

## Discussion # 10

Name:

**Bias-Variance Trade-off**

1. Assume that we have a function  $h(x)$  and some noise generation process that produces  $\epsilon$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon] = 0$  and  $\text{var}(\epsilon) = \sigma^2$ . Every time we query mother nature for  $Y$  at a given  $x$ , she gives us  $Y = h(x) + \epsilon$ . A new  $\epsilon$  is generated each time, independent of the last. We randomly sample some data  $(x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^n$  and use it to fit a model  $f_{\hat{\beta}}(x)$  according to some procedure (e.g. OLS, Ridge, LASSO). In class, we showed that

$$\underbrace{\mathbb{E}[(Y - f_{\hat{\beta}}(x))^2]}_{\text{empirical mean square error}} = \underbrace{\sigma^2}_{\text{observation variance}} + \underbrace{(h(x) - \mathbb{E}[f_{\hat{\beta}}(x)])^2}_{\text{model variance}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[f_{\hat{\beta}}(x)] - f_{\hat{\beta}}(x))^2]}_{\text{observation bias}^2}.$$

- (a) Label each of the terms above. Word bank: observation variance, model variance, observation bias<sup>2</sup>, model bias<sup>2</sup>, model risk, empirical mean square error.
- (b) What is random in the equation above? Where does the randomness come from?
- (c) True or false and explain.  $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon f_{\hat{\beta}}(x)] = 0$
- (d) Suppose you lived in a world where you could collect as many data sets you would like. Given a fixed algorithm to fit a model  $f_{\hat{\beta}}$  to your data e.g. linear regression, describe a procedure to get good estimates of  $\mathbb{E}[f_{\hat{\beta}}(x)]$  (technical point: you may assume this expectation exists).
- (e) If you could collect as many data sets as you would like, how does that affect the quality of your model  $f_{\hat{\beta}}(x)$ ?

## Ridge and LASSO Regression

2. Earlier, we posed the linear regression problem as follows: Find the  $\vec{\beta}$  value that minimizes the average squared loss. In other words, our goal is to find  $\vec{\beta}$  that satisfies the equation below:

$$\vec{\hat{\beta}} = \underset{\vec{\beta}}{\operatorname{argmin}} L(\vec{\beta}) = \underset{\vec{\beta}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{n} \|\vec{y} - \mathbb{X}\vec{\beta}\|_2^2$$

Here,  $\mathbb{X}$  is a  $n \times d$  matrix,  $\vec{\beta}$  is a  $d \times 1$  vector and  $\vec{y}$  is a  $n \times 1$  vector. As we saw in lecture and in last week's discussion, the optimal  $\vec{\beta}$  is given by the closed form expression  $\vec{\hat{\beta}} = (\mathbb{X}^T \mathbb{X})^{-1} \mathbb{X}^T \vec{y}$ .

To prevent overfitting, we saw that we can instead minimize the sum of the average squared loss plus a regularization function  $\lambda \mathcal{S}(\vec{\beta})$ . If we use the function  $\mathcal{S}(\vec{\beta}) = \|\vec{\beta}\|_2^2$ , we have "ridge regression". If we use the function  $\mathcal{S}(\vec{\beta}) = \|\vec{\beta}\|_1$ , we have "LASSO regression". For example, if we choose  $\mathcal{S}(\vec{\beta}) = \|\vec{\beta}\|_2^2$ , our goal is to find  $\vec{\hat{\beta}}$  that satisfies the equation below:

$$\vec{\hat{\beta}} = \underset{\vec{\beta}}{\operatorname{argmin}} L(\vec{\beta}) = \underset{\vec{\beta}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{n} \|\vec{y} - \mathbb{X}\vec{\beta}\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\vec{\beta}\|_2^2 = \underset{\vec{\beta}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mathbb{X}_{i,\cdot}^T \vec{\beta})^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^d \beta_j^2$$

Recall that  $\lambda$  is a hyperparameter that determines the impact of the regularization term. Though we did not discuss this in lecture, we can also find a closed form solution to ridge regression:  $\vec{\hat{\beta}} = (\mathbb{X}^T \mathbb{X} + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbb{X}^T \vec{y}$ . It turns out that  $\mathbb{X}^T \mathbb{X} + \lambda \mathbf{I}$  is guaranteed to be invertible (unlike  $\mathbb{X}^T \mathbb{X}$  which might not be invertible).

- (a) As model complexity increases, what happens to the bias and variance of the model?
- (b) In terms of bias and variance, how does a regularized model compare to ordinary least squares regression?
- (c) In ridge regression, what happens if we set  $\lambda = 0$ ? What happens as  $\lambda$  approaches  $\infty$ ?

- (d) How does model complexity compare between ridge regression and ordinary least squares regression? How does this change for large and small values of  $\lambda$ ?
- (e) If we have a large number of features (10,000+) and we suspect that only a handful of features are useful, which type of regression (Lasso vs Ridge) would be more helpful in interpreting useful features?
- (f) What are the benefits of using ridge regression?

## Cross Validation

3. After running 5-fold cross validation, we get the following mean squared errors for each fold and value of  $\lambda$ :

Fold Num	$\lambda = 0.1$	$\lambda = 0.2$	$\lambda = 0.3$	$\lambda = 0.4$	Row Avg
1	80.2	70.2	91.2	91.8	83.4
2	76.8	66.8	88.8	98.8	82.8
3	81.5	71.5	86.5	88.5	82.0
4	79.4	68.4	92.3	92.4	83.1
5	77.3	67.3	93.4	94.3	83.0
Col Avg	79.0	68.8	90.4	93.2	

How do we use the information above to choose our model? Do we pick a specific fold? a specific lambda? or a specific fold-lambda pair? Explain.

4. You build a model with two regularization hyperparameters  $\lambda$  and  $\gamma$ . You have 4 good candidate values for  $\lambda$  and 3 possible values for  $\gamma$ , and you are wondering which  $\lambda, \gamma$  pair will be the best choice. If you were to perform five-fold cross-validation, how many validation errors would you need to calculate?
5. In the typical setup of k-fold cross validation, we use a different parameter value on each fold, compute the mean squared error of each fold and choose the parameter whose fold has the lowest loss.
- ☐ A. True
- ☐ B. False