

# Non-Gaussian responses (week 2)

30 Jan 2023

## Table of contents

Non-Gaussian responses . . . . .	1
Some answers . . . . .	1
Why not linear? . . . . .	2
Logistic regression (ESL § 4.4) . . . . .	2
Log-likelihood . . . . .	3
Newton step . . . . .	3
Newton vs IRLS . . . . .	3
Families . . . . .	4
Regularized versions . . . . .	4
proximal gradient descent/Newton . . . . .	4
makeX . . . . .	4

## Non-Gaussian responses

- Why worry about it?
- Isn't least-squares good enough?
- poll ([polleverywhere](#))

## Some answers

- heteroscedasticity (Gauss-Markov only applies to homog. variance)
- still unbiased but no longer minimum variance

- maybe we shouldn't (e.g. **linear probability model** in econometrics)
  - adjust for heteroscedasticity with **robust/sandwich estimators** etc. (White):

$$\hat{\mathbf{V}} = (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X})^{-1} (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{G} \mathbf{X}) (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X})^{-1}$$

where  $\mathbf{G} = \text{Diag}(\hat{\varepsilon}_i^2)$  (contrast with  $s^2(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X})^{-1}$ )

- if we have
- if we have **nonlinear** models, MLEs are no longer unbiased

### Why not linear?

- actual nonlinear patterns (but can handle these by transformation/basis expansion)
- unrealistic predictions (e.g. probabilities outside of  $[0, 1]$ )
- varying effects (e.g. effect of a 1-unit change in  $x$  on probability must differ depending on baseline probability)
- Why not transform? **poll** ([polleverywhere](#))

### Logistic regression (ESL § 4.4)

- Worst-case scenario (farthest from Gaussian)
- ESL starts with a *multinomial* model:

$$\log \left( \frac{\Pr(G = i | X = x)}{\Pr(G = K | X = x)} \right) = \beta_{i0} + \beta_i^\top x, \quad i \in 1 \dots K - 1$$

(and so  $\Pr(G = K | X = x) = 1 / \left( 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \exp(\beta_{i0} + \beta_i^\top x) \right)$ )

- independent of baseline/reparameterization
- log-likelihood  $\sum \log p_i(x_i; \theta)$  where  $\theta$  is the complete set of parameters

## Log-likelihood

- for two categories, log-likelihood simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum (y_i \beta^\top x_i - \log(1 + e^{\beta^\top x_i})) \\ &= \sum (y_i \eta_i - \log(1 + \exp(\eta_i))) \end{aligned}$$

- **weight matrix**  $\mathbf{W} = \text{Diag}(p(1-p))$ 
  - more generally,  $\text{Diag}(1/\text{Var}(\mu))$
- score equation:
  - $\sum_i = 1^N x_i (y_i - p(x_i; \beta))$
  - Newton update is  $\beta^* - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{g}$
  - gradient:  $\mathbf{X}^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{p})$
  - generally  $\mathbf{X}^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mu) = \mathbf{X}^\top (\mathbf{y} - g^{-1}(\eta))$
- Hessian:  $-\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X}$
- solution is  $(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{z}$
- where  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{X} \beta_0 + \mathbf{W}^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{p})$  is the adjusted response

## Newton step

- iteratively reweighted least squares
- solve

$$\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{X} \beta^* = \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{z}$$

$$\beta$$

- [4C03 notes](#)
- [4C03 notes 2](#)

## Newton vs IRLS

- Newton vs *Fisher scoring* (expected value of the Hessian); equivalent for the *canonical link* (e.g. logistic for binary data, log for Poisson data)
- link mostly important for interpretation
- can be disregarded (?) if we are going to handle nonlinearity by basis expansion
- convergence? (Mount 2012)

Mount, John. 2012. “How Robust Is Logistic Regression?” *Win Vector LLC*. <https://win-vector.com/2012/08/23/how-robust-is-logistic-regression/>.

## Families

- Gaussian, Poisson, binomial (binary)
- May need to compute *scale/dispersion* parameter
  - for exponential families, calculate as  $\sqrt{D/(n-p)}$  where  $D$  is the *deviance* (-2 log likelihood, equal to SSQ for Gaussian)
  - not exactly the MLE but good enough
- **over-dispersion**: quasi-likelihood
- more complex families (negative binomial etc.) have an additional, non-collapsible parameters, need to estimate by MLE (or **profiling**)

## Regularized versions

- lasso, ridge, or elasticnet
- score equations:  $\mathbf{x}^{\text{top}}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{p}) = \lambda \cdot \text{sign}(\beta_j)$  for **active** variables (non-zero coeffs)
- ridge should still be solvable by data expansion

## proximal gradient descent/Newton

- simpler strategies (cyclic coordinate descent) may not work as well
- **proximal** gradient descent or **proximal** IRLS:

[glmnet family docs](#)

**makeX**