Hidden Markov Models

Hosein Mohimani GHC7717 hoseinm@andrew.cmu.edu

Dealer flips a coin and player bets on outcome

Dealer use either a fair coin (head and tail equally likely) or a biased coin (head with probability 3/4)



Can you guess which of the following sequences are generated by a fair coin, and which ones with a biased one ?

1 НТНННННТНТТТТТННТТТТННТТТТНННТТННТТТТНТТТ

2 ТНТНННТННННННТНТТНННННННННННННННННН

3 ННТНТТНННТТНННТТНННННННННННН

Dealer flips a coin and player bets on outcome

Dealer use either a fair coin (head and tail equally likely) or a biased coin (head with probability 3/4)



1 НТНННННТНТНТТТТННТНТТТННТТТНННТННТТТНТТТ	19/40
2 ТНТНННТННННННТНТТННННННННННННННННН	31/40

3 ННТНТТНННТТНННТНННННННН 28/40

The dealer changes the coin occasionally

Can you guess which parts the fair coin was used, and in which parts the Biased coin was used ?

The dealer changes the coin occasionally

Fair Bet Casino Problem : multiple hypothesis testing

• Is the following sequence coming from a fair (1/2,1/2) coin, or a biased (3/4,1/4) coin ?

НТНННННТНТТТТТННТТТТННТТТННТТТННТТТНТТТ 19/40

Hypothesis 1 : Fair coin (1/2, 1/2)

Hypothesis 2 : Biased coin (3/4, 1/4)

• Which of the two hypothesis is more likely to happen?

Lets compue the probabilities

- Consider sequence HTH
- What is the likelihood of HTH under fair coin hypothesis?
- What is the likelihood of HTH under biased coin hypothesis?
- Which of the two hypothesis is more likely?

Lets compute the probabilities

- P(HTH|fair) = P(H|fair).P(T|fair).P(H|fair) = 1/2.1/2.1/2 = 1/8
- $P(HTH|biased) = P(H|biased).P(T|biased).P(H|biased) = \frac{3}{4}.1/4.\frac{3}{4} = \frac{9}{64}$
- Biased coin hypothesis is slightly more likely

Multiple Hypothesis Testing

• What is the likelihood of this sequence under each hypothesis?

Under fair hypothesis $P(seq | fair) = (\frac{1}{2})^{40} = 9.10^{-13}$ Log-likelihoodlog P(seq | fair) = 40.log(1/2) = -12.04

Under biased hypothesis

$$P(seq \mid biased) = (\frac{3}{4})^{19} (\frac{1}{4})^{21} = 9.10^{-16}$$

log P(seq \neq \neq biased) = 19.log(3/4) + 21.log(1/4) = -15.01

• Fair hypothesis is more likely than biased hypothesis

Conditional Probabilities

•
$$P(x|F) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} P^F(x_i) = \frac{1}{2^n}$$

• $P(x|B) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} P^B(x_i) = \frac{1}{4^{n-k}} \frac{3^k}{4^k} = \frac{3^k}{4^n}$ (k is the number of heads in x)
• $P(x|F) > P(x|B) \rightarrow$ dealer probably use a fair coin k $< \frac{n}{\log_2 3}$
• $P(x|F) < P(x|B) \rightarrow$ dealer probably use a biased coin k $> \frac{n}{\log_2 3}$

• Log odd-ratio :
$$\log_2 \frac{P(x|F)}{P(x|B)} = \sum_{i=1}^n \log_2 \frac{P^F(x_i)}{P^B(x_i)} = n - k \log_2 3$$

Markov Model of Fair Bet Casino



- We observe a sequence coin tosses HHTTHTHHHHHTT
- How can we predict when the coin was fair/biased ? e.g. the most likely sequence FFFFFBBBBBBBBBF that resulted in this outcome ?

- Given a sequence of coin tosses, determine when a dealer used a fair coin and when he used a biased coin
- Input : A sequence $x=x_1x_2...x_n$ of coin tosses (either H or T) made by two possible coins (F or B).
- Output : A sequence $\pi = \pi_1 \pi_2 \dots \pi_n$ with each π_i being either *F* or *B* indicating that x_i is the result of tossing the fair or biased coin, respectively.

Is this even possible?

- In practice, any sequence $\pi = \pi_1 \pi_2 \dots \pi_n$ can generate any outcome $x = x_1 x_2 \dots x_n$
- We are interested in the most probable sequence π that explains the outcome *x*
- Fair coin : $P^{F}(H) = P^{F}(T) = 1/2$
- Biased coin : $P^{F}(H) = 3/4$, $P^{F}(T) = 1/4$

Markov Model of Fair Bet Casino





Hidden Markov Model of Fair Bet Casino





Transition Probabilities



Emission Probabilities

Hidden Markov Model

- An abstract machine with ability to produce output by coin tossing
- At the beginning, the machine is in one of the *k* hidden states (Fair or Biased in case of Fair Bet Casino)
- At each step, HMM makes two decisions :
 - What state will I move into (Fair or Biased)
 - What symbol from an alphabet Σ will I emit (Head or Tail)
- The observer see emitted symbols, but not HMM states
- The goal of the observer is to infer the most likely state by analyzing the emitted symbols.

HMM : formal definition

Formally, an HMM \mathcal{M} is defined by

- An alphabet of emitted symbols Σ
- A set of hidden states Q
- A |Q|x|Q| matrix of transition probabilities $A = (a_{kl})$, where a_{kl} is the probability of changing to state k after being in state l

A $|Q|x|\Sigma|$ matrix of emission probabilities $E = e_k(b)$, describing the probability of emitting the symbol *b* during a step in which the HMM is in step *k*

Back to the casino fair bet problem

- Each row of the matrix A is a state die with |Q| sides
- Each row of the matrix *E* is a state die with $|\Sigma|$ sides
- The casino fair bet problem $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma, Q, A, E)$
 - $\Sigma = \{0,1\}$, corresponding to tails (0) or heads (1)
 - $Q = \{F, B\}$, corresponding to fair (F) and biased (B) coin
 - $a_{FF} = a_{BB} = 0.9$, $a_{FB} = a_{BF} = 0.1$
 - $e_F(0) = 1/2$, $e_F(1) = 1/2$, $e_B(0) = 1/4$, $e_B(1) = 3/4$,





Casino Fair Bet problem : example

$$P(\pi_0 \to \pi_1) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n P(x_i | \pi_i) P(\pi_i \to \pi_{i+1}) = a_{\pi_0, \pi_1} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n e_{\pi_i}(x_i) \cdot a_{\pi_i, \pi_{i+1}}.$$

 $\left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{9}{10}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{9}{10}\right) \left(\frac{3}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{10}\right) \left(\frac{3}{4} \cdot \frac{9}{10}\right) \left(\frac{3}{4} \cdot \frac{9}{10}\right) \left(\frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{9}{10}\right) \left(\frac{3}{4} \cdot \frac{9}{10}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{10}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{9}{10}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{9}{10}\right$

Decoding Problem

• Goal : Find an optimal hidden path of states given observations.

• Input : Sequence of observations $x=x_1 \dots x_n$ generated by an HMM $\mathcal{M}(P, Q, A, \Sigma)$.

• Output: A path that maximizes $P(x|\pi)$ over all possible paths $\pi = \pi_1 \pi_2 \dots \pi_n$.

Developed by Andrew Viterbi, 1967

Andrew Viterbi, Electrical Engineering Department, USC





Given the observed states, what is the most likely path in the hidden state ?





 $s_{k,i}$ probability of the most likely path to state $k \in Q$ at step $1 \le i \le n$, given the observation $x_1 x_2 \dots x_i$



 $s_{k,i}$ probability of the most likely path to state $k \in Q$ at step $1 \le i \le n$, given the observation $x_1 x_2 \dots x_i$



The most likely path to l, i+1 passes from k, i for some $1 \le k \le m$

The likelihood of the optimal path to l,i+1 equals the maximum of the likelihood of the path k,i, times the transition probability from state k to state l, and the emission probability $e_l(x_{i+1})$ for $1 \le k \le m$

$$s_{l,i+1} = \max_{k \in Q} \{ s_{k,i} . a_{kl} . e_l (x_{i+1}) \}$$



probability of the optimal path at last step *n*, is the maximum $s_{k,n}$ for $k \in Q$

Finding the optimal path



By recording the maximal state at each step, we can compute the hidden states $\pi_1 \pi_2 \dots \pi_n$ that maximize $p(x_1 x_2 \dots x_n | \pi_1 \pi_2 \dots \pi_n)$

Forward & Backward algorithms

• Given observation x and stat k, what is the probability $P(\pi_i = k | x)$ that the HMM was at state k at time i?

$$P(x|\pi_i = k) = P(x_1, \dots, xn|\pi_i = k) = P(x_1, \dots, xi|\pi_i = k) P(x_{i+1,\dots,}xn|\pi_i = k) = f_k(i)b_k(i)$$

- $f_{k,i}$ the probability of emitting prefix $x_1, ..., x_i$ given $\pi_i = k$.
- $P(\pi_i = k | x)$ is affected not only by the values x_1, \dots, x_i but also x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n
- $b_{k,i}$ the probability of emitting prefix $x_{i+1}, ..., x_n$ given $\pi_i = k$.
- $f_{k,i}$ and $b_{k,i}$ using an iterative method very similar to what we saw in the previous slides.

Forward & Backward algorithm

• $f_{k,i}$ can be computed using the following iterations :

$$f_{k,i} = \sum_{l \in Q} f_{l,i-1} alk . ek (xi)$$

Maximization replaced by summation

• $b_{k,i}$ can be computed using the following iterations :

$$b_{k,i} = \sum_{l \in Q} b_{l,i+1} . akl . el (xi_{+1})$$

Complexity

Viterbi decoding works in $n|Q|^2$ time

Because each step involves multiplication, we might end up with overflows (very small/large numbers)

To avoid overflows, we can switch to logarithmic space by defining $S_{k,i} = log s_{k,i}$

 $S_{l,i+1} = \max_{k \in Q} \{S_{k,l} + \log(a_{kl}) + \log(a_{l}(x_{i+1}))\}$

Estimating HMM parameters

• How to estimate parameters from transition probabilities Q and and emission probabilities Σ ?

 x^{1} , ..., x^{m} : training sequence

Find maximum likelihood Σ and Q from x^1 , ..., x^m

 $max_{\Sigma,Q}\prod_{j=1}^{m}P(x^{j}|\Sigma,Q)$

Optimization in multi-dimensional parameter space Σ , Q

Supervised & unsupervised estimation

- If for each x^i , we now the corresponding hidden state π^i , the problem is easy
- If π^i are unknown, the problem is more difficult.

Parameter estimation in Supervised case

- A_{kl} : the number of transitions from state k to state l
- $E_k(b)$: the number of times b emitted from state k

$$a_{kl} = \frac{A_{kl}}{\sum_{q \in Q} A_{kq}} \qquad e_k(b) = \frac{E_k(b)}{\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma} E_k(\sigma)}$$

Baum-Welch iterations (unsupervised case)

- Guess initial state labels π^i for each input x^i and perform the following iterations :
 - Estimate Θ from labels π^i
 - Compute optimal states π^i from Θ and x^i using Viterbi decoding