

Keith Knight

OH: Tuesday

email: keith@utstat.utoronto.ca

evaluation : HW 40%

Final 35%

measurements of $p > 1$ v

- represent observations using vectors

$$\rightarrow \tilde{x}_i = \begin{pmatrix} x_{i1} \\ \vdots \\ x_{ip} \end{pmatrix} \quad i=1, \dots, n$$

① Test se

② Imaging (es. facial recognition)

n images }

p pixels

{ supervised learning

... 2.

each "input" x_i has an "output" (label)

1

② Classification: y_i is a class (e.g. spam or good) associated

- find structure in $\{\underline{x}_i\}$ (w/

- dimension-reduction

ed for unsupervised

Model: $\underline{X}_1, \dots, \underline{X}_n$ are sampled from

$$F(\underline{x}) = F(x_1, \dots, x_p) = P(X_1 \leq x_1, \dots, X_p \leq x_p) = P(\underline{X} \leq \underline{x})$$

- F can be τ

- F can be determined by a finite number of unknown parameters

② F is a mixture dist'n.

$$F(\underline{x}) = \lambda_1 F_1(\underline{x}_1; \underline{\theta}) + \dots + \lambda_k F_k(\underline{x}_k; \underline{\theta})$$

where $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ & $\underline{\theta}$ are unknown parameters
 $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k = 1$

Means, variances & covariances

$\underline{X} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_p \end{pmatrix}$ random vector $\underline{X} \sim F$ dist'd as

mean (expected values): $\mu_j = E(x_j) = E_F(x_j)$

mean vector $\underline{\mu} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mu_p \end{pmatrix}$

variances: $\sigma_j^2 = \text{Var}(x_j) = E[(x_j - \mu_j)^2]$

covariances: $\sigma_{ij} = \sigma_{ji} = \text{Cov}(x_i, x_j) = E[(x_i - \mu_i)(x_j - \mu_j)]$ ← measure of linear dependence

Variance-covariance (covariance) matrix

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & \sigma_{12} & \dots & \sigma_{1p} \\ \sigma_{21} & \sigma_2^2 & \dots & \sigma_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sigma_{p1} & \sigma_{p2} & \dots & \sigma_p^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Properties:

① C is a symmetric matrix, ($C = C^T$)

② C is a non-negative definite matrix

$\underline{a}^T C \underline{a} \geq 0$ for all vectors $\underline{a} = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ \vdots \\ a_p \end{pmatrix}$

Proof: Look at $\text{Var}(\underline{a}^T \underline{X})$

$$\sum_{j=1}^p a_j x_j$$

$$0 \leq \text{Var}(\underline{a}^T \underline{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p a_i a_j \text{Cov}(x_i, x_j) = \underline{a}^T C \underline{a}$$

③ Unless there are some $P(\underline{a}^T \underline{X} = \text{constant}) = 1$, $\underline{a} \neq \underline{0}$, C is also positive definite

i.e. $\underline{a}^T C \underline{a} > 0$ if $\underline{a} \neq \underline{0}$

Note: If C is positive definite then C^{-1} exists.

C^{-1} is called the concentration matrix and often contains useful information about dependence structure of \underline{X} .

Estimation of μ, C :

Method of moments: $\hat{\underline{\mu}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \underline{x}_i = \underline{\bar{x}}$ ← component-wise average

$$\hat{C} = S = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \underbrace{(\underline{x}_i - \bar{\underline{x}})}_{p \times 1 \text{ matrix}} \underbrace{(\underline{x}_i - \bar{\underline{x}})^T}_{1 \times p \text{ matrix}}$$

instead

can use $\frac{1}{n}$ instead

- under simple model, $\hat{\mu}$, S are unbiased-estimated

But... the matrix properties of S can be very different from those of C .

Example: If $p \geq n$ then S cannot be positive definite.

For Friday: Why?