STAT 535 Lecture 2 Independence and conditional independence ©Marina Meilă

mmp@stat.washington.edu

1 Conditional probability, total probability, Bayes' rule

Definition of *conditional distribution* of A given B.

$$P_{A|B}(a|b) = \frac{P_{AB}(a,b)}{P_B(b)}$$

whenever $P_B(b) \neq 0$ (and $P_{A|B}(a|b)$ undefined otherwise).

Total probability formula. When A, B are events, and \bar{B} is the complement of B

$$P(A) = P(A, B) + P(A, \bar{B}) = P(A|B)P(B) + P(A|\bar{B})P(\bar{B})$$

When A, B are random variables, the above gives the marginal distribution of A.

$$P_A(a) = \sum_{b \in \Omega(B)} P_{AB}(a, b) = \sum_{b \in \Omega(B)} P_{A|B}(a|b) P_B(b)$$

Bayes' rule

$$P_{A|B} = \frac{P_A P_{B|A}}{P_B}$$

The chain rule Any multivariate distribution over n variables X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n can be decomposed as:

$$P_{X_1,X_2,\dots,X_n} = P_{X_1}P_{X_2|X_1}P_{X_3|X_1X_2}P_{X_4|X_1X_2X_3}\dots P_{X_n|X_1\dots,X_{n-1}}$$

2 Probabilistic independence

$$A \perp B \iff P_{AB} = P_A \cdot P_B$$

We read $A \perp B$ as "A independent of B". An equivalent definition of independence is:

$$A \perp B \iff P_{A|B} = P_A$$

The above notation are shorthand for

for all
$$a \in \Omega(A)$$
, $b \in \Omega(b)$, $P_{A|B}(a|b) = P_A(a)$ whenever $P_B \neq 0$
$$\frac{P_{AB}(a,b)}{P_B(b)} = P_A(a)$$
 whenever $P_B \neq 0$
$$P_{AB}(a,b) = P_A(a)P_B(b)$$

Intuitively, probabilistic independence means that knowing B does not bring any additional information about A (i.e. doesn't change what we already believe about A). Indeed, the *mutual information*¹ of two independent variables is zero.

Exercise 1 [The exercises in this section are optional and will not influence your grade. Do them only if you have never done them before.]

Prove that the two definitions of independence are equivalent.

Exercise 2 A, B are two real variables. Assume that A, B are jointly Gaussian. Give a necessary and sufficient condition for $A \perp B$ in this case.

Conditional independence

A richer and more useful concepty is the *conditional independence* between sets of random variables.

¹An information theoretical quantity that measures how much information random variable A has about random variable B.

$$A \perp B \mid C \iff P_{AB\mid C} = P_{A\mid C} \cdot P_{B\mid C} \iff P_{A\mid BC} = P_{A\mid C}$$

Once C is known, knowing B brings no additional information about A. Here are a few more equivalent ways to express conditional independence. The expressions below must hold for every a, b, c for which the respective conditional probabilities are defined.

$$\begin{array}{lcl} P_{ABC}(a,b|c) &=& P_{A|C}(a|c)P_{B|C}(b|c) \\ \\ \hline P_{ABC}(a,b,c) &=& \frac{P_{AC}(a,c)P_{BC}(b,c)}{P_{C}(c)^{2}} \\ \\ P_{ABC}(a,b,c) &=& \frac{P_{A|C}(a|c)P_{B|C}(b|c)}{P_{C}(c)} \\ \\ \hline P_{ABC}(a,b,c) &=& \frac{P_{A|C}(a,c)}{P_{C}(c)} \\ \\ P_{A|BC}(a|b,c) &=& P_{A|C}(a|c) \\ \\ P_{ABC}(a,b,c) &=& P_{C}(c)P_{A|C}(a|c)P_{B|C}(b|c) \end{array}$$

Since independence between two variables implies the joint probability distribution factors, it implies far fewer parameters are necessary to represent the joint distribution $(r_A + r_B \text{ rather than } r_A r_B)$, and other important simplifications such as $A \perp B \Rightarrow E[AB] = E[A]E[B]$ [Exercise 3 Prove this relationship.]

These definitions extend to sets of variables:

$$AB \perp CD \equiv P_{ABCD} = P_{AB}P_{CD}$$

and

$$AB \perp CD | EF \equiv P_{ABCD|EF} = P_{AB|EF} P_{CD|EF}.$$

Furthermore, independence of larger sets of variables implies independence of subsets (for fixed conditions):

$AB \perp CD | EF \Rightarrow A \perp CD | EF, A \perp C | EF, \dots$

[Exercise 4 Prove this.]

Notice that $A \perp B$ does *not* imply $A \perp B|C$, nor the other way around. [Exercise 5 Find examples of each case.]

Two different factorizations of the joint probability p(a, b, c) when $A \perp B|C$ are a good basis for understanding the two primary types of graphical models we will study: *undirected graphs*, also known as *Markov random fields* (*MRFs*); and *directed graphs*, also known as *Bayes' nets* (BNs) and *belief networks*.

One factorization,

$$P_{ABC}(a, b, c) = \frac{P_{AC}(a, c)P_{BC}(b, c)}{P_{C}(c)} = \phi_{AC}(a, c)\phi_{BC}(b, c)$$

is into a product of *potential* functions defined over subsets of variables with a term in the denominator that compensates for "double-counting" of variables in the intersection. From this factorization an *undirected* graphical representation of the factorization can be constructed by adding an edge between any two variables that cooccur in a potential.

The other factorization,

$$P_{ABC}(a, b, c) = P_C(c)P_{A|C}(a|c)P_{B|C}(b|c),$$

is into a product of conditional probability distributions that imposes a partial order on the variables (e.g C comes before A, B). From this factorization a *directed* graphical model can be constructed by adding directed edges that match the "causality" implied by the conditional distributions. In particular, if the factorization involves $P_{X|YZ}$ then directed edges are added from Y and Z to X.

3 The (semi)-graphoid axioms

For any distribution P_V over a set of variables V the following properties of independence hold. Let X, Y, Z, W be disjoint subsets of discrete variables from V.

- $[\mathbf{S}] \ X \perp Y \mid Z \ \Rightarrow \ Y \perp X \mid Z \ (Symmetry)$
- **[D]** $X \perp YW \mid Z \Rightarrow X \perp Y \mid Z$ (Decomposition)

 $[\mathbf{WU}] \ X \perp YW | Z \Rightarrow X \perp Y | WZ \ (Weak \ union)$

- **[C]** $X \perp Y \mid Z$ and $X \perp W \mid YZ \Rightarrow X \perp YW \mid Z$ (Contraction)
- **[I]** If P is strictly positive for all instantiations of the variables, $X \perp Y \mid WZ$ and $X \perp W \mid YZ \Rightarrow X \perp YW \mid Z$ (Intersection)

Properties S, D, WU, C are called the **semi-graphoid axioms**. The semigraphoid axioms together with property [I] are called the **graphoid axioms**.