

# COMS 4771 HW1

Zach Schuermann, Joseph Paul High, Eliza Mace

TOTAL POINTS

**57 / 68**

QUESTION 1

Statistical Estimators 10 pts

**1.1 i) 3 / 3**

- ✓ - **0 pts** Correct answer, correct reasoning
  - **1 pts** Incorrect answer, correct reasoning
  - **2 pts** correct answer, incorrect reasoning
  - **3 pts** Incomplete / [incorrect answer, incorrect reasoning]

**1.2 ii) 3 / 3**

- ✓ - **0 pts** Correct
  - **3 pts** Incorrect
  - **1 pts** Partial Credit/partially right

**1.3 iii) 4 / 4**

- ✓ - **0 pts** Correct
  - **4 pts** Not attempted.
  - **1 pts** Part a incorrect
  - **1 pts** Part b incorrect
  - **1 pts** Part c incorrect
  - **1 pts** Part d incorrect
  - **0.5 pts** Minor error.

QUESTION 2

Forecasting 8 pts

**2.1 i) 4 / 4**

- ✓ - **0 pts** Correct
  - **1 pts** Not simplified enough
  - **1 pts** Did not distinguish F(D) from F(Q)
  - **2 pts** Not enough work shown
  - **4 pts** Incorrect
  - **4 pts** Used discrete formulation of expected value  
but profit is a continuous random variable
  - **2 pts** Small error in term

**2.2 ii) 4 / 4**

- ✓ - **0 pts** Correct
  - **4 pts** Incorrect
  - **2 pts** Need to show more work
  - **0.5 pts** Computational error

QUESTION 3

Evaluating Classifiers 10 pts

**3.1 i) 2 / 3**

- **0 pts** Correct
- **3 pts** Incorrect
- ✓ - **1 pts** Mostly Correct
  - What is  $P[f_t(x)=y_i]$ ? Can be simplified further

**3.2 ii) 3 / 3**

- ✓ - **0 pts** Correct
- **3 pts** Incorrect

**3.3 iii) 2 / 4**

- **0 pts** Correct
- ✓ - **2 pts** First Example Incorrect
- **2 pts** Second Example Incorrect
- What if  $\mu_1 < \mu_2$ ?

QUESTION 4

Richardson iteration 12 pts

**4.1 i) 3 / 3**

- ✓ - **0 pts** Correct
  - **1 pts** Missing/Incorrect symmetry proof
  - **2 pts** Missing/Incorrect PSD proof
  - **3 pts** Missing
  - **0.5 pts** nit (see comments)

#### 4.2 ii) 3 / 3

- ✓ - 0 pts Correct
- 3 pts No answer
- 1 pts Flaw in base case
- 2 pts Missing base case
- 1 pts Flaw in induction step
- 2 pts Multiple flaws in induction step
- 2 pts Incomplete proof

#### 4.3 iii) 3 / 3

- 0 pts Correct
- ✓ - 0 pts Make sure to justify that  $\lambda > 0$
- 1 pts Simplified answer not found
- 1.5 pts Flaw in derived expression
- 2 pts No work shown
- 3 pts Incorrect
- 3 pts No answer

#### 4.4 iv) 2 / 3

- 0 pts Correct
- ✓ - 1 pts Need to prove symmetry in order to derive largest eigenvalue from operator norm
- 1 pts Minor mistakes (see comments)
- 2 pts Major mistakes (see comments)
- 3 pts Missing/Incomplete

#### QUESTION 5

#### Socially aware classifiers 14 pts

##### 5.1 i) 2 / 2

- ✓ - 0 pts Correct
- 1 pts Didn't give a concrete example
- 1 pts Insufficient explanation
- 2 pts No solution

##### 5.2 ii) 1 / 2

- 0 pts Correct
- ✓ - 1 pts Only proved in one direction
- 2 pts No solution

##### 5.3 iii) 1 / 2

- 0 pts Correct

- 2 pts No solution/Incorrect

✓ - 1 pts Missing an equivalence relationship of two equalities.

#### 5.4 iv) 2 / 2

- ✓ - 0 pts Correct
- 2 pts missing

#### 5.5 v) 2 / 2

- ✓ - 0 pts Correct
- 1 pts missing / incorrect graphs
- 2 pts missing

#### 5.6 vi) 2 / 2

- ✓ - 0 pts Correct
- 1 pts Missing / incorrect graphs
- 0.5 pts Missing / incorrect discussion
- 2 pts Missing

#### 5.7 vii) 2 / 2

- ✓ - 0 pts Correct
- 0.5 pts Small error
- 2 pts Missing

#### 5.8 viii) 0 / 0

- ✓ + 0 pts Default
- + 1 pts Exceptional work

#### QUESTION 6

#### Email spam 14 pts

##### 6.1 i) 6 / 6

- ✓ - 0 pts Correct
- 6 pts No Submission/Incorrect

##### 6.2 iii) 3 / 8

- 0 pts Correct
- ✓ - 1 pts No discussion of evaluation metrics (accuracy, precision, recall, runtime, etc.)
- 1 pts No comparison of k values (kNN)
- 1 pts No comparison of test/train splits (or k for cross-validation)

✓ - 1 pts No comparison of distance metrics for knn

- 1 pts Minor issues with plots/figures
- 2 pts Major issues with plots/figures
- 1 pts Small missing elements in writeup

✓ - 3 pts Major missing elements in writeup

- 8 pts No writeup

1 You need a detailed writeup describing which method is best and providing statistical support with good figures and an exposition

#### QUESTION 7

### 7 Adjustments 0 / 0

✓ - 0 pts no adjustments

- 3 pts Improper Code Submission
- 3 pts Pages not selected properly
- 3 pts Not following signup instructions
- 3 pts Not selecting homework partners properly or made duplicate submissions, thus violating the requirements stated here:

<https://piazza.com/class/k5ey5fnwxxl2g9?cid=8>

- 68 pts HOLD. Please contact the instructor to release the hold.

- 0 pts bonus

# COMS 4771 Machine Learning 2020

## Problem Set #1

Joseph High, Eliza Mace, Zachary Schuermann - jph2185, emm2314, zvs2002

February 24, 2020

### Problem 1: Statistical Estimators

- (i) We are given that  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  are drawn independently from

$$p(x|\theta = (a, b)) \propto \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a \leq x \leq b \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

That is,  $x_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{unif}[a, b]$ ,  $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Then for each  $i$ , the pdf of  $x_i$  is

$$p(x_i|\theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{b-a} & \text{if } a \leq x_i \leq b \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad \text{Therefore, the likelihood function is}$$

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta|X) = \prod_{i=1}^n p(x_i|\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{b-a} = \frac{1}{(b-a)^n}, \quad \text{for } a \leq x_i \leq b, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

The constraints on  $\theta$  can be written equivalently as  $a \leq \min_i\{x_i\}$  and  $b \geq \max_i\{x_i\}$ .

The values of  $a$  and  $b$  that maximize  $\frac{1}{(b-a)^n}$  are equivalent to the values of  $a$  and  $b$  that minimize  $b-a$ . Subject to the constraints,  $b-a$  is minimized when  $a = \min_i\{x_i\}$  and  $b = \max_i\{x_i\}$  (both of which are feasible). The MLE estimate of  $\theta = (a, b)$ , denoted by  $\theta_{ML}$ , is then

$$\theta_{ML} = \arg \max_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta|X) = \arg \max_{a \leq x_i \leq b} \frac{1}{(b-a)^n} = \arg \min_{a \leq x_i \leq b} (b-a) = (\min_i\{x_i\}, \max_i\{x_i\})$$

Therefore,

$$\theta_{ML} = (\min\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}, \max\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$$

- (ii) *Proof.* For an arbitrary, differentiable function  $g$ , let  $\Gamma$  be such that  $g : \Omega \rightarrow \Gamma$ , where  $\Omega$  is the parameter space. That is,  $\Gamma := \{\tau : g(\theta) = \tau\}$ . For each  $\tau \in \Gamma$ , define  $\Theta_\tau := \{\theta : g(\theta) = \tau\}$ , and note that  $\Theta_\tau \subseteq \Omega$ . Finally, let  $\hat{\tau}$  be the MLE of  $g(\theta)$ . That is,

$$\hat{\tau} = \arg \max_{\tau \in \Gamma} \left( \max_{\theta \in \Theta_\tau} \log \mathcal{L}(\theta|\mathbf{x}) \right)$$

1.1 i) 3 / 3

- ✓ - **0 pts** Correct answer, correct reasoning
- **1 pts** Incorrect answer, correct reasoning
- **2 pts** correct answer, incorrect reasoning
- **3 pts** Incomplete / [incorrect answer, incorrect reasoning]

# COMS 4771 Machine Learning 2020

## Problem Set #1

Joseph High, Eliza Mace, Zachary Schuermann - jph2185, emm2314, zvs2002

February 24, 2020

### Problem 1: Statistical Estimators

- (i) We are given that  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  are drawn independently from

$$p(x|\theta = (a, b)) \propto \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a \leq x \leq b \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

That is,  $x_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{unif}[a, b]$ ,  $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Then for each  $i$ , the pdf of  $x_i$  is

$$p(x_i|\theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{b-a} & \text{if } a \leq x_i \leq b \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad \text{Therefore, the likelihood function is}$$

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta|X) = \prod_{i=1}^n p(x_i|\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{b-a} = \frac{1}{(b-a)^n}, \quad \text{for } a \leq x_i \leq b, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

The constraints on  $\theta$  can be written equivalently as  $a \leq \min_i\{x_i\}$  and  $b \geq \max_i\{x_i\}$ .

The values of  $a$  and  $b$  that maximize  $\frac{1}{(b-a)^n}$  are equivalent to the values of  $a$  and  $b$  that minimize  $b-a$ . Subject to the constraints,  $b-a$  is minimized when  $a = \min_i\{x_i\}$  and  $b = \max_i\{x_i\}$  (both of which are feasible). The MLE estimate of  $\theta = (a, b)$ , denoted by  $\theta_{ML}$ , is then

$$\theta_{ML} = \arg \max_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta|X) = \arg \max_{a \leq x_i \leq b} \frac{1}{(b-a)^n} = \arg \min_{a \leq x_i \leq b} (b-a) = (\min_i\{x_i\}, \max_i\{x_i\})$$

Therefore,

$$\theta_{ML} = (\min\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}, \max\{x_1, \dots, x_n\})$$

- (ii) *Proof.* For an arbitrary, differentiable function  $g$ , let  $\Gamma$  be such that  $g : \Omega \rightarrow \Gamma$ , where  $\Omega$  is the parameter space. That is,  $\Gamma := \{\tau : g(\theta) = \tau\}$ . For each  $\tau \in \Gamma$ , define  $\Theta_\tau := \{\theta : g(\theta) = \tau\}$ , and note that  $\Theta_\tau \subseteq \Omega$ . Finally, let  $\hat{\tau}$  be the MLE of  $g(\theta)$ . That is,

$$\hat{\tau} = \arg \max_{\tau \in \Gamma} \left( \max_{\theta \in \Theta_\tau} \log \mathcal{L}(\theta|\mathbf{x}) \right)$$

Since  $\Theta_\tau \subseteq \Omega$ ,  $\max_{\theta \in \Theta_\tau} \log \mathcal{L}(\theta | \mathbf{x}) \leq \max_{\theta \in \Omega} \log \mathcal{L}(\theta | \mathbf{x}) = \log \mathcal{L}(\theta_{ML} | \mathbf{x})$ , for all  $\tau \in \Gamma$ .

That is, since  $\log \mathcal{L}(\theta | \mathbf{x})$  is maximized by  $\theta_{ML}$  over all  $\theta \in \Omega$ , then it also maximizes  $\log \mathcal{L}(\theta | \mathbf{x})$  over  $\Theta_\tau \subseteq \Omega$ , for all  $\tau \in \Gamma$ . More specifically,

$$\max_{\tau \in \Gamma} \left( \max_{\theta \in \Theta_\tau} \log \mathcal{L}(\theta | \mathbf{x}) \right) = \max_{\theta \in \Omega} \log \mathcal{L}(\theta | \mathbf{x}) = \log \mathcal{L}(\theta_{ML} | \mathbf{x})$$

Then it must be the case that  $\theta_{ML} \in \Theta_{\hat{\tau}} = \{\theta : g(\theta) = \hat{\tau}\}$

$\implies g(\theta_{ML}) = \hat{\tau}$ . Hence,  $g(\theta_{ML})$  is the MLE of  $g(\theta)$ .

□

- (iii) • *Consistent and unbiased:* (i)  $\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$  and (ii) a linear combination of the data with unequal weights on each data point:

$$\hat{\mu} = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i X_i \text{ where } \gamma_i \neq \gamma_j \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i = 1$$

For each estimator, we will show why each estimate is consistent and unbiased.

$$(i) \boxed{\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i}$$

$$\text{Unbiased: } \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \right] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[X_i] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mu = \mu$$

Consistent:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \right] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mu = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu = \mu$$

and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}[\hat{\mu}] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \right] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{Var}[X_i] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N\sigma^2}{N^2} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma^2}{N} = 0$$

$$(ii) \boxed{\hat{\mu} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i X_i \right] \text{ where } \gamma_i \neq \gamma_j \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i = 1}$$

Unbiased:

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i X_i \right] = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i \mathbb{E}[X_i] = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i \mu = \mu \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i = \mu \times 1 = \mu$$

1.2 ii) 3 / 3

✓ - 0 pts Correct

- 3 pts Incorrect

- 1 pts Partial Credit/partially right

Since  $\Theta_\tau \subseteq \Omega$ ,  $\max_{\theta \in \Theta_\tau} \log \mathcal{L}(\theta | \mathbf{x}) \leq \max_{\theta \in \Omega} \log \mathcal{L}(\theta | \mathbf{x}) = \log \mathcal{L}(\theta_{ML} | \mathbf{x})$ , for all  $\tau \in \Gamma$ .

That is, since  $\log \mathcal{L}(\theta | \mathbf{x})$  is maximized by  $\theta_{ML}$  over all  $\theta \in \Omega$ , then it also maximizes  $\log \mathcal{L}(\theta | \mathbf{x})$  over  $\Theta_\tau \subseteq \Omega$ , for all  $\tau \in \Gamma$ . More specifically,

$$\max_{\tau \in \Gamma} \left( \max_{\theta \in \Theta_\tau} \log \mathcal{L}(\theta | \mathbf{x}) \right) = \max_{\theta \in \Omega} \log \mathcal{L}(\theta | \mathbf{x}) = \log \mathcal{L}(\theta_{ML} | \mathbf{x})$$

Then it must be the case that  $\theta_{ML} \in \Theta_{\hat{\tau}} = \{\theta : g(\theta) = \hat{\tau}\}$

$\implies g(\theta_{ML}) = \hat{\tau}$ . Hence,  $g(\theta_{ML})$  is the MLE of  $g(\theta)$ .

□

- (iii) • *Consistent and unbiased:* (i)  $\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$  and (ii) a linear combination of the data with unequal weights on each data point:

$$\hat{\mu} = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i X_i \text{ where } \gamma_i \neq \gamma_j \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i = 1$$

For each estimator, we will show why each estimate is consistent and unbiased.

$$(i) \boxed{\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i}$$

$$\text{Unbiased: } \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \right] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[X_i] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mu = \mu$$

Consistent:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \right] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mu = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu = \mu$$

and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}[\hat{\mu}] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \right] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{Var}[X_i] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N\sigma^2}{N^2} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma^2}{N} = 0$$

$$(ii) \boxed{\hat{\mu} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i X_i \right] \text{ where } \gamma_i \neq \gamma_j \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i = 1}$$

Unbiased:

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i X_i \right] = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i \mathbb{E}[X_i] = \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i \mu = \mu \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i = \mu \times 1 = \mu$$

Consistent:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i X_i \right] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^N \gamma_i \mu = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu = \mu$$

- *Consistent, but not unbiased:* (i)  $\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$  and (ii)  $\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i + \frac{1}{N}$

For each estimator, we will show why each estimate is consistent and biased.

(i) 
$$\boxed{\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i}$$

Biased: 
$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \right] = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[X_i] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mu = \frac{N\mu}{N-1} \neq \mu$$

Consistent:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \right] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mu = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N\mu}{N-1} = \mu$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}[\hat{\mu}] &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var} \left[ \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \right] \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1}{N-1} \right)^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma^2 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N\sigma^2}{(N-1)^2} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma^2}{N-2+\frac{1}{N}} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

(ii) 
$$\boxed{\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i + \frac{1}{N}}$$

Biased:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i + \frac{1}{N} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \right] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[X_i] + \frac{1}{N} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mu + \frac{1}{N} = \mu + \frac{1}{N} \neq \mu \end{aligned}$$

Consistent:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i + \frac{1}{N} \right] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mu + \frac{1}{N} \right) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left( \mu + \frac{1}{N} \right) = \mu$$

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}[\hat{\mu}] &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i + \frac{1}{N} \right] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{Var}[X_i] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N\sigma^2}{N^2} \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma^2}{N} = 0\end{aligned}$$

- *Not consistent, but unbiased:* (i)  $\hat{\mu} = X_k \in \{X_1, \dots, X_N\}$  and (ii)  $\hat{\mu} = \frac{X_1+X_2}{2}$   
For each estimator, we will show why each estimate is not consistent, but unbiased.

(i)  $\boxed{\hat{\mu} = X_k}$

Unbiased:  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \mathbb{E}[X_k] = \mu$

Not consistent: Inconsistent since  $X_k$  is fixed and will not change as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . That is,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}[\hat{\mu}] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}[X_k] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sigma^2 = \sigma^2 \neq 0$$

(ii)  $\boxed{\hat{\mu} = \frac{X_1+X_2}{2}}$

Unbiased:  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{X_1+X_2}{2}\right] = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[X_1] + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[X_2] = \frac{1}{2}\mu + \frac{1}{2}\mu = \mu$

Not consistent:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}[\hat{\mu}] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var} \left[ \frac{X_1+X_2}{2} \right] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \neq 0$$

- *Neither consistent, nor unbiased:* (i)  $X_k + \alpha$  and (ii)  $\alpha X_k$ , for some  $X_k \in \{X_1, \dots, X_N\}$  and a fixed constant  $\alpha > 1$

For each estimator, we will show why each estimate is neither consistent, nor unbiased.

(i)  $\boxed{\hat{\mu} = X_k + \alpha}$

Biased:  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \mathbb{E}[X_k + \alpha] = \mu + \alpha \neq \mu$

Not consistent:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_k + \alpha] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu + \alpha = \mu + \alpha \neq \mu$$

and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}[\hat{\mu}] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}[X_k + \alpha] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}[X_k] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sigma^2 = \sigma^2 > 0$$

(ii)  $\boxed{\hat{\mu} = \alpha X_k}$

Biased:  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \mathbb{E}[\alpha X_k] = \alpha\mu \neq \mu$

Not consistent:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mu}] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\alpha X_k] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \alpha \mu = \alpha \mu \neq \mu$$

and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}[\hat{\mu}] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}[\alpha X_k] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \alpha^2 \sigma^2 = \alpha^2 \sigma^2 > 0$$

1.3 iii) 4 / 4

✓ - 0 pts Correct

- 4 pts Not attempted.
- 1 pts Part a incorrect
- 1 pts Part b incorrect
- 1 pts Part c incorrect
- 1 pts Part d incorrect
- 0.5 pts Minor error.

## Problem 2: On Forecasting Product Demand

1. Expected profit  $\pi$ :

$$\pi = \begin{cases} (P - C)Q & D \geq Q \\ (P - C)D - C(Q - D) & D < Q \end{cases}$$

First, we will define  $f$  as the PDF of  $D$  and  $F$  as the CD of  $D$ .

If the retailer buys  $Q$  items:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\pi(D) &= \int_Q^\infty (P - C)Qf(D)dD + \int_0^Q [(P - C)Df(D) - C(Q - D)f(D)]dD \\ &= \int_Q^\infty (P - C)Qf(D)dD + \int_0^Q (P - C)Df(D)dD - \int_0^Q C(Q - D)f(D)dD \\ &= (P - C)Q \int_Q^\infty f(D)dD + (P - C) \int_0^Q Df(D)dD - CQ \int_0^Q f(D)dD \\ &\quad + C \int_0^Q Df(D)dD \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$F(Q) = \int_0^Q f(D)dD \implies \int_Q^\infty f(D)dD = 1 - F(Q)$$

we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\pi(D) &= (P - C)Q(1 - F(Q)) + P \int_0^Q Df(D)dD - \cancel{C \int_0^Q Df(D)dD} \\ &\quad - CQF(Q) + \cancel{C \int_0^Q Df(D)dD} \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying further:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\pi(D) &= (P - C)Q - PQF(Q) + CQF(Q) - CQF(Q) + P \int_0^Q Df(D)dD \\ &= \boxed{(P - C)Q - PQF(Q) + P \int_0^Q Df(D)dD} \end{aligned}$$

2. Derivative with respect to  $Q$  (using equation from above):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbb{E}_\pi(D)}{dQ} &= (P - C) - PF(Q) - PQf(Q) + P \left( \frac{d}{dQ} \int_0^Q Df(D)dD \right) \\ &= (P - C) - PF(Q) - PQf(Q) + PQF(Q) \\ &= \boxed{(P - C) - PF(Q)} \end{aligned}$$

2.1 i) 4 / 4

✓ - 0 pts Correct

- 1 pts Not simplified enough

- 1 pts Did not distinguish  $F(D)$  from  $F(Q)$

- 2 pts Not enough work shown

- 4 pts Incorrect

- 4 pts Used discrete formulation of expected value but profit is a continuous random variable

- 2 pts Small error in term

## Problem 2: On Forecasting Product Demand

1. Expected profit  $\pi$ :

$$\pi = \begin{cases} (P - C)Q & D \geq Q \\ (P - C)D - C(Q - D) & D < Q \end{cases}$$

First, we will define  $f$  as the PDF of  $D$  and  $F$  as the CD of  $D$ .

If the retailer buys  $Q$  items:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\pi(D) &= \int_Q^\infty (P - C)Qf(D)dD + \int_0^Q [(P - C)Df(D) - C(Q - D)f(D)]dD \\ &= \int_Q^\infty (P - C)Qf(D)dD + \int_0^Q (P - C)Df(D)dD - \int_0^Q C(Q - D)f(D)dD \\ &= (P - C)Q \int_Q^\infty f(D)dD + (P - C) \int_0^Q Df(D)dD - CQ \int_0^Q f(D)dD \\ &\quad + C \int_0^Q Df(D)dD \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$F(Q) = \int_0^Q f(D)dD \implies \int_Q^\infty f(D)dD = 1 - F(Q)$$

we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\pi(D) &= (P - C)Q(1 - F(Q)) + P \int_0^Q Df(D)dD - \cancel{C \int_0^Q Df(D)dD} \\ &\quad - CQF(Q) + \cancel{C \int_0^Q Df(D)dD} \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying further:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\pi(D) &= (P - C)Q - PQF(Q) + CQF(Q) - CQF(Q) + P \int_0^Q Df(D)dD \\ &= \boxed{(P - C)Q - PQF(Q) + P \int_0^Q Df(D)dD} \end{aligned}$$

2. Derivative with respect to  $Q$  (using equation from above):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbb{E}_\pi(D)}{dQ} &= (P - C) - PF(Q) - PQf(Q) + P \left( \frac{d}{dQ} \int_0^Q Df(D)dD \right) \\ &= (P - C) - PF(Q) - PQf(Q) + PQF(Q) \\ &= \boxed{(P - C) - PF(Q)} \end{aligned}$$

To find critical points:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d \mathbb{E}_\pi(D)}{dQ} &= P - C - PF(Q) = 0 \\ PF(Q) &= P - C \\ F(Q) &= 1 - \frac{C}{P}\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the optimal quality  $Q^*$  is when  $F(Q^*) = 1 - \frac{C}{P}$ .

2.2 ii) 4 / 4

✓ - 0 pts Correct

- 4 pts Incorrect

- 2 pts Need to show more work

- 0.5 pts Computational error

## Problem 3: Evaluating Classifiers

- (i) We get an error when  $x_i > t, y_i = y_2$  or when  $x_i \leq t, y_i = y_1$

$$\begin{aligned} P[f_t(X) \neq y] &= \int_x P[f_t(\vec{x}) \neq y | X = \vec{x}] P[X] dx \\ &= \int_x [P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_1, Y = y_2 | X = \vec{x}] + P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_2, Y = y_1 | X = \vec{x}]] dx \\ &= \int_t^\infty P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_1, Y = y_2 | X = \vec{x}] dx + \int_{-\infty}^t P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_2, Y = y_1 | X = \vec{x}] dx \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) We will find the optimal threshold via critical points:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dx} \left( \int_t^\infty P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_1, Y = y_2 | X = \vec{x}] dx + \int_{-\infty}^t P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_2, Y = y_1 | X = \vec{x}] dx \right) &= 0 \\ P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_1, Y = y_2 | X = t] dx - P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_2, Y = y_1 | X = t] dx &= 0 \\ P[f_t(\vec{x}) = t, Y = y_2] &= P[f_t(\vec{x}) = t, Y = y_1] \\ P(X = t | Y = y_1) P(Y = y_1) &= P(X = t | Y = y_2) P(Y = y_2) \end{aligned}$$

- (iii) Assuming that the underlying population distribution has equal class priors ( $P[Y = y_1] = P[Y = y_2]$ ) and the individual class conditionals ( $P[X|Y = y_1]$  and  $P[X|Y = y_2]$ ) are distributed as Gaussians.

- (a) An example of class conditionals such that for some threshold value  $t$ , the rule  $f_t$  achieves the Bayes error rate.

Since they are distributed as Gaussians, the thresholding will achieve the same error rate as Bayes when  $t$  is the intersection of the gaussians (the midpoint between the means if the variance is the same). The Bayes error rate, which is achieved when effectively selecting the label with the higher probability, is exactly matched when the two class conditionals are separated (different  $\mu$ ), and have the same variance, and the threshold is simply the intersection of the class conditionals.

- (b) An example setting of class conditionals such that for no threshold value  $t$ , the rule  $f_t$  achieves the Bayes error rate.

Class conditionals with the same mean and different variance will mean that any value of  $t$  will yield a higher error rate than the Bayes error rate. In this case, the Bayes error rate is achieved by predicting: class one  $\rightarrow$  class two  $\rightarrow$  class one. Since thresholding can only provide one transition, for any value of  $t$ , it will have a higher error rate.

3.1 i) 2 / 3

- **0 pts** Correct
- **3 pts** Incorrect
- ✓ **- 1 pts** Mostly Correct

💬 What is  $P[f_t(x)=y_i]$ ? Can be simplified further

## Problem 3: Evaluating Classifiers

- (i) We get an error when  $x_i > t, y_i = y_2$  or when  $x_i \leq t, y_i = y_1$

$$\begin{aligned} P[f_t(X) \neq y] &= \int_x P[f_t(\vec{x}) \neq y | X = \vec{x}] P[X] dx \\ &= \int_x [P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_1, Y = y_2 | X = \vec{x}] + P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_2, Y = y_1 | X = \vec{x}]] dx \\ &= \int_t^\infty P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_1, Y = y_2 | X = \vec{x}] dx + \int_{-\infty}^t P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_2, Y = y_1 | X = \vec{x}] dx \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) We will find the optimal threshold via critical points:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dx} \left( \int_t^\infty P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_1, Y = y_2 | X = \vec{x}] dx + \int_{-\infty}^t P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_2, Y = y_1 | X = \vec{x}] dx \right) &= 0 \\ P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_1, Y = y_2 | X = t] dx - P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_2, Y = y_1 | X = t] dx &= 0 \\ P[f_t(\vec{x}) = t, Y = y_2] &= P[f_t(\vec{x}) = t, Y = y_1] \\ P(X = t | Y = y_1) P(Y = y_1) &= P(X = t | Y = y_2) P(Y = y_2) \end{aligned}$$

- (iii) Assuming that the underlying population distribution has equal class priors ( $P[Y = y_1] = P[Y = y_2]$ ) and the individual class conditionals ( $P[X|Y = y_1]$  and  $P[X|Y = y_2]$ ) are distributed as Gaussians.

- (a) An example of class conditionals such that for some threshold value  $t$ , the rule  $f_t$  achieves the Bayes error rate.

Since they are distributed as Gaussians, the thresholding will achieve the same error rate as Bayes when  $t$  is the intersection of the gaussians (the midpoint between the means if the variance is the same). The Bayes error rate, which is achieved when effectively selecting the label with the higher probability, is exactly matched when the two class conditionals are separated (different  $\mu$ ), and have the same variance, and the threshold is simply the intersection of the class conditionals.

- (b) An example setting of class conditionals such that for no threshold value  $t$ , the rule  $f_t$  achieves the Bayes error rate.

Class conditionals with the same mean and different variance will mean that any value of  $t$  will yield a higher error rate than the Bayes error rate. In this case, the Bayes error rate is achieved by predicting: class one  $\rightarrow$  class two  $\rightarrow$  class one. Since thresholding can only provide one transition, for any value of  $t$ , it will have a higher error rate.

3.2 ii) 3 / 3

✓ - 0 pts Correct

- 3 pts Incorrect

## Problem 3: Evaluating Classifiers

- (i) We get an error when  $x_i > t, y_i = y_2$  or when  $x_i \leq t, y_i = y_1$

$$\begin{aligned} P[f_t(X) \neq y] &= \int_x P[f_t(\vec{x}) \neq y | X = \vec{x}] P[X] dx \\ &= \int_x [P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_1, Y = y_2 | X = \vec{x}] + P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_2, Y = y_1 | X = \vec{x}]] dx \\ &= \int_t^\infty P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_1, Y = y_2 | X = \vec{x}] dx + \int_{-\infty}^t P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_2, Y = y_1 | X = \vec{x}] dx \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) We will find the optimal threshold via critical points:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dx} \left( \int_t^\infty P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_1, Y = y_2 | X = \vec{x}] dx + \int_{-\infty}^t P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_2, Y = y_1 | X = \vec{x}] dx \right) &= 0 \\ P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_1, Y = y_2 | X = t] dx - P[f_t(\vec{x}) = y_2, Y = y_1 | X = t] dx &= 0 \\ P[f_t(\vec{x}) = t, Y = y_2] &= P[f_t(\vec{x}) = t, Y = y_1] \\ P(X = t | Y = y_1) P(Y = y_1) &= P(X = t | Y = y_2) P(Y = y_2) \end{aligned}$$

- (iii) Assuming that the underlying population distribution has equal class priors ( $P[Y = y_1] = P[Y = y_2]$ ) and the individual class conditionals ( $P[X|Y = y_1]$  and  $P[X|Y = y_2]$ ) are distributed as Gaussians.

- (a) An example of class conditionals such that for some threshold value  $t$ , the rule  $f_t$  achieves the Bayes error rate.

Since they are distributed as Gaussians, the thresholding will achieve the same error rate as Bayes when  $t$  is the intersection of the gaussians (the midpoint between the means if the variance is the same). The Bayes error rate, which is achieved when effectively selecting the label with the higher probability, is exactly matched when the two class conditionals are separated (different  $\mu$ ), and have the same variance, and the threshold is simply the intersection of the class conditionals.

- (b) An example setting of class conditionals such that for no threshold value  $t$ , the rule  $f_t$  achieves the Bayes error rate.

Class conditionals with the same mean and different variance will mean that any value of  $t$  will yield a higher error rate than the Bayes error rate. In this case, the Bayes error rate is achieved by predicting: class one  $\rightarrow$  class two  $\rightarrow$  class one. Since thresholding can only provide one transition, for any value of  $t$ , it will have a higher error rate.

3.3 iii) 2 / 4

- 0 pts Correct

✓ - 2 pts First Example Incorrect

- 2 pts Second Example Incorrect

💬 What if  $\mu_1 < \mu_2$ ?

## Problem 4: Analyzing iterative optimization

(i) *Proof.* We first show that  $M$  is *symmetric*.

Recall that a (square) matrix  $M$  is symmetric  $\iff M = M^\top$

Clearly,  $M = A^\top A$  is a square matrix ( $A^\top A$  a  $d \times d$  matrix). Consider the following

$$M^\top = (A^\top A)^\top = A^\top (A^\top)^\top = A^\top A = M \implies M^\top = M$$

Thus,  $M$  is symmetric.

To prove that  $M$  is also *positive semi-definite*, it suffices to show that for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $x^\top Mx \geq 0$ . As such, consider an arbitrary vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $\mathbf{w} = Ax$ , where  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathbf{w} = [w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n]^\top$ . We then have that,

$$\mathbf{x}^\top M\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^\top A^\top Ax = (Ax)^\top Ax = \|Ax\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \geq 0$$

$\implies M$  is positive semi-definite. □

(ii) *Proof.* Proof by induction on  $N$ .

Base case: ( $N = 1, 2$ )

For  $N = 1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^{(1)} &= \beta^{(0)} + \eta A^\top (b - A\beta^{(0)}) && \text{(by definition of the Richardson iteration)} \\ &= \eta A^\top b = \eta v && \text{(since } \beta^{(0)} \text{ is the zero vector and } v = A^\top b) \\ &= \eta Iv = \eta \underbrace{(I - \eta M)^0}_= v && \text{(Note: } (I - \eta M) \text{ is a square matrix since } I \text{ and } M \text{ are square)} \\ &= \eta \sum_{k=0}^0 (I - \eta M)^k v && \text{Thus, it holds for } N = 1. \end{aligned}$$

For  $N = 2$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^{(2)} &= \beta^{(1)} + \eta A^\top (b - A\beta^{(1)}) = \eta v + \eta(A^\top b - A^\top A\eta v) && \text{(since } \beta^{(1)} = \eta v \text{ from the above)} \\ &= \eta v + \eta(v - M\eta v) && \text{(since } M = A^\top A \text{ and } v = A^\top b) \\ &= \eta \underbrace{(I - \eta M)^0}_= v + \eta(I - \eta M)v && (\eta \text{ a real number}) \\ &= \eta[(I - \eta M)^0 v + (I - \eta M)^1 v] \\ &= \eta \sum_{k=0}^1 (I - \eta M)^k v && \text{Thus, the result holds for } N = 2. \end{aligned}$$

(Inductive hypothesis) Now assume the following holds for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$   
That is, assume the following holds:

$$\beta^{(N-1)} = \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (I - \eta M)^k v$$

4.1 i) 3 / 3

✓ - 0 pts Correct

- 1 pts Missing/Incorrect symmetry proof

- 2 pts Missing/Incorrect PSD proof

- 3 pts Missing

- 0.5 pts nit (see comments)

## Problem 4: Analyzing iterative optimization

(i) *Proof.* We first show that  $M$  is *symmetric*.

Recall that a (square) matrix  $M$  is symmetric  $\iff M = M^\top$

Clearly,  $M = A^\top A$  is a square matrix ( $A^\top A$  a  $d \times d$  matrix). Consider the following

$$M^\top = (A^\top A)^\top = A^\top (A^\top)^\top = A^\top A = M \implies M^\top = M$$

Thus,  $M$  is symmetric.

To prove that  $M$  is also *positive semi-definite*, it suffices to show that for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $x^\top Mx \geq 0$ . As such, consider an arbitrary vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $\mathbf{w} = Ax$ , where  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathbf{w} = [w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n]^\top$ . We then have that,

$$\mathbf{x}^\top M\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^\top A^\top Ax = (Ax)^\top Ax = \|Ax\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \geq 0$$

$\implies M$  is positive semi-definite. □

(ii) *Proof.* Proof by induction on  $N$ .

Base case: ( $N = 1, 2$ )

For  $N = 1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^{(1)} &= \beta^{(0)} + \eta A^\top (b - A\beta^{(0)}) && \text{(by definition of the Richardson iteration)} \\ &= \eta A^\top b = \eta v && \text{(since } \beta^{(0)} \text{ is the zero vector and } v = A^\top b) \\ &= \eta Iv = \eta \underbrace{(I - \eta M)^0}_= v && \text{(Note: } (I - \eta M) \text{ is a square matrix since } I \text{ and } M \text{ are square)} \\ &= \eta \sum_{k=0}^0 (I - \eta M)^k v && \text{Thus, it holds for } N = 1. \end{aligned}$$

For  $N = 2$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^{(2)} &= \beta^{(1)} + \eta A^\top (b - A\beta^{(1)}) = \eta v + \eta(A^\top b - A^\top A\eta v) && \text{(since } \beta^{(1)} = \eta v \text{ from the above)} \\ &= \eta v + \eta(v - M\eta v) && \text{(since } M = A^\top A \text{ and } v = A^\top b) \\ &= \eta \underbrace{(I - \eta M)^0}_= v + \eta(I - \eta M)v && (\eta \text{ a real number}) \\ &= \eta[(I - \eta M)^0 v + (I - \eta M)^1 v] \\ &= \eta \sum_{k=0}^1 (I - \eta M)^k v && \text{Thus, the result holds for } N = 2. \end{aligned}$$

(Inductive hypothesis) Now assume the following holds for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$   
That is, assume the following holds:

$$\beta^{(N-1)} = \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (I - \eta M)^k v$$

From the definition of the Richardson iteration, the  $N^{th}$  iterate is

$$\begin{aligned}
 \beta^{(N)} &= \beta^{(N-1)} + \eta A^\top (b - A\beta^{(N-1)}) = \beta^{(N-1)} + \eta(v - M\beta^{(N-1)}) \\
 &= \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (I - \eta M)^k v + \eta \left[ v - M \left( \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (I - \eta M)^k v \right) \right] \quad (\text{from the induction hypothesis}) \\
 &= \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (I - \eta M)^k v - \eta M \left( \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (I - \eta M)^k v \right) + \eta v \\
 &= (I - \eta M) \left( \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (I - \eta M)^k v \right) + \eta v \\
 &= \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (I - \eta M)^{k+1} v + \eta v \\
 &= \eta \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} (I - \eta M)^k v + \eta v \quad (\text{rearrange indices}) \\
 &= \eta \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} (I - \eta M)^k v + \eta \underbrace{(I - \eta M)^0 v}_{=I} \quad (\text{adding } k=0 \text{ summand}) \\
 &= \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (I - \eta M)^k v
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\beta^{(N)} = \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (I - \eta M)^k v$

□

- (iii) We are given that the eigenvalues of  $M$  are  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d$ . Then, the eigenvalues of  $I - \eta M$  are  $1 - \eta \lambda_i$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Indeed, without loss of generality, let  $\mathbf{x}$  be the eigenvector associated with  $\lambda_i$ , then  $M\mathbf{x} = \lambda_i \mathbf{x} \implies (\eta M)\mathbf{x} = (\eta \lambda_i)\mathbf{x} \implies I\mathbf{x} - (\eta M)\mathbf{x} = I\mathbf{x} - \eta \lambda_i \mathbf{x} = 1\mathbf{x} - \eta \lambda_i \mathbf{x} \implies (I - \eta M)\mathbf{x} = (1 - \eta \lambda_i)\mathbf{x}$ .

We also claim that since  $((1 - \eta \lambda_i), \mathbf{x})$  is the eigenvalue–eigenvector pair for  $(I - \eta M)$ , then  $((1 - \eta \lambda_i)^k, \mathbf{x})$  is the eigenvalue–eigenvector pair for  $(I - \eta M)^k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ .

*Proof of claim:* For any  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (I - \eta M)\mathbf{x} &= (1 - \eta \lambda_i)\mathbf{x} \implies (I - \eta M)^2\mathbf{x} = (1 - \eta \lambda_i)(I - \eta M)\mathbf{x} = (1 - \eta \lambda_i)^2\mathbf{x} \\
 &\implies (I - \eta M)^3\mathbf{x} = (1 - \eta \lambda_i)^2(I - \eta M)\mathbf{x} = (1 - \eta \lambda_i)^3\mathbf{x} \\
 &\vdots \\
 &\implies (I - \eta M)^k\mathbf{x} = (1 - \eta \lambda_i)^{k-1}(I - \eta M)\mathbf{x} = (1 - \eta \lambda_i)^k\mathbf{x}
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Using the above results, we have the following

$$\begin{aligned}
 \eta I\mathbf{x} + \eta(I - \eta M)\mathbf{x} + \eta(I - \eta M)^2\mathbf{x} + \cdots + \eta(I - \eta M)^{N-1}\mathbf{x} &= \\
 \eta\mathbf{x} + \eta(1 - \eta \lambda_i)\mathbf{x} + \eta(1 - \eta \lambda_i)^2\mathbf{x} + \cdots + \eta(1 - \eta \lambda_i)^{N-1}\mathbf{x}
 \end{aligned}$$

4.2 ii) 3 / 3

✓ - 0 pts Correct

- 3 pts No answer
- 1 pts Flaw in base case
- 2 pts Missing base case
- 1 pts Flaw in induction step
- 2 pts Multiple flaws in induction step
- 2 pts Incomplete proof

From the definition of the Richardson iteration, the  $N^{th}$  iterate is

$$\begin{aligned}
 \beta^{(N)} &= \beta^{(N-1)} + \eta A^\top (b - A\beta^{(N-1)}) = \beta^{(N-1)} + \eta(v - M\beta^{(N-1)}) \\
 &= \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (I - \eta M)^k v + \eta \left[ v - M \left( \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (I - \eta M)^k v \right) \right] \quad (\text{from the induction hypothesis}) \\
 &= \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (I - \eta M)^k v - \eta M \left( \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (I - \eta M)^k v \right) + \eta v \\
 &= (I - \eta M) \left( \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (I - \eta M)^k v \right) + \eta v \\
 &= \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} (I - \eta M)^{k+1} v + \eta v \\
 &= \eta \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} (I - \eta M)^k v + \eta v \quad (\text{rearrange indices}) \\
 &= \eta \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} (I - \eta M)^k v + \eta \underbrace{(I - \eta M)^0 v}_{=I} \quad (\text{adding } k=0 \text{ summand}) \\
 &= \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (I - \eta M)^k v
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\beta^{(N)} = \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (I - \eta M)^k v$

□

- (iii) We are given that the eigenvalues of  $M$  are  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d$ . Then, the eigenvalues of  $I - \eta M$  are  $1 - \eta \lambda_i$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Indeed, without loss of generality, let  $\mathbf{x}$  be the eigenvector associated with  $\lambda_i$ , then  $M\mathbf{x} = \lambda_i \mathbf{x} \implies (\eta M)\mathbf{x} = (\eta \lambda_i)\mathbf{x} \implies I\mathbf{x} - (\eta M)\mathbf{x} = I\mathbf{x} - \eta \lambda_i \mathbf{x} = 1\mathbf{x} - \eta \lambda_i \mathbf{x} \implies (I - \eta M)\mathbf{x} = (1 - \eta \lambda_i)\mathbf{x}$ .

We also claim that since  $((1 - \eta \lambda_i), \mathbf{x})$  is the eigenvalue–eigenvector pair for  $(I - \eta M)$ , then  $((1 - \eta \lambda_i)^k, \mathbf{x})$  is the eigenvalue–eigenvector pair for  $(I - \eta M)^k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ .

*Proof of claim:* For any  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (I - \eta M)\mathbf{x} &= (1 - \eta \lambda_i)\mathbf{x} \implies (I - \eta M)^2\mathbf{x} = (1 - \eta \lambda_i)(I - \eta M)\mathbf{x} = (1 - \eta \lambda_i)^2\mathbf{x} \\
 &\implies (I - \eta M)^3\mathbf{x} = (1 - \eta \lambda_i)^2(I - \eta M)\mathbf{x} = (1 - \eta \lambda_i)^3\mathbf{x} \\
 &\vdots \\
 &\implies (I - \eta M)^k\mathbf{x} = (1 - \eta \lambda_i)^{k-1}(I - \eta M)\mathbf{x} = (1 - \eta \lambda_i)^k\mathbf{x}
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Using the above results, we have the following

$$\begin{aligned}
 \eta I\mathbf{x} + \eta(I - \eta M)\mathbf{x} + \eta(I - \eta M)^2\mathbf{x} + \cdots + \eta(I - \eta M)^{N-1}\mathbf{x} &= \\
 \eta\mathbf{x} + \eta(1 - \eta \lambda_i)\mathbf{x} + \eta(1 - \eta \lambda_i)^2\mathbf{x} + \cdots + \eta(1 - \eta \lambda_i)^{N-1}\mathbf{x}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\implies \eta(I + (I - \eta M) + (I - \eta M)^2 + \cdots + (I - \eta M)^{N-1})\mathbf{x} = \\ \eta(1 + (1 - \eta\lambda_i) + (1 - \eta\lambda_i)^2 + \cdots + (1 - \eta\lambda_i)^{N-1})\mathbf{x}$$

$$\implies \left( \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (I - \eta M)^k \right) \mathbf{x} = \left( \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (1 - \eta\lambda_i)^k \right) \mathbf{x} = \left( \frac{1 - (1 - \eta\lambda_i)^N}{\lambda_i} \right) \mathbf{x}, \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, d$$

Thus, the eigenvalues of  $\eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (I - \eta M)^k$  are

$$\frac{1 - (1 - \eta\lambda_1)^N}{\lambda_1}, \frac{1 - (1 - \eta\lambda_2)^N}{\lambda_2}, \dots, \frac{1 - (1 - \eta\lambda_d)^N}{\lambda_d}$$

.

(iv) *Proof.*

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta} - \beta^{(N)} &= (\hat{\beta} + \eta A^\top (b - A\hat{\beta})) - (\beta^{(N-1)} + \eta A^\top (b - A\beta^{(N-1)})) \\ &= (\hat{\beta} + \eta v - \eta M\hat{\beta}) - (\beta^{(N-1)} + \eta v - \eta M\beta^{(N-1)}) \\ &= ((I - \eta M)\hat{\beta} + \eta v) - ((I - \eta M)\beta^{(N-1)} + \eta v) \\ &= (I - \eta M)(\hat{\beta} - \beta^{(N-1)}) \\ &= (I - \eta M)^2((\hat{\beta} - \beta^{(N-2)})) \\ &= (I - \eta M)^3(\hat{\beta} - \beta^{(N-3)}) \\ &\vdots \\ &= (I - \eta M)^N(\hat{\beta} - \beta^{(0)}) \\ &= (I - \eta M)^N\hat{\beta} \end{aligned}$$

Now consider,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta^{(N)} - \hat{\beta}\|_2^2 &= \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^{(N)}\|_2^2 = \|(I - \eta M)^N\hat{\beta}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|(I - \eta M)^N\|_2^2 \|\hat{\beta}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq (\|(I - \eta M)\|_2^2)^N \|\hat{\beta}\|_2^2 \\ &= \|I - \eta M\|_2^{2N} \|\hat{\beta}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq (1 - 2\eta\lambda_{min})^N \|\hat{\beta}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq e^{-2\eta\lambda_{min}N} \|\hat{\beta}\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

□

4.3 iii) 3 / 3

- 0 pts Correct
- ✓ - 0 pts Make sure to justify that  $\lambda > 0$
- 1 pts Simplified answer not found
- 1.5 pts Flaw in derived expression
- 2 pts No work shown
- 3 pts Incorrect
- 3 pts No answer

$$\implies \eta(I + (I - \eta M) + (I - \eta M)^2 + \cdots + (I - \eta M)^{N-1})\mathbf{x} = \\ \eta(1 + (1 - \eta\lambda_i) + (1 - \eta\lambda_i)^2 + \cdots + (1 - \eta\lambda_i)^{N-1})\mathbf{x}$$

$$\implies \left( \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (I - \eta M)^k \right) \mathbf{x} = \left( \eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (1 - \eta\lambda_i)^k \right) \mathbf{x} = \left( \frac{1 - (1 - \eta\lambda_i)^N}{\lambda_i} \right) \mathbf{x}, \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, d$$

Thus, the eigenvalues of  $\eta \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (I - \eta M)^k$  are

$$\frac{1 - (1 - \eta\lambda_1)^N}{\lambda_1}, \frac{1 - (1 - \eta\lambda_2)^N}{\lambda_2}, \dots, \frac{1 - (1 - \eta\lambda_d)^N}{\lambda_d}$$

.

(iv) *Proof.*

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta} - \beta^{(N)} &= (\hat{\beta} + \eta A^\top (b - A\hat{\beta})) - (\beta^{(N-1)} + \eta A^\top (b - A\beta^{(N-1)})) \\ &= (\hat{\beta} + \eta v - \eta M\hat{\beta}) - (\beta^{(N-1)} + \eta v - \eta M\beta^{(N-1)}) \\ &= ((I - \eta M)\hat{\beta} + \eta v) - ((I - \eta M)\beta^{(N-1)} + \eta v) \\ &= (I - \eta M)(\hat{\beta} - \beta^{(N-1)}) \\ &= (I - \eta M)^2((\hat{\beta} - \beta^{(N-2)})) \\ &= (I - \eta M)^3(\hat{\beta} - \beta^{(N-3)}) \\ &\vdots \\ &= (I - \eta M)^N(\hat{\beta} - \beta^{(0)}) \\ &= (I - \eta M)^N\hat{\beta} \end{aligned}$$

Now consider,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta^{(N)} - \hat{\beta}\|_2^2 &= \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^{(N)}\|_2^2 = \|(I - \eta M)^N\hat{\beta}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|(I - \eta M)^N\|_2^2 \|\hat{\beta}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq (\|(I - \eta M)\|_2^2)^N \|\hat{\beta}\|_2^2 \\ &= \|I - \eta M\|_2^{2N} \|\hat{\beta}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq (1 - 2\eta\lambda_{min})^N \|\hat{\beta}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq e^{-2\eta\lambda_{min}N} \|\hat{\beta}\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

□

4.4 iv) 2 / 3

- 0 pts Correct

✓ - 1 pts Need to prove symmetry in order to derive largest eigenvalue from operator norm

- 1 pts Minor mistakes (see comments)

- 2 pts Major mistakes (see comments)

- 3 pts Missing/Incomplete

## Problem 5: Designing socially aware classifiers

- (i) It is not enough just to remove the sensitive attribute  $A$  from the dataset because it is possible that other attributes in the feature vector are correlated with this attribute. For example, let's say we are hiring for a Computer Science job, and we want to look at the sensitive attribute  $gender$ . We can simply remove the Male/Female flag feature from the dataset. However, suppose that another feature in the dataset is where the applicant got their education. What if the process of college admissions is biased in terms of gender? Then this schooling feature will be highly correlated with gender. Thus, it is not always sufficient to remove ONLY the sensitive feature in question.
- (ii) Notation:  $\Sigma[\hat{Y} = y]$  will represent the count of  $\hat{Y} = y$  for the total population, where similarly  $\Sigma_a[\hat{Y} = y]$  will be the count of  $\hat{Y} = y$  for the population of sensitive attribute  $a$ . Also, for convenience, we will use  $N$  to represent the number of instances in the whole population and  $N_a$  to represent the number of instances in the population of sensitive attribute  $a$ .

$$\mathbb{P}_0[\hat{Y} = 1] = \mathbb{P}_1[\hat{Y} = 1]$$

$$\frac{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]}{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0]} = \frac{\Sigma_1[\hat{Y} = 1]}{\Sigma_1[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_1[\hat{Y} = 0]}$$

$$\frac{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]}{N_0} = \frac{\Sigma_1[\hat{Y} = 1]}{N - N_0}$$

$$\frac{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]}{N_0} = \frac{\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1] - \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]}{N - N_0}$$

$$(N - N_0)\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] = N_0\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1] - N_0\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]$$

$$(N - \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] - \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0])\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] = (\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0])\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1] - (\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0])\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]$$

$$N\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] - (\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1])^2 - \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0]\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] = \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0]\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1] - (\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1])^2 - \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0]\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]$$

$$N\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] = \Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1](\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0])$$

$$\frac{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]}{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0]} = \frac{\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1]}{N}$$

$$\mathbb{P}_a[\hat{Y} = 1] = \mathbb{P}[\hat{Y} = 1]$$

- (iii)  $\mathbb{P}[\hat{Y} = 1] = \mathbb{P}_a[\hat{Y} = 1]$  is equivalent to  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y} = y] = \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}] \forall a, y \in \{0, 1\}$ .

In general,  $\mathbb{P}[\hat{Y} = y | A = a] = \mathbb{P}[\hat{Y} = y] \forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \forall y \in \mathbb{R}$  [1]

5.1 i) 2 / 2

✓ - 0 pts Correct

- 1 pts Didn't give a concrete example

- 1 pts Insufficient explanation

- 2 pts No solution

## Problem 5: Designing socially aware classifiers

- (i) It is not enough just to remove the sensitive attribute  $A$  from the dataset because it is possible that other attributes in the feature vector are correlated with this attribute. For example, let's say we are hiring for a Computer Science job, and we want to look at the sensitive attribute  $gender$ . We can simply remove the Male/Female flag feature from the dataset. However, suppose that another feature in the dataset is where the applicant got their education. What if the process of college admissions is biased in terms of gender? Then this schooling feature will be highly correlated with gender. Thus, it is not always sufficient to remove ONLY the sensitive feature in question.
- (ii) Notation:  $\Sigma[\hat{Y} = y]$  will represent the count of  $\hat{Y} = y$  for the total population, where similarly  $\Sigma_a[\hat{Y} = y]$  will be the count of  $\hat{Y} = y$  for the population of sensitive attribute  $a$ . Also, for convenience, we will use  $N$  to represent the number of instances in the whole population and  $N_a$  to represent the number of instances in the population of sensitive attribute  $a$ .

$$\mathbb{P}_0[\hat{Y} = 1] = \mathbb{P}_1[\hat{Y} = 1]$$

$$\frac{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]}{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0]} = \frac{\Sigma_1[\hat{Y} = 1]}{\Sigma_1[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_1[\hat{Y} = 0]}$$

$$\frac{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]}{N_0} = \frac{\Sigma_1[\hat{Y} = 1]}{N - N_0}$$

$$\frac{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]}{N_0} = \frac{\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1] - \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]}{N - N_0}$$

$$(N - N_0)\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] = N_0\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1] - N_0\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]$$

$$(N - \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] - \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0])\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] = (\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0])\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1] - (\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0])\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]$$

$$N\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] - (\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1])^2 - \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0]\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] = \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0]\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1] - (\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1])^2 - \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0]\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]$$

$$N\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] = \Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1](\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0])$$

$$\frac{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]}{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0]} = \frac{\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1]}{N}$$

$$\mathbb{P}_a[\hat{Y} = 1] = \mathbb{P}[\hat{Y} = 1]$$

- (iii)  $\mathbb{P}[\hat{Y} = 1] = \mathbb{P}_a[\hat{Y} = 1]$  is equivalent to  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y} = y] = \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}] \forall a, y \in \{0, 1\}$ .

In general,  $\mathbb{P}[\hat{Y} = y | A = a] = \mathbb{P}[\hat{Y} = y] \forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \forall y \in \mathbb{R}$  [1]

5.2 ii) 1 / 2

- 0 pts Correct
- ✓ - 1 pts Only proved in one direction
- 2 pts No solution

## Problem 5: Designing socially aware classifiers

- (i) It is not enough just to remove the sensitive attribute  $A$  from the dataset because it is possible that other attributes in the feature vector are correlated with this attribute. For example, let's say we are hiring for a Computer Science job, and we want to look at the sensitive attribute  $gender$ . We can simply remove the Male/Female flag feature from the dataset. However, suppose that another feature in the dataset is where the applicant got their education. What if the process of college admissions is biased in terms of gender? Then this schooling feature will be highly correlated with gender. Thus, it is not always sufficient to remove ONLY the sensitive feature in question.
- (ii) Notation:  $\Sigma[\hat{Y} = y]$  will represent the count of  $\hat{Y} = y$  for the total population, where similarly  $\Sigma_a[\hat{Y} = y]$  will be the count of  $\hat{Y} = y$  for the population of sensitive attribute  $a$ . Also, for convenience, we will use  $N$  to represent the number of instances in the whole population and  $N_a$  to represent the number of instances in the population of sensitive attribute  $a$ .

$$\mathbb{P}_0[\hat{Y} = 1] = \mathbb{P}_1[\hat{Y} = 1]$$

$$\frac{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]}{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0]} = \frac{\Sigma_1[\hat{Y} = 1]}{\Sigma_1[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_1[\hat{Y} = 0]}$$

$$\frac{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]}{N_0} = \frac{\Sigma_1[\hat{Y} = 1]}{N - N_0}$$

$$\frac{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]}{N_0} = \frac{\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1] - \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]}{N - N_0}$$

$$(N - N_0)\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] = N_0\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1] - N_0\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]$$

$$(N - \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] - \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0])\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] = (\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0])\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1] - (\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0])\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]$$

$$N\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] - (\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1])^2 - \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0]\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] = \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0]\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1] - (\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1])^2 - \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0]\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]$$

$$N\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] = \Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1](\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0])$$

$$\frac{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1]}{\Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 1] + \Sigma_0[\hat{Y} = 0]} = \frac{\Sigma[\hat{Y} = 1]}{N}$$

$$\mathbb{P}_a[\hat{Y} = 1] = \mathbb{P}[\hat{Y} = 1]$$

- (iii)  $\mathbb{P}[\hat{Y} = 1] = \mathbb{P}_a[\hat{Y} = 1]$  is equivalent to  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y} = y] = \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}] \forall a, y \in \{0, 1\}$ .

In general,  $\mathbb{P}[\hat{Y} = y | A = a] = \mathbb{P}[\hat{Y} = y] \forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \forall y \in \mathbb{R}$  [1]

## References

- [1] Alekh Agarwal, Alina Beygelzimer, Miroslav Dudik, John Langford, and Hanna Wallach. *A Reductions Approach to Fair Classification*. ICML, 2018.
- [2] Solon Barocas and Moritz Hardt. *Fairness in Machine Learning*. NIPS, 2017.

5.3 iii) 1 / 2


- 0 pts Correct

- 2 pts No solution/Incorrect


✓ - 1 pts Missing an equivalence relationship

of two equalities.

(iv) We consider different values of  $k$  for our  $k$ -NN classifier:



We also consider different distance metrics ( $L_1, L_2, L_\infty$ ):




(v) The nearest neighbors classifier works best for this task:

5.4 iv) 2 / 2


✓ - 0 pts Correct

- 2 pts missing


(iv) We consider different values of  $k$  for our  $k$ -NN classifier:




We also consider different distance metrics ( $L_1, L_2, L_\infty$ ):



(v) The nearest neighbors classifier works best for this task:



- (vi) First, we consider Demographic Parity. The Naive Bayes classifier is the fairest, because the other two have statistically significant differences (outside 2 standard deviations) between the Positive rate for the two different races:




Next, we have Equalized Odds. Once again, Naive Bayes methods do not show a statistically significant difference across the sensitive feature for either the true positive or true negative rates:

5.5 v) 2 / 2


✓ - 0 pts Correct

- 1 pts missing / incorrect graphs


- 2 pts missing




- (vi) First, we consider Demographic Parity. The Naive Bayes classifier is the fairest, because the other two have statistically significant differences (outside 2 standard deviations) between the Positive rate for the two different races:



Next, we have Equalized Odds. Once again, Naive Bayes methods do not show a statistically significant difference across the sensitive feature for either the true positive or true negative rates:



Finally, we test for Predictive Parity. In the case of Positive predictive value, Naive Bayes is most fair. In contrast, Nearest Neighbors seems to be most fair for Negative Predictive Value, though all 3 methods struggle with fairness for this metric:



- (vii) Once again, we can consider the situation of hiring fairness. Equalized Odds (EO) is an appropriate fairness metric for hiring. It is superior to Demographic Parity (DP) because DP can still be achieved with “laziness.” Laziness could come into play if we consider that only a subset of the applicants are qualified for the job. It would be possible to achieve DP across the two gender groups by hiring only the qualified candidates from one group, while randomly hiring any candidates from the second. This does not equate to outcome equality, given that the random candidates will be


5.6 vi) 2 / 2

✓ - **0 pts** Correct


- **1 pts** Missing / incorrect graphs

- **0.5 pts** Missing / incorrect discussion

- **2 pts** Missing



Finally, we test for Predictive Parity. In the case of Positive predictive value, Naive Bayes is most fair. In contrast, Nearest Neighbors seems to be most fair for Negative Predictive Value, though all 3 methods struggle with fairness for this metric:



- (vii) Once again, we can consider the situation of hiring fairness. Equalized Odds (EO) is an appropriate fairness metric for hiring. It is superior to Demographic Parity (DP) because DP can still be achieved with “laziness.” Laziness could come into play if we consider that only a subset of the applicants are qualified for the job. It would be possible to achieve DP across the two gender groups by hiring only the qualified candidates from one group, while randomly hiring any candidates from the second. This does not equate to outcome equality, given that the random candidates will be

less likely to succeed in the long run. EO avoids this issue by looking at the true positive and true negative rate, as opposed to just the positive rate. However, EO still does have flaws. If once again we consider that only some candidates are qualified from each demographic, we could achieve EO by hiring the same proportion of candidates from each of the two qualified pools (one for each gender). However, if one of the two pools has significantly more qualified candidates than the other, the outcome could still be imbalanced in terms of overall hiring counts across gender. [2]

## References

- [1] Alekh Agarwal, Alina Beygelzimer, Miroslav Dudik, John Langford, and Hanna Wallach. *A Reductions Approach to Fair Classification*. ICML, 2018.
- [2] Solon Barocas and Moritz Hardt. *Fairness in Machine Learning*. NIPS, 2017.

5.7 vii) 2 / 2

- ✓ - **0 pts** Correct
- **0.5 pts** Small error
- **2 pts** Missing




5.8 viii) 0 / 0

✓ + 0 pts Default

+ 1 pts Exceptional work

## Problem 6: Email spam classification case study

- (i) We have reduced the feature space by stemming and removing stop words and punctuation. We reduced the space further by only considering words that appeared at least 10 times in the entire dataset. This left us with approximately 4,000 features.
- (ii) We implemented nearest neighbors and 2 versions of Naive Bayes: one with binary features (i.e. just presence/absence of a word) and one with word counts distributed as Gaussians. Please see our code for further details. Also note that our Decision Tree code did not come together in time, so for the purpose of analysis, we used a prepackaged decision tree classifier.
- (iii) Decision tree is the best classifier for this task, followed by naive bayes.




6.1 i) 6 / 6

✓ - **0 pts** Correct

- **6 pts** No Submission/Incorrect

## Problem 6: Email spam classification case study

- (i) We have reduced the feature space by stemming and removing stop words and punctuation. We reduced the space further by only considering words that appeared at least 10 times in the entire dataset. This left us with approximately 4,000 features.
- (ii) We implemented nearest neighbors and 2 versions of Naive Bayes: one with binary features (i.e. just presence/absence of a word) and one with word counts distributed as Gaussians. Please see our code for further details. Also note that our Decision Tree code did not come together in time, so for the purpose of analysis, we used a prepackaged decision tree classifier.
- (iii) Decision tree is the best classifier for this task, followed by naive bayes.



6.2 iii) 3 / 8

- 0 pts Correct

✓ - 1 pts No discussion of evaluation metrics (accuracy, precision, recall, runtime, etc.)

- 1 pts No comparison of k values (kNN)

- 1 pts No comparison of test/train splits (or k for cross-validation)

✓ - 1 pts No comparison of distance metrics for knn

- 1 pts Minor issues with plots/figures

- 2 pts Major issues with plots/figures

- 1 pts Small missing elements in writeup

✓ - 3 pts Major missing elements in writeup

- 8 pts No writeup

1 You need a detailed writeup describing which method is best and providing statistical support with good figures and an exposition

## 7 Adjustments 0 / 0

✓ - **0 pts** no adjustments

- **3 pts** Improper Code Submission

- **3 pts** Pages not selected properly

- **3 pts** Not following signup instructions

- **3 pts** Not selecting homework partners properly or made duplicate submissions, thus violating the requirements stated here: <https://piazza.com/class/k5ey5fnwxxl2g9?cid=8>

- **68 pts** HOLD. Please contact the instructor to release the hold.

- **0 pts** bonus