Spectral Estimation of Hidden Markov Models

Jordan Rodu

Department of Statistics University of Pennsylvania

with: Michael Collins¹, Paramveer Dhillon², Dean Foster³, Lyle Ungar², and Weichen Wu²

¹Department of Computer Science Columbia University

²Computer and Information Science University of Pennsylvania

> ³Department of Statistics University of Pennsylvania







$$P(x_1,\ldots,x_t)=1^{\top}A(x_t)\cdots A(x_1)\pi$$



$$P(x_1,\ldots,x_t)=1^{\top}A(x_t)\cdots A(x_1)\pi$$



$$P(x_1,\ldots,x_t)=1^{\top}A(x_t)\cdots A(x_1)\pi$$

The basic Hidden Markov Model, in pictures



Figure: HMM with states h_t , h_{t+1} , and h_{t+2} which emit observations x_t , x_{t+1} , and x_{t+2} respectively.

Assumptions for Hidden Markov Model

1. Assumption in a Hidden Markov Model: underlying state process is Markovian

Assumptions for Hidden Markov Model

1. Assumption in a Hidden Markov Model: underlying state process is Markovian

•
$$P(h_{t+1}|h_t,...,h_1) = P(h_{t+1}|h_t)$$

Assumptions for Hidden Markov Model

- 1. Assumption in a Hidden Markov Model: underlying state process is Markovian
 - $P(h_{t+1}|h_t,...,h_1) = P(h_{t+1}|h_t)$
- 2. Given the hidden states, the observations are independent







Figure: An example of an HMM with "Kilroy was here" as output

The new users











































Neuroscience







When spectral methods apply

Let v be the dimension of your observations, and k be the dimension of your hidden state space

When spectral methods apply

Let v be the dimension of your observations, and k be the dimension of your hidden state space

 $k \ll v$

Let v be the dimension of your observations, and k be the dimension of your hidden state space

$k \ll v$

While observations lie in high-dimensional space v, they distributionally move on a much smaller subspace of dimension k.






















The Hidden Markov Model parameters



Traditional formula

$$P(x_1,\ldots,x_t) = \sum_{h_1,\ldots,h_t} [\pi]_{h_1} \prod_{j=2}^t [T]_{h_j,h_{j-1}} \prod_{j=1}^t [O]_{x_j,h_j}$$

$$P(x_1,\ldots,x_t) = 1^{\top} A(x_t) \cdots A(x_1) \pi$$

where
$$A(x) = T \operatorname{diag}([O]_{x,\cdot})$$

$$P(x_1,\ldots,x_t) = 1^{\top} A(x_t) \cdots A(x_1) \pi$$

where
$$A(x) = T \operatorname{diag}([O]_{x,\cdot})$$



$$P(x_1,\ldots,x_t) = 1^{\top} A(x_t) \cdots A(x_1) \pi$$

where
$$A(x) = T \operatorname{diag}([O]_{x,\cdot})$$

$$A(x) =$$

$$P(x_1,\ldots,x_t) = 1^{\top}A(x_t)\cdots A(x_1)\pi$$

where
$$A(x) = T \operatorname{diag}([O]_{x,\cdot})$$

$$A(x) =$$

$$P(x_1,\ldots,x_t)=1^{\top}A(x_t)\cdots A(x_1)\pi$$

where
$$A(x) = T \operatorname{diag}([O]_{x,\cdot})$$

$$A(x) =$$

$P(\text{Kilroy was here}) = 1^{\top} A(\text{here}) A(\text{was}) A(\text{Kilroy}) \pi$

$P(\text{Kilroy was here}) = 1^{\top} A(\text{here}) A(\text{was}) A(\text{Kilroy}) \pi$



 $P(\text{Kilroy was here}) = 1^{\top} A(\text{here}) A(\text{was}) A(\text{Kilroy}) \pi$



$1^{\top} A(x_t) \cdots A(x_1) \pi$

Main Idea:

For most problems, we don't **need** to recover T and O. We really only need A(x).

$$P(x_1,\ldots,x_t) = 1^{\top} A(x_t) \cdots A(x_1) \pi$$

Main Idea:

For most problems, we don't **need** to recover T and O. We really only need A(x).

$1^{\top} A(x_t) \cdots A(x_1) \pi$

Problem: A(x) is still not fully observable

$1^{\top}A(x_t)\cdots A(x_1)\pi$

=

However:

. . .

$$1^{\top} A(x_t) \cdots A(x_1) \pi$$

$$=$$

$$1^{\top} \underbrace{S^{-1}S}_{\text{Do nothing}} A(x_t) S^{-1}S \cdots S^{-1}S A(x_1) S^{-1}S \pi$$

However:

. . .

$$1^{\top} A(x_t) \cdots A(x_1) \pi$$

$$=$$

$$1^{\top} S^{-1} \underbrace{SA(x_t)S^{-1}}_{\text{Similarity Transformation}} S \cdots S^{-1} SA(x_1)S^{-1} S\pi$$

However:

. . .

$$1^{\top} A(x_t) \cdots A(x_1) \pi$$

$$=$$

$$1^{\top} S^{-1} \underbrace{SA(x_t)S^{-1}}_{\text{Similarity Transformation}} S \cdots S^{-1} SA(x_1)S^{-1} S\pi$$

Solution:

Turns out for the right S the similarity transformation of A is fully observable

$$1^{\top} A(x_t) \cdots A(x_1) \pi$$
$$=$$
$$b_{\infty}^{\top} B(x_t) \cdots B(x_1) b_1$$

Solution:

Turns out for the right S the similarity transformation of A is fully observable

$P(\text{Kilroy was here}) = b_{\infty}^{\top} B(\text{here}) B(\text{was}) B(\text{Kilroy}) b_1$

 $P(\text{Kilroy was here}) = b_{\infty}^{\top} B(\text{here}) B(\text{was}) B(\text{Kilroy}) b_1$





To estimate the B(x) matrices, we need the first three moments...

To estimate the B(x) matrices, we need the first three moments...

$$E[x_1] =$$

$$E[x_2 \otimes x_1] =$$

$$E[x_3 \otimes x_1, x_2] =$$
...

 \boldsymbol{v} such matrices, one for each word \boldsymbol{x}

To estimate the B(x) matrices, we need the first three moments...

$$E[x_1] =$$

$$E[x_2 \otimes x_1] =$$

$$E[x_3 \otimes x_1, x_2] =$$

$$\dots$$

v such matrices, one for each word x

And an eigendictionary U that maps the moments to the lower dimensional subspace...

U maps observations x to a lower dimensional y in a way that preserves the underyling dynamics of x.

U maps observations x to a lower dimensional y in a way that preserves the underyling dynamics of x.

SVD



U maps observations x to a lower dimensional y in a way that preserves the underyling dynamics of x.

SVD



U maps observations x to a lower dimensional y in a way that preserves the underyling dynamics of x.

SVD



In the case of words, words that are distributionally similar will map closely together in y-space.

U maps observations x to a lower dimensional y in a way that preserves the underyling dynamics of x.

SVD



- In the case of words, words that are distributionally similar will map closely together in y-space.
- Example: "I will let him know" and "I will let her know", but not "I will let box know"

U projection, first two dimension



Figure: Projection of words onto the first two dimensions of the U matrix

U projection, second two dimensions



Figure: Projection of words onto the second two dimensions of the U matrix

We have these v third-moment matrices lying around.



We have these v third-moment matrices lying around.



An alternate way to think of these is to simply stack them

We have these v third-moment matrices lying around.



An alternate way to think of these is to simply stack them





What changes?



What changes?

Old way

- Separate matrix for each word
- Select matrix corresponding to the word of interest from a list

Tensor version

- One single tensor for all words
- Have a function that takes a vector (the word) to a matrix
Moving beyond basic HKZ



What changes?

Old way

- Separate matrix for each word
- Select matrix corresponding to the word of interest from a list

Tensor version

- One single tensor for all words
- Have a function that takes a vector (the word) to a matrix

So the natural question is, can we reduce the dimensionality of the third mode of the tensor?

Reduced Dimensional HMM

Yes! Calculate the three first moments using the reduced dimensional observations $y = U^{\top}x$.

Reduced Dimensional HMM

Yes! Calculate the three first moments using the reduced dimensional observations $y = U^{\top}x$.



Reduced Dimensional HMM

Yes! Calculate the three first moments using the reduced dimensional observations $y = U^{\top}x$.



Using these moments we construct a function $\mathcal{C}(lpha)$ such that

$$P(x_1,\ldots,x_T)=c_{\infty}^{\top}C(y_T)\cdots C(y_1)c_1$$

The fully reduced formula

 $P(\text{Kilroy was here}) = c_{\infty}^{\top} C(U^{\top} \text{here}) C(U^{\top} \text{was}) C(U^{\top} \text{Kilroy}) c_1$

The fully reduced formula

 $P(\text{Kilroy was here}) = c_{\infty}^{\top} C(U^{\top} \text{here}) C(U^{\top} \text{was}) C(U^{\top} \text{Kilroy}) c_1$

In pictures:



Typical theorem

Theorem: Foster, Rodu, Ungar

Let X_t be generated by an $m \ge 2$ state HMM. Suppose we are given a U which has the property that range(O) \subset range(U) and $|U_{ij}| \le 1$. Using N independent triples, we have

$$N \geq \frac{128m^2}{(\frac{2t+3}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon}-1})^2 \Lambda^2 \sigma_m^4} \log\left(\frac{2m}{\delta}\right) \cdot \underbrace{\frac{\epsilon^2/(2t+3)^2}{(\frac{2t+3}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon}-1})^2}}_{(\frac{2t+3}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon}-1})^2}$$

implies that

$$1 - \epsilon \le \left| \frac{\widehat{\mathsf{Pr}}(x_1, \dots, x_t)}{\mathsf{Pr}(x_1, \dots, x_t)} \right| \le 1 + \epsilon$$

holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$.



нкΖ





Reduced Rank HMM







Extension to hidden variable tree models





Extension to hidden variable tree models



Very similar to structure of Hidden Markov Models

Extension to hidden variable tree models



- Very similar to structure of Hidden Markov Models
- Requires a few modifications, for instance
 - 1. Defining left and right transition parameters
 - Estimating additional skip-bigram matrix instead of just bigram.

Extension to hidden variable tree models



Extension to hidden variable tree models



 Want the marginal probability of a particular tree and tree topology

Extension to hidden variable tree models



- Want the marginal probability of a particular tree and tree topology
- Sum over all possible hidden states (not shown on this slide)

Extension to hidden variable tree models



- Want the marginal probability of a particular tree and tree topology
- Sum over all possible hidden states (not shown on this slide)
- Can be used for re-ranking output from a parser













We've learned something valuable from the reduced dimensional spectral HMM.

We've learned something valuable from the reduced dimensional spectral HMM.

We've learned something valuable from the reduced dimensional spectral HMM.

- Any function of the data that preserves the underlying dynamic structure can be used to the first three moments of the data and build the tensor C(α).
- The tensor C(α) fully encodes all of the information for the hidden state dynamics.

We've learned something valuable from the reduced dimensional spectral HMM.

- Any function of the data that preserves the underlying dynamic structure can be used to the first three moments of the data and build the tensor C(α).
- The tensor C(α) fully encodes all of the information for the hidden state dynamics.
- Estimation of the observation distribution lies in the choice of α, and how α plugs into the tensor C(α).

We've learned something valuable from the reduced dimensional spectral HMM.

Estimation of the hidden state dynamics in spectral estimation is a separate problem from estimation of the output distribution.

- Any function of the data that preserves the underlying dynamic structure can be used to the first three moments of the data and build the tensor C(α).
- The tensor C(α) fully encodes all of the information for the hidden state dynamics.
- Estimation of the observation distribution lies in the choice of α , and how α plugs into the tensor $C(\alpha)$.

• For HKZ, $\alpha = x$

We've learned something valuable from the reduced dimensional spectral HMM.

- Any function of the data that preserves the underlying dynamic structure can be used to the first three moments of the data and build the tensor C(α).
- The tensor C(α) fully encodes all of the information for the hidden state dynamics.
- Estimation of the observation distribution lies in the choice of α , and how α plugs into the tensor $C(\alpha)$.
 - For HKZ, $\alpha = x$
 - For the RDHMM, $\alpha = y$

We've learned something valuable from the reduced dimensional spectral HMM.

- Any function of the data that preserves the underlying dynamic structure can be used to the first three moments of the data and build the tensor C(α).
- The tensor C(α) fully encodes all of the information for the hidden state dynamics.
- Estimation of the observation distribution lies in the choice of α , and how α plugs into the tensor $C(\alpha)$.
 - For HKZ, $\alpha = x$
 - For the RDHMM, $\alpha = y$
 - For a general distribution, $\alpha = E[y_{t+1}|x_t] = g(x_t)$.

The fully factored approach: A few example extensions

The fully factored approach: A few example extensions Factorial HMM

- One model of stock return covariance matrices is that they are generated by an HMM with parameters that vary over time, themselves according to an HMM
- Requires ability to estimate HMM with matrix-valued output, which is possible with the factored approach

The fully factored approach: A few example extensions Factorial HMM

- One model of stock return covariance matrices is that they are generated by an HMM with parameters that vary over time, themselves according to an HMM
- Requires ability to estimate HMM with matrix-valued output, which is possible with the factored approach

Occasionally available external information

- Consider a system in which external information is occasionally available that might refine our hidden state belief
 - Amazon Mechanical Turk- have people intermittently label a stochastic process (e.g. text or images) as a way to recalibrate an automatic labeling.
- Requires ability to modify the probability of seeing an observation given the hidden states, now possible with the fully factored approach!












Thanks!!

Papers

Using Regression for Spectral Estimation, Foster, Rodu, Ungar, Wu 2013

Two Step CCA: A new spectral method for estimating vector models of words, Dhillon, Foster, Rodu, Ungar 2013

Spectral Dependency Parsing with Latent Variables, Collins, Dhillon, Foster, Rodu, Ungar 2012

Spectral Demensionality Reduction for HMMs, Foster, Rodu, Ungar 2012

In Progress

Spectral Estimation of HMMs with a continuous output distribution, Foster (in progress) Spectral Estimation of hierarchical HMMs, Foster, Rodu, Sedoc, Ungar (in progress) An MDP clustering of neurons by their hidden state paths Jensen,

Rodu, Small (in progress)

Thanks!