Introduction to Latent Sequences & Expectation Maximization

CMSC 473/673 UMBC October 2nd, 2017 Recap from last time (and the first unit)...

N-gram Language Models

given some context...



compute beliefs about what is likely...

predict the next word

Maxent Language Models



Neural Language Models

(Some) Properties of Embeddings

Capture "like" (similar) words

target:	Redmond	Havel	ninjutsu	graffiti	capitulate
	Redmond Wash.	Vaclav Havel	ninja	spray paint	capitulation
	Redmond Washington	president Vaclav Havel	martial arts	grafitti	capitulated
	Microsoft	Velvet Revolution	swordsmanship	taggers	capitulating

Capture relationships

vector(*'king'*) – vector(*'man'*) + vector(*'woman'*) ≈ vector('queen')

vector('Paris') vector('France') + vector('Italy') ≈ vector('Rome')

Four kinds of vector models

Sparse vector representations

1. Mutual-information weighted word cooccurrence matrices

Dense vector representations:

- Singular value decomposition/Latent Semantic Analysis
- 3. Neural-network-inspired models (skip-grams, CBOW)
- 4. Brown clusters

Learn more in:

- Your project
- Paper (673)
- Other classes (478/678)

Shared Intuition

Model the meaning of a word by "embedding" in a vector space

The meaning of a word is a vector of numbers

Contrast: word meaning is represented in many computational linguistic applications by a vocabulary index ("word number 545") or the string itself

Intrinsic Evaluation: Cosine Similarity

Divide the dot product by the length of the two vectors

$\frac{\vec{a}\cdot\vec{b}}{|\vec{a}||\vec{b}|}$

This is the cosine of the angle between them

$$\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b} = |\vec{a}| |\vec{b}| \cos \theta$$
$$\frac{\vec{a} \cdot \vec{b}}{|\vec{a}| |\vec{b}|} = \cos \theta$$

Are the vectors parallel?

-1: vectors point in opposite directions

+1: vectors point in same directions

0: vectors are orthogonal

Basics of Probability

Requirements to be a distribution ("proportional to", \propto) Definitions of conditional probability, joint probability, and independence Bayes rule, (probability) chain rule

Basics of Probability

Requirements to be a distribution ("proportional to", \propto) Definitions of conditional

probability, joint probability, and independence

Bayes rule, (probability) chain rule

Basics of language modeling

Goal: model (be able to predict) and give a score to *language* (whole sequences of characters or words) Simple count-based model

Smoothing (and why we need it): Laplace (add-λ), interpolation, backoff

Evaluation: perplexity

Basics of Probability

Requirements to be a distribution ("proportional to", \propto)

Definitions of conditional probability, joint probability, and independence

Bayes rule, (probability) chain rule

Basics of language modeling

Goal: model (be able to predict) and give a score to *language* (whole sequences of characters or words)

Simple count-based model Smoothing (and why we need it): Laplace (add-λ), interpolation, backoff Evaluation: perplexity

Tasks and Classification (use Bayes rule!)

Posterior decoding vs. noisy channel model Evaluations: accuracy, precision, recall, and F_{β} (F_1) scores

Naïve Bayes (given the label, generate/explain each feature independently) and connection to language modeling

Basics of Probability

Requirements to be a distribution ("proportional to", \propto)

Definitions of conditional probability, joint probability, and independence

Bayes rule, (probability) chain rule

Basics of language modeling

Goal: model (be able to predict) and give a score to *language* (whole sequences of characters or words)

Simple count-based model

Smoothing (and why we need it): Laplace (add- λ), interpolation, backoff

Evaluation: perplexity

Tasks and Classification (use Bayes rule!)

Posterior decoding vs. noisy channel model Evaluations: accuracy, precision, recall, and F_β (F_1) scores

Naïve Bayes (given the label, generate/explain each feature independently) and connection to language modeling

Maximum Entropy Models

Meanings of feature functions and weights Use for language modeling or conditional classification ("posterior in one go") How to learn the weights: gradient descent

Basics of Probability

Bayes rule, (probability) chain rule

Basics of language modeling

Goal: model (be able to predict) and give a score to *language* (whole sequences of characters or words)

Simple count-based model

Smoothing (and why we need it): Laplace (add- λ), interpolation, backoff

Evaluation: perplexity

Tasks and Classification (use Bayes rule!)

Posterior decoding vs. noisy channel model Evaluations: accuracy, precision, recall, and F_{β} (F_1) scores Naïve Bayes (given the label, generate/explain each feature independently) and connection to language modeling

Maximum Entropy Models

Meanings of feature functions and weights Use for language modeling or conditional classification ("posterior in one go")

How to learn the weights: gradient descent

Distributed Representations & Neural Language Models

What embeddings are and what their motivation is

A common way to evaluate: cosine similarity

Basics of Probability

Requirements to be a distribution ("proportional to", \propto)

Definitions of conditional probability, joint probability, and independence

Bayes rule, (probability) chain rule

Basics of language modeling

Goal: model (be able to predict) and give a score to *language* (whole sequences of characters or words)
Simple count-based model
Smoothing (and why we need it): Laplace (add-λ), interpolation, backoff
Evaluation: perplexity

Tasks and Classification (use Bayes rule!)

Posterior decoding vs. noisy channel model

Evaluations: accuracy, precision, recall, and $F_{\beta}\left(F_{1}\right)$ scores

Naïve Bayes (given the label, generate/explain each feature independently) and connection to language modeling

Maximum Entropy Models

Meanings of feature functions and weights Use for language modeling or conditional classification ("posterior in one go") How to learn the weights: gradient descent

Distributed Representations & Neural Language Models What embeddings are and what their motivation is A common way to evaluate: cosine similarity

LATENT SEQUENCES AND LATENT VARIABLE MODELS

Is Language Modeling "Latent?"

p(Colorless green ideas sleep furiously) =
 p(Colorless) *
 p(green | Colorless) *
 p(ideas | Colorless green) *
 p(sleep | green ideas) *
 p(furiously | ideas sleep)

Is Language Modeling "Latent?" Most* of What We've Discussed: Not Really

*Neural language modeling as an exception

Is Document Classification "Latent?"

Three people have been fatally shot, and five people, including a mayor, were seriously wounded as a result of a Shining Path attack today against a community in Junin department, central Peruvian mountain region.

Is Document Classification "Latent?" As We've Discussed

Three people have been fatally shot, and five people, including a mayor, were seriously wounded as a result of a Shining Path attack today against a community in Junin department, central Peruvian mountain region.

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{X} \prod_{i} p(Y_{i}|X) * p(X)$$
$$\operatorname{argmax}_{X} \frac{\exp(\theta \cdot f(x, y))}{Z(x)} * p(x)$$
$$\operatorname{argmax}_{X} \exp(\theta \cdot f(x, y))$$

Is Document Classification "Latent?" As We've Discussed: Not Really

Three people have been fatally shot, and five people, including a mayor, were seriously wounded as a result of a Shining Path attack today against a community in Junin department, central Peruvian mountain region.

these values are unknown

but the generation process (explanation) is transparent

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{X} \prod_{i} p(Y_{i}|X) * p(X)$$
$$\operatorname{argmax}_{X} \frac{\exp(\theta \cdot f(x, y))}{Z(x)} * p(x)$$

TACK

 $\operatorname{argmax}_X \exp(\theta \cdot f(x, y))$

Ambiguity → Part of Speech Tagging

British Left Waffles on Falkland Islands British Left Waffles on Falkland Islands Adjective Noun Verb

British Left Waffles on Falkland Islands

Noun Verb Noun

Latent Modeling

p(British Left Waffles on Falkland Islands)

(i): Adjective Noun Verb Prep Noun Noun (ii): Noun Verb Noun Prep Noun Noun p(British Left Waffles on Falkland Islands)

(i): Adjective Noun Verb Prep Noun Noun (ii): Noun Verb Noun Prep Noun Noun p(British Left Waffles on Falkland Islands)

1. Explain this sentence as a sequence of (likely?) latent (unseen) tags (labels)

(i): Adjective Noun Verb Prep Noun Noun (ii): Noun Verb Noun Prep Noun Noun p(British Left Waffles on Falkland Islands)

- 1. Explain this sentence as a sequence of (likely?) latent (unseen) tags (labels)
- 2. Produce a tag sequence for this sentence

Noisy Channel Model

Le chat est sur la chaise.

Le chat est sur la chaise.

How do you know what words translate as?

Learn the translations!

Le chat est sur la chaise.

How do you know what words translate as?

Learn the translations!

How?

Learn a "reverse" latent alignment model p(French words, alignments | English words)

Le chat est sur la chaise.

The cat is on the chair.

How do you know what words translate as?

Learn the translations!

How?

Learn a "reverse" latent alignment model p(French words, alignments | English words)

Alignment?

Words can have different meaning/senses

Le chat est sur la chaise.

The cat is on the chair.

How do you know what words translate as?

Learn the translations!

How?

Learn a "reverse" latent alignment model p(French words, alignments | English words)

Alignment?

Words can have different meaning/senses

Why Reverse?

 $p(\text{English} | \text{French}) \propto$ p(French | English) * p(English)

Eddie Izzard, "Dress to Kill" (MPAA: R) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x1sQkEfAdfY

Le chat est sur la chaise.

The cat is on the chair.
How to Learn With Latent Variables (Sequences)

Expectation Maximization

Example: Unigram Language Modeling

$$p(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N) = p(w_1)p(w_2)\cdots p(w_N) = \prod_i [p(w_i)]$$

Example: Unigram Language Modeling

$$p(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N) = p(w_1)p(w_2) \cdots p(w_N) = \prod_i [p(w_i)]$$

maximize (log-)likelihood to learn the probability parameters

$$p(w_1, w_2, ..., w_N) = p(w_1)p(w_2) \cdots p(w_N) = \prod_i [p(w_i)]$$

add complexity to better explain what we see

$$p(z_1, w_1, z_2, w_2, \dots, z_N, w_N) = p(z_1)p(w_1|z_1) \cdots p(z_N)p(w_N|z_N)$$
$$= \prod_i p(w_i|z_i) p(z_i)$$

$$p(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N) = p(w_1)p(w_2) \cdots p(w_N) = \prod_i p(w_i)$$

add complexity to better explain what we see

$$p(z_1, w_1, z_2, w_2, \dots, z_N, w_N) = p(z_1)p(w_1|z_1) \cdots p(z_N)p(w_N|z_N)$$
$$= \prod_i p(w_i|z_i) p(z_i)$$

examples of latent classes z:

- part of speech tag
- topic ("sports" vs. "politics")

$$p(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N) = p(w_1)p(w_2) \cdots p(w_N) = \prod_i p(w_i)$$

$$add \ complexity \ to \ better$$

add complexity to better explain what we see

$$p(z_1, w_1, z_2, w_2, \dots, z_N, w_N) = p(z_1)p(w_1|z_1) \cdots p(z_N)p(w_N|z_N)$$
$$= \prod_i p(w_i|z_i) p(z_i)$$

goal: maximize (log-)likelihood

$$p(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N) = p(w_1)p(w_2) \cdots p(w_N) = \prod_i p(w_i)$$

$$add \ complexity \ to \ better$$

add complexity to better explain what we see

$$p(z_1, w_1, z_2, w_2, \dots, z_N, w_N) = p(z_1)p(w_1|z_1) \cdots p(z_N)p(w_N|z_N)$$
$$= \prod_i p(w_i|z_i) p(z_i)$$

goal: maximize (log-)likelihood

we don't actually observe these z values

we just see the words w

$$p(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N) = p(w_1)p(w_2) \cdots p(w_N) = \prod_i p(w_i)$$

$$\blacksquare add complexity to better$$

add complexity to better explain what we see

$$p(z_1, w_1, z_2, w_2, \dots, z_N, w_N) = p(z_1)p(w_1|z_1) \cdots p(z_N)p(w_N|z_N)$$
$$= \prod_i p(w_i|z_i) p(z_i)$$

goal: maximize (log-)likelihood we don't actually observe these z values we just see the words w

if we *did* observe *z*, estimating the probability parameters would be easy... but we don't! :(

$$p(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N) = p(w_1)p(w_2) \cdots p(w_N) = \prod_i p(w_i)$$

$$\blacksquare add complexity to better$$

add complexity to better explain what we see

$$p(z_1, w_1, z_2, w_2, \dots, z_N, w_N) = p(z_1)p(w_1|z_1) \cdots p(z_N)p(w_N|z_N)$$
$$= \prod_i p(w_i|z_i) p(z_i)$$

goal: maximize (log-)likelihood we don't actually observe these z values we just see the words w

if we *did* observe *z*, estimating the probability parameters would be easy... but we don't! :(if we *knew* the probability parameters then we could estimate *z* and evaluate likelihood... but we don't! :(

 $p(z_1, w_1, z_2, w_2, \dots, z_N, w_N) = p(z_1)p(w_1|z_1) \cdots p(z_N)p(w_N|z_N)$ $= \prod_i p(w_i|z_i) p(z_i)$

we don't actually observe these z values

$$p(z_1, w_1, z_2, w_2, \dots, z_N, w_N) = p(z_1)p(w_1|z_1) \cdots p(z_N)p(w_N|z_N)$$
$$= \prod_i p(w_i|z_i) p(z_i)$$

we don't actually observe these z values



$$p(z_1, w_1, z_2, w_2, \dots, z_N, w_N) = p(z_1)p(w_1|z_1) \cdots p(z_N)p(w_N|z_N)$$
$$= \prod_i p(w_i|z_i) p(z_i)$$

we don't actually observe these z values





$$p(w) = p(z_1, w) + p(z_2, w) + p(z_3, w) + p(z_4, w)$$





Marginal(ized) Probability



$$p(w) = \sum_{z} p(z, w)$$

Marginal(ized) Probability



$$p(w) = \sum_{z} p(z, w)$$
$$= \sum_{z} p(z)p(w \mid z)$$

 $p(z_1, w_1, z_2, w_2, \dots, z_N, w_N) = p(z_1)p(w_1|z_1) \cdots p(z_N)p(w_N|z_N)$ $= \prod_i p(w_i|z_i) p(z_i)$

we don't actually observe these z values



$$p(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N) = \left(\sum_{z_1} p(z_1, w)\right) \left(\sum_{z_2} p(z_2, w)\right) \cdots \left(\sum_{z_N} p(z_N, w)\right)$$

 $p(z_1, w_1, z_2, w_2, \dots, z_N, w_N) = p(z_1)p(w_1|z_1) \cdots p(z_N)p(w_N|z_N)$

goal: maximize marginalized (log-)likelihood



$$p(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N) = \left(\sum_{z_1} p(z_1, w)\right) \left(\sum_{z_2} p(z_2, w)\right) \cdots \left(\sum_{z_N} p(z_N, w)\right)$$

if we *did* observe *z*, estimating the probability parameters would be easy... but we don't! :(

if we *knew* the probability parameters then we could estimate *z* and evaluate likelihood... but we don't! :(



http://blog.innotas.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/chicken-or-egg-cropped1.jpg

if we *knew* the probability parameters then we could estimate *z* and evaluate likelihood... but we don't! :(

if we *did* observe *z*, estimating the probability parameters would be easy... but we don't! :(

http://blog.innotas.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/chicken-or-egg-cropped1.jpg



Expectation Maximization (EM)

0. Assume *some* value for your parameters

Two step, iterative algorithm

1. E-step: count under uncertainty (compute expectations)

2. M-step: maximize log-likelihood, assuming these uncertain counts

Expectation Maximization (EM): E-step

0. Assume *some* value for your parameters

Two step, iterative algorithm

1. E-step: count under uncertainty, assuming these parameters



2. M-step: maximize log-likelihood, assuming these uncertain counts

Expectation Maximization (EM): E-step

0. Assume *some* value for your parameters

Two step, iterative algorithm

1. E-step: count under uncertainty, assuming these parameters



Expectation Maximization (EM): M-step

- 0. Assume *some* value for your parameters
- Two step, iterative algorithm
- 1. E-step: count under uncertainty, assuming these parameters
- 2. M-step: maximize log-likelihood, assuming these uncertain counts

$$p^{(t)}(z)$$





$\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_{\theta}(t)}(\cdot|w) [\log p_{\theta}(z,w)]$

E-step: count under uncertainty

$$\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{z} \sim p_{\theta^{(t)}}(\cdot|w) [\log p_{\theta}(z,w)]$$

M-step: maximize log-likelihood

E-step: count under uncertainty

 $\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{Z} \sim p_{\theta}(t)(\cdot|w) \left[\log p_{\theta}(Z,w)\right]$

posterior distribution

M-step: maximize log-likelihood

E-step: count under uncertainty

 $\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{Z} \sim p_{\theta}(t)(\cdot|w) \left[\log p_{\theta}(z,w)\right]$

new parameters

posterior distribution

new parameters

M-step: maximize log-likelihood

Imagine three coins







Flip 1st coin (penny)

If heads: flip 2nd coin (dollar coin)

If tails: flip 3rd coin (dime)

Imagine three coins







Flip 1st coin (penny) <

If heads: flip 2nd coin (dollar coin) only observe these (record heads vs. tails outcome)

Imagine three coins







unobserved:vowel or constonant? part of speech?

If heads: flip 2nd coin (dollar coin)

If tails: flip 3rd coin (dime)

observed: *a*, *b*, *e*, etc. We run the code, vs. The *run* failed

Imagine three coins







Flip 1st coin (penny)

$$p(heads) = \lambda$$

 $p(\text{heads}) = \psi$

 $p(\text{tails}) = 1 - \lambda$

If heads: flip 2^{nd} coin (dollar coin) $p(heads) = \gamma$ If tails: flip 3^{rd} coin (dime)

 $p(tails) = 1 - \gamma$

 $p(\text{tails}) = 1 - \psi$

Imagine three coins







 $p(heads) = \lambda$ $p(heads) = \gamma$ $p(\text{tails}) = 1 - \lambda$ $p(\text{tails}) = 1 - \gamma$ $p(\text{tails}) = 1 - \psi$

 $p(\text{heads}) = \psi$

Three parameters to estimate: λ , γ , and ψ

H H T H T H H T H T T T

If *all* flips were observed

 $p(heads) = \lambda$ $p(heads) = \gamma$ $p(heads) = \psi$ $p(tails) = 1 - \lambda$ $p(tails) = 1 - \gamma$ $p(tails) = 1 - \psi$

H H T H T H H T H T T T

If all flips were observed

 $p(heads) = \lambda$ $p(heads) = \gamma$ $p(heads) = \psi$ $p(tails) = 1 - \lambda$ $p(tails) = 1 - \gamma$ $p(tails) = 1 - \psi$

 $p(\text{heads}) = \frac{4}{6} \qquad p(\text{heads}) = \frac{1}{4} \qquad p(\text{heads}) = \frac{1}{2}$ $p(\text{tails}) = \frac{2}{6} \qquad p(\text{tails}) = \frac{3}{4} \qquad p(\text{tails}) = \frac{1}{2}$
H	H	_T	H	_T	-H
Η	Т	Η	Т	Т	Т

But not all flips are observed \rightarrow set parameter values

 $p(\text{heads}) = \lambda = .6$ p(heads) = .8 p(heads) = .6p(tails) = .4 p(tails) = .2 p(tails) = .4

H	H	-T	H	-T	H
Η	Т	Η	Т	Т	Т

But not all flips are observed \rightarrow set parameter values

 $p(\text{heads}) = \lambda = .6$ p(heads) = .8 p(heads) = .6p(tails) = .4 p(tails) = .2 p(tails) = .4

Use these values to compute posteriors $p(\text{heads} \mid \text{observed item H}) = \frac{p(\text{heads \& H})}{p(\text{H})}$ $p(\text{heads} \mid \text{observed item T}) = \frac{p(\text{heads \& T})}{p(\text{T})}$

H	H	_T	H	_T	H
Η	Т	Η	Т	Т	Т

But not all flips are observed \rightarrow set parameter values

 $p(\text{heads}) = \lambda = .6$ p(heads) = .8 p(heads) = .6p(tails) = .4 p(tails) = .2 p(tails) = .4

Use these values to compute posteriors

 $p(\text{heads} \mid \text{observed item H}) = \frac{p(H \mid \text{heads})p(\text{heads})}{p(H)}$ marginal likelihood

<u>*Н Н Т Н Т Н*</u> Н Т Н Т Т Т

But not all flips are observed \rightarrow set parameter values

 $p(\text{heads}) = \lambda = .6$ p(heads) = .8 p(heads) = .6p(tails) = .4 p(tails) = .2 p(tails) = .4

Use these values to compute posteriors

$$p(\text{heads} \mid \text{observed item H}) = \frac{p(H \mid \text{heads})p(\text{heads})}{p(H)}$$

p(H | heads) = .8 p(T | heads) = .2

<u>*Н Н Т Н Т Н*</u> Н Т Н Т Т Т

But not all flips are observed \rightarrow set parameter values

 $p(\text{heads}) = \lambda = .6$ p(heads) = .8 p(heads) = .6p(tails) = .4 p(tails) = .2 p(tails) = .4

Use these values to compute posteriors

$$p(\text{heads} \mid \text{observed item H}) = \frac{p(H \mid \text{heads})p(\text{heads})}{p(H)}$$

p(H | heads) = .8 p(T | heads) = .2

p(H) = p(H | heads) * p(heads) + p(H | tails) * p(tails)= .8 * .6 + .6 * .4

Use posteriors to update parameters

 $p(\text{heads } | \text{ obs. H}) = \frac{p(\text{H} | \text{ heads})p(\text{heads})}{p(\text{H})}$ $= \frac{.8 * .6}{.8 * .6 + .6 * .4} \approx 0.667$ $p(\text{heads } | \text{ obs. T}) = \frac{p(\text{T} | \text{ heads})p(\text{heads})}{p(\text{T})}$ $= \frac{.2 * .6}{.2 * .6 + .6 * .4} \approx 0.334$

(in general, p(heads | obs. H) and p(heads | obs. T) do NOT sum to 1)

Use posteriors to update parameters

 $p(\text{heads} \mid \text{obs. H}) = \frac{p(\text{H} \mid \text{heads})p(\text{heads})}{p(\text{H})}$ $= \frac{.8 * .6}{.8 * .6 + .6 * .4} \approx 0.667$ $p(\text{heads} \mid \text{obs. T}) = \frac{p(\text{T} \mid \text{heads})p(\text{heads})}{p(\text{T})}$ $= \frac{.2 * .6}{.2 * .6 + .6 * .4} \approx 0.334$

(in general, p(heads | obs. H) and p(heads | obs. T) do NOT sum to 1)

fully observed setting $p(\text{heads}) = \frac{\# \text{ heads from penny}}{\# \text{ total flips of penny}}$

our setting: partially-observed

 $p(heads) = \frac{\# expected heads from penny}{\# total flips of penny}$

Use posteriors to update parameters

 $p(\text{heads} \mid \text{obs. H}) = \frac{p(\text{H} \mid \text{heads})p(\text{heads})}{p(\text{H})}$ $= \frac{.8 * .6}{.8 * .6 + .6 * .4} \approx 0.667$ $p(\text{heads} \mid \text{obs. T}) = \frac{p(\text{T} \mid \text{heads})p(\text{heads})}{p(\text{T})}$ $= \frac{.2 * .6}{.2 * .6 + .6 * .4} \approx 0.334$

 $p^{(t+1)}(\text{heads}) = \frac{\# \text{ expected heads from penny}}{\# \text{ total flips of penny}}$ $= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{p^{(t)}}[\# \text{ expected heads from penny}]}{\# \text{ total flips of penny}}$

H H T H T H

нтнттт

Use posteriors to update parameters

 $p(\text{heads} \mid \text{obs. H}) = \frac{p(\text{H} \mid \text{heads})p(\text{heads})}{p(\text{H})}$ $= \frac{.8 * .6}{.8 * .6 + .6 * .4} \approx 0.667$ $p(\text{heads} \mid \text{obs. T}) = \frac{p(\text{T} \mid \text{heads})p(\text{heads})}{p(\text{T})}$ $= \frac{.2 * .6}{.2 * .6 + .6 * .4} \approx 0.334$

our setting: partiallyobserved

$$p^{(t+1)}(\text{heads}) = \frac{\# \text{ expected heads from penny}}{\# \text{ total flips of penny}}$$
$$= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{p^{(t)}}[\# \text{ expected heads from penny}]}{\# \text{ total flips of penny}}$$
$$= \frac{2 * p(\text{heads} \mid \text{obs. H}) + 4 * p(\text{heads} \mid \text{obs. T})}{6}$$
$$\approx 0.444$$

Expectation Maximization (EM)

0. Assume *some* value for your parameters

Two step, iterative algorithm:

1. E-step: count under uncertainty (compute expectations)

2. M-step: maximize log-likelihood, assuming these uncertain counts

Related to EM

Latent clustering

K-means: <u>https://www.csee.umbc.edu/courses/undergraduate/473/f17/kmeans/</u>

Gaussian mixture modeling