HW04

Zixin Ouyang 10/6/2017

Exercise 1

```
hw04_train<-read.csv('hw04-trn-data.csv')
hw04_test<-read.csv('hw04-tst-data.csv')
library(caret)
c1 = function(data) {
  with(data, ifelse(x1 > 0, yes = "dodgerblue", no = "darkorange"))
c2 = function(data) {
  with(data, ifelse(x2 > x1 + 1, yes = "dodgerblue", no = "darkorange"))
c3 = function(data) {
  with(data, ifelse(x2 > x1 + 1,
                    yes = "dodgerblue",
                    no = ifelse(x2 < x1 - 1,
                                yes = "dodgerblue",
                                no = "darkorange")))
}
c4 = function(data) {
  with(data, ifelse(x2 > (x1 + 1) \hat{} 2,
                    yes = "dodgerblue",
                    no = ifelse(x2 < -(x1 - 1) ^ 2,
                                yes = "dodgerblue",
                                no = "darkorange")))
}
calc error = function(classifier, data) {
  mean(data$y != classifier(data))
classifiers = list(c1, c2, c3, c4)
results = data.frame(
  c("'c1'", "'c2'", "'c3'", "'c4'"),
  sapply(classifiers, calc_error, data = hw04_train),
  sapply(classifiers, calc_error, data = hw04_test)
colnames(results) = c("Classifier", "Train Error Rate", "Test Error Rate")
knitr::kable(results)
```

Classifier	Train Error Rate	Test Error Rate
c3	0.096	0.1270
c4	0.050	0.0665

Exercise 2

Models	Train Error Rate	Test Error Rate
mod_1	0.334	0.3305
mod_2	0.334	0.3305
mod_3	0.33	0.343
${\tt mod_4}$	0.098	0.136

Exercise 3

```
make_sim_data = function(n_obs = 25) {
  x1 = runif(n = n_obs, min = 0, max = 2)
 x2 = runif(n = n_obs, min = 0, max = 4)
  prob = \exp(1 + 2 * x1 - 1 * x2) / (1 + \exp(1 + 2 * x1 - 1 * x2))
  y = rbinom(n = n_obs, size = 1, prob = prob)
  data.frame(y, x1, x2)
}
set.seed(659017838)
n_sims = 1000
n_{models} = 3
x = data.frame(x1=1, x2=1)
predictions = matrix(0, nrow = n_sims, ncol = n_models)
for(sim in 1:n_sims) {
  sim data = make sim data()
  mod_1 = glm(y ~ 1, data = sim_data, family = "binomial")
  mod_2 = glm(y ~ ., data = sim_data, family = "binomial")
  mod_3 = glm(y \sim x1*x2 + I(x1 \sim 2) + I(x2 \sim 2), data = sim_data, family = "binomial")
```

```
predictions[sim, 1] = predict(mod_1, newdata=x , type = "response")
  predictions[sim, 2] = predict(mod_2, newdata=x, type = "response")
  predictions[sim, 3] = predict(mod_3, newdata=x, type = "response")
get_mse = function(truth, estimate) {
  mean((estimate - truth) ^ 2)
}
get_bias = function(estimate, truth) {
  mean(estimate) - truth
get_var = function(estimate) {
  mean((estimate - mean(estimate)) ^ 2)
p = function(x) {
with(x,
     exp(1 + 2 * x1 - 1 * x2) / (1 + exp(1 + 2 * x1 - 1 * x2))
}
bias = apply(predictions, 2, get_bias, truth = p(x))
variance = apply(predictions, 2, get_var)
mse = apply(predictions, 2, get_mse, truth = p(x))
```

K	Mean Squared Error	Bias Squared	Variance
Intercept Only Additive	0.05819 0.00933	0.04921 0.00006	0.00897 0.00927
Additive Second Order	0.00933 0.02317	$0.00006 \\ 0.00074$	0.009 0.022

Exercise 4

- (a) The true decision boundaries are non-linear since the fourth classifier performs best.
- (b) Model 4 performs best because it has smallest train and test error rates.
- (c) The first three models are underfitting as they are all simpler than the "best" model.
- (d) None of these models are overfitting as the "best" model is also the most complex.
- (e) Both the additive and second order models are performing unbiased estimation.
- (f) The additive model performs best because it has the lowest MSE.