# Bayesian linear regression, Gaussian process regression partial solution

#### 1 Introduction

This practical session aims at applying Bayesian linear regression in a first step, and Gaussian processes in a second step. You will need several libraries for this purpose.

```
import numpy as np
import scipy as sp
import scipy.stats as spst
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
```

### 2 Bayesian linear regression

#### 2.1 Practice

1 Create a function for generating synthetic outputs according to a sample of inputs and a user-defined model (i.e. a given functional relation). Generate training and test datasets.

```
def model(x, sign=1):
    f = 3 + 2*x
    y = f + spst.norm(0,sign).rvs(size=x.shape[0])
    return y

# training data
Xtr = spst.uniform(-5,10).rvs(size=5)
ytr = model(Xtr)
# prediction (test) data
Xpr = spst.uniform(-5,10).rvs(size=1)
ypr = model(Xpr)
```

2 Program a function which makes predictions given training data Xtr and ytr, a noise covariance matrix  $\Sigma_n$ , a prior matrix  $\Sigma_p$ , and the set of prediction (test) instances Xpr. Return the associated credibility intervals via vectors ypr\_inf and ypr\_sup.

You may use the np.linalg.inv function for this purpose. Optimizing the function (using, e.g., Cholesky decomposition) is not mandatory.

```
def predGLR(Xpr, Xtr, ytr, Sign, Sigp):
    Xtr = np.concatenate([np.ones(Xtr.shape), Xtr], axis=1)
    Xpr = np.concatenate([np.ones(Xpr.shape), Xpr], axis=1)
    ...
    return [ypr, ypr_cov, ypr_inf, ypr_sup]
```

3 Use the Gaussian LR model on the generated data, for several levels of noise and several covariance priors. Represent the credibility intervals obtained using the following code.

```
# noise and prior matrices
Sign = np.diag(np.repeat(sign**2, Xtr.shape[0]))
Sigp = np.diag(np.repeat(1e10,2))
# confidence level for prediction region
alph = 0.995
# predictions on test data
ypr_ave, ypr_cov, ypr_inf, ypr_sup = predGLR(Xpr, Xtr, ytr, Sign, Sigp, alph)
# define plot data
Xpl = np.linspace(-5,5,100)
# predict on the plot data
ypl_ave, ypl_cov, ypl_inf, ypl_sup = predGLR(Xpl, Xtr, ytr, Sign, Sigp, alph)
# display the results
fig, ax = plt.subplots()
ax.plot(Xtr, ytr, 'k+', label='test data')
ax.plot(Xpl, ypl_ave, label='estimates')
ax.fill_between(Xpl, ypl_inf.reshape(-1), ypl_sup.reshape(-1),
                 color='lightblue', label='credibility interval')
ax.legend()
```

Notice how the prior covariance matrix "influences" the training (the smaller the value on the diagonal of  $\Sigma_p$ , the more the model will deviate from the ML solution).

Notice also that the lower/upper bounds on the credibility intervals over the predicted outputs are quadratic in  $\mathbf{x}$ : the further we are from the training sample, the higher the uncertainty on  $f(\mathbf{x})$  is.

#### 2.2 Theory

4 Show that the ML estimates for the weights are obtained by

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}} = \left( X^{\top} X \right)^{-1} X^{\top} \mathbf{y},$$

where X stands for the training input matrix (with training instances  $\mathbf{x}_i$  stored row-wise), and  $\mathbf{y}$  for the vector of associated outputs  $y_i$ .

Maximizing the (log-)likelihood amounts to solve

$$\mathbf{w} = \arg\min J(\mathbf{w}) = \|\mathbf{y} - X\mathbf{w}\|^2,$$

i.e. to solve an ordinary least-squares problem. The vector of first-order derivatives writes as

$$\frac{\partial J(\mathbf{w})}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{w}} \left( \mathbf{w}^{\top} X^{\top} X \mathbf{w} - 2 \mathbf{w}^{\top} X^{\top} \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{y} \right),$$
$$= 2 X^{\top} X \mathbf{w} - 2 X^{\top} \mathbf{y},$$

and the matrix of second-order derivatives as

$$\frac{\partial^2 J(\mathbf{w})}{\partial \mathbf{w} \partial \mathbf{w}^{\top}} = 2X^{\top} X.$$

The matrix of second-order derivatives is obviously positive definite: therefore, the objective function  $J(\mathbf{w})$  is convex, and setting the vector of first-order derivatives to zero yields its global minimum:

$$\frac{\partial J(\mathbf{w})}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = 0 \iff 2X^{\top} X \mathbf{w} - 2X^{\top} \mathbf{y} = 0,$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \mathbf{w} = (X^{\top} X)^{-1} X^{\top} \mathbf{y},$$

since  $X^{\top}X$  is positive definite and therefore invertible.

 $\boxed{5}$  We study here the distribution of the ML estimator  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$  of the parameter vector  $\mathbf{w}$ .

5a Show that for any Gaussian random vector  $\mathbf{U} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{a}, B)$ , then the random vector  $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{c} + D\mathbf{U}$  is such that  $\mathbf{V} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{c} + D\mathbf{a}, DBD^{\top})$ .

A linear combination of Gaussian random vectors is a Gaussian random vector:  $\mathbf{V} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{E}\left[\overline{\mathbf{V}}\right], \mathrm{Var}\left(\mathbf{V}\right))$ . In addition, the expectation satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{V}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{c} + D\mathbf{U}\right] = \mathbf{c} + D\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{U}\right];$$

whereas for the variance,

$$\operatorname{Var}(\mathbf{V}) = \operatorname{Var}(\mathbf{c} + D\mathbf{U}) = D \operatorname{Var}(\mathbf{U}) D^{\top}.$$

5 b Show that the ML estimator  $\hat{\mathbf{w}}^{1}$  of the parameter vector  $\mathbf{w}$  is distributed as

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{w}, \sigma_n^2 \left(X^\top X\right)^{-1}\right).$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Note that this notation does not make a distinction between the estimator and its realization.

We apply the previous equality with  $\mathbf{U} := \mathbf{Y}$  (the realization of which is the output vector  $\mathbf{y}$ ),  $\mathbf{a} := X\mathbf{w}$ , and  $B := \sigma_n^2 \operatorname{Id}_p$ , our linear combination of Gaussian random vectors being thus

$$\mathbf{V} := \widehat{\mathbf{w}} = D\mathbf{Y} = (X^{\top}X)^{-1}X^{\top}\mathbf{Y}.$$

We recall that  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}] = X\mathbf{w}$  and  $\operatorname{Var}(\mathbf{Y}) = \sigma_n^2 \operatorname{Id}_n$ : thus,

$$\begin{split} \widehat{\mathbf{w}} &\sim \mathcal{N}\left(\left(X^{\top}X\right)^{-1}\left(X^{\top}X\right)\mathbf{w}, \left(X^{\top}X\right)^{-1}X^{\top}\left(\sigma_{n}^{2}\operatorname{Id}_{n}\right)\left(\left(X^{\top}X\right)^{-1}X^{\top}\right)^{\top}\right), \\ \Leftrightarrow & \widehat{\mathbf{w}} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{w}, \sigma_{n}^{2}\left(X^{\top}X\right)^{-1}X^{\top}\operatorname{Id}_{n}X\left(X^{\top}X\right)^{-1}\right), \\ \Leftrightarrow & \widehat{\mathbf{w}} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{w}, \sigma_{n}^{2}\left(X^{\top}X\right)^{-1}\right). \end{split}$$

## 3 Gaussian process regression

We consider the scikit-learn implementation of Gaussian process regression.

```
from sklearn.gaussian_process import GaussianProcessRegressor as GPR
from SKlearn.gaussian_process.kernels import RBF, ConstantKernel as C
from sklearn.gaussian_process.kernels import DotProduct as DP, WhiteKernel as WK
```

#### 3.1 Practice

6 We first consider the noise-free case.

6 a Take a function such as e.g.  $f(x) = x \cos(x)$ , with  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Generate training, prediction and plot data accordingly, without noise.

```
Note that GPR requires the training, test and plot data to be defined as n × p input matrices.

def model(x, sign=1):
    f = x * np.cos(x)
    y = f + spst.norm(0,sign).rvs(size=x.shape)
    return y

Xtr = spst.uniform(0,10).rvs(size=20)
ytr = model(Xtr, 0)

Xpr = spst.uniform(0,10).rvs(size=20)
ypr = model(Xpr, 0)

Xpl = np.linspace(0,10,1000)

Xtr = Xtr.reshape(-1,1)
Xpr = Xpr.reshape(-1,1)
Xpl = Xpl.reshape(-1,1)
```

6 b Build the GPR model; fit the model to the training data, make predictions, and display.

We build the GPR model by first creating a kernel and then instantiating the model.

7 We now introduce noise in the model outputs.

```
ytr_noi = model(Xtr.ravel(), 1)
```

7 a Train the model with the noisy data assuming they are noise-free, and display the results.

[7b] Display the outputs of a model which assumes the presence of noise in the training data, with a fixed amount of noise (using the GPR parameter alpha, set for instance to alpha=1).

Part of the variability in the outputs is now captured by the noise component. As a result, the GPR model fit to the data is more regular, and arguably closer to the actual model  $f(x) = x \cos(x)$ .