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Given a training data set, the input data samples are randomly generated subject to Circularly Symmetric Gaussian Distribution, the output data is generated by a given target linear function, Which is given by

(1)

Where Wdenotes the coefficient vector which is deterministic, denotes the th input data samples, and denotes the true output of the linear function.

The observations are disturbed by additive white Gaussian noise, denoted by . The signal to noise ratio (SNR) is defined as the ratio between the expectation of true output data and the variance of the Gaussian noise. Thus the observations can be given by

(2)

The experiments are performed by first training support vector regression (SVR) or minimum mean square error (MMSE) estimators by a randomly generated training data set, then the prediction performances are evaluated by prediction risk of the new testing data set(mean square error of the deviation between the true function output and the output of the regression estimation, that is ), where is the true output of the linear function and is the estimation output by SVR or MMSE estimator. The testing data set is uniform distributed but independent to training data set and are generated randomly, the size of the testing data set is 1000.

Because the prediction accuracy is a random variable determined by different realizations of the training-testing process, thus the training-testing procedure is repeated independent in a large number of realizations (100) by different and independent training and testing data sets. The MSE is the average of all the MSE in different realizations.

The prediction risk, training error and the accuracy of regression coefficient vectors are evaluated by mean square errors (MSE).

# Experiment 1

The first experiment is designed to test the performances of SVR and MMSE given different numbers of training date set. The SNR is fixed by 20dB.

The dimension of the linear function as shown in (1) is 30, the number of training data sets are [30, 40, 60, 100, 150].

The MSE are evaluated by a large number of testing data samples (1000) over 100 training-testing realizations.



Figure 1

The hyper-parameters settings of SVR are

C=1.000000

=0.0000001000

tolerence of the duality gap=0.0010000000

Figure 1 shows the prediction risk comparison between the SVR and MMSE, it indicate the SVR can outperform MMSE in a small training data set (30), but performs worse when it comes to large number of training data.



Figure 2

Figure 2 shows the MSE performances of training data set of SVR and MMSE, shows MMSE can achieve lower MSE for training data set over SVR.

# Experiment 2

Then the Second experiment is performed to evaluate the performances of SVR and MMSE under different SNRs.

The hyper-parameters settings of SVR are

C=1.000000

=0.0000001000

tolerence of the duality gap=0.0010000000



Figure 3

Figure 3 shows the prediction performances comparison between SVR and MMSE over different SNR. From figure 3, it can be seen that SVR outperforms MMSE in 5 to 30 dB region, but performs worse when the SNR gets higher.



Figure 4

Figure 4 shows the MSE performance over training data set. As we can see in 5-25 dB SNR region, MMSE outperforms SVR in training error, but as shown in Figure 3, the prediction performance of SVR outperforms MMSE in this SNR region.

# Experiment 3

The Third experiment is launched to compare the regression accuracies between SVR and MMSE with respect to the regression coefficient vectors.

The accuracy is evaluated by the mean square error, which is given by

(4)

Where W is the true weight coefficient vector of the linear function as defined in (1), denotes the estimation of W from SVR or MMSE.

The number of training data samples and the dimensions of the linear functions are

30, 60, 120, 150

The SNR (dB) we considered are 2:2:60 dB

Figure 5-8 show the comparison of the regression accuracy between SVR and MMSE with respect to different number of training data samples (30, 60, 120, 150).
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Figure 8

From Figure 5-8 we can concludes:

1. SVR outperforms MMSE at a certain region of SNR, (4-30 dB in figure 5, 4-34 dB in figure 6, 3.8-39 dB in figure 7 and 3.8-42 dB in figure 8). When the number of training data become larger, the SNR that MMSE begins to beat SVR becomes higher.
2. When SNR increases to infinite, the MSE of MMSE tends to be 0, however the MSE of SVR tends to converge to a positive constant.
3. With the number of training data increasing, the constant MSE that SVR finally convergent become lower.

# Experiment 4

The fourth experiment is launched to test the relation between coefficient vector regression performances and the weight of regularization term.

The parameter C is the constant used in the regularized risk function that make trade-off between the regularization and the penalty to the empirical risk. The weight of the regularization term gets lower when the parameter C increase.

The value of C we tested are 0.5, 1, 10
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Figure 11

From Fig.9 to Fig.11, the weight of the regularization term decreases while the weight of the penalty to the empirical risk increases.

From the simulation results in Fig.9 to Fig.11, we have the following conclusions:

1. When the weights of regularization term decrease, the MSE values that SVR finally converge gets lower. (In Fig.9, the minimum MSE value is 4e-3; in Fig.10, the minimum MSE value is 2e-3, in Fig.11, the minimum MSE value is 6e-4.) .
2. When the weights of regularization term increase, the MSE values of SVR at low and medium SNR region get lower. For example, see the comparison of MSE values of SVR in Fig.9 and Fig.10 before 10dB, the performance of SVR with C=0.5 (Fig.9) is better that that of SVR with C=1 (Fig.10).
3. Generally, MSE performances of SVR are better than that of MMSE in low and medium SNR region. For instance, 0-26dB in Fig.9; 4-28dB in Fig.10; 12-36dB in Fig.11.