CSE 473: Artificial Intelligence

Bayes' Nets



Luke Zettlemoyer --- University of Washington

Probabilistic Models

- Models describe how (a portion of) the world works

- Models are always simplifications
  - May not account for every variable
  - May not account for all interactions between variables
  - "All models are wrong; but some are useful."
    – George E. P. Box



- What do we do with probabilistic models?
  - We (or our agents) need to reason about unknown variables, given evidence
  - Example: explanation (diagnostic reasoning)
  - Example: prediction (causal reasoning)
  - Example: value of information

Independence



Independence

- Two variables are *independent* if:

$$\forall x, y : P(x, y) = P(x)P(y)$$

  - This says that their joint distribution *factors* into a product two simpler distributions
  - Another form:

$$\forall x, y : P(x|y) = P(x)$$

  - We write: $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$



- Independence is a simplifying *modeling assumption*
  - *Empirical* joint distributions: at best "close" to independent
  - What could we assume for {Weather, Traffic, Cavity, Toothache}?

Example: Independence?

$P(T)$

T	P
hot	0.5
cold	0.5

$P_1(T, W)$

T	W	P
hot	sun	0.4
hot	rain	0.1
cold	sun	0.2
cold	rain	0.3

$P_2(T, W)$

T	W	P
hot	sun	0.3
hot	rain	0.2
cold	sun	0.3
cold	rain	0.2

$P(W)$

W	P
sun	0.6
rain	0.4

Example: Independence

- N fair, independent coin flips:

$P(X_1)$

H	0.5
T	0.5

$P(X_2)$

H	0.5
T	0.5

$\dots$

$P(X_n)$

H	0.5
T	0.5



$P(X_1, X_2, \dots X_n)$

2^n

Conditional Independence



Conditional Independence

- P(Toothache, Cavity, Catch)

- If I have a cavity, the probability that the probe catches in it doesn't depend on whether I have a toothache:
  - P(+catch | +toothache, +cavity) = P(+catch | +cavity)

- The same independence holds if I don't have a cavity:
  - P(+catch | +toothache, -cavity) = P(+catch| -cavity)

- Catch is *conditionally independent* of Toothache given Cavity:
  - P(Catch | Toothache, Cavity) = P(Catch | Cavity)

- Equivalent statements:
  - P(Toothache | Catch , Cavity) = P(Toothache | Cavity)
  - P(Toothache, Catch | Cavity) = P(Toothache | Cavity) P(Catch | Cavity)
  - One can be derived from the other easily



Conditional Independence

- Unconditional (absolute) independence very rare (why?)

- *Conditional independence* is our most basic and robust form of knowledge about uncertain environments.

- X is conditionally independent of Y given Z $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y | Z$

  if and only if:

$$\forall x, y, z : P(x, y|z) = P(x|z)P(y|z)$$

  or, equivalently, if and only if

$$\forall x, y, z : P(x|z, y) = P(x|z)$$

Conditional Independence

- What about this domain:
  - Traffic
  - Umbrella
  - Raining



Conditional Independence

- What about this domain:
  - Fire
  - Smoke
  - Alarm





Conditional Independence and the Chain Rule

- Chain rule: $P(X_1, X_2, \ldots X_n) = P(X_1)P(X_2|X_1)P(X_3|X_1, X_2)\ldots$

- Trivial decomposition:

$$P(\text{Traffic}, \text{Rain}, \text{Umbrella}) =$$
$$P(\text{Rain})P(\text{Traffic}|\text{Rain})P(\text{Umbrella}|\text{Rain}, \text{Traffic})$$



- With assumption of conditional independence:

$$P(\text{Traffic}, \text{Rain}, \text{Umbrella}) =$$
$$P(\text{Rain})P(\text{Traffic}|\text{Rain})P(\text{Umbrella}|\text{Rain})$$

- Bayes' nets / graphical models help us express conditional independence assumptions

Ghostbusters Chain Rule

- Each sensor depends only on where the ghost is
- That means, the two sensors are conditionally independent, given the ghost position
- T: Top square is red
  B: Bottom square is red
  G: Ghost is in the top
- Givens:

  P(+g) = 0.5

  P(-g) = 0.5

  P(+t | +g) = 0.8
  P(+t | -g) = 0.4
  P(+b | +g) = 0.4
  P(+b | -g) = 0.8



P(T,B,G) = P(G) P(T|G) P(B|G)

T	B	G	P(T,B,G)
+t	+b	+g	0.16
+t	+b	-g	0.16
+t	-b	+g	0.24
+t	-b	-g	0.04
-t	+b	+g	0.04
-t	+b	-g	0.24
-t	-b	+g	0.06
-t	-b	-g	0.06



Bayes' Nets: Big Picture



Bayes' Nets: Big Picture

- Two problems with using full joint distribution tables as our probabilistic models:
  - Unless there are only a few variables, the joint is WAY too big to represent explicitly
  - Hard to learn (estimate) anything empirically about more than a few variables at a time

- Bayes' nets: a technique for describing complex joint distributions (models) using simple, local distributions (conditional probabilities)
  - More properly called graphical models
  - We describe how variables locally interact
  - Local interactions chain together to give global, indirect interactions
  - For about 10 min, we'll be vague about how these interactions are specified



Example Bayes' Net: Insurance



Example Bayes' Net: Car



Graphical Model Notation

- Nodes: variables (with domains)
  - Can be assigned (observed) or unassigned (unobserved)



- Arcs: interactions
  - Indicate "direct influence" between variables
  - Formally: encode conditional independence (more later)





- For now: imagine that arrows mean direct causation (in general, they don't!)

Example: Coin Flips

- N independent coin flips



- No interactions between variables: absolute independence

Example: Traffic



- Variables:
  - R: It rains
  - T: There is traffic

- Model 1: independence

- Model 2: rain causes traffic



- Why is an agent using model 2 better?

Example: Traffic II

- Let's build a causal graphical model!
- Variables
  - T: Traffic
  - R: It rains
  - L: Low pressure
  - D: Roof drips
  - B: Ballgame
  - C: Cavity



Example: Alarm Network

- Variables
  - B: Burglary
  - A: Alarm goes off
  - M: Mary calls
  - J: John calls
  - E: Earthquake!



Bayes' Net Semantics

Bayes' Net Semantics

- A set of nodes, one per variable X
- A directed, acyclic graph
- A conditional distribution for each node
  - A collection of distributions over X, one for each combination of parents' values

    $$P(X|a_1 \ldots a_n)$$

  - CPT: conditional probability table
  - Description of a noisy "causal" process



$$P(X|A_1 \ldots A_n)$$

A Bayes net = Topology (graph) + Local Conditional Probabilities

Probabilities in BNs

- Bayes' nets **implicitly** encode joint distributions
  - As a product of local conditional distributions
  - To see what probability a BN gives to a full assignment, multiply all the relevant conditionals together:

$$P(x_1, x_2, \ldots x_n) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} P(x_i | parents(X_i))$$

  - Example:





$P(+cavity, +catch, -toothache)$

Probabilities in BNs

- Why are we guaranteed that setting

$$P(x_1, x_2, \ldots x_n) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} P(x_i | parents(X_i))$$

results in a proper joint distribution?

- Chain rule (valid for all distributions): $P(x_1, x_2, \ldots x_n) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} P(x_i | x_1 \ldots x_{i-1})$

- <u>Assume</u> conditional independences: $P(x_i | x_1, \ldots x_{i-1}) = P(x_i | parents(X_i))$

→ Consequence: $P(x_1, x_2, \ldots x_n) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} P(x_i | parents(X_i))$

- Not every BN can represent every joint distribution
  - The topology enforces certain conditional independencies

Example: Coin Flips

X_1 X_2 $\cdots$ X_n

$P(X_1)$

h	0.5
t	0.5

$P(X_2)$

h	0.5
t	0.5

$\cdots$

$P(X_n)$

h	0.5
t	0.5



$$P(h, h, t, h) =$$

Only distributions whose variables are absolutely independent can be represented by a Bayes' net with no arcs.

Example: Traffic



$P(R)$

+r	1/4
-r	3/4

$P(T|R)$

+r	+t	3/4
	-t	1/4
-r	+t	1/2
	-t	1/2

$$P(+r, -t) =$$



Example: Traffic

- Causal direction



$P(R)$

+r	1/4
-r	3/4

$P(T|R)$

+r	+t	3/4
	-t	1/4
-r	+t	1/2
	-t	1/2

$P(T,R)$

+r	+t	3/16
+r	-t	1/16
-r	+t	6/16
-r	-t	6/16

Example: Reverse Traffic

- Reverse causality?



$P(T)$

+t	9/16
-t	7/16

$P(R|T)$

+t	+r	1/3
	-r	2/3
-t	+r	1/7
	-r	6/7

$P(T,R)$

+r	+t	3/16
+r	-t	1/16
-r	+t	6/16
-r	-t	6/16

Causality?

- When Bayes' nets reflect the true causal patterns:
  - Often simpler (nodes have fewer parents)
  - Often easier to think about
  - Often easier to elicit from experts
- BNs need not actually be causal
  - Sometimes no causal net exists over the domain (especially if variables are missing)
  - E.g. consider the variables *Traffic* and *Drips*
  - End up with arrows that reflect correlation, not causation
- What do the arrows really mean?
  - Topology may happen to encode causal structure
  - Topology really encodes conditional independence

$$P(x_i|x_1, \ldots x_{i-1}) = P(x_i|\mathit{parents}(X_i))$$



Example: Alarm Network

B	P(B)
+b	0.001
-b	0.999



E	P(E)
+e	0.002
-e	0.998



A	J	P(J|A)
+a	+j	0.9
+a	-j	0.1
-a	+j	0.05
-a	-j	0.95

A	M	P(M|A)
+a	+m	0.7
+a	-m	0.3
-a	+m	0.01
-a	-m	0.99

B	E	A	P(A|B,E)
+b	+e	+a	0.95
+b	+e	-a	0.05
+b	-e	+a	0.94
+b	-e	-a	0.06
-b	+e	+a	0.29
-b	+e	-a	0.71
-b	-e	+a	0.001
-b	-e	-a	0.999

$$P(+b, -e, +a, -j, +m) =$$

Example: Alarm Network

B	P(B)
+b	0.001
-b	0.999



E	P(E)
+e	0.002
-e	0.998



A	J	P(J|A)
+a	+j	0.9
+a	-j	0.1
-a	+j	0.05
-a	-j	0.95

A	M	P(M|A)
+a	+m	0.7
+a	-m	0.3
-a	+m	0.01
-a	-m	0.99

B	E	A	P(A|B,E)
+b	+e	+a	0.95
+b	+e	-a	0.05
+b	-e	+a	0.94
+b	-e	-a	0.06
-b	+e	+a	0.29
-b	+e	-a	0.71
-b	-e	+a	0.001
-b	-e	-a	0.999

$$P(+b, -e, +a, -j, +m) =$$
$$P(+b)P(-e)P(+a| + b, -e)P(-j| + a)P(+m| + a) =$$
$$0.001 \times 0.998 \times 0.94 \times 0.1 \times 0.7$$

Size of a Bayes' Net

- How big is a joint distribution over N Boolean variables?

  2^N

- How big is an N-node net if nodes have up to k parents?

  $O(N * 2^{k+1})$

- Both give you the power to calculate

  $$P(X_1, X_2, \ldots X_n)$$

- BNs: Huge space savings!
- Also easier to elicit local CPTs
- Also faster to answer queries (coming)





Bayes' Nets

- So far: how a Bayes' net encodes a joint distribution
- Next: how to answer queries about that distribution
  - Today:
    - First assembled BNs using an intuitive notion of conditional independence as causality
    - Then saw that key property is conditional independence
  - Main goal: answer queries about conditional independence and influence
- After that: how to answer numerical queries (inference)



Bayes' Nets

- ✓ Representation
- Conditional Independences
- Probabilistic Inference
- Learning Bayes' Nets from Data

Conditional Independence

- X and Y are independent if

$$\forall x, y \;\; P(x, y) = P(x)P(y) \dashrightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$$

- X and Y are conditionally independent given Z

$$\forall x, y, z \;\; P(x, y|z) = P(x|z)P(y|z) \dashrightarrow X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y|Z$$

- (Conditional) independence is a property of a distribution

- Example: $Alarm \perp\!\!\!\perp Fire|Smoke$



Bayes Nets: Assumptions

- Assumptions we are required to make to define the Bayes net when given the graph:

$$P(x_i|x_1 \cdots x_{i-1}) = P(x_i|parents(X_i))$$

- Beyond above "chain rule → Bayes net" conditional independence assumptions
  - Often additional conditional independences
  - They can be read off the graph
- Important for modeling: understand assumptions made when choosing a Bayes net graph



Example



- Conditional independence assumptions directly from simplifications in chain rule:

- Additional implied conditional independence assumptions?

Independence in a BN

- Important question about a BN:
  - Are two nodes independent given certain evidence?
  - If yes, can prove using algebra (tedious in general)
  - If no, can prove with a counter example
  - Example:



  - Question: are X and Z necessarily independent?
    - Answer: no. Example: low pressure causes rain, which causes traffic.
    - X can influence Z, Z can influence X (via Y)
    - Addendum: they *could* be independent: how?

D-separation: Outline



D-separation: Outline

- Study independence properties for triples
- Analyze complex cases in terms of member triples
- D-separation: a condition / algorithm for answering such queries

Causal Chains

- This configuration is a "causal chain"

X: Low pressure Y: Rain Z: Traffic

$$P(x, y, z) = P(x)P(y|x)P(z|y)$$

- Guaranteed X independent of Z ? *No!*
  - One example set of CPTs for which X is not independent of Z is sufficient to show this independence is not guaranteed.
  - Example:
    - Low pressure causes rain causes traffic, high pressure causes no rain causes no traffic
    - In numbers:

      P(+y | +x) = 1, P(-y | - x) = 1,
      P(+z | +y) = 1, P(-z | -y) = 1

Causal Chains

- This configuration is a "causal chain"

X: Low pressure Y: Rain Z: Traffic

$$P(x, y, z) = P(x)P(y|x)P(z|y)$$

- Guaranteed X independent of Z given Y?

$$P(z|x,y) = \frac{P(x,y,z)}{P(x,y)}$$

$$= \frac{P(x)P(y|x)P(z|y)}{P(x)P(y|x)}$$

$$= P(z|y)$$

Yes!

- Evidence along the chain "blocks" the influence

Common Cause

- This configuration is a "common cause"



$$P(x, y, z) = P(y)P(x|y)P(z|y)$$

- Guaranteed X independent of Z ? *No!*
  - One example set of CPTs for which X is not independent of Z is sufficient to show this independence is not guaranteed.
  - Example:
    - Project due causes both forums busy and lab full
    - In numbers:

P(+x | +y) = 1, P(-x | -y) = 1,
P(+z | +y) = 1, P(-z | -y) = 1

Common Cause

- This configuration is a "common cause"

Y: Project due



X: Forums busy

Z: Lab full

$$P(x,y,z) = P(y)P(x|y)P(z|y)$$

- Guaranteed X and Z independent given Y?

$$P(z|x,y) = \frac{P(x,y,z)}{P(x,y)}$$

$$= \frac{P(y)P(x|y)P(z|y)}{P(y)P(x|y)}$$

$$= P(z|y)$$

Yes!

- Observing the cause blocks influence between effects.

Common Effect

- Last configuration: two causes of one effect (v-structures)



- Are X and Y independent?
  - *Yes*: the ballgame and the rain cause traffic, but they are not correlated
  - Still need to prove they must be (try it!)
- Are X and Y independent given Z?
  - *No*: seeing traffic puts the rain and the ballgame in competition as explanation.
- This is backwards from the other cases
  - Observing an effect activates influence between possible causes.

The General Case

The General Case

- General question: in a given BN, are two variables independent (given evidence)?
- Solution: analyze the graph
- Any complex example can be broken
  into repetitions of the three canonical cases



Reachability

- Recipe: shade evidence nodes, look for paths in the resulting graph
- Attempt 1: if two nodes are connected by an undirected path not blocked by a shaded node, they are conditionally independent
- Almost works, but not quite
  - Where does it break?
  - Answer: the v-structure at T doesn't count as a link in a path unless "active"



Active / Inactive Paths

- Question: Are X and Y conditionally independent given evidence variables {Z}?
  - Yes, if X and Y "d-separated" by Z
  - Consider all (undirected) paths from X to Y
  - No active paths = independence!

- A path is active if each triple is active:
  - Causal chain A → B → C where B is unobserved (either direction)
  - Common cause A ← B → C where B is unobserved
  - Common effect (aka v-structure)
    A → B ← C where B *or one of its descendents* is observed

- All it takes to block a path is a single inactive segment



D-Separation

- Query: $X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X_j | \{X_{k_1}, ..., X_{k_n}\}$?
- Check all (undirected!) paths between X_i and X_j
  - If one or more active, then independence not guaranteed

$$X_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_j | \{X_{k_1}, ..., X_{k_n}\}$$

  - Otherwise (i.e. if all paths are inactive), then independence is guaranteed

$$X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X_j | \{X_{k_1}, ..., X_{k_n}\}$$



Example

$R \perp\!\!\!\perp B$ *Yes*

$R \perp\!\!\!\perp B | T$

$R \perp\!\!\!\perp B | T'$



Example

$L \perp\!\!\!\perp T' | T$ *Yes*

$L \perp\!\!\!\perp B$ *Yes*

$L \perp\!\!\!\perp B | T$

$L \perp\!\!\!\perp B | T'$

$L \perp\!\!\!\perp B | T, R$ *Yes*



Example

- Variables:
  - R: Raining
  - T: Traffic
  - D: Roof drips
  - S: I'm sad
- Questions:



$$T \perp\!\!\!\perp D$$

$$T \perp\!\!\!\perp D | R$$ Yes

$$T \perp\!\!\!\perp D | R, S$$

Structure Implications

- Given a Bayes net structure, can run d-separation algorithm to build a complete list of conditional independences that are necessarily true of the form

$$X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X_j | \{X_{k_1}, ..., X_{k_n}\}$$

- This list determines the set of probability distributions that can be represented



Computing All Independences





Topology Limits Distributions

- Given some graph topology G, only certain joint distributions can be encoded
- The graph structure guarantees certain (conditional) independences
- (There might be more independence)
- Adding arcs increases the set of distributions, but has several costs
- Full conditioning can encode any distribution



Bayes Nets Representation Summary

- Bayes nets compactly encode joint distributions
- Guaranteed independencies of distributions can be deduced from BN graph structure
- D-separation gives precise conditional independence guarantees from graph alone
- A Bayes' net's joint distribution may have further (conditional) independence that is not detectable until you inspect its specific distribution

Bayes' Nets

- ✓ Representation
- ✓ Conditional Independences
- Probabilistic Inference
  - Enumeration (exact, exponential complexity)
  - Variable elimination (exact, worst-case exponential complexity, often better)
  - Probabilistic inference is NP-complete
  - Sampling (approximate)
- Learning Bayes' Nets from Data