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## Random variable

- A variable that can take values within a fixed set (discrete) or within some range (continuous).

| event | event space |
| :---: | :---: |
| dice throw | $\{1,2,3,4,5,6\}$ |
| the next word I say | $\{$ the, a, dog, runs, to, store $\}$ |
| author of a text | $\{$ Austen, Dickens $\}$ |
| height of a skyscraper | $[0, \infty]$ |

Note this includes both data $(X)$ and labels we're predicting $(Y)$ -
they can all be thought of as random variables

## Joint probability

| weather | hot | cloudy | rainy | hot | hot | cloudy | rainy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ice cream | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

$$
P(X=\text { hot }, Y=\text { ice cream })
$$

The probability of multiple things happening at the same time.

## Chain Rule of Probability

$$
P(X, Y)=P(X) P(Y \mid X)
$$

## Joint probability

| weather | hot cloudy | rainy | hot | hot | cloudy | rainy |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ice cream | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  |  |  | hot | cloudy | rainy |  |  |
|  | $P(X, Y)=P(X) P(Y \mid X)$ | $3 / 7=0.42$ | $2 / 7=0.29$ | $2 / 7=0.29$ |  |  |  |
|  | $P(Y=$ ice cream $\mid X=x)$ | $3 / 3=1.0$ | $1 / 2=0.50$ | $0.2=0.0$ |  |  |  |

$$
P(X=\text { hot }, Y=\text { ice cream })=0.42
$$

## Latent variables

- A latent variable is one that's unobserved, either because:
- we are predicting it (but have observed that variable for other data points)
- it is unobservable


## Latent variables

|  | observed variables | latent variables |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| email | text, date, sender | topic, urgency |
| novels | text, author, date | genre, happy ending, <br> archetypes |
| netflix users | viewing data | preferences |

## Probabilistic graphical models

- Nodes represent variables (shaded = observed, clear = latent)
- Arrows indicate conditional relationships
- The probability of $\times$ here is dependent on y

- Simply a visual way of writing the joint probability:

$$
P(x, y)=P(y) P(x \mid y)
$$

## Classification

P(y = dickens | x = "it was the best of times")

## Bayes' Rule



## Independence Assumption

it was the best of times


We will assume the features are independent:

$$
P\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{N} \mid y\right)=\prod_{i}^{N} P\left(x_{i} \mid y\right)
$$

## Naive Bayes

- To fully specify Naive Bayes, we need to add the implicit parameters $\theta$ (the prior distribution) and $\Phi$ (the distribution of $x$ given y ).


$$
P(x, y \mid \theta, \phi)=P(y \mid \theta) P(x \mid y, \phi)
$$

$\theta$

$$
P(y=\text { Austen } \mid \theta)=0.5
$$

## Look up the value of $y$ in $\theta$





$$
P(x=\text { love } \mid y=\text { Austen }, \phi)=0.04
$$

Look up the value of $x$ in the $\Phi$ indexed by $y$

## Naive Bayes

- We can plug these multinomials in to make this more clear


$$
P(x, y \mid \theta, \phi)=P(y \mid \theta) P(x \mid y, \phi)
$$

## Naive Bayes

- When we train Naive Bayes, y is observed, and we estimate the parameters $\theta$ and $\Phi$ with (e.g.) maximum likelihood estimation

$$
\begin{aligned}
\theta_{i} & =\frac{\operatorname{count}(i)}{N} \\
\phi_{y, i} & =\frac{\operatorname{count}(y, i)}{N_{y}}
\end{aligned}
$$



## Naive Bayes MLE

$$
\theta_{i}=\frac{\operatorname{count}(i)}{N}
$$

The number of Austen texts divided by the total number of texts

$$
\phi_{y, i}=\frac{\operatorname{count}(y, i)}{N_{y}}
$$

The number of times "love" appears in Austen texts divided by the total number of words in Austen
texts

## Naive Bayes

- When we predict, y is no longer observed (we are predicting it), but $\oplus$ and $\theta$ are.

$$
P(y \mid x, \theta, \phi)=\frac{P(y \mid \theta) P(x \mid y, \phi)}{\sum_{y^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Y}} P\left(y^{\prime} \mid \theta\right) P\left(x \mid y^{\prime}, \phi\right)}
$$

- We calculate the posterior probability of y using Bayes' rule



## Unsupervised Naive Bayes

- Same model structure
- Same conditional relationships
- No observed labels y
- Why would we do this??


相


## Structure

- Unsupervised learning finds structure in data.



## Unsupervised Naive Bayes

- The only variables we observe are the data $\times$
- But we still want to estimate $\varnothing$ and $\theta$ and learn posterior probabilities for y
- y here is still a choice among K alternatives:

$$
\mathcal{Y}=\{1,2, \ldots K\}
$$



## Inference

- We want to estimate the best values of the parameters $Ф$ and $\theta$ and infer the most likely values for latent variables y


## Inference

- Guiding principle: we want to maximize the likelihood of the observed data

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P(x \mid \phi, \theta)=\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P(x, y \mid \phi, \theta) \\
& P(x \mid \phi, \theta)=\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P(x \mid y, \phi) P(y \mid \theta)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Inference

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \ell(\phi, \theta)=\sum_{i=1}^{N} \log P(x \mid \phi, \theta) \\
& \ell(\phi, \theta)=\sum_{i=1}^{N} \log \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P(x \mid y, \phi) P(y \mid \theta)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Inference

Lots of standard inference techniques we can use

- Expectation Maximization
- Markov chain Monte Carlo (Gibbs sampling, Metropolis Hastings, etc.)
- Variational methods
- Spectral methods (Anandkumar et al. 2012, Arora et al. 2013)


## Expectation Maximization



## Expectation Maximization

- Start out with random values for the parameters
- Iterate until convergence:
- Calculate expected values for latent variables y
- Use those expected values to update parameters $\Phi$ and $\theta$



## Expectation Maximization

1. Calculate expected values for latent variables

$$
P(y \mid x, \theta, \phi)=\frac{P(y \mid \theta) P(x \mid y, \phi)}{\sum_{y^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Y}} P\left(y^{\prime} \mid \theta\right) P\left(x \mid y^{\prime}, \phi\right)}
$$

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.10 | 0.50 | 0.25 | 0.07 | 0.08 |



## Expectation Maximization

Expected values for 10 data points, with $K=5$

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| y1 | 0.35 | 0.03 | 0.12 | 0.27 | 0.23 |
| y2 | 0.39 | 0.08 | 0.31 | 0.03 | 0.19 |
| y3 | 0.05 | 0.36 | 0.22 | 0.1 | 0.27 |
| y4 | 0.31 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.28 | 0.22 |
| y5 | 0.65 | 0.05 | 0.17 | 0.07 | 0.06 |
| y6 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.34 | 0.27 | 0.24 |
| y7 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.45 | 0.02 | 0.39 |
| y8 | 0.14 | 0.54 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.18 |
| y9 | 0.51 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.29 | 0.05 |
| y10 | 0.01 | 0.23 | 0.08 | 0.14 | 0.54 |

## Expectation Maximization

2. Use those expected values to maximize parameters


## Expectation Maximization

k
2. Use those expected values to maximize parameters

$$
\theta_{k}=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} r_{i, k}
$$

$r_{i, k}$ is proportion of the count we attribute to $k$

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| y1 | 0.35 | 0.03 | 0.12 | 0.27 | 0.23 |
| y2 | 0.39 | 0.08 | 0.31 | 0.03 | 0.19 |
| y3 | 0.05 | 0.36 | 0.22 | 0.1 | 0.27 |
| y4 | 0.31 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.28 | 0.22 |
| y5 | 0.65 | 0.05 | 0.17 | 0.07 | 0.06 |
| y6 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.34 | 0.27 | 0.24 |
| y7 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.45 | 0.02 | 0.39 |
| y8 | 0.14 | 0.54 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.18 |
| y9 | 0.51 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.29 | 0.05 |
| y10 | 0.01 | 0.23 | 0.08 | 0.14 | 0.54 |
| avg | 0.259 | 0.160 | 0.186 | 0.158 | 0.237 |

## Expectation Maximization

2. Use those expected values to maximize parameters

$$
\phi_{k, w}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} r_{i, k} \operatorname{count}(i, w)}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} r_{i, k} N_{i}}
$$

| ri.k is proportion of the <br> count we attribute to $k$ |
| :---: |
| count $(i, w)=$ count of <br> word $w$ in document $i$ |
| $N i$ is the total word count <br> in document $i$ |

k

$$
\begin{aligned}
& r_{i, k} \text { is proportion of the } \\
& \text { count we attribute to } k \\
& \text { count }(i, w)=\text { count of } \\
& \text { word } w \text { in document } i \\
& V_{i} \text { is the total word coun } \\
& \text { in document } i
\end{aligned}
$$

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| y1 | 0.35 | 0.03 | 0.12 | 0.27 | 0.23 |
| y2 | 0.39 | 0.08 | 0.31 | 0.03 | 0.19 |
| y3 | 0.05 | 0.36 | 0.22 | 0.1 | 0.27 |
| y4 | 0.31 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.28 | 0.22 |
| y5 | 0.65 | 0.05 | 0.17 | 0.07 | 0.06 |
| y6 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.34 | 0.27 | 0.24 |
| y7 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.45 | 0.02 | 0.39 |
| y8 | 0.14 | 0.54 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.18 |
| y9 | 0.51 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.29 | 0.05 |
| y10 | 0.01 | 0.23 | 0.08 | 0.14 | 0.54 |

## Expectation Maximization

In general, EM involves iterating between two steps:
E-step: calculate the posterior probability of latent y

$$
Q(y)=P\left(y \mid x_{i}, \theta\right)
$$

M-step: find the values of parameters $\theta$ that maximize:

$$
\theta=\arg \max _{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} Q(y) \log \frac{P\left(x_{i}, y \mid \theta\right)}{Q(y)}
$$

## Expectation Maximization

- Start out with random values for the parameters
- Iterate until convergence:
- Calculate expected values for latent variables
- Use those expected values to maximize parameter values


## K-means

```
    Given: a set \(\mathcal{X}=\left\{\vec{x}_{1}, \ldots, \vec{x}_{n}\right\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m}\)
    a distance measure \(d: \mathbb{R}^{m} \times \mathbb{R}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\)
    a function for computing the mean \(\mu: \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m}\)
    Select \(k\) initial centers \(\vec{f}_{1}, \ldots, \vec{f}_{k}\)
    5 while stopping criterion is not true do
        for all clusters \(c_{j}\) do
        \(c_{j}=\left\{\vec{x}_{i} \mid \forall \vec{f}_{l} d\left(\vec{x}_{i}, \vec{f}_{j}\right) \leq d\left(\vec{x}_{i}, \vec{f}_{l}\right)\right\}\)
        end
        for all means \(\vec{f}_{j}\) do
        \(\vec{f}_{j}=\mu\left(c_{j}\right)\)
        end
    end
```


## Expectation Maximization

Expectation maximization yields a soft clustering (where a given data point can have fractional membership in multiple clusters.

K-means is an approximation to this: instead of allowing fractional membership, each data point is placed into its single most likely cluster. Also known as "hard EM"

## Semi-supervised

EM is useful for when we have partially labeled data


## Semi-supervised

How would the presence of some supervised labels change your calculating of the $E$ and $M$ steps?

1. Calculate expected values for latent variables

$$
P(y \mid x, \theta, \phi)=\frac{P(y \mid \theta) P(x \mid y, \phi)}{\sum_{y^{\prime} \in \mathcal{Y}} P\left(y^{\prime} \mid \theta\right) P\left(x \mid y^{\prime}, \phi\right)}
$$

what's this value for an observed label?
2. Use those expected values to maximize parameters

$$
\theta_{k}=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} r_{i, k}
$$

## what's ri,k for a data point with observed label?

In more complex models, there are often dependencies between
multiple latent variables


In more complex models, there are often dependencies between multiple latent variables

Here's an example: if you don't know the value of $\theta$, but you believe $\mathrm{y}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{y}_{2}=2$, then your best estimate of $\theta$ will favor 2 , making $\mathrm{P}\left(\mathrm{y}_{3}=2\right)$ high

## the y's are dependent <br> on each other



Markov chain Monte Carlo methods (like Gibbs sampling) are appropriate for inferring the values of multiple latent variables


Markov chain Monte Carlo methods (like Gibbs sampling) are appropriate for inferring the values of multiple latent variables

The idea is very simple: start out with random guesses for all variables


Markov chain Monte Carlo methods (like Gibbs sampling) are appropriate for inferring the values of multiple latent variables

Then, iterate through each variable and sample a new value for it conditioned on the current samples of everything else


$$
P(y \mid \theta=\square, x) \propto P(y \mid \theta=\square) P(x \mid y)
$$

Markov chain Monte Carlo methods (like Gibbs sampling) are appropriate for inferring the values of multiple latent variables

Then, iterate through each variable and sample a new value for it conditioned on the current samples of everything else


$$
P(y \mid \theta=\square, x) \propto P(y \mid \theta=\square) P(x \mid y)
$$

Markov chain Monte Carlo methods (like Gibbs sampling) are appropriate for inferring the values of multiple latent variables

Then, iterate through each variable and sample a new value for it conditioned on the current samples of everything else


$$
P(y \mid \theta=\square, x) \propto P(y \mid \theta=\square) P(x \mid y)
$$

Markov chain Monte Carlo methods (like Gibbs sampling) are appropriate for inferring the values of multiple latent variables

Then, iterate through each variable and sample a new value for it conditioned on the current samples of everything else

$$
P(\theta \mid a, y) \propto P(\theta \mid a) \prod_{i=1}^{N} P\left(y_{i} \mid \theta\right)
$$



Markov chain Monte Carlo methods (like Gibbs sampling) are appropriate for inferring the values of multiple latent variables

Then, iterate through each variable and sample a new value for it conditioned on the current samples of everything else


## Graphical models

- Graphical models articulate the relationship between variables
- Lots of standard inference techniques are available; the art is in defining the structure of the model:
- what the variables are
- what parametric form they take
- what's observed and what's latent
- what the relationship is between the variables

Beta
$[0,1]$
position in time bounded series
real


| Bernoulli | 0 or 1 | presence of feature | binary |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Normal | $(-\infty, \infty)$ | age, height | real |  |
| Multinomial | count data | word counts | discrete |  |
| Poisson | $\{0,1,2, \ldots, \infty\}$ | number of children | discrete | ( |

## Topic models



## Clustering

- Clustering is designed to learn structure in the data:
- Hierarchical structure between data points
- Natural partitions between data points


## Topic Models

- A probabilistic model for discovering hidden "topics" or "themes" (groups of terms that tend to occur together) in documents.
- Unsupervised (find interesting structure in the data)
- Clustering algorithm, clustering tokens into topics


Antoniak et al. 2019, "Narrative Paths and Negotiation of Power in Birth Stories"

The Ten Most Significant Topics in the National Anti-Slavery Standard

| Topic | Label | PMI | Keywords |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| T49 | places | 1.54 | ohio, philadelphia, mass, office, york, miller, penn, <br> standard, thomas, free |
| T32 | miscellaneous ads | 1.48 | 1.10 |
| T91 | shopping, york, duty, free, street, fair, ad, cotton, good, cent |  |  |
| T46 | ads for dry goods | 0.87 | street, philadelphia, books, goods, hand, prices, store, <br> cases, assortment, attention <br> cents, corn, flour, wheat, american, advance, made, paper, <br> white, sales <br> slavery, anti, abolitionists, american, society, abolition, <br> T16 |
| abolition | 0.87 | 0.52 | pro, slave, liberty, garrison <br> friends, aid, fair, money, work, make, means, committee, <br> time, funds |
| T7 | organizing | 0.38 | time, made, found, left, place, day, return, received, <br> immediately, told |
| T2 | time | 0.37 | texas, mexico, war, states, united, annexation, california, <br> mexican, government, country |
| T62 | war and expansion | 0.36 | society, meeting, friends, held, annual, county, anti, <br> present, members, meetings |
| T42 | formal organizing | slave, slaves, slavery, free, master, negroes, states, |  |
| T97 | slavery | property, slaveholders, emancipation |  |

The Ten Most Significant Topics in the National Anti-Slavery Standard While Child Was Editor

| Topic | Label | PMI | Keywords |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| T70 | cooking | 0.88 | water, put, half, sugar, pound, cold, milk, salt, add, butter |
| T26 | foreign relations | 0.63 | 0.63 |
| T49 | places | united, government, states, american, cuba, foreign, <br> british, treaty, trade, president <br> ohio, philadelphia, mass, office, york, miller, penn, <br> standard, thomas, free |  |
| T40 | correspondence | 0.53 | 0.49 |
| T42 | formal organizing | letter, office, post, letters, received, written, send, <br> addressed, department, general <br> society, meeting, friends, held, annual, county, anti, <br> present, members, meetings |  |
| T14 | Massachusetts | 0.45 | boston, mass, rev, john, wm, george, salem, charles, <br> bamel, esq <br> travel and accidents |
| T35 | federal government | 0.44 | fire, railroad, city, train, boston, cars, company, york, <br> road, accident <br> house, congress, district, petition, representatives, adams, <br> legislature, petitions, people |
| T9 | violence and crime | 0.39 | house, man, shot, negro, murder, mob, night, city, <br> arrested, men |
| T5 | state government | 0.38 | state, law, laws, act, states, citizens, person, persons, <br> united, legislature |

Klein 2020, "Dimensions of Scale: Invisible Labor, Editorial
Work, and the Future of Quantitative Literary Studies"

| List | Grid Ye |  | click a column label to sort; click a row for more about a topic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| topic $\downarrow \uparrow$ | 1889-2013 | top words | proportion of corpus |
| 1 |  | see both own view role university further account critical particular | 2.5\% |
| 2 | . L $^{\text {L }}$ | other both two form same even each part experience process | 2.6\% |
| 3 |  | old beowulf english ic mid swa pe poet ond grendel | 0.3\% |

Goldstone and Underwood (2014), The Quiet Transformations of Literary Studies

## Topic Models

- Input: set of documents, number of clusters to learn.
- Output:
- topics
- topic ratio in each document
- topic distribution for each word in doc

| \{album, band, music\} | \{government, party, election\} | \{game, team, player\} |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| album | government | game |
| band | party | team |
| music | election | player |
| song | state | win |
| release | political | play |
| \{god, call, give \} | \{company, market, business\} | \{math, number, function\} |
| god | company | math |
| call | market | number |
| give | business | function |
| man | year | code |
| time |  |  |
| \{city, large, area \} | \{math, energy, light\} | \{law, state, case\} |
| city | math | law |
| large | energy | state |
| area | light | case |
| station | field | court |
| include | star | legal |

## Applications






Antoniak et al. 2019, "Narrative Paths and Negotiation of Power in Birth Stories"

$$
x=\text { feature vector }
$$

Feature

| contains "love" | 0 |
| :---: | :--- |
| contains "castle" | 0 |
| contains "dagger" | 0 |
| contains "run" | 0 |
| contains "the" | 1 |
| topic 1 | 0.55 |
| topic 2 | 0.32 |
| topic 3 | 0.13 |

$\beta=$ coefficients

| Feature | $\beta$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| contains "love" | -3.1 |
| contains "castle" | 6.8 |
| contains "dagger" | 7.9 |
| contains "run" | -3.0 |
| contains "the" | -1.7 |
| topic 1 | 0.3 |
| topic 2 | -1.2 |
| topic 3 | 5.7 |

## Software

- Mallet http://mallet.cs.umass.edu/
- Gensim (python) https://radimrehurek.com/ gensim/
- Visualization https://github.com/uwdata/ termite-visualizations
online advantages



## topic models cluster tokens into "topics"

... The messenger, however, does not reach Romeo and, instead, Romeo learns of Juliet's apparent death from his servant Balthasar. Heartbroken, Romeo buys poison from an apothecary and goes to the Capulet crypt. He encounters Paris who has come to mourn Juliet privately. Believing Romeo to be a vandal, Paris confronts him and, in the ensuing battle, Romeo kills Paris. Still believing Juliet to be dead, he drinks the poison. Juliet then awakens and, finding Romeo dead, stabs herself with his dagger. The feuding families and the Prince meet at the tomb to find all three dead. Friar Laurence recounts the story of the two "star-cross'd lovers". The families are reconciled by their children's deaths and agree to end their violent feud. The play ends with the Prince's elegy for the lovers: "For never was a story of more woe / Than this of Juliet and her Romeo."

## topic models cluster tokens into "topics"

> ... The messenger, however, does not reach Romeo and, instead, Romeo learns of Juliet's apparent death from his servant Balthasar. Heartbroken, Romeoo buys poison from an apothecary and goes to the Capulet crypt. He encounters Paris who has come to mourn Juliet privately. Believing Romeo to be a vandal, Paris confronts him and, in the ensuing battle, Romeo kills Paris. Still believing Juliet to be dead, he drinks the poison. Juliet then awakens and, finding Romeo dead, stabs herself with his dagger. The feuding families and the Prince meet at the tomb to find all three dead. Friar Laurence recounts the story of the two "star-cross'd lovers". The families are reconciled by their children's deaths and agree to end their violent feud. The play ends with the Prince's elegy for the lovers: "For never was a story of more woe / Than this of Juliet and her Romeo."

## topic models cluster tokens into "topics"

> ... The messenger, however, does not reach Romeo and, instead, Romeo learns of Juliet's apparent death from his servant Balthasar. Heartbroken, Romeoo buys poison from an apothecary and goes to the Capulet crypt. He encounters Paris who has come to mourn Juliet privately. Believing Romeo to be a vandal, Paris confronts him and, in the ensuing battle, Romeo kills Paris. Still believing Juliet to be dead, he drinks the poison. Juliet then awakens and, finding Romeo dead, stabs herself with his dagger. The feuding families and the Prince meet at the tomb to find all three dead. Friar Laurence recounts the story of the two "star-cross'd lovers". The families are reconciled by their children's deaths and agree to end their violent feud. The play ends with the Prince's elegy for the lovers: "For never was a story of more woe / Than this of Juliet and her Romeo."

## topic models cluster tokens into "topics"

> ... The messenger, however, does not reach Romeo and, instead, Romeo learns of Juliet's apparent death from his servant Balthasar. Heartbroken, Romeoo buys poison from an apothecary and goes to the Capulet crypt. He encounters Paris who has come to mourn Juliet privately. Believing Romeo to be a vandal, Paris confronts him and, in the ensuing battle, Romeo kills Paris. Still believing Juliet to be dead, he drinks the poison. Juliet then awakens and, finding Romeo dead, stabs herself with his dagger. The feuding families and the Prince meet at the tomb to find all three dead. Friar Laurence recounts the story of the two "star-cross'd lovers". The families are reconciled by their children's deaths and agree to end their violent feud. The play ends with the Prince's elegy for the lovers: "For never was a story of more woe / Than this of Juliet and her Romeo."

## topic models cluster tokens into "topics"

> ... The messenger, however, does not reach Romeo and, instead, Romeo learns of Juliet's apparent death from his servant Balthasar. Heartbroken, Romeo buys poison from an apothecary and goes to the Capulet crypt. He encounters Paris who has come to mourn Juliet privately. Believing Romeo to be a vandal, Paris confronts him and, in the ensuing battle, Romeo kills Paris. Still believing Juliet to be dead, he drinks the poison. Juliet then awakens and, finding Romeo dead, stabs herself with his dagger. The feuding families and the Prince meet at the tomb to find all three dead. Friar Laurence recounts the story of the two "star-cross'd lovers". The families are reconciled by their children's deaths and agree to end their violent feud. The play ends with the Prince's elegy for the lovers: "For never was a story of more woe / Than this of Juliet and her Romeo."

## tokens, not types

... The messenger, however, does not reach Romeo and, instead, Romeo learns of Juliet's apparent death from his servant Balthasar. Heartbroken, Romeo buys poison from an apothecary and goes to the Capulet crypt. He encounters Paris who has come to mourn Juliet privately. Believing Romeo to be a vandal, Paris confronts him and, in the ensuing battle, Romeo kills Paris. Still believing Juliet to be dead, he drinks the poison. Juliet then awakens and, finding Romeo dead, stabs herself with his dagger. The feuding families and the Prince meet at the tomb to find all three dead. Friar Laurence recounts the story of the two "star-cross'd lovers". The families are reconciled by their children's deaths and agree to end their violent feud. The play ends with the Prince's elegy for the lovers: "For never was a

## "People"

A different Paris token might belong to a "Place" or "French" topic


## Topic Models

- A document has distribution over topics




## Topic Models

- A topic is a distribution over words


- e.g., P("adore" | topic = love) = . 18

















## Inferred Topics

| \{album, band, music\} | \{government, party, election\} | \{game, team, player\} |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| album <br> band <br> music <br> song <br> release | government <br> party <br> election <br> state <br> political | game <br> team <br> player <br> win <br> play |
| \{god, call, give\} | \{company, market, business\} | \{math, number, function\} |
| god <br> call <br> give <br> man <br> time | company <br> market <br> business <br> year <br> product | math <br> number <br> function <br> code <br> set |
| \{city, large, area\} | \{math, energy, light\} | \{law, state, case\} |
| city <br> large <br> area <br> station <br> include | math <br> energy <br> light <br> field <br> star | law <br> state <br> case <br> court <br> legal |



## Inference

- What are the topic distributions for each document?
- What are the topic assignments for each word in a document?
- What are the word distributions for each topic?

Find the parameters that maximize
 the likelihood of the data!


## Assumptions

- Every word has one topic
- Every document has one topic distribution
- No sequential information (topics for words are independent of each other given the set of topics for a document)
- Topics don't have arbitrary correlations (Dirichlet prior)
- Words don't have arbitrary correlations (Dirichlet prior)
- The only information you learn from are the identities of words and how they are divided into documents.

What if you want to encode other assumptions or reason over other observations?






## Deep Latent Variable Models

- Making models "deep" involves changing the parameterization of the underlying probability distribution
- Multinomial ~ Dirichlet $\rightarrow$ FFNN, RNNLM, Transformer
- Allows for more flexible parameterization, alternative independence assumptions, and richer models of context.


## Deep Latent Variable Models

Unsupervised "Naive" Bayes (each $x_{i}$ is independent from the others)

$$
\begin{aligned}
P\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{N} \mid y ; \phi\right) & =\prod_{i}^{N} P\left(x_{i} \mid y\right) \\
& =\prod_{i}^{N} \phi_{x_{i}}
\end{aligned}
$$



## Deep Latent Variable Models

Deep version (each $x_{i}$ depends on the other tokens)

$$
P\left(x_{i} \mid y, \phi\right)=\operatorname{RNNLM}\left(x_{1: i} ; \phi^{y}\right)
$$



## Latent variable models

- See Kim et al. 2019 for more!

