

# Naive Bayes and Gaussian models for classification

Michael Collins

February 22, 2012

# Today's Lecture

- ▶ Probabilistic models:
  - ▶ Naive bayes
  - ▶ Gaussian models

# Classification using Perceptron, SVMs

- ▶ Input: training examples  $(\underline{x}_i, y_i)$  for  $i = 1 \dots n$ , where  $\underline{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $y_i \in \{-1, +1\}$
- ▶ Output: a parameter vector  $\underline{\theta}$  that defines a function

$$f(\underline{x}; \underline{\theta})$$

that maps points  $\underline{x}$  to labels  $y \in \{-1, +1\}$

# Naive Bayes

- ▶ Input: a training sample  $(\underline{x}_i, y_i)$  for  $i = 1 \dots n$ , where  $\underline{x}_i \in \{-1, 1\}^d$  and  $y_i \in \{-1, +1\}$
- ▶ Output: a parameter vector  $\underline{\theta}$  that defines a distribution (i.e., a probability mass function (PMF))

$$p(\underline{x}, y; \underline{\theta})$$

- ▶  $p$  is a well-defined PMF, i.e.,

$$\sum_{\underline{x}, y} p(\underline{x}, y; \underline{\theta}) = 1 \quad \text{and for all } \underline{x}, y, \quad p(\underline{x}, y; \underline{\theta}) \geq 0$$

# Using the Model for Classification

- ▶ The output of a naive bayes classifier is

$$\begin{aligned} f(\underline{x}) &= \arg \max_y p(y|\underline{x}; \underline{\theta}) \\ &= \arg \max_y \frac{p(\underline{x}, y; \underline{\theta})}{\sum_y p(\underline{x}, y; \underline{\theta})} \\ &= \arg \max_y p(\underline{x}, y; \underline{\theta}) \end{aligned}$$

## How do we Define $p(\underline{x}, y; \theta)$ ?

- ▶ There are  $2^d$  possible values for  $\underline{x}$ , and 2 possible values for  $y$ , giving  $2^{d+1}$  possibilities in total

# The Naive Bayes Assumption

- ▶ Define random variables  $Y, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_d$ . Each sample point is an input vector, with a label, defining values for  $Y$  and  $X_1 \dots X_d$ .
- ▶ We'll make the following assumption:

$$\begin{aligned} & P(Y = y, X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2, \dots, X_d = x_d) \\ &= P(Y = y)P(X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2, \dots, X_d = x_d | Y = y) \\ &= P(Y = y) \prod_{j=1}^d P(X_j = x_j | Y = y) \end{aligned}$$

Note: the first step is exact (by the chain rule). The second step is an assumption, **the naive bayes assumption**

# Parameters in a Naive Bayes Model

- ▶ The model form is as follows:

$$p(\underline{x}, y; \underline{\theta}) = q(y) \prod_{j=1}^d q_j(x_j|y)$$

- ▶ The parameter vector  $\underline{\theta}$  contains the following parameters:
  - ▶  $q(y)$  for  $y \in \{-1, +1\}$
  - ▶  $q_j(x|y)$  for  $j = 1 \dots d$ ,  $y \in \{-1, +1\}$ , and  $x \in \{-1, 1\}$
- ▶ Constraints on these parameters:

$$q(+1) + q(-1) = 1$$

and for  $y \in \{-1, +1\}$ , for  $j = 1 \dots d$ ,

$$q_j(+1|y) + q_j(-1|y) = 1$$



# Maximum Likelihood Estimates

- ▶ Given a training sample  $(\underline{x}_i, y_i)$  for  $i = 1 \dots n$ , parameter estimates can be defined as

$$q(y) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n [[y_i = y]]}{n}$$

and

$$q_j(x|y) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n [[x_{i,j} = x \wedge y_i = y]]}{\sum_{i=1}^n [[y_i = y]]}$$

- ▶ Notation:  $[[\pi]] = 1$  if the statement  $\pi$  is true, 0 otherwise. For example,  $\sum_{i=1}^n [[y_i = y]]$  is the number of times  $y_i = y$  in the training sample.

# The Log-Likelihood Function, and ML Estimation

- ▶ The model form is as follows:  $p(\underline{x}, y; \underline{\theta}) = q(y) \prod_{j=1}^d q_j(x_j|y)$ . Our training data is  $(\underline{x}_i, y_i)$  for  $i = 1 \dots n$
- ▶ The **likelihood** of the training data under parameters  $\underline{\theta}$  is

$$L'(\underline{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^n p(\underline{x}_i, y_i; \underline{\theta})$$

- ▶ The **log-likelihood** is

$$L(\underline{\theta}) = \log L'(\underline{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log p(\underline{x}_i, y_i; \underline{\theta})$$

- ▶ The maximum-likelihood estimates are

$$\arg \max_{\underline{\theta}} L(\underline{\theta}) = \arg \max_{\underline{\theta}} L'(\underline{\theta})$$

# Laplace Smoothing

- ▶ Define the smoothed estimates to be

$$q_j(x|y) = \frac{\alpha + \sum_{i=1}^n [[x_{i,j} = x \wedge y_i = y]]}{2\alpha + \sum_{i=1}^n [[y_i = y]]}$$

where  $\alpha > 0$  is some (typically small) constant, e.g.,  $\alpha = 1$

- ▶ In practice, this can give a big improvement over maximum-likelihood estimates.

# Naive Bayes: Summary

- ▶ Input: a training sample  $(\underline{x}_i, y_i)$  for  $i = 1 \dots n$ , where  $\underline{x}_i \in \{0, 1\}^d$  and  $y_i \in \{-1, +1\}$
- ▶ Output: a parameter vector  $\underline{\theta}$  that defines a distribution  $p(\underline{x}, y; \underline{\theta})$ . The vector  $\underline{\theta}$  contains the  $q(y)$  and  $q_j(x|y)$  parameter estimates, which are estimated using maximum-likelihood or laplace smoothing.
- ▶ On a new test example, the output of the classifier is

$$\arg \max_y p(\underline{x}, y; \underline{\theta})$$

# Naive Bayes: Generalizations

- ▶ Generalizations: it's simple to generalize naive bayes to the multi-class case where  $y \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$
- ▶ Generalizations: it's simple to generalize naive bayes to the case where attributes can take more than 2 values, i.e., for all  $j = 1 \dots d$ ,  $x_j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_j\}$

## More Notes on Naive Bayes

- ▶ One potential advantage: Simplicity, and efficiency
- ▶ A second potential advantage: The method is well defined in cases of *missing attributes*: training or test examples where some  $x_j$  values are not observed.
- ▶ An important thing to realise: naive bayes constructs a linear classifier

# Today's Lecture

- ▶ Probabilistic models:
  - ▶ Naive bayes
  - ▶ Gaussian models

# Data with Continuous-Valued Attributes

- ▶ For naive bayes, we assumed  $\underline{x} \in \{-1, +1\}^d$
- ▶ What probabilistic models can we use when  $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ?



# The Multivariate Normal Distribution

- ▶ The density (pdf) for a multivariate normal distribution where  $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is

$$N(\underline{x}; \underline{\mu}, \Sigma) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2} |\Sigma|^{1/2}} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu})^T \Sigma^{-1} (\underline{x} - \underline{\mu}) \right)$$

- ▶  $\underline{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  specifies the mean of the distribution
- ▶  $\Sigma$  is a  $d \times d$  matrix specifying the covariance of the distribution.  $\Sigma$  must be symmetric and positive semi-definite
- ▶  $|\Sigma|$  is the determinant of  $\Sigma$

# More about the Gaussian Distribution

- ▶ For a random variable  $\underline{X}$  with pdf  $N(\underline{x}; \underline{\mu}, \Sigma)$ , the mean of the distribution is  $\underline{\mu}$ :

$$\mathbf{E}[\underline{X}] = \underline{\mu}$$

- ▶ The covariance of the random variable is  $\Sigma$ : for all  $i, j$

$$\mathbf{E}[(X_i - \mu_i)(X_j - \mu_j)] = \Sigma_{i,j}$$

# A Probabilistic Model Based on Normal Distributions

- ▶ Define

$$p(\underline{x}, y; \underline{\theta}) = q(y)N(\underline{x}; \underline{\mu}_y, \Sigma)$$

- ▶ The parameter vector  $\underline{\theta}$  contains the following parameters:
  - ▶  $q(y)$  for  $y \in \{-1, +1\}$
  - ▶  $\underline{\mu}_y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for  $y \in \{-1, +1\}$
  - ▶  $\Sigma$ , a  $d \times d$  positive semi-definite matrix

# Applying the Model

- ▶ For a new test point  $\underline{x}$ , the output of the classifier is

$$\begin{aligned} f(\underline{x}) &= \arg \max_y p(y|\underline{x}; \underline{\theta}) \\ &= \arg \max_y \frac{p(\underline{x}, y; \underline{\theta})}{\sum_y p(\underline{x}, y; \underline{\theta})} \\ &= \arg \max_y p(\underline{x}, y; \underline{\theta}) \\ &= \arg \max_y q(y) N(\underline{x}; \underline{\mu}_y, \Sigma) \end{aligned}$$

# The Maximum-Likelihood Estimates

- Define our estimates as:

$$q(y) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n [[y_i = y]]}{n}$$

and

$$\underline{\mu}_y = \frac{\sum_{i:y_i=y} \underline{x}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n [[y_i = y]]}$$

and

$$\Sigma = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\underline{x}_i - \underline{\mu}_{y_i})(\underline{x}_i - \underline{\mu}_{y_i})^T$$

## Linear Decision Boundaries in the Model

- ▶ Because we've used a single parameter  $\Sigma$ , for the covariance of both distributions, it can be shown that the *decision boundary is again a linear separator*.
- ▶ Note: the decision boundary is the set of points  $\underline{x}$  for which

$$p(\underline{x}, +1; \underline{\theta}) = p(\underline{x}, -1; \underline{\theta})$$