

Q3) b) Naive Bayes algorithm is based on Bayes theorem of Probability and statistics with an assumption that features are all independent of each other.

If one of the classes have 0 training examples then the frequency based probability estimate of Naive Bayes will be 0 and its known as the Zero Frequency Problem. We will get a 0 when probabilities are multiplied. If one feature value is not associated with a class (let class 1) in training set then in test set any ~~new~~ query point containing that feature value will always be predicted as class 0.

Solution to above problem is to add 1 to the count of every feature/attribute value class combination so that we don't get a 0 anymore and at the same time not impact the small relative frequency of the classes. The process ~~is~~ of ~~adding or smoothing~~ smoothing by adding a number is called additive smoothing or Laplace smoothing.

Naive Bayes will be helpful because —

- ✓ it works very fast
- ✓ best suitable for multi class problem
- ✓ if assumption of independence of features holds true it will perform better than other models with less training data
- ✓ best suited for categorical input variables
- ✓ used in realtime application as it is very fast
- ✓ used in sentiment analysis

~~✓~~



Q5) a)

### Convex set

it is a subset that intersects every line into a single line segment (possibly empty).

given ~~n~~ points  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  in a convex set  $S$ ,  
and  $n$  nonnegative numbers  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  such  
that  $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \dots + \lambda_n = 1$ , the affine combination  
 $\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k v_k$  belongs to  $S$ . As the definition of a

convex set is the case  $n=2$ , this same property  
characterizes the convex sets. Such an affine  
combination is called a convex combination of  
 $v_1, \dots, v_n$ .

## convex function

a convex function is a continuous function whose value at the midpoint of every interval in its domain does not exceed the arithmetic mean of its values at the ends of the interval.

mathematically,

for a <sup>convex</sup> function  $f(x)$  with interval  $[a, b]$ ,  $x_1, x_2$  any 2 points in  $[a, b]$  and  $\lambda$  (any)  $0 < \lambda < 1$

$$f[\lambda x_1 + (1-\lambda)x_2] \leq \lambda f(x_1) + (1-\lambda)f(x_2)$$

$f(x)$  will be strictly convex if the above inequality ~~holds for~~ is strict for all  $x_1, x_2$ .

if  $f(x)$  has a 2nd derivative then a necessary and sufficient condition for it to be convex on that particular interval is the 2nd derivative must be greater than or equal to 0 for all  $x$  in  $[a, b]$ .

## ridge regression regularization

ridge <sup>regularization</sup> ~~regression~~ is strictly convex.

defining ridge regression —

$$\min_{\beta} \|y - X\beta\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\beta\|_2^2, \lambda \geq 0$$



Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Page \_\_\_\_\_

On differentiating above function <sup>twice</sup> with  $\lambda$  we get

$$2\lambda I + 2x^T x \quad \text{--- (1)}$$

now  $\checkmark \lambda I$  is positive definite for any  $\lambda > 0$

$\checkmark x^T x$  is positive definite for any  $x$

$\checkmark$  sum of a positive definite and positive definite matrix is positive definite

Thus (1) is positive definite for  $\lambda > 0$

Thus we have proved the 2nd derivative of a function is strictly greater than 0  $\therefore$  hence the function is strictly convex.

### Lasso regularization

Lasso regularization is not strictly convex but only a convex function.

It is so because the penalty in lasso is not strict as here  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  (defined above in convex function) are of same sign and thus the line segment and the curve are exactly equal and so there are infinitely many points in common.



or) b)  $k=3$  will be a more accurate nearest neighbour as with  $k=2$  it might lead to overfitting. Though ~~it is problem depend~~ the two values of  $k$  are quite close and the difference it is making with respect to the cluster formation is problem dependant, still  $k=3$  (out of the two  $k$ 's) would be a better choice. Looking at only 2 neighbours might not be a good measure to classify a data point to one particular cluster, ~~it~~ we might be biased.

Also choosing  $k$  as an odd ~~is a~~ number is beneficial as if suppose we have binary classification ~~then~~ and with  $k=2$  we get equal votes for positive and negative class then any one class will be chosen randomly. But with  $k=3$  this condition will never occur, we will always have a class with more votes than the other. (here votes are the <sup>number</sup> of nearest neighbours belonging to a particular class)

Q5) c) Assuming our training set is  $D$  and it consists of  $N$  points  $(x_i, y_i)$  and it is sampled IID.

Let the classifier be denoted as  $H_T$

$y = H_T(x)$  with mean  $\mu$  & variance  $\sigma^2$  as given.

now we create  $k$  models such that each works on a subset of  $D$ . each has a output with mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$ .



$$\text{Average total loss} = E_{x_D} [L(H_D(x), y)]$$

squared loss -

$$E_{x_D} [H_D(x) - y]^2$$

$$\Rightarrow E_{x_D} [(H_D(x) - E_D[H_D(x)] + E_D[H_D(x)] - y)^2]$$

$$\Rightarrow E_{x_D} [(H_D(x) - E_D[H_D(x)])^2 + (E_D[H_D(x)] - y)^2 + 2(H_D(x) - E_D[H_D(x)])(E_D[H_D(x)] - y)]$$

$$\Rightarrow E_{x_D} [(H_D(x) - E_D[H_D(x)])^2] + E_x [(E_D[H_D(x)] - y)^2]$$

$\Rightarrow$  variance - bias

$$H_D(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H_{D_i}(x)$$

$$\Rightarrow E(H_D(x)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E_{D_i}(H_{D_i}(x))$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \times n \mu$$

$$= \mu$$

so with ensembling, bias does not change



$$H_D(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H_{D_i}(x)$$

$$2) \text{Var}(H_D(x)) = \text{Var}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H_{D_i}(x)\right)$$

$$2) \frac{1}{n^2} \text{Var}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n H_{D_i}(x)\right) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Var}(kn) = \\ n^2 \text{Var}(n) \end{array} \right.$$

$$2) \frac{1}{n^2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(H_{D_i}(x)) \right) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{when } n_i \text{ is IID} \\ \text{Var}(n_1 + n_2) \\ = \text{Var}(n_1) + \\ \text{Var}(n_2) \end{array} \right.$$

$$2) \frac{1}{n^2} \times n L \sigma^2$$

$$2) \frac{L}{n} \sigma^2$$

as bias is not changing, so reducing variance  
as an ensemble model should be probabilistically  
better than an original model.

$$\therefore \frac{L}{n} \sigma^2 < \sigma^2$$

$$\rightarrow L < n$$

so large of  $n$  is  $n > L$ .