
Exam Solutions: Statistical modelling and its applications

Mines Saint-Étienne – majeure Data Science – 21 Décembre 2016

Exercise 1 : The Morris method

For the graph A , the location of X_2 indicates that this variable has no influence at all on the function: as a consequence, this must correspond to f_4 .

The graph C is associated to a function such that X_2 has a purely linear influence but x_1 has a more complex behaviour. Therefore, this graph is the one of f_5 .

The graphs B and C show a similar pattern where both variables have a non-linear influence on the output. They must thus correspond to f_1 and f_2 . It can be noticed that f_1 is a symmetric function and that the two points in D are on top of each other. As a consequence, these two are associated one with each other.

Exercise 2 : Sobol-Hoeffding decomposition over the disk

Let $\mathcal{D} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2, x^2 + y^2 \leq 1\}$ be the unit disk in Cartesian coordinates and $X = (X_1, X_2)$ a random point, uniformly distributed over \mathcal{D} . We are interested in performing sensitivity analysis on the following function:

$$f(x_1, x_2) = x_1 + \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}.$$

Q1. Given X_1 , X_2 is uniformly distributed on $[-\sqrt{1 - X_1^2}, \sqrt{1 - X_1^2}]$. As a consequence, the conditional mean $\mathbb{E}(X_2|X_1)$ is always null but the conditional variance $\text{var}(X_2|X_1)$ decreases with $|X_1|$. This implies that X_1 and X_2 are not independent so it is not possible to perform Sobol sensitivity analysis directly on f .

Q2. Since f_p writes as a product, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_p(\rho, \theta) &= \rho(\cos(\theta) + 1) \\ &= (\rho - m_r + m_r)(\cos(\theta) - m_a + m_a + 1) \\ &= m_r(m_a + 1) + (\rho - m_r)(m_a + 1) + m_r(\cos(\theta) - m_a) + (\rho - m_r)(\cos(\theta) - m_a) \end{aligned}$$

By construction, this decomposition satisfies the centring and non-simplification conditions.

Exercise 3 : Polynomial Chaos

[4 pts]

We consider the uniform probability measure on $[-1, 1]$ and the Legendre basis which consists in orthonormal polynomials for L^2 with increasing orders:

$$\begin{aligned} h_0(x) &= 1 & h_2(x) &= \sqrt{5}/2(3x^2 - 1) \\ h_1(x) &= \sqrt{3}x & & \dots \end{aligned}$$

Q1. [1 pt] The next basis function h_3 can be obtained by Gram-Schmitt orthonormalization : starting from the function $x \rightarrow x^3$, we subtract its projections onto the previous basis functions and we normalize it. Since x^3 is odd and, h_0 and h_1 are even, we know this functions are already orthogonal. On the other hand, we have:

$$\langle x^3, \sqrt{3}x \rangle = \int_{-1}^1 \sqrt{3}x^4 \frac{1}{2} dx = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \left[\frac{1}{5}x^5 \right]_{-1}^1 = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{5}$$

As a consequence, $x^3 - \frac{3}{5}x$ is orthogonal to all previous basis functions. The last task left is to normalise this function:

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|x^3 - \frac{3}{5}x\right\|^2 &= \int_{-1}^1 \left(x^3 - \frac{3}{5}x\right)^2 \frac{1}{2} dx = \int_{-1}^1 \left(x^3 - \frac{3}{5}x\right) x^3 \frac{1}{2} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{7}x^7 - \frac{3}{25}x^5 \right]_{-1}^1 = \frac{1}{7} - \frac{3}{25} = \frac{4}{175}\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the order three basis function is $h_3(x) = \frac{\sqrt{175}}{2} \left(x^3 - \frac{3}{5}x\right)$.

Q2. By construction, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle h_{ij}, h_{kl} \rangle &= \int_{-1}^1 \int_{-1}^1 h_{ij}(x) h_{kl}(x) \frac{1}{4} dx_1 dx_2 \\ &= \int_{-1}^1 h_i(x_1) h_k(x_1) \frac{1}{2} dx_1 \int_{-1}^1 h_j(x_2) h_l(x_2) \frac{1}{2} dx_2 \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = k \text{ and } j = l \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

All the h_{ij} (except h_{00}) are orthogonal to the constant function h_{00} so they satisfy the centring conditions. Furthermore $E[h_{ij}(X)|X_1] = h_i(X_1)E[h_j(X_2)] = 0$ for $j \neq 0$ so they also satisfy the non simplification properties.

Q3. According to the previous questions we have

$$m = \underbrace{\beta_{00}h_{00}}_{m_0} + \underbrace{\beta_{10}h_{10} + \beta_{20}h_{20}}_{m_1(x_1)} + \underbrace{\beta_{01}h_{01} + \beta_{02}h_{02}}_{m_2(x_2)} + \underbrace{\beta_{11}h_{11} + \beta_{21}h_{21} + \beta_{12}h_{12} + \beta_{22}h_{22}}_{m_{12}(x)}.$$

The orthonormality of the h_i implies:

$$\begin{aligned}E[h_i(X_1)] &= 0 & \text{for } i \neq 0 \\ \text{var}[h_i(X_1)] &= 1 & \text{for } i \neq 0 \\ \text{var}[h_i(X_1) + h_j(X_1)] &= \text{var}[h_i(X_1)] + \text{var}[h_j(X_1)] & \text{for } i \neq j\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\text{var}[m(X)] = -\beta_{0,0}^2 + \sum_{i,j} \beta_{i,j}^2$ and similarly for the $\text{var}[m_i(X)]$. The Sobol indices are then:

$$\begin{aligned}S_1 &= \frac{\text{var}[m_1(X_1)]}{\text{var}[m(X)]} = \frac{\beta_{1,0}^2 + \beta_{2,0}^2}{-\beta_{0,0}^2 + \sum_{i,j} \beta_{i,j}^2} \\ S_2 &= \frac{\text{var}[m_2(X_2)]}{\text{var}[m(X)]} = \frac{\beta_{0,1}^2 + \beta_{0,2}^2}{-\beta_{0,0}^2 + \sum_{i,j} \beta_{i,j}^2} \\ S_{1,2} &= \frac{\text{var}[m_{1,2}(X)]}{\text{var}[m(X)]} = \frac{\beta_{1,1}^2 + \beta_{2,1}^2 + \beta_{1,2}^2 + \beta_{2,2}^2}{-\beta_{0,0}^2 + \sum_{i,j} \beta_{i,j}^2}\end{aligned}$$

Exercise 4 : Kriging models

The *model 1* has some observation noise but no trend so it must be *model C*

The *model 2* has a linear trend, so it corresponds to *model D*. **bonus:** Since the confidence intervals width is constant in the region far away from the observations, the prediction type is *simple kriging*.

The *model 3* has a very short length-scale, as can be seen in *model A*.

The *model 4* has an exponential covariance function, as for *model E*.

Exercise 5: Kernel design

Q1. We already know from the lecture notes that k_0 , k_1 and k_3 are valid covariance functions, and k_2 is also a valid kernel since it is the composition of a linear kernel $\sigma_2^2 xy$ with the function $x \mapsto x^2$. Since k is a sum of covariance functions, it is also symmetric and positive semi-definite.

Q2. The following R code will return the covariance matrices for k_2

```
k2 <- function(a,b,s2=1){
  s2*outer(a^2,b^2)
}
```

Note the default value of 1 for the parameter $s2$, which allows to call the function without specifying any value for this parameter.

Q3. The sum of 4 independent Gaussian processes is also a GP, so it is sufficient to show that Z and $Z_s = Z_0 + Z_1 + Z_2 + Z_3$ have the same mean and covariance function. This is straightforward using the linearity of the expectation and the independence of the Z_i :

$$\begin{aligned} E[Z_s(x)] &= E[Z_0(x) + Z_1(x) + Z_2(x) + Z_3(x)] \\ &= E[Z_0(x)] + E[Z_1(x)] + E[Z_2(x)] + E[Z_3(x)] \\ &= 0 = E[Z(x)] \\ \text{cov}[Z_s(x), Z_s(y)] &= \text{cov}[Z_0(x) + Z_1(x) + Z_2(x) + Z_3(x), Z_0(y) + Z_1(y) + Z_2(y) + Z_3(y)] \\ &= \text{cov}[Z_0(x), Z_0(y)] + \dots + \text{cov}[Z_3(x), Z_3(y)] \quad (\text{by independence}) \\ &= k(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

Represent graphically (for $x \in [-1, 1]$) a typical sample from each of this processes for the following parameters values: $\sigma_i^2 = 1$ and $\theta = 0.2$.

Q4. [1 pt] let (X, Y) be a set of n observation points. What is the expression of the conditional mean and variance of $Z(x)$ given $Z(X) = F$. How does the mean function behaves when the prediction point x is far away from the observations X ?

Q5. [2 pts] Show that the conditional mean writes as a sum of conditional mean functions : $m(x) = m_0 + \dots + m_3(x)$. According to this, what is the polynomial content m_p of the mean function m ? What is the conditional variance that can be associated to m_p ?

bonus: Would we obtain the exact same model as m if we were to construct a universal kriging model with kernel k_3 and a trend of the form $\beta_0 + \beta_1 x + \beta_2 x^2$?

Exercise 6: Optimization

[3 pts]

Consider a kriging model based on the design of experiments $X = (-0.2, 0.2)$ and the vector of observations $Y = (-0.2, 0.2)$. We will consider fixed values for the variance and length-scale parameters: $\sigma^2 = 1$ and $\theta = 0.2$.

Q1. The simple kriging equations give

$$\begin{aligned} m(x) &= k(x, X)k(X, X)^{-1}F \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^2 e^{-1} \\ \sigma^2 e^{-1} \end{bmatrix}^T \times \begin{bmatrix} \sigma^2 & \sigma^2 e^{-2} \\ \sigma^2 e^{-2} & \sigma^2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \times \begin{bmatrix} -0.2 \\ 0.2 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - e^{-4}} \begin{bmatrix} e^{-1} \\ e^{-1} \end{bmatrix}^T \times \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -e^{-2} \\ -e^{-2} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} -0.2 \\ 0.2 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

In a similar fashion, we obtain:

$$v(x) = k(x, x) - k(x, X)k(X, X)^{-1}k(X, x) = \dots = 0.76$$

Note that the result $m(x) = 0$ could also be obtained noticing the problem symmetry.

Q2. The expression of the expected improvement is

$$EI(x) = \sqrt{v(x)}(u(x)\Phi(u(x)) + \phi(u(x))) \quad \text{with } u(x) = \frac{\min(F) - m(x)}{\sqrt{v(x)}}$$

In $x = 0$, we thus have $u(0) = -0.2/0.87 = -0.23$. As a consequence, we have

$$EI(0) = 0.87 \times (-0.23 \times \Phi(-0.23) + \phi(-0.23)) = 0.26$$

Q3. The expected improvement is smaller when using a Gaussian kernel since the confidence intervals of the later model are much smaller than the initial one.