EE 660 **Homework 2 (Week 3)** Posted: Fri., 9/11/2020
Due: Fri., 9/18/2020, 5:00 PM PDT

Logistic regression

Reading

Review Murphy Sec. 8.1, 8.2, 8.3.1-8.3.2, 8.3.6. (These have been mostly covered in lecture already.)

Problems

1. (A) Murphy Exercise 8.1, as expanded and explained below. Note that in this dataset, $y_i = 1$ denotes spam.

   (i) This problem may be solved with MATLAB, or with Python.

   (ii) Murphy's statistics given for features 56 and 57 don't make sense; you can ignore them because you won't be using his statistics to solve this exercise. Instead, it's best to compute your own statistics (where needed) from the current training data.

   (iii) For the classification error measure, use percent misclassified points, with $\underline{w}^T \underline{x}_i \geq 0 \Rightarrow \hat{y}_i = +1$ and $\underline{w}^T \underline{x}_i < 0 \Rightarrow \hat{y}_i = -1$ (or 0).

   (iv) To read the csv files in Matlab we recommend using the command readtable. In Python, you can use libraries such as csv or pandas.

   (v) For preprocessing method (a) note that you should compute the mean and variance for the training set and then use them to standardize the validation/test set. Matlab users are recommended to use function zscore to standardize the training data. You must code the standardization of the validation/test set using statistics from the train set yourself. Python users are recommended to use scikit-learn's StandardScaler.

   (vi) Matlab provides the function fitclinear. Be sure to check its documentation – this function will run an SVM classifier if not given the proper parameters. Scikit-learn provides the LogisticRegression class. Pay attention to the fact that parameter C is **not** equal to λ. You may also want to change parameter max_iter.

   (vii) You may code up the cross-validation loop yourself or use library functions.

   MATLAB users may find cvpartition or crossval useful. If you choose to use crossval, be extra careful at the standardization step – be sure to check the documentation examples. Python users may find StratifiedKFold or cross_val_score useful. If you choose to use cross_val_score, be sure to use a pipeline (https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.pipeline.Pipeline.html).

   (viii) For model selection (choosing your value of **λ**), use 5-fold cross validation, and run the cross-validation 5 times, taking average

validation errors over the multiple runs for each value of **λ**. Note that at each run you should partition the given training set randomly.

(ix) **Report your selected value of λ and explain why you chose that particular λ.** This value of λ defines your "selected model".

(x) After choosing your value of λ, train again using all the training data, and then test using the test data. **Report on the following classification errors for your selected value of λ.** Please use a table like the example in Murphy except with 5 columns instead of 3 as follows:

Column 1: preprocessing method

Column 2: value of **λ**

Column 3: average cross-validation error from the validation sets.

Column 4: error on the full given training set (trained on the full given training set)

Column 5: error on the full given test set (trained on the full given training set)

(B) Additional Question:

This problem pertains only to the given test data, as provided with the dataset. After using preprocessing method (c) on the given test data, use **sum of features 1-48 (total count of keywords in percentage)** as x axis, and **sum of features 49-54 (total count of special characters in percentage)** as y axis, and draw the following plots:

(i) A scatter plot of all testing points, using different colors and marker size for spam and non-spam emails.

(ii) For emails labeled spam, generate a 3D histogram. In Matlab, use function `hist3()`. In Python, you will need to follow and adapt this demo https://matplotlib.org/3.1.1/gallery/mplot3d/hist3d.html

(iii) For emails labeled non-spam, generate a 3D histogram using the same tips given above.

(iv) Do you notice any significant difference between the two histograms generated in (ii) and (iii)? If so, briefly describe.

2. Murphy Exercise 8.3.

For part (b), also answer the question: is Eq. (8.5) the gradient of the log likelihood, or of the negative log likelihood?

For part (c), also answer the question: $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{H}}}$ is positive definite implies what about the negative log likelihood function?

Feasibility and fundamental issues of learning

Reading

AML 1.3 (p.15) to end of Ch. 1 (p. 32). (This will be covered in Lectures 7 and 8.)

Comments on notation and terminology in AML:

- "Sample" means a set of data points or a set of marbles. We can also think of our training dataset as being a "sample".
- $f\left(\underline{x}\right)$ is the "target function", and denotes the true function that gives the correct output (class label) for an input $\underline{x}$. This function is typically unknown to us. We try to find some reasonable approximation to f by learning from the training data.

Problem

3. Suppose our "learning algorithm" uses a standard linear model for $\hat{f}$ in a classification problem, in which there are D input variables (features), and augmented notation is used:

$$\hat{f}\left(\underline{x}\right) = \text{sgn}\left(\underline{w}^T \underline{x}\right)$$

in which $\text{sgn}\left(u\right) \triangleq 1 \bullet \left[\!\left[u > 0 \right]\!\right] - 1 \bullet \left[\!\left[u < 0 \right]\!\right]$, and $\left[\!\left[\;\; \right]\!\right]$ denotes the indicator function. The learning algorithm picks the best weight vector $\underline{\hat{w}}$ using the training data $\mathcal{D}$, based on minimizing some objective function $J\left(\underline{w}, \mathcal{D}\right)$, with each component of $\underline{w}$ restricted to:

$$w_0 = 1; \quad w_j \in \left\{1, 2\right\} \quad \forall j \in \left\{1, 2, \cdots, D\right\}.$$

(a) How many elements (hypotheses) are there in the hypothesis set $\mathcal{H}$?

(b) How would the Hoeffding Inequality be applied to this case? That is, give an expression, if possible, for an upper bound on $P\left[\left| E_{\mathcal{D}}\left(\hat{h}\right) - E_{out}\left(\hat{h}\right)\right| > \varepsilon\right]$.