Appendix: Worst-case Optimal Submodular Extensions for Marginal Estimation

1 Proofs for Potts Model Extension

Remark 1 We show using induction over the number of variables that with 1-of-L encoding for Potts,

$$\sum_{A \in \mathcal{M}} \exp(-s(A)) = \prod_{a=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{L} \exp(-s_{ai}).$$
(1)

Proof. Let t be the number of variables, V^t be the corresponding ground set and \mathcal{M}^t be the sets corresponding to valid labelings. Equation (1) clearly holds for t = 1.

Let us assume that the relation holds for t = N, that is,

$$\sum_{A^{N} \in \mathcal{M}^{N}} \exp(-s(A^{N})) = \prod_{a=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{L} \exp(-s_{ai})$$
(2)

For t = N + 1,

$$\sum_{A^{N+1} \in \mathcal{M}^{N+1}} \exp(-s(A^{N+1})) = \sum_{i=1}^{L} \sum_{A^N \in \mathcal{M}^N} \exp(-s(A^N) - s_{N+1,i})$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{L} \exp(-s_{N+1,i}) \sum_{A^N \in \mathcal{M}^N} \exp(-s(A^N))$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{L} \exp(-s_{N+1,i}) \prod_{a=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{L} \exp(-s_{ai})$$
$$= \prod_{a=1}^{N+1} \sum_{i=1}^{L} \exp(-s_{ai})$$
(3)

Remark 2 Given any submodular extension F(.) of a Potts energy function E(.), its Lovasz extension f(.) defines an LP relaxation of the MAP problem for E(.) as

$$\min_{\mathbf{y}\in\Delta} f(\mathbf{y}).\tag{4}$$

Proof. By definition of a submodular extension and the Lovasz extension, $E(\mathbf{x}) = F(A_{\mathbf{x}}) = f(1_{A_{\mathbf{x}}})$ for all valid labelings \mathbf{x} . Also, from property 1, $f(\mathbf{y})$ is maximum of linear functions. Hence, $f(\mathbf{y})$ is a piecewise linear relaxation of $E(\mathbf{x})$.

The domain Δ is a polytope formed by union of N probability simplices

$$\Delta = \{ \mathbf{y}_a \in \mathbb{R}^L | \mathbf{y}_a \succeq 0 \text{ and } \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{y}_a \rangle = 1 \}$$
(5)

With objective as maximum of linear functions and domain as a polytope, we have an LP relaxation of the corresponding MAP problem. $\hfill \Box$

Proposition 1. In the limit $T \rightarrow 0$, the following problem for Potts energies

$$\min_{\mathbf{s}\in EP(F)} \quad g_T(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{a=1}^N T \cdot \log \sum_{i=1}^L \exp(-\frac{s_{ai}}{T}).$$
(6)

becomes

$$-\min_{\mathbf{y}\in\Delta} f(\mathbf{y}). \tag{7}$$

Proof. In the limit of $T \to 0$, we can rewrite the above problem as

$$\min_{\mathbf{s}\in EP(F)} \quad \sum_{a=1}^{N} \max_{i}(-s_{ai}). \tag{8}$$

In vector form, the problem becomes

$$\min_{\mathbf{s}\in EP(F)} \max_{\mathbf{y}\in\Delta} -\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{s} \rangle \tag{9}$$

$$= -\max_{\mathbf{s}\in EP(F)} \min_{\mathbf{y}\in\Delta} \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{s} \rangle$$
(10)

 Δ is the union of N probability simplices:

$$\Delta = \{ \mathbf{y}_a \in \mathbb{R}^L | \mathbf{y}_a \succeq 0 \text{ and } \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{y}_a \rangle = 1 \}$$
(11)

where \mathbf{y}_a is the component of \mathbf{y} corresponding to the *a*-th variable. By the minimax theorem for LP, we can reorder the terms:

$$-\min_{\mathbf{y}\in\Delta}\max_{\mathbf{s}\in EP(F)}\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{s}\rangle$$
(12)

Recall that $\max_{\mathbf{s}\in EP(F)} \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{s} \rangle$ is the value of the Lovasz extension of F at \mathbf{y} , that is, $f(\mathbf{y})$. Hence, as $T \to 0$, the marginal inference problem converts to minimising the Lovasz extension under the simplices constraint:

$$-\min_{\mathbf{y}\in\Delta}f(\mathbf{y})\tag{13}$$

Proposition 2. The objective function $E(\mathbf{y})$ of the LP relaxation (P-LP) is the Lovasz extension of $F_{Potts}(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{L} F_i(A)$, where

$$F_{i}(A) = \sum_{a} \phi_{a}(i)[|A \cap \{v_{ai}\}| = 1] + \sum_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{w_{ab}}{2} \cdot [|A \cap \{v_{ai}, v_{bi}\}| = 1].$$
(14)

Proof. Since F_{Potts} is sum of Ising models F_i , we first focus on a particular label i and then generalize. Consider a graph with only two variables X_a and X_b with an edge between them. The ground set in this case is $\{v_{ai}, v_{bi}\}$. Let the corresponding relaxed indicator variables be $\mathbf{y} = \{y_{aj}, y_{bj}\}$, such that $y_{ai}, y_{bi} \in [0, 1]$ and assume $y_{ai} > y_{bi}$. The Lovasz extension is:

$$f(\mathbf{y}) = y_{ai} \cdot [F_i(\{v_{ai}\}) - F_i(\{\})] + y_{bi} \cdot [F_i(\{v_{ai}, v_{bi}\}) - F_i(\{v_{ai}\})]$$

= $y_{ai} \cdot [\left(\phi_a(j) + \frac{w_{ab}}{2}\right) - 0] + y_{bi} \cdot [(\phi_a(j) + \phi_b(j)) - \left(\phi_a(j) + \frac{w_{ab}}{2}\right)]$
= $\phi_a(j) \cdot y_{ai} + \phi_b(j) \cdot y_{bi} + \frac{w_{ab}}{2} \cdot (y_{ai} - y_{bi})$ (15)

In general for both orderings of y_{ab} and y_{bi} , we can write

$$f(\mathbf{y}) = \phi_a(j) \cdot y_{ai} + \phi_b(j) \cdot y_{bi} + \frac{w_{ab}}{2} \cdot |y_{ai} - y_{bi}|$$
(16)

Extending Lovasz extension (equation (16)) to all variables and labels gives $E(\mathbf{y})$ in (P-LP). \Box

2 Proofs for Hierarchical Potts Model Extension

Transformed Tightest LP Relaxation We take (T-LP) and rewrite it using indicator variables for all labels and meta-labels. Let \mathcal{R} denote the set of all labels and meta-labels, that is, all nodes in the tree apart from the root. Also, let \mathcal{L} denote the set of labels, that is, the leaves of the tree. Let T_i denote the subtree which is rooted at the *i*-th node. We introduce an indicator variable $z_{ai} \in \{0, 1\}$, where

$$z_{ai} = \begin{cases} y_{ai} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{L} \\ y_a(T_i) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{R} - \mathcal{L} \end{cases}$$
(17)

We need to extend the definition of unary potentials to the expanded label space as follows:

where
$$\phi_a'(i) = \begin{cases} \phi_a(i) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{L} \\ 0 & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{R} - L \end{cases}$$
 (18)

We can now rewrite problem (T-LP) in terms of new indicator variables z_{ai} :

(T-LP-FULL)
$$\min \widetilde{E}(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{X}} \phi'_a(i) \cdot z_{ai} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \sum_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{N}} w_{ab} \cdot l_{T_i} \cdot |z_{ai} - z_{bi}|$$

such that $\mathbf{z} \in \Delta'$ (19)

where Δ' is the convex hull of the vectors satisfying

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} z_{ai} = 1, \ z_{ai} \in \{0, 1\} \ \forall a \in \mathcal{X}, i \in \mathcal{L}$$

$$(20)$$

and
$$z_{ai} = \sum_{j \in L(T_i)} z_{aj}$$
. $\forall a \in \mathcal{X}, i \in \mathcal{R} - \mathcal{L}$ (21)

Constraint (21) ensures consistency among labels and meta-labels, that is, if a label is assigned then all the meta-labels which lie on the path from the root to the label should be assigned as well. We are now going to identify a suitable set encoding and the worst-case optimal submodular extension using (T-LP-FULL).

Remark 3 Given any submodular extension F(.) of a hierarchical Potts energy function E(.), its Lovasz extension defines an LP relaxation of the corresponding MAP estimation problem as

$$\min_{\mathbf{z}\in\Delta'} f(\mathbf{z}). \tag{22}$$

Proof. By definition of a submodular extension and the Lovasz extension, $E(\mathbf{x}) = F(A_{\mathbf{x}}) = f(1_{A_{\mathbf{x}}})$ for all valid labelings \mathbf{x} . Also, from property 1, $f(\mathbf{y})$ is maximum of linear functions. Hence, $f(\mathbf{y})$ is a piecewise linear relaxation of $E(\mathbf{x})$.

We can write the domain Δ' as

$$\Delta' = \{ \mathbf{y}_a \in \mathbb{R}^M | \mathbf{y}_a \succeq 0, \ \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{y}_a^{label} \rangle = 1, \ \mathbf{y}_a(p_{ai}) = \mathbf{1} \text{ or } \mathbf{y}_a(p_{ai}) = \mathbf{0} \forall i \in [1, L] \}$$
(23)

where \mathbf{y}_a is the component of \mathbf{y} corresponding to the *a*-th variable, \mathbf{y}_a^{label} is the component of \mathbf{y}_a corresponding to the *L* labels, and $\mathbf{y}_a(p_{ai})$ is the component of \mathbf{y}_a corresponding to the elements of p_{ai} .

Since Δ' is defined by linear equalities and inequalities, it is a polytope. With objective as maximum of linear functions and domain as a polytope, we have an LP relaxation of the corresponding MAP problem.

Proposition 3. In the limit $T \rightarrow 0$, the following problem for hierarchical Potts energies

$$\min_{\mathbf{s}\in EP(F)} \quad g_T(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{a=1}^N T \cdot \log \sum_{i=1}^L \exp(-\frac{s'_{ai}}{T}).$$
(24)

becomes:

$$-\min_{\mathbf{z}\in\Delta'}f(\mathbf{z}).$$
(25)

Proof. In the limit of $T \to 0$, we can rewrite the above problem as

$$\min_{\mathbf{s}\in EP(F)} \quad \sum_{a=1}^{N} \max_{i}(-s'_{ai}). \tag{26}$$

In vector form, the problem becomes

$$\min_{\mathbf{s}\in EP(F)} \max_{\mathbf{z}\in\Delta} -\langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{s}' \rangle$$
(27)

$$= -\max_{\mathbf{s}\in EP(F)} \min_{\mathbf{z}\in\Delta} \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{s}' \rangle$$
(28)

where
$$\Delta = \{ \mathbf{z}_a \in \mathbb{R}^L | \mathbf{z}_a \succeq 0 \text{ and } \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{z}_a \rangle = 1 \}$$
 (29)

where \mathbf{z}_a is the component of \mathbf{z} corresponding to the *a*-th variable. We can unpack \mathbf{s}' using

$$s'_{ai} = \sum_{t \in p_{ai}} s_t. \tag{30}$$

and rewrite problem (28) as

$$-\max_{\mathbf{s}\in EP(F)}\min_{\mathbf{y}\in\Delta'}\langle\mathbf{y},\mathbf{s}\rangle\tag{31}$$

The new constraint set Δ' ensures that the binary entries of labels and meta-labels is consistent:

where
$$\Delta' = \{ \mathbf{y}_a \in \mathbb{R}^M | \mathbf{y}_a \succeq 0, \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{y}_a^{label} \rangle = 1,$$

 $\mathbf{y}_a(p_{ai}) = \mathbf{1} \text{ or } \mathbf{y}_a(p_{ai}) = \mathbf{0} \forall i \in [1, L] \}$
(32)

where \mathbf{y}_a is the component of \mathbf{y} corresponding to the *a*-th variable, \mathbf{y}_a^{label} is the component of \mathbf{y}_a corresponding to the *L* labels, and $\mathbf{y}_a(p_{ai})$ is the component of \mathbf{y}_a corresponding to the elements of p_{ai} .

By the minimax theorem for LP, we can reorder the terms:

$$-\min_{\mathbf{y}\in\Delta'}\max_{\mathbf{s}\in EP(F)}\langle\mathbf{y},\mathbf{s}\rangle\tag{33}$$

Recall that $\max_{\mathbf{s}\in EP(F)}\langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{s} \rangle$ is the value of the Lovasz extension of F at \mathbf{y} , that is, $f(\mathbf{y})$. Hence, as $T \to 0$, the marginal inference problem converts to minimising the Lovasz extension under the constraints Δ' :

$$-\min_{\mathbf{y}\in\Delta'}f(\mathbf{y}).\tag{34}$$

Proposition 4. The objective function $\widetilde{E}(\mathbf{z})$ of (T-LP-FULL) is the Lovasz extension of $F_{r-HST}(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} F_i(A)$, where

$$F_{i}(A) = \sum_{a} \phi_{a}'(i)[|A \cap \{v_{ai}\}| = 1] + \sum_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{N}} w_{ab} \cdot l_{T_{i}} \cdot [|A \cap \{v_{ai}, v_{bi}\}| = 1].$$
(35)

Proof. We observe that F_{r-HST} is of exactly the same form as F_{Potts} , except that the Ising models F_i are defined over not just labels, but meta-labels as well. Using the same logic as in the proof of proposition 2, each F_i is the Lovasz extension of

$$\widetilde{E}_{i}(\mathbf{z}) = \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{X}} \phi_{a}'(i) \cdot z_{ai} + \sum_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{N}} w_{ab} \cdot l_{T_{i}} \cdot |z_{ai} - z_{bi}|\right)$$
(36)

and the results follows.

Proposition 5. Computing the subgradient of $E(\mathbf{y})$ in (P-LP) is equivalent to computing the conditional gradient for the submodular function F_{Potts} .

 $\mathit{Proof.}\,$ Due to Edmond's greedy algorithm, the Lovasz extension f of a given submodular function can be written as

$$f(\mathbf{y}) = \max_{\mathbf{s} \in EP(F)} \mathbf{y}^T \cdot \mathbf{s}$$
(37)

Hence, $f(\mathbf{y})$ is the pointwise maximum of linear functions. The subdifferential of $f(\mathbf{y})$ at \mathbf{y}_0 is the differential of the 'active' linear function at \mathbf{y}_0 . Hence,

$$\partial f(\mathbf{y}) = \underset{\mathbf{s} \in EP(F)}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathbf{y}^T \cdot \mathbf{s}$$
(38)

This is exactly the computation of conditional gradient, and hence we have proved the equivalence. $\hfill \square$