Using probabilistic couplings in data analysis

Víctor H. Cervantes¹, Ehtibar N. Dzhafarov²

Purdue University ¹cervantv@purdue.edu ²ehtibar@purdue.edu

Quantum Contextuality in Quantum Mechanics and Beyond Prague May 19, 2019

Stochastically unrelated random variables

- Consider a coin flipped n₁ times here and another coin flipped n₂ times in the USA.
- The number of head of these coins may be represented by random variables X₁ ~ Binomial(n₁, p₁) and X₂ ~ Binomial(n₁, p₂).

Stochastically unrelated random variables

- Random variables X₁ and X₂ are generally taken as independent random variables.
- There is no logical justification for this.
- We investigated a more principled approach: using all possible couplings and choosing one that is optimal in accordance with certain criteria.
- We did this for the case where both X_1 and X_2 have the same n.

Stochastically unrelated random variables Bell inequalities

• Note that in the usual Alice-Bob setting, the situation is similar when considering each pair of measurements performed by Alice with varying choices of Bob, and vice versa.

Couplings

- A coupling of a pair of random variables $\{X, Y\}$ is a random variable $(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y})$ (with jointly distributed components), such that $\widetilde{X} \stackrel{d}{=} X$, $\widetilde{Y} \stackrel{d}{=} Y$, where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ stands for "has the same distribution as."
- A coupling always exists, generally non-uniquely.

Optimal Coupling

• We applied the maximum likelihood meaning of optimality to the task of identifying and comparing two probabilities from two stochastically unrelated sets of binary events.

- Let X₁ ~ Binomial(n, p₁) and X₂ ~ Binomial(n, p₂) be two stochastically unrelated random variables for a given number of observations n.
- Let $Z = (Z_1, Z_2)$ be a coupling of X_1 and X_2

• Z is a random 2 × 2 matrix whose cells follow a multinomial distribution with parameters $(n, \theta_{11}, \theta_{12}, \theta_{21}, \theta_{22})$ such that $\theta_{11} + \theta_{12} = p_1$ and $\theta_{11} + \theta_{21} = p_2$.

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc} \theta_{11} & \theta_{12} \\ \theta_{21} & \theta_{22} \end{array}\right]$$

• Z is a random 2×2 matrix whose cells follow a multinomial distribution with parameters $(n, \theta_{11}, \theta_{12}, \theta_{21}, \theta_{22})$ such that $\theta_{11} + \theta_{12} = p_1$ and $\theta_{11} + \theta_{21} = p_2$.

$$\begin{bmatrix} \theta_{11} & p_1 - \theta_{11} \\ p_2 - \theta_{11} & 1 - p_1 - p_2 + \theta_{11} \end{bmatrix}$$

• Z is a random 2×2 matrix whose cells follow a multinomial distribution with parameters $(n, \theta_{11}, \theta_{12}, \theta_{21}, \theta_{22})$ such that $\theta_{11} + \theta_{12} = p_1$ and $\theta_{11} + \theta_{21} = p_2$.

$$\begin{bmatrix} \theta_{11} & p_1 - \theta_{11} \\ p_2 - \theta_{11} & 1 - p_1 - p_2 + \theta_{11} \end{bmatrix}$$

 Given data for X₁ = x₁ and X₂ = x₂, we wish to explore the likelihood of the possible couplings Z.

Note that a realization of a coupling Z is of the following form

 $\left[\begin{array}{cc}m_{11}&m_{12}\\m_{21}&m_{22}\end{array}\right]$

where

$$\begin{split} & \mathfrak{m}_{11} + \mathfrak{m}_{12} + \mathfrak{m}_{21} + \mathfrak{m}_{22} = \mathfrak{n}, \\ & \mathfrak{m}_{11} \in \{ \mathsf{max}(\mathfrak{x}_1 + \mathfrak{x}_2 - \mathfrak{n}, 0), \dots, \mathsf{min}(\mathfrak{x}_1, \mathfrak{x}_2) \}, \\ & \mathfrak{m}_{11} + \mathfrak{m}_{12} = \mathfrak{x}_1, \\ & \mathfrak{m}_{11} + \mathfrak{m}_{21} = \mathfrak{x}_2. \end{split}$$
 $\bullet \ \mathsf{Pr}(\mathsf{Z} = \{ \mathfrak{m}_{11}, \mathfrak{m}_{12}, \mathfrak{m}_{21}, \mathfrak{m}_{22} \}) = \left(\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{m}_{11}\mathfrak{m}_{12}\mathfrak{m}_{21}\mathfrak{m}_{22}} \right) \prod_{i=1}^2 \prod_{j=1}^2 \theta_{ij}^{\mathfrak{m}_{ij}} \end{split}$

Likelihood

Thus, the likelihood is defined by

 $\mathcal{L}(\theta_{11}, p_1, p_2 | n, x_1, x_2) =$ $Pr(Z_1 = x_1, Z_2 = x_2) =$ $\sum_{m_{11} = a}^{b} Pr(Z = \{m_{11}, x_1 - m_{11}, x_2 - m_{11}, n - x_1 - x_2 + m_{11}\})$

where $a = \max(x_1 + x_2 - n, 0)$ and $b = \min(x_1, x_2)$

Maximizing the likelihood

- Given data, the likelihood can easily be maximized numerically.
- Also, by functional invariance of likelihood estimators,

$$\hat{p}_i = x_i/n, i = 1, 2$$

Maximizing the likelihood (examples)



Maximizing the likelihood (examples) $n = 20, x_1 = 12, x_2 = 15, p_1 = 0.6, p_2 = 0.75$ 0.048 -- Pivelihood arg min Independence coupling 0.040 -0.036 -0.50 0.55 0.40 0.35 0.45 0.60 θ_{11}



Testing equality of two probabilities

Likelihood

If we assume equality of proportions, the restricted likelihood becomes

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta_{11}, p|n, x_1, x_2) = \sum_{m_{11}=a}^{b} \frac{1}{2^{-(n-x_1-x_2+m_{11})}} \times \frac{n!}{m_{11}!(x_1-m_{11})!(x_2-m_{11})!(n-x_1-x_2+m_{11})!} \times \theta_{11}^{m_{11}}(2p-2\theta_{11})^{x_1+x_2-2m_{11}}(1-2p+\theta_{11})^{n-x_1-x_2+m_{11}}$$

Maximizing the likelihood (examples)

For all cases we have explored, the optimal coupling maximizing $(p,\theta_{11}),$ is given by

•
$$\hat{p} = \frac{x_1 + x_2}{2n} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{x_1}{n} + \frac{x_2}{n} \right)$$

• $\hat{\theta}_{11} = \begin{cases} \max(0, \frac{(x_1 + x_2)}{n} - 1) & (\text{minimal coupling}) \\ \min(\frac{x_1}{n}, \frac{x_2}{n}) & (\text{maximal coupling}) \end{cases}$

Maximizing the likelihood (examples)





Testing equality

$$\begin{split} & \mathsf{H}_{o}: \mathfrak{p}_{1} = \mathfrak{p}_{2} = \mathfrak{p} \\ & \mathsf{vs.} \\ & \mathsf{H}_{a}: \mathfrak{p}_{1} \neq \mathfrak{p}_{2} \\ & \hat{\lambda} = \frac{\max\{\mathcal{L}(\theta_{11}, \mathfrak{p}_{1}, \mathfrak{p}_{2} | \mathfrak{n}, x_{1}, x_{2})\}}{\max\{\mathcal{L}(\theta_{11}, \mathfrak{p} | \mathfrak{n}, x_{1}, x_{2})\}}. \end{split}$$

Testing equality

We approximate the distribution of $\hat{\lambda}$ via parametric bootstrap:

- Given n, x_1, x_2 find $\hat{\lambda}$, and $\hat{\theta}_{11}, \hat{p}$ such that $\mathcal{L}(\hat{\theta}_{11}, \hat{p}|n, x_1, x_2) = \max{\mathcal{L}(\theta_{11}, p|n, x_1, x_2)}$
- **②** For each possible sample of Z distributed with $\hat{\theta}_{11}, \hat{p}$ find $\lambda(n, z_1, z_2)$.

Testing equality (examples)

$$n = 10, \, x_1 = 1, \, x_2 = 9, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Opt} = 39.67, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Opt}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.021, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 1573.86,$$



Testing equality (examples)

$$n = 30, \, x_1 = 12, \, x_2 = 18, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Opt} = 1.83, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Opt}) = 0.362, \, \hat{\lambda}_{Ind} = 3.35, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind}) = 0.155, \, Pr(\Lambda \geq \hat{\lambda}_{Ind})$$



Closing Remarks

- Optimal couplings are readily identifiable, and the independent coupling is rarely optimal.
- Considerations of stochastical unrelatedness and couplings lead to rethink the basic assumptions of statistical analysis.
- Some conclusions may coincide between optimal and independence couplings (e.g., some point estimates).
- Decisions may not necessarily be the same: given the same data and choice of significance level, the optimal coupling leads to a more conservative test.

Thank you!