


# Neural Networks

## Lecture 15 Mixtures of Experts

# A spectrum of models


## Very local models

- e.g. Nearest neighbors
- Very fast to fit
  - Just store training cases
- Local smoothing obviously improves things



## Fully global models

- e. g. Polynomial
- May be slow to fit
  - Each parameter depends on all the data




# Multiple local models

- Instead of using a single global model or lots of very local models, use several models of intermediate complexity.
  - Good if the dataset contains several different regimes which have different relationships between input and output.
  - But how do we partition the dataset into subsets for each expert?

# Partitioning based on input alone versus partitioning based on input-output relationship

- We need to cluster the training cases into subsets, one for each local model.
  - The aim of the clustering is NOT to find clusters of similar input vectors.
  - We want each cluster to have a relationship between input and output that can be well-modeled by one local model




which partition is best:

I=input alone or I/O=input→output mapping?

# Mixtures of Experts

- Can we do better than just averaging predictors in a way that does not depend on the particular training case?
  - Maybe we can look at the input data for a particular case to help us decide which model to rely on.
    - This may allow particular models to specialize in a subset of the training cases. They do not learn on cases for which they are not picked. So they can ignore stuff they are not good at modeling.
- The key idea is to make each expert focus on predicting the right answer for the cases where it is already doing better than the other experts.
  - This causes specialization.
  - If we always average all the predictors, each model is trying to compensate for the combined error made by all the other models.

# A picture of why averaging is bad



Do we really want to move the output of predictor  $i$  away from the target value?

# Making an error function that encourages specialization instead of cooperation

- If we want to encourage cooperation, we compare the average of all the predictors with the target and train to reduce the discrepancy. 

- This can overfit badly. It makes the model much more powerful than training each predictor separately.

- If we want to encourage specialization we compare each predictor separately with the target and train to reduce the average of all these discrepancies. 

- Its best to use a weighted average, where the weights,  $p$ , are the probabilities of picking that “expert” for the particular training case.

Average of all the predictors



$$E = (d - \langle y_i \rangle_i)^2$$

$$E = \langle p_i (d - y_i)^2 \rangle_i$$




probability of picking expert  $i$  for this case

# The mixture of experts architecture

Combined predictor:  $y = \sum_i p_i y_i$

Simple error function for training:  $E = \sum_i p_i (d - y_i)^2$   
(There is a better error function)



# The derivatives of the simple cost function

- If we differentiate w.r.t. the outputs of the experts we get a signal for training each expert.

$$E = \sum_i p_i (d - y_i)^2$$

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial y_i} = p_i (d - y_i)$$

- If we differentiate w.r.t. the outputs of the gating network we get a signal for training the gating net.

- We want to raise  $p$  for all experts that give less than the average squared error of all the experts (weighted by  $p$ )

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial x_i} = p_i [(d - y_i)^2 - E]$$



$$\text{where } p_i = \frac{e^{x_i}}{\sum_j e^{x_j}}$$

# Another view of mixtures of experts

- One way to combine the outputs of the experts is to take a weighted average, using the gating network to decide how much weight to place on each expert.
- But there is another way to combine the experts.
  - How many times does the earth rotate around its axis each year?
  - What will be the exchange rate of the Canadian dollar the day after the Quebec referendum?


# Giving a whole distribution as output

- If there are several possible regimes and we are not sure which one we are in, its better to output a whole distribution.
  - Error is negative log probability of right answer



# The probability distribution that is implicitly assumed when using squared error

- Minimizing the squared residuals is equivalent to maximizing the log probability of the correct answers under a Gaussian centered at the model's guess.
  - If we assume that the variance of the Gaussian is the same for all cases, its value does not matter.



$$p(d) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-\frac{(d-y)^2}{2\sigma^2}}$$
$$-\log p(d) = k + \frac{(d-y)^2}{2\sigma^2}$$

# The probability of the correct answer under a mixture of Gaussians

Mixing proportion assigned to expert  $i$  for case  $c$  by the gating network

$$p(d^c | MoG) = \sum_i p_i^c \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \|d^c - o_i^c\|^2}$$

Prob. of desired output on case  $c$  given the mixture

Normalization term for a Gaussian with  $\sigma^2 = 1$

output of expert  $i$

# A natural error measure for a Mixture of Experts

$$-\log p(d^c | MoE) = -\log \sum_i p_i^c \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \|d^c - o_i^c\|^2}$$

$$\frac{\partial E^c}{\partial o_i^c} = -2 \frac{p_i^c e^{-\frac{1}{2} \|d^c - o_i^c\|^2}}{\sum_j p_j^c e^{-\frac{1}{2} \|d^c - o_j^c\|^2}} (d^c - o_i^c)$$

This fraction is the  
posterior probability  
of expert  $i$


# What are vowels?

- The vocal tract has about four resonant frequencies which are called formants.
  - We can vary the frequencies of the four formants.
- How do we hear the formants?
  - The larynx makes clicks. We hear the dying resonances of each click.
  - The click rate is the pitch of the voice. It is independent of the formants. The relative energies in each harmonic of the pitch define the envelope of a formant.



- Each vowel corresponds to a different region in the plane defined by the first two formants, F1 and F2. Diphthongs are different.

# A picture of two imaginary vowels and a mixture of two linear experts after learning



# Decision trees

- In a decision tree, we start at the root node and perform a test on the input vector to determine whether to take the right or left branch.
- At each internal node of the tree we have a different test, and the test is usually some very simple function of the input vector.
  - Typical test: Is the third component of the input vector bigger than 0.7?
- Once we reach a leaf node, we apply a function to the input vector to compute the output.
  - The function is specific to that leaf node, so the sequence of tests is used to pick an appropriate function to apply to the current input vector.

# Decision Stumps

- Consider a decision tree with one root node directly connected to  $N$  different leaf nodes.
  - The test needs to have  $N$  possible outcomes.
- Each leaf node is an “expert” that uses its own particular function to predict the output from the input.
- Learning a decision stump is tricky if the test has discrete outcomes because we do not have a continuous space in which to optimize parameters.

# Creating a continuous search space for decision stumps

- If the test at the root node uses a softmax to assign probabilities to the leaf nodes we get a continuous search space:
  - Small changes to the parameters of the softmax “manager” cause small changes to the expected log probability of predicting the correct answer.
- A mixture of experts can be viewed as a probabilistic way of viewing a decision stump so that the tests and leaf functions can be learned by maximum likelihood.
  - It can be generalised to a full decision tree by having a softmax at each internal node of the tree.