

Problem 3.2

So we first need to prove that matrix $\Psi = \Phi(\Phi^\top \Phi)^{-1}\Phi^\top$ projects any N-dimensional vector v onto the subspace spanned by M columns of Φ (lets denote this subspace as $S(\Phi)$). Here we just assume $(\Phi^\top \Phi)^{-1}$ exists (i.e. $\Phi^\top \Phi$ is invertible) since it is a part of the definition of the matrix given in the problem condition.

Let us consider any N-dimensional vector v . We need to prove that there exist $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_M \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Psi v = \alpha_1 \varphi_1(D) + \dots + \alpha_M \varphi_M(D)$. If we denote $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_M)^\top$, then we need to prove there exists M-dimensional vector α such that $\Phi \cdot \alpha = \Psi v$. We notice now that $\alpha = (\Phi^\top \Phi)^{-1}\Phi^\top v$ is the very vector we are looking for, so it exists, so we proved that Ψ indeed projects v onto the subspace of columns of Φ .

Lets us now consider $w_{ML} = (\Phi^\top \Phi)^{-1}\Phi^\top t$. We need to prove $y = \Phi w_{ML}$ is an orthogonal projection of t onto the subspace of columns of Φ . This means, we need to prove $y - t \perp S(\Phi)$. This is the same as proving that $\Phi(\Phi^\top \Phi)^{-1}\Phi^\top t - t \perp S(\Phi)$.

Consider left part of the statement and multiply it by Φ^\top . This gives us $\Phi^\top(\Phi(\Phi^\top \Phi)^{-1}\Phi^\top t - t) = (\Phi^\top \Phi)(\Phi^\top \Phi)^{-1}\Phi^\top t - \Phi^\top t = 0$. So, we see that all the columns of Φ are orthogonal with $\Phi(\Phi^\top \Phi)^{-1}\Phi^\top t - t$, which means $\Phi(\Phi^\top \Phi)^{-1}\Phi^\top t$ is an orthogonal projection of t onto $S(\Phi)$.

Problem 3.3

Since w^* is extremum, we can equate E_D gradient to zero:

$$\nabla E_D = - \sum_{n=1}^N r_n (t_n - w^\top \varphi(x_n)) \varphi^\top(x_n) = 0 \quad (1)$$

Let us consider $R = \begin{pmatrix} r_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & r_2 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & r_n \end{pmatrix}$

We can rewrite equation 1 in the following way:

$$\nabla E_D = -\Phi^\top R t + \Phi^\top R \Phi w = 0 \quad (2)$$

Thus we obtain

$$w^* = (\Phi^\top R \Phi)^{-1} \Phi^\top R t \quad (3)$$

We can consider the matrix R , on the one hand, as inverse data-dependent noise variance: different x_i will have different correspondent r_i , and the smaller r_i is, the smaller is the impact of i_{th} sample. So, r_i can be used as our confidence in the t_i value.

On the other hand, at least when r_i is integer, it can be considered as the number of times sample (x_i, t_i) was present in the dataset.

Problem 3.4

Let us average error function over all possible noise values, i.e. let us compute it's expected value with respect to added noise $\{\epsilon_i\}$. Lets us denote $x'_n = x_n + \epsilon_n$ - input variable with added noise.

$$E[E_D] = E\left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \{y(x'_n, w) - t_n\}^2\right] = \quad (4)$$

$$= E\left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \left\{w_0 + \sum_{i=1}^D w_i(x_{ni} + \epsilon_{ni}) - t_n\right\}^2\right] = \quad (5)$$

$$= E\left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \left\{w_0 + \sum_{i=1}^D w_i(x_{ni} + \epsilon_{ni}) - t_n\right\}\right] = \quad (6)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N E\left[\left\{w_0 - t_n + \sum_{i=1}^D w_i(x_{ni} + \epsilon_{ni})\right\}^2\right] = \quad (7)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N E\left[(w_0 - t_n)^2 + (w_0 - t_n) \sum_{i=1}^D w_i(x_{ni} + \epsilon_{ni}) + \sum_{i,j=1}^D w_i w_j (x_{ni} + \epsilon_{ni})(x_{nj} + \epsilon_{nj})\right] = \quad (8)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \left\{(w_0 - t_n)^2 + (w_0 - t_n) \sum_{i=1}^D w_i x_{ni} + \sum_{i,j=1}^D w_i w_j (x_{ni} x_{nj} + \delta_{ij} \sigma^2)\right\} = \quad (9)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \{y(x_n, w) - t_n\}^2 + \frac{N\sigma^2}{2} w^\top w \quad (10)$$

So, as expected, we see that error function, averaged over noise values, gives us weight-decayed sum-of-squares error function over noise-free input variables with omitted bias in regularization term, so minimizing the latter gives the same result as minimizing the former.

Problem 3.5

Suppose we want to minimize $E_D(w)$ subject to $\sum_{j=1}^M |w_j|^q \leq \eta$. This is equivalent to minimizing Lagrange function $L(w, \lambda) = E_D(w) + \lambda' \left(\sum_{j=1}^M (|w_j|^q - \eta)\right)$ under conditions that $\lambda' \geq 0$, $\sum_{j=1}^M |w_j|^q \leq \eta$ and $\lambda' \left(\sum_{j=1}^M |w_j|^q - \eta\right) = 0$. When we use regularization, we suppose we only vary $\{w_j\}$ while keeping λ fixed. So we can substitute $\lambda' = \frac{\lambda}{2}$ and pay no attention to η since it is constant, and try to minimize the Lagrangian which now takes form of $E_D(w) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^M (|w_j|^q)\right)$, and this is exactly the regularized least squares error function.

To find the dependence between η and w we note that for optimal solution $\{w_j^*\}$ we have $\eta = \sum_{j=1}^M (|w_j^*|^q)$.

As of dependence between η and λ we can see that the greater λ is, the more is regularization effect and so the less will be η .

Problem 3.6

This problem looks simple, but in fact to understand it deeply one need to perform certain actions. First of all, we will write down the log-likelihood of the dataset with given W :

$$L(D) = \prod_{n=1}^N (2\pi)^{-\frac{k}{2}} |\Sigma|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} (t_n - W^\top \varphi(X_n))^\top \Sigma^{-1} (t_n - W^\top \varphi(X_n))\right) \quad (11)$$

$$\log L(D) = -\frac{kN}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{N}{2} |\Sigma| - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N (t_n - W^\top \varphi(X_n))^\top \Sigma^{-1} (t_n - W^\top \varphi(X_n)) \quad (12)$$

We now want to find the maximum of the log-likelihood with respect to W to find W_{ML} . To achieve this, we will use matrix derivatives notation (see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Matrix_calculus)

In fact, we see that taking derivative of scalar with respect to matrix gives us a matrix of the same size:

$$\frac{\partial \log L(D)}{\partial W} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \log L(D)}{\partial W_{11}} & \frac{\partial \log L(D)}{\partial W_{12}} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \log L(D)}{\partial W_{1K}} \\ \frac{\partial \log L(D)}{\partial W_{21}} & \frac{\partial \log L(D)}{\partial W_{22}} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \log L(D)}{\partial W_{2K}} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \frac{\partial \log L(D)}{\partial W_{M1}} & \frac{\partial \log L(D)}{\partial W_{M2}} & \cdots & \frac{\partial \log L(D)}{\partial W_{MK}} \end{pmatrix}$$

To get the work done, we first prove following identity:

$$\frac{\partial (Xa + b)^\top C (Xa + b)}{\partial X} = (C + C^\top)(Xa + b)a^\top \quad (13)$$

Here, C is a square matrix of some size $N \times N$, b is a vector of size N , a is a vector of size M , and X is $M \times N$ matrix.

To prove it, let's use write down the numerator in non-matrix form:

$$(Xa + b)^\top C (Xa + b) = \sum_{l=1}^N \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \left(\sum_{\beta=1}^M X_{l\beta} a_\beta + b_l \right) C_{kl} \right) \left(\sum_{\gamma=1}^N X_{k\gamma} a_\gamma + b_k \right) \quad (14)$$

Taking now derivative of this with respect to X_{ij} we get:

$$\frac{\partial (Xa + b)^\top C (Xa + b)}{\partial X_{ij}} = \sum_{k=1}^N a_j C_{ki} (X_k a + b_k) + \sum_{l=1}^N (X_l a + b_l) C_{il} a_j = \quad (15)$$

$$= a_j [C^{i^\top} (Xa + b) + (Xa + b)^\top C_i] = \quad (16)$$

$$= (C + C^\top)_i (Xa + b) a_j \quad (17)$$

So, we see that $\frac{\partial (Xa+b)^\top C (Xa+b)}{\partial X} = (C + C^\top)(Xa + b)a^\top$.

Now, returning to the original problem, we have

$$\frac{\partial \log L(D)}{\partial W} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N (\Sigma^{-1} + \Sigma^{-1^\top}) (t_n - W^\top \varphi(X_n)) \varphi(X_n)^\top = \quad (18)$$

$$= \Sigma^{-1} (T^\top - W^\top \Phi^\top) \Phi = 0 \quad (19)$$

Just a reminder, T is a $N \times K$ matrix, $\Phi(X)$ is a $N \times M$ matrix, and W is $M \times K$ matrix.

So assigning this to 0 and reducing Σ^{-1} we get $T^\top \Phi = W_{ML}^\top \Phi^\top \Phi$ and so $W_{ML} = (\Phi^\top \Phi)^{-1} \Phi^\top T$ which shows us that indeed i -th column of W_{ML} has the same well known form of $W_{ML_i} = (\Phi^\top \Phi)^{-1} \Phi^\top t_i$ and W_{ML} is independent of Σ .

Now let us consider

$$\frac{\partial \log L(D)}{\partial \Sigma^{-1}} = -\frac{N}{2} \frac{\partial \log |\Sigma|}{\partial \Sigma^{-1}} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N (t_n - W_{ML}^\top \varphi(X_n)) (t_n - W_{ML}^\top \varphi(X_n))^\top = \quad (20)$$

$$= \frac{N}{2} \Sigma - \frac{1}{2} (T^\top - W^\top \Phi^\top) (T^\top - W^\top \Phi^\top)^\top \quad (21)$$

So we obtain $\Sigma = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N (t_n - W_{ML}^\top \varphi(X_n))(t_n - W_{ML}^\top \varphi(X_n))^\top$.

Problem 8.1

The idea is to start integrating from x_K down to x_1 . Since there is just one factor containing x_K , which is $p(x_K|pa_K)$ we can easily integrate it with respect to x_K and we obviously get 1. After that, we get a reduced problem with $K - 1$ factors, and by the same logic we can integrate sequentially with respect to $x_{K-1} \dots x_1$. On every step, we get a 1 factor after integration, so in the end we will get 1, which means the distribution is normalized.