Ensemble learning, bias-variance decomposition

Victor Kitov
v.v.kitov@yandex.ru

Yandex School of Data Analysis

Loss vs. model complexity



Comments:

- expected loss on test set is always higher than on train set.
- left to A: model too simple, underfitting, high bias
- right to A: model too complex, overfitting, high variance

Table of Contents

Bias-variance decomposition

- True relationship $y = f(x) + \varepsilon$
- This relationship is estimated using random training set $(X, Y) = \{(x_n, y_n),\ n = 1, 2...N\}$
- Recovered relationship $\widehat{f}(x)$, x-some fixed constant
- Noise ε is independent of any X, Y, $\mathbb{E}\varepsilon = 0$ and $Var[\varepsilon] = \sigma^2$

Bias-variance decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{X,Y,\varepsilon}\{[\widehat{f}(x) - y(x)]^2\} &= \left(\mathbb{E}_{X,Y}\{\widehat{f}(x)\} - f(x)\right)^2 \\ &+\mathbb{E}_{X,Y}\left\{[\widehat{f}(x) - \mathbb{E}_{X,Y}\widehat{f}(x)]^2\right\} + \sigma^2\end{aligned}$$

- Intuition: $MSE = \text{bias}^2 + \text{variance} + \text{irreducible error}$
  - darts intuition

Proof of bias-variance decomposition

Define for brevity of notation $f = f(x)$, $\widehat{f} = \widehat{f}(x)$, $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E}_{X,Y,\varepsilon}$.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{f}-f\right)^2 &= \mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{f}-\mathbb{E}\widehat{f}+\mathbb{E}\widehat{f}-f\right)^2 = \mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{f}-\mathbb{E}\widehat{f}\right)^2 + \left(\mathbb{E}\widehat{f}-f\right)^2 \\ &+ 2\mathbb{E}\left[(\widehat{f}-\mathbb{E}\widehat{f})(\mathbb{E}\widehat{f}-f)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{f}-\mathbb{E}\widehat{f}\right)^2 + \left(\mathbb{E}\widehat{f}-f\right)^2\end{aligned}$$

We used that $(\mathbb{E}\widehat{f}-f)$ is a constant w.r.t. X, Y and hence
$\mathbb{E}\left[(\widehat{f}-\mathbb{E}\widehat{f})(\mathbb{E}\widehat{f}-f)\right] = (\mathbb{E}\widehat{f}-f)\mathbb{E}(\widehat{f}-\mathbb{E}\widehat{f}) = 0.$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{f}-y\right)^2 &= \mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{f}-f-\varepsilon\right)^2 = \mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{f}-f\right)^2 + \mathbb{E}\varepsilon^2 - 2\mathbb{E}\left[(\widehat{f}-f)\varepsilon\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\widehat{f}-\mathbb{E}\widehat{f}\right)^2 + \left(\mathbb{E}\widehat{f}-f\right)^2 + \sigma^2\end{aligned}$$

Here $\mathbb{E}\left[(\widehat{f}-f)\varepsilon\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[(\widehat{f}-f)\right]\mathbb{E}\varepsilon = 0$ since ε is independent of X, Y.

Ensemble learning

Definition 1

Ensemble learning - using multiple machine learning methods for a given problem and integrating their output to obtain final result.

Synonyms: committee-based learning, multiple classifier systems.

Applications:

- supervised methods: regression, classification
- unsupervised methods: clustering

Ensembles use cases

- solving C class classification with many binary classifiers
- underfitting, high model bias
  - existing model hypothesis space is too narrow to explain the true one
  - different oversimplified models have bias in different directions, mutually compensating each other.
- overfitting, high model variance
  - avoid local optima of optimization methods
  - too small dataset to figure out concretely the exact model hypothesis
- when task itself promotes usage of ensembles with features of different nature
  - E.g. computer security:
    - multiple sources of diverse information (password, face detection, fingerprint)
    - different abstraction levels need to be united (current action, behavior pattern during day, week, month)

Table of Contents

Classification: original model space too narrow



Classification: original model space too narrow



Classification: original model space too narrow



Classification: original model space too narrow

Classifier 1 and classifier 2 combined using AND rule



Motivation for ensembles

- Consider M classifiers $f_1(x), ...f_M(x)$, performing binary classification.
- Let probability of mistake be constant $p \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$: $p(f_m(x) = y) = p \, \forall m$
- Suppose all models make mistakes or correct guesses independently of each other.
- Let $F(x)$ be majority voting combiner.
- Then $p(F(x) \neq y) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$

Regression: high variance



Regression: high variance



Regression: high variance



Regression: high variance

Regression 1 and regression 2 combined using averaging



Use combination or individual models?

- Consider regression task, performed by individual learners $f_1(x), ...f_K(x)$ and their weighted combination $F(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \alpha_k f_k(x)$ with some weights$\alpha_1, ...\alpha_K$: $\alpha_k \geq 0 \, \forall k$, $\sum_{k=1}^{K} \alpha_k = 1$.
- Take convex loss $\mathcal{L}(\widehat{y} - y)$, such as absolute or square.
- What is better: to use $F(x)$ or take one of $f_1(x), ...f_K(x)$ randomly with probabilities $\alpha_1, ...\alpha_K$?

Table of Contents

Fixed combiner at class level

Output of base learner k

Exact class: ω_1 or ω_2.

Combiner predicts ω_1 if:

- all classifiers predict ω_1 (AND rule)
- at least one classifier predicts ω_1 (OR rule)
- at least k classifiers predict ω_1 (k-out-of-N)
- majority of classifiers predict ω_1 (majority vote)

Each classifier may be assigned a weight, based on its performance:

- weighted majority vote
- weighted k-out-of-N (based on score sum)

Fixed combiner - ranking level

Output of base learner k

Ranking of classes:

$$\omega_{k_1} \succeq \omega_{k_2} \succeq \ldots \succeq \omega_{k_C}$$

Ranking is equivalent to scoring of each class (with incomparable scoring between classifiers).

Definition 2

Let $B_k(i)$ be the count of classes scored below ω_i by classifier k. **Borda count $B(i)$ of class** ω_i is the total number of classes scored below ω_i by all classifiers:

$$B(i) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} B_k(i)$$

Combiner predicts ω_i where $i = \arg\max_i B(i)$

Fixed combiner at class probability level

Output of base learner k

Vectors of class probabilities:

$$[p^k(\omega_1),\ p^k(\omega_2),\ \dots\ p^k(\omega_C)]$$

Combiner predicts ω_i if $i = \arg\max_i F(p^1(\omega_i), p^2(\omega_i), \dots p^K(\omega_i))$

- F = mean or median.

Table of Contents

Weighted averaging

Consider regression with K predictor models $f_k(x)$, $k = 1, 2, ...K$. (Alternatively we may consider K discriminant functions in classification)

Weighted averaging combiner

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k f_k(x)$$

Naive fitting

$$\widehat{w} = \arg\min_{w} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}(y_i, \sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k f_k(x_i))$$

will overfit. The mostly overfitted method will get the most weight.

Linear stacking

- Let training set $\{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, 2, ...N\}$ be split into M folds.
- Denote $fold(i)$ to be the fold, containing observation i
- Denote $f_k^{-fold(i)}$ be predictor k trained on all folds, except $fold(i)$.

Definition

Linear stacking is weighted averaging combiner, where weights are found using

$$\widehat{w} = \arg\min_w \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}(y_i, \sum_{k=1}^{K} w_k f_k^{-fold(i)}(x_i))$$

- For decreased overfitting we may add constraints $\{w_k \geq 0\}_{k=1}^K$ or regularizer $\sum_{k=1}^K \left(w_k - \frac{1}{K}\right)^2$.

General stacking

Definition

Generalized stacking is prediction

$$f(x) = A_\theta \left(f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots f_K(x) \right),$$

where A is some general form predictor and θ is a vector of parameters, estimated by

$$\widehat{\theta} = \arg\min_\theta \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{L} \left(y_i,\ A_\theta \left(f_1^{-fold(i)}(x), f_2^{-fold(i)}(x), \dots f_K^{-fold(i)}(x) \right) \right)$$

- Stacking is the most general approach
- It is a winning strategy in most ML competitions.
- $f_i(x)$ may be:
  - class number (coded using one-hot encoding).
  - vector of class probabilities
  - any initial or generated feature

Table of Contents

Bagging& random subspaces

- **Bagging**:
  - random selection of samples (with replacement)[1][2]
  - efficient for methods with high variance w.r.t. X, Y.
- **Random subspace method**:
  - random selection of features (without replacement)
- We can apply both methods jointly
- Also we may sample different

[1] *what is the probability that observation will not belong to bootstrap sample?*

[2] *what is the limit of this probability with* $N \to \infty$*?*

Random forests

Input: training dataset $TDS = \{(x_i, y_i),\ 1 = 1, 2, ...N\}$; the number of trees B and the size of feature subsets m.
for $b = 1, 2, ...B$:

1. generate random training dataset TDS^b of size N by sampling (x_i, y_i) pairs from TDS with replacement.
2. build a tree using TDS^b training dataset with feature selection for each node from random subset of features of size m (generated **individually for each node**).

Output: B trees. Classification is done using majority vote and regression using averaging of B outputs.

Comments

- Random forests use random selection on both samples and features
- Step 1) is optional.
- Left out samples may be used for evaluation of model performance.
  - *Out-of-bag* prediction: assign output to x_i, $i = 1, 2, ...N$ using majority vote (classification) or averaging (regression) among trees with $b \in \{b : (x_i, y_i) \notin T^b\}$
  - *Out-of-bag* quality - lower bound for true model quality.[3]
- Less interpretable than individual trees
- +: Parallel implementation
- -: different trees are not targeted to correct mistakes of each other

[3] why *lower* bound?

Comments

- Extra-Random trees-random sampling of (feature,value) pairs
  - more bias and less variance for each tree
  - faster training of each tree
- RandomForest and ExtraRandomTrees do not overfit with increasing B
- Each tree should have high depth
  - otherwise averaging over oversimplified trees will also give oversimplified model!