```
    Laura Haege

    Philipp Noel von Bachmann, Matrikelnummer: 4116220

Exercise 11
(a)
```

Statistical Machine Learning Exercise Sheet 7

 $\langle \Phi_m(x), \Phi_m(y) 
angle = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \Phi_m(x), \Phi_m(y)$  $u = \sum_{m \in M} \sqrt{rac{d!}{\prod_i m_i!}} \prod_i x_i^{m_i} \cdot \sqrt{rac{d!}{\prod_i m_i!}} \prod_i y_i^{m_i}$  $u=\sum_{m\in M}rac{d!}{\prod_i m_i!}(\prod_i x_i^{m_i}\prod_i y_i^{m_i})$  $egin{aligned} &= \sum_{m \in M} rac{d!}{\prod_i m_i!} \prod_i x_i^{m_i} y_i^{m_i} \end{aligned}$  $=\sum_{m\in M}rac{d!}{\prod_i m_i!}\prod_i (x_i\cdot y_i)^{m_i}$  $=(x_1\cdot y_1+\cdots+x_n\cdot y_n)^d$ 

(b) assume a Loss function  $\sum\limits_{i=1}^n L(y_i,\phi(x_i)) + \lambda ||\phi||_H^2$  minimized by  $\phi^*(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n lpha_i K(x,x_i)$ equivalent (due to representer theorem) to:  $\sum_{i=1}^n L(y_i,lpha_i K) + \lambda \sum_{i,j=1}^n lpha_i lpha_j K$ 

for  $L_2$  - Loss there exists a unique solution:  $lpha^* = (K + \lambda I)^{-1} y$  With  $\Omega = R^d$ we get  $K(x,y) = (1 + \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} x_i y_i)^d = (1 + \sum\limits_{i=0}^{n-1} x_i y_i)^d$  $=ig(^d_kig)1^{d-k}st\sum\limits_{i=0}^{n-1}x_iy_i^d$ 

Therefore the dimension of H is  $\binom{(d+n-1)}{d}$ 

(c) We have d=5 and n=16\*16=256. Therefore we get a dimension of H of  $\binom{5+256+1}{5}=\binom{262}{5}$ . This means we have too mayn features to explicitly compute/store. However if we use the kernel  $\langle x,y\rangle^5$ , we first have to take a product over 256 dimensions and then

**Exercise 12** 

We can reformulate the problem as:

Therefore it is sufficient to show that  $P(2\sup_{f\in F}|\hat{R}_m(f)-R(f)|\geq \epsilon)\leq \delta\Rightarrow \epsilon=\sqrt{rac{2}{m}\lograc{2N}{\delta}}$ Reformulating gives  $P(2\sup_{f\in F}|\hat{R}_m(f)-R(f)|\geq \epsilon)=P(\sup_{f\in F}|\hat{R}_m(f)-R(f)|\geq rac{\epsilon}{2})$ 

a sum over 256 dimensions and finally just compute the power of one number, which is much cheaper to compute and store.

 $R(f') = \inf_{f \in F} R(f) + R(f') - \inf_{f \in F} R(f)$ 

 $\leq \inf_{f \in F} R(f) + |R(f') - \inf_{f \in F} R(f)|$ 

 $\leq \inf_{f \in F} R(f) + 2 \sup_{f \in F} |\hat{R}_m(f) - R(f)|$ 

 $\leq P(\cup_{f\in F}(|\hat{R}_m(f)-R(f)|\geq rac{\epsilon}{2})$ 

 $=\sum_{f\in F}P(|\hat{R}_m(f)-R(f)|\geq rac{\epsilon}{2})$ 

 $=\sum_{f\in F}2exp(-2m(rac{\epsilon}{2})^2)$ 

 $\Rightarrow \delta = 2Nexp(-\frac{1}{2}m\epsilon^2)$ 

 $=2Nexp(-rac{1}{2}m\epsilon^2)$ 

**Exercise 13** 

import numpy as np

from numpy.linalg import norm

X\_train = data["Xtrain"] Y\_train = data["Ytrain"]

from scipy.linalg import cho\_factor, cho\_solve

data = np.load("diabetes\_data.npy", allow\_pickle=True).item()

from scipy.spatial.distance import cdist

K = gaussian kernel(X, X, mu)

for mu\_index, mu in enumerate(mus):

validation\_loss = []

for l\_index, l in enumerate(lambdas): # compute k-fold cross validation

print("The resulting train loss is: ", final\_train\_loss)

test\_loss = test(X\_test, Y\_test, X\_train, alpha=best\_alphas, mu=0.1)

alphas, train loss = train(x\_train, y\_train, 1, mu)

TrainErrors[l index, mu index] = train loss

The pest parameters are given as mu=0.1, lambda=0.0001

The resulting train loss is: 95.33362470817943

print("The resulting test loss is: ", test\_loss)

The resulting test loss is: 193.4644670217247

return TrainErrors, TestErrors

Evaluating of the final parameters on the test set

return alpha, train loss

train loss = Loss(Y, predict(X, X, alpha, mu))

Now solve for epsilon 
$$\delta = 2N \exp(-\frac{1}{2}m\epsilon^2)$$
 
$$\frac{\delta}{2N} = \exp(-\frac{1}{2}m\epsilon^2)$$
 
$$\frac{2N}{\delta} = \exp(\frac{1}{2}m\epsilon^2)$$
 
$$\log\frac{2N}{\delta} = \frac{1}{2}m\epsilon^2$$
 
$$\frac{2}{m}\log\frac{2N}{\delta} = \epsilon^2$$
 
$$\sqrt{\frac{2}{m}\log\frac{2N}{\delta}} = \epsilon$$

X\_test = data["Xtest"] Y\_test = data["Ytest"] def gaussian\_kernel(x, y, mu): return np.exp(- mu \* cdist(x,y)\*\*2) def Loss(Y, Y\_prediction):

return 0.5\* norm(Y == np.sign(Y prediction)) In [4]: def train(X, Y, lambda reg, mu): n = X.shape[0]

alpha = cho solve(cho factor(K + n \* lambda reg \* np.eye(n)), Y)

def predict(X pred, X t, alpha, mu): return np.sum(np.multiply(np.squeeze(alpha), gaussian kernel(X pred, X t, mu)), axis=1) def test(X test, Y test, X, alpha, mu): return Loss(Y test, predict(X test, X, alpha, mu)) def CrossValidation(X, Y, lambdas, mus, k=5): X split = np.array(np.array split(X, k)) Y\_split = np.array(np.array\_split(Y, k)) min\_loss=np.inf min mu = None min\_lambda = None CVErrors = np.zeros((len(lambdas), len(mus)))

for i in range(k): x train = np.concatenate(np.delete(X split, i, axis=0)) y train = np.concatenate(np.delete(Y split, i, axis=0))  $x_val = X_split[i]$ y val = Y split[i] alphas, train\_loss = train(x\_train, y\_train, 1, mu) validation loss.append(test(x val, y val, x train, alphas, mu)) # average over all losses and store validation\_loss = np.mean(validation\_loss) CVErrors[l\_index, mu\_index] = validation\_loss # check if smaller if validation loss < min loss:</pre> min\_loss = validation\_loss min mu = mu min\_lambda = 1 print(f"The pest parameters are given as mu={min\_mu}, lambda={min\_lambda}") # finally train on the whole set again return train(X, Y, min lambda, min mu), CVErrors **Cross Validation Training** mus = [1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2, 1e-1, 1]lambdas = [1e-4, 1e-3, 1e-2, 1e-1, 1]

(best alphas, final train loss), validation loss = CrossValidation(X train, Y train, lambdas, mus, 5)

**Plots** 

In [8]: def train\_test\_plot(x\_train, y\_train, x\_test, y\_test, lambdas, mus): TrainErrors = np.zeros((len(lambdas), len(mus))) TestErrors = np.zeros((len(lambdas), len(mus))) for mu index, mu in enumerate(mus): for 1 index, 1 in enumerate(lambdas): # compute k-fold cross validation

TestErrors[l\_index, mu\_index] = test(x\_test, y\_test, x\_train, alpha=alphas, mu=mu)

In [9]: TrainErrors, TestErrors = train\_test\_plot(X\_train, Y\_train, X\_test, Y\_test, lambdas, mus)

For cross validation

For whole train set

For test set

from matplotlib import pyplot as plt from matplotlib import cm fig, ax = plt.subplots(subplot kw={"projection": "3d"})

surf = ax.plot\_surface(plot\_lambda, plot\_mu, validation\_loss, cmap=cm.coolwarm, linewidth=0, antialiased=False) ax.set(xlabel="\$\lambda\$", ylabel="\$\mu\$", zlabel="Cross-validation error");

0

plot lambda, plot mu = np.meshgrid(np.log10(lambdas), np.log10(mus))

20.4 20.2 20.0 19.6 19.4 Cross-validation

from matplotlib import cm fig, ax = plt.subplots(subplot\_kw={"projection": "3d"}) surf = ax.plot\_surface(plot\_lambda, plot\_mu, TrainErrors, cmap=cm.coolwarm, linewidth=0, antialiased=False) ax.set(xlabel="\$\lambda\$", ylabel="\$\mu\$", zlabel="Train error"); 102 100 98 96 94 0 **-**3 **-**2

from matplotlib import pyplot as plt

206 204 202 200 198 196 194 0

from matplotlib import pyplot as plt

fig, ax = plt.subplots(subplot kw={"projection": "3d"})

surf = ax.plot\_surface(plot\_lambda, plot\_mu, TestErrors, cmap=cm.coolwarm, linewidth=0, antialiased=False)

ax.set(xlabel="\$\lambda\$", ylabel="\$\mu\$", zlabel="Test error");

from matplotlib import cm

We can see in general that the larger  $\mu$  gets, the better the error becomes. For  $\lambda$  it is the other way around. Note however that the minimum for the Test error and the Cross Validation error is not given for  $\mu=1$  (as in the Train set), but for  $\mu=0.1$ . This shows that Cross validation gives a better estimate of the test error.