



Variable Selection

Jeff Goldsmith
Department of Biostatistics

August 23, 2018

Overview

- Linear regression
- Variable selection
- Penalties
- Grouped penalties
- Tuning parameters
- Caveats

Multiple linear regression model

- Observe data $(y_i, x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ip})$ for subjects $1, \dots, n$. Want to estimate $\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p$ in the model

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \dots + \beta_p x_{ip} + \epsilon_i; \epsilon_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} (0, \sigma^2)$$

- Assumptions: residuals have mean zero, constant variance, and are independent
- Estimate parameters using OLS

(This covers a lot of ground – general goodness of linear models, interpretation, inference, unbiasedness, diagnostics, ...)

Multiple linear regression

- Let

$$y = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad X = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x_{11} & \cdots & x_{1p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 1 & x_{n1} & \cdots & x_{np} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \beta = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_0 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_p \end{bmatrix}, \quad \epsilon = \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_1 \\ \vdots \\ \epsilon_n \end{bmatrix}$$

- Then we can write the model in a more compact form:

$$y = X\beta + \epsilon$$

Matrix notation

- Matrix notation provides a compact way to discuss regression models and related areas
- X is called the *design matrix*
- In settings where there are many predictors, specifying the design matrix is typically easier than a “formula interface”

OLS Estimation

- OLS estimate found by minimizing the RSS:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\beta}_{OLS} &= \arg \min_{\beta} [RSS(\beta)] \\
 &= \arg \min_{\beta} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j x_{i,j} \right)^2 \right] \\
 &= \arg \min_{\beta} \left[(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta)^T (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta) \right] \\
 & (= (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y})
 \end{aligned}$$

Variable selection

- Often we need to do *variable selection*
 - ▶ Sometimes $p > n$
 - ▶ Sometimes we have many variables and want to identify the “important” ones
 - ▶ Sometimes we have many variables and want to remove “unimportant” ones

Methods for variable selection

- Subset selection
 - ▶ More traditional methods
- Penalization / shrinkage
 - ▶ More recent methods

Subset selection

- Forward / backward selection
 - Best subset selection
-
- Won't speak for everyone, but I don't like these ...
 - ▶ Often not feasible
 - ▶ Can be unstable
 - ▶ Overall uncertainty is hard to assess, so inference is suspect

Penalized regression

- Trade some bias for lower variance and overall MSE
 - ▶ Can outperform OLS in some important ways
- Rather than a subset selection approach, all parameters stay in the model but we restrict their effect
- Penalize the size of the coefficients – “unimportant” variables will have their coefficients shrunk towards to zero

Ridge regression

Start with RSS and add a penalty:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\beta}_R &= \arg \min_{\beta} [RSS(\beta) + \lambda Pen(\beta)] \\
 &= \arg \min_{\beta} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j x_{i,j} \right)^2 + \lambda Pen(\beta) \right] \\
 &= \arg \min_{\beta} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j x_{i,j} \right)^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j^2 \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

Notes on ridge regression

- Not unbiased
- Lower variance than OLS
- Avoid subset selection; add tuning parameter selection
 - ▶ For “small” values of λ , $\hat{\beta}_R \approx \hat{\beta}_{OLS}$
 - ▶ For “large” values of λ , $\hat{\beta}_R \approx 0$
- Results in coefficients that are small but non-zero
- Doesn't have to penalize everything
- (Has a closed-form solution)

Standardizing predictors

- OLS estimates are scale equivariant: multiplying a predictor by a constant rescales the coefficient but leaves the model (and the fitted values) unchanged
- In contrast, ridge regression coefficient estimates can change substantially when multiplying a given predictor by a constant
 - ▶ Rescaling a predictor changes the impact in of the coefficient in the penalty
- Therefore, it is best to apply ridge regression (and other penalized methods) after standardizing the predictors, using the formula

Tuning parameters

Before considering other penalization methods, a brief digression ...

- Goal is to trade some increase in the bias of $\hat{\beta}$ for a decrease in the variance of $\hat{\beta}$
- Mean squared error formalizes this:

$$\begin{aligned}
 MSE(\hat{\beta}) &= E \left[\left(\hat{\beta} - \beta \right)^2 \right] \\
 &= E \left[\left(\hat{\beta} - E(\hat{\beta}) \right)^2 \right] + \left(E(\hat{\beta}) - \beta \right)^2 \\
 &= \text{variance}(\hat{\beta}) + \text{bias}^2(\hat{\beta})
 \end{aligned}$$

MSE for predictions

MSE for β isn't feasible in practice

- MSE for predictions is easier, and incorporates dependence on $\hat{\beta}$ through the fitted values

$$MSE(\hat{y}) = E \left[(\hat{y} - y)^2 \right]$$

- Can evaluate this using cross-validation

Cross validation


- Set aside some subset of the data as a “test” data set
- Use remaining data to “train” the model (i.e. estimate parameters $\hat{\beta}_R$)
- Compute $E(\hat{y}_{i,\lambda} - y_i)^2$ across all i in the “test” set
- Evaluate many values of λ , and choose the one with the smallest CV prediction error

Over and under fitting

Over- and under-fitting are common problems

- Over-fitting means you're fitting the current (training) data too well, and will make bad predictions for future (test) data
- Under-fitting means you're not fitting the current data well enough, and will make bad predictions for future (test) data
- Over-fitting is a problem of high variance; under-fitting is a problem of high bias

Cross validation



Lasso penalization

- Lasso (least absolute shrinkage and selection operator) is a more recent penalized regression estimator
- Basic form is similar to that of ridge regression, but penalty function is different:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\beta}_L &= \arg \min_{\beta} [RSS(\beta) + \lambda ||\beta||_1] \\
 &= \arg \min_{\beta} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j x_{i,j} \right)^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^p |\beta_j| \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

- Quite popular – broadly used, many adaptations

Lasso penalization

Some properties of Lasso penalties

- No closed form solution (although there are some computationally useful tricks)
- The different penalty form means Lasso has a tendency to shrink coefficients *all the way* to zero
- Can be useful as an automated variable selection approach
- Still have to choose λ ; cross validation is a popular tool for this

Lasso vs ridge – “the picture”




Figure: ISL 6.7, Page 222

The lasso performs ℓ_1 shrinkage, and there are “corners” in the constraint. If the RSS “hits” one of these corners, the coefficient corresponding to the axis is shrunk to zero.

Lasso vs ridge – “the other picture”




Figure: ISL 6.7, Page 222

Comments on lasso

... especially with respect to MLR:

- Emphasis is on *prediction*, not inference
- Coefficients for selected variables is *not the same* as an MLR including only that subset
- When predictors are correlated, lasso tends to select one element of a group

Bias-reducing penalties

Penalized regression framework is pretty broad:

$$\arg \min_{\beta} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j x_{i,j} \right)^2 + \lambda \text{Pen}(\beta) \right]$$

In addition to lasso and ridge regression, other popular alternatives include

- Adaptive lasso
- MCP: minimax concave penalty
- SCAD: smoothly clipped absolute deviation

These all try to give unbiased coefficients for covariates with large effects, but operate under the same general framework

Adaptive lasso


Adaptive lasso adds weights:

$$\arg \min_{\beta} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j x_{i,j} \right)^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^p w_j |\beta_j| \right]$$

Weights (obtained via e.g. a first-round “standard” lasso) increase or decrease the effect of penalization on individual coefficients.

MCP, SCAD

SCAD and MCP use a different penalty structure:



Elastic net

- Unbiasedness is one problem with lasso; selection of a single covariate among from a correlated group is another
- The elastic net is one solution to this:

$$\arg \min_{\beta} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j x_{i,j} \right)^2 + \lambda \left((1 - \alpha) \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j^2 + \alpha \sum_{j=1}^p |\beta_j| \right) \right]$$

- Combines regularization via the ridge-type penalty with variable selection via the lasso penalty
- More effective to deal with groups of correlated predictors

Group variable selection

Elastic net often “works”, but you can make grouping explicit

- Partition covariates into known groups
- Apply a relevant penalty to groups, not individual coefficients

$$\arg \min_{\beta} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j x_{i,j} \right)^2 + \lambda \sum_{g=1}^G \text{Pen}(\beta_g) \right]$$

- Group lasso, SCAD, MCP, etc exist
- How you group matters

Closing thoughts

- Inference (and, at least to some extent, interpretation) is challenging in variable selection methods
 - ▶ Emphasis is on prediction accuracy
 - ▶ Some work of post-selection inference exists, but hasn't yet been widely adopted
- Variable selection can be included in other models
 - ▶ Sparse PCA, for example
- Variable selection methods can have a similar goal as principal components regression, but use a very different approach

Other directions

- Other approaches to variable selection (e.g. Bayesian methods ...)
- Consistency across approaches

How to describe results

In response to a common question in the workshop, the following is (roughly) how one might describe the results of a lasso analysis:

- Cross validation was used to choose the tuning parameter with the lowest prediction error
- The selected variables that resulted in the best predictions were [blank], and these may reflect the impact of [blank] on the response.
- We compared the lasso fit to an unconstrained MLR in terms of cross-validated prediction error, and found that the lasso model resulted in ZZ% improvement in mean squared prediction error

Sessions's big ideas

- Penalization; tuning parameters; cross validation; group penalties

-
- ISLR 6