Estimation Maximum Likelihood and Smoothing

Introduction to Natural Language Processing Computer Science 585—Fall 2009 University of Massachusetts Amherst

David Smith

Simple Estimation

- Probability courses usually start with equiprobable events
 - Coin flips, dice, cards
- How likely to get a 6 rolling 1 die?
- How likely the sum of two dice is 6?
- How likely to see 3 heads in 10 flips?

Binomial Distribution

For *n* trials, *k* successes, and success probability *p*:

$$P(k) = \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}$$

Prob. mass function

$$\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}$$

Estimation problem: If we observe n and k, what is p?

Say we win 40 games out of 100.

$$P(40) = \binom{100}{40} p^{40} (1-p)^{60}$$

The maximum likelihood estimator for p solves:

$$\max_{p} P(\text{observed data}) = \max_{p} {\binom{100}{40}} p^{40} (1-p)^{60}$$

Likelihood of 40/100 wins



р

How to solve

$$\max_{p} \binom{100}{40} p^{40} (1-p)^{60}$$

How to solve $\max_{p} {\binom{100}{40}} p^{40} (1-p)^{60}$

$$0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial p} {100 \choose 40} p^{40} (1-p)^{60}$$

= $40p^{39} (1-p)^{60} - 60p^{40} (1-p)^{59}$
= $p^{39} (1-p)^{59} [40(1-p) - 60p]$
= $p^{39} (1-p)^{59} 40 - 100p$

How to solve $\max_{p} {\binom{100}{40}} p^{40} (1-p)^{60}$

$$D = \frac{\partial}{\partial p} {\binom{100}{40}} p^{40} (1-p)^{60}$$

= $40p^{39} (1-p)^{60} - 60p^{40} (1-p)^{59}$
= $p^{39} (1-p)^{59} [40(1-p) - 60p]$
= $p^{39} (1-p)^{59} 40 - 100p$

Solutions: 0, 1, .4

How to solve $\max_{p} {\binom{100}{40}} p^{40} (1-p)^{60}$

$$D = \frac{\partial}{\partial p} {\binom{100}{40}} p^{40} (1-p)^{60}$$

= $40p^{39} (1-p)^{60} - 60p^{40} (1-p)^{59}$
= $p^{39} (1-p)^{59} [40(1-p) - 60p]$
= $p^{39} (1-p)^{59} 40 - 100p$

The maximizer!

Solutions: 0, 1, .4

 $\max_{p} \binom{100}{40} p^{40} (1-p)^{60}$ How to solve

$$D = \frac{\partial}{\partial p} {\binom{100}{40}} p^{40} (1-p)^{60}$$

= $40p^{39} (1-p)^{60} - 60p^{40} (1-p)^{59}$
= $p^{39} (1-p)^{59} [40(1-p) - 60p]$
= $p^{39} (1-p)^{59} 40 - 100p$
The maximizer!

In general, k/n

Solutions: 0, 1, .4

e

How to solve $\max_{p} {\binom{100}{40}} p^{40} (1-p)^{60}$

$$D = \frac{\partial}{\partial p} {\binom{100}{40}} p^{40} (1-p)^{60}$$

= $40p^{39} (1-p)^{60} - 60p^{40} (1-p)^{59}$
= $p^{39} (1-p)^{59} [40(1-p) - 60p]$
= $p^{39} (1-p)^{59} 40 - 100p$

The maximizer!

In general, k/n

Solutions: 0, 1, .4

This is trivial here, but a widely useful approach.

ML for Language Models

- Say the corpus has "in the" 100 times
- If we see "in the beginning" 5 times,
 PML(beginning | in the) = ?
- If we see "in the end" 8 times,
 PML(end | in the) = ?
- If we see "in the kitchen" 0 times,
 PML(kitchen | in the) = ?

ML for Naive Bayes

• Recall: p(+ | Damon movie)

= p(Damon | +) p(movie | +) p(+)

 If corpus of positive reviews has 1000 words, and "Damon" occurs 50 times,

PML(Damon | +) = ?

If pos. corpus has "Affleck" 0 times,

p(+ | Affleck Damon movie) = ?

Will the Sun Rise Tomorrow?



Will the Sun Rise Tomorrow?

Laplace's Rule of Succession: On day n+1, we've observed that the sun has risen s times before.

$$p_{Lap}(S_{n+1} = 1 \mid S_1 + \dots + S_n = s) = \frac{s+1}{n+2}$$

What's the probability on day 0? On day 1? On day 10⁶? Start with prior assumption of equal rise/not-rise probabilities; *update* after every observation.



Laplace (Add One) Smoothing

• From our earlier example:

PML(beginning | in the) = 5/100? reduce!

 $p_{ML}(end | in the) = 8/100?$ reduce!

PML(kitchen | in the) = 0/100? increase!

Laplace (Add One) Smoothing

• Let V be the vocabulary size:

i.e., the number of unique words that could follow "in the"

From our earlier example:
 PML(beginning | in the) = (5 + 1)/(100 + V)
 PML(end | in the) = (8 + 1)/(100 + V)
 PML(kitchen | in the) = (0 + 1) / (100 + V)

Generalized Additive Smoothing

- Laplace add-one smoothing now assigns too much probability to unseen words
- More common to use λ instead of I:

$$p(w_3 \mid w_1, w_2) = \frac{C(w_1, w_2, w_3) + \lambda}{C(w_1, w_2) + \lambda V}$$

= $\mu \frac{C(w_1, w_2, w_3)}{C(w_1, w_2)} + (1 - \mu) \frac{1}{V}$
 $\mu = \frac{C(w_1, w_2)}{C(w_1, w_2) + \lambda V}$

Generalized Additive Smoothing

- Laplace add-one smoothing now assigns too much probability to unseen words
- More common to use λ instead of I:

$$p(w_{3} | w_{1}, w_{2}) = \frac{C(w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3}) + \lambda}{C(w_{1}, w_{2}) + \lambda V}$$

interpolation = $\mu \frac{C(w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3})}{C(w_{1}, w_{2})} + (1 - \mu) \frac{1}{V}$
 $\mu = \frac{C(w_{1}, w_{2})}{C(w_{1}, w_{2}) + \lambda V}$

Generalized Additive Smoothing

- Laplace add-one smoothing now assigns too much probability to unseen words
- More common to use λ instead of I: $C(w_1, w_2, w_3) + \lambda$ (What's the right λ ?

$$p(w_{3} | w_{1}, w_{2}) = \frac{C(w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3}) + \lambda}{C(w_{1}, w_{2}) + \lambda V}$$

interpolation = $\mu \frac{C(w_{1}, w_{2}, w_{3})}{C(w_{1}, w_{2})} + (1 - \mu) \frac{1}{V}$

$$\mu = \frac{C(w_{1}, w_{2})}{C(w_{1}, w_{2}) + \lambda V}$$

Picking Parameters

- What happens if we optimize parameters on training data, i.e. the same corpus we use to get counts?
- Maximum likelihood estimate!
- Use held-out data aka development data

Good-Turing Smoothing

- Intuition: Can judge rate of novel events by rate of singletons
 - Developed to estimate # of unseen species in field biology
- Let N_r = # of word types with r training tokens
 - e.g., N_0 = number of unobserved words
 - e.g., N_1 = number of singletons (hapax legomena)
- Let N = $\sum r N_r$ = total # of training tokens

Good-Turing Smoothing

- Max. likelihood estimate if w has r tokens? r/N
- Total max. likelihood probability of all words with r tokens? N_r
 r / N
- Good-Turing estimate of this total probability:
 - Defined as: N_{r+1} (r+1) / N
 - So proportion of novel words in test data is estimated by proportion of singletons in training data.
 - Proportion in test data of the N₁ singletons is estimated by proportion of the N₂ doubletons in training data. etc.
 - $p(any given word w/freq. r) = N_{r+1} (r+1) / (N N_r)$
- NB: No parameters to tune on held-out data

Backoff

- Say we have the counts:
 C(in the kitchen) = 0
 C(the kitchen) = 3
 C(kitchen) = 4
 - C(arboretum) = 0
- ML estimates seem counterintuitive:
 p(kitchen | in the) = p(arboretum | in the) = 0

Backoff

- Clearly we shouldn't treat "kitchen" the same as "arboretum"
- Basic add- λ (and other) smoothing methods assign the same prob. to *all* unseen events
- Backoff divides up prob. of unseen unevenly in proportion to, e.g., lower-order n-grams

• If
$$p(z | x,y) = 0$$
, use $p(z | y)$, etc.

Deleted Interpolation

- Simplest form of backoff
- Form a *mixture* of different order n-gram models; learn weights on held-out data

 $p_{del}(z \mid x, y) = \alpha_3 p(z \mid x, y) + \alpha_2 p(z \mid y) + \alpha_1 p(z)$ $\sum \alpha_i = 1$

• How else could we back off?

Readings, etc.

- For more information on basic probability, read M&S 2.1
- For more information on language model estimation, read M&S 6
- Next, time Hidden Markov Models