

# MLE and MAP Examples

## 1 Multinomial Distribution

Given some integer  $k > 1$ , let  $\Theta$  be the set of vectors  $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k)$  satisfying  $\theta_i \geq 0$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^k \theta_i = 1$ . For any  $\theta \in \Theta$  we define the probability mass function

$$p_\theta(x) = \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^k \theta_i^{I(x=i)} & \text{for } x \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \\ 0 & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

Given  $n$  observations  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , we would like to derive the maximum likelihood estimate for the parameter  $\theta$  under this model.

First, let's write down the likelihood of the data for some  $\theta \in \Theta$  (recall that we have assumed  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , since otherwise there is no meaningful solution):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\theta; X_1, \dots, X_n) &= \prod_{j=1}^n p_\theta(X_j) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{i=1}^k \theta_i^{I(X_j=i)} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=1}^n \theta_i^{I(X_j=i)} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^k \theta_i^{S_i} \end{aligned}$$

where, for brevity, we have defined  $S_i = \sum_{j=1}^n I(X_j = i)$ . Our goal is to maximize  $\mathcal{L}$  with respect to  $\theta$ , subject to the constraint that  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Equivalently, we can maximize the log likelihood:

$$\log \mathcal{L}(\theta; X_1, \dots, X_n) = \sum_{i=1}^k S_i \log \theta_i.$$

Introducing a Lagrange multiplier for the constraint  $\sum_{i=1}^k \theta_i = 1$ , we have

$$\Lambda(\theta, \lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^k S_i \log \theta_i + \lambda \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \theta_i - 1 \right).$$

(we need not worry about the positivity constraints, since the solution will satisfy those regardless). Differentiating with respect to  $\theta_i$  and  $\lambda$ , for each  $i = 1, \dots, k$  we have

$$\frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial \theta_i} = \frac{S_i}{\theta_i} + \lambda$$

and  $\frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial \lambda} = \sum_{i=1}^k \theta_i - 1$ . Setting the latter partial derivative to 0 gives back the original constraint  $\sum_{i=1}^k \theta_i = 1$ , as expected. Also for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial \theta_i} = 0 &\Rightarrow \frac{S_i}{\hat{\theta}_i} = -\lambda \\ &\Rightarrow \hat{\theta}_i = \frac{S_i}{-\lambda}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

By definition of  $S_i$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{S_i}{-\lambda} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k S_i}{-\lambda} \\ &= \frac{n}{-\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

which implies that in order for the summation constraint on  $\theta_i$  to be satisfied, we require  $\frac{n}{-\lambda} = 1$ , i.e.  $\lambda = -n$ .

Plugging this value for  $\lambda$  into (1),

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_i &= \frac{S_i}{n} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n X_j \end{aligned}$$

i.e. the maximum likelihood estimates for the elements of  $\theta$  are simply the intuitively obvious estimators – the empirical means.

## 2 Multivariate Normal (unknown mean and variance)

The PDF of the multivariate normal in  $d$  dimensions is

$$p(x; \mu, \Sigma) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2} |\Sigma|^{1/2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (x - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x - \mu) \right\}$$

where the parameters are the mean vector  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and the covariance matrix  $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , which must be symmetric positive definite.

### 2.1 MLE

The likelihood function given  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\mu, \Sigma; X_1, \dots, X_n) &= c_1 |\Sigma|^{-n/2} \prod_{i=1}^n \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (X_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (X_i - \mu) \right\} \\ &= c_1 |\Sigma|^{-n/2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (X_i - \mu) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where  $c_1 = (2\pi)^{-nd/2}$  is a constant independent of the data and parameters and can be ignored.

The log likelihood is

$$\log \mathcal{L}(\mu, \Sigma; X_1, \dots, X_n) = -\frac{n}{2} \log |\Sigma| - \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (X_i - \mu) \right) + c_2$$

where  $c_2$  is another inconsequential constant.

It is easiest to first maximize this with respect to  $\mu$ . The corresponding partial derivative is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \log \mathcal{L} &= - \sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma^{-1} (X_i - \mu) \\ &= -\Sigma^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu) \\ &= n\Sigma^{-1} \left( \mu - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right) \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i.$$

The partial derivative of the log likelihood with respect to  $\Sigma$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Sigma} \log \mathcal{L} &= -\frac{n}{2} \frac{1}{|\Sigma|} |\Sigma| \Sigma^{-1} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n -\Sigma^{-1} (X_i - \mu) (X_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} \right) \\ &= -\frac{n}{2} \Sigma^{-1} + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu) (X_i - \mu)^T \right) \Sigma^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Equating this to 0 and plugging in the estimate  $\hat{\mu}$ , we see that the estimator  $\hat{\Sigma}$  must solve the equation

$$n\hat{\Sigma}^{-1} = \hat{\Sigma}^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \hat{\mu})(X_i - \hat{\mu})^T \right) \hat{\Sigma}^{-1}.$$

It is easy to see that a solution for  $\hat{\Sigma}$  is

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \hat{\mu})(X_i - \hat{\mu})^T,$$

which is known as the sample covariance matrix.

## 2.2 MAP under the conjugate prior

The conjugate prior for the mean and covariance of a multivariate normal is sometimes called the Normal-inverse-Wishart distribution and has the density

$$f(\mu, \Sigma | \mu_0, \beta, \Psi, \nu) = p(\mu | \mu_0, \beta \Sigma) w(\Sigma | \Psi, \nu)$$

where  $p$  is the density of the multivariate normal distribution, and  $w$  is the density of the inverse-Wishart distribution given by

$$w(\Sigma|\Psi, \nu) = \frac{|\Psi|^{\nu/2}}{2^{\nu d/2} \Gamma_d(\frac{\nu}{2})} |\Sigma|^{-(\nu+d+1)/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\Psi \Sigma^{-1})\right\}$$

where  $\Gamma_d$  is the multivariate Gamma function, and  $\text{Tr}(\cdot)$  denotes the trace of a matrix. The parameters of the Normal-inverse-Wishart are  $\mu_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  positive definite, and  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $\nu > d - 1$ . We need to

1. calculate the posterior distribution of  $\mu$  and  $\Sigma$  assuming this prior and  $n$  observations  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ;
2. convince ourselves that the posterior is indeed a Normal-inverse-Wishart distribution and find its parameters;
3. and finally find the values for  $\mu$  and  $\Sigma$  that maximize the posterior distribution.

### 2.2.1 Calculating the posterior distribution

We have

$$f(\mu, \Sigma | \mu_0, \beta, \Psi, \nu, X_1, \dots, X_n) \propto \left( \prod_{i=1}^n p(X_i | \mu, \Sigma) \right) f(\mu, \Sigma | \mu_0, \beta, \Psi, \nu)$$

where we omit the term in the denominator which is a finite, non-zero constant that doesn't depend on  $\mu$  or  $\Sigma$ , since any such term does not affect the shape of the posterior distribution and only factors in the normalizing constant that ensures the posterior integrates to 1. Continuing from above,

$$f(\mu, \Sigma | \mu_0, \beta, \Psi, \nu, X_1, \dots, X_n) \propto \left( \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2} |\Sigma|^{1/2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} (X_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (X_i - \mu)\right\} \right) \times \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2} |\beta \Sigma|^{1/2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} (\mu - \mu_0)^T (\beta \Sigma)^{-1} (\mu - \mu_0)\right\} \times \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{|\Psi|^{\nu/2}}{2^{\nu d/2} \Gamma_d(\frac{\nu}{2})} |\Sigma|^{-(\nu+d+1)/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\Psi \Sigma^{-1})\right\}$$

$$\propto \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (X_i - \mu)\right\} \times$$

$$\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} (\mu - \mu_0)^T (\beta \Sigma)^{-1} (\mu - \mu_0)\right\} \times$$

$$|\Sigma|^{-(\nu+n+d+2)/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\Psi \Sigma^{-1})\right\}. \quad (4)$$

While messy, this fully defines the posterior distribution.

### 2.2.2 The posterior is a Normal-inverse-Wishart distribution

Our goal now is to find  $\mu'_0, \beta', \Psi', \nu'$  such that (4) looks like a Normal-inverse-Wishart density with those parameters. First we write out explicitly the form of the Normal-inverse-Wishart density, up to constants, for these as of yet unknown parameters:

$$f(\mu, \Sigma | \mu'_0, \beta', \Psi', \nu') \propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (\mu - \mu'_0)^T (\beta' \Sigma)^{-1} (\mu - \mu'_0) \right\} \times |\Sigma|^{-(\nu' + d + 2)/2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\Psi' \Sigma^{-1}) \right\}. \quad (5)$$

It is immediately clear that the only value  $\nu'$  can take to satisfy  $f(\mu, \Sigma | \mu_0, \beta, \Psi, \nu, X_1, \dots, X_n) = f(\mu, \Sigma | \mu'_0, \beta', \Psi', \nu')$  is

$$\nu' = \nu + d.$$

Furthermore we see that for this value of  $\nu'$  the term involving  $|\Sigma|$  in (4) is accounted for in (5). So now we only need find  $\mu'_0, \beta', \Psi'$  such that

$$\exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (X_i - \mu) \right\} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (\mu - \mu_0)^T (\beta \Sigma)^{-1} (\mu - \mu_0) \right\} \times \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\Psi \Sigma^{-1}) \right\} \quad (6)$$

is equal to

$$\exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (\mu - \mu'_0)^T (\beta' \Sigma)^{-1} (\mu - \mu'_0) \right\} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\Psi' \Sigma^{-1}) \right\} \quad (7)$$

up to a multiplicative constant independent of  $\mu$  and  $\Sigma$  (note that the terms involving  $|\Sigma|$  are already equalized and needn't be considered any more).

By taking the log of each quantity and multiplying by  $-2$ , we see that the above problem is equivalent to finding  $\mu'_0, \beta', \Psi'$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (X_i - \mu) + (\mu - \mu_0)^T (\beta \Sigma)^{-1} (\mu - \mu_0) + \text{Tr}(\Psi \Sigma^{-1}) \quad (8)$$

is equal to

$$(\mu - \mu'_0)^T (\beta' \Sigma)^{-1} (\mu - \mu'_0) + \text{Tr}(\Psi' \Sigma^{-1}) \quad (9)$$

up to an *additive* constant independent of  $\mu$  and  $\Sigma$ .

Defining  $S = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ , we can rewrite (8) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (X_i - \mu) + (\mu - \mu_0)^T (\beta \Sigma)^{-1} (\mu - \mu_0) + \text{Tr}(\Psi \Sigma^{-1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta} \mu^T \Sigma^{-1} \mu - 2 \frac{1}{\beta} \mu^T \Sigma^{-1} \mu_0 + \frac{1}{\beta} \mu_0^T \Sigma^{-1} \mu_0 + \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^T \Sigma^{-1} X_i - 2 \mu^T \Sigma^{-1} S + n \mu^T \Sigma^{-1} \mu + \text{Tr}(\Psi \Sigma^{-1}) \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{\beta} + n \right) \mu^T \Sigma^{-1} \mu - 2 \mu^T \Sigma^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \mu_0 + S \right) + \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\beta} \mu_0^T \Sigma^{-1} \mu_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^T \Sigma^{-1} X_i + \text{Tr}(\Psi \Sigma^{-1}). \quad (11)$$

Notice each appearance of  $\mu$  is now in the two terms on line (10), which look like the first two terms of the expansion of a quadratic form similar to the first term in (9). In order to “complete the square”, we must set

$$\beta' = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\beta} + n}$$

so that the first term on line (10) is equal to the quadratic term (in  $\mu$ ) from the expansion of  $(\mu - \mu'_0)^T (\beta' \Sigma)^{-1} (\mu - \mu'_0)$ . The linear term in  $\mu$  on line (10) now implies that we must set

$$\mu'_0 = \beta' \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \mu_0 + S \right) = \frac{\frac{1}{\beta} \mu_0 + S}{\frac{1}{\beta} + n}.$$

Continuing from line (11) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{1}{\beta} + n \right) \mu^T \Sigma^{-1} \mu - 2 \mu^T \Sigma^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \mu_0 + S \right) + \frac{1}{\beta} \mu_0^T \Sigma^{-1} \mu_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^T \Sigma^{-1} X_i + \text{Tr}(\Psi \Sigma^{-1}) = \\ & = \mu^T (\beta' \Sigma)^{-1} \mu - 2 \mu^T (\beta' \Sigma)^{-1} \mu'_0 + \mu_0^T (\beta' \Sigma)^{-1} \mu'_0 - \mu_0^T (\beta' \Sigma)^{-1} \mu'_0 + \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\beta} \mu_0^T \Sigma^{-1} \mu_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^T \Sigma^{-1} X_i + \text{Tr}(\Psi \Sigma^{-1}) = \\ & = (\mu - \mu'_0)^T (\beta' \Sigma)^{-1} (\mu - \mu'_0) - \mu_0^T (\beta' \Sigma)^{-1} \mu'_0 + \frac{1}{\beta} \mu_0^T \Sigma^{-1} \mu_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^T \Sigma^{-1} X_i + \text{Tr}(\Psi \Sigma^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

and since the  $(\mu - \mu'_0)^T (\beta' \Sigma)^{-1} (\mu - \mu'_0)$  term is completed we can drop it from the last line and from (9). I.e. we now only need find  $\Psi'$  such that

$$- \mu_0^T (\beta' \Sigma)^{-1} \mu'_0 + \frac{1}{\beta} \mu_0^T \Sigma^{-1} \mu_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^T \Sigma^{-1} X_i + \text{Tr}(\Psi \Sigma^{-1}) \quad (12)$$

equals

$$\text{Tr}(\Psi' \Sigma^{-1})$$

up to constants.

Continuing from (12):

$$\begin{aligned} & - \text{Tr}(\mu_0^T (\beta' \Sigma)^{-1} \mu'_0) + \text{Tr} \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \mu_0^T \Sigma^{-1} \mu_0 \right) + \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} (X_i^T \Sigma^{-1} X_i) + \text{Tr}(\Psi \Sigma^{-1}) = \\ & = - \text{Tr} \left( \frac{1}{\beta'} \mu'_0 \mu_0^T \Sigma^{-1} \right) + \text{Tr} \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \mu_0 \mu_0^T \Sigma^{-1} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} (X_i X_i^T \Sigma^{-1}) + \text{Tr}(\Psi \Sigma^{-1}) = \\ & = \text{Tr} \left( \left[ \Psi + \frac{1}{\beta} \mu_0 \mu_0^T + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^T - \frac{1}{\beta'} \mu'_0 \mu_0^T \right] \Sigma^{-1} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

so we set

$$\Psi' = \Psi + \frac{1}{\beta} \mu_0 \mu_0^T + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^T - \frac{1}{\beta'} \mu'_0 \mu_0^T.$$

After simplifying this a bit, you should be able to recognize the empirical means and covariance matrix:

$$\Psi' = \Psi + \sum_{i=1}^n \left( X_i - \frac{1}{n} S \right) \left( X_i - \frac{1}{n} S \right)^T + \frac{\frac{n}{\beta}}{\frac{1}{\beta} + n} \left( \frac{1}{n} S - \mu_0 \right) \left( \frac{1}{n} S - \mu_0 \right)^T.$$

### 2.2.3 Maximizing the posterior

In the last section we showed that the posterior distribution of  $\mu$  and  $\Sigma$  after  $n$  observations under a Normal-inverse-Wishart distribution is again a Normal-inverse-Wishart distribution with parameters

$$\mu'_0 = \frac{\frac{1}{\beta}\mu_0 + S}{\frac{1}{\beta} + n},$$

$$\beta' = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\beta} + n},$$

$$\Psi' = \Psi + \sum_{i=1}^n \left( X_i - \frac{1}{n}S \right) \left( X_i - \frac{1}{n}S \right)^T + \frac{\frac{n}{\beta}}{\frac{1}{\beta} + n} \left( \frac{1}{n}S - \mu_0 \right) \left( \frac{1}{n}S - \mu_0 \right)^T,$$

and

$$\nu' = \nu + d,$$

where  $S = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ . Recall that the density of this distribution is

$$f(\mu, \Sigma | \mu'_0, \beta', \Psi', \nu') = p(\mu | \mu'_0, \beta' \Sigma) w(\Sigma | \Psi', \nu') \quad (14)$$

where  $p$  is the density of the multivariate normal distribution, and  $w$  is the density of the inverse-Wishart distribution given by

$$w(\Sigma | \Psi', \nu') = \frac{|\Psi'|^{\nu'/2}}{2^{\nu'd/2} \Gamma_d(\frac{\nu'}{2})} |\Sigma|^{-(\nu'+d+1)/2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\Psi' \Sigma^{-1}) \right\}.$$

Since  $\mu$  only appears in the first term on the right hand side of 14, it is obvious that the value of  $\mu$  that maximizes the posterior is also the value that maximizes  $p(\mu | \mu'_0, \beta' \Sigma)$ , which, of course, is  $\mu'_0$ :

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{\frac{1}{\beta}\mu_0 + S}{\frac{1}{\beta} + n}.$$

We can think of this quantity as the maximum likelihood estimator for the mean of the normal distribution if, along with  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ , we had also observed  $1/\beta$ -many samples, all equal to  $\mu_0$ .

Maximizing the posterior with respect to  $\Sigma$  is equivalent to minimizing

$$J(\Sigma) = (\nu' + d + 2) \log |\Sigma| + (\hat{\mu} - \mu'_0)^T (\beta' \Sigma)^{-1} (\hat{\mu} - \mu'_0) + \text{Tr}(\Psi' \Sigma^{-1}) \quad (15)$$

where we have plugged in the MAP value for  $\mu$ ;

$$\frac{\partial J}{\partial \Sigma} = (\nu' + d + 2) \Sigma^{-1} - \frac{1}{\beta'} \Sigma^{-1} (\hat{\mu} - \mu'_0) (\hat{\mu} - \mu'_0)^T \Sigma^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1} \Psi' \Sigma^{-1} \quad (16)$$

and the maximizer is

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{\beta'(\nu' + d + 2)} (\hat{\mu} - \mu'_0) (\hat{\mu} - \mu'_0)^T + \frac{1}{\nu' + d + 2} \Psi'. \quad (17)$$