Specifically, let x be equal to the number of "A" grades (including A-. A and A+ grades) that a student receives in their first year of college (freshmen year). We would like to predict the value of y, which we define as the number of "A" grades they get in their second year (sophomore year).

Refer to the following training set of a small sample of different students' performances (note that this training set may also be referenced in other questions in this quiz). Here each row is one training example. Recall that in linear regression, our hypothesis is $h_{\theta}(x) = \theta_0 + \theta_1 x$, and we use m to denote the number of training examples.

x	У
3	4
2	1
4	3
0	1

For the training set given above, what is the value of m? In the box below, please enter your answer (which should be a number between 0 and 10).

4

2. Consider the following training set of m=4 training examples:

1 point

х	у
1	0.5
2	1
4	2
0	0

Consider the linear regression model $h_{\theta}(x)=\theta_0+\theta_1x$. What are the values of θ_0 and θ_1 that you would expect to obtain upon running gradient descent on this model? (Linear regression will be able to fit this data perfectly.)

 \bigcirc $heta_0=1, heta_1=0.5$

 $\bigcirc \ \theta_0=1, \theta_1=1$

 $\bigcirc \ \theta_0 = 0.5, \theta_1 = 0.5$

 $\bigcirc \ \theta_0=0.5, \theta_1=0$

3. Suppose we set $heta_0 = -1, heta_1 = 0.5$. What is $h_{ heta}(4)$?

1 point

-

-

1

4.	Let	f be some function so that	1 point
		$f(heta_0, heta_1)$ outputs a number. For this problem,	
		f is some arbitrary/unknown smooth function (not necessarily the	
		cost function of linear regression, so \boldsymbol{f} may have local optima).	
		Suppose we use gradient descent to try to minimize $f(heta_0, heta_1)$	
		as a function of $ heta_0$ and $ heta_1$. Which of the	
		following statements are true? (Check all that apply.)	
	~	If the first few iterations of gradient descent cause $f(heta_0, heta_1)$ to	
		increase rather than decrease, then the most likely cause is that we have set the	
		learning rate $lpha$ to too large a value.	
	~	If $ heta_0$ and $ heta_1$ are initialized at	
		the global minimum, then one iteration will not change their values.	
		No matter how $ heta_0$ and $ heta_1$ are initialized, so long	
		as $lpha$ is sufficiently small, we can safely expect gradient descent to converge	
		to the same solution.	
		Setting the learning rate $lpha$ to be very small is not harmful, and can	
		only speed up the convergence of gradient descent.	
5.		ppose that for some linear regression problem (say, predicting housing prices as in the lecture), we have some ining set, and for our training set we managed to find some $ heta_0, heta_1$ such that $J(heta_0, heta_1)=0$.	1 point
	Wł	nich of the statements below must then be true? (Check all that apply.)	
		We can perfectly predict the value of \boldsymbol{y} even for new examples that we have not yet seen.	
		(e.g., we can perfectly predict prices of even new houses that we have not yet seen.)	
	~	For these values of $ heta_0$ and $ heta_1$ that satisfy $J(heta_0, heta_1)=0,$	
		we have that $h_{ heta}(x^{(i)}) = y^{(i)}$ for every training example $(x^{(i)}, y^{(i)})$	
		This is not possible: By the definition of $J(heta_0, heta_1)$, it is not possible for there to exist $ heta_0$ and $ heta_1$ so that $J(heta_0, heta_1)=0$	
		$ heta_0$ and $ heta_1$ so that $J(heta_0, heta_1)=0$	
		For this to be true, we must have $ heta_0=0$ and $ heta_1=0$	
		so that $h_{ heta}(x)=0$	