


Introduction to Machine Learning

Regularization Introduction




Learning goals

- Overfitting
- Motivation of regularization
- First overview of techniques
- Pattern of regularized ERM formula

WHAT IS REGULARIZATION?


Methods that add **inductive bias** to model, usually some “low complexity” priors (shrinkage and sparsity) to reduce overfitting and get better bias-variance tradeoff



- **Explicit regularization:** penalize explicit measure of model complexity in ERM (e.g., $L1/L2$)
- **Implicit regularization:** early stopping, data augmentation, parameter sharing, dropout or ensembling
- **Structured regularization:** structural prior knowledge over groups of parameters or subnetworks (e.g., group lasso [► Yuan and Lin 2006](#))


RECAP: OVERFITTING

- Occurs when model reflects noise or artifacts in training data
- Model often then does not generalize well (small train error, high test error) – or at least works better on train than on test data




Overfitted model

TrainErr=0.01; TestErr=0.12





Appropriate model

TrainErr=0.08; TestErr=0.06



EXAMPLE 1: OVERFITTING


- Data set: daily maximum **ozone level** in LA; $n = 50$
- 12 features: time (weekday, month); weather (temperature at stations, humidity, wind speed); pressure gradient
- Orig. data was subsetting, so it feels “high-dim.” now (low n in relation to p)
- LM with all features (L2 loss)
- MSE evaluation under 10×10 REP-CV



Model fits train data well, but generalizes poorly.

EXAMPLE II: OVERFITTING

- We train an MLP and a CART on the mtcars data
- Both models are not regularized
- And configured to make overfitting more likely




	Train MSE	Test MSE
Neural Network	1.47	345.84
CART	0.00	6.91

(And we now switch back to the Ozone example...)


AVOIDING OVERFITTING – COLLECT MORE DATA

We explore our results for increased dataset size.



Fit slightly worsens, but test error decreases.


But: Often not feasible in practice.




AVOIDING OVERFITTING – REDUCE COMPLEXITY

We try the simplest model: a constant. So for $L2$ loss the mean of $y^{(i)}$.

We then increase complexity by adding one feature at a time.



NB: We added features in a specific (clever) order, so we cheated a bit.





AVOIDING OVERFITTING – OPTIMIZE LESS

Now: polynomial regression with temperature as single feature

$$f(\mathbf{x} \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{k=0}^d \theta_k \cdot (x_T)^k$$

We set $d = 15$ to overfit to small data. To investigate early stopping, we don't analytically solve the OLS problem, but run GD stepwise.




We see: Early stopping GD can improve results.

NB: GD for poly-regr usually needs many iters before it starts to overfit, so we used a very small training set.

REGULARIZED EMPIRICAL RISK MINIMIZATION

We have contradictory goals:

- **maximizing fit** (minimizing the train loss)
- **minimizing complexity** of the model



We saw how we can include features in a binary fashion.
But we would rather control complexity **on a continuum**.

REGULARIZED EMPIRICAL RISK MINIMIZATION

Common pattern:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{reg}}(f) = \mathcal{R}_{\text{emp}}(f) + \lambda \cdot J(f) = \sum_{i=1}^n L\left(y^{(i)}, f\left(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}\right)\right) + \lambda \cdot J(f)$$

- $J(f)$: **complexity penalty, roughness penalty** or **regularizer**
- $\lambda \geq 0$: **complexity control** parameter
- The higher λ , the more we penalize complexity
- $\lambda = 0$: We just do simple ERM; $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$: we don't care about loss, models become as “simple” as possible
- λ is hard to set manually and is usually selected via CV
- As for \mathcal{R}_{emp} , \mathcal{R}_{reg} and J are often defined in terms of θ :

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{reg}}(\theta) = \mathcal{R}_{\text{emp}}(\theta) + \lambda \cdot J(\theta)$$

