

Week 8 Tutorial Theoretical Task

Sarat Moka

LogitBoost: Gradient Boosting with Logistic Deviance

We follow exactly the notation of our generic gradient-boosting algorithm from lecture notes: At round m we have the current ensemble prediction

$$g_{m-1}(x)$$

and seek an additive update h_m and step size γ_m to minimize

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Loss}(y_i, g_{m-1}(x_i) + \gamma_m h(x_i))$$

for the *logistic deviance* (binomial loss)

$$\text{Loss}(y, z) = \ln(1 + e^{-yz}), \quad y_i \in \{-1, +1\}.$$

1. Pseudo-residuals (negative gradients):

$$r_i^{(m)} = - \left. \frac{\partial \text{Loss}(y_i, z)}{\partial z} \right|_{z=g_{m-1}(x_i)} = \frac{y_i}{1 + \exp(y_i g_{m-1}(x_i))}.$$

2. Second derivatives (optional):

$$q_i^{(m)} = \left. \frac{\partial^2 \text{Loss}(y_i, z)}{\partial z^2} \right|_{z=g_{m-1}(x_i)} = \frac{\exp(y_i g_{m-1}(x_i))}{(1 + \exp(y_i g_{m-1}(x_i)))^2}.$$

3. Fit weak learner h_m : Either

$$h_m = \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (r_i^{(m)} - h(x_i))^2 \quad (\text{gradient step}),$$

or (Newton step) solve the weighted least-squares problem

$$h_m = \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n q_i^{(m)} \left(\frac{r_i^{(m)}}{q_i^{(m)}} - h(x_i) \right)^2,$$

where \mathcal{H} is the family of weak learners.

4. Line-search for γ_m :

$$\gamma_m = \arg \min_{\gamma} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Loss}(y_i, g_{m-1}(x_i) + \gamma h_m(x_i)).$$

In the Newton-approximation one obtains the closed-form

$$\gamma_m = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n r_i^{(m)} h_m(x_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n q_i^{(m)} h_m(x_i)^2}.$$

5. Update:

$$g_m(x) = g_{m-1}(x) + \gamma_m h_m(x).$$

After M rounds, classification is by

$$\hat{y}(x) = \text{sign}(g_M(x)), \quad \hat{p}(x) = \sigma(g_M(x)) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-g_M(x)}}.$$

When one uses the logistic deviance in the Newton-boosting style above, the algorithm is precisely *LogitBoost*¹.

¹Friedman, Jerome, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. "Additive logistic regression: a statistical view of boosting (with discussion and a rejoinder by the authors)." The annals of statistics 28.2 (2000): 337-407.