11-755 Machine Learning for Signal Processing

Independent Component Analysis

Class 20. 8 Nov 2012

Instructor: Bhiksha Raj

A brief review of basic probability

- *Uncorrelated:* Two random variables X and Y are uncorrelated iff:
  - The *average* value of the product of the variables equals the product of their individual averages
- Setup: Each draw produces one instance of X and one instance of Y
  - I.e one instance of (X,Y)
- E[XY] = E[X]E[Y]
- The average value of X is the same regardless of the value of Y

Uncorrelatedness



- Which of the above represent uncorrelated RVs?

A brief review of basic probability

- *Independence:* Two random variables X and Y are independent iff:
  - Their joint probability equals the product of their individual probabilities
- P(X,Y) = P(X)P(Y)
- ➔ The average value of X is the same regardless of the value of Y
  - E[X|Y] = E[X]

A brief review of basic probability

- *Independence:* Two random variables X and Y are independent iff:
- The average value of any function X is the same regardless of the value of Y
- **E[f(X)g(Y)] = E[f(X)] E[g(Y)] for all f(), g()**

Independence



- Which of the above represent independent RVs?
- Which represent uncorrelated RVs?

A brief review of basic probability

f(x)



p(x)



- The expected value of an odd function of an RV is 0 if
  - The RV is 0 mean
  - The PDF is of the RV is symmetric around 0
- **E[f(X)] = 0 if f(X) is odd symmetric**

A brief review of basic info. theory

T(all), M(ed), S(hort)…

$$H(X)=\sum_X P(X)[-\log P(X)]$$

- Entropy: The *minimum average* number of bits to transmit to convey a symbol

X

T, M, S…

M F F M..

Y

$$H(X,Y)=\sum_{X,Y} P(X,Y)[-\log P(X,Y)]$$

- Joint entropy: The *minimum average* number of bits to convey sets (pairs here) of symbols

A brief review of basic info. theory

X

T, M, S…

M F F M..

Y

$$H(X|Y)=\sum_Y P(Y)\sum_X P(X|Y)[-\log P(X|Y)]=\sum_{X,Y} P(X,Y)[-\log P(X|Y)]$$

- Conditional Entropy: The *minimum average* number of bits to transmit to convey a symbol X, after symbol Y has already been conveyed
  - Averaged over all values of X and Y

A brief review of basic info. theory

$$H(X|Y)=\sum_Y P(Y)\sum_X P(X|Y)[-\log P(X|Y)]=\sum_Y P(Y)\sum_X P(X)[-\log P(X)]=H(X)$$

- Conditional entropy of X = H(X) if X is independent of Y

$$H(X,Y)=\sum_{X,Y} P(X,Y)[-\log P(X,Y)]=\sum_{X,Y} P(X,Y)[-\log P(X)P(Y)]$$
$$=-\sum_{X,Y} P(X,Y)\log P(X)-\sum_{X,Y} P(X,Y)\log P(Y)=H(X)+H(Y)$$

- Joint entropy of X and Y is the sum of the entropies of X and Y if they are independent

Onward..

Projection: multiple notes

M =



W =





- $P = W (W^TW)^{-1} W^T$
- Projected Spectrogram = P * M

We're actually computing a score



- $\mathbf{M} \sim \mathbf{WH}$
- $\mathbf{H} = \text{pinv}(\mathbf{W})\mathbf{M}$

How about the other way?



- $\mathbf{M} \sim \mathbf{WH}$ $\quad \mathbf{W} = \mathbf{M}\text{pinv}(\mathbf{V})$ $\quad \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{WH}$

So what are we doing here?



- $\mathbf{M} \sim \mathbf{WH}$ is an approximation
- Given $\mathbf{W}$, estimate $\mathbf{H}$ to minimize error

$$\mathbf{H} = \arg\min_{\overline{\mathbf{H}}} \| \mathbf{M} - \mathbf{W}\overline{\mathbf{H}} \|_F^2 = \arg\min_{\overline{\mathbf{H}}} \sum_i \sum_j \left(\mathbf{M}_{ij} - (\mathbf{W}\overline{\mathbf{H}})_{ij}\right)^2$$

- Must ideally find *transcription* of given notes

Going the other way..



- $\mathbf{M} \sim \mathbf{WH}$ is an approximation
- Given $\mathbf{H}$, estimate $\mathbf{W}$ to minimize error

$$\mathbf{W} = \arg\min_{\overline{\mathbf{W}}} \| \mathbf{M} - \overline{\mathbf{W}}\mathbf{H} \|_F^2 = \arg\min_{\overline{\mathbf{H}}} \sum_i \sum_j \left(\mathbf{M}_{ij} - (\overline{\mathbf{W}}\mathbf{H})_{ij}\right)^2$$

- Must ideally find the *notes* corresponding to the transcription

When both parameters are unknown



- Must estimate both $\mathbf{H}$ and $\mathbf{W}$ to best approximate $\mathbf{M}$
- Ideally, must learn *both* the *notes* and *their* transcription!

A least squares solution

$$\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{H} = \arg\min_{\overline{\mathbf{W}}, \overline{\mathbf{H}}} \| \mathbf{M} - \overline{\mathbf{W}}\overline{\mathbf{H}} \|_F^2$$

- Unconstrained
  - For any W,H that minimizes the error, $\mathbf{W'}=\mathbf{WA}$, $\mathbf{H'}=\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{H}$ also minimizes the error for any invertible $\mathbf{A}$



- For our problem, lets consider the "truth"..
- When one note occurs, the other does not
  - $\mathbf{h}_i^T\mathbf{h}_j = 0$ for all i != j
- The rows of $\mathbf{H}$ are *uncorrelated*

A least squares solution



- Assume: $\mathbf{HH}^T = \mathbf{I}$
  - Normalizing all rows of $\mathbf{H}$ to length 1
- $\text{pinv}(\mathbf{H}) = \mathbf{H}^T$
- Projecting $\mathbf{M}$ onto $\mathbf{H}$
  - $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{M}\,\text{pinv}(\mathbf{H}) = \mathbf{MH}^T$
  - $\mathbf{WH} = \mathbf{M}\,\mathbf{H}^T\mathbf{H}$

$$\mathbf{W},\mathbf{H} = \arg\min_{\overline{\mathbf{W}},\overline{\mathbf{H}}} \|\mathbf{M} - \overline{\mathbf{W}}\overline{\mathbf{H}}\|_F^2$$

$$\mathbf{H} = \arg\min_{\overline{\mathbf{H}}} \|\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{M}\overline{\mathbf{H}}^T\overline{\mathbf{H}}\|_F^2$$ **Constraint: Rank(H) = 4**

Finding the notes

$$\mathbf{H} = \arg\min_{\overline{\mathbf{H}}} \|\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{M}\overline{\mathbf{H}}^T\overline{\mathbf{H}}\|_F^2$$

- Note $\mathbf{H}^T\mathbf{H} \mathrel{!=} \mathbf{I}$
  - Only $\mathbf{HH}^T = \mathbf{I}$
  - Could also be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{H} = \arg\min_{\overline{\mathbf{H}}} trace\left(\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{I} - \overline{\mathbf{H}}^T\overline{\mathbf{H}})\mathbf{M}^T\right)$$

$$\mathbf{H} = \arg\min_{\overline{\mathbf{H}}} trace\left(\mathbf{M}^T\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{I} - \overline{\mathbf{H}}^T\overline{\mathbf{H}})\right)$$

$$\mathbf{H} = \arg\min_{\overline{\mathbf{H}}} trace\left(Correlation(\mathbf{M}^T)(\mathbf{I} - \overline{\mathbf{H}}^T\overline{\mathbf{H}})\right)$$

$$\mathbf{H} = \arg\max_{\overline{\mathbf{H}}} trace\left(Correlation(\mathbf{M}^T)\overline{\mathbf{H}}^T\overline{\mathbf{H}}\right)$$

Finding the notes

- Constraint: every row of $\mathbf{H}$ has length 1

$$\mathbf{H} = \arg\max_{\overline{\mathbf{H}}} trace\left(Correlation(\mathbf{M}^T)\overline{\mathbf{H}}^T\overline{\mathbf{H}}\right) - trace\left(\Lambda\overline{\mathbf{H}}^T\overline{\mathbf{H}}\right)$$

- Differentiating and equating to 0

$$Correlation(\mathbf{M}^T)\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}\Lambda$$

- Simply requiring the rows of H to be orthonormal gives us that $\mathbf{H}$ is the set of Eigenvectors of the data in $\mathbf{M}^T$

Equivalences

$$\mathbf{H} = \arg\max_{\overline{\mathbf{H}}} trace\left(Correlation(\mathbf{M}^T)\overline{\mathbf{H}}^T\overline{\mathbf{H}}\right) - trace\left(\Lambda\overline{\mathbf{H}}^T\overline{\mathbf{H}}\right)$$

- is identical to

$$\mathbf{W},\mathbf{H} = \arg\min_{\overline{\mathbf{W}},\overline{\mathbf{H}}} \|\mathbf{M} - \overline{\mathbf{W}}\overline{\mathbf{H}}\|_F^2 + \sum_i \lambda_i \|\overline{\mathbf{h}}_i\|^2 + \sum_{i \neq j} \lambda_{ij} \overline{\mathbf{h}}_i^T \overline{\mathbf{h}}_j$$

- Minimize least squares error with the constraint that the rows of $\mathbf{H}$ are length 1 and orthogonal to one another

So how does that work?



- There are 12 notes in the segment, hence we try to estimate 12 notes..

So how does that work?



- The first three "notes" and their contributions
  - The spectrograms of the notes are statistically uncorrelated

Finding the notes

- Can find $\mathbf{W}$ instead of $\mathbf{H}$

$$\mathbf{W} = \arg\min_{\overline{\mathbf{W}}} \|\mathbf{M} - \overline{\mathbf{W}}^T\overline{\mathbf{W}}\mathbf{M}\|_F^2$$

- Solving the above, with the constraints that the columns of $\mathbf{W}$ are orthonormal gives you the eigen vectors of the data in $\mathbf{M}$

$$\mathbf{W} = \arg\max_{\overline{\mathbf{W}}} trace\left(\overline{\mathbf{W}}^T\overline{\mathbf{W}}Correlation(\mathbf{M})\right) - trace\left(\Lambda\overline{\mathbf{W}}^T\overline{\mathbf{W}}\right)$$

$$Correlation(\mathbf{M})\mathbf{W} = \Lambda\mathbf{W}$$

So how does that work?



- There are 12 notes in the segment, hence we try to estimate 12 notes..

Our notes are not orthogonal



- Overlapping frequencies
- Note occur concurrently
  - Harmonica continues to resonate to previous note
- More generally, simple orthogonality will not give us the desired solution

What *else* can we look for?



- Assume: The "transcription" of one note does not depend on what else is playing
  - Or, in a multi-instrument piece, instruments are playing independently of one another
- Not strictly true, but still..

Formulating it with Independence

$$\mathbf{W},\mathbf{H} = \arg\min_{\overline{\mathbf{W}},\overline{\mathbf{H}}} \|\mathbf{M} - \overline{\mathbf{W}\mathbf{H}}\|_F^2 + \Lambda(rows.of.H.are.independent)$$

- Impose statistical independence constraints on decomposition

Changing problems for a bit



- Two people speak simultaneously
- Recorded by two microphones
- Each recorded signal is a mixture of both signals

Imposing Statistical Constraints



- **M** = **WH**
  - **M** = "mixed" signal
  - **W** = "notes"
  - **H** = "transcription"
- Given only **M** estimate **H**
- Ensure that the components of the vectors in the estimated **H** are statistically independent
- Multiple approaches..

Imposing Statistical Constraints



- **M** = **WH**
- Given only **M** estimate **H**
- **H** = $\mathbf{W}^{-1}$**M** = **AM**
- Estimate **A** such that the components of **AM** are statistically independent
  - **A** is the *unmixing* matrix
- Multiple approaches..

Statistical Independence

- **M** = **WH** **H** = **AM**
- *Emulating independence*
  - Compute **W** (or **A**) and **H** such that **H** has statistical characteristics that are observed in statistically independent variables
- *Enforcing independence*
  - Compute **W** and **H** such that the components of **M** are independent

Emulating Independence



- The rows of **H** are uncorrelated
  - $E[\mathbf{h}_i\mathbf{h}_j] = E[\mathbf{h}_i]E[\mathbf{h}_j]$
  - $\mathbf{h}_i$ and $\mathbf{h}_j$ are the i^{th} and j^{th} components of any vector in **H**
- The fourth order moments are independent
  - $E[\mathbf{h}_i\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{h}_k\mathbf{h}_l] = E[\mathbf{h}_i]E[\mathbf{h}_j]E[\mathbf{h}_k]E[\mathbf{h}_l]$
  - $E[\mathbf{h}_i^2\mathbf{h}_j\mathbf{h}_k] = E[\mathbf{h}_i^2]E[\mathbf{h}_j]E[\mathbf{h}_k]$
  - $E[\mathbf{h}_i^2\mathbf{h}_j^2] = E[\mathbf{h}_i^2]E[\mathbf{h}_j^2]$
  - Etc.

Zero Mean

- Usual to assume *zero mean* processes
  - Otherwise, some of the math doesn't work well
- **M** = **WH** **H** = **AM**
- If mean(**M**) = 0 => mean(**H**) = 0
  - E[**H**] = **A**E[**M**] = **A0** = **0**
  - First step of ICA: Set the mean of **M** to 0

$$\mu_m = \frac{1}{cols(\mathbf{M})}\sum_i \mathbf{m}_i$$

$$\mathbf{m}_i = \mathbf{m}_i - \mu_m \qquad \forall i$$

  - $\mathbf{m}_i$ are the columns of **M**

Emulating Independence..



- Independence → Uncorrelatedness
- Estimate a **C** such that **CM** is uncorrelated
- **X** = **CM**
  - $E[\mathbf{x}_i\mathbf{x}_j] = E[\mathbf{x}_i]E[\mathbf{x}_j] = \delta_{ij}$ [since M is now "centered"]
  - $\mathbf{XX}^T = \mathbf{I}$
    - In reality, we only want this to be a diagonal matrix, but we'll make it identity

Decorrelating



H=AM

A=BC

H=BCM

- $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{CM}$
- $\mathbf{XX}^T = \mathbf{I}$

- Eigen decomposition $\mathbf{MM}^T = \mathbf{USU}^T$
- Let $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{U}^T$
  - $\mathbf{WMM}^T\mathbf{W}^T = \mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{U}^T\,\mathbf{USU}^T\mathbf{US}^{-1/2} = \mathbf{I}$

Decorrelating



H=AM

A=BC

H=BCM

- $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{CM}$
- $\mathbf{XX}^T = \mathbf{I}$

- Eigen decomposition $\mathbf{MM}^T = \mathbf{ESE}^T$
- Let $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{E}^T$
  - $\mathbf{WMM}^T\mathbf{W}^T = \mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{E}^T\,\mathbf{ESE}^T\mathbf{ES}^{-1/2} = \mathbf{I}$

- $\mathbf{X}$ is called the ***whitened*** version of $\mathbf{M}$
  - The process of decorrelating $\mathbf{M}$ is called *whitening*
  - $\mathbf{C}$ is the *whitening matrix*

Uncorrelated != Independent

- Whitening merely ensures that the resulting shat signals are uncorrelated, i.e.

$$E[\mathbf{x}_i\mathbf{x}_j] = 0 \text{ if } i \,!\!= j$$

- This does not ensure higher order moments are also decoupled, e.g. it does not ensure that

$$E[\mathbf{x}_i^2\mathbf{x}_j^2] = E[\mathbf{x}_i^2]E[\mathbf{x}_j^2]$$

- This is *one* of the signatures of independent RVs
- Lets explicitly decouple the fourth order moments

Decorrelating



H=AM

A=BC

H=BX

- $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{CM}$
- $\mathbf{XX}^T = \mathbf{I}$

- Will multiplying $\mathbf{X}$ by $\mathbf{B}$ *re-correlate* the components?
- Not if B is *unitary*
  - $\mathbf{BB}^T = \mathbf{B}^T\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I}$
- So we want to find a *unitary* matrix
  - Since the rows of $\mathbf{H}$ are uncorrelated
    - Because they are independent

ICA: Freeing Fourth Moments

- We have $E[\mathbf{x}_i\,\mathbf{x}_j] = 0$ if i != j
  - Already been decorrelated

- $\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{BC}$, $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{BCM}$, $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{CM}$, $\rightarrow$ $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{BX}$

- The fourth moments of $\mathbf{H}$ have the form:
  $E[\mathbf{h}_i\,\mathbf{h}_j\,\mathbf{h}_k\,\mathbf{h}_l]$

- If the rows of $\mathbf{H}$ were independent
  $E[\mathbf{h}_i\,\mathbf{h}_j\,\mathbf{h}_k\,\mathbf{h}_l] = E[\mathbf{h}_i]\,E[\mathbf{h}_j]\,E[\mathbf{h}_k]\,E[\mathbf{h}_l]$

- Solution: Compute $\mathbf{B}$ such that the fourth moments of $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{BX}$ are decoupled
  - While ensuring that $\mathbf{B}$ is Unitary

ICA: Freeing Fourth Moments

- Create a matrix of fourth moment terms that would be diagonal were the rows of $\mathbf{H}$ independent and diagonalize it
- A good candidate
  - Good because it incorporates the energy in all rows of $\mathbf{H}$

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} d_{11} & d_{12} & d_{13} & .. \\ d_{21} & d_{22} & d_{23} & .. \\ .. & .. & .. & .. \end{bmatrix}$$

  - Where
    $d_{ij} = E[\,\Sigma_k\,\mathbf{h}_k^2\,\mathbf{h}_i\,\mathbf{h}_j]$
  - i.e.
    $D = E[\mathbf{h}^T\mathbf{h}\,\mathbf{h}\,\mathbf{h}^T]$
    - $\mathbf{h}$ are the columns of $\mathbf{H}$
    - Assuming $\mathbf{h}$ is real, else replace transposition with Hermition

ICA: The D matrix

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} d_{11} & d_{12} & d_{13} & .. \\ d_{21} & d_{22} & d_{23} & .. \\ .. & .. & .. & .. \end{bmatrix} \qquad d_{ij} = E[\Sigma_k \mathbf{h}_k^2 \mathbf{h}_i \mathbf{h}_j] = \frac{1}{cols(\mathbf{H})}\sum_m \sum_k h_{mk}^2 h_{mi} h_{mj}$$



- Average above term across all columns of **H**

ICA: The D matrix

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} d_{11} & d_{12} & d_{13} & .. \\ d_{21} & d_{22} & d_{23} & .. \\ .. & .. & .. & .. \end{bmatrix} \qquad d_{ij} = E[\Sigma_k \mathbf{h}_k^2 \mathbf{h}_i \mathbf{h}_j] = \frac{1}{cols(\mathbf{H})}\sum_m \sum_k h_{mk}^2 h_{mi} h_{mj}$$

- If the $\mathbf{h}_i$ terms were independent
  - For i != j

$$E\left[\sum_k \mathbf{h}_k^2 \mathbf{h}_i \mathbf{h}_j\right] = E[\mathbf{h}_i^3]E[\mathbf{h}_j] + E[\mathbf{h}_j^3]E[\mathbf{h}_i] + \sum_{k\neq i,k\neq j} E[\mathbf{h}_k^2]E[\mathbf{h}_i]E[\mathbf{h}_j]$$

  - Centered: $E[\mathbf{h}_j] = 0$ ➔ $E[\Sigma_k \mathbf{h}_k^2 \mathbf{h}_i \mathbf{h}_j]=0$ for i != j
  - For i = j

$$E\left[\sum_k \mathbf{h}_k^2 \mathbf{h}_i \mathbf{h}_j\right] = E[\mathbf{h}_i^4] + E[\mathbf{h}_i^2]\sum_{k\neq i} E[\mathbf{h}_k^2] \neq 0$$

- Thus, if the $\mathbf{h}_i$ terms were independent, $d_{ij} = 0$ if i != j
- i.e., if $\mathbf{h}_i$ were independent, D would be a diagonal matrix
  - **Let us diagonalize *D***

Diagonalizing D

- Compose a fourth order matrix from **X**
  - Recall: $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{CM}$, $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{BX} = \mathbf{BCM}$
    - **B** is what we're trying to learn to make **H** independent
  - Compose $\mathbf{D}' = E[\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}\, \mathbf{x}\, \mathbf{x}^T]$
- Diagonalize $\mathbf{D}'$ via Eigen decmpositin

  $\mathbf{D}' = \mathbf{U}\Lambda\mathbf{U}^T$
- $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{U}^T$
  - **That's it!!!!**

B frees the fourth moment

$\mathbf{D}' = \mathbf{U}\Lambda\mathbf{U}^T$; $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{U}^T$

- **U** is a unitary matrix, i.e. $\mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^T = \mathbf{I}$ (identity)
- $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{BX} = \mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{X}$
- $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{x}$
- The fourth moment matrix of H is

$$\begin{aligned} E[\mathbf{h}^T \mathbf{h}\, \mathbf{h}\, \mathbf{h}^T] &= E[\mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{x}\, \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{x}\, \mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{U}] \\ &= E[\mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{x}\, \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{x}\, \mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{U}] \\ &= \mathbf{U}^T E[\mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{x}\, \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T]\mathbf{U} \\ &= \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{D}'\, \mathbf{U} \\ &= \mathbf{U}^T\, \mathbf{U}\, \Lambda\, \mathbf{U}^T\, \mathbf{U} = \Lambda \end{aligned}$$

- The fourth moment matrix of $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{X}$ is Diagonal!!

Overall Solution

- $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{AM} = \mathbf{BCM} = \mathbf{BX}$
- $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{BC} = \mathbf{U}^T\mathbf{C}$

Independent Component Analysis

- Goal: to derive a matrix **A** such that the rows of **AM** are independent
- Procedure:
  1. "Center" **M**
  2. Compute the autocorrelation matrix R_{MM} of **M**
  3. Compute whitening matrix **C** via Eigen decomposition

     $R_{XX} = \mathbf{ESE}^T$, $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{E}^T$
  4. Compute $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{CM}$
  5. Compute the fourth moment matrix $D' = E[\mathbf{x}^T\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T]$
  6. Diagonalize D' via Eigen decomposition
  7. $D' = \mathbf{U}\Lambda\mathbf{U}^T$
  8. Compute $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}^T C$
- The fourth moment matrix of **H**=**AM** is diagonal
  - **Note that the autocorrelation matrix of H will also be diagonal**

ICA by diagonalizing moment matrices

- The procedure just outlined, while fully functional, has shortcomings
  - Only a subset of fourth order moments are considered
  - There are many other ways of constructing fourth-order moment matrices that would ideally be diagonal
    - Diagonalizing the particular fourth-order moment matrix we have chosen is not guaranteed to diagonalize every other fourth-order moment matrix
- JADE: (Joint Approximate Diagonalization of Eigenmatrices), J.F. Cardoso
  - Jointly diagonalizes several fourth-order moment matrices
  - More effective than the procedure shown, but more computationally expensive

Enforcing Independence

- Specifically ensure that the components of $\mathbf{H}$ are independent
  - $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{AM}$
- *Contrast function*: A non-linear function that has a minimum value when the *output components* are independent
- Define and minimize a contrast function
  - F(**AM**)
- Contrast functions are often only *approximations* too..

A note on pre-whitening

- The mixed signal is usually "prewhitened"
  - Normalize variance along all directions
  - Eliminate second-order dependence
- $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{CM}$
  - $E[\mathbf{x}_i\mathbf{x}_j] = E[\mathbf{x}_i]E[\mathbf{x}_j] = \delta_{ij}$ for centered signals
- Eigen decomposition $\mathbf{MM}^T = \mathbf{ESE}^T$
- $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{E}^T$
- Can use *first K* columns of $\mathbf{E}$ only if only K independent sources are expected
  - In microphone array setup – only K < M sources

The contrast function

- *Contrast function*: A non-linear function that has a minimum value when the *output components* are independent
- An explicit contrast function

$$I(\mathbf{H}) = \sum_i H(\bar{\mathbf{h}}_i) - H(\bar{\mathbf{H}})$$

- With constraint : $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{BX}$
  - $\mathbf{X}$ is "whitened" $\mathbf{M}$

Linear Functions

- $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{Bx}$
  - Individual columns of the $\mathbf{H}$ and $\mathbf{X}$ matrices
  - $\mathbf{x}$ is mixed signal, $\mathbf{B}$ is the *unmixing* matrix

$$P_{\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{h}) = P_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{h})\,|\mathbf{B}|^{-1}$$

$$H(\mathbf{x}) = \int P(\mathbf{x}) \log P(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$$

$$H(\mathbf{h}) = H(\mathbf{x}) + \log|\mathbf{B}|$$

The contrast function

$$I(\mathbf{H}) = \sum_i H(\bar{\mathbf{h}}_i) - H(\bar{\mathbf{H}})$$

$$I(\mathbf{H}) = \sum_i H(\bar{\mathbf{h}}_i) - H(\mathbf{x}) - \log|\mathbf{B}|$$

- Ignoring $H(\mathbf{x})$ (Const)

$$J(\mathbf{H}) = \sum_i H(\bar{\mathbf{h}}_i) - \log|\mathbf{W}|$$

- Minimize the above to obtain $\mathbf{B}$

An alternate approach

- Recall PCA
- $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{WH}$, the columns of $\mathbf{W}$ must be statistically independent
- Leads to: $\min_{\mathbf{W}} ||\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{W}^T\mathbf{W}\mathbf{M}||^2$
  - Error minimization framework to estimate $\mathbf{W}$
- Can we arrive at an error minimization framework for ICA
- Define an "Error" objective that represents independence

An alternate approach

- Definition of Independence – if x and y are independent:
  - $E[f(x)g(y)] = E[f(x)]E[g(y)]$
  - Must hold for *every* $f()$ and $g()$!!

An alternate approach

- Define $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{H}) = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{BX})$ (component-wise function)

$$\begin{bmatrix} g(h_{11}) & g(h_{21}) & \cdots \\ g(h_{12}) & g(h_{22}) & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix}$$

- Define $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{H}) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{BX})$

$$\begin{bmatrix} f(h_{11}) & f(h_{21}) & \cdots \\ f(h_{12}) & f(h_{22}) & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix}$$

An alternate approach

- $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{H})\,\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{H})^T = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{BX})\,\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{BX})^T$

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & P_{21} & \cdots \\ P_{12} & P_{22} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix} \qquad P_{ij} = \sum_k g(h_{ik})\,f(h_{jk})$$

This is a square matrix

- Must ideally be

$$\mathbf{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{21} & \cdots \\ Q_{12} & Q_{22} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix} \qquad Q_{ij} = \sum_k g(h_{ik}) \sum_l f(h_{jl}) \quad i \neq j$$

$$Q_{ii} = \sum_k g(h_{ik})\,f(h_{il})$$

- $\text{Error} = ||\mathbf{P}\text{-}\mathbf{Q}||_F^2$

An alternate approach

- Ideal value for $\mathbf{Q}$

$$\mathbf{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} Q_{11} & Q_{21} & \cdots \\ Q_{12} & Q_{22} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \end{bmatrix} \qquad Q_{ij} = \sum_k g(h_{ik}) \sum_l f(h_{jl}) \quad i \neq j$$

$$Q_{ii} = \sum_k g(h_{ik})\,f(h_{il})$$

- If g() and h() are odd symmetric functions
  $\Sigma_j g(h_{ij}) = 0$ for all i
  - Since $= \Sigma_j h_{ij} = 0$ ($\mathbf{H}$ is centered)
  - $\mathbf{Q}$ is a Diagonal Matrix!!!

An alternate approach

- Minimize Error

$$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{BX})\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{BX})^T$$

$$\mathbf{Q} = Diagonal$$

$$error = ||\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}||_F^2$$

- Leads to trivial Widrow Hopf type iterative rule:

$$\mathbf{E} = Diag - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{BX})\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{BX})^T$$

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B} + \eta \mathbf{E}\mathbf{B}^T$$

Update Rules

- Multiple solutions under different assumptions for g() and f()
- $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{BX}$
- $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B} + \eta\ \Delta\mathbf{B}$
- Jutten Herraut : Online update
  - $\Delta B_{ij} = f(\mathbf{h}_i)g(\mathbf{h}_j)$; -- actually assumed a recursive neural network
- Bell Sejnowski
  - $\Delta\mathbf{B} = ([\mathbf{B}^T]^{-1} - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{H})\mathbf{X}^T)$

Update Rules

- Multiple solutions under different assumptions for g() and f()
- $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{BX}$
- $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B} + \eta\ \Delta\mathbf{B}$
- Natural gradient -- f() = identity function
  - $\Delta\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{H})\mathbf{H}^T)\mathbf{W}$
- Cichoki-Unbehaeven
  - $\Delta\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{H})\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{H})^T)\mathbf{W}$

What are G() and H()

- Must be odd symmetric functions
- Multiple functions proposed

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} x + \tanh(x) & \text{x is super Gaussian} \\ x - \tanh(x) & \text{x is sub Gaussian} \end{cases}$$

- Audio signals in general
  - $\Delta\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{H}^T\text{-}\mathbf{K}\tanh(\mathbf{H})\mathbf{H}^T)\mathbf{W}$
- Or simply
  - $\Delta\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{K}\tanh(\mathbf{H})\mathbf{H}^T)\mathbf{W}$

So how does it work?



- Example with instantaneous mixture of two speakers
- Natural gradient update
- Works very well!

Another example!



Another Example



- Three instruments..

The Notes



- Three instruments..

ICA for data exploration

- The “bases” in PCA represent the “building blocks”
  - Ideally notes
- Very successfully used
- So can ICA be used to do the same?



ICA vs PCA bases

- Motivation for using ICA vs PCA
- PCA will indicate orthogonal directions of maximal variance
  - May not align with the data!
- ICA finds directions that are independent
  - More likely to “align” with the data



Finding useful transforms with ICA

- Audio preprocessing example
- Take a lot of audio snippets and concatenate them in a big matrix, do component analysis
- PCA results in the DCT bases
- ICA returns time/freq localized sinusoids which is a better way to analyze sounds
- Ditto for images
  - ICA returns localizes edge filters



Example case: ICA-faces vs. Eigenfaces



ICA for Signal Enhncement

- Very commonly used to enhance EEG signals
- EEG signals are frequently corrupted by heartbeats and biorhythm signals
- ICA can be used to separate them out

So how does that work?



- There are 12 notes in the segment, hence we try to estimate 12 notes..

PCA solution



- There are 12 notes in the segment, hence we try to estimate 12 notes..

So how does this work: **ICA solution**



- Better..
  - But not much
- But the issues here?

ICA Issues

- No sense of *order*
  - Unlike PCA
- Get K independent directions, but does not have a notion of the "best" direction
  - So the sources can come in any order
  - *Permutation invariance*
- Does not have sense of *scaling*
  - Scaling the signal does not affect independence
- Outputs are scaled versions of desired signals in permuted order
  - In the best case
  - In worse case, output are not desired signals at all..

What else went wrong?

- Assume distribution of signals is symmetric around mean
  - Note energy here
  - *Not* symmetric – negative values never happen
  - Still this didn't affect the three instruments case..
- *Notes are not independent*
  - Only one note plays at a time
  - If one note plays, other notes are *not* playing

Continue in next class..

- NMF
- Factor analysis..