Complexity, Information and Geometry

Peyresque July 2008 Alfred Hero Digiteo and University of Michigan

- 1. Overview
- 2. Motivation: Topological inference

1. Overview of cursus

- •Overview and motivation (Now)
- •Complexity and Information
- Entropy estimation
- Random geometric graphs
- Applications
 - Dimension estimation
 - Anomaly detection
 - •Pattern matching and image registration

2. Motivation: Topological inference

- •Three examples
- Structured vs unstructured inference
- Benefit of integrated approaches

A 2D dataset



Hero. Peyresque 08

A 2D dataset

•A simple fit

–5 parameter 2 component Gaussian mixture model



Hero. Peyres

I. Fairly low dimensional data: Flow cytometry

 One 2D projection of 6 color flow cytometry data – N = 30,000 (UM Hemopathology Lab – Dr. W. Finn)



Hero. Peyresque 08

I. Higher dimensional data: Wireless sensor networks

 13x14=182 dimensional RSS data sample collected from 14 node UM wireless sensor network – N=3500





64 2D projections of 182 dimensional data

NIPS-07

Geometric entropy minimization (GEM) for anomaly detection and localization

Alfred O Hero, III University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2122

NIPS 2006

Hero. Peyresque 08

I. Even Higher Dimensional Data: High throughput genomic time series

- 280 peripheral blood samples of 20 individuals at 14 timepoints.
- mRNA, metabolite, protein, and antibody assays at each time point (24,000 probe dimensions)



II. Structured vs Unstructured Modeling

- Structured modeling
 - Estimation involves fitting parametric model to a data sample
 - Frequentist parametric models and Fisher's ML principle (Fisher25)
 - Bayesian parametric models and minimum risk estimation (Jeffreys39)
 - Minimum distance parameter estimation (Beran77)
 - (Likelihood and prior) models include
 - Exponential families of densities (Lehman57)
 - Finite mixtures of densities (MclachlanBasford88)
 - Graphical models (Lauritzen96)
- Unstructured modeling
 - Estimation is performed directly on the density in data space
 - Nearest neighbor density estimators (FixHodges51)
 - Partitioning density estimators (NobelLugosi96)
 - Models include
 - Multiscale density representations (WadaSato90)
 - Topological density representations (Wishart69)
 - Cluster tree density representations (Hartigan75)

Hero. Peyresque 08

II. Structured graphical model



Hero. Peyresque 08

II. Unstructured topological model





• Density function f(x)

• Cutting plane

⊂nigraph sets



II. Toolkit for graphical modeling

Factored representation of density (factor graphs)

$$f(y_1, y_2, y_3) = f_a(y_1, y_3) f_b(y_1, y_3) f_c(y_1, y_2)$$

Mixture representation of density (Hidden variable models)

$$f(y_1, y_2, y_3) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \theta_i \phi_i(y_1, y_2, y_3)$$

• Parameter and structure estimation with EM, variational bayes, MCMC, dependency tests

II. Toolkit for topological modeling

• Density cluster tree representations

Estimating the cluster tree of a density by analyzing the minimal spanning tree of a sample

> Werner Stuetzle * Department of Statistics University of Washington wxs@stat.washington.edu



Morse-Smale representions

Figure 2: Density and corresponding tree of high density clusters.

Maximizing Adaptivity in Hierarchical Topological Models Using Extrema Trees

Peer-Timo Bremer¹, Valerio Pascucci², and Bernd Hamann³



Fig. 1. Morse-Smale complex.

⊚ minimum ● maximum

🕀 saddle

 Non-parametric support set and level set estimation, manifold learning, dimension estimation, entropic graphs, modal analysis
 Hero. Peyresque 08

II. Modal analysis

- Wishart (69): one level mode analysis
 - High density clusters extracted from a high level set: single linkage clustering on a level set of kernel density estimator
- Hartigan ('75): multi-level hierarchical mode analysis
 - Concept of density cluster tree introduced
- Software developed: dBScan ('90), OPTICS ('99)
- Stuetzle ('03): mode analysis by runt size pruning

Hero. Peyresque 08 Hero. Peyresque 08

III. Benefit of an integrated approach

- Structured model describes broad class of densities with relatively few parameters but suffers from mismodeling errors and bias, especially when there are dimension degeneracies.
- Unstructured model describes general properties of the class of densities without explicit parameterization but suffers from high variance.
- We can bound the theoretical performance gains

III. Theory predicts significant gains

- Achievable minimax density estimation rates over smooth Holder class of densities over \mathcal{R}^d (Tsybakov 1991)

$$\min_{\widehat{f}} \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}(\beta,K)} \|f - \widehat{f}\| = O\left(n^{-\beta/(2\beta+d)}\right)$$

$$\mathcal{F}(\beta, K) = \left\{ f : \|f(z) - p_x^{\lfloor \beta \rfloor}(z)\| \le K \|x - z\| \right\}$$

 Exponential convergence rate advantage if density were restricted to known domain of dimension m<d

III. Theory predicts significant gains



• Relative rates inside and outside level set Ω_{ρ} , $\rho > 0.5$

$$\min_{\widehat{f}} \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}(\beta,K)} \|f - \widehat{f}\| = n^{-\beta/(2\beta+d)}$$
$$\min_{\widehat{f}} \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}(\beta,K)} \|f_{\Omega_{\rho}} - \widehat{f}\| = (\rho n)^{-\beta/(2\beta+d)}$$
$$\min_{\widehat{f}} \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}(\beta,K)} \|f_{\Omega_{1-\rho}} - \widehat{f}\| = ((1-\rho)n)^{-\beta/(2\beta+d)}$$

- Faster convergence occurs inside level set
- Density level set can be estimated with rate no worse than $n^{-\beta/(2\beta+d-2)}$ &Nowak:2006)

III. Level set screening advantage

- Remark: restricting inference to level set avoids
 poorest regions of the data sample
- Known level set boundary: Gain= $O(n^{d/(2\beta+d)})$

ρ

• Unknown level set boundary:







Outlier detection

How to find the "critical region" for testing whether a test point is an outlier

Classical parametric and non-parametric models try to

- ii) Fit a smooth function to data
- interpolate the data
- do model checking via statistical tests
- WS Wada & Sato 1990 (ICCPR)

Require upper-semicontinuous function for level sets to exist and epigraph to be bounded