probabilities From Data

- ▶ To use MAP, we need probabilities for  $P(H_i)$ ; that is,  $P(spam)$  and  $P(not\ spam)$ , as well as  $P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | H_i)$ .
- ▶ We can estimate these probabilities if we have access to a lot of email that has already been classified as spam or not spam.
- ▶ How can we estimate  $P(spam)$ ?
- ▶ 
$$P(spam) = \frac{\# \text{ of emails labeled as spam}}{\# \text{ of total emails}}$$
- ▶ How can we estimate  $P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | spam)$ ?
- ▶ 
$$P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | spam) = \frac{\# \text{ of emails labeled as spam with those exact features}}{\# \text{ of total spam emails}}$$

# Learning Probabilities From Data

- ▶ To use MAP, we need probabilities for  $P(H_i)$ ; that is,  $P(spam)$  and  $P(not\ spam)$ , as well as  $P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | H_i)$ .
- ▶ We can estimate these probabilities if we have access to a lot of email that has already been classified as spam or not spam.
- ▶ How can we estimate  $P(spam)$ ?
- ▶ 
$$P(spam) = \frac{\# \text{ of emails labeled as spam}}{\# \text{ of total emails}}$$
- ▶ How can we estimate  $P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | spam)$ ?
- ▶ 
$$P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | spam) = \frac{\# \text{ of emails labeled as spam with those exact features}}{\# \text{ of total spam emails}}$$
- ▶ Why is that last estimate going to be a problem?

## Conditional Independence to the Rescue!

## Conditional Independence to the Rescue!

- ▶ It is unlikely that we would ever have enough email to get a good estimate of  $P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | spam)$  using the previous idea because the number of emails in our collection *with the exact same feature set as our new email* is probably very small, or zero.

## Conditional Independence to the Rescue!

- ▶ It is unlikely that we would ever have enough email to get a good estimate of  $P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | spam)$  using the previous idea because the number of emails in our collection *with the exact same feature set as our new email* is probably very small, or zero.
- ▶ Therefore, we will **assume all our features are conditionally independent of each other, given the hypothesis** (spam or not spam).

## Conditional Independence to the Rescue!

- ▶ It is unlikely that we would ever have enough email to get a good estimate of  $P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | spam)$  using the previous idea because the number of emails in our collection *with the exact same feature set as our new email* is probably very small, or zero.
- ▶ Therefore, we will **assume all our features are conditionally independent of each other, given the hypothesis** (spam or not spam).
- ▶ Therefore,  
$$P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | spam) = P(F_1 | spam) \cdot P(F_2^c | spam) \cdot P(F_3 | spam)$$

## Conditional Independence to the Rescue!

- ▶ It is unlikely that we would ever have enough email to get a good estimate of  $P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | spam)$  using the previous idea because the number of emails in our collection *with the exact same feature set as our new email* is probably very small, or zero.
- ▶ Therefore, we will **assume all our features are conditionally independent of each other, given the hypothesis** (spam or not spam).
- ▶ Therefore,  
$$P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | spam) = P(F_1 | spam) \cdot P(F_2^c | spam) \cdot P(F_3 | spam)$$
- ▶ Those probabilities are easier to get good estimates for!

## Conditional Independence to the Rescue!

- ▶ It is unlikely that we would ever have enough email to get a good estimate of  $P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | spam)$  using the previous idea because the number of emails in our collection *with the exact same feature set as our new email* is probably very small, or zero.
- ▶ Therefore, we will **assume all our features are conditionally independent of each other, given the hypothesis** (spam or not spam).
- ▶ Therefore,
$$P(F_1 \cap F_2^c \cap F_3 | spam) = P(F_1 | spam) \cdot P(F_2^c | spam) \cdot P(F_3 | spam)$$
- ▶ Those probabilities are easier to get good estimates for!
- ▶ A classifier that makes this assumption is called a **Naive Bayes classifier**.

# Learning Probabilities From Data

## Learning Probabilities From Data

- ▶ How would we estimate  $P(F_1 | spam)$ , or equivalently, the probability an email contains the word “Wallach,” given that it’s a spam email? (Remember, we have a lot of existing emails already classified as spam or not spam.)

## Learning Probabilities From Data

- ▶ How would we estimate  $P(F_1 | spam)$ , or equivalently, the probability an email contains the word “Wallach,” given that it’s a spam email? (Remember, we have a lot of existing emails already classified as spam or not spam.)
- ▶  $P(F_1 | spam) =$   
$$\frac{\# \text{ of emails labeled as spam containing the word Wallach}}{\# \text{ of total spam emails}}$$

## Learning Probabilities From Data

- ▶ How would we estimate  $P(F_1 | spam)$ , or equivalently, the probability an email contains the word “Wallach,” given that it’s a spam email? (Remember, we have a lot of existing emails already classified as spam or not spam.)
- ▶  $P(F_1 | spam) = \frac{\# \text{ of emails labeled as spam containing the word Wallach}}{\# \text{ of total spam emails}}$
- ▶ Spam filters typically operate so every word in an email is its own feature. What happens if we see a word we’ve never encountered before?

## Learning Probabilities From Data

- ▶ How would we estimate  $P(F_1 | spam)$ , or equivalently, the probability an email contains the word “Wallach,” given that it’s a spam email? (Remember, we have a lot of existing emails already classified as spam or not spam.)
- ▶  $P(F_1 | spam) = \frac{\# \text{ of emails labeled as spam containing the word Wallach}}{\# \text{ of total spam emails}}$
- ▶ Spam filters typically operate so every word in an email is its own feature. What happens if we see a word we’ve never encountered before?
- ▶  $P(F_1 | spam) = \frac{\# \text{ of emails labeled as spam containing the word Wallach} + 1}{\# \text{ of total spam emails} + 2}$

## Learning Probabilities From Data

- ▶ How would we estimate  $P(F_1 | spam)$ , or equivalently, the probability an email contains the word “Wallach,” given that it’s a spam email? (Remember, we have a lot of existing emails already classified as spam or not spam.)
- ▶  $P(F_1 | spam) = \frac{\text{\# of emails labeled as spam containing the word Wallach}}{\text{\# of total spam emails}}$
- ▶ Spam filters typically operate so every word in an email is its own feature. What happens if we see a word we’ve never encountered before?
- ▶  $P(F_1 | spam) = \frac{\text{\# of emails labeled as spam containing the word Wallach} + 1}{\text{\# of total spam emails} + 2}$
- ▶ This is called **smoothing**, and it removes the chance that a zero probability will wipe out the entire calculation.

## Summary of Naive Bayes Classification

- ▶ The email can be classified by computing:

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\text{MAP}} &= \underset{i}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(D | H_i) P(H_i) \\ &= \underset{i \in \{\text{spam}, \text{not spam}\}}{\operatorname{argmax}} (F_1 \cap \dots \cap F_m | H_i) P(H_i) \\ &= \underset{i \in \{\text{spam}, \text{not spam}\}}{\operatorname{argmax}} (F_1 | H_i) \dots (F_m | H_i) P(H_i) \\ &= \underset{i \in \{\text{spam}, \text{not spam}\}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \left( \prod_{j=1}^m P(F_j | H_i) \right) P(H_i) \end{aligned}$$

## Summary of Naive Bayes Classification

- ▶ The email can be classified by computing:

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\text{MAP}} &= \underset{i}{\operatorname{argmax}} P(D | H_i) P(H_i) \\ &= \underset{i \in \{\text{spam}, \text{not spam}\}}{\operatorname{argmax}} (F_1 \cap \dots \cap F_m | H_i) P(H_i) \\ &= \underset{i \in \{\text{spam}, \text{not spam}\}}{\operatorname{argmax}} (F_1 | H_i) \dots (F_m | H_i) P(H_i) \\ &= \underset{i \in \{\text{spam}, \text{not spam}\}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \left( \prod_{j=1}^m P(F_j | H_i) \right) P(H_i) \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ In other words, compute **likelihood**  $\times$  **prior** for each hypothesis (spam vs. not spam) and see which has a greater value

# Summary

- ▶ Estimate the priors using:

$$P(H_i) = \frac{\# \text{ emails labeled as } H_i}{\text{total } \# \text{ of emails}}$$

## Summary

- ▶ Estimate the priors using:

$$P(H_i) = \frac{\# \text{ emails labeled as } H_i}{\text{total } \# \text{ of emails}}$$

- ▶ Estimate the probability of a feature given a class using:

$$P(F_j | H_i) = \frac{\# \text{ of emails labeled as } H_i \text{ containing } F_j + 1}{\# \text{ of emails labeled as } H_i + 2}$$