

Continuous Probability Distributions from Finite Data

David M. Schmidt

Biophysics Group, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

(August 5, 1998)

Abstract

Recent approaches to the problem of inferring a continuous probability distribution from a finite set of data have used a scalar field theory for the form of the prior probability distribution. This letter presents a more general form for the prior distribution that has a geometrical interpretation which is useful for tailoring prior distributions to the needs of each application. Examples are presented that demonstrate some of the capabilities of this approach, including the applicability of this approach to problems of more than one dimension.

02.50.Wp, 02.50.-r

Inferring the continuous probability distribution, or target distribution, from which a finite number of data samples were drawn is an example of an ill-posed inverse problem: there are many different distributions that could have produced the given finite data. Often one has prior information, separate from the data itself, that can reduce the range of possible target distributions. More generally, one can assign a prior probability to each target distribution based on the prior information. Combining this prior probability distribution with the likelihood of the data given any particular target distribution, using Bayes' rule of probability, produces a posterior probability over the space of target distributions. This posterior distribution encapsulates all the information available, both from the data and from the prior information, and can be used to make probabilistic inferences.

Let $P[Q|x_1, \dots, x_N]$ denote the posterior probability that the target distribution $Q(x)$ describes the data x_1, \dots, x_N . By Bayes' rule,

$$P[Q|x_1, \dots, x_N] = \frac{P[x_1, \dots, x_N|Q]P[Q]}{P[x_1, \dots, x_N]} \quad (1)$$

$$= \frac{Q(x_1) \cdots Q(x_N)P[Q]}{\int \mathcal{D}Q Q(x_1) \cdots Q(x_N)P[Q]}, \quad (2)$$

where $P[Q]$ is the prior probability of the target distribution Q .

The form for $P[Q]$ should incorporate the available prior information. For example, by setting $Q(x) = \psi^2(x)$ [1], where ψ may take any value in $(-\infty, \infty)$, we may insure that Q is non-negative. ψ is referred to as the *amplitude* by analogy with quantum mechanics [2]. A particular form for $P[Q]$, or rather $P[\psi]$, that has been presented in order to, the authors say, incorporate a bias that Q be "smooth" is [2-4]

$$P[\psi] = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left[- \int dx \frac{\ell^2}{2} (\partial_x \psi)^2 \right] \delta \left(1 - \int dx \psi^2 \right), \quad (3)$$

where Z is the normalization factor and ℓ is a constant which controls the penalty applied to gradients. The delta function enforces normalization of the distribution Q .

Because this particular prior distribution is not very effective at generating smooth distributions (as will be shown) and because the prior information available for each problem will vary, it is useful to consider a more general form for the prior distribution. A more general approach is to define the prior distribution as

$$P[\psi] = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left[- \frac{1}{2} \langle \psi | V^{-1} | \psi \rangle \right] \delta (1 - \langle \psi | \psi \rangle), \quad (4)$$

where V is a positive, symmetric (Hermitian) operator within whatever Hilbert space is chosen for ψ . This distribution is a generalization of a multi-dimensional Gaussian distribution with V acting as the covariance operator. Continuing this analogy, we write

$$V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sigma(\mathbf{x})\sigma(\mathbf{y})\rho(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \quad (5)$$

where $\sigma^2(\mathbf{x})$ is the variance at \mathbf{x} and ρ is the correlation function. Information about smoothness is encoded in the correlation function. For example, if the distribution from which the $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}$ were drawn is expected to be smooth over distances smaller than a certain

spatial scale then the correlation function should be near unity over distances smaller than this scale. The prior distribution used in [2,3] is equivalent to the one presented here in one dimension with $V^{-1} = -\ell^2 \partial_x^2$, assuming ψ goes to zero at $\pm\infty$.

It is useful to consider this prior probability distribution in geometrical terms. The eigenfunctions of the the operator V form a basis for the space of ψ . The normalization constraint restricts ψ to lie on a hyper-spherical surface of radius one. Those eigenfunctions with larger eigenvalues are more likely, *a priori*. If V has any eigenvalues that are zero then the corresponding eigenfunctions form a basis for a subspace that is orthogonal to ψ ; that is the prior distribution prevents ψ from having any components along these eigenfunctions.

With this form for the prior distribution the probability $P[Q|x_1, \dots, x_N]$ of a distribution Q given the data is

$$P[\psi|x_1, \dots, x_N] \propto \psi^2(x_1) \cdots \psi^2(x_N) \times \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \langle \psi | V^{-1} | \psi \rangle \right] \delta(1 - \langle \psi | \psi \rangle) \quad (6)$$

$$= e^{-S[\psi]} \delta(1 - \langle \psi | \psi \rangle), \quad (7)$$

where the effective action S is

$$S[\psi] = \frac{1}{2} \langle \psi | V^{-1} | \psi \rangle - 2 \sum_i \ln(\langle x_i | \psi \rangle). \quad (8)$$

The most likely distribution given the data is that function ψ_{cl} which minimizes the effective action subject to the normalization constraint. To enforce this constraint a Lagrange multiplier term $\lambda(1 - \langle \psi | \psi \rangle)/2$ is subtracted from the action. Variational methods then lead to the following equations for ψ_{cl} and λ :

$$|\psi_{\text{cl}}\rangle = 2 \sum_i \frac{(V^{-1} + \lambda I)^{-1} |x_i\rangle}{\langle x_i | \psi_{\text{cl}} \rangle} \quad (9a)$$

$$\langle \psi_{\text{cl}} | \psi_{\text{cl}} \rangle = 1. \quad (9b)$$

The solution to these equations may be written

$$|\psi_{\text{cl}}\rangle = \sum_i a_i U(\lambda) |x_i\rangle, \quad (10)$$

where $U(\lambda) = (V^{-1} + \lambda I)^{-1}$. Eqs. (9) imply

$$a_i \sum_j a_j \langle x_i | U(\lambda) |x_j\rangle = 2, \quad i = 1, \dots, N \quad (11a)$$

$$\sum_{i,j} a_i a_j \langle x_i | U^2(\lambda) |x_j\rangle = 1. \quad (11b)$$

These $N + 1$ non-linear equations determine λ and the a_i and may be solved using Newton's method [2].




FIG. 1. The most likely distributions from an inverse Laplacian prior distribution with $\ell = 6$ and from $N = 20$ (dashed line) and $N = 1000$ (dotted line) data drawn randomly from a target distribution consisting of the sum of two Normal distributions (solid curve).

The covariance operator V in the prior distribution should be chosen for each different probability distribution that one is estimating. A few examples with three different forms for V are described below in order to illustrate the effects that different choices of V can have. First consider the case used in [2,3] in which the prior covariance operator is an inverse Laplacian in one dimension, $V^{-1} = -\ell^2 \partial_x^2$. In this case

$$U(\lambda) = \left(-\ell^2 \partial_x^2 + \lambda I \right)^{-1} \quad (12)$$

which is the Green's function of the modified Helmholtz equation. The solutions of this equation are well known, even for dimensions larger than one [5]. In particular, in one dimension the most likely solution $\psi_{\text{cl}}(x)$ is, from Eq. 10

$$\psi_{\text{cl}}(x) = \sum_i a_i \frac{1}{2k\ell^2} \exp(-k|x - x_i|) \quad (13)$$

where $k = \sqrt{\lambda}/\ell$. Examples of the most likely probability distributions for this case with $\ell = 6$ are shown in Fig. 1. For these examples the data were drawn from a target distribution consisting of the sum of two Normal distributions, shown as the solid curve in the figure. The most likely distributions are not very smooth, as would be expected from the functional form of Eq. 13.

For the second example consider the case in which the prior covariance operator has a correlation function which is a Gaussian,

$$V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; r) = \sigma^2 \exp \left[\frac{-(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})^2}{2r^2} \right]. \quad (14)$$




FIG. 2. The most likely distributions from a Sinc function prior distribution with $k_0 = 3.33$ and from the same $N = 20$ (dashed line) and $N = 1000$ (dotted line) data used for the examples in Fig. 1, which were drawn randomly from a target distribution consisting of the sum of two Normal distributions (solid curve).

Here σ^2 is the prior variance for the magnitude of the target probability distribution and r is a correlation scale below which the target probability distribution is believed to be smooth. In this case it is useful to expand U in an operator product expansion in V ,

$$U(\lambda) = V \left(1 - \lambda V + \lambda^2 V \cdot V - \lambda^3 V \cdot V \cdot V + \dots \right). \quad (15)$$

Because $V \cdot V \propto V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; \sqrt{2}r)$ for this particular V , Eq. 15 generates a multi-resolution expansion, analogous to a wavelet expansion, for U and therefore also for ψ_{cl} consisting of Gaussians of ever increasing width, increasing each step by a factor of $\sqrt{2}$ with the finest scale being represented by the original $V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}; r)$. This functional form for V therefore generates a most likely probability distribution that has finite derivatives to all orders and is generally more smooth than that from the first example.

For the final example, consider the case in which the prior covariance operator is a projection operator that projects onto the subspace formed by functions having only Fourier wavenumbers smaller than a particular wavenumber k_0 . In one dimension this covariance operator is the Sinc function,

$$V(x, y; k_0) = \frac{\sin [k_0(x - y)]}{\pi(x - y)}. \quad (16)$$

Because this is a projection operator, $V \cdot V = V$ and from Eq. 15 U for this case is simply $U(\lambda) = V/(1 + \lambda)$. The most likely amplitude therefore consists of sums of Sinc functions centered at each data point. Examples of the most likely probability distribution using




FIG. 3. The Fourier spectra of the three types of covariance operators shown in the legend. Free parameters in each case have been set to correspond roughly to a cutoff at wavenumber $k_0 = 3.33$.

this prior distribution with $k_0 = 3.33$ are shown in Fig. 2. The same data used for the examples in Fig. 1 were used here. Even with only 20 data points the most likely solution indicates a doubly peaked distribution. Both of the examples here are more smooth than those generated by the prior distribution discussed above in the first case and shown in Fig. 1.

It is useful to examine the Fourier spectrum of the prior covariance operator in order to understand some of the properties of the resulting most likely distribution. The Fourier spectra of the three covariance operators considered in the above examples are shown in Fig. 3. Because of the form of the prior distribution (Eq. 4) those wavenumbers with larger Fourier amplitudes are more likely, *a priori*. However, in order to maximize the likelihood of the given data, the most likely amplitude will tend to consist of the largest possible wavenumber components. Because the Sinc function covariance operator has the sharpest high wavenumber cutoff it will tend to generate the smoothest most likely distribution. Conversely, the inverse Laplacian covariance operator will tend to produce the least smooth most likely distribution. If the Sinc function covariance operator is used, however, the cutoff k_0 should be chosen with great care because this prior forbids any solutions containing wavenumbers higher than the cutoff. Thus if the chosen cutoff wavenumber is lower than the maximum wavenumber component of the target distribution then the most likely distribution will not converge to the target distribution as the number of data points increases.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Supported by Los Alamos National Laboratory and by NIDA/NIMH Grant DA/MH09972, J.S. George, Principal Investigator.

REFERENCES

- [1] I. J. Good and R. A. Gaskins, *Biometrika* **58**, 255 (1971).
- [2] T. E. Holy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 3545 (1997).
- [3] W. Bialek, C. G. Callan, and S. P. Strong, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 4693 (1996).
- [4] For a reparametrization invariant geometrical formulation see: V. Periwál, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 4671 (1997).
- [5] For example see: G. Arfken, *Mathematical Methods for Physicists* (Academic Press, Orlando, 1985).