The Infinite Factorial Hidden Markov Model

Jurgen Van Gael Yee Whye Teh Zoubin Ghahramani Prese

Presented by Zachary Kahn

Motivation

- HMMs allow us to use latent variables to describe the emissions of data at discrete steps, but the latent variable can only describe one hidden state
- It might be that multiple hidden states are combining to create your data in a more complicated fashion

Graphical Model



Figure 1: The Hidden Markov Model



Figure 2: The Factorial Hidden Markov Model

Finite Model

- S = Binary Matrix with T rows (data points) and M columns (features)
- C_m^{ij} = # transitions from state i to j in chain m

$$\begin{split} \boldsymbol{W}^{(m)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 - a_m & a_m \\ 1 - b_m & b_m \end{pmatrix} \qquad \boldsymbol{W}^{(m)}_{ij} = p(s_{t+1,m} = j | s_{tm} = i) \\ \forall m \in \{1, 2, \cdots, M\} : a_m \sim \text{Beta}\left(\frac{\alpha}{M}, 1\right) \quad , \quad b_m \sim \text{Beta}(\gamma, \delta), \\ s_{0m} &= 0 \quad , \quad s_{tm} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(a_m^{1-s_{t-1,m}} b_m^{s_{t-1,m}}). \\ p(\boldsymbol{S} | \boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}) &= \prod_{m=1}^{M} (1 - a_m)^{c_m^{00}} a_m^{c_m^{01}} (1 - b_m)^{c_m^{10}} b_m^{c_m^{11}}. \end{split}$$

 $p(\boldsymbol{S}|\alpha,\gamma,\delta) = \prod_{m=1}^{M} \frac{\frac{\alpha}{M} \Gamma(\frac{\alpha}{M} + c_m^{01}) \Gamma(c_m^{00} + 1) \Gamma(\gamma + \delta) \Gamma(\delta + c_m^{10}) \Gamma(\gamma + c_m^{11})}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha}{M} + c_m^{00} + c_m^{01} + 1) \Gamma(\gamma) \Gamma(\delta) \Gamma(\gamma + \delta + c_m^{10} + c_m^{11})}$

Infinite Limit

• Just taking the limit as M $\rightarrow \infty$ we get a probability of zero, need to use lof-equivalence classes

$$\begin{split} p([S]) &= \sum_{S \in [S]} p(S|\alpha, \gamma, \delta) \\ &= \frac{M!}{\prod_{h=0}^{2^{T}-1} M_{h}!} \prod_{m=1}^{M} \frac{\frac{\alpha}{M} \Gamma(\frac{\alpha}{M} + c_{m}^{01}) \Gamma(c_{m}^{00} + 1) \Gamma(\gamma + \delta) \Gamma(\delta + c_{m}^{10}) \Gamma(\gamma + c_{m}^{11})}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha}{M} + c_{m}^{00} + c_{m}^{01} + 1) \Gamma(\gamma) \Gamma(\delta) \Gamma(\gamma + \delta + c_{m}^{10} + c_{m}^{11})}. \\ \lim_{M \to \infty} p([S]) &= \frac{\alpha^{M_{+}}}{\prod_{h=0}^{2^{T}-1} M_{h}!} \exp\{-\alpha H_{T}\} \prod_{m=1}^{M_{+}} \frac{(c_{m}^{01} - 1)! c_{m}^{00}! \Gamma(\gamma + \delta) \Gamma(\delta + c_{m}^{10}) \Gamma(\gamma + c_{m}^{11})}{(c_{m}^{00} + c_{m}^{01})! \Gamma(\gamma) \Gamma(\delta) \Gamma(\gamma + \delta + c_{m}^{10} + c_{m}^{11})} \\ \bullet \quad \mathbf{H}_{t} = \mathbf{Harmonic} \ \mathbf{\#} \ \mathbf{t} \end{split}$$

M₁ = # active Markov chains

M

A Modified Indian Buffet Process

- First Customer takes Poisson(α) dishes starting from left.
- The t'th customer looks at dish m
 - If t-1'th customer took dish m, t'th takes with prob $(c_m^{11} + \delta)/(\gamma + \delta + c_m^{10} + c_m^{11})$

– If not, t'th takes with prob $c_m^{00}/(c_m^{00}+c_m^{01})$

• He then takes $Poisson(\alpha/t)$ new dishes

 $p([\mathbf{S}]) = \frac{\alpha^{M_{+}}}{\prod_{t=1}^{T} M_{1}^{(t)}!} \exp\{-\alpha H_{T}\} \prod_{m=1}^{M} \frac{\frac{\alpha}{M} \Gamma(\frac{\alpha}{M} + c_{m}^{01}) \Gamma(c_{m}^{00} + 1) \Gamma(\gamma + \delta) \Gamma(\delta + c_{m}^{10}) \Gamma(\gamma + c_{m}^{11})}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha}{M} + c_{m}^{00} + c_{m}^{01} + 1) \Gamma(\gamma) \Gamma(\delta) \Gamma(\gamma + \delta + c_{m}^{10} + c_{m}^{11})}.$

 $M_+ \sim \mathsf{Poisson}(\alpha H_T)$

Stick Breaking Representation

 While theoretically convenient, the previous models are not practical for inference.
 Instead, stick breaking will be more tractable.

$$\begin{aligned} a_{(1)} &\propto & \mathsf{Beta}(\alpha, 1), \\ p(a_{(m)}|a_{(m-1)}) &= & \alpha a_{(m-1)}^{-\alpha} a_{(m)}^{\alpha-1} \mathbb{I}(0 \le a_{(m)} \le a_{(m-1)}). \\ b_{(m)} &\sim \mathsf{Beta}(\gamma, \delta) \end{aligned}$$

The Infinite Factorial HMM

- To use the mIBP as a probabilistic model, we need to add feature properties through $\theta_m \sim H$
- Need to define conditional probability over observations given latent features $F(y_t|\theta, s_{t,\cdot})$
- In order to be valid in the infinite limit, we require the probability to be invariant to permutations of features, and independent of θ_m if $s_{tm} = 0$.

iFHMM Graphical Model



Independent Component Analysis

- Assume that M signals are represented as vectors x_m and $X = [x_1x_2...x_M]$.
- Signals are combined using mixing matrix W to generate Y=XW

- Also assume IID Normal($0,\sigma_Y^2$) \in s.t. Y=XW+ \in

 There exist fast algorithms to extract X from Y (e.g. ICA) but they depend on the number of signals being known in advance.

ICA iFHMM Generative Model

- S ~ mIBP
- X_{ij} ~ Laplace(0, 1) i.i.d.
- $W_{ij} \sim Normal(0, \sigma_w^2)$ i.i.d
- $\epsilon \sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma_Y^2)$
- $Y = (S \odot X)W + \epsilon$

Inference Plan

- Nonparametric models are typically inferred using Gibbs sampling with augmented Metropolis Hastings steps.
- Gibbs sampling is known to be bad in time series though due to string coupling in successive steps.
- Can avoid this using a dynamic programming solution with stick breaking.

Auxiliary Slice variable

$$\begin{split} \mu &\sim \mathsf{Uniform}(0, \min_{m:\exists t, s_{tm}=1} a_m).\\ p(\mu, \boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{S}) &= p(\mu | \boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{S}) p(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}, \boldsymbol{S}). \end{split}$$
 $p(\boldsymbol{S} | \boldsymbol{Y}, \mu, \boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}) \propto p(\boldsymbol{S} | \boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}) \frac{\mathbb{I}(0 \leq \mu \leq \min_{m:\exists t, s_{tm}=1} a_m)}{\min_{m:\exists t, s_{tm}=1} a_m} \end{split}$

 The slice variables force all columns of S where a_m < μ to be 0, allowing us to resample a finite number of columns in S

Inference Algorithm

- Start with an initial S and sample a and b.
 Then sample an initial X and W. Then iterate
 - 1. Sample the auxiliary variable $\boldsymbol{\mu}$
 - 2. Sample S, X, and W for all represented features
 - 3. Resample the hyperparameters.
 - 4. Remove all unused features.

Sampling methods

- There are multiple ways that S, X, and W can be sampled in step 2
 - A naïve Gibbs sampler performs badly as expected
 - A blocked sampler that fixes all but one column of S and runs a forwards-backwards algorithm.
 - A third sampler runs dynamic programming on multiple chains with the possibility to merge features, but you can't integrate out X and W.

Results



Questions?