


Probabilistic Belief States and Bayesian Networks

(Where we exploit the sparseness
of direct interactions among
components of a world)

R&N: Chan 14 Sect. 14.1-4




Probabilistic Belief

- Consider a world where a dentist agent D meets with a new patient P
- D is interested in only whether P has a cavity; so, a state is described with a single proposition - Cavity
- Before observing P , D does not know if P has a cavity, but from years of practice, he believes Cavity with some probability p and \neg Cavity with probability $1-p$
- The proposition is now a boolean **random variable**²


Probabilistic Belief State

- The world has only two possible states, which are respectively described by *Cavity* and \neg *Cavity*
- The **probabilistic belief state** of an agent is a probabilistic distribution over all the states that the agent thinks possible
- In the dentist example, D's belief state is:




Vacuum Robot


If the robot has no idea what the state of the world is, and thinks that all states are equally probable (using the "principle of indifference"), its belief state is:



How are beliefs and belief states related?



How does a belief affects the entire belief state and the other beliefs?



- (Clean(R_1), 5/16)
- (Clean(R_2), 0.5)
- (In(Robot, R_1), 0.5)
- (In(Robot, R_2), 0.5)

It is usually more convenient to deal with individual beliefs than with entire belief states, e.g.:

- The robot may choose to execute Suck(R_2) only if Clean(R_2) has low probability
- The robot may directly observe whether Clean(R_1) or Clean(R_2)

Back to the dentist example ...

- We now represent the world of the dentist D using three propositions - *Cavity*, *Toothache*, and *PCatch*
- D's belief state consists of $2^3 = 8$ states each with some probability:
{*Cavity* \wedge *Toothache* \wedge *PCatch*,
 \neg *Cavity* \wedge *Toothache* \wedge *PCatch*,
Cavity \wedge \neg *Toothache* \wedge *PCatch*, ...}

The belief state is defined by the full joint probability of the propositions

	Toothache		\neg Toothache	
	PCatch	\neg PCatch	PCatch	\neg PCatch
Cavity	0.108	0.012	0.072	0.008
\neg Cavity	0.016	0.064	0.144	0.576

Probabilistic Inference

	Toothache		\neg Toothache	
	PCatch	\neg PCatch	PCatch	\neg PCatch
Cavity	0.108	0.012	0.072	0.008
\neg Cavity	0.016	0.064	0.144	0.576

$$\begin{aligned}P(\text{Cavity} \vee \text{Toothache}) &= 0.108 + 0.012 + \dots \\ &= 0.28\end{aligned}$$

Probabilistic Inference

	Toothache		\neg Toothache	
	PCatch	\neg PCatch	PCatch	\neg PCatch
Cavity	0.108	0.012	0.072	0.008
\neg Cavity	0.016	0.064	0.144	0.576

$$\begin{aligned} P(\text{Cavity}) &= 0.108 + 0.012 + 0.072 + 0.008 \\ &= 0.2 \end{aligned}$$

Probabilistic Inference

	Toothache		\neg Toothache	
	PCatch	\neg PCatch	PCatch	\neg PCatch
Cavity	0.108	0.012	0.072	0.008
\neg Cavity	0.016	0.064	0.144	0.576

Marginalization: $P(c) = \sum_t \sum_{pc} P(c \wedge t \wedge pc)$

using the conventions that $c = \text{Cavity}$ or $\neg\text{Cavity}$ and that \sum_t is the sum over $t = \{\text{Toothache}, \neg\text{Toothache}\}$

Conditional Probability

- $P(A \wedge B) = P(A|B) P(B)$
 $= P(B|A) P(A)$

$P(A|B)$ is the posterior probability of A given B

	Toothache		\neg Toothache	
	PCatch	\neg PCatch	PCatch	\neg PCatch
Cavity	0.108	0.012	0.072	0.008
\neg Cavity	0.016	0.064	0.144	0.576

$$P(\text{Cavity} | \text{Toothache}) = P(\text{Cavity} \wedge \text{Toothache}) / P(\text{Toothache})$$

$$= (0.108 + 0.012) / (0.108 + 0.012 + 0.016 + 0.064) = 0.6$$

Interpretation: After observing Toothache, the patient is no longer an "average" one, and the prior probability (0.2) of Cavity is no longer valid

$P(\text{Cavity} | \text{Toothache})$ is calculated by keeping the ratios of the probabilities of the 4 cases unchanged, and normalizing their sum to 1

	Toothache		\neg Toothache	
	PCatch	\neg PCatch	PCatch	\neg PCatch
Cavity	0.108	0.012	0.072	0.008
\neg Cavity	0.016	0.064	0.144	0.576

$$P(\text{Cavity} | \text{Toothache}) = P(\text{Cavity} \wedge \text{Toothache}) / P(\text{Toothache})$$

$$= (0.108 + 0.012) / (0.108 + 0.012 + 0.016 + 0.064) = 0.6$$

$$P(\neg \text{Cavity} | \text{Toothache}) = P(\neg \text{Cavity} \wedge \text{Toothache}) / P(\text{Toothache})$$

$$= (0.016 + 0.064) / (0.108 + 0.012 + 0.016 + 0.064) = 0.4$$

$$P(c | \text{Toothache}) = (P(\text{Cavity} | \text{Toothache}), P(\neg \text{Cavity} | \text{Toothache}))$$

$$= \alpha P(c \wedge \text{Toothache})$$

$$= \alpha \sum_{pc} P(c \wedge \text{Toothache} \wedge pc)$$

$$= \alpha [(0.108, 0.016) + (0.012, 0.064)]^{13}$$

$$= \alpha (0.12, 0.08) = (0.6, 0.4)$$

normalization
constant

Conditional Probability

- $P(A \wedge B) = P(A|B) P(B)$
 $= P(B|A) P(A)$
- $P(A \wedge B \wedge C) = P(A|B, C) P(B \wedge C)$
 $= P(A|B, C) P(B|C) P(C)$
- $P(\text{Cavity}) = \sum_t \sum_{pc} P(\text{Cavity} \wedge t \wedge pc)$
 $= \sum_t \sum_{pc} P(\text{Cavity}|t, pc) P(t \wedge pc)$
- $P(c) = \sum_t \sum_{pc} P(c \wedge t \wedge pc)$
 $= \sum_t \sum_{pc} P(c|t, pc) P(t \wedge pc)$

Independence

- Two random variables A and B are **independent** if

$$P(A \wedge B) = P(A) P(B)$$

hence if $P(A|B) = P(A)$

- Two random variables A and B are **independent given C** , if

$$P(A \wedge B | C) = P(A | C) P(B | C)$$

hence if $P(A|B, C) = P(A|C)$

Updating the Belief State

	Toothache		\neg Toothache	
	PCatch	\neg PCatch	PCatch	\neg PCatch
Cavity	0.108	0.012	0.072	0.008
\neg Cavity	0.016	0.064	0.144	0.576

- Let D now observe Toothache with probability 0.8 (e.g., "the patient says so")
- How should D update its belief state?

Updating the Belief State

	Toothache		\neg Toothache	
	PCatch	\neg PCatch	PCatch	\neg PCatch
Cavity	0.108	0.012	0.072	0.008
\neg Cavity	0.016	0.064	0.144	0.576

- Let E be the evidence such that $P(\text{Toothache}|E) = 0.8$
- We want to compute $P(c \wedge t \wedge \neg pc | E) = P(c \wedge \neg pc | t, E) P(t | E)$
- Since E is not directly related to the cavity or the probe catch, we consider that c and pc are independent of E given t , hence: $P(c \wedge \neg pc | t, E) = P(c \wedge \neg pc | t)$

Updating the Belief State

	Toothache		\neg Toothache	
	PCatch	\neg PCatch	PCatch	\neg PCatch
Cavity	0.108 0.432	0.012 0.048	0.072 0.018	0.008 0.002
\neg Cavity	0.016 0.064	0.064 0.256	0.144 0.036	0.576 0.144

- Let E be the evidence such that $P(\text{Toothache}|E) = 0.8$
- To get these 4 probabilities we normalize their sum to 0.8
- Since E is not directly related to the cavity or the probe catch, we assume they are independent of E given t , hence
 - To get these 4 probabilities we normalize their sum to 0.2

Issues

- If a state is described by n propositions, then a belief state contains 2^n states (possibly, some have probability 0)
- → **Modeling difficulty**: many numbers must be entered in the first place
- → **Computational issue**: memory size and time

	Toothache		\neg Toothache	
	PCatch	\neg PCatch	PCatch	\neg PCatch
Cavity	0.108	0.012	0.072	0.008
\neg Cavity	0.016	0.064	0.144	0.576

- Toothache and PCatch are independent given Cavity (or \neg Cavity), but this relation is hidden in the numbers ! [Verify this]
- **Bayesian networks** explicitly represent independence among propositions to reduce the number of probabilities defining a belief

Bayesian Network


- Notice that Cavity is the "cause" of both Toothache and PCatch, and represent the causality links explicitly
- Give the prior probability distribution of Cavity
- Give the conditional probability tables of Toothache and PCatch

$$P(c \wedge t \wedge pc) = P(t \wedge pc | c) P(c) \\ = P(t | c) P(pc | c) P(c)$$

P(Cavity)
0.2

	P(Toothache c)
Cavity	0.6
¬Cavity	0.1

	P(PCatch c)
Cavity	0.9
¬Cavity	0.02



5 probabilities, instead of 7


Bayesian Networks continued

CS 121


July 29, 2009

Chris Archibald

A More Complex BN




A More Complex BN



10 probabilities, instead of 31


What does the BN encode?



Each of the beliefs
JohnCalls and MaryCalls is
independent of Burglary
and Earthquake given
Alarm or \neg Alarm

For example, John does
not observe any burglaries
directly


What does the BN encode?



The beliefs JohnCalls and MaryCalls are independent given Alarm or \neg Alarm

For instance, the reasons why John and Mary may not call if there is an alarm are unrelated

What does the BN encode?



Burglary and Earthquake are independent

A node is independent of its non-descendants given its parents

The beliefs JohnCalls and MaryCalls are independent given Alarm or \neg Alarm

For instance, the reasons why John and Mary may not call if there is an alarm are unrelated


Locally Structured World


- A world is **locally structured (or sparse)** if each of its components interacts directly with relatively few other components
- In a sparse world, the CPTs are small and the BN contains much fewer probabilities than the full joint distribution
- If the # of entries in each CPT is bounded by a constant, i.e., $O(1)$, then the # of probabilities in a BN is **linear** in n - the # of propositions - instead of 2^n for the joint distribution

**But does a BN represent a
belief state?**

**In other words, can we compute
the full joint distribution of the
propositions from it?**


Calculation of Joint Probability





- $P(J \wedge M \wedge A \wedge \neg B \wedge \neg E)$
 $= P(J \wedge M | A, \neg B, \neg E) \times P(A \wedge \neg B \wedge \neg E)$
 $= P(J | A, \neg B, \neg E) \times P(M | A, \neg B, \neg E) \times P(A \wedge \neg B \wedge \neg E)$
 (J and M are independent given A)
- $P(J | A, \neg B, \neg E) = P(J | A)$
 (J and $\neg B \wedge \neg E$ are independent given A)
- $P(M | A, \neg B, \neg E) = P(M | A)$
- $P(A \wedge \neg B \wedge \neg E) = P(A | \neg B, \neg E) \times P(\neg B | \neg E) \times P(\neg E)$
 $= P(A | \neg B, \neg E) \times P(\neg B) \times P(\neg E)$
 ($\neg B$ and $\neg E$ are independent)
- $P(J \wedge M \wedge A \wedge \neg B \wedge \neg E) = P(J | A)P(M | A)P(A | \neg B, \neg E)P(\neg B)P(\neg E)$

Calculation of Joint Probability



Calculation of Joint Probability



$$\begin{aligned} &P(J \wedge M \wedge A \wedge \neg B \wedge \neg E) \\ &= P(J|A)P(M|A)P(A|\neg B, \neg E)P(\neg B)P(\neg E) \\ &= 0.9 \times 0.7 \times 0.001 \times 0.999 \times 0.998 \\ &= 0.00062 \end{aligned}$$

B	E	P(A ...)
T	T	0.95
T	F	0.94
F	T	0.29
F	F	0.001

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

→ full joint distribution table

Calculation of Joint Probability

Burglary

P(B)
0.001

Since a BN defines the full joint distribution of a set of propositions, it represents a belief state


$$\begin{aligned} &P(J \wedge M \wedge A \wedge \neg B \wedge \neg E) \\ &= P(J|A)P(M|A)P(A|\neg B, \neg E) \\ &= 0.9 \times 0.7 \times 0.001 \times 0.999 \times 0.998 \\ &= 0.00062 \end{aligned}$$

T	F	0.94
F	T	0.29
F	F	0.001

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

→ full joint distribution table

Querying the BN



- The BN gives $P(t|c)$
 - What about $P(c|t)$?
 - $P(\text{Cavity}|t)$
 - $= P(\text{Cavity} \wedge t) / P(t)$
 - $= P(t|\text{Cavity}) P(\text{Cavity}) / P(t)$
- [Bayes' rule]
- $P(c|t) = \alpha P(t|c) P(c)$
 - Querying a BN is just applying the trivial Bayes' rule on a larger scale


Querying the BN

- New evidence E indicates that JohnCalls with some probability p
- We would like to know the posterior probability of the other beliefs, e.g. $P(\text{Burglary}|E)$
- $$\begin{aligned} P(B|E) &= P(B \wedge J|E) + P(B \wedge \neg J|E) \\ &= P(B|J,E) P(J|E) + P(B|\neg J,E) P(\neg J|E) \\ &= P(B|J) P(J|E) + P(B|\neg J) P(\neg J|E) \\ &= p P(B|J) + (1-p) P(B|\neg J) \end{aligned}$$
- We need to compute $P(B|J)$ and $P(B|\neg J)$

Querying the BN

- $P(b|J) = \alpha P(b \wedge J)$
 - = $\alpha \sum_m \sum_a \sum_e P(b \wedge J \wedge m \wedge a \wedge e)$ [marginalization]
 - = $\alpha \sum_m \sum_a \sum_e P(b)P(e)P(a|b,e)P(J|a)P(m|a)$ [BN]
 - = $\alpha P(b)\sum_e P(e)\sum_a P(a|b,e)P(J|a)\sum_m P(m|a)$ [re-ordering]
- Depth-first evaluation of $P(b|J)$ leads to computing each of the 4 following products twice:
 $P(J|A) P(M|A), P(J|A) P(\neg M|A), P(J|\neg A) P(M|\neg A), P(J|\neg A) P(\neg M|\neg A)$
- Bottom-up (right-to-left) computation + caching - e.g., variable elimination algorithm (see R&N) - avoids such repetition
- For singly connected BN, the computation takes time **linear in the total number of CPT entries** (\rightarrow time linear in the # propositions if CPT's size is bounded)

Comparison to Classical Logic



Burglary \rightarrow Alarm

Earthquake \rightarrow Alarm

Alarm \rightarrow JohnCalls

Alarm \rightarrow MaryCalls

If the agent observes

\neg JohnCalls,


it infers \neg Alarm, \neg MaryCalls,

\neg Burglary, and \neg Earthquake

If it observes JohnCalls, then

it infers nothing



More Complicated Singly-Connected Belief Net




Some Applications of BN

- Medical diagnosis
- Troubleshooting of hardware/software systems
- Fraud/uncollectible debt detection
- Data mining
- Analysis of genetic sequences
- Data interpretation, computer vision, image understanding

Region = {Sky, Tree, Grass, Rock}





BN to evaluate insurance risks