Markov chain Monte Carlo

Roadmap:
— Monte Carlo basics
— What is MCMC?
— Gibbs and Metropolis–Hastings
— Practical details

Iain Murray
http://iainmurray.net/
Enrico Fermi (1901–1954) took great delight in astonishing his colleagues with his remarkably accurate predictions of experimental results. . . he revealed that his “guesses” were really derived from the statistical sampling techniques that he used to calculate with whenever insomnia struck in the wee morning hours!

—The beginning of the Monte Carlo method,
N. Metropolis
Linear Regression: Prior

Prior $P(\theta)$

Input $\rightarrow$ output mappings considered plausible before seeing data.
Posterior much more compact than prior.
Linear Regression: Posterior

\[ P(\theta | \text{Data}) \propto P(\text{Data} | \theta) P(\theta) \]

Draws from posterior. Non-linear error envelope. Possible explanations linear.
What will Bayesian linear regression do?
Given a (wrong) linear assumption, which explanations are typical of the posterior distribution?

D All of the above
E None of the above
Z Not sure
Posterior very certain despite blatant misfit. Prior ruled out truth.
Microsoft Kinect (Shotton et al., 2011)

Eyeball modelling assumptions

Generate training data

Random forest applied to fantasies
Inference:

\[ p(\theta | \mathcal{D}) \propto \sum_h p(\mathcal{D}, h, \theta) \]

Prediction:

\[ P(x | \mathcal{D}) = \int d\theta \ P(x, \theta | \mathcal{D}) \]

\[ = \int d\theta \ P(x | \theta, \mathcal{D}) \ P(\theta | \mathcal{D}) \]
A statistical problem

What is the average height of the people in this room?
Method: measure our heights, add them up and divide by $N$.

What is the average height $f$ of people $p$ in Iceland $\mathcal{I}$?

$$E_{p \in \mathcal{I}}[f(p)] \equiv \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{I}} f(p), \text{ “intractable”?}$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} f(p^{(s)}), \text{ for random survey of } S \text{ people } \{p^{(s)}\} \in \mathcal{I}$$

Surveying works for large and notionally infinite populations.
Simple Monte Carlo

Statistical sampling can be applied to any expectation:

**In general:**

\[
\int f(x) P(x) \, dx \approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} f(x^{(s)}), \quad x^{(s)} \sim P(x)
\]

**Example: making predictions**

\[
P(x | \mathcal{D}) = \int P(x | \theta) p(\theta | \mathcal{D}) \, d\theta
\]

\[
\approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} P(x | \theta^{(s)}), \quad \theta^{(s)} \sim p(\theta | \mathcal{D})
\]

**More examples:** E-step statistics in EM, Boltzmann machine learning
Marginalization is trivial

\[ P(x | \mathcal{D}) \approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} P(x | \theta^{(s)}), \quad \theta^{(s)} \sim p(\theta | \mathcal{D}) \]

Need to ‘sum out’ hidden variables? (Answer: No.)

\[ p(\theta | \mathcal{D}) \propto \sum_{h} p(\mathcal{D}, h, \theta) \]

Sample hidden variables too:

\[ (\theta^{(s)}, h^{(s)}) \sim p(\theta, h | \mathcal{D}) \propto p(\mathcal{D}, h, \theta) \]

The \( \theta^{(s)} \) are still samples from \( p(\theta | \mathcal{D}) \)
Properties of Monte Carlo

Estimator: \[ \int f(x) \, P(x) \, dx \approx \hat{f} \equiv \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} f(x^{(s)}), \quad x^{(s)} \sim P(x) \]

Estimator is unbiased:

\[ \mathbb{E}_{P(\{x^{(s)}\})} \left[ \hat{f} \right] = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} \mathbb{E}_{P(x)} [f(x)] = \mathbb{E}_{P(x)} [f(x)] \]

Variance shrinks \( \propto 1/S \):

\[ \text{var}_{P(\{x^{(s)}\})} \left[ \hat{f} \right] = \frac{1}{S^2} \sum_{s=1}^{S} \text{var}_{P(x)} [f(x)] = \frac{\text{var}_{P(x)} [f(x)]}{S} \]

“Error bars” shrink like \( \sqrt{S} \)
Aside: don’t always sample!

“Monte Carlo is an extremely bad method; it should be used only when all alternative methods are worse.”

— Alan Sokal, 1996
A dumb approximation of $\pi$

$$P(x, y) = \begin{cases} 
1 & 0 < x < 1 \text{ and } 0 < y < 1 \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}$$

$$\pi = 4 \iint \mathbb{1} \left( (x^2 + y^2) < 1 \right) P(x, y) \, dx \, dy$$

octave:1> S=12; a=rand(S,2); 4*mean(sum(a.*a,2)<1)
an = 3.3333
octave:2> S=1e7; a=rand(S,2); 4*mean(sum(a.*a,2)<1)
an = 3.1418
Alternatives to Monte Carlo

There are other methods of numerical integration!

**Example: (nice) 1D integrals are easy:**

```
octave:1> 4 * quadl(@(x) sqrt(1-x.^2), 0, 1, tolerance)
```

Gives $\pi$ to 6 dp’s in 108 evaluations, machine precision in 2598.

(NB Matlab’s quadl fails at tolerance=0, but Octave works.)

In higher dimensions sometimes deterministic approximations work:
Variational Bayes, EP, INLA, . . .
Reminder

Want to sample to approximate expectations:

$$\int f(x)P(x)\,dx \approx \frac{1}{S}\sum_{s=1}^{S} f(x^{(s)}), \quad x^{(s)} \sim P(x)$$

How do we get the samples?
Sampling simple distributions

Use library routines for univariate distributions
(and some other special cases)

This book (free online) explains how some of them work

http://cg.scs.carleton.ca/~luc/rnbookindex.html
Sampling discrete values

\[ u \sim \text{Uniform}[0, 1] \]

\[ u = 0.4 \quad \Rightarrow \quad x = b \]

There are more efficient ways for large numbers of values and samples. See Devroye book.
Sampling from densities

How to convert samples from a Uniform[0,1] generator:

\[ h(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{y} p(y') \, dy' \]

\[ u \sim \text{Uniform}[0,1] \]

Sample, \( y(u) = h^{-1}(u) \)

Although we can’t always compute and invert \( h(y) \)
Sampling from densities

Draw points uniformly under the curve:

\[
P(x) \quad x^{(2)} \quad x^{(3)} \quad x^{(1)} \quad x^{(4)}
\]

Probability mass to left of point \( \sim \) Uniform\([0,1]\)
Rejection sampling

Sampling from $\pi(x)$ using tractable $q(x)$:

$q(x) \geq \pi^*(x), \forall x$

$\pi^*(x) = c \cdot \pi(x)$

Figure credit: Ryan P. Adams
Importance sampling

Rewrite integral: expectation under simple distribution $Q$:

$$\int f(x) P(x) \, dx = \int f(x) \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} Q(x) \, dx,$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} f(x^{(s)}) \frac{P(x^{(s)})}{Q(x^{(s)})}, \quad x^{(s)} \sim Q(x)$$

Simple Monte Carlo applied to any integral. Unbiased and independent of dimension?
Importance sampling (2)

If only know $P(x) = P^*(x)/\mathcal{Z}_P$ up to constant:

$$
\int f(x) P(x) \, dx \approx \frac{\mathcal{Z}_Q}{\mathcal{Z}_P} \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} f(x^{(s)}) \frac{P^*(x^{(s)})}{Q^*(x^{(s)})} w^*(s), \quad x^{(s)} \sim Q(x)
$$

$$
\approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} f(x^{(s)}) \frac{w^*(s)}{\frac{1}{S} \sum_{s'} w^*(s')}
$$

This estimator is consistent but biased.

**Exercise:** Prove that $\mathcal{Z}_P/\mathcal{Z}_Q \approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_s w^*(s)$
Summary so far

- **Monte Carlo**
  approximate expectations with a sample average

- **Rejection sampling**
  draw samples from complex distributions

- **Importance sampling**
  apply Monte Carlo to ‘any’ sum/integral

Next: High dimensional problems: MCMC
Application to large problems

Approximations scale badly with dimensionality

Example: \( P(x) = \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{I}), \quad Q(x) = \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbb{I}) \)

Rejection sampling:
Requires \( \sigma \geq 1 \). Fraction of proposals accepted = \( \sigma^{-D} \)

Importance sampling:
\[
\text{Var}[P(x)/Q(x)] = \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{2 - 1/\sigma^2} \right)^{D/2} - 1
\]
Infinite / undefined variance if \( \sigma \leq 1/\sqrt{2} \)
Reminder

Need to sample large, non-standard distributions:

\[ P(x|\mathcal{D}) \approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} P(x|\theta), \quad \theta \sim P(\theta|\mathcal{D}) = \frac{P(\mathcal{D}|\theta) P(\theta)}{P(\mathcal{D})} \]
Importance sampling weights

$w = 0.00548$

$w = 1.59 \times 10^{-8}$

$w = 9.65 \times 10^{-6}$

$w = 0.371$

$w = 0.103$

$w = 1.01 \times 10^{-8}$

$w = 0.111$

$w = 1.92 \times 10^{-9}$

$w = 0.0126$

$w = 1.1 \times 10^{-51}$
Metropolis algorithm

- Perturb parameters: \( Q(\theta'; \theta) \), e.g. \( \mathcal{N}(\theta, \sigma^2) \)
- Accept with probability \( \min\left(1, \frac{\tilde{P}(\theta'|D)}{\tilde{P}(\theta|D)}\right) \)
- Otherwise keep old parameters

Detail: Metropolis, as stated, requires \( Q(\theta'; \theta) = Q(\theta; \theta') \)
Equation of State Calculations by Fast Computing Machines

Nicholas Metropolis, Arianna W. Rosenbluth, Marshall N. Rosenbluth, and Augusta H. Teller,
Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico

AND

Edward Teller,* Department of Physics, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois
(Received March 6, 1953)

THE purpose of this paper is to describe a general method, suitable for fast electronic computing machines, of calculating the properties of any substance which may be considered as composed of interacting individual molecules. Classical statistics is assumed,
Target distribution

\[ P(x) = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-E(x)} \]

e.g. \( x = \) [Diagram of a grid with some nodes colored black and others white]
Local moves

\[ Q(x'; x) \]
Goal: a Markov chain,

\[ x_t \sim T(x_t \leftarrow x_{t-1}) \text{, such that:} \]

\[ P(x^{(t)}) = e^{-E(x^{(t)})}/Z \text{ for large } t. \]
If $x^{(t-1)}$ is a sample from $P$,

$x^{(t)}$ is also a sample from $P$.

$$
\sum_x T(x' \leftarrow x) P(x) = P(x')
$$
Ergodicity

Unique invariant distribution

if ‘forget’ starting point, $x^{(0)}$
Quick review

**MCMC**: biased random walk exploring a target dist.

Markov steps,
\[ x^{(s)} \sim T \left( x^{(s)} \leftarrow x^{(s-1)} \right) \]

MCMC gives approximate, correlated samples

\[ \mathbb{E}_P[f] \approx \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} f(x^{(s)}) \]

\( T \) must leave target invariant

\( T \) must be able to get everywhere in \( K \) steps
Gibbs sampling

Pick variables in turn or randomly, and resample \( P(x_i | x_{j \neq i}) \)

\[
T_i(x') \leftarrow x = P(x'_i | x_{j \neq i}) \delta(x'_j \neq i - x_{j \neq i})
\]
Gibbs sampling correctness

\[ P(\mathbf{x}) = P(x_i | \mathbf{x}_{\setminus i}) P(\mathbf{x}_{\setminus i}) \]

Simulate by drawing \( \mathbf{x}_{\setminus i} \), then \( x_i | \mathbf{x}_{\setminus i} \)

**Draw** \( \mathbf{x}_{\setminus i} \): sample \( \mathbf{x} \), throw initial \( x_i \) away
Reverse operators

If \( T \) leaves \( P(x) \) stationary, define a reverse operator

\[
R(x \leftarrow x') = \frac{T(x' \leftarrow x) P(x)}{\sum_x T(x' \leftarrow x) P(x)} = \frac{T(x' \leftarrow x) P(x)}{P(x')},
\]

A necessary condition: there exists \( R \) such that:

\[
T(x' \leftarrow x) P(x) = R(x \leftarrow x') P(x'), \quad \forall x, x'.
\]

If \( R = T \), known as detailed balance (not necessary)
Balance condition

\[ T(x' \leftarrow x) P(x) = R(x \leftarrow x') P(x') \]

Implies that \( P(x) \) is left invariant:

\[ \sum_x T(x' \leftarrow x) P(x) = P(x') \sum_x R(x \leftarrow x') \]
Metropolis–Hastings

Arbitrary proposals $\sim Q$:

$$Q(x'; x) P(x) \neq Q(x; x') P(x')$$

Satisfies detailed balance by rejecting moves:

$$T(x' \leftarrow x) = \begin{cases} 
Q(x'; x) \min \left(1, \frac{P(x') Q(x; x')}{P(x) Q(x'; x)} \right) & x' \neq x \\
\ldots & x' = x 
\end{cases}$$
Metropolis–Hastings

Transition operator

- Propose a move from the current state $Q(x'; x)$, e.g. $\mathcal{N}(x, \sigma^2)$
- Accept with probability $\min\left(1, \frac{P(x')Q(x'; x)}{P(x)Q(x'; x)}\right)$
- Otherwise next state in chain is a copy of current state

Notes

- Can use $P^* \propto P(x)$; normalizer cancels in acceptance ratio
- Satisfies detailed balance (shown below)
- $Q$ must be chosen so chain is ergodic

\[P(x) \cdot T(x' \leftarrow x) = P(x) \cdot Q(x'; x) \min\left(1, \frac{P(x')Q(x'; x)}{P(x)Q(x'; x)}\right) = \min\left(P(x)Q(x'; x), P(x')Q(x; x')\right)\]

\[= P(x') \cdot Q(x; x') \min\left(1, \frac{P(x)Q(x'; x)}{P(x')Q(x; x')}\right) = P(x') \cdot T(x \leftarrow x')\]
function samples = dumb_metropolis(init, log_ptilde, iters, sigma)

D = numel(init);
samples = zeros(D, iters);

state = init;
Lp_state = log_ptilde(state);
for ss = 1:iters
    % Propose
    prop = state + sigma*randn(size(state));
    Lp_prop = log_ptilde(prop);
    if log(rand) < (Lp_prop - Lp_state)
        % Accept
        state = prop;
        Lp_state = Lp_prop;
    end
    samples(:, ss) = state(:);
end
Step-size demo

Explore $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ with different step sizes $\sigma$

$$\sigma = @(s) \text{plot(dumb\_metropolis(0, @(x)-0.5*x*x, 1e3, s));}$$

- $\sigma(0.1)$
  - 99.8% accepts

- $\sigma(1)$
  - 68.4% accepts

- $\sigma(100)$
  - 0.5% accepts
Diffusion time

Generic proposals use
\[ Q(x'; x) = \mathcal{N}(x, \sigma^2) \]

- \( \sigma \) large \( \rightarrow \) many rejections
- \( \sigma \) small \( \rightarrow \) slow diffusion:
  \[ \sim (L/\sigma)^2 \text{ iterations required} \]

Adapted from MacKay (2003)
An MCMC strategy

Come up with good proposals $Q(x'; x)$

Combine transition operators:

\[
\begin{align*}
    x_1 &\sim T_A(\cdot \leftarrow x_0) \\
    x_2 &\sim T_B(\cdot \leftarrow x_1) \\
    x_3 &\sim T_C(\cdot \leftarrow x_2) \\
    x_4 &\sim T_A(\cdot \leftarrow x_3) \\
    x_5 &\sim T_B(\cdot \leftarrow x_4)
\end{align*}
\]
Summary so far

- We need approximate methods to solve sums/integrals
- Monte Carlo does not explicitly depend on dimension, although simple methods work only in low dimensions
- Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) can make local moves. By assuming less, it’s more applicable to higher dimensions
- simple computations $\Rightarrow$ “easy” to implement (harder to diagnose).
Can you find the Dark Matter that dominates our Universe?
Winton Capital offers you the chance to unlock the secrets of dark worlds.

There is more to the Universe than meets the eye. Out in the cosmos exists a form of matter that outnumber the stuff we can see by almost 7 to 1, and we don’t know what it is. What we do know is that it does not emit or absorb light, so we call it Dark Matter.

Such a vast amount of aggregated matter does not go unnoticed. In fact we observe that this stuff aggregates and forms massive structures called Dark Matter Halos.

Although dark, it warps and bends spacetime such that any light from a background galaxy which passes close to the Dark Matter will have its path altered and changed. This bending causes the galaxy to appear as an ellipse in the sky.
Dark Matter

http://www.kaggle.com/c/DarkWorlds
A. Distant circular galaxies (or dots in this case) are randomly distributed in the sky. Each galaxy has an (x, y) coordinate corresponding to the position in the sky.

B. By placing a Dark Matter halo in the middle of the sky between us and the background galaxies, they are altered such that they become elliptical. The lines show the orientation and size of the major axis of the galaxy.

C. However unfortunately galaxies are NOT circular and in fact they are inherently elliptical. This property is random, however since the Universe has no preferred ellipticity this averages out to zero in the case of no other influence.

D. Therefore if we placed a Dark Matter halo into a field of randomly elliptical galaxies we would get a field that does not average out to zero. If we can use the fact that Dark Matter makes the pattern seen in B, we should be able to detect the position of the central halo.

http://www.kaggle.com/c/DarkWorlds
Probabilistic model

\[ e_1^{(n)} \sim \mathcal{N}(f^{(n)} \cos 2\theta^{(n)}, \sigma^2) \quad f^{(n)} = m/r^{(n)} \]

\[ e_2^{(n)} \sim \mathcal{N}(f^{(n)} \sin 2\theta^{(n)}, \sigma^2) \]

\[ f = m/ \min(r_0, r) \]

\[ \sigma^2 \text{ larger for small } r \]
Inference

Markov chain Monte Carlo

(MCMC)
Reporting results?

— Average/mean sample?

— Most probable sample?

— Cluster?
Evaluation

Cost: \( \text{RMSE}/1000 + G \)

\[
G = \sqrt{\left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \cos \phi_n \right)^2 + \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sin \phi_n \right)^2}
\]

http://www.kaggle.com/c/DarkWorlds/details/evaluation
Toy demo

![Graph showing shear vs position on sky]
Ave. max. likelihood separation = 0.96, 4% too close
Graphical model

galaxies n=1..N

Made with http://daft-pgm.org/
Graphical model

sky $s=1..S$

galaxies $n=1..N$

$\theta$

$h^{(s)}$

$e^{(n)}$

$x^{(n)}$

Made with http://daft-pgm.org/
How should we run MCMC?

- The samples aren’t independent. Should we thin, only keep every $K$th sample?
- Arbitrary initialization means starting iterations are bad. Should we discard a “burn-in” period?
- Maybe we should perform multiple runs?
- How do we know if we have run for long enough?
Forming estimates

Approximately independent samples can be obtained by *thinning*. However, all the samples can be used.

Use the simple Monte Carlo estimator on MCMC samples. It is:

— consistent
— unbiased if the chain has “burned in”

The correct motivation to thin: if computing $f(x^{(s)})$ is expensive

In some special circumstances strategic thinning can help.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0167-7152(99)00142-X — Thanks to Simon Lacoste-Julien for the reference.
Empirical diagnostics

Recommendations

For diagnostics:
Standard software packages like R-CODA

For opinion on thinning, multiple runs, burn in, etc.
Practical Markov chain Monte Carlo
http://www.jstor.org/stable/2246094
Consistency checks

Do I get the right answer on tiny versions of my problem?

Can I make good inferences about synthetic data drawn from my model?


Posterior Model checking: Gelman et al. Bayesian Data Analysis textbook and papers.
Getting it right

We write MCMC code to update $\theta \mid y$

**Idea:** also write code to sample $y \mid \theta$

Both codes leave $P(\theta, y)$ invariant

Run codes alternately. Check $\theta$’s match prior
Example / warning

Proposal: \[
\begin{cases}
  x_{t+1} = 9x_t + 1, & 0 < x_t < 1 \\
  x_{t+1} = (x_t - 1)/9, & 1 < x_t < 10
\end{cases}
\]

Accept move with probability:

\[
\min \left( 1, \frac{P(x') Q(x; x')}{P(x) Q(x'; x)} \right) = \min \left( 1, \frac{P(x')}{P(x)} \right) \quad \text{(WRONG!)}
\]
Summary

Write down the probability of everything.

Condition on what you know,
sample everything that you don’t.

Samples give plausible explanations:
  — Look at them
  — Average their predictions
References
Further reading (1/2)

General references:

Various figures and more came from (see also references therein):

Specific points:

If you do Gibbs sampling with continuous distributions this method, which I omitted for material-overload reasons, may help:

An example of picking estimators carefully:

A key reference for auxiliary variable methods is:


An early reference for parallel tempering:

Further reading (2/2)

Software:
Neural networks and other flexible models: http://www.cs.utoronto.ca/~radford/fbm.software.html
CODA: http://www-fis.iarc.fr/coda/

Other Monte Carlo methods:
Nested sampling is a new Monte Carlo method with some interesting properties:
Nested sampling for general Bayesian computation, John Skilling, Bayesian Analysis, 2006.

Approaches based on the “multi-canonical ensemble” also solve some of the problems with traditional temperature-based methods:

A good review paper:

Particle filters / Sequential Monte Carlo are famously successful in time series modeling, but are more generally applicable.
This may be a good place to start: http://www.cs.ubc.ca/~arnaud/journals.html

Exact or perfect sampling uses Markov chain simulation but suffers no initialization bias. An amazing feat when it can be performed:
Annotated bibliography of perfectly random sampling with Markov chains, David B. Wilson
http://dbwilson.com/exact/

MCMC does not apply to doubly-intractable distributions. For what that even means and possible solutions see:
http://www.gatsby.ucl.ac.uk/~iam23/pub/06doubly_intractable/doubly_intractable.pdf