SDS385 Fall '16: Statistical Models For Big Data Exercises 01 - Linear regression

Matteo Vestrucci

August 29th 2016

A)

The objective function can be rewritten like this:

$$\hat{\beta} = \arg\min_{\beta \in \mathcal{R}^P} (X\beta - Y)^T \frac{W}{2} (X\beta - Y).$$

The function is smooth and convex, being a sum of squares. Thus we can set the first derivative equal to zero to find the minimum:

$$\nabla_{\beta} \left[(X\beta - Y)^T \frac{W}{2} (X\beta - Y) \right] = 0$$
$$2X^T \frac{W}{2} (X\beta - Y) = 0$$
$$(X^T W X)\beta - X^T W Y = 0$$
$$(X^T W X)\beta = X^T W Y.$$

B)

Inverting a matrix is a very slow and expansive operation in the order of $O(P^3)$. The "inversion method" is also not very stable because it introduces precision problems when using floating point variables, especially when the determinant is close to zero. As long as within the N rows we can find a number of linearly independent ones greater than P and with positive weight assigned, then the matrix resulting from the product X^TWX will be symmetric and positive definite, which compels us to use the Choleski decomposition and the Gaussian elimination, an algorithm that is much faster than the "inversion method".

The algorithm can be summarized as this:

- Calculate $A = X^T W X$
- Calculate $B = X^T W Y$
- Apply Choleski decomposition on A, keep the upper triangular matrix C
- Apply Gaussian elimination on the system $C^TD = B$, keep the vector D
- Apply Gaussian elimination on the system $C\beta = D$, keep the solution β

The Choleski decomposition is also the fastest but also the most unstable among the other decompositions available. A good middle ground would be the QR decomposition that outputs an orthonormal matrix Q and an upper triangular matrix R. In that case we would work on $W^{\frac{1}{2}}X = QR$ and proceed with the following simplifications:

$$X^{T}WY = X^{T}WX\beta$$

$$X^{T}W^{\frac{1}{2}}W^{\frac{1}{2}}Y = X^{T}W^{\frac{1}{2}}W^{\frac{1}{2}}X\beta$$

$$(QR)^{T}W^{\frac{1}{2}}Y = (QR)^{T}QR\beta$$

$$R^{T}Q^{T}W^{\frac{1}{2}}Y = R^{T}Q^{T}QR\beta$$

$$Q^{T}W^{\frac{1}{2}}Y = R\beta.$$

C)

Running the code in appendix, we can obtain the following benchmarks:

$silly_data(N=21,P=7)$ Unit:microseconds												
expr	\min	lq	mean	median	uq	max	neval					
inversion	25.44	26.4	32.61	27.03	34.35	61.48	10					
factorization	31.82	33.36	41.39	34.74	38.82	91.56	10					
silly_data(N=150,P=50) Unit:microseconds												
expr	min	lq	mean	median	uq	max	neval					
inversion	409.76	411.72	416.63	412.99	416.85	445.64	10					
factorization	77.9	79.63	90.17	80.19	85.52	170.83	10					
silly_data(N=900,P=300) Unit:milliseconds												
expr	\min	lq	mean	median	uq	max	neval					
inversion	71.45	71.59	71.79	71.64	72.01	72.42	10					
factorization	6.39	6.41	6.45	6.45	6.48	6.53	10					
silly_data(N=3000,P=1000) Unit:milliseconds												
expr	\min	lq	mean	median	uq	max	neval					
inversion	2650.49	2654.23	2659.47	2656.83	2666.07	2673.65	10					
factorization	227.22	227.78	228.13	228.02	228.56	229.47	10					

D)

Running the code in appendix, we can obtain the following benchmarks:

sparse_data(N=900	,P=300,pro	p=0.05) Ur	nit:microseco	onds						
expr	\min	lq	mean	median	uq	max	neval			
$inversion_m$	72864.47	72937.55	73102.84	72959.86	73162.11	73717.14	10			
factorization_m	8035.45	8058.48	8162.63	8079.58	8180.62	8700.15	10			
$sparse_m$	758.47	839.55	865.19	852.88	873.94	890.28	10			
sparse_data(N=3000,P=1000,prop=0.05) Unit:milliseconds										
expr	min	lq	mean	median	uq	max	neval			
inversion_m	2675.76	2683.88	2696.26	2686.89	2698.53	2775.58	10			
$factorization_m$	245.69	247.65	248.43	247.85	249.18	256.64	10			
$sparse_m$	8.04	8.25	8.80	8.53	8.81	9.62	10			
sparse_data(N=3000,P=1000,prop=0.01) Unit:milliseconds										
expr	\min	lq	mean	median	uq	max	neval			
$inversion_m$	2664.54	2669.19	2673.19	2671.9	2673.31	2688.53	10			
$factorization_m$	235.53	235.25	236.04	236.15	236.78	237.61	10			
sparse_m	7.18	7.20	7.29	7.23	7.27	7.91	10			

CODE)

```
library(Matrix)
library(microbenchmark)
inversion_m<-function(matA,matB){</pre>
  #matA*beta=matB
  beta<-solve.default(matA)%*%matB</pre>
  return(beta)
}
factorization_m<-function(matA,matB){</pre>
  #matA*beta=matB
  #matL'*matL*beta=matB
  #matL'*matC=matB
  #matL*beta=matC
  matL<-chol.default(matA)</pre>
  matC<-forwardsolve(t(matL),matB)</pre>
  beta<-backsolve(matL,matC)</pre>
  return(beta)
silly_data<-function(N,P){</pre>
  X<-matrix(rnorm(N*P,sd=10), nrow=N, ncol=P)</pre>
  truebeta<-rnorm(P,sd=10)</pre>
  W<-diag(sample(c(1,2),N,replace=T))</pre>
  error<-rnorm(N)</pre>
  Y = X%*%truebeta+error
```

```
matA \leftarrow t(X)%*%W%*%X
 matB < -t(X)%*%W%*%Y
 return(list(matA=matA,matB=matB))
data<-silly_data(N=21,P=7)</pre>
matA<-data$matA;matB<-data$matB</pre>
p7<-microbenchmark(inversion_m(matA,matB),factorization_m(matA,matB),times=10);p7
data<-silly_data(N=150,P=50)</pre>
matA<-data$matA;matB<-data$matB</pre>
p50<-microbenchmark(inversion_m(matA,matB),factorization_m(matA,matB),times=10);p50
data<-silly_data(N=900,P=300)</pre>
matA<-data$matA;matB<-data$matB</pre>
p300<-microbenchmark(inversion_m(matA, matB), factorization_m(matA, matB), times=10);p300
data<-silly_data(N=3000,P=1000)</pre>
matA<-data$matA;matB<-data$matB</pre>
p1000<-microbenchmark(inversion_m(matA,matB),factorization_m(matA,matB),times=10);p1000
sparse_data<-function(N,P,prop=0.05){</pre>
 X<-matrix(rnorm(N*P,sd=10), nrow=N, ncol=P)</pre>
 mask = matrix(rbinom(N*P,1,prop), nrow=N)
 X = mask*X
 truebeta<-rnorm(P,sd=10)</pre>
 W<-diag(sample(c(1,2),N,replace=T))</pre>
 error<-rnorm(N)</pre>
 Y = X%*%truebeta+error
 matA<-Matrix(t(X)%*%W%*%X,sparse=T)</pre>
 matB<-Matrix(t(X)%*%W%*%Y,sparse=F)</pre>
 return(list(matA=matA,matB=matB))
sparse_m<-function(matA,matB){</pre>
  #matA*beta=matB
 beta<-solve(matA,matB)</pre>
 return(beta)
}
data<-sparse_data(N=900,P=300,prop=0.05)</pre>
matA<-data$matA;matB<-data$matB</pre>
p300_0.05<-microbenchmark(inversion_m(matA,matB),factorization_m(matA,matB),
                         sparse_m(matA,matB),times=10);p300_0.05
data<-sparse_data(N=3000,P=1000,prop=0.05)</pre>
matA<-data$matA;matB<-data$matB</pre>
p1000_0.05<-microbenchmark(inversion_m(matA,matB),factorization_m(matA,matB),
                          sparse_m(matA,matB),times=10);p1000_0.05
data<-sparse_data(N=3000,P=1000,prop=0.01)</pre>
matA<-data$matA;matB<-data$matB</pre>
p1000_0.01<-microbenchmark(inversion_m(matA,matB),factorization_m(matA,matB),
                          sparse_m(matA,matB),times=10);p1000_0.01
```