# Linear Regression

Machine Learning 1 — Lecture 4

28th March 2023

Robert Peharz
Institute of Theoretical Computer Science
Graz University of Technology

**Regression**: Predict a *continuous* **target variable** from one or more **input variables**. Hence, a form of **supervised learning.**

**input variables** (also **independent variables**, **features**):

$$x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_D, \text{ collected in a vector } \boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_D)^T$$

**target variable** (also **dependent variable**, **output variable**, or **ground truth**):

$$y$$

# Height Regression

**Example**



| knee height [cm] | arm span [cm] | body height [cm] |
|---|---|---|
| 57 | 181 | 185 |
| 55 | 177 | 177 |
| 53 | 167 | 176 |
| ... | ... | ... |

- You need to measure the body height of a hospitalized patient, who is bed tied and cannot stand to take a measurement
- Say you have collected data about the knee length, arm span and height of $N$ persons
- You might now learn to predict patients' height from their arm span and knee height, thus "indirectly measure" the height of the hospitalized patient

# Height Regression – Data

Example

| knee height [cm] | arm span [cm] | height [cm] |
|---|---|---|
| 57 | 181 | 185 |
| 55 | 177 | 177 |
| 53 | 167 | 176 |
| ... | ... | ... |

$N = 30$ data points






# Height Regression – Data

Example

| knee height [cm] | arm span [cm] | height [cm] |
|---|---|---|
| 57 | 181 | 185 |
| 55 | 177 | 177 |
| 53 | 167 | 176 |
| ... | ... | ... |

$N = 30$ data points



# Regression

The target $y$ is a **"noisy" function** of the input variables $\boldsymbol{x}$:

$$y = f(\boldsymbol{x}) + e \qquad\qquad e: \text{ noise term}$$

Assume we have a **training data set** with $N$ examples:

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{(\boldsymbol{x}^{(1)}, y^{(1)}), (\boldsymbol{x}^{(2)}, y^{(2)}), \ldots, (\boldsymbol{x}^{(N)}, y^{(N)})\right\}$$

$\boldsymbol{x}^i$: $D$-dimensional vector

$y^i$: target value

$(\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)}, y^{(i)})$: $i^{\text{th}}$ **training example** (input-output pair)

**Goal: Learn the function $f$ from $\mathcal{D}$.**

Searching over **all possible** functions $f : \mathbb{R}^D \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is challenging.

Thus, one usually considers a **restricted** class of functions, the so-called **hypothesis space** $\mathcal{H}$ (also called **model class**, **function space**, etc.).

Often, the hypothesis space is given via some **parametrized function**

$$f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = f(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ is a $M$-dimensional **parameter vector**.

# The Overall Picture




(Same picture generally applies to **supervised learning**, not only regression)

When the hypothesis space is restricted to all **affine functions**

$$\mathcal{H} = \left\{ f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}) := \boldsymbol{w}^T \boldsymbol{x} + b \,|\, \boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{R}^D, b \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$$

we speak of **linear regression**.* Thus, each function is of the form

$$f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{w}^T \boldsymbol{x} + b = \left( \sum_{d=1}^{D} w_d x_d \right) + b$$

The parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ consists of **bias** $b$ and **weight vector** $\boldsymbol{w} = (w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_D)^T$:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} = (b, w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_D)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{D+1}$$

*The distinction between *affine* and *linear* function is sloppy at times.

# How to pick suitable parameters?

## Example

| knee height [cm] | height [cm] |
|---|---|
| 57 | 185 |
| 55 | 177 |
| 53 | 176 |
| ... | ... |




- Predict height from knee height
- Hypothesis class: $f_\theta(x) = wx + b$
- Parameters: $\theta = (b, w)^T \in \mathbb{R}^2$
- Say we have $\theta^{(1)} = (150, 0.5)^T$ and $\theta^{(2)} = (84, 1.7)^T$
- Which one is better? In what sense it is better?

- Consider an arbitrary training point $\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)}$, $y^{(i)}$
- Consider parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (b, \overbrace{w_1, \ldots, w_D}^{\boldsymbol{w}^T})^T$
- The **predicted target** is $\hat{y}^{(i)} =: f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)}) = \boldsymbol{w}^T \boldsymbol{x}^{(i)} + b$
- The **squared error** ($\ell_2$ **error**) between prediction and target is

$$\big(\underbrace{\hat{y}^{(i)} - y^{(i)}}_{\text{prediction error}}\big)^2 = \left(f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)}) - y^{(i)}\right)^2 = \left(\boldsymbol{w}^T \boldsymbol{x}^{(i)} + b - y^{(i)}\right)^2$$

# Squared Error

Example



- We want the squared error to be small on all training examples
- Idea: average the squared error over the whole data set
- This yields the **least-squares loss function** ($\ell_2$ **loss**):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\hat{y}^{(i)} - y^{(i)}\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)}) - y^{(i)}\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\boldsymbol{w}^T\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)} + b - y^{(i)}\right)^2\end{aligned}$$

- A **loss function** (**objective**, **cost function**) is a notion of fitness
- The lower $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, the better $\boldsymbol{\theta}$

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)}) - y^{(i)}\right)^2$$

$\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(1)} = (150, 0.5)^T$

$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(1)}) = 22.67$



$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)}) - y^{(i)}\right)^2$$

$\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(2)} = (84, 1.7)^T$

$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(2)}) = 9.28$



# Loss Function Illustrated

Example

- ranging over all $\theta$ yields a "**loss landscape**"
- least squares: **quadratic function**
- **convex** ("bowl shaped")
- thus, every **local minimum** is a **global minimum**

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( f_\theta(\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)}) - y^{(i)} \right)^2$$



# Least Squares — Analytic Solution

# Minimum of $\mathcal{L}(\theta)$ (Quadratic Function)

The regression loss $\mathcal{L}(\theta)$ has (under regularity conditions) a **unique** stationary point, which is its **unique global minimum**.




Thus, we find the **least-squares solution** $\theta^*$ by setting $\nabla_\theta \mathcal{L} = 0$.

# Absorbing the Bias

The model is an affine function

$$f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{w}^T \boldsymbol{x} + b$$

We can simplify notation a bit, by expanding the input vector by a **constant** ("dummy feature"): $\boldsymbol{x} := (1, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_D)^T$

$$f_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{D} \theta_i x_i + \theta_0 \, 1 = \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \boldsymbol{x},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (b, w_1, \ldots, w_D)^T$.

# Least-Squares in Matrix Form

- Collect all $\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)}$ as rows in a $N \times (D+1)$ matrix:

$$\boldsymbol{X} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{x}^{(1)\,T} \\ \boldsymbol{x}^{(2)\,T} \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{x}^{(N)\,T} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_1^{(1)} & x_2^{(1)} & \dots & x_D^{(1)} \\ 1 & x_1^{(2)} & x_2^{(2)} & \dots & x_D^{(2)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & x_1^{(N)} & x_2^{(N)} & \dots & x_D^{(N)} \end{pmatrix}$$

- $\boldsymbol{X}$ is called the **design matrix**
- The vector of predictions is

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{y}} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{y}^{(1)} \\ \hat{y}^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \hat{y}^{(N)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{x}^{(1)\,T}\boldsymbol{\theta} \\ \boldsymbol{x}^{(2)\,T}\boldsymbol{\theta} \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{x}^{(N)\,T}\boldsymbol{\theta} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{x}^{(1)\,T} \\ \boldsymbol{x}^{(2)\,T} \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{x}^{(N)\,T} \end{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\theta}$$

# Least-Squares in Matrix Form cont'd

- Collect all targets $y^{(i)}$ in a vector:

$$\boldsymbol{y} = \begin{pmatrix} y^{(1)} \\ y^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ y^{(N)} \end{pmatrix}$$

- The vector of **prediction errors** is given as

$$\boldsymbol{e} := \begin{pmatrix} \hat{y}^{(1)} - y^{(1)} \\ \hat{y}^{(2)} - y^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \hat{y}^{(N)} - y^{(N)} \end{pmatrix} = \hat{\boldsymbol{y}} - \boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{y}$$

# Least-Squares in Matrix Form cont'd

- The least-squares objective can now be written

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\hat{y}^{(i)} - y^{(i)}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} e^{(i)} e^{(i)}$$
$$= \frac{1}{N}\boldsymbol{e}^T\boldsymbol{e}$$
$$= \frac{1}{N}\left(\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{y}\right)^T\left(\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{y}\right)$$

- **Quadratic function** in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$
- The gradient can be shown to be

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{N} 2\boldsymbol{X}^T\left(\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{y}\right)$$

- Compare this with the 1-d case: $\frac{d}{\mathrm{d}\theta}(x\theta - y)^2 = 2x(x\theta - y)$

# Closed Form Solution

Setting the gradient to zero yields the minimum:

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{N} 2 \boldsymbol{X}^T (\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{y}) \stackrel{!}{=} 0$$
$$\boldsymbol{X}^T (\boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{y}) = 0$$

Hence, we have to solve a linear system of equations:

$$\boldsymbol{X}^T \boldsymbol{X} \boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \boldsymbol{X}^T \boldsymbol{y}$$
$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \underbrace{(\boldsymbol{X}^T \boldsymbol{X})^{-1} \boldsymbol{X}^T}_{\text{Moore-Penrose Inverse}} \boldsymbol{y}$$

$(\boldsymbol{X}^T \boldsymbol{X})^{-1}$ exist, if the columns of $\boldsymbol{X}$ are **linearly independent** (i.e., when there are no "redundant features").

# Closed Form Solution

**Example**

| n | knee height | height |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 56.7 | 185.0 |
| 2 | 54.8 | 177.4 |
| 3 | 52.7 | 175.5 |
| 4 | 51.5 | 164.6 |
| 5 | 51.6 | 173.4 |
| 6 | 52.3 | 173.0 |
| 7 | 52.8 | 174.5 |
| 8 | 50.7 | 171.5 |
| 9 | 53.1 | 174.8 |
| 10 | 53.9 | 172.3 |
| 11 | 49.6 | 167.6 |
| 12 | 55.1 | 180.0 |
| 13 | 54.0 | 179.9 |
| 14 | 57.3 | 184.6 |
| 15 | 53.3 | 175.3 |

| n | knee height | height |
|---|---|---|
| 16 | 52.8 | 172.7 |
| 17 | 52.5 | 171.9 |
| 18 | 50.5 | 166.3 |
| 19 | 52.9 | 180.5 |
| 20 | 52.4 | 168.8 |
| 21 | 49.5 | 168.4 |
| 22 | 52.7 | 173.8 |
| 23 | 55.8 | 183.3 |
| 24 | 52.3 | 176.3 |
| 25 | 51.2 | 169.3 |
| 26 | 52.8 | 171.0 |
| 27 | 53.7 | 178.5 |
| 28 | 51.6 | 174.1 |
| 29 | 48.6 | 170.7 |
| 30 | 51.4 | 173.7 |

$$\boldsymbol{X} = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 56.7 \\ 1 & 54.8 \\ 1 & 52.7 \\ \vdots & \vdots \end{pmatrix}}_{30\times 2} \quad \boldsymbol{y} = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 185 \\ 177.4 \\ 175.5 \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}}_{30\times 1}$$

$$\boldsymbol{X}^T\boldsymbol{X} = \begin{pmatrix} 30 & 1580.1 \\ 1580.1 & 83339.25 \end{pmatrix} \qquad (\boldsymbol{X}^T\boldsymbol{X})^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 24.076 & -0.456 \\ -0.456 & 0.009 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\boldsymbol{X}^T\boldsymbol{y} = \begin{pmatrix} 5228.7 \\ 275645.13 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \boldsymbol{\theta}^* = (\boldsymbol{X}^T\boldsymbol{X})^{-1}\boldsymbol{X}^T\boldsymbol{y} = \begin{pmatrix} 60.4 \\ 2.16 \end{pmatrix}$$




**Optimal in least-squares sense**: $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \begin{pmatrix} 60.4 \\ 2.16 \end{pmatrix}$ $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) = 7.95$

# Duality to Maximum Likelihood

- least-squares has an interesting connection to **Gaussian density estimation** and the **maximum likelihood principle**
- we will first review Gaussian density estimation, an **unsupervised** technique, and connect it then to linear regression, a **supervised** technique

Consider the univariate **Gaussian distribution** with density

$$p(x; \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\,\sigma} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)^2}$$

with parameters **mean** $\mu$ and **standard deviation** $\sigma > 0$, which might be written as parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\mu, \sigma)^T$.




Carl Friedrich Gauss 1777–1855

Image: wikipedia

# How to fit a Gaussian?

Say we have observed data $\mathcal{D} = \{x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(N)}\}$? Which $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\mu, \sigma)^T$ explain this data best? What is a good objective function for density estimation?




Note that there are only inputs now – density estimation is **unsupervised**.

When $\mathcal{D} = \left\{x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}, \ldots, x^{(N)}\right\}$ are drawn **independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.)**, the probability density of the whole dataset $\mathcal{D}$ is

$$p(\mathcal{D}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} p(x^{(i)}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$$

Note: Generally, multiple random variables $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_N$ are **statistically independent** if their distribution factorizes. Hence, the probability density $p(\mathcal{D}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ factorizes into sample-wise densities $p(x^{(i)}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ due to the i.i.d. assumption.

$p(\mathcal{D}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$ depends on the dataset $\mathcal{D}$ and the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

- When seen as function of data: probability density of $\mathcal{D}$
- When seen as function of parameters: **likelihood** of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$

**Maximum Likelihood Estimator**

Parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ which maximize the likelihood

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* := \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \; p(\mathcal{D}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \; \prod_{i=1}^{N} p(x^{(i)}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$$

Generally, for any parametric model (not only Gaussians), maximum likelihood is a **consistent estimator,** i.e. for $N \to \infty$ it recovers the distribution closest to the true data distribution.

Instead of likelihood, we can maximize the **log-likelihood**:

$$\log p(\mathcal{D}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) := \log \prod_{i=1}^{N} p(x^{(i)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \log p(x^{(i)}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$$

Since the log is a **strictly increasing** function, the log-likelihood has exactly the same maxima as the likelihood, i.e. maximizing log-likelihood is equivalent to maximizing likelihood.

Optimizing the log-likelihood is usually easier and numerically more stable than optimizing likelihood (product of many small factors).

# Maximum Likelihood for Gaussians

- Gaussian likelihood: $p(\mathcal{D}; \mu, \sigma) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\,\sigma} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x^{(i)}-\mu}{\sigma}\right)^2}$
- Thus, the log-likelihood is

$$\log p(\mathcal{D}; \mu, \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} -\log(\sqrt{2\pi}\,\sigma) - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x^{(i)}-\mu}{\sigma}\right)^2$$

- **(Negative) quadratic function** in $\mu$
- Deriving after $\mu$ delivers:

$$\frac{\partial \log p}{\partial \mu} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} -\frac{1}{2}\,2\left(\frac{x^{(i)}-\mu}{\sigma}\right)\left(-\frac{1}{\sigma}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{x^{(i)}-\mu}{\sigma^2}$$

- At maximum, $\frac{\partial \log p(\mathcal{D};\mu,\sigma)}{\partial \mu} \stackrel{!}{=} 0$

# Maximum Likelihood for Gaussians cont'd

$$\frac{\partial \log p(\mathcal{D}; \mu, \sigma)}{\partial \mu} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{x^{(i)} - \mu}{\sigma^2} \stackrel{!}{=} 0$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} x^{(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mu^* = N\mu^* \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mu^* = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} x^{(i)}$$

- Maximum likelihood $\mu^*$ is simply the **average** over data
- Solution independent of $\sigma$
- Thus, we can now fix $\mu^*$ and maximize w.r.t. $\sigma$

# Maximum Likelihood for Gaussians: $\sigma^*$

$$\log p(\mathcal{D}; \mu^*, \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} -\log(\sqrt{2\pi}\,\sigma) - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x^{(i)} - \mu^*}{\sigma}\right)^2$$

Deriving after $\sigma$:

$$\frac{\partial \log p}{\partial \sigma} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} -\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\,\sigma} - \frac{1}{2}\,2\left(\frac{x^{(i)} - \mu^*}{\sigma}\right)(-1)\left(\frac{x^{(i)} - \mu^*}{\sigma^2}\right)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{N} -\frac{1}{\sigma} + \left(\frac{(x^{(i)} - \mu^*)^2}{\sigma^3}\right) \stackrel{!}{=} 0$$

Hence, we get the **empirical standard deviation** as ML solution:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sigma^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (x^{(i)} - \mu^*)^2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sigma^* = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} (x^{(i)} - \mu^*)^2}$$

The maximum likelihood solution



# Connection to Linear Regression

# Connection to Linear Regression

- Assume now a **regression problem** with data

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{ (\boldsymbol{x}^{(1)}, y^{(1)}), (\boldsymbol{x}^{(2)}, y^{(2)}), \ldots, (\boldsymbol{x}^{(N)}, y^{(N)}) \right\}$$

- We model now **the output** $y^{(i)}$ as univariate Gaussian with
  - **fixed** standard deviation $\sigma$,
  - but whose **mean depends on** $\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)}$:

$$\mu^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{w}^T \boldsymbol{x}^{(i)} + b$$

- Thus, $y^{(i)}$ is drawn from a **conditional Gaussian**:

$$p(y^{(i)} \mid x^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{w}, b, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\,\sigma} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{y^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{w}^T \boldsymbol{x}^{(i)} + b}{\sigma}\right)^2}$$

- Equivalently, the prediction error $e^{(i)} = y^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{w}^T \boldsymbol{x}^{(i)} + b$ is assumed to be Gaussian with $\mu = 0$, and fixed $\sigma$

$$\mu^{(i)} = wx^{(i)} + b$$


$p(y^{(i)} \mid x^{(i)}, w, b, \sigma)$
$y^{(i)}$
190
185
180
175
170
165
160
48
50
52
54
56
58
$x^{(i)}$

# Maximum Likelihood for Linear Regression

- Let $\boldsymbol{y} = (y^{(1)}, y^{(2)}, \ldots, y^{(N)})^T$ be the target vector
- $\boldsymbol{x}^{(1)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}^{(N)}$ are fixed, with "dummy feature" for the bias
- $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (b, w_1, \ldots, w_D)^T$ are model parameters to be learned
- Thus, we can simply write $\mu^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \boldsymbol{x}^{(i)}$
- Standard deviation $\sigma$ is fixed
- We want to maximize the log-likelihood:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log p(\boldsymbol{y} \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{(1)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}^{(N)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \sigma)$$

# Maximum Likelihood for Linear Regression

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\log p(\boldsymbol{y} \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{(1)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}^{(D)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \sigma) \\
&\quad = \log \prod_{i=1}^{N} p(y^{(i)} \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \sigma) \\
&\quad = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \log \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\,\sigma} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{y^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \boldsymbol{x}^{(i)}}{\sigma}\right)^2} \right) \\
&\quad = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \overbrace{-\log \sqrt{2\pi}\,\sigma}^{\text{const.}} - \overbrace{\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}}^{\textit{scaling}} \left( y^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \boldsymbol{x}^{(i)} \right)^2
\end{aligned}
$$

Compare this with the least squares objective:

$$
\overbrace{\frac{1}{N}}^{\textit{scaling}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( y^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \boldsymbol{x}^{(i)} \right)^2
$$

# Maximum Likelihood for Linear Regression

Clearly,

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \quad -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( y^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \boldsymbol{x}^{(i)} \right)^2$$

is equivalent to

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( y^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \boldsymbol{x}^{(i)} \right)^2$$

**Thus, minimizing least squares is equivalent to maximum likelihood under Gaussian output assumption, with fixed $\sigma$!**

# Equivalence to Probabilistic Model

Why does this matter?

- Understanding methods in different ways
- Probabilistic analysis and justification
- Making the implicit model assumptions explicit
- Generalizing the model by playing with probabilistic assumptions
- Generally, many apparently non-probabilistic machine learning algorithms can be explained with probabilistic arguments