STATS 665 Homework 2

Lecturer: Leon Lixing Yu   *Scribe: Leon Lixing Yu*

1   Problem 1

1.1   closed form of $\hat{\beta}$

$\hat{\beta}$ is given by:

$$\hat{\beta} = \underset{\beta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{2} \|X\beta - y\|_2^2 + \lambda\|\beta\|_2^2$$

In order to find *argmin*, we need to take the derivative of the loss function and make it equal to 0. In this assignment, I will use the notation, $x_j^{(i)}$, to denote that for the given data $(x^{(i)}, y^{(i)})_{i=1}^n$, $x_j^{(i)}$ is the jth element of $x^{(i)}$, where $x^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^d, y \in \mathbb{R}, X \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times n}, Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Therefore, we have:

$$\frac{d}{d\beta_j} l(\beta|X,Y) = (\sum_{i=1}^n ((\sum_{j=1}^d x_j^{(i)} \beta_j) - y^{(i)})^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^d \beta_j^2)' = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow 2X^T(X\beta - Y) + 2\lambda(I_d)\beta = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{\beta} = (X^TX + \lambda(I_d))^{-1}X^TY$$

1.2   Find a simple expression for $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|$

FIXME

1.3   Find a closed form of $\hat{f}$

Notation Note: Following the previous convention, I am using $(x^{(i)}, y^{(i)})_{i=1}^n$ instead of $(x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^n$ to represent the dataset. In this question, I use $f(x^{(i)})$ and $< f, \phi(x^{(i)}) >$ interchangably. We know that:

$$f \in \mathcal{H} \Rightarrow \quad f(x^{(i)}) \in \mathcal{H} \Rightarrow \quad < f, \phi(x^{(i)}) > \in \mathcal{H}$$

With the notation given, we have equation:

$$\hat{f} = \underset{f}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n (y^{(i)} - < f, \phi(x^{(i)}) >_{\mathcal{H}})^2 + \lambda\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$$

Using representer theorm, we have:

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha^{(i)} \phi(x^{(i)}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha^{(i)} k(x^{(i)}, \cdot)$$

The equation above means f is a linear combination of feature space, mapping of points. substitute the relation above into the original $\hat{f}$ equation, we have:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y^{(i)} - <f, \phi(x^{(i)})>_{\mathcal{H}})^2 + \lambda\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \|Y - K\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2 + \lambda\boldsymbol{\alpha}^T K\boldsymbol{\alpha}$$

Taking derivative over α and make it equal to 0 to get $\underset{\alpha}{\operatorname{argmin}}$:

$$\frac{d}{d\alpha}(\|Y - K\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2 + \lambda\boldsymbol{\alpha}^T K\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow 2K(Y - K\boldsymbol{\alpha}) + 2\lambda\mathbf{I_d}K\boldsymbol{\alpha} = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow (K + \lambda\mathbf{I_d})\boldsymbol{\alpha} = 2Y$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = (K + \lambda\mathbf{I_d})^{-1}Y$$

recall:

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\alpha^{(i)}\phi(x^{(i)}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\alpha^{(i)}k(x^{(i)}, \cdot)$$

our $\hat{f}$ is then:

$$\hat{f} = K^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = K^T(K + \lambda\mathbf{I_d})^{-1}Y$$

In which K is the Kernel matrix W.R.T X

1.4   implement the solution of $\hat{f}$ in matlab

The code for this part is attached in **Appendix A: problem 1 Code**, I use Gaussian Kernel because it is the first one I tried and it worked pretty well. I have attached a few graphs to show the differences between real label value and decision values got from $\hat{f}$.
To have a perfect fit, I adujust the values of λ and σ. Multiple attempts are shown below with descriptions.

Figure 1: Red circle indicates labels, blue cross is the $\hat{f}$ value. $n = 10, \lambda = 1, \sigma^2 = 0.1$ in this test case. I see that when $x^{(i)}$ is close to decision boundary, 0, it is more accurate in this setting. It is an underfit case.


Figure 2: $\lambda = 1, \sigma = 1$ in this test case. I see that most of the $x^{(i)}$ can be predicted accurately with two exceptions at the end of the decision boundary

Figure 3: $\lambda = 1, \sigma = 5$ in this test case. Though the $x^{(i)}$ at both ends are better predicted, the average accuracy has dropped.

Figure 4: $\lambda = 1, \sigma = 10$. All $x^{(i)}$ are fitted badly. It is clearly a case of over fitting.

Figure 5: $\lambda = 1, \sigma = 0.1$. It is clearly a case of under fit. It is way under fit so that the decision boundary looks like a straight line.


Figure 6: $\lambda = 0.01, \sigma = 3$. Most of the predictions for $x^{(i)}$ tends to overlap with their labels or be really close to their actual labels. I consider this is a good fit for the test data.

2   Problem 2

2.1   Heatmap of learned function

The Matlab code for this problem is attached in **Appendix B: problem 2 code**. I use *libsvm* library for this problem. I fixed the σ to 1. The heatmap is attached below for both training dataset and testing dataset.


Figure 7: $\sigma = 1$. This heatmap is for training dataset,we can clearly see the decision boundary based on the heatmap

2.2 Level curves

Figure 8: When $\sigma = 5$. we can not see the boundary

Figure 9: When $\sigma = 1$. we can see the boundary but the heatmap is still quite vague

Figure 10: When $\sigma = 0.1$. The boundary became clear and the decision values are most accurate


Figure 11: When $\sigma = 0.02$. The boundary fades away and is about to disappear

Figure 12:   When $\sigma = 0.01$. The boundary is again gone

As a result $\sigma \in (1, 0.01)$ shows accurate boundary decision values. The level curve of $\hat{f} = 0$ for $\sigma = 1, \sigma = 0.02$ is shown below.


Figure 13: $\sigma = 1$ level curve of $\hat{f} = 0$

Figure 14: $\sigma = 0.01$ level curve of $\hat{f} = 0$

2.3   Plot the training and testing error vs $1/\sigma$

The plot is shown in the figure below.

Figure 15: $\sigma \in [1, 0.01)$ with step size -0.02. X-axis shows $1/\sigma$, and y-axis shows the accuracy in %, we see that even though the error keeps reducing with smaller σ value, the testing results is not improving. This is because while $\sigma \to 0$, the decision boundary is overfitted onto each data point, $x_i{}_{i=1}^n, n = 10,000$. The testing dataset cannot benefit from the overfitting of training dataset.

3   Problem 3

3.1   Show $k(x, y)$ is a valid kernel

We know that kernel is a function that maps $\chi \times \chi \to \mathbb{R}$. We also know that kernel is valid if and only if for $x_i{}_{i=1}^n \in \chi, K_{ij} = k(x_i, x_j)$ is PSD. We need to prove these two statements.
Proving $k(x, y)$ maps $\chi \times \chi \to \mathbb{R}$:
Assuming:

$$k_1(x, y) =< \Phi_1(x), \Phi_1(y) >$$

$$k_2(x, y) =< \Phi_2(x), \Phi_2(y) >$$

Since $k_1(x, y)$ and $k_2(x, y)$ are vaild kernel, they both maps $\chi \times \chi \to \mathbb{R}$. we now have

$$k(x, y) =< \Phi_1(x), \Phi_1(y) > \cdot < \Phi_2(x), \Phi_2(y) >$$

$$\Rightarrow k(x, y) = (\Phi_1(x)^T \Phi_1(y)) \cdot (\Phi_2(x)^T \Phi_2(y))$$

$$\Rightarrow k(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}$$

We also know that $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^\chi$, so $k(x, y)$ maps $\chi \times \chi \to \mathbb{R}$.
Proving $k(x, y)$ is PSD:

$$K_{ij} = k(x_i, x_j) =< \Phi(x_i), \Phi(x_j) >= \Phi(x_i)^T \Phi(x_j)$$

$$v^T K v = \sum_i^n \sum_j^n v_i K_{ij} v_j$$

$$= \sum_i^n \sum_j^n v_i \Phi(x_i)^T \Phi(x_j) v_j$$

$$= \sum_i^n \sum_j^n v_i \sum_l^n \phi_l(x_i)^T \phi_l(x_j) v_j$$

$$= \sum_l^n \sum_i^n \sum_j^n v_i \phi_l(x_i)^T \phi_l(x_j) v_j$$

$$= \sum_l^n (\sum_i^n v_i \phi_l(x_i))^2 \geq 0$$

3.2 Prove RKHS

FIXME

4 Problem 4

The code for this section is attached in **Appendix C: problem 4 code**.

Figure 16: mean square error between $\hat{f}$ and f plot with the testing dataset. n is set from 100 to 2000 with step size of 20. The plot shows that it is when n is very small, the error is minimum. The error reaches a maximum at halfway point and declines afterwards.

end of the story