

# STAT406- Methods of Statistical Learning Lecture 2

Matias Salibian-Barrera

UBC - Sep / Dec 2017

# Predictions

Mean squared prediction error (MSPE)

$$Y \longleftrightarrow \hat{f}(\mathbf{X})$$

$$\left(Y - \hat{f}(\mathbf{X})\right)^2 \quad ?$$

$$E \left[ \left(Y - \hat{f}(\mathbf{X})\right)^2 \right] \quad ?$$

What are we “averaging” over?  
What is random?

# Predictions

- What we want, typically, is

$$E_{(Y^*, \mathbf{X}^*)} \left[ \left( Y^* - \hat{f}(\mathbf{X}^*) \right)^2 \right]$$

where  $(Y^*, \mathbf{X}^*)$  are new, future observations, not used when computing  $\hat{f}$ .

# Predictions

If we assume that  $Y = f(X) + \epsilon$ , then

$$E_{(Y^*, \mathbf{X}^*)} \left[ \left( Y^* - \hat{f}(\mathbf{X}^*) \right)^2 \right] =$$

$$E_{(Y^*, \mathbf{X}^*)} \left[ \left( f(\mathbf{X}^*) - \hat{f}(\mathbf{X}^*) \right)^2 \right] + V(\epsilon)$$

- what assumptions are needed for this to be true?
- is it still true if I look at predictions for a single & fixed  $\mathbf{X}_0$ ?

# Predictions

- What we want

$$E_{(Y^*, \mathbf{X}^*)} \left[ \left( Y^* - \hat{f}(\mathbf{X}^*) \right)^2 \right]$$

is very difficult to estimate

- Something similar

$$E_{\{(Y^*, \mathbf{X}^*), \text{data}\}} \left[ \left( Y^* - \hat{f}(\mathbf{X}^*) \right)^2 \right]$$

is easier to estimate

# Discussion points

- Goodness of fit vs. prediction power
- How do we estimate prediction MSE?

$$E_{(Y^*, \mathbf{X}^*)} \left[ \left( Y^* - \hat{f}(\mathbf{X}^*) \right)^2 \right]$$

- Can it be done without a test set?

# Mean squared prediction error

- How do we estimate the MSPE

$$E_{(Y^*, \mathbf{X}^*)} \left[ \left( Y^* - \hat{f}(\mathbf{X}^*) \right)^2 \right] \quad ?$$

- (a): “Training / Testing” data sets
- (b): “Recycling” a single data set
- (c): “Direct estimates”

# Test set approach

- Randomly split the data into a training set and a test set
- “Train” (“estimate”, “fit”) your model(s) using only the training set
- Use the estimated model(s) to obtain predictions for the test set (only)



# Test set approach

- Check how well your model(s) did

$$\widehat{\text{MSPE}} = \frac{1}{n_T} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{T}} (y_j - \hat{y}_j)^2$$

where:

$\mathcal{T}$  is the **test set**,

$n_T$  is the size of  $\mathcal{T}$ , and

$\hat{y}_j$  are the **predicted values**

# Predictions

- Back to the Pollution example
- Read the training set
- Train the full and the reduced models
- Read the test set
- Use both models to predict `MORT`
- Compare both sets of predictions

# Predictions

```
> x.te <- read.table('pollution-test.dat', ...  
>  
> x.te$pr.full <- predict(full, newdata=x.te)  
> x.te$pr.reduced <- predict(reduced,  
                             newdata=x.te)  
>  
> with(x.te, mean( (MORT - pr.full)^2 ))  
[1] 4677.45  
>  
> with(x.te, mean( (MORT - pr.reduced)^2 ))  
[1] 1401.571
```

## Discuss

# Predictions

- Back to the Pollution example
- Repeat with a different training / test split
- Compare conclusions

# Test set approach

- **Pros:**
- Estimates what we (generally) want to estimate
- It is computationally very fast

# Test set approach

- **Cons:**
- Estimated MSPE depends on the training set
- Estimated MSPE may be quite variable
  - why is this a problem?
- One does not use all the available information for training the model(s)

# Cross validation

- Leave-one-out
- Description
- Picture

# CV - Pollution data

- Run it on the pollution data



# CV - leave-one-out

- **Pros:**
  - It is not random!
  - It uses almost all of the data for training
- **Cons:**
  - It can be numerically very expensive (although “shortcuts” for linear models exist).

# Cross validation

- K-fold
- Description
- Picture

# CV - Revisit example data

- Run it on the pollution example

# K-fold CV

- **Pros:**
- Faster than leave-one-out
- Less variable estimator for MSPE than leave-one-out (explain)
- Training set is larger than “training/test” method - less biased MSPE estimate (but more biased than leave-one-out)

# K-fold CV

- **Cons:**
- Choosing  $K$  is not trivial ( $K = 5$  or  $K = 10$  have been shown empirically to work well)
- Training set is smaller than leave-one-out's
- It is a random estimate of MSPE (it is a good idea to run it several times)