



COMPUTER SCIENCE

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

School of Informatics and Computing
Bloomington

Generalized linear models



Reminders/Comments

- Thought questions due today
- Notations file updates
 - e.g., $\exp(-x)$ is e^{-x}
- Look at date in notes to know when updated



Summary so far

- From chapters 1 and 2, obtained tools needed to talk about uncertainty/noise underlying machine learning
 - capture uncertainty about data/observations using probabilities
 - formalize estimation problem for distributions
- Identify variables x_1, \dots, x_d
 - e.g. observed features, observed targets
- Pick the desired distribution
 - e.g. $p(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ or $p(x_1 \mid x_2, \dots, x_d)$ (conditional distribution)
 - e.g. $p(x_i)$ is Poisson or $p(y \mid x_1, \dots, x_d)$ is Gaussian
- Perform parameter estimation for chosen distribution
 - e.g., estimate λ for Poisson
 - e.g. estimate μ and σ for Gaussian



Summary so far (2)

- For prediction problems, which is much of machine learning, first discuss
 - the types of data we get (i.e., features and types of targets)
 - the costs associated with incorrect predictions
 - specify the desire to minimize expected cost of incorrect predictions
- Starting from this general problem specification, it is useful to use our parameter estimation techniques to solve this problem
 - e.g., specify $Y = Xw + \text{noise}$, estimate $\mu = xw$
- Underlying assumptions
 - iid data, so log of likelihood splits up into sum
 - potentially other assumptions (like noise is independent of features)



Summary so far (3)

- Discussed notion of the “optimal” thing to do
 - this section on Bayes optimal was mostly to give intuition about how this might be formalized; if it is confusing you, it did not have its intended purpose and you can mostly ignore it as you will not be tested on it
- Optimal if we can specify individual values for each x
 - this would never be possible in practice, unless x is discrete and small
- Optimality if have a restricted class of functions
 - e.g., $\mathcal{F} = \{f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{w} \text{ for } \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$
 - implicitly, we think of this set as $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$
 - clearly for this set, cannot specify $f(x)$ individual, as tied by w
- For now, we will not try to weight over all functions in F ; we are going to pick a point estimate (which corresponds to MAP)



Summary so far (4)

- For regression setting, modeling $p(y|x)$ as a Gaussian with $\mu = \langle x, w \rangle$ and a constant sigma
- Perform point-estimation (maximum likelihood and MAP) to get weights w (rather than weighting across multiple “good” w)
- For linear regression, parametrized $\mu = f(x) = \langle x, w \rangle$
- Possible question: why all this machinery to get to linear regression?
 - one answer: makes our assumptions about uncertainty more clear
 - another answer: gives us nice (convex) optimizations (we’ll see this now)



Example: linear regression

- For the Gaussian distribution, why did we parametrize μ with $f(x) = xw$ a linear function, in $p(y | x)$?
- What if we picked a different function? e.g., polynomial, sigmoid, neural network, or generally any non-linear function
- If we picked a constant function (like sine), no parameters to learn, expert has specified $\mu = \sin(x)$
 - this seems like a poor choice, let's not do this
- Otherwise, imagine f is some generic non-linear function parameterized by w (not necessarily linear)
- How do we get the MAP estimate?
 - using knowledge of models makes optimization specification easier



Example: regularization and bias

- Remember that we picked a prior (Gaussian or Laplace) and obtained (l2 or l1) regularization

- We discussed the bias of this regularization

- no regularization was unbiased $E[w^*] = \text{true } w$
- with regularization meant $E[w^*]$ was not equal to the true w

$$\mathbb{E}[(w^* - w_{\text{true}})^2] = \text{Bias}(w^*, w_{\text{true}})^2 + \text{Variance}(w^*)$$

- Previously, however, mentioned that MAP and ML converge to the same estimate
- Does that happen here?



Whiteboard

- Generalized linear models
 - Poisson regression
 - Logistic regression (intro)
 - General exponential family models