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## Structured probability spaces?

## Running Example

## Courses:

- Logic (L)
- Knowledge Representation (K)
- Probability (P)
- Artificial Intelligence (A)


## Data

| L | K | P | A | Students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 54 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |

## Running Example

## Courses:

- Logic (L)
- Knowledge Representation (K)
- Probability (P)
- Artificial Intelligence (A)


## Constraints

- Must take at least one of Probability or Logic.
- Probability is a prerequisite for AI.
- The prerequisites for KR is either AI or Logic.


## Data

| L | K | P | A | Students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 54 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |

## Probability Space

unstructured

| $L$ | K | P | A |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

## Structured Probability Space
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
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structured

| L | K | P | A |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

## Learning with Constraints

## Data

## Constraints

## Learn

## Statistical Model <br> (Distribution)

(Background Knowledge)
(Physics)

## Learning with Constraints

## Data

Constraints<br>(Background Knowledge)<br>(Physics)

Learn a statistical model that assigns zero probability
to instantiations that violate the constraints.

## Example: Video


[Lu, W. L., Ting, J. A., Little, J. J., \& Murphy, K. P. (2013). Learning to track and identify players from broadcast sports videos.]

## Example: Video



We also connect all pairs of identity nodes $y_{t, i}$ and $y_{t, j}$ if they appear in the same time $t$. We then introduce an edge potential that enforces mutual exclusion:

$$
\psi_{\text {mutex }}\left(y_{t, i}, y_{t, j}\right)= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } y_{t, i} \neq y_{t, j}  \tag{5}\\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

This potential specifies the constraint that a player can be appear only once in a frame. For example, if the $i$-th detection $y_{t, i}$ has been assign to Bryant, $y_{t, j}$ cannot have the same identity because Bryant is impossible to appear twice in a frame.
[Lu, W. L., Ting, J. A., Little, J. J., \& Murphy, K. P. (2013). Learning to track and identify players from broadcast sports videos.]
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At least one verb in each sentence
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## Example: Language

- Non-local dependencies: At least one verb in each sentence
- Sentence compression If a modifier is kept, its subject is also kept
- Information extraction

| Citations |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Start | The citation must start with author <br> or editor. |  |
| AppearsOnce | Each field must be a consecutive list <br> of words, and can appear at most <br> once in a citation. |  |
| Punctuation | State transitions must occur on <br> punctuation marks. |  |
| BookJournal | The words proc, journal, proceed- <br> ings, ACM <br> are JOURNAL or BOOKTITLE. |  |
| $\ldots$ | The words tech, technical are <br> TECH_REPORT. |  |
| TechReport |  |  |
| Title | Quotations can appear only in titles. <br> Location <br> The words CA, Australia, NY are <br> LOCATION. |  |

[Chang, M., Ratinov, L., \& Roth, D. (2008). Constraints as prior knowledge],..., [Chang, M. W., Ratinov, L., \& Roth, D. (2012). Structured learning with constrained conditional models.], [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Constrained_conditional_model]

## Example: Language

- Non-local dependencies: At least one verb in each sentence
- Sentence compression If a modifier is kept, its subject is also kept
- Information extraction
- Semantic role labeling
- ... and many more!

| Citations |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Start | The citation must start with author or editor. |
| AppearsOnce | Each field must be a consecutive list of words, and can appear at most once in a citation. |
| Punctuation | State transitions must occur on punctuation marks. |
| BookJournal | The words proc, journal, proceedings, $A C M$ are JOURNAL or BOOKTITLE. |
| $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| TechReport | The words tech, technical are TECH_REPORT. |
| Title | Quotations can appear only in titles. |
| Location | The words CA, Australia, $N Y$ are LOCATION. |

[Chang, M., Ratinov, L., \& Roth, D. (2008). Constraints as prior knowledge],..., [Chang, M. W., Ratinov, L., \& Roth, D. (2012). Structured learning with constrained conditional models.], [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Constrained_conditional_model]
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## adaptkind

## sensor

- SensorCurrent_w0
- readCurrentLo
readCurrentHi
-- SensorTouch_c0
-...readOpen
....readClosed
G-․Sensorvoltage_w0
-...readVoltageLo
readVoltageHi
command
-.Command_c0
cmdOpen
......CodClose
health
$\pm$ Health_b0
$\pm$ Health_c 0
$\pm$ Health_lo
+ SensorGurrentHealth_*
+     + SensorTouchHealth_c 0
+ SensorVoltageHealth_v
current
© Current_b0
+ Current_co
$\dagger$ Current_10
Đ-Gurrent_w0
aux
$\dagger$ OpenOrClosed co
$\pm$ OpenOrClosed_w0
+- Operational_bo
+ Operational_10
Đ-ToBattery_bo
†- ToBattery_c0
$\dagger$ ToBattery_lo
+ ToBattery_w

Bayesian network synthesized from specs of power system (NASA Ames): Has many constraints ( $0 / 1$ parameters) due to domain "physics"


# Example: Deep Learning 


[Graves, A., Wayne, G., Reynolds, M., Harley, T., Danihelka, I., Grabska-Barwińska, A., et al.. (2016). Hybrid computing using a neural network with dynamic external memory. Nature, 538(7626), 471-476.]

## Example: Deep Learning

## Example: Deep Learning

optimal planner recalculating a shortest path to the end node. To ensure that the network always moved to a valid node, the output distribution was renormalized over the set of possible triples outgoing from the current node. The performance

## Example: Deep Learning

optimal planner recalculating a shortest path to the end node. To ensure that the network always moved to a valid node, the output distribution was renormalized over the set of possible triples outgoing from the current node. The performance
it also received input triples during the answer phase, indicating the actions chosen on the previous time-step. This makes the problem a 'structured prediction'

## What are people doing now?

- Ignore constraints
- Handcraft into models
- Use specialized distributions
- Find non-structured encoding

- Try to learn constraints
- Hack your way around


## What are people doing now?

- Ignore constraints
- Handcraft into models
- Use specialized distributions
- Find non-structured encoding
- Try to learn constraints
- Hack your way around


Accuracy?
Specialized skill ?
Intractable inference?
Intractable learning?
Waste parameters?
Risk predicting out of space ?
you are on your own :
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- Everywhere in ML!
- Configuration problems, inventory, video, text, deep learning
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- Causal models: cooking scenarios (interpreting videos)
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## Structured Probability Spaces

- Everywhere in ML!
- Configuration problems, inventory, video, text, deep learning
- Planning and diagnosis (physics)
- Causal models: cooking scenarios (interpreting videos)
- Combinatorial objects: parse trees, rankings, directed acyclic graphs, trees, simple paths, game traces, etc.
- Some representations: constrained conditional models, mixed networks, probabilistic logics.


## No statistical ML boxes out there that take constraints as input! :

Goal: Constraints as important as data! General purpose!

# Specification Language: Logic 

## Structured Probability Space

unstructured

| L | K | P | A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

structured

| L | K | P | A |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

## Boolean Constraints

| unstructured |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L | K | P | A |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |



## Combinatorial Objects: Rankings

| rank | sushi | rank | sushi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | fatty tuna | 1 | shrimp |
| 2 | sea urchin | 2 | sea urchin |
| 3 | salmon roe | 3 | salmon roe |
| 4 | shrimp | 4 | fatty tuna |
| 5 | tuna | 5 | tuna |
| 6 | squid | 6 | squid |
| 7 | tuna roll | 7 | tuna roll |
| 8 | see eel | 8 | see eel |
| 9 | egg | 9 | egg |
| 10 | cucumber roll | 10 | cucumber roll |

10 items:<br>3,628,800<br>rankings

20 items:
2,432,902,008,176,640,000
rankings

## Combinatorial Objects: Rankings
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | fatty tuna | 1 | shrimp |
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| 4 | shrimp | 4 | fatty tuna |
| 5 | tuna | 5 | tuna |
| 6 | squid | 6 | squid |
| 7 | tuna roll | 7 | tuna roll |
| 8 | see eel | 8 | see eel |
| 9 | egg | 9 | egg |
| 10 | cucumber roll | 10 | cucumber roll |

$A_{i j}$ item $\boldsymbol{i}$ at position $\boldsymbol{j}$ ( $n$ items require $n^{2}$ Boolean variables)

## Combinatorial Objects: Rankings

| rank | sushi | rank | sushi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | fatty tuna |  | 1 |
| 2 | sea urchin | 2 | shrimp |
| 3 | salmon roe | 3 | sea urchin |
| 4 | shrimp | 4 | fattyon roe tuna |
| 5 | tuna | 5 | tuna |
| 6 | squid | 6 | squid |
| 7 | tuna roll | 7 | tuna roll |
| 8 | see eel | 8 | see eel |
| 9 | egg | 9 | egg |
| 10 | cucumber roll | 10 | cucumber roll |

> $A_{i j}$ item $i$ at position $j$ ( $n$ items require $n^{2}$ Boolean variables)

An item may be assigned to more than one position

A position may contain more than one item

## Encoding Rankings in Logic

$A_{i j}:$ item $i$ at position $j$

|  | pos 1 | pos 2 | pos 3 | pos 4 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| item 1 | $A_{11}$ | $A_{12}$ | $A_{13}$ | $A_{14}$ |
| item 2 | $A_{21}$ | $A_{22}$ | $A_{23}$ | $A_{24}$ |
| item 3 | $A_{31}$ | $A_{32}$ | $A_{33}$ | $A_{34}$ |
| item 4 | $A_{41}$ | $A_{42}$ | $A_{43}$ | $A_{44}$ |
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constraint: each item $i$ assigned to a unique position ( $n$ constraints)

$$
\bigvee_{j} A_{i j} \wedge\left(\bigwedge_{k \neq j} \neg A_{i k}\right)
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## Encoding Rankings in Logic

$A_{i j}:$ item $i$ at position $j$

|  | pos 1 | pos 2 | pos 3 | pos 4 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| item 1 | $A_{11}$ | $A_{12}$ | $A_{13}$ | $A_{14}$ |
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| item 3 | $A_{31}$ | $A_{32}$ | $A_{33}$ | $A_{34}$ |
| item 4 | $A_{41}$ | $A_{42}$ | $A_{43}$ | $A_{44}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

constraint: each item $i$ assigned to a unique position ( $n$ constraints)

$$
\bigvee_{j} A_{i j} \wedge\left(\bigwedge_{k \neq j} \neg A_{i k}\right)
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constraint: each position $j$ assigned a unique item ( $n$ constraints)

$$
\bigvee_{i} A_{i j} \wedge\left(\bigwedge_{k \neq i} \neg A_{k j}\right)
$$

## Encoding Rankings in Logic

$A_{i j}:$ item $i$ at position $j$

|  | pos 1 | pos 2 | pos 3 | pos 4 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| item 1 | $A_{11}$ | $A_{12}$ | $A_{13}$ | $A_{14}$ |
| item 2 | $A_{21}$ | $A_{22}$ | $A_{23}$ | $A_{24}$ |
| item 3 | $A_{31}$ | $A_{32}$ | $A_{33}$ | $A_{34}$ |
| item 4 | $A_{41}$ | $A_{42}$ | $A_{43}$ | $A_{44}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

constraint: each item $i$ assigned to a unique position ( $n$ constraints)

$$
\bigvee_{j} A_{i j} \wedge\left(\bigwedge_{k \neq j} \neg A_{i k}\right)
$$

constraint: each position $j$ assigned a unique item ( $n$ constraints)

$$
\bigvee_{i} A_{i j} \wedge\left(\bigwedge_{k \neq i} \neg A_{k j}\right)
$$

total constraints $2 n$
unstructured space $2^{n^{2}}$
structured space $n$ !

## Structured Space for Paths
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## Structured Space for Paths




Good variable assignment (represents route)

184


Bad variable assignment (does not represent route)

16,777,032

## Space easily encoded in logical constraints ©

Unstructured probability space: $184+16,777,032=2^{24}$

## Undirected Graphs (Unstructured)



# "Deep Architecture" 

## Logic + Probability

## Logical Circuits



## Property: Decomposability



## Property: Decomposability



## Property: Determinism



## Sentential Decision Diagram (SDD)
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- Is structured space empty? (SAT)
- Count size of structured space (\#SAT)
- Check equivalence of spaces
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## Tractable for Logical Inference

- Is structured space empty? (SAT)
- Count size of structured space (\#SAT)
- Check equivalence of spaces

Algorithms linear in circuit size $)$ (pass up, pass down, similar to backprop)

```
SCIENCE + TECHNOLOGY
```

Artificial intelligence framework developed by UCLA professor now powers Toyota websites

Adnan Darwiche's invention helps consumers customize their vehicles online

## PSDD: Probabilistic SDD
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## PSDD: Probabilistic SDD



Input: $L, K, P, A$
$\operatorname{Pr}(L, K, P, A)=0.3 \times 1.0 \times 0.8 \times 0.4 \times 0.25=0.024$


## PSDD nodes induce



## PSDD nodes induce



Can read probabilistic independences off the circuit structure

# Tractable for Probabilistic Inference 

- MAP inference: Find most-likely assignment (otherwise NP-complete)
- Computing conditional probabilities $\operatorname{Pr}(x \mid y)$ (otherwise PP-complete)
- Sample from $\operatorname{Pr}(x \mid y)$


# Tractable for Probabilistic Inference 

- MAP inference: Find most-likely assignment (otherwise NP-complete)
- Computing conditional probabilities $\operatorname{Pr}(x \mid y)$ (otherwise PP-complete)
- Sample from $\operatorname{Pr}(x \mid y)$

Algorithms linear in circuit size $)$
(pass up, pass down, similar to backprop)

## PSDDs are Arithmetic Circuits

[Darwiche, JACM 2003]


## PSDDs are Arithmetic Circuits

[Darwiche, JACM 2003]


PSDD


Known in the ML literature as SPNs UAI 2011, NIPS 2012 best paper awards
[ICML 2014]
(SPNs equivalent to ACs)

## Learning PSDDs

## Logic + Probability + ML

## Parameters are Interpretable
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## Learning Algorithms

- Parameter learning:

Closed form max likelihood from complete data
One pass over data to estimate $\operatorname{Pr}(x \mid y)$
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## Learning Algorithms

- Parameter learning:

Closed form max likelihood from complete data
One pass over data to estimate $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{x} \mid \mathrm{y})$

- Structure learning:
- Compile constraints to SDD (naive)

Use SAT solver technology

- Search for structure to fit data (ongoing work)


## Learning Preference Distributions



## Learning Preference Distributions



This is the naive approach, without real structure learning!

## What happens if you ignore constraints?




## Structured Naïve Bayes Classifier



Attribute with 362,880 values (possible game traces)

## Structured Naïve Bayes Classifier



Attribute with 789,360,053,252 values (routes in $8 \times 8$ grid) Ongoing work: learn anomalies from Uber data

## Structured datasets and queries

## Incomplete Data

| a classical   <br> complete dataset   |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id | X | Y | z |
| 1 | $\mathrm{x}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{z}_{1}$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{z}_{2}$ |
| 3 | $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{z}_{2}$ |
| 4 | $\mathrm{x}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{z}_{1}$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{x}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{z}_{2}$ |
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| a classical |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| incomplete dataset |  |  |  |

EM algorithm (on PSDDs)

## Incomplete Data

| a classical |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| complete dataset |  |  |  |  |
| id | X | Y | z |  |
| 1 | $\mathrm{x}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{z}_{1}$ |  |
| 2 | $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{z}_{2}$ |  |
| 3 | $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{z}_{2}$ |  |
| 4 | $\mathrm{x}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{z}_{1}$ |  |
| 2 | $\mathrm{x}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{z}_{2}$ |  |

closed-form
(maximum-likelihood estimates are unique)
a classical
incomplete dataset

| id | $X$ | $Y$ | $Z$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\mathrm{x}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{2}$ | $?$ |
| 2 | $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{1}$ | $?$ |
| 3 | $?$ | $?$ | $\mathrm{z}_{2}$ |
| 4 | $?$ | $\mathrm{y}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{z}_{1}$ |
| 5 | $\mathrm{x}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{y}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{z}_{2}$ |

EM algorithm (on PSDDs)
a new type of incomplete dataset

| id | $X$ | $Y$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $X \equiv Z$ |  |
| 2 | $x_{2}$ and $\left(y_{2}\right.$ or $\left.z_{2}\right)$ |  |
| 3 | $x_{2} \Rightarrow y_{1}$ |  |
| 4 | $X \oplus Y \oplus Z \equiv 1$ |  |
| 5 | $x_{1}$ and $y_{2}$ and $z_{2}$ |  |

Missed in the ML literature

## Structured Datasets

a classical complete dataset (e.g., total rankings)

| id | $1^{\text {st }}$ <br> sushi | $2^{\text {nd }}$ <br> sushi | $3^{\text {rd }}$ <br> sushi | $\ldots$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | fatty <br> tuna | sea <br> urchin | salmon <br> roe | $\ldots$ |
| 2 | fatty <br> tuna | tuna | shrimp | $\ldots$ |
| 3 | tuna | tuna <br> roll | sea <br> eel | $\ldots$ |
| 4 | fatty <br> tuna | salmon <br> roe | tuna | $\ldots$ |
| 5 | egg | squid | shrimp | $\ldots$ |

a classical incomplete dataset
(e.g., top-k rankings)

| id | $1^{\text {st }}$ <br> sushi | $2^{\text {nd }}$ <br> sushi | $3^{\text {rd }}$ <br> sushi | $\ldots$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | fatty <br> tuna | sea <br> urchin | $\boldsymbol{?}$ | $\ldots$ |
| 2 | fatty <br> tuna | $\boldsymbol{?}$ | $\boldsymbol{?}$ | $\ldots$ |
| 3 | tuna | tuna <br> roll | $\boldsymbol{?}$ | $\ldots$ |
| 4 | fatty | salmon |  |  |
| tuna | roe | $\boldsymbol{?}$ | $\ldots$ |  |
| 5 | egg | $\boldsymbol{?}$ | $\boldsymbol{?}$ | $\ldots$ |

## Structured Datasets

a classical complete dataset (e.g., total rankings)

| id | $1^{\text {st }}$ <br> sushi | $2^{\text {nd }}$ <br> sushi | $3^{\text {rd }}$ <br> sushi | $\ldots$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | fatty <br> tuna | sea <br> urchin | salmon <br> roe | $\ldots$ |
| 2 | fatty <br> tuna | tuna | shrimp | $\ldots$ |
| 3 | tuna | tuna <br> roll | sea <br> eel | $\ldots$ |
| 4 | fatty | salmon | tuna | $\ldots$ |
| 5 | tuna | egg | squid | shrimp |
|  | $\ldots$ |  |  |  |

a new type of incomplete dataset (e.g., partial rankings)

| id | $\begin{gathered} 1^{\text {st }} \\ \text { sushi } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2^{\text {nd }} \\ \text { sushi } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3^{\text {rd }} \\ \text { sushi } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (fatty tuna > sea urchin) and (tuna > sea eel) |  |  | $\ldots$ |
| 2 | (fatty tuna is $1^{\text {st) }}$ ) and (salmon roe > egg) |  |  | .. |
| 3 | tuna $>$ squid |  |  | $\ldots$ |
| 4 | egg is last |  |  | $\ldots$ |
| 5 | egg $>$ squid $>$ shrimp |  |  | $\ldots$ |

(represents constraints on possible total rankings)

## Learning from Incomplete Data

- Movielens Dataset:
- 3,900 movies, 6,040 users, 1 m ratings
- take ratings from 64 most rated movies
- ratings 1-5 converted to pairwise prefs.
- PSDD for partial rankings
- 4 tiers
- 18,711 parameters
movies by expected tier

| rank | movie |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | The Godfather |
| 2 | The Usual Suspects |
| 3 | Casablanca |
| 4 | The Shawshank Redemption |
| 5 | Schindler's List |
| 6 | One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest |
| 7 | The Godfather: Part II |
| 8 | Monty Python and the Holy Grail |
| 9 | Raiders of the Lost Ark |
| 10 | Star Wars IV: A New Hope |

## PSDD Sizes

| items | tier size | Size |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| $n$ | $k$ | SDD | Structured Space | Unstructured Space |
| 8 | 2 | 443 | 840 | $1.84 \cdot 10^{19}$ |
| 27 | 3 | 4,114 | $1.18 \cdot 10^{9}$ | $2.82 \cdot 10^{219}$ |
| 64 | 4 | 23,497 | $3.56 \cdot 10^{18}$ | $1.04 \cdot 10^{1233}$ |
| 125 | 5 | 94,616 | $3.45 \cdot 10^{31}$ | $3.92 \cdot 10^{4703}$ |
| 216 | 6 | 297,295 | $1.57 \cdot 10^{48}$ | $7.16 \cdot 10^{14044}$ |
| 343 | 7 | 781,918 | $4.57 \cdot 10^{68}$ | $7.55 \cdot 10^{35415}$ |

## Structured Queries

| rank | movie |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Star Wars V: The Empire Strikes Back |
| 2 | Star Wars IV: A New Hope |
| 3 | The Godfather |
| 4 | The Shawshank Redemption |
| 5 | The Usual Suspects |

## Structured Queries

- no other Star Wars movie in top-5
- at least one comedy in top-5

| rank | movie |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Star Wars V: The Empire Strikes Back |
| 2 | Star Wars IV: A New Hope |
| 3 | The Godfather |
| 4 | The Shawshank Redemption |
| 5 | The Usual Suspects |

## Structured Queries

| rank | movie |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Star Wars V: The Empire Strikes Back |
| 2 | Star Wars IV: A New Hope |
| 3 | The Godfather |
| 4 | The Shawshank Redemption |
| 5 | The Usual Suspects |

- no other Star Wars movie in top-5
- at least one comedy in top-5

| rank | movie |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Star Wars V: The Empire Strikes Back |
| 2 | American Beauty |
| 3 | The Godfather |
| 4 | The Usual Suspects |
| 5 | The Shawshank Redemption |

## Structured Queries

| rank | movie |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Star Wars V: The Empire Strikes Back |
| 2 | Star Wars IV: A New Hope |
| 3 | The Godfather |
| 4 | The Shawshank Redemption |
| 5 | The Usual Suspects |

- no other Star Wars movie in top-5
- at least one comedy in top-5

| rank | movie |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Star Wars V: The Empire Strikes Back |
| 2 | American Beauty |
| 3 | The Godfather |
| 4 | The Usual Suspects |
| 5 | The Shawshank Redemption |

diversified recommendations via logical constraints

## Conclusions

- Structured spaces are everywhere :)
- Roles of Boolean constraints in ML
- Domain constraints and combinatorial objects (structured probability space)
- Incomplete examples (structured datasets)
- Questions and evidence (structured queries)
- Learn distributions over combinatorial objects
- Strong properties for inference and learning: Probabilistic sentential decision diagram (PSDD)


## Conclusions
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## Questions?

PSDD with 15,000 nodes

## Compiling PGMs into PSDDs



## Compiling PGMs into PSDDs
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$$
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## Compiling PGMs into PSDDs

$$
\operatorname{Pr}(A, B, C, D, E)=\Theta_{A} \Theta_{B} \Theta_{C / A B} \Theta_{D / B} \Theta_{E / C D}
$$

## $P_{S D D}^{A}$

$\mathrm{PSDD}_{B}$


Sparse tables [Larkin \& Decther 2003], ADDs [Bahar, et al. 1993], AOMDDs [Mateescu, et al., 2008], PDGs [Jaeger, 2004]


