
Variational hybridization and transformation for large inaccurate noisy-or networks

Yusheng Xie Nan Du Wei Fan Jing Zhai Weicheng Zhu

Baidu Research
Sunnyvale, CA 94089

{xieyusheng, dunan, fanwei03, zhajing01, zhuweicheng}@baidu.com

Abstract

Variational inference provides approximations to the computationally intractable posterior distribution in Bayesian networks. A prominent medical application of noisy-or Bayesian network is to infer potential diseases given observed symptoms. Previous studies focus on approximating a handful of complicated pathological cases using variational transformation. Our goal is to use variational transformation as part of a novel hybridized inference for serving reliable and real time diagnosis at web scale. We propose a hybridized inference that allows variational parameters to be estimated without disease posteriors or priors, making the inference faster and much of its computation recyclable. In addition, we propose a transformation ranking algorithm that is very stable to large variances in network prior probabilities, a common issue that arises in medical applications of Bayesian networks. In experiments, we perform comparative study on a large real life medical network and scalability study on a much larger (36,000x) synthesized network.

1 Introduction

Noisy-or Bayesian network (NOBN) is a popular class of statistical models in modeling observable events and their unobserved potential causes. One of the best known medical applications of NOBN is Quick Medical Reference (QMR-DT) (Middleton et al., 1991). QMR-DT describes expert-assessed relationships between 4,000+ observable binary symptom variables (collectively denoted as S) and 500+ binary latent disease variables (collectively denoted as D) as illustrated in Figure 1 (a).

We improve variational inference for a large QMR-DT style NOBN in areas of scalability, stability, and accuracy to previously unattainable or untested levels. As part of a medical messaging bot, the inference goal is to perform reliable real time diagnosis at web scale. Figure 1 (b) shows the messaging bot's interface. The ongoing project aims to serve a substantial portion of Internet users who experience health issues (e.g., 3 to 8 million daily active users¹) with reliable disease diagnosis that is more accurate and accessible than text-based web searches, web searches that emphasize retrieval similarity but lack clinical technicality (e.g., *38.5 °C fever lasting 3 days* and *39.5 °C fever lasting 8 days*. The latter could be 20x more fatal in probability). The developing bot has completed 1,000+ organic, non-scripted dialogues with 100+ qualified human testers. Assessed by 50+ licensed doctors, the network plans to cover *all* conceivable human diseases and health conditions²: approximately 40,000 (80x that of QMR-DT) according to *the 10th revision of the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD-10)*. To the best of our knowledge, the aforementioned scales make it the largest medical application of noisy-or Bayesian networks.

¹Assume an average person is sick 2-4 days per year and our reachable population is 600 to 800 million.

²A sub-network focusing on maternal and infant care is completed and used in our experiments.




Figure 1: (a) Graphical model structure of QMR-DT. The shaded round nodes are observed nodes (f^+ or f^-). All variables are binary. (b) Screenshot of the diagnosis bot. (c) Running time comparison of exact Quickscore (qs) and variational inference for $|F^+| = 4, 6, \dots, 16$. qs (matlab) and qs (MEX) are provided by (Murphy, 2002). qs (julia) and variational are authors’ own implementation.

Recent advances in modern machine learning and artificial intelligence quickly proliferate far beyond the traditional Bayesian framework. But for mission critical applications such as medical diagnosis, one prefers Bayesian network-based approach for reasoning instead of entirely data driven approach. The reasons are due to traceable outcome, easy debuggability, and provenance. Data source unreliability and scarcity also prevent some medical applications from taking full advantage of the large body of data driven algorithms that can be quickly accelerated by larger datasets (e.g., machine translation (Luong et al., 2015), speech recognition (Amodei et al., 2015)). For example, the *Caroli disease*³ has fewer than 250 recorded cases worldwide, making it almost impossible to “gather/label more data points”. On the other hand, no disease should be too rare to deserve attention From an ethical perspective, even a 1-in-1,000,000 chance (technically *extremely rare*) translates into over 6,000 suffering individuals worldwide. From an academic perspective, understanding rare diseases brings irreplaceable medical knowledge.

The expert-assessed probability of observing symptom f given *only* disease d is denoted as $P(f^+ | d^+)$. We use $\pi(f)$ to denote $\{d | d \in D, P(f^+ | d^+) > 0\}$, the set of diseases that could cause f with non-zero probability. Like QMR-DT, we assume⁴ $P(d^+)$ for each $d \in D$: the prior probability of having disease d without observing any symptoms. We further define $P(f^-)$ and $P(d^-)$ notations as $P(f^-) = 1 - P(f^+)$ and $P(d^-) = 1 - P(d^+)$, respectively.

In a typical diagnosis session, the user first inputs her positive and negative findings: $F^+ = \{f_1^+, f_2^+, \dots\} \subset S$, $F^- = \{f_1^-, f_2^-, \dots\} \subset S$. Then the model performs inference to calculate $P(F^+, F^-)$, which is the crux in deriving the conditional $P(d_i^+ | F^+, F^-)$ for each $d \in D$.

1.1 Background on variational inference

The exact inference for $P(F^+, F^-)$ is intractable (Cooper, 1990) and intractability motivates investigations into approximation inference algorithms. The variational method (Jordan et al., 1999; Jaakkola and Jordan, 1999) and the mean field local approximation (Ng and Jordan, 2000) are both hybrid approximation algorithms.

To describe the variational approximation, let $\theta_{ji} \equiv -\log P(f_j^- | d_i^+)$. (Jordan et al., 1999; Jaakkola and Jordan, 1999) show that

$$P(f_j^+ | \pi(f_j)^+) = e^{f \left(\sum_{i=1}^{|\pi(f_j)^+|} \theta_{ji} \right)} \leq e^{\sum_{i=1}^{|\pi(f_j)^+|} \xi_j \theta_{ji} - f^* (\xi_j)} \equiv P(f_j^+ | \pi(f_j)^+, \xi_j) \quad (1)$$

and

$$P(f_j^+ | \xi_j) = \prod_{d_i \in \pi(f_j)} [P(f_j^+ | d_i^+, \xi_j) \cdot P(d_i^+) + P(f_j^+ | d_i^-, \xi_j) \cdot P(d_i^-)] \geq P(f_j^+), \quad (2)$$

³Caroli disease is a type of congenital dilatation of intrahepatic bile duct. It has the code Q44.6 in ICD-10.

⁴Without loss of generality, the leak probabilities (Jordan et al., 1999) are omitted in our discussion.

where ξ_j is the free variational parameter, $f(x) \equiv \log(1 - e^{-x})$, and $f(x)$'s convex conjugate function takes the form $f^*(\xi) = -\xi \log \xi + (\xi + 1) \log(\xi + 1)$, for $\xi > 0$. Equation 2 transforms $P(f_j^+)$ into its variational upper bound $P(f_j^+ | \xi_j)$ using the inequality from conjugate duality.

Breaking $F^+ = \{f_1^+, f_2^+, \dots\}$ into the partition F_1^+ and F_2^+ allows exact inference on F_2^+ and variational inference on F_1^+ . (Jaakkola and Jordan, 1999) (JJ99) calculates the joint variational posterior as

$$P_{JJ99}(F_1^+, F_2^+, F^- | \Xi^{\min}) = e^{-\sum_{j=1}^{|F_1^+|} f^*(\xi_j^{\min})} \prod_{d_i \in \pi(F_1^+)} \left[e^{\sum_{j=1}^{|F_1^+|} \xi_j^{\min} \theta_{ji}} \cdot P(d_i^+ | F_2^+, F^-) + P(d_i^- | F_2^+, F^-) \right], \quad (3)$$

where $\Xi = \{\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots\}$. Finding $\arg \min_{\Xi} P(F^+ | \Xi)$ can be relaxed to finding $\arg \min_{\xi_j} \log P(f_j^+ | \xi_j)$ for each $\xi_j \in \Xi$. The ξ -convexity permits second order optimization methods (CVX) to find each ξ_j . From Equation 6, the 1st order partial derivatives are

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_j} \log P(f_j^+ | \xi_j) = \log \frac{\xi_j}{1 + \xi_j} + \sum_{d_i \in \pi(f_j^+)} \frac{\theta_{ji}}{p_i \cdot e^{-\xi_j \theta_{ji}} + 1}, \quad (4)$$

where $p_i \equiv P(d_i^-)/P(d_i^+)$ is the inverse prior odds for the i th disease. The 2nd order partial derivatives are derived mechanically. Figure 1 (c) illustrates the complexity of exact and variational inference in real application. More discussion on existing inference algorithms are in related works section (see Table 2).

2 Inaccuracy in widely-ranged disease priors

Inaccurate hidden variable prior is a recognized (Jernite et al., 2013; Mansinghka et al., 2006) but often avoided (Cheng et al., 2002; Liao and Ji, 2009; Riggelsen, 2006) issue in NOBN. Inaccuracy in disease prior is among the most likely errors in constructing a NOBN for medical applications. Real life disease priors can span several orders of magnitude. For example, *acne* (ICD-10 code: L70.0) affects 80% to 90% teenagers in the western world (Dawson and Dellavalle, 2013) while syndromes like the *Caroli* disease have historical infection rates less than 0.00001%. It is very likely, even for medical experts or statistical estimators, to misjudge the prior probability by an order of magnitude relative to other very rare or very common diseases. So it is beneficial to obtain fast and accurate variational algorithms that are *resistant* to the large variances in disease priors.

In the following two sections, we propose inference algorithms that can greatly immunize the current variational inference against inaccuracy in disease priors.

3 Variational-first hybridization and joint hybridization

The $F^+ = F_1^+ \cup F_2^+$ partition employed in JJ99 is a realization of the classic hybrid paradigm: balancing accuracy and runtime over the entire F^+ by 1) applying different posterior estimators (variational, exact, MCMC, etc.) to F_1^+, F_2^+ , and 2) controlling their cardinalities. But JJ99 has two main drawbacks that prevent it from fulfilling the scalability and stability requirements in building a web diagnostic bot.

First, Equation 3 estimates Ξ^{\min} by using the exactly treated disease posterior $P(d_i^+ | F_2^+, F^-)$. The Ξ^{\min} estimations need be recalculated for every case of $F_1^+ \cup F_2^+ \cup F^-$ since each case would produce different disease posteriors that affect the gradients in Equation 4. Second, in order to pass confident posteriors to its variational step, JJ99 basically “primes” the potentially inaccurate disease priors with evidences from $F_2^+ \cup F^-$. Since the hybridized complexity decreases exponentially w.r.t. to $|F_1^+|$, F_1^+ usually contains less evidence than $F_2^+ \cup F^-$ in practice (i.e., $|F_1^+| < |F_2^+ \cup F^-|$). In other words, JJ99 uses a substantial portion of the evidence in priming the *unaudited* priors first and then refines the posterior probabilities using the smaller leftover portion of evidence.

We propose the variational-first hybridization (VFH) that can fix both issues. Described in Algorithm 1, VFH performs inference on F_1^+ first (to prime the unaudited priors) and on F_2^+ and F^- later (to refine the posteriors). Calculating Ξ^{\min} in VFH relies on disease priors instead of posteriors.

Algorithm 1: the proposed variational-first hybridization (VFH) algorithm.

Input: F_1^+ , list of positive findings to be inferred variationally, F_2^+ , list of positive findings to be inferred exactly, F^- , list of negative findings to be inferred exactly, θ_{ji} for each $f_j \in S$ and $d_i \in D$, $P(d_i)$, disease prior probability for each $d_i \in D$.

Output: The joint variational evidence of given findings F_1^+ , F_2^+ , and F^- .

- 1 Calculate $P(F_1^+ | \Xi)$ as a function of Ξ from Equation 6.
 - 2 $\Xi^{\min} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\Xi} P(F_1^+ | \Xi)$ using Newton's method on its derivatives (shown in Equation 4).
 - 3 **for each** $d_i \in D$ **do**
 - 4 Calculate $P(d_i^+ | F_1^+, \Xi^{\min})$ from Equation 6 and $P(F_1^+ | \Xi)$.
 - 5 $P(d_i) \leftarrow P(d_i^+ | F_1^+, \Xi^{\min})$ (update disease priors with posteriors).
 - 6 $P(F_2^+, F^-) \leftarrow \text{Quickscore}(F_2^+, F^-)$.
 - 7 **return** $P(F_2^+, F^-)$
-

Therefore, the calculation is invariant to the findings that make up $F_1^+ \cup F_2^+ \cup F^-$. Invariant Ξ^{\min} allows caching Ξ^{\min} values and leads to faster inference as summarized in Table 1.

Equation 5 explicitly expresses the joint variational evidence of given findings using VFH:

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_{VFH}(F_1^+, F_2^+, F^- | \Xi^{\min}) \\
&= \sum_{F' \in 2^{F_2^+}} (-1)^{|F'|} \prod_{i=1}^{|D|} \left(\left[\prod_{j=1}^{|F^- \cup F'|} P(f_j^- | d_i^+) \right] P(d_i^+ | F_1^+, \Xi^{\min}) + P(d_i^- | F_1^+, \Xi^{\min}) \right), \quad (5)
\end{aligned}$$

where $2^{F_2^+}$ denotes the power set of F_2^+ and the $P(d_i^+ | F_1^+, \Xi^{\min})$ terms are calculated from

$$P(F^+ | \Xi) = e^{-\sum_{j=1}^{|F^+|} f^*(\xi_j)} \prod_{d_i \in \pi(F^+)} \left[e^{\sum_{j=1}^{|F^+|} \xi_j \theta_{ji}} \cdot P(d_i^+) + P(d_i^-) \right]. \quad (6)$$

Besides VFH, we can also hybridize the exact evidence $P(F_2^+, F^-)$ and the variational evidence $P(F_1^+ | \Xi)$ jointly (JH):

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_{JH}(F_1^+, F_2^+, F^- | \Xi^{\min}) \\
&= \sum_{F' \in 2^{F_2^+}} (-1)^{|F'|} \prod_{i=1}^{|D|} \left(\left[\prod_{j=1}^{|F^- \cup F'|} P(f_j^- | d_i^+) \right] \left[\prod_{k=1}^{|F_1^+|} P(f_k^+ | d_k^+, \xi_k^{\min}) \right] P(d_i^+) + \left[\prod_{k=1}^{|F_1^+|} P(f_k^+ | d_k^-, \xi_k^{\min}) \right] P(d_i^-) \right) \\
&= \left[e^{-\sum_{k=1}^{|F_1^+|} f^*(\xi_k^{\min})} \right] \sum_{F' \in 2^{F_2^+}} (-1)^{|F'|} \prod_{i=1}^{|D|} \left(\left[\prod_{j=1}^{|F^- \cup F'|} P(f_j^- | d_i^+) \right] \left[e^{\sum_{k=1}^{|F_1^+|} \xi_k^{\min} \theta_{ki}} \right] P(d_i^+) + P(d_i^-) \right). \quad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

Like VFH, JH has the same advantages over JJ99 when $|F_1^+| < |F_2^+ \cup F^-|$.

3.1 Estimate ξ_j^{\min} without disease prior or posterior

If we solve ξ_j^{\min} from $\arg \min_{\xi_j} \log P(f_j^+ | \xi_j, \pi(f_j)^+)$ instead of $\arg \min_{\xi_j} \log P(f_j^+ | \xi_j)$, the resulting ξ_j^{\min} has a closed form solution. To see this, take the equality in Equation 1 and let $x_j \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{|\pi(f_j^+)|} \theta_{ji}$. The equality $e^{f(x_j)} = e^{\xi_j x_j - f^*(\xi_j)}$ holds if and only if $\xi_j^{\min} = \arg \min_{\xi_j} \xi_j x_j - f^*(\xi_j)$. Simple algebra gives the closed form $\xi_j^{\min} = (e^{x_j} - 1)^{-1}$. Conceptually, $\arg \min_{\xi_j} \log P(f_j^+ | \xi_j, \pi(f_j)^+)$ would surely result in suboptimal ξ_j^{\min} due to its lack of prior knowledge. However, we find this approach competitive for a certain range of disease priors (shown in experiments). The prior/posterior-free (PPF) estimator of Ξ^{\min} is independent of disease prior or posterior and allows ξ_j^{\min} to be pre-computed and cached regardless of JJ99, VFH or JH.

3.2 N -scalability of JJ99, VFH, and JH

The ability to process a large number (N) of diagnosis with low latency is quintessential for web scalability. The variational step in JJ99+CVX (baseline) is $O(N)$, which would put increasing strain

on the server as N grows. On the other hand, the proposed VFH and JH perform the variational step in constant time w.r.t. N . With the proposed PPF estimator of Ξ^{\min} , all hybridization schemes can execute variational transformation in constant time w.r.t. N . Table 1 summarizes the practical efficiency of the proposed variational hybridization when used with either CVX or PPF estimator of Ξ^{\min} . The $\log \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ term is the optimization cost using second order algorithms like Newton’s method. Note that Table 1 only compares the cost of the variational step. We evaluate the overall inference cost for different inferencers in the Experiments section.

Table 1: Detailed temporal complexities for the proposed variational parameter estimation in terms of $|D|$, $|F_1^+|$, $|F^-|$, ϵ , $|S|$, and N . All entries are Big- O complexity. Note that although JH is equivalent to VFH in variational parameter estimation, JH will have higher overall inference complexity due to difference between Equation 5 and 7.

| Ξ^{\min} solver | # of queries | JJ99 | VFH | JH |
|---------------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| CVX | 1 | $ D \cdot F_1^+ \log \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ | $ D \cdot F_1^+ \log \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ | $ D \cdot F_1^+ \log \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ |
| | N | $N \cdot D \cdot F_1^+ \log \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ | $ D \cdot S \log \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ | $ D \cdot S \log \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ |
| PPF | 1 | $ D \cdot F_1^+ $ | $ D \cdot F_1^+ $ | $ D \cdot F_1^+ $ |
| | N | $N \cdot D \cdot F_1^+ $ | $ D \cdot S $ | $ D \cdot S $ |

4 Variational transformation with uncertain disease priors

In addition to the inference formula (JJ99, VFH, or JH) and the Ξ^{\min} solver (CVX or PPF), there is a third component in variational inference that is critical to the posterior accuracy: the transformation ranking algorithm that partitions F^+ into F_1^+ and F_2^+ , given fixed $|F_1^+|$.

(Jaakkola and Jordan, 1999) and (Ng and Jordan, 2000) use a simple greedy heuristic ordering (GDO) algorithm to rank the order of transformation based on the greedy local optimum for further minimizing the overall variational upper bound (which is firstly minimized by setting $\Xi = \Xi^{\min}$). Minimizing the overall variational upper bound is, naturally, a commendable goal. But given the inaccuracy in widely-ranged disease priors, is there an ordering algorithm that can fender off that uncertainty more effectively than GDO?

To simplify the discussion, we assume uniform $\theta_{ji} = c$ for any j, i pair such that $P(f_j^- | d_i^+) < 1$, where $c \in (0, +\infty)$. Let the random variable (r.v.) $\mathcal{P} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \mathcal{U}_k$, where $\mathcal{U}_k \sim \text{iid Unif}(0, \frac{2}{1+p})$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$. We further assume that the inverse disease prior odds: $P(d_i^-) / P(d_i^+) = p_i$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, |D|\}$ are drawn independently from \mathcal{P} . The choice of m is rather inconsequential in our discussion. For a reasonable m (e.g., $5 < m < 1,000$), the uniform mean distribution \mathcal{P} introduces Gaussian-like variance without breaking the positive definite constraint on p_i ’s.

We desire to establish an ordering algorithm that minimizes the variance in posterior predictions due to \mathcal{P} . The first step is to show its existence. Formally, it is stated and proved in Proposition 1.

Proposition 1. Fix $p \in [0, +\infty)$, $c \in (0, +\infty)$, and $n \in \{1, 2, \dots, |F^+|\}$. Then there exists a $F_1^+ \subset F^+$ such that $|F_1^+| = n$ and $\text{Var} [\log P(d_i | F_1^+, \mathcal{P}, \Xi^{\min}) \cdot \mathcal{P}]$ is approximately minimized for every $d_i \in D$.

Proof. Let the r.v. \mathcal{Q}_i denote $P(d_i | F_1^+, \mathcal{P}, \Xi^{\min}) \cdot \mathcal{P}$. And let $\gamma > 1$ denote the expected value of $\exp \left[c \sum_{j=1}^{|F_1^+|} \xi_j^{\min} \mathbf{1}_{ji} \right]$, where the r.v. $\mathbf{1}_{ji}$ models the likelihood of whether $d_i \in \pi(f_j)$. Now we can express \mathcal{Q}_i as $\mathcal{Q}_i = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma \mathcal{P} + 1 - \mathcal{P}}$ and reduce $\text{Var} [\log \mathcal{Q}_i]$ to simple functions of $\mathbf{E}[\mathcal{P}]$ and $\text{Var}[\mathcal{P}]$, which are known quantities of the uniform mean (Bates) distribution.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} [\log \mathcal{Q}_i] &= \text{Var} \left[\log \frac{\gamma}{(\gamma - 1)\mathcal{P} + 1} \right] = \text{Var} [\log ((\gamma - 1)\mathcal{P} + 1)] \approx \frac{\text{Var} [(\gamma - 1)\mathcal{P} + 1]}{(\mathbf{E}[(\gamma - 1)\mathcal{P} + 1])^2}, \text{ where} \\ \frac{\text{Var} [(\gamma - 1)\mathcal{P} + 1]}{(\mathbf{E}[(\gamma - 1)\mathcal{P} + 1])^2} &= \frac{(\gamma - 1)^2 \text{Var}[\mathcal{P}]}{[(\gamma - 1)\mathbf{E}[\mathcal{P}] + 1]^2} = \frac{1}{12n} \left(\frac{2\frac{\gamma-1}{1+p}}{\frac{\gamma-1}{1+p} + 1} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{3n} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \frac{1+p}{\gamma-1}} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The “ \approx ” in Equation 8 is the result of Taylor series expansion on $\log((\gamma - 1)\mathcal{P} + 1)$, a common resort to approximate the moments of a (log-)transformed random variable (van der Vaart, 1998).




Figure 2: **Blue:** $\mathbf{E}[|\pi(f^+)|]$ (y -axis) vs. ξ^{\min} (x -axis) on synthesized experimental data.

Red: γ (y -axis) vs. the average of ξ^{\min} 's correspond to that γ (x -axis).

(a) $p = \frac{1-0.01}{0.01}$, $c = -\log(1-0.5)$. (b) $p = \frac{1-0.001}{0.001}$, $c = -\log(1-0.6)$. (c) $p = \frac{1-0.002}{0.002}$, $c = -\log(1-0.7)$. (d) $p = \frac{1-0.005}{0.005}$, $c = -\log(1-0.9)$.

Approximately, $\text{Var}[\log Q_i] \propto \gamma$. Observe that, for fixed n , choosing the n smallest $\xi_j^{\min} \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{j_i}]$'s will guarantee the smallest γ . We show the existence of $F_1^+ \subset F^+$ by the following construction: consecutively selecting the f_j^+ 's associated with the n smallest $\xi_j^{\min} \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{j_i}]$'s. \square

Proposition 1 states the existence and the construction of $F_1^+ \subset F^+$ for each n . However, the construction of F_1^+ involves calculating γ for each Q_i and ξ_j^{\min} for all $f_j \in F^+$, which makes the ordering algorithm slower than the actual variational transformation (so is GDO).

Now we show how to simplify the construction algorithm of F_1^+ to FDO without calculating γ 's or ξ_j^{\min} 's. For a wide range of practical parameter settings we are interested in (e.g., Figure 2 subfigures),

we notice that γ is empirically $\propto \left(\sum_{j=1}^{|F_1^+|} \xi_j^{\min}\right)^{-1}$. The exact analysis of this claim may be transcendental but $\lim_{\xi_j^{\min} \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[|\pi(f_j^+)|] \xi_j^{\min} = 0$, suggesting that γ eventually approaches minimum when F_1^+ is made of f^+ 's that have the largest ξ^{\min} 's. Proposition 2 shows that $\mathbf{E}[|\pi(f_j^+)|] \propto \frac{1}{\xi_j^{\min}}$

for any fixed $p \in [0, +\infty)$, $c \in (0, +\infty)$. As a result, we have $\sum_{j=1}^{|F_1^+|} \mathbf{E}[|\pi(f_j^+)|] \propto \gamma$. In other words, compose F_1^+ with the f_j^+ 's that have the smallest $|\pi(f_j^+)|$ yields the minimal γ .

Proposition 2. Fix $p \in [0, +\infty)$, $c \in (0, +\infty)$. Then for any $j \in \{j | \pi(f_j^+) \neq \emptyset\}$, its variational parameter ξ_j^{\min} decreases monotonically on $(0, +\infty)$ as $\mathbf{E}[|\pi(f_j^+)|]$ increases.

Proof. ξ_j^{\min} can be solved from either $\arg \min_{\xi_j} P(f_j^+ | \xi_j, \pi(f_j)^+)$ or $\arg \min_{\xi_j} P(f_j^+ | \xi_j)$. Since $\xi_j^{\min} = \arg \min_{\xi_j} P(f_j^+ | \xi_j, \pi(f_j)^+)$ can be seen as the special case when $p = 0$, our argument below applies to both cases.

For fixed p, c , we can solve for ξ_j^{\min} by letting $\frac{\partial}{\partial \xi_j} \log P(f_j^+ | \xi_j) = 0$. We have $\mathbf{E}[|\pi(f_j^+)|] = \frac{1}{c} \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{\xi_j^{\min}}\right) \left(pe^c e^{-\xi_j^{\min}} + 1\right)$. Taking derivative of $\mathbf{E}[|\pi(f_j^+)|]$ w.r.t. ξ_j^{\min} gives:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{E}[|\pi(f_j^+)|]}{d\xi_j^{\min}} = -\frac{e^{\xi_j^{\min}} + pe^c \left[1 + \xi_j^{\min} (\xi_j^{\min} + 1) \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{\xi_j^{\min}}\right)\right]}{ce^{\xi_j^{\min}} \xi_j^{\min} (\xi_j^{\min} + 1)} < 0, \text{ for } \xi_j^{\min} > 0. \quad (9)$$

\square

Since the same strategy minimizes $\text{Var}[\log Q_i]$ for every $d_i \in D$, it must be the most stable globally as well. Therefore, we arrive at an extremely simple variational transformation algorithm: sort $f_j^+ \in F^+$ by ascending rank of $\pi(f_j^+)$ and let that order be the order of variational transformation. We refer to this strategy as finding-degree order (FDO).

5 Related work

Exact inference on NOBN is fundamentally intractable (Cooper, 1990). Brute force inference on NOBN is $O(|F| \cdot 2^{|D|})$ as it calculates $P(F)$ by summing up $P(F | D') \cdot P(D')$, where D' can be

the combination of the presence or the absence of any subsets of D . Junction tree algorithms (Pearl, 1988) can be more efficient in practice at $O(2^{|M|})$, where $|M|$ is the maximal clique size of the moralized network.

Quickscore (Heckerman, 1990) reduces the temporal complexity to some exponential function of a quantity substantially smaller than $|D|$ or $|M|$ and make the inference practical for common usage. Quickscore (Heckerman, 1990) achieves $\tilde{O}(|D| \cdot 2^{|F|})$ by exploiting marginal and conditional independence⁵.

Table 2: Overall temporal complexities for exact and variational inferences on NOBN in terms of $|D|$, $|M|$, $|F|$, and $|F'|$ (note that all results are independent of $|S|$). In practical applications like QMR-DT, $|D| = 534$, $|M| \approx 151$, and $|F| \approx 43$ (Jordan et al., 1999; Jaakkola and Jordan, 1999).

| Brute force | Junction tree | Quickscore | Variational |
|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| $O(F \cdot 2^{ D })$ | $O(D \cdot 2^{ M })$ | $\tilde{O}(D \cdot 2^{ F })$ | $\tilde{O}(D \cdot [F' + 2^{ F-F' }])$ |

Various approximate inference methods are proposed in place of Quickscore when processing expensive inference cases in NOBN (particularly QMR-DT). Variational inference for NOBN developed in (Jaakkola and Jordan, 1999) reduces the cost in computing $P(F)$ by applying variational transformation to a subset of $F' \subset F$. The variational evidence is incorporated as posterior probability when performing quickscore on the remaining findings. The running time is then $\tilde{O}(|D| \cdot [|F'| + 2^{|F-F'|}])$.

Other general approximation methods that can be applied to NOBN include loopy belief propagation (Murphy et al., 1999), mean field approximation (Ng and Jordan, 2000), and importance sampling based sampling methods (Gogate and Domingos, 2010). Some have also considered processing each finding in F sequentially (Bellala et al., 2013), which is arguably more similar to the style of a realistic patient-to-doctor diagnosis.

6 Experiments

We evaluate the proposed inference algorithms on a real-world symptom-disease NOBN called F120. F120 is a QMR-like medical NOBN constructed from multiple reliable medical knowledge sources and is amended by medical experts. Unlike QMR-DT, F120 focuses on symptoms and diseases related to maternal and infant care. Due to the anonymous submission, the authors refrain from discussing F120’s details other than listing its vital statistics in Table 3.

Due to the unavailability of the proprietary QMR-DT network (Mansinghka et al., 2006), an anonymized version (aQMR) is available (Halpern and Sontag, 2013). However, aQMR anonymizes the symptom and disease node names and randomizes QMR-DT’s $P(f^+ | d^+)$ probabilities. With the medical connotation removed, it is difficult to confidently generate user queries (a user query is a tuple $\langle F^+, F^-, d_i \rangle$, where d_i is the label disease: the most likely disease given the symptoms according to medical experts). Previous works working with aQMR do not face this issue since they do not require use-cases. For example, (Halpern and Sontag, 2013; Jernite et al., 2013) focus on recovering the network structure and parameters; (Gogate and Domingos, 2010) focuses on the inference time and the *relative* divergence between approximate inference outcome and the exact inference outcome.

We also evaluate the algorithm’s scalability on the artificially generated S1 that is much larger in scale than F120 and QMR-DT. S1 has 40,000 hidden disease nodes, which is approximately the total number of diseases in ICD-10 classification. Figure 3 compares various inference algorithms against the baseline in (Jaakkola and Jordan, 1999) (JJ99+CVX). The proposed variational-first hybridization (VFH) is consistently faster than other methods. Despite having the same variational cost as VFH (shown in Table 1), Joint hybridization (JH) is the slowest due to its repeated negative evidence computation of Equation 7. JJ99+PPF is significantly faster than JJ99+CVX due to the simplified Ξ^{\min} estimation.

Figure 4 compares the inference accuracies on F120. To simulate the wide-ranged inaccuracy in the disease priors $P(d^+)$ ’s, we scramble them with samples drawn from the uniform mean (Bates)

⁵the soft- O bound is derived from $O(|D| \cdot |F^-| \cdot 2^{|F^+|})$ given in (Heckerman, 1990).

distribution \mathcal{P} at different $\frac{1}{1+p}$ values. In total, we test four sets of queries with different kinds of false positive findings. Each query in the 1st set (`random20`) contains 20% random f^+ 's that are not caused by the labeled disease. For the 2nd set (`chronic20`), the 20% false f^+ 's are symptoms caused by some common chronic diseases (e.g., asthma, hypertension). Chronic symptoms are often mentioned inadvertently by patients during doctor's visit and making the diagnosis harder. The 3rd set (`chronic40`) has the same type of false f^+ 's as `chronic20` but the ratio is 40% of F^+ . For the 4th set (`confuse20`), the 20% false f^+ 's are symptoms caused by diseases similar to the labeled disease (e.g., influenza and common cold). Such diseases share several symptoms, but often the severity and other key symptoms are decisive in telling them apart. Each of the four sets has 800 queries and each query consists of on average eight f^+ 's and four f^- 's. Shown in Figure 4, VFH+CVX+FDO performs better than the JJ99+CVX+GDO baseline across the wide range of $P(d^+)$ and even outperforms the exact Quickscore for certain $P(d^+)$ values. VFH+PPF+FDO suffers from its suboptimal (although fast, shown in Figure 3) ξ^{\min} estimations. VFH+PPF+FDO is comparable to JJ99+CVX+JJ99 at the lower range of $P(d^+)$ values. Lastly, JH+CVX+FDO has the closest performance portfolio to that of Quickscore and is quite competitive.

| NOBN | $ D $ | $ S $ | $ \{P(f^+ d^+) > 0\} $ | Density |
|--------|--------|--------|--------------------------|---------|
| F120 | 665 | 1,276 | 10,552 | 1.24% |
| QMR-DT | 534 | 4,040 | 40,740 | 1.89% |
| S1 | 40,000 | 12,000 | 384 million | 80.0% |

Table 3: Comparisons of NOBNs on the network size and density (measured as total number of nonzero $P(f^+ | d^+)$ as a percentage of $|D| \cdot |F|$).




Figure 3: Runtime comparisons of different algorithms on the S1 network.




Figure 4: Accuracy comparisons on F120. x -axis is the mean $P(d^+)$ value (i.e., $\frac{1}{1+p}$); y -axis is top-1/top-3 accuracy. All configurations (except Quickscore) transforms 2 findings variationally. (a, e) `random20`. (b, f) `chronic20`. (c, g) `chronic40`. (d, h) `confuse20`. (a, b, c, d) measure top-1 accuracies. (e, f, g, h) measure the corresponding top-3 accuracies.

7 Conclusions and future work

In this work, we study the important problem of approximate inference on noisy-or Bayesian networks (specifically, their medical applications). We introduce novel algorithms for variational hybridization

and variational transformation. The proposed algorithms greatly immunize the current variational inference algorithms against the inaccuracies in widely-ranged hidden prior probabilities, a common issue that arises in modern medical applications of Bayesian networks. In the future, we plan to investigate the applicability of the proposed algorithms to more general Bayesian networks.

References

- D. Amodei, R. Anubhai, E. Battenberg, C. Case, J. Casper, B. C. Catanzaro, J. Chen, M. Chrzanowski, A. Coates, G. Diamos, E. Elsen, J. Engel, L. Fan, C. Fougner, T. Han, A. Y. Hannun, B. Jun, P. LeGresley, L. Lin, S. Narang, A. Y. Ng, S. Ozair, R. Prenger, J. Raiman, S. Satheesh, D. Seetapun, S. Sengupta, Y. Wang, Z. Wang, C. Wang, B. Xiao, D. Yogatama, J. Zhan, and Z. Zhu. Deep speech 2: End-to-end speech recognition in english and mandarin. *CoRR*, abs/1512.02595, 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.02595>.
- G. Bellala, J. Stanley, S. K. Bhavnani, and C. Scott. A rank-based approach to active diagnosis. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 35(9):2078–2090, Sept 2013. ISSN 0162-8828. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2013.30.
- J. Cheng, R. Greiner, J. Kelly, D. Bell, and W. Liu. Learning bayesian networks from data: An information-theory based approach. *Artificial Intelligence*, 137(1 - 2):43 – 90, 2002. ISSN 0004-3702. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0004-3702\(02\)00191-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0004-3702(02)00191-1). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0004370202001911>.
- G. F. Cooper. The computational complexity of probabilistic inference using bayesian belief networks (research note). *Artif. Intell.*, 42(2-3):393–405, Mar. 1990. ISSN 0004-3702. doi: 10.1016/0004-3702(90)90060-D. URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0004-3702\(90\)90060-D](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0004-3702(90)90060-D).
- A. L. Dawson and R. P. Dellavalle. Acne vulgaris. *BMJ*, 346, 2013. doi: 10.1136/bmj.f2634. URL <http://www.bmj.com/content/346/bmj.f2634>.
- V. Gogate and P. M. Domingos. Formula-based probabilistic inference. In P. Grunwald and P. Spirtes, editors, *UAI*, pages 210–219. AUAI Press, 2010.
- Y. Halpern and D. Sontag. Unsupervised learning of noisy-or bayesian networks. In *Proceedings of the 29th Conference, UAI*, pages 272–281, 2013.
- D. Heckerman. A tractable inference algorithm for diagnosing multiple diseases. In *UAI*, pages 163–172, 1990.
- T. S. Jaakkola and M. I. Jordan. Variational probabilistic inference and the qmr-dt network. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, pages 291–322, 1999.
- Y. Jernite, Y. Halpern, and D. Sontag. Discovering hidden variables in noisy-or networks using quartet tests. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, pages 2355–2363, 2013.
- M. I. Jordan, Z. Ghahramani, T. S. Jaakkola, and L. K. Saul. An introduction to variational methods for graphical models. *Machine learning*, 37(2):183–233, 1999.
- W. Liao and Q. Ji. Learning bayesian network parameters under incomplete data with domain knowledge. *Pattern Recognition*, 42(11):3046 – 3056, 2009. ISSN 0031-3203. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.patcog.2009.04.006>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0031320309001472>.
- T. Luong, I. Sutskever, Q. V. Le, O. Vinyals, and W. Zaremba. Addressing the rare word problem in neural machine translation. In *ACL*, 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1410.8206v4.pdf>.
- V. K. Mansinghka, C. Kemp, T. L. Griffiths, and J. B. Tenenbaum. Structured priors for structure learning. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Conference, UAI*, 2006.
- B. Middleton, M. Shwe, D. Heckerman, M. Henrion, E. Horvitz, H. Lehmann, and G. Cooper. Probabilistic diagnosis using a reformulation of the internist-1/qmr knowledge base. *Methods of information in medicine*, 30:241–255, 1991.
- K. Murphy. Bayes Net Toolbox. <https://github.com/bayesnet/bnt>, 2002. [Online Lecture notes; accessed Jan-2016].
- K. P. Murphy, Y. Weiss, and M. I. Jordan. Loopy belief propagation for approximate inference: An empirical study. In *UAI*, pages 467–475, 1999.
- A. Y. Ng and M. I. Jordan. Approximate inference algorithms for two-layer bayesian networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 533–539, 2000.

- J. Pearl. *Probabilistic Reasoning in Intelligent Systems: Networks of Plausible Inference*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA, 1988. ISBN 1558604790.
- C. Riggelsen. Learning parameters of bayesian networks from incomplete data via importance sampling. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 42(1 - 2):69 – 83, 2006. ISSN 0888-613X. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2005.10.005>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0888613X05000654>.
- A. W. van der Vaart. *Asymptotic statistics*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 1998. ISBN 0-521-49603-9.