Recap: Sampling Idea

• Objective: Evaluate expectation of a function \( f(x) \) w.r.t. a probability distribution \( p(x) \).
  \[ \mathbb{E}[f] = \int f(x) p(x) dx \]

• Sampling idea
  - Draw \( L \) independent samples \( z^i \) with \( i = 1, \ldots, L \) from \( p(x) \).
  - This allows the expectation to be approximated by a finite sum
  \[ f \approx \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^{L} f(z^i) \]
  - As long as the samples \( z^i \) are drawn independently from \( p(x) \), then
  \[ \mathbb{E}[f] = \mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{L}\sum_{i=1}^{L} f(z^i)] \]

Recap: Transformation Method

• In general, assume we are given the pdf \( p(x) \) and the corresponding cumulative distribution:
  \[ F(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} p(z) dz \]
  - To draw samples from this pdf, we can invert the cumulative distribution function:
  \[ u \sim \text{Uniform}(0,1) \Rightarrow F^{-1}(u) \sim p(x) \]

Recap: Rejection Sampling

• Assumptions
  - Sampling directly from \( p(x) \) is difficult.
  - But we can easily evaluate \( p(x) \) (up to some norm. factor \( Z_p \)):
    \[ p(x) = \frac{1}{Z_p} q(x) \]

• Idea
  - We need some simpler distribution \( q(x) \) (called proposal distribution) from which we can draw samples.
  - Choose a constant \( k \) such that: \( \forall z: k q(z) \geq p(z) \)

• Sampling procedure
  - Generate a number \( z_0 \) from \( q(z) \).
  - Generate a number \( u_0 \) from the uniform distribution over \([0, k q(z_0)]\).
  - If \( u_0 > p(z_0) \) reject sample, otherwise accept.
Evaluating Expectations

• Motivation
  – Often, our goal is not sampling from \( p(z) \) by itself, but to evaluate expectations of the form
  \[
  \mathbb{E}[f] = \int f(z)p(z)dz
  \]

• Simplistic strategy: Grid sampling
  – Discretize \( z \)-space into a uniform grid.
  – Evaluate the integrand as a sum of the form
  \[
  \mathbb{E}[f] \approx \sum_{i=1}^{L} f(\mathbf{z}^{(i)})p(\mathbf{z}^{(i)})dx
  \]
  – Problem: number of terms grows exponentially with number of dimensions!

Recap: Importance Sampling

• Approach
  – Approximate expectations directly
    \[
    \mathbb{E}[f] = \int f(z)p(z)dz
    \]
    (but does not enable to draw samples from \( p(z) \) directly).

• Idea
  – Use a proposal distribution \( q(\mathbf{z}) \) from which it is easy to sample.
  – Express expectations in the form of a finite sum over samples \( \{\mathbf{z}^{(l)}\} \)
    drawn from \( q(\mathbf{z}) \).

  \[
  \mathbb{E}[f] \approx \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^{L} q(\mathbf{z}^{(l)})f(\mathbf{z}^{(l)})
  \]

  Importance weights

Curse of Dimensionality

• Problem
  – Rejection & Importance Sampling both scale badly with high dimensionality.
  – Example:
    \[
    p(\mathbf{z}) \sim N(0, I), \quad q(\mathbf{z}) \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I)
    \]
  – Rejection Sampling
    – Requires \( \sigma \geq 1 \). Fraction of proposals accepted: \( \sigma^{-D} \).

  • Importance Sampling
    – Variance of importance weights:
      \[
      \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{2 - 1/\sigma^2} \right)^{D/2} - 1
      \]
    – Infinite / undefined variance if
      \[\sigma \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\]

Topics of This Lecture

• Recap: Sampling approaches
  – Transformation Sampling
  – Ancestral Sampling
  – Rejection Sampling
  – Importance Sampling

• Markov Chain Monte Carlo
  – Markov Chains
  – Metropolis Algorithm
  – Properties of Markov Chains
  – Metropolis-Hastings Algorithm
  – Gibbs Sampling

Independent Sampling vs. Markov Chains

• So far
  – We’ve considered two methods, Rejection Sampling and Importance Sampling, which were both based on independent samples from \( q(\mathbf{z}) \).
  – However, for many problems of practical interest, it is difficult or impossible to find \( q(\mathbf{z}) \) with the necessary properties.

• Different approach
  – We abandon the idea of independent sampling.
  – Instead, rely on a Markov Chain to generate dependent samples from the target distribution.
  – Independence would be a nice thing, but it is not necessary for the Monte Carlo estimate to be valid.

MCMC – Markov Chain Monte Carlo

• Overview
  – Allows to sample from a large class of distributions.
  – Scales well with the dimensionality of the sample space.

• Idea
  – We maintain a record of the current state \( \mathbf{z}^{(t)} \)
  – The proposal distribution depends on the current state: \( q(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{z}^{(t)}) \)
  – The sequence of samples forms a Markov chain \( \mathbf{z}^{(1)}, \mathbf{z}^{(2)},... \)

• Setting
  – We can evaluate \( p(\mathbf{z}) \) (up to some normalizing factor \( Z_p \)):
    \[
    p(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{z})}{Z_p}
    \]
  – At each time step, we generate a candidate sample from the proposal distribution and accept the sample according to a criterion.
### MCMC – Metropolis Algorithm

- **Metropolis algorithm**
  
  **Proposal distribution is symmetric:**
  \[ q(z_A|z_B) = q(z_B|z_A) \]
  
  **The new candidate sample** \( z^* \) **is accepted with probability**
  \[ A(z^*, z^{t+1}) = \min \left( 1, \frac{q(z^*|z^{t+1})}{q(z^{t+1}|z^*)} \right) \]

- **Implementation**
  
  - Choose random number \( u \) uniformly from unit interval \((0,1)\).
  
  - Accept sample if \[ A(z^*, z^{t+1}) > u \]

- **Note**
  
  - New candidate samples always accepted if \[ q(z^*|z^{t+1}) \geq q(z^{t+1}|z^*) \].
  
  - I.e. when new sample has higher probability than the previous one.
  
  - The algorithm sometimes accepts a state with lower probability.

\[ q(z_A|z_B) = q(z_B|z_A) \]

\[ A(z^*, z^{t+1}) > u \]

### Line Fitting Example

- **Importance Sampling weights**
  
  \[ w = 0.00548 \quad w = 1.56e-08 \quad w = 9.64e-06 \quad w = 0.371 \quad w = 0.103 \]
  
  \[ w = 1.01e-08 \quad w = 0.111 \quad w = 1.92e-09 \quad w = 0.0126 \quad w = 1.1e-51 \]

\[ w = 0.00548 \quad w = 1.56e-08 \quad w = 9.64e-06 \quad w = 0.371 \quad w = 0.103 \]

\[ w = 1.01e-08 \quad w = 0.111 \quad w = 1.92e-09 \quad w = 0.0126 \quad w = 1.1e-51 \]

\[ \Rightarrow \text{Many samples with very low weights...} \]

- **Metropolis algorithm**
  
  - Perturb parameters: \( Q(z', z) \) e.g. \( N(z, \sigma^2) \)
  
  - Accept with probability \( \min \left( 1, \frac{p(z')}{p(z)} \right) \)
  
  - Otherwise, keep old parameters.

### Topics of This Lecture

- Recap: Sampling approaches
  
  - Transformation Sampling
  
  - Ancestral Sampling
  
  - Rejection Sampling
  
  - Importance Sampling

- Markov Chain Monte Carlo
  
  - Markov Chains
  
  - Metropolis Algorithm
  
  - Properties of Markov Chains
  
  - Metropolis-Hastings Algorithm
  
  - Gibbs Sampling
### Markov Chains

**Question**
- How can we show that \( x \) tends to \( p(x) \) as \( \tau \to \infty \)?

**Markov chains**
- First-order Markov chain:
  \[
  p\left(x^{(m+1)}|x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(m)}\right) = p\left(x^{(m+1)}|x^{(m)}\right)
  \]
- Marginal probability
  \[
  p\left(x^{(m+1)}\right) = \sum_{x^{(m)}} p\left(x^{(m+1)}|x^{(m)}\right) p\left(x^{(m)}\right)
  \]
- A Markov chain is called **homogeneous** if the transition probabilities \( p(x^{(m+1)}|x^{(m)}) \) are the same for all \( m \).

### Detailed Balance

**Detailed balance**
- If we pick a state from the target distribution \( p(x) \) and make a transition under \( T \) to another state, it is just as likely that we will pick \( x \) and go from \( x \) to \( x' \) than that we will pick \( x' \) and go from \( x \) to \( x \).
- It can easily be seen that a transition probability that satisfies detailed balance w.r.t. a particular distribution will leave that distribution invariant, because
  \[
  \sum_{x'} p'(x') T(x', x) = \sum_{x'} T(x, x') p'(x') = p'(x) \sum_{x'} T(x, x') = p'(x)
  \]

### Mixture Transition Distributions

**Mixture distributions**
- In practice, we often construct the transition probabilities from a set of 'base' transitions \( B_1, \ldots, B_k \).
- This can be achieved through a mixture distribution
  \[
  T(x', x) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \alpha_k B_k(x', x)
  \]
  with mixing coefficients \( \alpha_k \geq 0 \) and \( \sum_k \alpha_k = 1 \).

**Properties**
- If the distribution is invariant w.r.t. each of the base transitions, then it will also be invariant w.r.t. \( T(x', x) \).
- If each of the base transitions satisfies detailed balance, then the mixture transition \( T \) will also satisfy detailed balance.
- Common example: each base transition changes only a subset of variables.

### Markov Chains – Properties

**Invariant distribution**
- A distribution is said to be invariant (or stationary) w.r.t. a Markov chain if each step in the chain leaves that distribution invariant.
- Transition probabilities:
  \[
  T\left(x^{(m)}, x^{(m+1)}\right) = p\left(x^{(m+1)}|x^{(m)}\right)
  \]
- Distribution \( p'(x) \) is invariant if:
  \[
  p'(x) = \sum_{x'} T(x', x) p'(x')
  \]

**Detailed balance**
- Sufficient (but not necessary) condition to ensure that a distribution is invariant:
  \[
  p'(x)T'(x', x) = p'(x')T'(x, x')
  \]
- A Markov chain which respects detailed balance is reversible.

### Ergodicity in Markov Chains

**Remark**
- Our goal is to use Markov chains to sample from a given distribution.
- We can achieve this if we set up a Markov chain such that the desired distribution is invariant.
- However, must also require that for \( m \to \infty \), the distribution \( p(x^{(m)}) \) converges to the required invariant distribution \( p'(x) \) irrespective of the choice of initial distribution \( p(x^{(0)}) \).
- This property is called ergodicity and the invariant distribution is called the equilibrium distribution.
- It can be shown that this is the case for a homogeneous Markov chain, subject only to weak restrictions on the invariant distribution and the transition probabilities.
Approximate Inference II

Evaluation of acceptance criterion does not require normalizing constant \( Z_p \).

Strong correlations
- The scale of the problem should be of the same order as the smallest length scale.

Central goal in MCMC is to avoid random walk behavior!

Analysis
- Evaluation of acceptance criterion does not require normalizing constant \( Z_p \).
- When the proposal distributions are symmetric, Metropolis-Hastings reduces to the standard Metropolis algorithm.

Properties
- We can show that \( p(a) \) is an invariant distribution of the Markov chain defined by the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm.
- We show detailed balance:
  \[
  A(x', a) = \min \left( 1, \frac{p(x')q_k(x|z')}{p(x)q_k(z'|x)} \right)
  \]
  \[
  \pi(x')q_k(x'|z')A_k(x', a) = \min \left( \pi(x)q_k(z'|x), \pi(x')q_k(z'|x') \right)
  \]

Note: This is wrong in the Bishop book!

Random Walks
- Example: Random Walk behavior
  - Consider a state space consisting of the integers \( z \in \mathbb{Z} \) with initial state \( x(1) = 0 \) and transition probabilities:
    \[
    p(z^{(r+1)} = z^{(r)}) = 0.5
    \]
    \[
    p(z^{(r+1)} = z^{(r)} + 1) = 0.25
    \]
    \[
    p(z^{(r+1)} = z^{(r)} - 1) = 0.25
    \]
- Analysis
  - Expected state at time \( \tau \):
    \[
    \mathbb{E}[z^{(\tau)}] = 0
    \]
  - Variance:
    \[
    \mathbb{E}[(z^{(\tau)})^2] = \tau/2
    \]
  - After \( \tau \) steps, the random walk has only traversed a distance that is on average proportional to \( \sqrt{\tau} \).

⇒ Central goal in MCMC is to avoid random walk behavior!

Topics of This Lecture
- Recap: Sampling approaches
  - Transformation Sampling
  - Ancestral Sampling
  - Rejection Sampling
  - Importance Sampling
- Markov Chain Monte Carlo
  - Markov Chains
  - Metropolis Algorithm
  - Properties of Markov Chains
  - Metropolis-Hastings Algorithm
  - Gibbs Sampling

Gibbs Sampling
- Approach
  - MCMC-algorithm that is simple and widely applicable.
  - May be seen as a special case of Metropolis-Hastings.
- Idea
  - Sample variable-wise: replace \( x_i \) by a value drawn from the distribution \( p(z|x_i) \).
    - This means we update one coordinate at a time.
    - Repeat procedure either by cycling through all variables or by choosing the next variable.

MCMC – Metropolis-Hastings Algorithm
- Generalization: Proposal distribution not required to be symmetric.
  - The new candidate sample \( x' \) is accepted with probability
    \[
    A(x', a) = \min \left( 1, \frac{p(x')q_k(x|z')} {p(x)q_k(z'|x)} \right)
    \]
  - where \( k \) labels the members of the set of possible transitions considered.

Note:
- Evaluation of acceptance criterion does not require normalizing constant \( Z_p \).
- When the proposal distributions are symmetric, Metropolis-Hastings reduces to the standard Metropolis algorithm.

MCMC – Metropolis-Hastings Algorithm
- Properties
  - We can show that \( p(a) \) is an invariant distribution of the Markov chain defined by the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm.
  - We show detailed balance:
    \[
    A(x', a) = \min \left( 1, \frac{p(x')q_k(x|z')} {p(x)q_k(z'|x)} \right)
    \]
    \[
    \pi(x')q_k(x'|z')A_k(x', a) = \min \left( \pi(x)q_k(z'|x), \pi(x')q_k(z'|x') \right)
    \]

Note: This is wrong in the Bishop book!
Approximate Inference II

Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) scales well with the dimensionality of the state space.

Gibbs sampling

- Replaces the sampling from joint distributions by
- Samplings from the conditional distributions.
- Does not require
- Rejection sampling.
- It can
- Sample independently.

Gibbs Sampling

- Properties
- The factor that determines the acceptance probability in the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm is determined by
- We have used
- The algorithm is always accepted.
- If you can compute (and sample from) the conditionals, you can apply Gibbs sampling.
- The algorithm is completely parameter free.
- Can also be applied to subsets of variables.

Discussion

- Gibbs sampling benefits from few free choices and convenient features of conditional distributions:
  - Conditionals with a few discrete settings can be explicitly normalized:
  - Continuous conditionals are often only univariate.
  - In case of graphical models, the conditional distributions depend only on the variables in the corresponding Markov blankets.

How Should We Run MCMC?

- Arbitrary initialization means starting iterations are bad
- Discard a "burn-in" period.
- How do we know if we have run for long enough?
- You don’t. That’s the problem.
- The samples are not independent
- Solution 1: Keep only every \( M \) sample ("thinning").
- Solution 2: Keep all samples and use the simple Monte Carlo estimator
- It is consistent and unbiased if the chain has "burned in".
- Use thinning only if computing \( f(x^n) \) is expensive.
- For opinion on thinning, multiple runs, burn in, etc.

Summary: Approximate Inference

- Exact Bayesian Inference often intractable.
- Rejection and Importance Sampling
- Generate independent samples.
- Impractical in high-dimensional state spaces.
- Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)
- Simple & effective (even though typically computationally expensive).
- Scales well with the dimensionality of the state space.
- Issues of convergence have to be considered carefully.
- Gibbs Sampling
- Used extensively in practice.
- Parameter free
- Requires sampling conditional distributions.
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