1

Maximum likelihood and EM algorithm (after the Chapter 8)

Pasha Zusmanovich, deCODE

Statistics Colloquium March 30, 2007

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Likelihood is just a conditional probability.

Formal definition

Given random events A and B, the **likelihood function** of A relative to B is:

$$\{\text{set of states of } B\} \to [0,1]$$
$$x \mapsto \Pr(A \,|\, B = x).$$

Nothing fancy so far. Consider an ...

What is likelihood and what it is good for? Example: alleles and genotypes

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

frequencies of alleles: *a*: θ

A: $1 - \theta$

_

Example: alleles and genotypes

frequencies of alleles:

а: *θ* А: 1 — *θ* frequencies of genotypes: *aa*: θ^2 *aA*: $2\theta(1-\theta)$ *AA*: $(1-\theta)^2$

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

Example: alleles and genotypes

frequencies of alleles:		frequencies of genotypes:	numbers:
a: θ	\implies	aa: $ heta^2$	n _{aa}
A: $1 - \theta$		aA: $2\theta(1-\theta)$	n _{aA}
A. $1 = 0$		AA: $(1- heta)^2$	n _{AA}

The probability that numbers of genotypes would be exactly (n_{aa}, n_{aA}, n_{AA}) :

$$f(\theta) = \frac{(n_{aa} + n_{aA} + n_{AA})!}{n_{aa}! n_{aA}! n_{AA}!} \theta^{2n_{aa}} (2\theta(1-\theta))^{n_{aA}} (1-\theta)^{2n_{AA}}$$

f is a likelihood function:

 $\{ \mbox{ probability of alleles } \} \rightarrow \{ \mbox{ conditional probability of genotypes assuming given probability of alleles } \}.$

・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・

Example: alleles and genotypes

frequencies of alleles:		frequencies of genotypes:	numbers:
a: θ	\implies	aa: $ heta^2$	n _{aa}
A: $1 - \theta$		aA: $2\theta(1-\theta)$	n _{aA}
A. $\mathbf{I} = 0$		AA: $(1- heta)^2$	n _{AA}

The probability that numbers of genotypes would be exactly (n_{aa}, n_{aA}, n_{AA}) :

$$f(\theta) = \frac{(n_{aa} + n_{aA} + n_{AA})!}{n_{aa}! n_{aA}! n_{AA}!} \theta^{2n_{aa}} (2\theta(1-\theta))^{n_{aA}} (1-\theta)^{2n_{AA}}$$

f is a likelihood function:

 $\{ \mbox{ probability of alleles } \} \rightarrow \{ \mbox{ conditional probability of genotypes assuming given probability of alleles } \}.$

This is a model with parameter θ . **Question**: Which parameter makes model the "best"? **Answer** ...

Example: alleles and genotypes (continued)

Question: Which parameter makes model the "best"? **Answer**: Those which makes the observed data more likely, i.e. which maximizes

$$f(\theta) = \frac{(n_{aa} + n_{aA} + n_{AA})!}{n_{aa}! n_{aA}! n_{AA}!} \theta^{2n_{aa}} (2\theta(1-\theta))^{n_{aA}} (1-\theta)^{2n_{AA}}$$

on [0, 1]. **Solution**:

$$\hat{\theta} = \frac{2n_{aa} + n_{aA}}{2(n_{aa} + n_{aA} + n_{AA})}.$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Example: alleles and genotypes (continued)

Question: Which parameter makes model the "best"? **Answer**: Those which makes the observed data more likely, i.e. which maximizes

$$f(\theta) = \frac{(n_{aa} + n_{aA} + n_{AA})!}{n_{aa}! n_{aA}! n_{AA}!} \theta^{2n_{aa}} (2\theta(1-\theta))^{n_{aA}} (1-\theta)^{2n_{AA}}$$

on [0, 1]. **Solution**:

$$\hat{\theta} = \frac{2n_{aa} + n_{aA}}{2(n_{aa} + n_{aA} + n_{AA})}.$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

But this is exactly the Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium!

Another example: linear regression

Fitting a line to the set of points on the plane $\{(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)\}$, assuming observations are independent, and errors are normally distributed. The model is:

$$Y = \beta_1 X + \beta_0 + \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2).$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

What is the "probability" to have the observed data under the given model?

Another example: linear regression

Fitting a line to the set of points on the plane $\{(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)\}$, assuming observations are independent, and errors are normally distributed. The model is:

$$Y = \beta_1 X + \beta_0 + \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2).$$

What is the "probability" to have the observed data under the given model?

 $P(Y \text{ lies in } \delta \text{-neighbourhood of } y_i | X = x_i) \approx \text{density}(Y) |_{X = x_i, Y = y_i} \cdot 2\delta$

so "probability" is replaced by density. If X is fixed,

$$Y - \beta_1 X - \beta_0 \sim N(0, \sigma^2) \Rightarrow Y \sim N(\beta_1 X + \beta_0, \sigma^2).$$

Another example: linear regression (continued) Maximizing

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{density}(Y)|_{X=x_i,Y=y_i} &= \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left(-\frac{(\beta_1 x_i + \beta_0 - y_i)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma}\right)^n \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\beta_1 x_i + \beta_0 - y_i)^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

is equivalent to minimizing

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\beta_1 x_i + \beta_0 - y_i)^2.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Another example: linear regression (continued) Maximizing

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{density}(Y)|_{X=x_i,Y=y_i} &= \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left(-\frac{(\beta_1 x_i + \beta_0 - y_i)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma}\right)^n \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\beta_1 x_i + \beta_0 - y_i)^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

is equivalent to minimizing

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\beta_1 x_i + \beta_0 - y_i)^2.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

But this is exactly the least squares!

Refined formal definition

Assuming a random variable X has a density function $f(x, \theta)$ parametrized by θ , the likelihood function is:

$$\theta \mapsto f(x, \theta).$$

"Conceptual" definition

Likelihood is the probability of observed data under the given model.

Thus, the maximum likelihood correspond to the model (in the given parametrized class of models) which makes the observerd data "most likely".

One usually maximize $log f(x, \theta)$ instead of $f(x, \theta)$ (log-likelihood function). Ok, since log is monotonic. But ...

Why logarithm?

Turns multiplicative things to additive.

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

Diminishes the "long tail".

Why logarithm?

▶ Turns multiplicative things to additive. In most cases on practice, the likelihood function is the product of several functions. E.g., if *X*₁,..., *X*_n are independent random variables, then their likelihood function:

$$f(x_1,\ldots,x_n,\theta)=f(x_1,\theta)\ldots f(x_n,\theta),$$

so logarithm turns multiplicative things to additive and easier to deal with. (And logarithm is the **only** "good" function taking multiplication to addition).

Diminishes the "long tail".

Why logarithm?

▶ Turns multiplicative things to additive. In most cases on practice, the likelihood function is the product of several functions. E.g., if *X*₁,..., *X*_n are independent random variables, then their likelihood function:

$$f(x_1,\ldots,x_n,\theta)=f(x_1,\theta)\ldots f(x_n,\theta),$$

so logarithm turns multiplicative things to additive and easier to deal with. (And logarithm is the **only** "good" function taking multiplication to addition).

Diminishes the "long tail". A random variable with values in R⁺ (say, results of a measurement) tends to have a skewed distribution to the right because there is lower limit but not upper limit. Passing to log diminishes this skewness.

Maximum likelihood behaves nicely asymtotically Taylor series:

$$\ell(heta) = \ell(\hat{ heta}) + rac{1}{2}(heta - \hat{ heta})^2 \ell''(\hat{ heta}) + \dots$$

・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・

$$\begin{split} i(\theta) &= E(-\ell''(\theta)) - \text{Fisher information.} \\ \hat{\theta} &\sim N(\theta_0, i(\theta_0)^{-1}) \text{ as number of samples} \to \infty. \\ \text{Could be used to assess the precision of } \hat{\theta}. \end{split}$$

Connection with some fancy areas of Mathematics Back to alleles and genotypes example: model with **inbreeding coefficient** λ :

frequencies of alleles:
а : θ
A: $1 - \theta$

numbers:
38
95
53

(some real blood groups data from UK, 1947)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Scoring equations are equivalent to:

Connection with some fancy areas of Mathematics Back to alleles and genotypes example: model with **inbreeding coefficient** λ :

frequencies of alleles:	frequencies of genotypes:	numbers:
	aa: $ heta^2+ heta(1- heta)\lambda$	38
	aA: $2\theta(1- heta)(1-\lambda)$	95
A: $1 - \theta$	AA: $(1- heta)^2 + heta(1- heta)\lambda$	53

(some real blood groups data from UK, 1947)

Scoring equations are equivalent to:

$$\begin{split} 372\theta^{3}\lambda^{2} - 744\theta^{3}\lambda - 558\theta^{2}\lambda^{2} + 372\theta^{3} + 1131\theta^{2}\lambda + 186\theta\lambda^{2} - 573\theta^{2} \\ &- 668\theta\lambda + 201\theta + 148\lambda = 0; \\ 186\theta^{2}\lambda^{2} - 372\theta^{2}\lambda - 186\theta\lambda^{2} + 186\theta^{2} + 387\theta\lambda - 201\theta - 148\lambda + 53 = 0. \end{split}$$

Connection with some fancy areas of Mathematics Back to alleles and genotypes example: model with inbreeding **coefficient** λ :

frequencies of alleles:	frequencies of genotypes:	numbers:
	aa: $ heta^2+ heta(1- heta)\lambda$	38
a: θ A: 1 - 0	aA: $2\theta(1-\theta)(1-\lambda)$	95
A: $1 - \theta$	AA: $(1- heta)^2 + heta(1- heta)\lambda$	53

(some real blood groups data from UK, 1947)

Scoring equations are equivalent to:

 $372\theta^{3}\lambda^{2} - 744\theta^{3}\lambda - 558\theta^{2}\lambda^{2} + 372\theta^{3} + 1131\theta^{2}\lambda + 186\theta\lambda^{2} - 573\theta^{2}$ $-668\theta\lambda + 201\theta + 148\lambda = 0$: $186\theta^{2}\lambda^{2} - 372\theta^{2}\lambda - 186\theta\lambda^{2} + 186\theta^{2} + 387\theta\lambda - 201\theta - 148\lambda + 53 = 0.$

Statistics + Algebraic Geometry = **Algebraic Statistics**. ・ロト ・ 理 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ・ うへぐ

Advantages (to summarize)

- Agrees with intuition.
- Confirmed by other methods.
- "Nice" asymptotic behavior.
- Very good practical results.
- Universal.
- Connection with other areas of Mathematics.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Advantages (to summarize)

- Agrees with intuition.
- Confirmed by other methods.
- "Nice" asymptotic behavior.
- Very good practical results.
- Universal.
- Connection with other areas of Mathematics.

Disadvantages

- No "theoretical" justification.
- Could be bad for small samples.
- ▶ No way to compare "disjoint" models.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

"Bayesian" issue …

```
"Bayesian" issue:
```

$$Pr(data|model) = rac{Pr(model|data)Pr(data)}{Pr(model)}.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

"Bayesian" issue:

$$Pr(data|model) = rac{Pr(model|data)Pr(data)}{Pr(model)}$$

Philosophical mumbo-jumbo:

 M. Forster and E. Sober, Why likelihood?, The Nature of Scientific Evidence (ed. M. Taper and S. Lele), Univ. of Chicago Press, 2004, 153–165 http://philosophy.wisc.edu/forster/Likelihood/default.htm

 B. Fitelson, Likelihoodism, bayesianism, and relational confirmation, Synthese, to appear http://fitelson.org/research.htm

Finding the maximum of likelihood function could be difficult.

Example: alleles and phenotypes

Assume A is **dominant**, and we observe only **phenotypes**:

	frequencies of geno-		- f	
frequencies of alleles:	types:	numbers types:	01	pneno-
a : θ	aa: θ^2	a: 38		
A: $1- heta$	aA: $2\theta(1-\theta)$	<i>A</i> : 148		
	AA: $(1- heta)^2$	A. 140		

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

Finding the maximum of likelihood function could be difficult.

Example: alleles and phenotypes

Assume A is **dominant**, and we observe only **phenotypes**:

	frequencies of geno-	
frequencies of alleles:	types:	numbers of pheno-
а : θ	aa: $ heta^2$	types:
A: $1- heta$	aA: 2 $ heta(1- heta)$	<i>a</i> : 38 <i>A</i> : 148
	AA: $(1- heta)^2$	A: 140

Scoring equation amounts to: $38/\theta^2 - 148/(1-\theta^2) = 0$, i.e. is biquadratic. Suppose we don't know how/don't want to solve it. What to do?

Finding the maximum of likelihood function could be difficult.

Example: alleles and phenotypes

Assume A is **dominant**, and we observe only **phenotypes**:

	frequencies of geno-	
frequencies of alleles:	types:	numbers of pheno-
а: <i>θ</i>	aa: $ heta^2$	types:
A: $1- heta$	aA: 2 $ heta(1- heta)$	a: 38 A: 148
	AA: $(1- heta)^2$	A: 140

Scoring equation amounts to: $38/\theta^2 - 148/(1-\theta^2) = 0$, i.e. is biquadratic. Suppose we don't know how/don't want to solve it. What to do? Introduce back missing numbers n_{aA} and n_{AA} (hidden parameters) and iterate.

Example: alleles and phenotypes (continued)

Example: alleles and phenotypes (continued)

Step 1: initial genotype numbers: $n_{aA} = n_{AA} =$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

E 148/2 = 74.00

Example: alleles and phenotypes (continued)

Step 1: initial genotype numbers: $n_{aA} = n_{AA} =$

E 148/2 = 74.00

Step 2: find MLE for those numbers: $\theta = (2 \cdot 38 + 74.00)/(2 \cdot 186) = 0.40$

Ε

Example: alleles and phenotypes (continued)

Step 1: initial genotype numbers: $n_{aA} = n_{AA} =$

$$148/2 = 74.00$$

Step 2: find MLE for those numbers: $\theta = (2 \cdot 38 + 74.00)/(2 \cdot 186) = 0.40$

Step 3: for $\theta = 0.40$, find genotype frequencies: for *aA*: $2 \cdot 0.40 \cdot (1-0.40) = 0.48$ and for *AA*: $(1-0.40)^2 = 0.36$,

E and for them, genotype numbers: $n_{aA} = 186 \cdot 0.48 = 89.28$, $n_{AA} = 148 - 89.28 = 58.72$

Example: alleles and phenotypes (continued) Step 1: initial genotype numbers: $n_{aA} = n_{AA} =$

E 148/2 = 74.00

Step 2: find MLE for those numbers: $\theta = (2 \cdot 38 + 74.00)/(2 \cdot 186) = 0.40$

Step 3: for $\theta = 0.40$, find genotype frequencies: for *aA*: $2 \cdot 0.40 \cdot (1-0.40) = 0.48$ and for *AA*: $(1-0.40)^2 = 0.36$,

E and for them, genotype numbers: $n_{aA} = 186 \cdot 0.48 = 89.28$, $n_{AA} = 148 - 89.28 = 58.72$

Step 4: find MLE for those numbers: $\theta = (2 \cdot 38 + 89.28)/(2 \cdot 186) = 0.44$

Example: alleles and phenotypes (continued) Step 1: initial genotype numbers: $n_{aA} = n_{AA} =$ Ε 148/2 = 74.00Step 2: find MLE for those numbers: $\theta = (2 \cdot 38 +$ **M** $74.00)/(2 \cdot 186) = 0.40$ Step 3: for $\theta = 0.40$, find genotype frequencies: for *aA*: $2 \cdot 0.40 \cdot (1 - 0.40) = 0.48$ and for AA: $(1 - 0.40)^2 = 0.36$, Ε and for them, genotype numbers: $n_{aA} = 186 \cdot 0.48 =$ 89.28, $n_{AA} = 148 - 89.28 = 58.72$ Step 4: find MLE for those numbers: $\theta = (2 \cdot 38 +$ М $89.28)/(2 \cdot 186) = 0.44$ Step 5: for $\theta = 0.44$, find genotype frequencies: for aA: $2 \cdot 0.44 \cdot (1 - 0.44) = 0.49$ and for AA: $(1 - 0.44)^2 = 0.31$ Ε and genotype numbers: $n_{aA} = 186 \cdot 0.49 = 91.14$, $n_{AA} = 148 - 91.14 = 56.86$

Example: alleles and phenotypes (continued) Step 1: initial genotype numbers: $n_{aA} = n_{AA} =$ Ε 148/2 = 74.00Step 2: find MLE for those numbers: $\theta = (2 \cdot 38 +$ **M** $74.00)/(2 \cdot 186) = 0.40$ Step 3: for $\theta = 0.40$, find genotype frequencies: for *aA*: $2 \cdot 0.40 \cdot (1 - 0.40) = 0.48$ and for AA: $(1 - 0.40)^2 = 0.36$, Ε and for them, genotype numbers: $n_{aA} = 186 \cdot 0.48 =$ 89.28, $n_{AA} = 148 - 89.28 = 58.72$ Step 4: find MLE for those numbers: $\theta = (2 \cdot 38 +$ Μ $89.28)/(2 \cdot 186) = 0.44$ Step 5: for $\theta = 0.44$, find genotype frequencies: for aA: $2 \cdot 0.44 \cdot (1 - 0.44) = 0.49$ and for AA: $(1 - 0.44)^2 = 0.31$ Ε and genotype numbers: $n_{aA} = 186 \cdot 0.49 = 91.14$, $n_{AA} = 148 - 91.14 = 56.86$ Step 6: find MLE for those numbers: $\theta = (2 \cdot 38 + 1)^{-1}$ м $91.14)/(2 \cdot 186) = 0.44$

Example: alleles and phenotypes (continued) Step 1: initial genotype numbers: $n_{aA} = n_{AA} =$ Е 148/2 = 74.00Step 2: find MLE for those numbers: $\theta = (2 \cdot 38 +$ **M** $74.00)/(2 \cdot 186) = 0.40$ Step 3: for $\theta = 0.40$, find genotype frequencies: for *aA*: $2 \cdot 0.40 \cdot (1 - 0.40) = 0.48$ and for AA: $(1 - 0.40)^2 = 0.36$, Ε and for them, genotype numbers: $n_{aA} = 186 \cdot 0.48 =$ 89.28, $n_{AA} = 148 - 89.28 = 58.72$ Step 4: find MLE for those numbers: $\theta = (2 \cdot 38 +$ Μ $89.28)/(2 \cdot 186) = 0.44$ Step 5: for $\theta = 0.44$, find genotype frequencies: for aA: $2 \cdot 0.44 \cdot (1 - 0.44) = 0.49$ and for AA: $(1 - 0.44)^2 = 0.31$ Ε and genotype numbers: $n_{aA} = 186 \cdot 0.49 = 91.14$, $n_{AA} = 148 - 91.14 = 56.86$ Step 6: find MLE for those numbers: $\theta = (2 \cdot 38 + 1)^{-1}$ М $91.14)/(2 \cdot 186) = 0.44$ ・ロト・日本・モート モー うへぐ Stop!

Advantages

 Reduces MLE problem to another more manageable (MLE) problem.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

- Agrees with results obtained by other means.
- Works on practice.

Advantages

 Reduces MLE problem to another more manageable (MLE) problem.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- Agrees with results obtained by other means.
- Works on practice.

Disadvantages

No theoretical justification.

Associations studies

nemo by Daníel Gudbjartsson.

Typical input data: list of affected and unaffected individuals, list of markers (e.g. SNPs), list of genotypes (per marker and per individual).

Associations studies

nemo by Daníel Gudbjartsson.

Typical input data: list of affected and unaffected individuals, list of markers (e.g. SNPs), list of genotypes (per marker and per individual).

Haplotypes inference from genotypes

Maximum parsimony vs. maximum likelihood.

Associations studies

nemo by Daníel Gudbjartsson.

Typical input data: list of affected and unaffected individuals, list of markers (e.g. SNPs), list of genotypes (per marker and per individual).

Haplotypes inference from genotypes

Maximum parsimony vs. maximum likelihood. Example (0,1 – homozygote, 2 – heterozygote): genotypes: 2120 2102 1221

Associations studies

nemo by Daníel Gudbjartsson.

Typical input data: list of affected and unaffected individuals, list of markers (e.g. SNPs), list of genotypes (per marker and per individual).

Haplotypes inference from genotypes

Maximum parsimony vs. maximum likelihood.Example (0,1 - homozygote, 2 - heterozygote):
genotypes:2120
21020100 + 1110
0100 + 1101
1010 + 110112211011 + 1101

That's all.

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

Slides at http://justpasha.org/tmp/presentation.pdf .