

ESE 546, FALL 2020

HOMEWORK 3

SHEIL SARDA [SHEILS@SEAS],
COLLABORATORS: RAHUL M. [RMAG@SEAS]

Solution 1 (Time spent: 5 hours). (1) Prove that co-coercivity implies Lipschitz continuity.

$$\langle \nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle \geq \frac{1}{L} \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|^2 \Rightarrow \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \leq L \|x - y\|$$

According to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\|\langle u, v \rangle\| \leq \|u\| \|v\|$$

Applying Cauchy Schwarz to the RHS of the given inequality and multiplying by L on both sides:

$$\begin{aligned} L \langle \nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle &\leq \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \|x - y\| L \\ \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|^2 &\leq L \langle \nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle \leq \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \|x - y\| L \end{aligned}$$

Eliminating the middle term in the inequality above:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|^2 &\leq \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \|x - y\| L \\ \implies \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| &\leq L \|x - y\| \end{aligned}$$

□

(2) Prove that the Lipschitz continuity implies co-coercivity. Consider 2 functions:

$$\begin{aligned} g(z) &= f(z) - \langle \nabla f(x), z \rangle \\ h(z) &= f(z) - \langle \nabla f(y), z \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Applying the descent lemma to $g(y)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla g(y)\| &\leq g(y) - g(x) \\ \Rightarrow \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla g(y)\| &\leq f(y) - f(x) - \langle \nabla f(x), y \rangle - \langle \nabla f(x), x \rangle \\ \Rightarrow \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla g(y)\| &\leq f(y) - f(x) - \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} f(y) - f(x) - \langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle &\geq \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla f(y) - \nabla f(x)\| \\ f(x) - f(y) - \langle \nabla f(y), x - y \rangle &\geq \frac{1}{2L} \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\| \end{aligned}$$

Adding the two above inequalities, we have

$$\langle \nabla f(x) - f(y), x - y \rangle \geq \frac{1}{L} \|\nabla f(x) - \nabla f(y)\|$$

- (3) Prove that $m \leq \|\nabla^2 f(x)\|_2 \leq L$ Applying the mean value theorem to $\nabla f(x)$,

$$\nabla^2 f(x) = \frac{\nabla f(b) - \nabla f(a)}{b - a}$$

Applying the result from (1) of this question $\implies \nabla^2 f(x) \leq L$.

For any strongly convex function ℓ , the following must hold

$$\ell(w) + \langle \nabla \ell(w), w' - w \rangle + \frac{m}{2} \|w' - w\|^2 \leq \ell(w')$$

Since we know that $f(x)$ is strongly convex, $\nabla^2 f(x) \succeq mI_{p \times p} = m$ (from Lecture Notes 09). Combining both results, we get:

$$m \leq \|\nabla^2 f(x)\|_2 \leq L$$

□

Solution 2 (Time spent: 3 hours). To prove:

$$\min_w \mathbb{E}_R [\|y - (R \odot X)w\|_2^2] = \min_{\tilde{w}} \|y - X\tilde{w}\|_2^2 + \left(\frac{p}{1-p} \right) \tilde{w}^\top \text{diag}(X^\top X) \tilde{w}$$

where $\tilde{w} = (1-p)w$

For context (from Lecture Notes 07),

- Each row of matrix R consists of the dropout mask for the i^{th} row x^i of the data matrix X .
- Each entry of R is a Bernoulli random variable with probability $1-p$ of being 1.
- For linear regression, dropout is equivalent to weight decay where the coefficient α depends on the diagonal of the data covariance and is different for different weights.
- If a particular data dimension varies a lot $\implies X^\top X$ is large, then dropout tries to squeeze its weight to zero.
- If $p=0$, most activations are retained by the mask and regularization is small.
- Given weights w of a model trained using dropout, we can compute the committee average over models created using dropout masks simply by scaling the weights by a factor $1-p \implies \tilde{w} = (1-p)w$ is the effective weight.

The RHS can be re-written as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_w \mathbb{E}_R [\|y - (R \odot X)w\|_2^2] \\ & \implies \min_w [\|y - (X(1-p))w\|_2^2] \quad \text{since } R \text{ comprises of Bernoulli variables} \\ & \implies \min_w [\|y - X\tilde{w}\|_2^2] \quad \text{by definition of } \tilde{w} \end{aligned}$$

Now, to go from

$$\min_w [\|y - X\tilde{w}\|_2^2] \rightarrow \min_{\tilde{w}} \|y - X\tilde{w}\|_2^2 + \left(\frac{p}{1-p} \right) \tilde{w}^\top \text{diag}(X^\top X) \tilde{w}$$

We observe that $\left(\frac{p}{1-p} \right) \tilde{w}^\top \text{diag}(X^\top X) \tilde{w}$ can be re-written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{p}{1-p} \right) \tilde{w}^\top \text{diag}(X^\top X) \tilde{w} \\ & \implies \left(\frac{p}{1-p} \right) \tilde{w}^\top \text{diag}(X^\top X) w(1-p) \\ & \implies p(1-p) w^\top \text{diag}(X^\top X) w \end{aligned}$$

Solution 3 (Time spent: 3 hours). Population risk of a regression is

$$R(f) = \int |f(x) - y|^2 P(x, y) dx dy$$

Prove that model that minimizes the population risk is

$$f^* = \operatorname{argmin}_f R(f) = \mathbb{E}[y | x]$$

Notes: This is the MSE loss. Minimum of that is the conditional mean of $y|x$. If just trying to optimize $R(f)$, how do you take into account the integral?

The conditional expectation is essentially the integral of $y \times p(y|x) \times dy$. Just looking for the minimum, so write some equations to find the minimum (differentiation with respect to f).

You are finding the min of the regressor by differentiating.

Proof: We can follow