

# Algorithms, Evidence, and Data Science Cookbook

## Part I: Classic Statistical Inference

- \* **Population:** the entire group
- \* **Sample:** a subset of the population
- \* **Mean:**  $\mu$  is the mean of the population;  $\bar{x}$  is the mean of the sample

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$$

- \* **Variance:** the dispersion around the mean

Variance of a population:      Variance of a sample:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \mu)^2$$

$$s^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2$$

- \* **Standard Deviation:** square root of the variance
- \* **Standard Error:** an estimate of the standard deviation of the sampling distribution
- For a mean:

$$se(\bar{x}) = \sqrt{\frac{s^2}{n}}$$

For the difference between two means:

$$se(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) = \sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}}$$

## Algorithms and Inference

- \* **Algorithm:** set of data probability-steps to produce an estimator
- \* **Inference:** measuring the uncertainty around the estimator *e.g.*:  $\bar{x}$  the algorithm, while  $se(\bar{x})$  is the inference

## A Regression Example

### Linear Regression

any regression is a conditional mean  $\hat{Y}_i = E(Y_i | X_i)$

- \*  $Y$  : response variable
- \*  $X$  : covariate/predictor/feature
- \*  $\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1$  : regression coefficients

$$\hat{\beta}_0 = \hat{Y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \hat{X}$$

$$se(\hat{\beta}_0) = \hat{\sigma}^2 \left[ \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2} \right] \quad \hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})(Y_i - \bar{Y})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2}$$

$$se(\hat{\beta}_1) = \frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2}$$

- \* predicted values = fitted curve given  $x$ :

$$\hat{Y}(x) = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x$$

- \* residuals  $\hat{\epsilon}$ :

$$\hat{\epsilon}_i = Y_i - \hat{Y}_i = Y_i - \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 X_i$$

- \* residual sum of squares  $RSS$

$$RSS(\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\epsilon}_i^2$$

- \* mean square error  $\hat{\sigma}^2$

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{RSS(\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1)}{n - 2}$$

## LOWESS & LOESS

- \* 1) specify the number of points within the range/window  $n$
- \* 2) neighbour weightings  $w(x_k)$

$$w(x_k) = \left( 1 - \left| \frac{x_i - x_k}{d} \right|^3 \right)^3$$

*fork* = 1, ...,  $n$   
*d* is the distance between  $x_i$  and the  $k^{th}$  neighbouring point

- \* 3) for each range, estimate a regression function

LOWESS:  $\hat{y}_k = a + bx_k$

LOESS:  $\hat{y}_k = a + bx_k + cx_k^2$

- \* 4) robust weightings  $G(x_k)$

$$G(x_k) = \begin{cases} \left( 1 - \left( \frac{|y_i - \hat{y}_i|}{\delta \text{median}(|y_i - \hat{y}_i|)} \right)^2 \right)^2, & \left| \frac{|y_i - \hat{y}_i|}{\delta \text{median}(|y_i - \hat{y}_i|)} \right| < 1 \\ 0, & \left| \frac{|y_i - \hat{y}_i|}{\delta \text{median}(|y_i - \hat{y}_i|)} \right| \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

if  $(p - \text{value} < \alpha)$  { reject  $H_o$  and accept  $H_a$  }  
 else { can't reject  $H_o$  }

LOWESS:  $\hat{y}_k = \sum_k w(x_k) G(x_k) (a + bx_k)^2$

LOESS:  $\hat{y}_k = \sum_k w(x_k) G(x_k) (a + bx_k + cx_k^2)^2$

- \* 5) A series of new smoothed values is the result. The procedure can be repeated to get a more precise curve fitting.

## Bootstrapping

- \* bootstrap principle:
- $\sigma_{\text{(sampling w/replacement)}} = \sigma_{\text{(across samples)}}$
- \* bootstrap iterations:  $B$
- \* original sample:  $(x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^N$
- \* bootstrap samples:  $(x_{j(b)}, y_{j(b)})_{j \in I}$  for  $b = 1, \dots, B$ ,  $I = \{1, \dots, N\}$ , and  $j$  is the index that is randomly sampled from  $I$
- \* for each  $b$ , compute  $y_{j(b)}$  using LOWESS or any other model

j \ b	1	2	3	...	B
	$y_{1(1)}$	$y_{1(2)}$	$y_{1(3)}$	...	$y_{1(B)}$
2	$y_{2(1)}$	$y_{2(2)}$	$y_{2(3)}$	...	$y_{2(B)}$
...	...	...	...	...	...
N	$y_{N(1)}$	$y_{N(2)}$	$y_{N(3)}$	...	$y_{N(B)}$

- \* for each  $j$  row, the standard deviation  $\sigma_j^{boot}$  is

$$\sigma_j^{boot} = \sqrt{\frac{(\bar{y}_j - \bar{\bar{y}}_j)^2}{B - 1}}$$

- \* sort  $i(\bar{b})$  by value from min to max  $\rightarrow$  get the 5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> values to get a 90% confidence interval

## Hypothesis Testing

### T-test, one-sample

- \* null hypothesis  $H_o : \mu = \mu_0$
- \* alternative hypothesis  $H_a : \mu \{=, > \text{ or } < \} \mu_0$
- \*  $t$  - *statistic* standardizes the difference between  $\bar{x}$  and  $\mu_0$

$$t = \frac{\bar{x} - \mu_0}{se(\bar{x})}$$

degrees of freedom  $df = n - 1$

- \*  $p$  - *value*: probability that  $\bar{x}$  was obtained by chance given  $\mu_0 = \mu$ .
- \* **algorithm**: read the t-distribution critical values (chart) for the  $p$  - *value* using  $t$  and  $df$
- if  $(p - \text{value} < \alpha)$  { reject  $H_o$  and accept  $H_a$  }
- else { can't reject  $H_o$  }
- \*  $\alpha$  is the predetermined value of significance (usually 0.05)
- \* if ( $t$  is of the 'wrong' sign)  $p - \text{value} = 1 - p - \text{value}_{chart}$

### paired two-sample t-test

- each value of one group corresponds to a value in the other group
- \* **algorithm**: subtract the values for each sample to get one set of values and use  $\mu_0$  to perform a one-sample t-test

### unpaired two-sample t-test

the two populations are independent

- \*  $H_o : \mu_1 = \mu_2$
- \*  $H_a : \mu_1 \{=, > \text{ or } < \} \mu_2$
- \*  $t$  - *statistic*

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{se(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)}$$

degrees of freedom  $df = (n_1 - 1) + (n_2 - 1)$

- \* **algorithm**: same as in one-sample t-test
- \* double the  $p$  - *value* for  $H_a : \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

- \* **Type I error**  $\alpha$ : probability of rejecting a true  $H_o$
- \* **Type II error**  $\beta$ : probability of failing to reject a false  $H_o$

## Notes

- \* the OLS confidence intervals work asymptotically  $\rightarrow$  they assume the number of available observations is infinite, but it assumes normality
- \* in LOWESS,  $n$  is not infinite, but it does not assume any distribution

## Frequentist Inference

- \* assumes the observed data comes from a probability distribution  $F$
- \*  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  is the data vector (aka. *the sample's values*)
- \*  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$  is the vector of random variables (aka. *a sample, individual draws of  $F$* )
- \* the expectation property  $\theta = E_F(X_i)$  (aka. the true expectation value of any draw  $X_i$ )
- \*  $\hat{\theta}$  is the best estimate of  $\theta$

$$\hat{\theta} = t(x) \quad \text{usually,} \quad t(x) = \bar{x}$$

- \*  $\hat{\theta}$  is sample specific, is a realization of  $\hat{\Theta} = t(x)$ . Typically,  $\mu$  is the expected value of producing an estimate using  $t(x)$  when  $x$  comes from  $F$

$$E_F(\hat{\Theta}) = \mu$$

- \* **Bias-Variance Trade-Off:** models with lower bias will have higher variance and vice versa.
- \* **Bias:** error from incorrect assumptions to make target function easier to learn (high bias  $\rightarrow$  missing relevant relations or under-fitting)
- \* **Variance:** error from sensitivity to fluctuations in the dataset, or how much the target estimate would differ if different training data was used (high variance  $\rightarrow$  modelling noise or over-fitting)

$$\text{bias} = \mu - \theta \quad (\text{aka. } \text{expected} - \text{true values}) \quad \text{var} = E_F\{(\hat{\Theta} - \mu)^2\}$$

## Frequentist principles

- \* usually defines parameters with infinite sequence of trials  $\rightarrow$  hypothetical data sets  $X^{(1)}, X^{(2)}, \dots$  generate infinite samples  $\hat{\Theta}^{(1)}, \hat{\Theta}^{(2)}, \dots$
- \* 1) Plug-in principle: relate the sample  $se(\bar{x})$  with the true variance.

$$\text{var}_F(x) = \text{var}_F = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2$$

$$se(\bar{x}) = \left[ \frac{\text{var}_F(x)}{n} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

- \* 2) Taylor series approximations: relate  $t(x)$  by local linear approximations (aka. compute  $\bar{se}(x)$  of the transformed estimator)

$$se(\hat{\theta}) = se(\bar{x}) \frac{d\hat{\theta}}{d\bar{x}} = se(\bar{x}) \frac{dt(x)}{d\bar{x}}$$

- \* 3.1) Parametric Families: given  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , the Likelihood Function  $L(x)$  (aka. the probability to observe  $x$ ) is given by:  
e.g.  $\hat{\theta} = \mu$  for a normal distribution

$$P(x|N(\mu, \sigma^2)) = P(x_1|N(\mu, \sigma^2)) \dots P(x_n|N(\mu, \sigma^2))$$

$$P(x|N(\mu, \sigma^2)) = \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \right)^n \prod_{i=1}^n e^{-\frac{(x_i - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}} = L(x)$$

$$L(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n f_{\theta}(x_i)$$

- where  $f_{\theta}$  is the density function
- \* 3.2) MLE (maximum likelihood estimate): find  $\hat{\theta}$  such that  $L(x)$  is maximized  
e.g.

$$\max_{\hat{\theta}} L(x) \Rightarrow \max_{\hat{\mu}} L(x) = \hat{\mu}^{MLE}$$

- \* 4) Simulation and Bootstrap: estimate  $F$  as  $\hat{F}$ , then simulate values from  $\hat{F}$  to get a prior sample  $\hat{\Theta}^{(k)} = t(x^{(b)})$   
The empirical standard deviation of the  $\hat{\Theta}'s$  is the frequentist estimate for  $se(\hat{\theta})$
- \* 5) Pivotal Statistics: Frequentist use pivotal statistics whenever they are available to conduct stat. tests  
e.g. t-test is a pivotal statistic as it does not depend on parameters the distribution might have.

## Frequentist Optimality

- Neyman-Pearson lemma optimum hypothesis-testing algorithm:  
purpose: choose one of the two possible density functions for observed data  $x$
- \* null hypothesis density  $f_0(x)$
- \* alternative density  $f_1(x)$
- let  $L(x)$  be the Likelihood Ratio

$$L(X) = \frac{f_1(X)}{f_0(X)}$$

- let the testing rule  $t_c x$  be:

$$t_c x = \begin{cases} 1(\text{pic} f_1(x)), & \ln(L(X)) \geq c \\ 0(\text{pic} f_0(x)), & \ln(L(X)) < c \end{cases}$$

- \* only rules in the  $t_c x$  form can be optimal *problem Steps*
- \* 1) define the density functions  $f_0(x_i)$  and  $f_1(x_i)$  for  $f_0(x)$  and  $f_1(x)$   
e.g.

$$f_0 \sim N(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2) \quad f_1 \sim N(\mu_1, \sigma_1^2)$$

$$f_0 \sim N(0, 1) \quad f_1 \sim N(0.5, 1)$$

$$f_0(x_i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{x_i^2}{2}} \quad f_1(x_i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{x_i - 0.5^2}{2}}$$

- \* 2) calculate the likelihood functions  $f_0(X)$  and  $f_1(X)$   
e.g.

$$f_0(X) = \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right]^n e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}$$

$$f_1(X) = \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right]^n e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n ((x_i - 0.5)^2)}$$

- \* 3) calculate the likelihood ratio  
e.g.

$$L(X) = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n ((x_i - 0.5)^2)}}{e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}}$$

$$L(X) = e^{-\frac{1}{2} [n\bar{x} - \frac{n}{4}]}$$

- \* 4) remove all independent variables e.g.

$$L(X) > c \Rightarrow \begin{aligned} e^{-\frac{1}{2} [n\bar{x} - \frac{n}{4}]} &> c_1 \\ -\frac{1}{2} \left[ n\bar{x} - \frac{n}{4} \right] &> C_2 \\ n\bar{x} - \frac{n}{4} &> c_3 \\ \bar{x} &> c_4 \\ \bar{x} &> c \end{aligned}$$

- only the mean depends on the sample  $x$
- \* 5) the *most powerful* hypothesis test at any type I error rate  $\alpha$  is to compare  $c$  to a constant.  
e.g.

$$\alpha = P(\bar{x} > c | \mu = \mu_0)$$

$$\alpha = P((\bar{x} - \mu)\sqrt{n} > (c - \mu)\sqrt{n} | \mu = 0)$$

$$\alpha = 1 - P(\bar{x}\sqrt{n} \leq c\sqrt{n} | \mu = 0)$$

$$\alpha = 1 - \Phi(c\sqrt{n})$$

- $\Phi$  is the cumulative density function (CDF) of a normal distribution  $N(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2)$
- \* 6) calculate  $c$   
e.g.

$$\Phi(c\sqrt{n}) = 1 - \alpha$$

$$c\sqrt{n} = \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha)$$

$$c = 0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha) \quad c = \mu_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha)$$

- \* 7) calculate  $\beta$ , such that it's minimized  
e.g.

$$\beta = P(\bar{x} \leq c | \mu = \mu_1)$$

$$\beta = P((\bar{x} - \mu)\sqrt{n} \leq (c - \mu)\sqrt{n} | \mu = 0.5)$$

$$\beta = \Phi((c - 0.5)\sqrt{n})$$

## Notes and Details

- \*  $1 - \beta$  is the power of the hypothesis test (probability of correctly rejecting  $f_0(x)$ )

## Bayesian Inference

### Bayes Rule

$$P(A|B) = \frac{P(B|A)P(A)}{P(B)}$$

- \* Bayes Rule (for one  $\mu$ ) can be written as:

$$g(\mu|x) = c_x L_x(\mu) \Pi(\mu)$$

where:  
 $\mu$  : an unobserved point in the parameter space  $\Omega$   
 $x$  : a point in the sample space  $X$   
 $c_x$  : normalization constant of the posterior distribution  
 $g(\mu|x)$  : posterior distribution  
 $L_x(\mu)$  : likelihood function  
 $\Pi(\mu)$  : prior distribution

- \* Bayes Rule (for two  $\mu_1, \mu_2$ ) can be written as:

$$\frac{g(\mu_1|x)}{g(\mu_2|x)} = \frac{g(\mu_1)}{g(\mu_2)} \frac{L_x(\mu_1)}{L_x(\mu_2)}$$

$$L_x(\mu) = \prod_{i=1}^n e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x_i - \mu)^2}$$

### Warm-up example

e.g. Find the probability of identical twins. The doctor says that  $\frac{1}{3}$  of twin births are identical. A sonogram observed same sex. identical twins are of the same sex, while fraternal have 0.5 probability to be of the same sex.

$$\frac{g(\text{identical}|\text{sameSex})}{g(\text{fraternal}|\text{sameSex})} = \frac{g(\text{identical})}{g(\text{fraternal})} \times \frac{L_{\text{identical}}(\text{sameSex})}{L_{\text{fraternal}}(\text{sameSex})}$$

$$\frac{g(\text{identical}|\text{sameSex})}{g(\text{fraternal}|\text{sameSex})} = \frac{\frac{1}{3}}{1 - \frac{1}{3}} \times \frac{1}{2}$$

### Flaws in Frequentist Inference

\* In Frequentist, if the algorithm changes (even if the data points stay exactly the same), the significance level is different for each algorithm.  
 \* On Bayesian inference, the algorithm stays the same  $\rightarrow$  the significance level does not change.

### A Bayesian/Frequentist Comparison List

Bayesian:	Frequentist:
	* attention is in choosing a prior $\Pi$
* attention is in choosing an algorithm $t(x)$	* operates with one parameter (specific question) in many samples
* operates only in one sample with the whole parameter space	* only computes the expected value and the variance (each answer requires an specific algorithm)
* answers all posible questions at once, since the posterior is a as we can come up with many distribution	* is more flexible than Bayes algorithms

### Bayesian Reasoning - estimate $\mu$ from $x$ if

$$\mu \sim N(m, A)$$

normal likelihood function (assume a variance of 1):

$$x|\mu \sim N(\mu, 1)$$

the normal posterior:

$$\mu|x \sim N(m + B(x - m), B)$$

where  $B = \frac{A=\text{prior variance}}{A+1=\text{total variance}}$ ,  $m$  = prior parameter therefore:

$$\hat{\mu}_{\text{Bayes}} = m + B(x - m)$$

### Notes and Details

\* like in frequentist, the fundamental unit of inference is a family of probability densities.  
 \* Bayesian inferences assumes the knowledge of a prior density  $g(\mu)$ ,  $\mu \in \Omega$

## Fisherian Inference and Maximum Likelihood Estimation

\* The log-likelihood function is defined as:

$$\ell_x(\theta) = \text{Log}\{f_\theta(x)\}$$

$\ell_x(\theta)$  : gets the most likely parameters to get the sample  $x$   
 $f_\theta(x)$  : likelihood function (aka. family probability densities)  $\theta$  : vector of parameters

for a fixed  $x$  and a variable  $\theta$

\* The MLE is the value of  $\theta \in \Omega$  that maximizes  $\ell_x(\theta)$

$$MLE : \hat{\theta} = \underset{\theta \in \Omega}{\text{argmax}} \{ \ell_x(\theta) \}$$

\* Estimate functions of the true parameter:  $\hat{\gamma} = T(\hat{\theta})$

\* Good frequentist properties (good bias & variance):

$$\text{bias} = \mu - E(\hat{\mu})$$

$\mu$  : true value of the parameter  
 $E(\hat{\mu})$  : expected value of the estimate

$$\text{variance} = \sum_{i=1}^I (\hat{\mu}^{(i)} - E(\hat{\mu}))^2$$

$\text{variance} = E_F\{(\hat{\mu}^{(i)} - E(\hat{\mu}))^2\}$

\* Reasonable Bayesian justification

$P(\theta|x)$  : posterior  
 $c_x$  : constant  
 $\Pi(\theta)$  : prior  
 $e^{\ell_x(\theta)}$  : maximum likelihood estimation

\* Fisherian inference assumes a flat prior (aka. unknown prior), so that the MLE  $\hat{\theta}^{MLE}$  is a maximizer of  $P(\theta|x)$ . (The MLE is the highest point of the posterior distribution)  
 \* As the algorithm does not change, the significance level is not affected by unexpected changes in the algorithm.

e.g. - for a Normal density function

\* let  $\theta = (\mu, \sigma^2)$

\* density function  $f_\theta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x_i - \mu}{\sigma}\right)^2}$  \* Since:

$$L(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n f_\theta(x_i) \quad \text{Log-Likelihood function}$$

$$\ell_x(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Log}\{f_\theta(x_i)\} = \sum_{i=1}^I \ell_x(\theta)$$

$$\mu^{\hat{MLE}} = \bar{x}$$

$$\sigma^{MLE} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n}}$$

\* MLE can cause over-fitting identification problems when we fit a lot of parameters in  $\theta$  (it would become very specific to our sample  $\rightarrow$  may not represent the population)

### Fisher Information and the MLE

Log-Likelihood Function

$$\ell_x(\theta) = \text{Log} f_\theta(x)$$

Score Function

how higher or lower is the likelihood function value of the sample as  $\theta$  varies?

$$\dot{\ell}_x(\theta) = \frac{\dot{f}_\theta(x)}{f_\theta(x)}$$

Expectation of  $\dot{\ell}_x(\theta)$

$$E(x) = \int_x x f(x) dx$$

$f(x)$  : density function

$$E[\dot{\ell}_x(\theta)] = 0$$

Variance of  $\dot{\ell}_x(\theta)$

$$V[x] = \int_x [x - E(x)]^2 f(x) dx$$

$$V[\dot{\ell}_x(\theta)] = \int_x [\dot{\ell}_x(\theta)]^2 f_\theta(x) dx$$

Fisher Information  $I_0$

$$I_0 = V[\dot{\ell}_x(\theta)]$$

$$\ddot{\ell}_x(\theta) = \frac{\ddot{f}_\theta(x)}{f_\theta(x)} - \left( \frac{\dot{f}_\theta(x)}{f_\theta(x)} \right)^2 \quad E(\ddot{\ell}_x(\theta)) = -I_0$$

MLE estimator of  $\theta$  :  $\hat{\theta}^{MLE}$

$$\hat{\theta}^{MLE} \sim N\left(\theta, \frac{1}{I_0}\right)$$

e.g. for a normal dist.

let  $x_i \sim N(\theta, \sigma^2)$

\* 1) compute  $\ell_x(\theta)$

$$\text{density function } f_\theta(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-\frac{(x_i - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}}$$

$$\text{likelihood function } \ell_x(\theta) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(x_i - \theta)^2}{\sigma^2} - \frac{n}{2} \text{Log}(2\pi\sigma^2)$$

\* 2) score function  $\dot{\ell}_x(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \theta)$

$$\ddot{\ell}_x(\theta) = -\frac{n}{\sigma^2}$$

\* 3) compute  $I_0$

as  $E(\ddot{\ell}_x(\theta)) = -I_0$ , Fisher Information  $I_0 = \frac{n}{\sigma^2}$

\* 4) compute  $\hat{\theta}^{MLE}$

$$E(\dot{\ell}_x(\theta)) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \theta) = 0, \text{ such that}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = n\theta \Rightarrow \hat{\theta}^{MLE} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{n} = \bar{x}$$

\* 5) compute  $se(\hat{\theta}^{MLE})$

for a large n,

$$\hat{\theta}^{MLE} \sim N\left(\theta, \frac{1}{I_0}\right) \Rightarrow \hat{\theta}^{MLE} \sim N\left(\theta, \frac{\sigma^2}{n}\right)$$

$$se(\hat{\theta}^{MLE}) = \frac{1}{I_0} = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}$$

\* 6)  $se(\hat{\theta}^{MLE}) = \frac{1}{nI_0}$ , by Cramer-Rao lower bound.

The MLE has variance at least as small as the best unbiased estimate of  $\theta$

Conditional Inference

e.g. An iid sample  $x \sim N(\theta, 0)$  has produced estimate  $\hat{\theta} = \bar{x}$ . however,

$n = 25$  was declined  
$$n = \begin{cases} 25, & \text{prob } \frac{1}{2} \\ 100, & \text{prob } \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}$$
  
\* Classical Frequentist rational:

$$sd(\bar{x}) = \sigma_{\bar{x}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma^2}{100} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma^2}{25}} = 0.158$$

\* Conditional Inference rational:

$$sd(\bar{x}) = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2}{25}} = 0.2$$

\* use the likelihood function (based on observation) without the prior  
\* “just take the sample you have”  
1) more relevant inferences (w/what really happened)  
2) simpler inferences (no correlation between the result and the sample size selection)

e.g. Observed Fisher Information  $I_{(x)}$

$$I_{(x)} = -\ddot{\ell}_x(\hat{\theta}^{MLE})$$

In large samples  $I_{(x)} = I_0$ . Use  $I_{(x)}$  in small samples

$$E[I_{(x)}] = nI_0$$

\* 1) compute the log-likelihood

$$f_{\theta}(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{1}{1 + (x + \theta)^2} \Rightarrow \text{Cauchy density function}$$

$$\ell_x(\theta) = \text{Log}\left(\frac{1}{\pi}\right) + \text{Log}(1) - \text{Log}(1 + (x + \theta)^2)$$

\* 2) get its derivative

$$\dot{\ell}_x(\theta) = \frac{2(x - \theta)}{1 + (x + \theta)^2}$$

\* 3) get the 2nd derivative

$$\ddot{\ell}_x(\theta) = \frac{-2(1 + (x - \theta)^2) + 4(x - \theta)^2}{(1 + (x - \theta)^2)^2}$$

\* 4) get the observed fisher information

$$I_{(x)} = -\ddot{\ell}_x(\hat{\theta}^{MLE})$$

\* 5) get the variance of the estimate, even if the distribution does not have a defined variance or expected value  
- for 10000 samples of size  $n$  with  $\theta = 0$ , compute  $1/I_{(x)}$  and  $\hat{\theta}^{MLE}$   
- group the 10000  $\hat{\theta}^{MLE}$  values according to quantiles of  $1/I_{(x)}$  and calculate the empirical variance for each sample.  
\* for all samples, the unconditional variance  $1/nI_0$  is the same because all the samples are of the same size.  
\* on the other hand,  $I_{(x)}$  will vary from sample to sample ( $\hat{\theta}^{MLE}$  is different for each sample). \*  $I_{(x)}$  is related to the variance.

Permutation and Randomization

\* when performing a t-test, it’s assumed that the data samples come from a normal distribution.  
\* small samples may follow a different distribution.  
Randomization removes the normality assumption  
\* Randomization is: taking random groups from the data that are of the same size as the tested groups.

\* 1) compute the t-statistic for each randomly sampled pair of groups  
\* 2) get the t-statistic histogram  
Utilizing random generated groups, it’s expected the t-values not to be very high → construct an empirical distribution of t-values

Parametric Models and Exponential Families  
Univariate Families

Name Notation	Density	X	$\Omega$	E Var
Normal $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \frac{(x-\mu)^2}{\sigma^2}}$	$\mathbb{R}^{(1)}$	$\mu \in \mathbb{R}^{(1)}$ $\sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$	$\mu$ $\sigma^2$

\* has two parameters, but they are very specific.  $\mu$  is the location parameter, and  $\sigma^2$  is the wide/narrow parameter  
\* model quatities that take positive and/or negative continuous values, if the distribution is symetric and if there are no too many extreme values

Name Notation	Density	X	$\Omega$	E Var
Poisson $Poi(\lambda)$	$\frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^x}{x!}$	$\mathbb{N}_0$	$\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$	$\lambda$ $\lambda$

\* if the mean grows/shrinks the variance also grows/shrinks proportionally  
\*  $\lambda$  must stay positive and is the interval of time of an exponential distribution, which is continuous → the expected number of successes can have decimals  
\* model a quantity that is discrete, it’s the number of counts of something  
\* It’s not very flexible as only has one parameter to tweak

Name Notation	Density	X	$\Omega$	E Var
Binomial $Bi(n, \theta)$	$\binom{n}{x} \theta^n (1 - \theta)^{n-x}$	$\{0, \dots, n\}$	$0 \leq \theta \leq 1$	$n\theta$ $n\theta(1 - \theta)$

\* model the count of successes as Poisson, but we know the number of trials  $n$

Name Notation	Density	X	$\Omega$	E Var
Gamma $Ga(\nu, \sigma)$	$\frac{x^{\nu-1} e^{-\frac{x}{\sigma}}}{\sigma^{\nu} \Gamma(\nu)}$	$\mathbb{R}^+$	$\nu > 0$ $\sigma > 0$	$\sigma \nu$ $\sigma^2 \nu$

\* the Gamma is used to model positive quantities. its common to use the inverse Gamma to model variances.

Name Notation	Density	X	$\Omega$	E Var
Beta $Be(\alpha, \beta)$	$\frac{x^{\alpha-1} (1-x)^{\beta-1}}{B(\alpha, \beta)}$	$0 \leq x \leq 1$	$\alpha > 0$ $\beta > 0$	$\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}$ $var$

$var = \frac{\alpha\beta}{(\alpha+\beta)^2(\alpha+\beta+1)}$   
\* as x goes from 0 to 1, it’s mostly used to talk about probabilities (aka. probability distribution)

\* both the Gamma and Beta have two parameters that convey some degree of flexibility  
\* Gamma is flexible but not as flexible as Beta  
\* The Binomial can approximate a Poisson with a large  $n$  and small probability.

Multinomial Distribution (a.k.a. multidimensional binomial)

Used when observations take take a finite number of possible outcome values  $L$ .

\* let  $\underline{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_L)$  be the vector of counts given the possible outcomes, where  $x_l$  is de number of cases/counts having outcome  $l$ . e.g.  $\underline{x} = (150, 300, 1000, 50)$ , where outcome  $l = 1$  happened 150 times, and outcome  $l = 4$  happened 50 times  
\* code the outcomes in terms of unit vectors of length  $L$ . e.g.  $e_l = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)^T$ , where the 1 is in the  $l^{th}$  place.  
\* encode the outcomes as unit vectors with assigned probabilities in  $\pi_l$ , a vector of probabilities.

$$\pi_l = P\{e_l\}, l = 1, 2, 3, \dots, L$$

$\underline{x}$  follows a multinomial distribution  $f_{\pi}$

$$f_{\pi}(\underline{x}) = \underline{x} \sim Mult_L(n, \pi) = \frac{n!}{x_1!x_2! \dots x_L!} \cdot \prod_{l=1}^L \pi_l^{x_l}$$

where  $L$  is the no. of outcomes,  $n$  the no. of observations, and  $\pi$  is the prob. vector.  
\* The multinomial distribution assumes the probabilities are constant.

The parameter space  $\Omega$  of  $\pi$  is  $S_L$ ; a set of probability vectors  $\pi$  such that the components of  $\pi$  are positive quantities for all  $l$ 's

$$S_L = \{\pi : \pi_l \geq 0 \forall l \text{ and } \sum_{l=1}^L \pi_l = 1\}$$

The sample space  $X$  for  $\underline{x}$  is a subset of  $nS_L$  with integer components. e.g. for  $L = 2$  (a Binomial dist.),  $(\pi_1, \pi_2) = (\pi, 1 - \pi)$ ;  $(x_1, x_2) = (x, n - x)$

The mean vector  $E(x) = n\pi$

The covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  is given by:

$$\Sigma = n \cdot \left( \begin{bmatrix} \pi_1 & & \text{zeros} \\ & \pi_2 & \\ & & \ddots \\ \text{zeros} & & & \pi_L \end{bmatrix} - \pi \cdot \pi^T \right)$$

The variance of  $x_l$  is:

$$V(x_l) = n \cdot \pi_l \cdot (1 - \pi_l)$$

The covariance of  $x_l$  is:

$$Cov(x_l, x_j) = -n\pi_l \cdot \pi_j$$

### Multinomial-Poisson relationship

IF {  
 $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_L$  are independent Poisson distributions/counts;  
 meaning that the counts of each category follow the  
 distribution:  $S_l \overset{iid}{\sim} Poi(\mu_l), l = 1, 2, \dots, L$ .  
 Each Poisson has a different  $\mu_l$  parameter, which is a vector of  
 mean/rate parameters.

}  
 THEN {  
 the vector of successes is given by:

$$\mathbb{S} | \sum_{l=1}^L S_l \sim Mult_L \left( \sum_{l=1}^L S_L, \frac{\underline{\mu}}{\sum_{l=1}^L \mu_l} \right)$$

}

IF {  
 the number of trials  $N$  is distributed Poisson with parameter  $n$

$$N \sim Poi(n)$$

}

THEN {

$$Mult_L(N, \underline{\pi}) \sim Poi(n \cdot \underline{\pi})$$

}

where  $\underline{\pi}$  is the probability vector, and  $n \cdot \underline{\pi}$  is a vector of  
 expected values (means).

For a large  $n$ , the approximation

$$\underline{x} \overset{a}{\sim} Poi(n \cdot \underline{\pi})$$

removes the need to compute multinomial correlations

\* the multinomial distribution contains all distributions on  
 sample space  $X$  composed of  $\underline{L}$  discrete categories  $\rightarrow$  the  
 multinomial dist. can model any distribution

### Exponential Families - Poisson Dist.

$$f_{\mu}(x) = \frac{\mu^x e^{-\mu}}{x!}$$

From the ratio of two Poissons  $\frac{f_{\mu}(x)}{f_{\mu_o}(x)}$ ,

$$f_{\mu}(x) = e^{-(\mu - \mu_o)} \cdot \left( \frac{\mu}{\mu_o} \right)^x \cdot f_{\mu_o}(x)$$

given:  $\alpha = \log(\frac{\mu}{\mu_o})$ , then:  $\left( \frac{\mu}{\mu_o} \right)^x = e^{\alpha x}$  and  $\mu = e^{\alpha} \mu_o$   
 therefore:

$$f_{\mu}(x) = e^{\alpha x} - \Psi(\alpha) \cdot f_{\mu_o}(x)$$

$$\Psi(\alpha) = \mu_o(e^{\alpha-1})$$

### Exponential Families - Gamma Dist.

$$f_{\underline{\alpha}}(x) = \frac{x^{\nu-1} \cdot e^{-\frac{x}{\sigma}}}{\sigma^{\nu} \Gamma(\nu)}$$

$\underline{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (-\frac{1}{\sigma}, \nu) \in A \subseteq \{\alpha_1 < 0; \alpha_2 > 0\}$   
 $\underline{y} = (y_1, y_2) = (\gamma, \log(x))$   
 $\Psi(\underline{\alpha}) = \alpha_2 \log(-\alpha_1) + \log(\Gamma(\alpha_2))$

IF {  
 $\underline{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  is iid from  $f_{\mu}(x) = e^{\alpha^T \underline{y} - \Psi(\underline{\alpha})} \cdot f_{\mu_o}(x)$  and  
 $\underline{y}_i = t(x_i)$   
 }  
 THEN {

$$f_{\underline{\alpha}}(\underline{x}) = e^{n(\underline{\alpha}^T \bar{\underline{y}} - \Psi(\underline{\alpha}))} \cdot f_o(\underline{x})$$

with:  $\bar{\underline{y}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\underline{y}_i}{n}$   
 }

$\Psi(\alpha)$  can be computed numerically by doing:

$$\Psi(\alpha) = \log \int_{\text{sample space } X} e^{\alpha y} f_o(x) dx$$

where  $f_o(x)$  is the pdf in question

### James-Stein Estimator vs Bayes vs MLE

**Estimate  $\mu$  from  $x$  if  $\mu \sim N(m, A)$**

$$\hat{\underline{\mu}}^{Bayes} = \underline{M} + B(\underline{x} - \underline{M})$$

where  $m$  = prior parameter,  $B = \frac{A}{A+1} = \frac{\text{prior variance}}{\text{total variance}}$ ,  
 $\underline{M} = [m, m, \dots, m]$

$$\hat{\underline{\mu}}^{MLE} = \underline{x}$$

$$\hat{\underline{\mu}}^{JS} = \hat{\underline{M}} + \hat{B}(\underline{x} - \hat{\underline{M}})$$

where  $\hat{\underline{M}} = \bar{\underline{x}}$ ,  $\hat{\underline{M}} = [\hat{M}, \hat{M}, \dots, \hat{M}]$ ,  $\hat{B} = \frac{1-N-3}{\sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \bar{x})^2}$   
 (for  $N$  points)

### Expected Squared Error

$$E\{\|\hat{\underline{\mu}}^{Bayes} - \underline{\mu}\|^2\} = NB$$

$$E\{\|\hat{\underline{\mu}}^{MLE} - \underline{\mu}\|^2\} = N$$

$$E\{\|\hat{\underline{\mu}}^{JS} - \underline{\mu}\|^2\} = NB + 3(1 - B)$$

$\hat{\underline{\mu}}^{JS}$  has a bigger ESE than  $\hat{\underline{\mu}}^{Bayes}$  as  $\underline{M}$  and  $B$  are estimated,  
 but still better than  $\hat{\underline{\mu}}^{MLE}$  if  $N \leq 4$  observations.

### James-Stein Theorem

IF  $x_i | \mu_i \sim N(\mu_i, 1)$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  with  $N \geq 4$ ; THEN

$$E\{\|\hat{\underline{\mu}}^{JS} - \underline{\mu}\|^2\} < E\{\|\hat{\underline{\mu}}^{MLE} - \underline{\mu}\|^2\}$$

for all choices of  $\underline{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^N$  (not Bayesian reasoning any more)

\* JS gets observations from Normal distributions which have  
 different means for each observation (estimate different means  
 for each observation). \* JS is a shrinks the effects of individual  
 observations towards the common mean \* extreme shrinkage is  
 to say each observation is the average of all observations \* void  
 shrinkage is to say each observation is its own average (as in  
 MLE) \* JS is in between.

### Ridge Regression vs Linear Regression

#### Linear Regression

based on MLE, it assumes a n-dimensional vector  
 $\underline{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^T$  from a linear model  $\underline{y} = x\beta + \underline{\epsilon}$   
 where:

$\beta$  a unknown p-dimensional parameter vector  
 $\underline{\epsilon}$  uncertain values (aka. independent random variables or  
 independent draws from a dist.)  
 $x$  known data points  
 $\underline{y}$  outcomes taken from the linear model

Thus:  $\epsilon \sim (0, \sigma^2 I_n)$  where:

mean = 0

the variance  $I_n$  is the identity matrix of size  $n$

$$\hat{\beta} = \underset{\beta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{\|\epsilon\|^2\} = \underset{\beta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{\|\underline{y} - x\beta\|^2\}$$

differentiating:

$$\hat{\beta}^{OLS} = S^{-1} \cdot x^T y$$

where:  $S = x^T x$

standard error:

$$\hat{\beta}^{OLS} \sim (\beta, \sigma^2 \cdot S^{-1})$$

### Ridge Regression

$$\hat{\beta} = \underset{\beta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{\|\underline{y} - x \cdot \beta\|^2 + \lambda \cdot \|\beta\|^2\}$$

where:  $\|\beta\|^2 = \beta_1^2 + \beta_2^2 + \dots + \beta_p^2$

if  $\beta$  coefficients are small, the better the results  $\rightarrow$  as the  
 variance decreases by introducing some bias.  $\lambda$  is how much  
 the sum of squares is penalized.

differentiating:

$$\hat{\beta}^{Ridge} = (S + \lambda \cdot I_n)^{-1} \cdot x^T y$$

standard error:

$$\hat{\beta}^{Ridge} \sim ((S + \lambda \cdot I_n)^{-1} \cdot S \cdot \beta, \sigma^2 \cdot (S + \lambda \cdot I_n)^{-1} \cdot S \cdot (S + \lambda \cdot I_n)^{-1})$$

Ridge is a regularized regression, meaning that the variables need to be rescaled as the coefficients have to be on the same scale.

OLS is a special case of Ridge where  $\lambda = 0$

## Logistic Regression

In OLS  $y$  can take values in  $\mathbb{R}$ , or  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ . However, to predict proportions then  $y = p$  should  $y_i = p_i \in \{0, 1\} \forall i$

for each observation the odds ratio is:  $\lambda_i = \log\left(\frac{p_i}{1-p_i}\right)$

for the 1-dimension case,  $\lambda_i = \log\left(\frac{p_i}{1-p_i}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot x_i + \epsilon_i$  using MLE, estimate  $\beta_0$ ,  $\beta_1$  and therefore  $\lambda_i$   
 $\hat{\lambda}(x) = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 \cdot x_i$

$$\hat{\lambda}_i = \log\left(\frac{\hat{p}_i}{1-\hat{p}_i}\right)$$

$$\hat{p}_i = (1 + e^{-(\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 \cdot x_i)})^{-1}$$

This transformation does not work well when  $x = 0$  or  $x = 1$  as the OLS loss function  $\beta^{min} \|\lambda - x\beta\|^2$  increases with the right prediction and decreases with a wrong prediction.

The Deviance Function has the opposite behaviour...

$$D = p_i \cdot \log\left(\frac{p_i}{\hat{p}_i}\right) + (1 - p_i) \cdot \log\left(\frac{1 - p_i}{1 - \hat{p}_i}\right)$$

multiply assuming independent sampling to get the loss function:

$$D(\hat{p}_i | p_i) = 2n_i \left[ p_i \cdot \log\left(\frac{p_i}{\hat{p}_i}\right) + (1 - p_i) \cdot \log\left(\frac{1 - p_i}{1 - \hat{p}_i}\right) \right]$$

Then minimize the loss function to estimate  $(\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1)$

## Generalized Linear Models - GLMs

GLMs extend linear regression to Binomial, Poisson, Gamma or any exponential distribution.

\* GLMs transform an estimation problem in to a regression problem where the regression parameters are to be estimated.

## GLM - exponential family

start with 1-parameter exponential family:

$$f_{\lambda}(y) = e^{\lambda y - \gamma(\lambda)} \cdot f_o(y)$$

where: the observed data  $\underline{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N)^T$  is assumed to come from  $y_i \stackrel{ind}{\sim} f_{\lambda_i}(\cdot)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$

write  $\underline{\lambda}$  as a regression equation to avoid  $N$  estimations (one for each  $\lambda_i$ )

$$\underline{\lambda} = \underline{x} \cdot \underline{\alpha}$$

where:

$\alpha$  is a coefficients vector to assess the importance of each  $x$   
 $x$  the covariance matrix from the data

the likelihood of  $\underline{y}$  for an exponential family is:

$$f_{\underline{\lambda}}(\underline{y}) = e^{\underline{\lambda} \cdot \underline{y} - \gamma(\underline{\lambda})} \cdot f_o(\underline{y})$$

let  $\underline{\lambda} = \underline{x} \cdot \underline{\alpha}$ ,  $\underline{z} = \underline{x}^T y$ ,  $\Psi(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma(x_i^T \cdot \alpha)$  such that

$$f_{\underline{\alpha}}(\underline{y}) = e^{\underline{\alpha}^T \underline{z} - \Psi(\alpha)} \cdot f_o(\underline{y})$$

## GLM - Binomial Distribution

$$\lambda = \log\left(\frac{\pi}{1 + \pi}\right)$$

$$\gamma(\lambda) = n \log(1 + e^{\lambda})$$

## GLM - Poisson Distribution

$$\lambda = \log(\mu)$$

$$\gamma(\lambda) = e^{\lambda}$$

## GLM - Parameter Estimation

$(\mu_{\lambda}, \sigma_{\lambda}^2)$  denotes the expectation and variance of a univariate density  $f_{\lambda}(y)$  in terms of the exponential family properties

$$y \sim (\mu_{\lambda}, \sigma_{\lambda}^2)$$

a N-dimensional vector  $y$  from  $f_{\underline{\alpha}}(y)$  has mean and covariance matrix:

$$y \sim (\underline{\mu}(\underline{\alpha}), \Sigma(\underline{\alpha}))$$

where:

$$\underline{\mu}(\underline{\alpha}) = [\mu_{\lambda_1}, \mu_{\lambda_2}, \dots, \mu_{\lambda_N}]$$

$$\Sigma(\underline{\alpha}) = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{\lambda_1}^2 & & & \text{zeros} \\ & \sigma_{\lambda_2}^2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ \text{zeros} & & & \sigma_{\lambda_N}^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

\* MLE estimate of  $\alpha$  is to satisfy:  $x^T [y - \mu(\alpha)] = 0$

where:

$y$  is the data

$\mu(\alpha)$  is the means vector (adjust  $\alpha$  to better describe  $y$ )

For the Normal distribution,  $\hat{\alpha}^{MLE} = (x^T x)^{-1} \cdot x^T y$

For other family distributions  $\hat{\alpha}$  is to be solved numerically.

$$* \hat{\alpha}^{MLE} \stackrel{a}{\sim} (\alpha, (x^T \cdot \Sigma(\alpha) \cdot x)^{-1})$$

where  $(x^T \cdot \Sigma(\alpha) \cdot x)^{-1}$  is the variance of  $\hat{\alpha}^{MLE}$

The DEVIANCE FUNCTION D() can be used to get MLE estimates of  $\alpha$ . The D() between two densities  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  is:

$$D(f_1, f_2) = 2 \cdot \int_{sampleSpace} f_1(y) \cdot \log\left(\frac{f_1(y)}{f_2(y)}\right) dy$$

Deviance for:

Normal (known  $\sigma^2$ )

$$\left(\frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{\sigma}\right)^2$$

Binomial

$$2n \left[ \pi_1 \cdot \log\left(\frac{\pi_1}{\pi_2}\right) + (1 - \pi_1) \cdot \log\left(\frac{1 - \pi_1}{1 - \pi_2}\right) \right]$$

Poisson

$$2 \cdot \mu_1 \left[ \left(\frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1} - 1\right) \cdot \log\left(\frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1}\right) \right]$$

Hoeffding's Lemma  $\rightarrow$  the MLE  $\hat{\alpha}$  is the choice of  $\alpha$  that minimizes the total deviance. (as OLS minimizes the sum of squares)

## Regression Trees

(aka. fancy averaging) - a technique to estimate regression surfaces using adapting partitioning.

At a given step  $k$ , of the partitioning algorithm, the mean of group  $k$  is

$$m_k = \sum_{i \in \text{group } k} \frac{y_i}{N_k}$$

and the sum of squares of group  $k$  is

$$S_k^2 = \sum_{i \in \text{group } k} (y_i - m_k)^2$$

The total  $S_k^2$  is given by:

$$S_k^2 = S_{k_{left}}^2 + S_{k_{right}}^2 + \frac{N_{k_{left}}^2 N_{k_{right}}^2}{N_k} (m_{k_{left}} - m_{k_{right}})^2$$

the purpose is to maximize the 3rd term (aka. the information gain) in order to get a smaller  $S_k^2$

## Impurity

The impurity of a node measures the deviation from the predicted behaviour of the node.  $\rightarrow$  it's the probability that the prediction is incorrect usually measured by the Gini impurity or the mse (sum of squares error)

The Gini impurity is as follows:

$$\sum_{\text{group } i} p(i) \cdot (1 - p(i))$$

where  $p(i)$  is the probability of success of the node. e.g.

$\sum_{\text{group } i} p(i) \cdot (1 - p(i)) = \frac{5}{95+5} \left(\frac{95}{95+5}\right) + \frac{10}{150+10} \left(\frac{150}{150+10}\right)$ , where 5 points were wrong about outcome A, 95 right about outcome A, 10 wrong about outcome B and 150 right about outcome B.

## Life Tables & Hazard Rates

What is the probability of dying/failing at time  $i$ ?

### Discrete time

$$S_i = \sum_{j \geq i} f_j = P_r(x \geq i)$$

is the probability of surviving past time  $i - 1$ , where

$S_i$  is the marginal survival rate ( $S_{0,i-1} = S_{i,j}$ )

$f_j$  probability of dying at time  $j$

$x$  length of a lifetime

$$h_i = \frac{f_i}{S_i} = P_r(x = i | x \geq i)$$

is the probability of dying exactly at time  $i$  given survival past time  $i - 1$

$$S_{i,j} = \prod_{k=i}^j (1 - h_k) = P(x > j | x \geq i)$$

is the conditional surviving rate past age  $j$  given survived time  $i - 1$

parameter estimates:

$\hat{h}_i = \frac{y_i}{n_i}$  death rate at time  $i$

$$\hat{S}_{t_0,j} = \prod_{k=t_0}^j (1 - \hat{h}_k)$$

It can be used to learn the probability of a  $t_0$  old to survive past time  $t_n$

### Continuous time

---

Osamu Katagiri - A01212611, <https://www.katagiri-mx.com/>