2 Representation

Computationally accounting for uncertainty requires a formal representation. This chapter discusses how to represent uncertainty.\(^1\) We begin by introducing the notion of degree of belief and show how a set of axioms results in our ability to use probability distributions to quantify our uncertainty.\(^2\) We discuss several useful forms of distributions over both discrete and continuous variables. Because many important problems involve probability distributions over a large number of variables, we discuss a way to represent joint distributions efficiently that takes advantage of conditional independence between variables.

2.1 Degrees of Belief and Probability

In problems involving uncertainty, it is essential to be able to compare the plausibility of different statements. We would like to be able to represent, for example, that proposition \(A\) is more plausible than proposition \(B\). If \(A\) represents “my actuator failed”, and \(B\) represents “my sensor failed”, then we would write \(A \succ B\). Using this basic relation \(\succ\), we can define several other relations:

\[
\begin{align*}
A &\prec B \text{ if and only if } B \succ A \\
A &\sim B \text{ if and only if neither } A \succ B \text{ nor } B \succ A \\
A &\geq B \text{ if and only if } A \succ B \text{ or } A \sim B \\
A &\leq B \text{ if and only if } B \succ A \text{ or } A \sim B
\end{align*}
\]

We want to make certain assumptions about the relationships induced by the operators \(\succ, \sim, \prec\). The assumption of universal comparability requires exactly one of the following to hold: \(A \succ B\), \(A \sim B\), or \(A \prec B\). The assumption of transitivity requires that if \(A \geq B\) and \(B \geq C\) then \(A \geq C\). Universal comparability

\(^1\) A detailed discussion of a variety of approaches to representing uncertainty is provided by F. Cuzzolin, *The Geometry of Uncertainty*. Springer, 2021, 876 pp..

and transitivity assumptions lead to an ability to represent plausibility by a real-valued function $P$ that has the following two properties:\(^3\)

\begin{align*}
P(A) &> P(B) \text{ if and only if } A \succ B \\
P(A) &= P(B) \text{ if and only if } A \sim B
\end{align*}

(2.5)

(2.6)

If we make a set of additional assumptions\(^4\) about the form of $P$, then we can show that $P$ must satisfy the basic axioms of probability (appendix A.2). If we are certain of $A$, then $P(A) = 1$. If we believe $A$ is impossible, then $P(A) = 0$. Uncertainty in the truth of $A$ is represented by values in between the two extrema. Hence, probability masses must lie between 0 and 1 with $0 \leq P(A) \leq 1$.

### 2.2 Probability Distributions

A probability distribution assigns probabilities to different outcomes.\(^5\) There are different ways to represent probability distributions depending on whether they involve discrete or continuous outcomes.

#### 2.2.1 Discrete Probability Distributions

A discrete probability distribution is a distribution over a discrete set of values. We can represent such a distribution as a probability mass function, which assigns a probability to every possible assignment of its input variable to a value. For example, suppose we have a variable $X$ that can take on one of $n$ different values: $1, \ldots, n$, or, using colon notation, $1 : n$.\(^6\) A distribution associated with $X$ specifies the $n$ probabilities of the various assignments of values to that variable, in particular $P(X = 1), \ldots, P(X = n)$. Figure 2.1 shows an example of a discrete distribution.

There are constraints on the probability masses associated with discrete distributions. The masses must sum to one:

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{n} P(X = i) = 1
$$

(2.7)

and $0 \leq P(X = i) \leq 1$ for all $i$.
For notational convenience, we will use lowercase letters and superscripts as shorthand when discussing the assignment of values to variables. For example, \( P(x^3) \) is shorthand for \( P(X = 3) \). If \( X \) is a binary variable, it can take on the value true or false.\(^7\) We will use 0 to represent false and 1 to represent true. For example, we use \( P(x^0) \) to represent the probability that \( X \) is false.

The parameters of a distribution govern the probabilities associated with different assignments. For example, if we use \( X \) to represent the outcome of a roll of a six-sided die, then we would have \( P(x^1) = \theta_1, \ldots, P(x^6) = \theta_6 \), with \( \theta_{1:6} \) being the six parameters of the distribution. However, we need only five independent parameters to uniquely specify the distribution over the outcomes of the roll because we know that the distribution must sum to 1.

### 2.2.2 Continuous Probability Distributions

A continuous probability distribution is a distribution over a continuous set of values. Representing a distribution over a continuous variable is a little less straightforward than for a discrete variable. For instance, in many continuous distributions, the probability that a variable takes on a particular value is infinitesimally small. One way to represent a continuous probability distribution is to use a probability density function (see figure 2.2), represented with lowercase letters. If \( p(x) \) is a probability density function over \( X \), then \( p(x) \, dx \) is the probability \( X \) falls within the interval \((x, x + dx)\) as \( dx \to 0 \). Similarly to how the probability masses associated with a discrete distribution must sum to 1, a probability density function \( p(x) \) must integrate to 1:

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x) \, dx = 1 \tag{2.8}
\]

Another way to represent a continuous distribution is with a cumulative distribution function (see figure 2.3), which specifies the probability mass associated with values below some threshold. If we have a cumulative distribution function \( P \) associated with variable \( X \), then \( P(x) \) represents the probability mass associated with \( X \) taking on a value less than or equal to \( x \). A cumulative distribution function can be defined in terms of a probability density function \( p \) as follows:

\[
cdf_X(x) = P(X \leq x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} p(x') \, dx' \tag{2.9}
\]
Related to the cumulative distribution function is the \textit{quantile function}, also
called the \textit{inverse cumulative distribution function} (see figure 2.4). The value of
quantile \(X(\alpha)\) is the value \(x\) such that \(P(X \leq x) = \alpha\). In other words, the quantile
function returns the minimum value of \(x\) whose cumulative distribution value exceeds \(\alpha\). Of course, we have \(0 \leq \alpha \leq 1\).

There are many different parameterized families of distributions. We outline
several in appendix B. A simple distribution family is the \textit{uniform distribution}
\(U(a, b)\), which assigns probability density uniformly between \(a\) and \(b\), and zero
elsewhere. Hence, the probability density function is \(p(x) = 1/(b - a)\) for \(x\) in
the interval \([a, b]\). We can use \(U(x \mid a, b)\) to represent the density at \(x\).\footnote{Some texts use a semicolon to separate the parameters of the distribution. For example, one can also write \(U(x; a, b)\).} The \textit{support}
of a distribution is the set of values that are assigned non-zero density. In the case
of \(U(a, b)\), the support is the interval \([a, b]\). See example 2.1.

The uniform distribution \(U(0, 10)\) assigns equal probability to all values in
the range \([0, 10]\) with a probability density function:

\[
U(x \mid 0, 10) = \begin{cases} 
1/10 & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq 10 \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]  

(2.10)

The probability that a random sample from this distribution is equal to the
constant \(\pi\) is essentially zero. However, we can define non-zero probabilities
for samples being within some interval, say \([3, 5]\). For example, the probability
that a sample lies between 3 and 5 given the distribution plotted below is:

\[
\int_3^5 U(x \mid 0, 10) \, dx = \frac{5 - 3}{10} = \frac{1}{5}
\]  

(2.11)

The support of this distribution is the interval \([0, 10]\).
Another common distribution for continuous variables is the Gaussian distribution (also called the normal distribution). The Gaussian distribution is parameterized by a mean $\mu$ and variance $\sigma^2$:

$$p(x) = \mathcal{N}(x \mid \mu, \sigma^2)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.12)

Here, $\sigma$ is the standard deviation, which is the square root of the variance. The variance is also commonly denoted by $\nu$. We use $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ to represent a Gaussian distribution with parameters $\mu$ and $\sigma^2$ and $\mathcal{N}(x \mid \mu, \sigma^2)$ to represent the probability density at $x$ as given by

$$\mathcal{N}(x \mid \mu, \sigma^2) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{x - \mu}{\sigma}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.13)

where $\phi$ is the standard normal density function:

$$\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.14)

Appendix B shows plots of Gaussian density functions with different parameters.

Although a Gaussian distribution is often convenient because it is defined by only two parameters and makes computation and derivation easy, it has some limitations. It assigns non-zero probability to large positive and negative values, which may not be appropriate for the quantity we are trying to model. For example, we might not want to assign non-zero probabilities for aircraft flying below the ground or at infeasible altitudes. We can use a truncated Gaussian distribution (see figure 2.5) to bound the support of possible values, that is, the range of values assigned non-zero probabilities. The density function is given by

$$\mathcal{N}(x \mid \mu, \sigma^2, a, b) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \phi\left(\frac{x - \mu}{\sigma}\right) \frac{\Phi\left(b - \frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right) - \Phi\left(a - \frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right)}{\Phi\left(b - \frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right) - \Phi\left(a - \frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.15)

when $x$ is within the interval $(a, b)$.

The function $\Phi$ is the standard normal cumulative distribution function as given by

$$\Phi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} \phi(x') \, dx'$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.16)
The Gaussian distribution is *unimodal*, meaning that there is a point in the distribution at which the density increases on one side and decreases on the other side. There are different ways to represent continuous distributions that are *multimodal*. One way is to use a *mixture model*, which is a mixture of multiple distributions. We mix together a collection of unimodal distributions to obtain a multimodal distribution. A *Gaussian mixture model* is a mixture model that is simply a weighted average of different Gaussian distributions. The parameters of a Gaussian mixture model include the parameters of the Gaussian distribution components \( \mu_{1:n}, \sigma^2_{1:n} \) as well as their weights \( \rho_{1:n} \). The density is given by

\[
p(x \mid \mu_{1:n}, \sigma^2_{1:n}, \rho_{1:n}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho_i \mathcal{N}(x \mid \mu_i, \sigma_i^2)
\]

(2.17)

where the weights must sum to 1. Example 2.2 shows a Gaussian mixture model with two components.

---

**Example 2.2.** An example Gaussian mixture model.

---

Another approach to representing multimodal continuous distributions is through discretization. For example, we can represent a distribution over a continuous variable as a *piecewise-uniform density*. The density is specified by the bin edges, and a probability mass is associated with each bin. Such a piecewise-uniform distribution is a type of mixture model where the components are uniform distributions.
2.3 Joint Distributions

A joint distribution is a probability distribution over multiple variables. A distribution over a single variable is called a univariate distribution, and a distribution over multiple variables is called a multivariate distribution. If we have a joint distribution over two discrete variables $X$ and $Y$, then $P(x, y)$ denotes the probability that both $X = x$ and $Y = y$.

From a joint distribution, we can compute a marginal distribution of a variable or a set of variables by summing out all other variables using what is known as the law of total probability:

$$P(x) = \sum_y P(x, y) \tag{2.18}$$

This property is used throughout this book.

Real-world decision making often requires reasoning about joint distributions involving many variables. Sometimes there are complex relationships between the variables that are important to represent. We may use different strategies to represent joint distributions depending on whether the variables involve discrete or continuous values.

2.3.1 Discrete Joint Distributions

If the variables are discrete, the joint distribution can be represented by a table like the one shown in table 2.1. That table lists all possible assignments of values to three binary variables. Each variable can only be 0 or 1, resulting in $2^3 = 8$ possible assignments. As with other discrete distributions, the probabilities in the table must sum to 1. It follows that although there are eight entries in the table, only seven of them are independent. If $\theta_i$ represents the probability in the $i$th row in the table, then we only need the parameters $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_7$ to represent the distribution because we know $\theta_8 = 1 - (\theta_1 + \ldots + \theta_7)$.

If we have $n$ binary variables, then we need as many as $2^n - 1$ independent parameters to specify the joint distribution. This exponential growth in the number of parameters makes storing the distribution in memory difficult. In some cases, we can assume that our variables are independent, which means that the realization of one does not affect the probability distribution of the other. If $X$ and $Y$ are independent, which is sometimes written $X \perp Y$, then we know $P(x, y) = P(x)P(y)$.
for all $x$ and $y$. Suppose we have binary variables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ that are all independent of each other, resulting in $P(x_1:n) = \prod_i P(x_i)$. This factorization allows us to represent this joint distribution with only $n$ independent parameters instead of the $2^n - 1$ required when we cannot assume independence (see table 2.2). Independence can result in an enormous savings in terms of representational complexity, but it is often a poor assumption.

We can represent joint distributions in terms of factors. A factor $\phi$ over a set of variables is a function from assignments of those variables to the real numbers. In order to represent a probability distribution, the real numbers in the factor must be non-negative. A factor with non-negative values can be normalized such that it represents a probability distribution. Algorithm 2.1 provides an implementation for discrete factors, and example 2.3 demonstrates how they work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$X$</th>
<th>$P(X)$</th>
<th>$Y$</th>
<th>$P(Y)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2. If we know the variables in table 2.1 are independent, we can represent $P(x,y,z)$ using the product $P(x)P(y)P(z)$. This representation requires only one parameter for each of the three univariate distributions.
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We can instantiate the table from table 2.1 using the `Factor` type using the following code:

\[
X = \text{Variable}(x, 2) \\
Y = \text{Variable}(y, 2) \\
Z = \text{Variable}(z, 2) \\
\phi = \text{Factor}([X, Y, Z], \text{FactorTable}( \\
(x=1, y=1, z=1) \Rightarrow 0.08, (x=1, y=1, z=2) \Rightarrow 0.31, \\
(x=1, y=2, z=1) \Rightarrow 0.09, (x=1, y=2, z=2) \Rightarrow 0.37, \\
(x=2, y=1, z=1) \Rightarrow 0.01, (x=2, y=1, z=2) \Rightarrow 0.05, \\
(x=2, y=2, z=1) \Rightarrow 0.02, (x=2, y=2, z=2) \Rightarrow 0.07, \\
))
\]

Another approach to reduce the storage required to represent joint distributions with repeated values is to use a decision tree. A decision tree involving three discrete variables is shown in example 2.4. Although the savings in this example in terms of the number of parameters may not be significant, it can become quite substantial when there are many variables and many repeated values.

Example 2.3. Constructing a discrete factor. The construction of the factor table using named tuples takes advantage of the utility functions defined in appendix G.5.

Example 2.4. A decision tree can be a more efficient representation of a joint distribution than a table.

Suppose we have the following table representing a joint probability distribution. We can use the decision tree to the right of it to more compactly represent the values in the table. Red arrows are followed when a variable is 0, and blue arrows are followed when a variable is 1. Instead of storing eight probabilities, we store only five along with a representation of the tree.
2.3.2 Continuous Joint Distributions

We can also define joint distributions over continuous variables. A rather simple distribution is the *multivariate uniform distribution*, which assigns a constant probability density everywhere there is support. We can use \( \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \) to represent a uniform distribution over a *box*, which is a Cartesian product of intervals with the \( i \)-th interval being \([a_i, b_i]\). This family of uniform distributions is a special type of *multivariate product distribution*, which is a distribution defined in terms of the product of univariate distributions. In this case,

\[
\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \prod_i \mathcal{U}(x_i \mid a_i, b_i) \tag{2.19}
\]

We can create a mixture model from a weighted collection of multivariate uniform distributions, just as we can with univariate distributions. If we have a joint distribution over \( n \) variables and \( k \) mixture components, we need to define \( k(2n + 1) - 1 \) independent parameters. For each of the \( k \) components, we need to define the upper and lower bounds for each of the variables in addition to their weights. We can subtract 1 because the weights must sum to 1. Figure 2.6 shows an example that can be represented by five components.

It is also common to represent piecewise constant density functions by discretizing each of the variables independently. The discretization is represented by a set of bin edges for each variable. These bin edges define a grid over the variables. We then associate a constant probability density with each grid cell. The bin edges do not have to be uniformly separated. In some cases, it may be desirable to have increased resolution around certain values. Different variables might have different bin edges associated with them. If there are \( n \) variables and \( m \) bins for each variable, then we need \( m^n - 1 \) independent parameters to define the distribution—in addition to the values that define the bin edges.

In some cases, it may be more memory efficient to represent a continuous joint distribution as a decision tree in a manner similar to what we discussed for discrete joint distributions. The internal nodes compare variables against thresholds and the leaf nodes are density values. Figure 2.7 shows a decision tree that represents the density function in figure 2.6.

Another useful distribution is the *multivariate Gaussian distribution* with the density function

\[
\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{\mu}, \Sigma) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2}|\Sigma|^{1/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{\mu})^\top \Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{\mu})\right) \tag{2.20}
\]
where \( x \) is in \( \mathbb{R}^n \), \( \mu \) is the *mean vector*, and \( \Sigma \) is the *covariance matrix*. The density function above requires that \( \Sigma \) be positive definite. The number of independent parameters is equal to \( n + (n + 1)n/2 \), the number of components in \( \mu \) added to the number of components in the upper triangle of matrix \( \Sigma \). Appendix B shows plots of different multivariate Gaussian density functions. We can also define *multivariate Gaussian mixture models*. Figure 2.8 shows an example of one with three components.

If we have a multivariate Gaussian with all of the variables independent, then the covariance matrix \( \Sigma \) is diagonal with only \( n \) independent parameters. In fact, we can write the density function as a product of univariate Gaussian densities:

\[
N(x | \mu, \Sigma) = \prod_i N(x_i | \mu_i, \Sigma_{ii})
\]  

(2.21)

### 2.4 Conditional Distributions

The previous section introduced the idea of independence, which can help reduce the number of parameters used to define a joint distribution. However, as was mentioned, independence can be too strong of an assumption. This section will introduce the idea of conditional independence, which can help reduce the number of independent parameters without making assumptions that are as strong. Before discussing conditional independence, we will first introduce the notion of a *conditional distribution*, which is a distribution over a variable given the value of one or more others.
The definition of conditional probability states that

\[ P(x \mid y) = \frac{P(x, y)}{P(y)} \quad (2.22) \]

where \( P(x \mid y) \) is read as “probability of \( x \) given \( y \).” In some contexts, it is common to refer to \( y \) as evidence.

Since a conditional probability distribution is a probability distribution over one or more variables given some evidence, we know that

\[ \sum_x P(x \mid y) = 1 \quad (2.23) \]

for a discrete \( X \). If \( X \) is continuous, it integrates to 1.

We can incorporate the definition of conditional probability into equation (2.18) to obtain a slightly different form of the law of total probability:

\[ P(x) = \sum_y P(x \mid y)P(y) \quad (2.24) \]

for a discrete distribution.

Another useful relationship that follows from the definition of conditional probability is Bayes’ rule:\(^\text{12}\)

\[ P(x \mid y) = \frac{P(y \mid x)P(x)}{P(y)} \quad (2.25) \]

If we have a representation of a conditional distribution \( P(y \mid x) \), we can apply Bayes’s rule to swap the \( y \) and \( x \) to obtain the conditional distribution \( P(x \mid y) \).

We will now discuss a variety of ways to represent conditional probability distributions over discrete and continuous variables.

### 2.4.1 Discrete Conditional Models

A conditional probability distribution over discrete variables can be represented using a table. In fact, we can use the same discrete factor representation that we used in section 2.3.1 for joint distributions. Table 2.3 shows an example of a table representing \( P(X \mid Y, Z) \) with all binary variables. In contrast with a joint table (e.g., table 2.1), the column containing the probabilities need not sum to 1. However, if we sum over the probabilities that are consistent with what we are conditioning on, we must get 1. For example, conditioning on \( y^0 \) and \( z^0 \) (the evidence), we have

\[ P(x^0 \mid y^0, z^0) + P(x^1 \mid y^0, z^0) = 0.08 + 0.92 = 1 \quad (2.26) \]

\(^\text{12}\) Named for the English statistician and Presbyterian minister Thomas Bayes (c. 1701–1761) who provided a formulation of this theorem.
Conditional probability tables can become quite large. If we were to create a table like table 2.3 where all variables can take on $m$ values and we are conditioning on $n$ variables, there would be $m^{n+1}$ rows. However, since the $m$ values of the variable we are not conditioning on must sum to 1, there are only $(m - 1)m^n$ independent parameters. There is still an exponential growth in the number of variables on which we condition. When there are many repeated values in the conditional probability table, a decision tree (introduced in section 2.3.1) may be a more efficient representation.

### 2.4.2 Conditional Gaussian Models

A conditional Gaussian model can be used to represent a distribution over a continuous variable given one or more discrete variables. For example, if we have a continuous variable $X$ and a discrete variable $Y$ with values $1 : n$, we can define a conditional Gaussian model as follows:

$$
p(x | y) = \begin{cases} 
\mathcal{N}(x | \mu_1, \sigma_1^2) & \text{if } y^1 \\
\vdots \\
\mathcal{N}(x | \mu_n, \sigma_n^2) & \text{if } y^n
\end{cases}
$$

(2.27)

with parameter vector $\theta = [\mu_{1:n}, \sigma_{1:n}]$. All $2n$ of those parameters can be varied independently. If we want to condition on multiple discrete variables, we just need to add more cases and associated parameters.

### 2.4.3 Linear Gaussian Models

The linear Gaussian model of $P(X | Y)$ represents the distribution over a continuous variable $X$ as a Gaussian distribution with the mean being a linear function of the value of the continuous variable $Y$. The conditional density function is

$$
p(x | y) = \mathcal{N}(x | my + b, \sigma^2)
$$

(2.28)

with parameters $\theta = [m, b, \sigma]$. The mean is a linear function of $y$ defined by parameters $m$ and $b$. The variance is constant. Figure 2.9 shows an example.

![Figure 2.9. A linear Gaussian model with $p(x | y) = \mathcal{N}(x | 2y + 1, 1^2)$](image)
2.4.4 Conditional Linear Gaussian Models

The conditional linear Gaussian model combines the ideas of conditional Gaussian and linear Gaussian models to be able to handle conditioning a continuous variable on both discrete and continuous variables. Suppose we want to represent \( p(X | Y, Z) \), where \( X \) and \( Y \) are continuous and \( Z \) is discrete with values \( 1 : n \). The conditional density function is then

\[
p(x | y, z) = \begin{cases} 
    \mathcal{N}(x | m_1 y + b_1, \sigma_1^2) & \text{if } z^1 \\
    \vdots \\
    \mathcal{N}(x | m_n y + b_n, \sigma_n^2) & \text{if } z^n
\end{cases}
\]  

(2.29)

Above, the parameter vector \( \theta = [m_{1:n}, b_{1:n}, \sigma_{1:n}] \) has \( 3n \) components.

2.4.5 Sigmoid Models

We can use a sigmoid model to represent a distribution over a binary variable conditioned on a continuous variable. For example, we may want to represent \( P(x^1 | y) \), where \( x \) is binary and \( y \) is continuous. Of course, we could just set a threshold \( \theta \) and say \( P(x^1 | y) = 0 \) if \( y < \theta \) and \( P(x^1 | y) = 1 \) otherwise. However, in many applications, we may not want to have such a hard threshold that results in assigning zero probability to \( x^1 \) for certain values of \( y \).

Instead of a hard threshold, we could use a soft threshold that assigns low probabilities when below a threshold and high probabilities when above a threshold. One way to represent a soft threshold is to use a logit model, which produces a sigmoid curve:

\[
P(x^1 | y) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp \left( -\frac{y - \theta_1}{\theta_2} \right)}
\]  

(2.30)

The parameter \( \theta_1 \) governs the location of the threshold, and \( \theta_2 \) controls the “softness” or spread of the probabilities. Figure 2.10 shows an example plot of \( P(x^1 | y) \) with a logit model.

2.4.6 Deterministic Variables

Some problems may involve a deterministic variable whose value is fixed given evidence. In other words, we assign probability 1 to a value that is a deterministic function of its evidence. Using a conditional probability table to represent
a discrete deterministic variable is possible, but it is wasteful. A single variable instantiation will have probability 1 for each parental instantiation, and the remaining entries will be 0. Our implementation can take advantage of this sparsity for a more compact representation. Algorithms in this text using discrete factors treat any assignments missing from the factor table as having value 0, making it so that we only have to store the assignments that have non-zero probability.

2.5 Bayesian Networks

A Bayesian network can be used to represent a joint probability distribution. The structure of a Bayesian network is defined by a directed acyclic graph consisting of nodes and directed edges. Each node corresponds to a variable. Directed edges connect pairs of nodes, with cycles in the graph being prohibited. The directed edges indicate direct probabilistic relationships. Associated with each node \( X_i \) is a conditional distribution \( P(X_i \mid Pa(X_i)) \), where \( Pa(X_i) \) represents the parents of \( X_i \) in the graph. Algorithm 2.2 provides an implementation of a Bayesian network data structure. Example 2.5 illustrates the application of Bayesian networks to a satellite-monitoring problem.

```
struct BayesianNetwork
    vars::Vector{Variable}
    factors::Vector{Factor}
    graph::SimpleDiGraph{Int64}
end
```

The chain rule for Bayesian networks specifies how to construct a joint distribution from the local conditional probability distributions. Suppose we have the variables \( X_{1:n} \) and want to compute the probability of a particular assignment of all these variables to values \( P(x_{1:n}) \). The chain rule says

\[
P(x_{1:n}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} P(x_i \mid pa(x_i))
\]

where \( pa(x_i) \) is the particular assignment of the parents of \( X_i \) to their values. Algorithm 2.3 provides an implementation for Bayesian networks with conditional probability distributions represented as discrete factors.


Appendix A.16 reviews common graph terminology.

In causal networks, the direction of the edges indicate causal relationships between variables. However, causality is not required in general Bayesian networks. As will be discussed shortly, the structure of the network is used to encode certain assumptions about the joint probability distribution. J. Pearl, *Causality: Models, Reasoning, and Inference*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Algorithm 2.2. A discrete Bayesian network representation in terms of a set of variables, factors, and a graph. The graph data structure is provided by LightGraphs.jl.
Below the caption is a Bayesian network for a satellite-monitoring problem involving five binary variables. Fortunately, battery failure and solar panel failures are both rare, although solar panel failures are somewhat more likely than battery failures. Failures in either can lead to an electrical system failure. There may be causes of electrical system failure other than battery or solar panel failure, such as a problem with the power management unit. An electrical system failure can result in trajectory deviation, which can be observed from the earth by telescope, as well as a communication loss that interrupts the transmission of telemetry and mission data down to various ground stations. Other anomalies not involving the electrical system can result in trajectory deviation and communication loss.

Associated with each of the five variables are five conditional probability distributions. Because $B$ and $S$ do not have any parents, we only need to specify $P(B)$ and $P(S)$. The code below creates a Bayesian network structure with example values for the elements of the associated factor tables. The tuples in the factor tables index into the domains of the variables, which is \{0,1\} for all of the variables. For example, $(e=2,b=1,s=1)$ corresponds to $(e^1,b^0,s^0)$.

```
B = Variable(:b, 2); S = Variable(:s, 2)
E = Variable(:e, 2)
D = Variable(:d, 2); C = Variable(:c, 2)
vars = [B, S, E, D, C]
factors = [  
    Factor([B], FactorTable((b=1,) => 0.99, (b=2,) => 0.01)),
    Factor([S], FactorTable((s=1,) => 0.98, (s=2,) => 0.02)),
    Factor([E,B,S], FactorTable(   
        (e=1,b=1,s=1) => 0.90, (e=1,b=1,s=2) => 0.04,
        (e=1,b=2,s=1) => 0.05, (e=1,b=2,s=2) => 0.01,
        (e=2,b=1,s=1) => 0.10, (e=2,b=1,s=2) => 0.96,
        (e=2,b=2,s=1) => 0.95, (e=2,b=2,s=2) => 0.99)),
    Factor([D, E], FactorTable(   
        (d=1,e=1) => 0.96, (d=1,e=2) => 0.03,
        (d=2,e=1) => 0.04, (d=2,e=2) => 0.97)),
    Factor([C, E], FactorTable(   
        (c=1,e=1) => 0.98, (c=1,e=2) => 0.01,
        (c=2,e=1) => 0.02, (c=2,e=2) => 0.99))
]
graph = SimpleDiGraph(5)
add_edge!(graph, 1, 3); add_edge!(graph, 2, 3)
add_edge!(graph, 3, 4); add_edge!(graph, 3, 5)
bn = BayesianNetwork(vars, factors, graph)
```

Example 2.5. A Bayesian network representing a satellite-monitoring problem. Below is the structure of the network represented as a directed acyclic graph. Associated with each node is a conditional probability distribution.

$B$ battery failure  
$S$ solar panel failure  
$E$ electrical system failure  
$D$ trajectory deviation  
$C$ communication loss
In the satellite example, suppose we want to compute the probability that nothing is wrong, that is, \( P(b^0, s^0, e^0, d^0, c^0) \). From the chain rule,

\[
P(b^0, s^0, e^0, d^0, c^0) = P(b^0)P(s^0)P(e^0 \mid b^0, s^0)P(d^0 \mid e^0)P(c^0 \mid e^0)
\]  

(2.32)

If we had fully specified a joint distribution over the five variables \( B, S, E, D, \) and \( C \), then we would have needed \( 2^5 - 1 = 31 \) independent parameters. The structure assumed in our Bayesian network allows us to specify the joint distribution using only \( 1 + 1 + 4 + 2 + 2 = 10 \) independent parameters. The difference between 10 and 31 does not represent an especially significant savings in the number of parameters, but the savings can become enormous in larger Bayesian networks. The power of Bayesian networks comes from their ability to reduce the number of parameters required to specify a joint probability distribution.

### 2.6 Conditional Independence

The reason that a Bayesian network can represent a joint distribution with fewer independent parameters than would normally be required is due to the conditional independence assumptions encoded in its graphical structure.\(^{17}\) Conditional independence is a generalization of the notion of independence introduced in section 2.3.1. Variables \( X \) and \( Y \) are conditionally independent given \( Z \) if and only if

\[
P(X, Y \mid Z) = P(X \mid Z)P(Y \mid Z).
\]

The assertion that \( X \) and \( Y \) are conditionally independent given \( Z \) is written \( (X \perp Y \mid Z) \). It is possible to show from this definition that \( (X \perp Y \mid Z) \) if and only if

\[
P(X \mid Z) = P(X \mid Y, Z).
\]

Given \( Z \), information about \( Y \) provides no additional information about \( X \), and vice versa. Example 2.6 provides an example.

We can use a set of rules to determine whether the structure of a Bayesian network implies that two variables must be conditionally independent given a set of other evidence variables.\(^{18}\) Suppose we want to check whether \( (A \perp B \mid C) \) is implied by the network structure, where \( C \) is a set of evidence variables. We have

```algorithm
function probability(bn::BayesianNetwork, assignment)
    subassignment(ϕ) = select(assignment, variablenames(ϕ))
    probability(ϕ) = get(ϕ.table, subassignment(ϕ), 0.0)
    return prod(probability(ϕ) for ϕ in bn.factors)
end
```

Algorithm 2.3. A function for evaluating the probability of an assignment given a Bayesian network \( bn \). For example, if \( bn \) is as defined in example 2.5, then

\[
a = (b=1, s=1, e=1, d=2, c=1)
\]

\[
probability(bn, Assignment(a)) returns 0.03422865599999996.
\]
Suppose the presence of satellite trajectory deviation \((D)\) is conditionally independent of whether we have a communication loss \((C)\) given knowledge of whether we have an electrical system failure \((E)\). We would write this \((D \perp C \mid E)\). If we know that we have an electrical system failure, then the fact that we observe a loss of communication has no impact on our belief that there is a trajectory deviation. We may have an elevated expectation that there is a trajectory deviation, but that is only because we know that an electrical system failure has occurred.

Example 2.6. Conditional independence in the satellite-tracking problem.

to check all possible undirected paths from \(A\) to \(B\) for what is called \(d\)-separation. A path between \(A\) and \(B\) is \(d\)-separated by \(C\) if any of the following are true:

1. The path contains a \textit{chain} of nodes, \(X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z\), such that \(Y\) is in \(C\).
2. The path contains a \textit{fork}, \(X \leftarrow Y \rightarrow Z\), such that \(Y\) is in \(C\).
3. The path contains an \textit{inverted fork} (also called a \textit{v-structure}), \(X \rightarrow Y \leftarrow Z\), such that \(Y\) is \textit{not} in \(C\) and no descendant of \(Y\) is in \(C\). Example 2.7 provides some intuition for this rule.

We say that \(A\) and \(B\) are \(d\)-separated by \(C\) if all paths between \(A\) and \(B\) are \(d\)-separated by \(C\). This \(d\)-separation implies that \((A \perp B \mid C)\).\(^{19}\) Example 2.8 demonstrates this process for checking whether a graph implies a particular conditional independence assumption.

Sometimes the term \textit{Markov blanket}\(^{20}\) of a node \(X\) is used to refer to the minimal set of nodes that, if their values were known, makes \(X\) conditionally independent of all other nodes. A Markov blanket of a particular node turns out to consist of its parents, its children, and the other parents of its children.

2.7 Summary

- Representing uncertainty as a probability distribution is motivated by a set of axioms related to the comparison of the plausibility of different statements.
- There are many different families of both discrete and continuous probability distributions.


If we have $X \to Y \to Z$ (chain) or $X \leftarrow Y \to Z$ (fork) with evidence at $Y$, then $X$ and $Z$ are conditionally independent, meaning that $P(X \mid Y, Z) = P(X \mid Y)$. Interestingly, if the directions of the arrows were slightly different with $X \to Y \leftarrow Z$ (inverted fork), then $X$ and $Z$ may no longer be conditionally independent given $Y$. In other words, it may be the case that $P(B \mid E) \neq P(B \mid S, E)$. To provide some intuition, consider the inverted fork path from battery failure $B$ to solar panel failure $S$ via electrical system failure $E$. Suppose we know that we have an electrical failure. If we know that we do not have a battery failure, then we are more inclined to believe that we have a solar panel failure because it is an alternative cause of our electrical failure. Conversely, if we found out that we do have a battery failure, then our belief that we have a solar panel failure decreases. This effect is referred to as *explaining away*. Observing a solar panel failure explains away the cause of the electrical system failure.

Example 2.7. Intuition behind conditional independence assumptions implied (and not implied) in chains, forks, and inverted forks.

Suppose we want to determine whether the network shown in the margin implies that $(D \perp B \mid F)$. There are two undirected paths from $D$ to $B$. We need to check both paths for d-separation.

The path $D \leftarrow A \to C \leftarrow B$ involves a fork $D \leftarrow A \to C$ followed by an inverted fork $A \to C \leftarrow B$. There is no evidence at $A$, so there is no d-separation from the fork. Since $F$ is a descendant of $C$, there is not d-separation along the inverted fork. Hence, there is not d-separation along this path.

The second path, $D \to E \leftarrow C \leftarrow B$, involves an inverted fork $D \to E \leftarrow C$ and a chain $E \leftarrow C \leftarrow B$. Since $F$ is a descendant of $E$, there is not d-separation along the inverted fork. Because there is no d-separation along the chain part of this path either, there is no d-separation along this path from $D$ to $B$.

In order for $D$ and $B$ to be conditionally independent given $F$, there must be d-separation along all undirected paths from $D$ to $B$. In this case, neither of the two paths have d-separation. Hence, conditional independence is not implied by the network structure.

Example 2.8. Conditional independence assumptions implied by the graphical structure below.
• Continuous probability distributions can be represented by density functions.
• Probability distribution families can be combined together in mixtures to result in more flexible distributions.
• Joint distributions are distributions over multiple variables.
• Conditional distributions are distributions over one or more variables given values of evidence variables.
• A Bayesian network is defined by a graphical structure and a set of conditional distributions.
• Depending on the structure of the Bayesian network, we can represent joint distributions with fewer parameters due to conditional independence assumptions.

2.8 Exercises

Exercise 2.1. Consider a continuous random variable $X$ that follows the exponential distribution parameterized by $\lambda$ with density $p(x \mid \lambda) = \lambda \exp(-\lambda x)$ with nonnegative support. Compute the cumulative distribution function of $X$.

Solution: We start with the definition of the cumulative distribution function. Since the support of the distribution is lower-bounded by $x = 0$, there is no probability mass in the interval $(-\infty, 0)$, allowing us to adjust the lower bound of the integral to 0. After computing the integral, we obtain $\text{cdf}_X(x)$:

$$
\text{cdf}_X(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} p(x') \, dx'
$$

$$
\text{cdf}_X(x) = \int_{0}^{x} \lambda e^{-\lambda x'} \, dx'
$$

$$
\text{cdf}_X(x) = -e^{-\lambda x} \bigg|_{0}^{x}
$$

$$
\text{cdf}_X(x) = 1 - e^{-\lambda x}
$$

Exercise 2.2. For the density function in figure 2.6, what are the five components of the mixture? (There are multiple valid solutions.)

Solution: One solution is $\mathcal{U}([-10, -10], [-5, 10]), \mathcal{U}([-5, 0], [0, 10]), \mathcal{U}([-5, -10], [0, 0]), \mathcal{U}([0, -10], [10, 5])$, and $\mathcal{U}([0, 5], [10, 10])$.

Exercise 2.3. Given the following table representation of $P(X, Y, Z)$, generate an equivalent compact decision tree representation.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P(X, Y, Z)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solution: We start with the most common probabilities, 0.13, which occurs when \( Z = 0 \) and \( Y = 0 \), and 0.05, which occurs when \( Z = 0 \) and \( Y = 1 \). We choose to make \( Z \) the root of our decision tree and when \( Z = 0 \) we continue to a \( Y \) node. Based on the value of \( Y \) we branch to either 0.13 or 0.05. Next, we continue with cases when \( Z = 1 \). The most common probabilities are 0.02, which occurs when \( Z = 1 \) and \( X = 0 \), and 0.12, which occurs when \( Z = 1 \) and \( X = 2 \). So, when \( Z = 1 \), we choose to continue to an \( X \) node. Based on the whether \( X \) is 0, 1, or 2, we continue to 0.02, a \( Y \) node, or 0.12, respectively. Finally, based on the value of \( Y \), we branch to either 0.01 or 0.17.

Exercise 2.4. Suppose we want to specify a multivariate Gaussian mixture model with three components defined over four variables. We require that two of the three Gaussian distributions assume independence between the four variables, while the other Gaussian distribution is defined without any independence assumptions. How many independent parameters are required to specify this mixture model?
Solution: For a Gaussian distribution over four variables \((n = 4)\) with independence assumptions, we need to specify \(n + n = 2n = 8\) independent parameters; there are four parameters for the mean vector and four parameters for the covariance matrix (which is equivalent to the mean and variance parameters of four independent univariate Gaussian distributions). For a Gaussian distribution over four variables without independence assumptions, we need to specify \(n + n(n + 1)/2 = 14\) independent parameters; there are four parameters for the mean vector and ten parameters for the covariance matrix. Additionally, for our three mixture components \((k = 3)\), we need to specify \(k - 1 = 2\) independent parameters for the weights. Thus, we need \(2(8) + 1(14) + 2 = 32\) independent parameters to specify this mixture distribution.

Exercise 2.5. We have three independent variables \(X_{1:3}\) defined by piecewise-constant densities with 4, 7, and 3 bin edges, respectively. How many independent parameters are required to specify their joint distribution?

Solution: If we have a piecewise-constant density with \(m\) bins edges, then there are \(m - 1\) bins and \(m - 2\) independent parameters. For this problem, there will be \((4 - 2) + (7 - 2) + (3 - 2) = 8\) independent parameters.

Exercise 2.6. Suppose we have four continuous random variables, \(X_1, X_2, Y_1,\) and \(Y_2,\) and we want to construct a linear Gaussian model of \(X = X_{1:2}\) given \(Y = Y_{1:2},\) i.e. \(p(X \mid Y).\) How many independent parameters are required for this model?

Solution: In this case, our mean vector for the Gaussian distribution is two-dimensional and requires four independent parameters for the transformation matrix \(M\) and two independent parameters for the bias vector \(b.\) We also require three independent parameters for the covariance matrix \(\Sigma.\) In total, we need \(4 + 2 + 3 = 9\) independent parameters to specify this model:

\[
p(x \mid y) = \mathcal{N}(x \mid My + b, \Sigma)
\]

Exercise 2.7. Given the following Bayesian network where each node can take on one of four values, how many independent parameters are there? What is the percent reduction in the number of independent parameters required when using the following Bayesian network compared to using a full joint probability table?
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Solution: The number of independent parameters for each node is equal to $(k - 1)k^m$ where $k$ is the number of values the node can take on and $m$ is the number of parents that the node has. The variable $A$ has 3, $B$ has 12, $C$ has 48, $D$ has 3, $E$ has 12, and $F$ has 48 and independent parameters. There are 126 total independent parameters for this Bayesian network.

The number of independent parameters required to specify a joint probability table over $n$ variables that can take on $k$ values is equal to $k^n - 1$. Therefore, specifying a joint probability table would require $4^6 - 1 = 4096 - 1 = 4095$ independent parameters. The percent reduction in the number of independent parameters required is $(4095 - 126) / 4095 \approx 96.9\%$.

Exercise 2.8. Given the following Bayesian network, is $A$ d-separated from $E$ given $C$?

![Bayesian Network Diagram]

Solution: There are two paths from $A$ to $E$: $A \to D \to E$ and $A \to C \to E$. There is d-separation along the second path, but not the first. Hence, $A$ is not d-separated from $E$ given $C$.

Exercise 2.9. Given the following Bayesian network, determine the Markov blanket of $B$.

![Bayesian Network Diagram]

Solution: Paths from $B$ to $A$ can only be d-separated given $A$. Paths from $B$ to $D$ can only be d-separated given $D$. Paths from $B$ to $E$ and simultaneously $F$, $G$, and $H$ can be efficiently d-separated given $E$. Paths from $B$ to $C$ are naturally d-separated due to a v-structure; however, since $E$ must be contained in our Markov blanket, paths from $B$ to $C$ given $E$ can only be d-separated given $C$. So, the Markov blanket of $B$ is $\{A, C, D, E\}$.
Exercise 2.10. In a Bayesian network with structure $A \rightarrow B$, is it possible for $A$ to be independent of $B$?

Solution: There is a direct arrow from $A$ to $B$, which indicates that independence is not implied. However, this does not mean that they are not independent. Whether or not $A$ and $B$ are independent depends on the choice of conditional probability tables. We can choose the tables so that there is independence. For example, suppose both variables are binary and $P(a) = 0.5$ is uniform and $P(b | a) = 0.5$. Clearly, $P(A)P(B | A) = P(A)P(B)$, which means they are independent.