10 Automating interpretation systems

Interpretation

Plausible inference of hidden semantic structure from observable inputs

E.g.

input		hidden structure
word sequence	→	meaning
pixel matrix	→	object, relations
speech signal	→	phonemes, words
words in e-mail Subject:	→	Is message spam? Yes/No
symptoms	→	illness

How to combine ambiguous, incomplete and conflicting evidence to draw reasonable conclusions?

Distinct from logical reasoning

- plausible inference:
  - non-monotonic: might change conclusions given more evidence
  - uncertain: conclusions are not guaranteed to be correct (but still want to do as well as possible)
- logical inference:
  - monotonic: once a conclusion is drawn it can never be retracted
  - certain: conclusions are certain given assumptions

10.1 How to build an interpretation system?

$$\text{observables} \rightarrow \boxed{\ ?\ } \rightarrow \text{hidden semantic structure}$$

Two key problems

1. need to represent facts about process that connects evidence to truth
2. need principles of evidence combination

In this course

We will represent uncertain knowledge using *probability theory*

Some alternatives we will not cover are

- fuzzy logic, fuzzy sets
- default logic
- rule-based systems
- Dempster-Shafer theory
- rough sets, ...

10.2 Probability theory

We will cover this in depth for the next several lectures. To get started, consider of some simple examples and basic properties of probability

- example: rolling a dice
- example: random variable

Independent random variables

$$\mathrm{P}(X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2) \quad = \quad \mathrm{P}(X_1 = x_1)\,\mathrm{P}(X_2 = x_2)$$

Alternative definition

$$\mathrm{P}(X_1 = x_1 | X_2 = x_2) \quad = \quad \mathrm{P}(X_1 = x_1)$$

It is easy to prove these two definitions are equivalent (prove it!)

Conditional probability

$$\mathrm{P}(A|B) \quad = \quad \frac{\mathrm{P}(A, B)}{\mathrm{P}(B)}$$

Bayes' Theorem

$$\mathrm{P}(A|B) \quad = \quad \frac{\mathrm{P}(B|A)\,\mathrm{P}(A)}{\mathrm{P}(B)}$$

Conditionally independent random variables

X_1 and X_2 are *conditionally independent given* X_3 if

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{P}(X_1{=}x_1, X_2{=}x_2|X_3{=}x_3)\\ &\quad= \mathrm{P}(X_1{=}x_1|X_3{=}x_3)\mathrm{P}(X_2{=}x_2|X_3{=}x_3) \quad \text{for all } x_1, x_2, x_3\end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, if

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{P}(X_1{=}x_1|X_2{=}x_2, X_3{=}x_3)\\ &\quad= \mathrm{P}(X_1{=}x_1|X_3{=}x_3) \quad \text{for all } x_1, x_2, x_3\end{aligned}$$

Prove these definitions are equivalent

10.3 Forward generative models

Now, to apply this to building interpretation systems

1. Represent knowledge with probability: forward generative models

$$\begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \boxed{\text{truth}} \\ \downarrow \\ \boxed{\text{evidence}} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{world} \\ \downarrow \\ \text{sensor} \\ \downarrow \\ \text{observed measurement} \end{array}$$

2. Principle of evidence combination: Bayesian inference

$$\begin{aligned}\text{conclusion} &= \arg\max_{\text{possible truth}} P(\text{possible truth}|\text{evidence})\\ &= \arg\max_{\text{possible truth}} \frac{P(\text{evidence}|\text{possible truth})P(\text{possible truth})}{P(\text{evidence})}\\ &= \arg\max_{\text{possible truth}} P(\text{evidence}|\text{possible truth})P(\text{possible truth})\end{aligned}$$

10.4 Demos

Demo 1: Image normalization

Bayesian inference



A time component is included to model image stabilization

Demo 2: Independent object tracking

Demo 3: Independent object tracking and object removal

Demo 4: Face tracking

Two models combined: low-level model



High-level model



Readings

Dean, Allen, Aloimonos: Section 3.7
Russell and Norvig: Section 14.7