

# SM2 Assessed Coursework

Rachel Wood

2023-03-14

This portfolio considers a model for  $n$  observations  $\{(y_i^0, x_i^0)\} \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p$  defined by

$$Y_i^0 \sim f(y; \mu_i, \phi) dy, \quad g(\mu_i) = \alpha + f(x_i^0), \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\phi \in (0, \infty)$  and  $f \in \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{H}_k$ .

Here  $(\mathcal{H}_k, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$  is a reproducible kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) with positive semi definite kernel  $k$ . Then we have that  $\mathcal{H}_k$  satisfies the reproducibility property

$$f(x) = \langle f, k(x, \cdot) \rangle \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \forall f \in \mathcal{H}_k \quad (2)$$

## Part 1

### Question 1

Here we consider the identifiability of (1). A kernel will lead to identifiable models if and only if the corresponding RKHS does not contain constant functions.

**Unidentifiable kernel:** We can take the kernel to be

$$k(x, y) = 1$$

which is positive semi-definite, we can see that taking  $\mathcal{H}_k = \{f : f(x) = c \forall x\}$  and  $\langle f, g \rangle_k = fg$  satisfies the reproducing property:

$$f(x) = \langle f, k(x, \cdot) \rangle = \langle f, 1 \rangle = f \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \forall f \in \mathcal{H}_k$$

and thus  $(\mathcal{H}_k, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_k)$  is the corresponding RKHS. Since  $\mathcal{H}_k$  is made up of constant functions,  $k$  does not produce identifiable models.

**Identifiable Kernel:** An example of an identifiable kernel is the Gaussian kernel:

$$k_\lambda(x, x') = \exp\left(-\frac{\|x - x'\|^2}{\lambda}\right)$$

Any function in the corresponding RKHS  $f \in \mathcal{H}_k$  must satisfy:

$$f(x) = \langle f, k(x, \cdot) \rangle = \frac{1}{\lambda} \langle f, -\exp\|x - \cdot\|^2 \rangle$$

It is clear that there is no constant function  $f$  (excepting the zero function) which satisfies this. Hence the Gaussian kernel leads to identifiable models.

## Question 2

For this question, we consider the solution  $\hat{f}_\lambda$  to the optimisation problem

$$(\hat{\alpha}_\lambda, \hat{\phi}_\lambda, \hat{f}_\lambda) \in \underset{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \phi \in (0, \infty), f \in \mathcal{H}_k}{\operatorname{argmax}} \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log f(y_i; g^{-1}(\alpha + f(x_i^0)), \phi) - \lambda \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 \quad (3)$$

We assume  $\mathcal{H}_k = \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_n \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_n^\perp$ , hence we can write  $\hat{f}_\lambda = f_1 + f_2$  where  $f_1 \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_n$  and  $f_2 \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_n^\perp$ . Thus there exists coefficients  $\hat{\beta}_\lambda = (\hat{\beta}_{\lambda,1}, \dots, \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,n}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$f_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,i} k(x_i^0, \cdot)$$

and we can write  $f = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,i} k(x_i^0, \cdot) + f_2$ . Further, by the reproducing property, for any  $x_j$ :

$$f(x_j) = \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,i} k(x_i^0, \cdot) + f_2, k(x_j^0, \cdot) \right\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,i} \langle k(x_i^0, \cdot), k(x_j^0, \cdot) \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,i} k(x_i^0, x_j^0)$$

and so  $f(x_j)$  does not depend on  $f_2$  and as a consequence, the first term in (3) also does not depend on  $f_2$ . Hence to choose  $f_2$  we only need to consider minimizing the regularisation term. Using that  $\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle = 0$ , we see

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 = \langle f_1 + f_2, f_1 + f_2 \rangle = \|f_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 + \|f_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 \geq \|f_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2$$

with the last inequality becoming an equality when  $f_2 = 0$ . Hence the minimiser  $\hat{f}_\lambda$  must have  $f_2 = 0$  and can be written as

$$\hat{f}_\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,i} k(x_i^0, \cdot) \quad (4)$$

## Question 3

We now want to substitute the results of (4) into (3). The regularisation term becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 &= \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,i} k(x_i^0, \cdot), \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,j} k(x_j^0, \cdot) \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,i} \langle k(x_i^0, \cdot), k(x_j^0, \cdot) \rangle \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,j} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,i} k(x_i^0, x_j^0) \hat{\beta}_{\lambda,j} \\ &= \hat{\beta}_\lambda^T K \hat{\beta}_\lambda \end{aligned}$$

and so (3) becomes

$$(\hat{\alpha}_\lambda, \hat{\phi}_\lambda, \hat{\beta}_\lambda) \in \underset{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \phi \in (0, \infty), \beta \in \mathbb{R}^n}{\operatorname{argmax}} \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log f \left( y_i; g^{-1} \left( \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j k(x_i^0, x_j^0) \right), \phi \right) - \lambda \beta^T K \beta \quad (5)$$

## Question 4

Given  $m \leq n + 2$ , we want to obtain an  $m$ -dimensional problem. Then  $d = m - 2$  is the length of the new  $\tilde{\beta}_\lambda$  vector to estimate.

The Nystrom method approximates  $k$  by  $\tilde{f}^{(m)} = k^{(m)}$ , given by

$$\tilde{k}^{(d)}(x, x') = k_d(x)^T K_{d,d}^{-1} k_d(x')$$

where  $K_{d,d} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is the first  $d$  rows and columns of the gram matrix  $K$  and  $k_d(x) = (k(x_1^0, x), \dots, k(x_d^0, x))$

Then we can write  $f(x)$  as

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \tilde{k}_d(x_i^0, \cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i k_d(x_i^0)^T K_{d,d}^{-1} k_d(\cdot) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i k_d(x_i^0)^T K_{d,d}^{-1} \right) k_d(\cdot)$$

and take the new vector of coefficients to be:

$$\tilde{\beta}^T = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i k_d(x_i^0)^T (K_d^0)^{-1} = \beta^T K_{n,d} K_{d,d}^{-1}$$

where  $K_{n,d} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  is the first  $d$  columns of  $K$ . We can now rewrite  $f$  as:

$$f = \tilde{\beta}^T k_d(\cdot) = \sum_{j=1}^d \tilde{\beta}_j k(x_j, \cdot)$$

We now consider the regularisation term, again we substitute  $\tilde{k}^{(d)}$ :

$$\beta^T \tilde{K}^{(d)} \beta = \beta^T K_{n,d} K_{d,d}^{-1} K_{n,d}^T \beta = \left( \beta^T K_{n,d} K_{d,d}^{-1} \right) K_{d,d}^T \left( K_{d,d}^{-T} K_{n,d} \beta \right) = \tilde{\beta}^T K_{d,d}^T \tilde{\beta}$$

Hence we can now write our  $m$ -dimension optimisation problem:

$$(\hat{\alpha}_\lambda, \hat{\phi}_\lambda, \tilde{\beta}_\lambda) \in \underset{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \phi \in (0, \infty), \tilde{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^d}{\operatorname{argmax}} \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log f \left( y_i; g^{-1} \left( \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^d \tilde{\beta}_j k(x_j, x_i) \right), \phi \right) - \lambda \tilde{\beta}^T K_{d,d}^T \tilde{\beta} \quad (6)$$

## Question 5

For this question we first need to obtain the penalty term as  $\omega^T \omega$  for some vector  $\omega$ . We can first obtain the eigen-decomposition of  $K_{d,d}^T$ :

$$K_{d,d}^T = V \Lambda V^T$$

Then writing  $\Lambda = \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} = \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^T$ , we get

$$\tilde{\beta}^T K_{d,d} \tilde{\beta} = \tilde{\beta}^T V \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^T V^T \tilde{\beta} = \omega^T \omega$$

where  $\omega^T = \tilde{\beta}^T V \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , or equivalently  $\tilde{\beta}^T = \omega^T \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} V^T$ .

Then our objective function becomes

$$(\hat{\alpha}_\lambda, \hat{\phi}_\lambda, \hat{\omega}_\lambda) \in \underset{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \phi \in (0, \infty), \omega \in \mathbb{R}^d}{\operatorname{argmax}} \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log f\left(y_i; g^{-1}\left(\alpha + \omega^T \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} V^T K_{d,n}\right), \phi\right) - \lambda \omega^T \omega \quad (7)$$

so we can use  $X' = \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} V^T K$ , where  $K$  is the Gram matrix of the original data, as the input for `glmnet()` and this will give the estimated  $\omega$ .

## Part2

This section implements the theory from Part 1 on the `wesdr` data from the `gss` package, which has the binary response variable `ret` and explanatory variables `dur`, `gly` and `bmi`

```
library(dplyr)
library(kableExtra)
library(gss)
data("wesdr")
head(wesdr)
```

```
##   dur  gly  bmi ret
## 1 10.3 13.7 23.8  0
## 2  9.9 13.5 23.5  0
## 3 15.6 13.8 24.8  0
## 4 26.0 13.0 21.6  1
## 5 13.8 11.1 24.6  1
## 6 31.1 11.3 24.6  1
```

## Question 6

We can now use `glmnet` to write a function implementing Question 4 and 5:

```
library(kernlab)
estimate <- function(X, y, lambda, kernel, m){
  d <- m - 2
  K <- kernelMatrix(kernel = kernel, x = X)
  K_d <- K[1:d, 1:d]

  K_eigen <- eigen(K_d)
  V <- K_eigen$vectors
  Lambda <- (K_eigen$values)

  X_new <- diag(1/sqrt(Lambda)) %*% t(V) %*% K

  fit <- glmnet(X_new, y, family = "binomial", alpha = 0, lambda = lambda)
  summary(fit)
  alpha <- fit$beta[1]
  omega <- fit$beta[-1]
}
```

```
X <- as.matrix(wesdr[,1:3])  
y <- wesdr[,4]
```

```
#estimate(X, y, lambda = 0.3, kernel = rbfdot(sigma = 1), m = 300)
```