

1 K-nearest Neighbor (40pts)

I. What is the role of the number of training instances to accuracy (hint: try different “--limit” and plot accuracy vs. number of training instances)?

The larger the number of training instances are, the higher accuracy can be. When the number of training instances are 500, the accuracy is 83.11%. And when the training instances up to 5000, the accuracy increases to 94.01%. Furthermore, if you use all training set to train the model, the accuracy will be 97.27%. (All data based on $k = 3$)

II. What numbers get confused with each other most easily?

```
chenqis-MacBook-Pro:hw1 chenchi$ python knn.py
<__main__.Numbers object at 0x110734f60>
Done loading data
      0      1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8      9
-----
0:    984      0      2      0      0      0      2      0      1      2
1:      0    1060      1      0      1      0      1      1      0      0
2:      4      8     953      2      1      1      1      19      1      0
3:      0      0      7    1002      0      8      1      3      6      3
4:      0     11      0      0     951      0      0      2      0     19
5:      2      0      2     20      1    869     15      2      1      3
6:      1      1      0      0      0      1     964      0      0      0
7:      0     10      0      0      3      0      0    1071      0      6
8:      6      8      3     10      4     16      4      4     947      7
9:      3      3      1     10     14      3      0      6      2    919
Accuracy: 0.972000
```

Based on the result above, the most easily numbers to get confused are set (2,7) and set (4,9) .

III. What is the role of k to training accuracy?

	Limit = 500	Limit = 5000
k = 1	84.58%	93.88%
k = 3	83.11%	94.01%
k = 5	79.95%	93.29%
k = 7	79.63%	93.03%

Since the difference of size of data set, the best k will be different too. It's hard to say the large k will be better or the smaller k will be better in this set. But when the

data set is getting bigger, the best k will be a little bit larger too. The small k will cause the overfitting.

IV. In general, does a small value for k cause “overfitting” or “underfitting”?

In general, if the data set is large enough, a small k will cause “overfitting”, because it took only one nearest data as itself’s label. The bias will be low but the variance will be high.

2 Cross Validation (30pts)

I. What is the best k chosen from 5-fold cross validation with “--limit 500”?

The best k chosen from 5-fold cross validation with “—limit 500” is 3.

II. What is the best k chosen from 5-fold cross validation “--limit 5000”?

The best k chosen from 5-fold cross validation with “—limit 5000” is 1.

III. Is the best k consistent with the best performance k in problem 1?

No, the best k didn’t consistent with the best performance k with only KNN. The best k for “—limit 500” with only KNN is 1 but the best k with KNN and CV is 3. And The best k for “—limit 5000” with only KNN is 3 but the best k with KNN and CV is 1.

3 Bias-variance tradeoff (20pts)

Derive the bias-variance decomposition for k -NN regression in class. Specifically, assuming the training set is fixed $S = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)\}$, where the data are generated from the following process $y = f(x) + \epsilon$, $E(\epsilon) = 0$, $\text{Var}(\epsilon) = \sigma_\epsilon^2$. k -NN regression algorithm predict the value for x_0 as $h_S(x_0) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=1}^k y_{(l)}$, where $x_{(l)}$ is the l -th nearest neighbor to x_0 . $\text{Err}(x_0)$ is defined as $E((y_0 - h_S(x_0))^2)$.

Prove that

$$\text{Err}(x_0) = \sigma_\epsilon^2 + \left[f(x_0) - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=1}^k f(x_{(l)}) \right]^2 + \frac{\sigma_\epsilon^2}{k}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
Err(x_0) &= E((y_0 - h_s(x_0))^2) \\
&= \sigma_\varepsilon^2 + [Eh(x_0) - f(x_0)]^2 + E[h(x_0) - Eh(x_0)]^2 \\
&= \sigma_\varepsilon^2 + [f(x_0) - Eh(x_0)]^2 + Var(h(x_0)) \\
&= \sigma_\varepsilon^2 + [f(x_0) - E \frac{1}{k} \sum_l y(l)]^2 + Var(\frac{1}{k} \sum_l y(l)) \\
&= \sigma_\varepsilon^2 + [f(x_0) - E \frac{1}{k} \sum_l (f(x_{(l)}) + \varepsilon)]^2 + Var(\frac{1}{k} \sum_l (f(x_{(l)}) + \varepsilon)) \\
&= \sigma_\varepsilon^2 + [f(x_0) - E \frac{1}{k} \sum_l (f(x_{(l)})) + E \frac{1}{k} \sum_l (\varepsilon)]^2 + Var(\frac{1}{k} \sum_l (f(x_{(l)})) + \frac{1}{k} \sum_l (\varepsilon)) \\
&= \sigma_\varepsilon^2 + [f(x_0) - E \frac{1}{k} \sum_l (f(x_{(l)})) + 0]^2 + Var(0 + \frac{1}{k} \sum_l (\varepsilon)) \\
&= \sigma_\varepsilon^2 + [f(x_0) - \frac{1}{k} \sum_l E(f(x_{(l)}))]^2 + \frac{1}{k^2} \sum_l Var(\varepsilon) \\
&= \sigma_\varepsilon^2 + [f(x_0) - \frac{1}{k} \sum_l (f(x_{(l)}))]^2 + \frac{1}{k} \sigma_\varepsilon^2
\end{aligned}$$