

# Interpreting Log Error

James Chen

March 5, 2018

Let  $\hat{P}$  be an estimate of the target value  $P$ . Say in the training we have obtained

$$\log(1 + P) = \log(1 + \hat{P}) \pm \hat{\epsilon} \quad (1)$$

where  $\hat{\epsilon}$  is some estimate <sup>1</sup> of the test error and

$$\hat{\epsilon} \ll 1 \ll \hat{P}, \quad (2)$$

then

$$P \approx \hat{P}(1 \pm \hat{\epsilon}), \quad \hat{P} \approx P(1 \pm \hat{\epsilon}). \quad (3)$$

In other words, the error  $\hat{\epsilon}$  for  $\log(1 + \hat{P})$  translates <sup>2</sup> to the percentage-error  $100\hat{\epsilon} \%$  for  $\hat{P}$ .

*Proof.* From (1), we have  $\log[(1 + P)/(1 + \hat{P})] = \pm \hat{\epsilon}$ , that is,

$$P = -1 + e^{\pm \hat{\epsilon}}(1 + \hat{P}) \quad (4)$$

Since  $\hat{\epsilon}$  is relatively small, e.g.,  $\hat{\epsilon} \approx 0.01$ , (see (2)), by Taylor series,

$$e^{\pm \hat{\epsilon}} \approx 1 \pm \hat{\epsilon} \quad (5)$$

Substitue (5) into (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} P &\approx \hat{P} \pm \hat{\epsilon} \hat{P} \pm \hat{\epsilon} \\ &\approx \hat{P}(1 \pm \hat{\epsilon}) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Notice that in the last step leading to (6), we drop the term  $\pm \epsilon$  since  $\epsilon \ll \hat{P}$  and  $\epsilon \ll \hat{\epsilon} \hat{P}$  (see (2)). This proves the first approximation in (3).

Next, from (6), we estimate that

$$\hat{P} \approx P(1 \pm \hat{\epsilon}), \quad (7)$$

which can be derived by substituting the following two approximations into (6):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1 - \hat{\epsilon}} &= 1 + \hat{\epsilon} + \hat{\epsilon}^2 + \hat{\epsilon}^3 + \dots \approx 1 + \hat{\epsilon}, \\ \frac{1}{1 + \hat{\epsilon}} &= 1 - \hat{\epsilon} + \hat{\epsilon}^2 - \hat{\epsilon}^3 + \dots \approx 1 - \hat{\epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the second approximation in (3). □

---

<sup>1</sup>For example, we may take  $\hat{\epsilon}$  to be the worst (largest) root mean square error from cross validations.

<sup>2</sup>By the way, (3) also hold for the case when  $\log P = \pm \hat{\epsilon} + \log \hat{P}$  under the same assumption (2). The proof is similar.