Linear regression

Course of Machine Learning
Master Degree in Computer Science
University of Rome ``Tor Vergata''

Giorgio Gambosi

a.a. 2017-2018

Linear models

- Linear combination of input features

$$y(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) = w_0 + w_1 x_1 + w_2 x_2 + \ldots + w_D x_D$$

  with $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_D)$
- Linear function of parameters $\mathbf{w}$
- Linear function of features $\mathbf{x}$. Extension to linear combination of base functions

$$y(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) = w_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} w_j \phi_j(\mathbf{x})$$

- Let $\phi_0(\mathbf{x}) = 1$, then $y(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})$

Base functions

- Many types:
  - Polynomial (global functions)

$$\phi_j(x) = x^j$$

  - Gaussian (local)

$$\phi_j(x) = \exp\left(-\frac{(x-\mu_j)^2}{2s^2}\right)$$

  - Sigmoid (local)

$$\phi_j(x) = \sigma\left(\frac{x-\mu_j}{s}\right) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-\frac{x-\mu_j}{s}}}$$

  - Hyperbolic tangent (local)

$$\phi_j(x) = \tanh(x) = 2\sigma(x) - 1 = \frac{1-e^{-\frac{x-\mu_j}{s}}}{1+e^{-\frac{x-\mu_j}{s}}}$$



Maximum likelihood and least squares

- Assume an additional gaussian noise

$$t = y(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) + \varepsilon$$

with

$$p(\varepsilon) = \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon|0, \beta^{-1})$$

$\beta = \frac{1}{\sigma^2}$ is the precision.

- Then,

$$p(t|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, \beta) = \mathcal{N}(t|y(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}), \beta^{-1})$$

and the expectation of the conditional distribution is

$$E[t|\mathbf{x}] = \int tp(t|\mathbf{x})dt = y(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w})$$

Maximum likelihood and least squares

- The likelihood of a given training set $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{t}$ is

$$p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{w}, \beta) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{N}(t_i|\mathbf{w}^T\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i), \beta^{-1})$$

- The corresponding log-likelihood is then

$$\ln p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{w}, \beta) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \ln \mathcal{N}(t_i|\mathbf{w}^T\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i), \beta^{-1}) = \frac{N}{2}\ln\beta - \frac{N}{2}\ln(2\pi) - \beta E_D(\mathbf{w})$$

where

$$E_D(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\Big(t_i - \mathbf{w}^T\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)\Big)^2 = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\Phi}\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{y})^T(\boldsymbol{\Phi}\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{y})$$

Maximum likelihood and least squares

- Maximizing the log-likelihood w.r.t. $\mathbf{w}$ is equivalent to minimizing the error function $E_D(\mathbf{w})$
- Maximization performed by setting the gradient to 0

$$\mathbf{0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{w}} \ln p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{w}, \beta) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(t_i - \mathbf{w}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i) \right) \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)^T$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{N} t_i \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)^T - \mathbf{w}^T \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i) \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)^T \right)$$

- Result

$$\mathbf{w}_{ML} = (\boldsymbol{\Phi}^T \boldsymbol{\Phi})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Phi}^T \mathbf{t}$$

normal equations for least squares

$$\boldsymbol{\Phi} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_0(\mathbf{x}_1) & \phi_1(\mathbf{x}_1) & \cdots & \phi_{M-1}(\mathbf{x}_1) \\ \phi_0(\mathbf{x}_2) & \phi_1(\mathbf{x}_2) & \cdots & \phi_{M-1}(\mathbf{x}_2) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \phi_0(\mathbf{x}_N) & \phi_1(\mathbf{x}_N) & \cdots & \phi_{M-1}(\mathbf{x}_N) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\beta_{ML}^{-1} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(t_i - \mathbf{w}_{ML}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i) \right)^2$$

Least squares geometry

- $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \ldots, t_N)^T$ is a vector in $\mathbb{R}^N$
- Each basis function ϕ_j applied to $\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_N$ is a vector $\varphi_j = (\phi_j(\mathbf{x}_1), \ldots, \phi_j(\mathbf{x}_N))^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$
- If $M < N$, vectors $\varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_{M-1}$ define a subspace $\mathcal{S}$ of dimension (at most) M
- $\mathbf{y} = (y(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{w}), \ldots, y(\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{w}))^T$ is a vector in $\mathbb{R}^N$: it can be represented as linear combination $\mathbf{y} = \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} w_i \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)$. Hence, it belongs to $\mathcal{S}$
- Given $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is the vector in subspace $\mathcal{S}$ at minimal squared distance from $\mathbf{t}$
- Given $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and vectors $\phi_0, \ldots, \phi_{M-1}$, $\mathbf{w}_{ML}$ is such that $\mathbf{y}$ is the vector on $\mathcal{S}$ nearest to $\mathbf{t}$



Gradient descent

- The minimum of $E_D(\mathbf{w})$ may be computed numerically, by means of gradient descent methods
- Initial assignment $\mathbf{w}^{(0)} = (w_0^{(0)}, w_1^{(0)}, \ldots, w_D^{(0)})$, with a corresponding error value

$$E_D(\mathbf{w}^{(0)}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(t_i - (\mathbf{w}^{(0)})^T \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i) \right)^2$$

- Iteratively, the current value $\mathbf{w}^{(i-1)}$ is modified in the direction of steepest descent of di $E_D(\mathbf{w})$
- At step i, $w_j^{(i-1)}$ is updated as follows:

$$w_j^{(i)} := w_j^{(i-1)} - \eta \frac{\partial E_D(\mathbf{w})}{\partial w_j} \bigg|_{\mathbf{w}^{(i-1)}}$$

Gradient descent

- In matrix notation:

$$\mathbf{w}^{(i)} := \mathbf{w}^{(i-1)} - \eta \frac{\partial E_D(\mathbf{w})}{\partial \mathbf{w}}\bigg|_{\mathbf{w}^{(i-1)}}$$

- By definition of $E_D(\mathbf{w})$:

$$\mathbf{w}^{(i)} := \mathbf{w}^{(i-1)} - \eta(t_i - \mathbf{w}^{(i-1)}\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i))\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)$$

Regularized least squares

- Regularization term in the cost function

$$E_D(\mathbf{w}) + \lambda E_W(\mathbf{w})$$

  $E_D(\mathbf{w})$ dependent from the dataset (and the parameters), $E_W(\mathbf{w})$ dependent from the parameters alone.

- The regularization coefficient controls the relative importance of the two terms.
- Simple form

$$E_W(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{w} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{M-1} w_i^2$$

- Sum-of squares cost function: weight decay

$$E(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\{t_i - \mathbf{w}^T\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{w} = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\Phi}\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{y})^T(\boldsymbol{\Phi}\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{y}) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{w}$$

  with solution

$$\mathbf{w} = (\lambda\mathbf{I} + \boldsymbol{\Phi}^T\boldsymbol{\Phi})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Phi}^T\mathbf{t}$$

Regularization

- A more general form

$$E(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\{t_i - \mathbf{w}^T\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)\}^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2}\sum_{j=0}^{M-1}|w_j|^q$$



- The case $q = 1$ is denoted as lasso: sparse models are favored (in blue, level curves of the cost function)



Bias-variance decomposition

In considering the regression problem:

- we are looking for an estimator $y(\mathbf{x})$ of the value y for any $\mathbf{x}$
- we wish to minimize a given cost function $\mathcal{C}(y, y(\mathbf{x}))$

A common choice for the cost function is the squared difference

$$C(y, y(\mathbf{x})) = (y(\mathbf{x}) - y)^2$$

Bias-variance decomposition

We want to choose an estimator $y(\mathbf{x})$ which minimizes the expected cost. It can be shown that the expected cost can be seen as

$$E_{\mathbf{x},y}[\mathcal{C}(y, y(\mathbf{x}))] = E_{\mathbf{x}}[(y(\mathbf{x}) - E_y[y|\mathbf{x}])^2] + E_{\mathbf{x}}[\sigma^2_{y|\mathbf{x}}]$$

where

- $E_{\mathbf{x}}[(y(\mathbf{x}) - E_y[y|\mathbf{x}])^2]$ is the contribution to the cost deriving by the chosen estimator $y(\mathbf{x})$: it results 0 if the (unknown) conditional mean $E_y[y|\mathbf{x}]$, a.k.a. the regression function, is chosen as estimator
- the second term is the expectation wrt $\mathbf{x}$ of the conditional variance

$$\sigma^2_{y|\mathbf{x}} = \int_y (y - E_y[y|\mathbf{x}])^2 p(y|\mathbf{x}) dy$$

it is a measure of the variability of y when $\mathbf{x}$ is known and it is only related to data, not to the estimator

Evaluating the regression function

- The regression function $E_y[y|\mathbf{x}]$ can be (approximately) derived from training data.
- Assume a collection of training set is available, each of them of same size n and independently sampled from distribution $p(\mathbf{x}, y)$. When one such set $\mathcal{T}$ is submitted to the learning algorithm applied, an estimator function $y(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{T})$ is obtained

Measuring the quality of the learning algorithm

Observe that

- $(y(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{T}) - E_y[y|\mathbf{x}])^2$ is the cost of the estimator learned from $\mathcal{T}$ when applied on point $\mathbf{x}$
- $E_{\mathcal{T}}[(y(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{T}) - E_y[y|\mathbf{x}])^2]$ is the (expected) cost of the learned estimator (wrt the available training set) when applied to $\mathbf{x}$

The overall quality of the learning algorithm can be modeled in terms of expectation (on the input space) of the expected cost (on the training set used for learning)

$$E_{\mathbf{x}}[E_{\mathcal{T}}[(y(\mathbf{x}) - E_y[y|\mathbf{x}])^2]] = \int_{\mathbf{x}} E_{\mathcal{T}}[(y(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{T}) - E_y[y|\mathbf{x}])^2]p(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}$$

This measure should be minimized.

Measuring the quality of the learning algorithm

It can be easily shown that the measure can indeed be decomposed as

$$E_{\mathbf{x}}[E_{\mathcal{T}}[(y(\mathbf{x}) - E_y[y|\mathbf{x}])^2]] =$$
$$\int_{\mathbf{x}} E_{\mathcal{T}}[(y(\mathbf{x},\mathcal{T}) - E_{\mathcal{T}}[y(\mathbf{x},\mathcal{T})])^2]p(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\mathbf{x}} (E_{\mathcal{T}}[y(\mathbf{x},\mathcal{T})] - E_y[y|\mathbf{x}])^2 p(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}$$

Bias

The term

$$\int_{\mathbf{x}} (E_{\mathcal{T}}[y(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{T})] - E_y[y|\mathbf{x}])^2 p(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$$

is denoted as (bias)^2

- expectation over all $\mathbf{x}$, of the squared difference between the expected (wrt training set) value returned by the learned estimator and the value returned by the regression function
- measure of the correspondence between the derived estimator and the regression function

Variance

The term

$$\int_{\mathbf{x}} E_{\mathcal{T}}[(y(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{T}) - E_{\mathcal{T}}[y(\mathbf{x}, \mathcal{T})])^2] p(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$$

is said variance

- expectation on the input space of the variance of the value returned by a learned estimator wrt the training set available
- measure of the variability of the behavior of different estimator functions learned by the algorithm when different training sets are used

Aim: minimize the expected cost, that is the sum $(\text{bias})^2$+variance.
Unfortunately, there exists a tradeoff between them.

An example

- Consider the case of function $y = \sin 2\pi x$ and assume $L = 100$ training sets $\mathcal{T}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_L$ are available, each of size $n = 25$.
- Given $M = 24$ gaussian basis functions $\phi_1(x), \ldots, \phi_M(x)$, from each training set $\mathcal{T}_i$ a prediction function $y_i(x)$ is derived by minimizing the regularized cost function

$$E_D(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{\Phi w} - \mathbf{t})^T(\mathbf{\Phi w} - \mathbf{t}) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{w}$$

An example



Left, a possible plot of prediction functions $y_i(\mathbf{x})$ $(i = 1, \ldots, 100)$, as derived, respectively, by training sets $\mathcal{T}_i, i = 1, \ldots, 100$ setting $\ln \lambda = 2.6$. Right, their expectation, with the unknown function $y = \sin 2\pi x$.

The prediction functions $y_i(\mathbf{x})$ do not differ much between them (small variance), but their expecation is a bad approximation of the unknown function (large bias).

An example





Plot of the prediction functions obtained with $\ln \lambda = -0.31$.

An example



Plot of the prediction functions obtained with $\ln \lambda = -2.4$. As λ decreases, the variance increases (prediction functions $y_i(\mathbf{x})$ are more different each other), while bias decreases (their expectation is a better approximation of $y = \sin 2\pi x$).

An example



- Plot of (bias)^2, variance and their sum as unctions of λ: las λ increases, bias increases and varinace decreases. Their sum has a minimum in correspondance to the optimal value of λ.
- The term $E_{\mathbf{x}}[\sigma^2_{y|\mathbf{x}}]$ shows an inherent limit to the approximability of $y = \sin 2\pi x$.

Bayesian approach to regression

- Applying maximum likelihood to determine the values of model parameters is prone to overfitting: need of a regularization term $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{w})$.
- In order control model complexity, a bayesian approach assumes a prior distribution of parameter values.

Prior distribution

Posterior proportional to prior times likelihood: likelihood is gaussian (gaussian noise).

$$p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{\Phi}, \mathbf{w}, \beta) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{N}(t_i|\mathbf{w}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i), \beta^{-1})$$

Conjugate of gaussian is gaussian: choosing a gaussian prior distribution of $\mathbf{w}$

$$p(\mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{m}_0, \mathbf{S}_0)$$

results into a gaussian posterior distribution

$$p(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{\Phi}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{m}_N, \mathbf{S}_N) \propto p(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{\Phi}|\mathbf{w})p(\mathbf{w})$$

where

$$\mathbf{m}_N = \mathbf{S}_N(\mathbf{S}_0^{-1}\mathbf{m}_0 + \beta\mathbf{\Phi}^T\mathbf{t})$$
$$\mathbf{S}_N^{-1} = \mathbf{S}_0^{-1} + \beta\mathbf{\Phi}^T\mathbf{\Phi}$$

Prior distribution

A common approach: zero-mean isotropic gaussian prior distribution of $\mathbf{w}$

$$p(\mathbf{w}|\alpha) = \prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \left(\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\right)^{1/2} e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2} w_i^2}$$

- Parameters in $\mathbf{w}$ are assumed independent e identically distributed, according to a gaussian with mean $\mathbf{0}$, uniform variance $\sigma^2 = \alpha^{-1}$ and null covariance.
- Prior distribution defined with a hyper-parameter α, inversely proportional to the variance.

Posterior distribution

Given the likelihood

$$p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{\Phi}, \mathbf{w}, \beta) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}(t_i - \mathbf{w}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}(x_i))^2}$$

the posterior distribution for $\mathbf{w}$ derives from Bayes' rule

$$p(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{\Phi}, \alpha, \sigma) = \frac{p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{\Phi}, \mathbf{w}, \sigma)p(\mathbf{w}|\alpha)}{p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{\Phi}, \alpha, \sigma)} \propto p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{\Phi}, \mathbf{w}, \sigma)p(\mathbf{w}|\alpha)$$

Reminder

Remind that, in general, if

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{m}_0, \mathbf{S}_0)$$
$$p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{S}_1)$$

then

$$p(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{m}_N, \mathbf{S}_N)$$

with

$$\mathbf{m}_N = (\mathbf{S}_0^{-1} + \mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{S}_1^{-1}\mathbf{A})^{-1}(\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{S}_1^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{S}_0^{-1}\mathbf{m}_0)$$
$$\mathbf{S}_N = (\mathbf{S}_0^{-1} + \mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{S}_1^{-1}\mathbf{A})^{-1}$$

In this case

In this case, by the model assumptions

$$p(\mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{0}, \alpha^{-1}\mathbf{I})$$
$$p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{\Phi}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{\Phi}, \beta^{-1}\mathbf{I})$$

and, as a consequence,

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{w}, \quad \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{\Phi}, \quad \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{S}_1 = \beta^{-1}\mathbf{I}, \quad \mathbf{m}_0 = \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{S}_0 = \alpha^{-1}\mathbf{I}$$

then

$$\mathbf{S}_N = (\alpha\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{\Phi}^T\beta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{\Phi})^{-1} = (\alpha\mathbf{I} + \beta\mathbf{\Phi}^T\mathbf{\Phi})^{-1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{m}_N &= (\alpha\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{\Phi}^T\beta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{\Phi})^{-1}(\mathbf{\Phi}^T\beta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{t} + \alpha\mathbf{I}) \\ &= (\alpha\mathbf{I} + \beta\mathbf{\Phi}^T\mathbf{\Phi})^{-1}\beta\mathbf{\Phi}^T\mathbf{y} = \beta(\alpha\mathbf{I} + \beta\mathbf{\Phi}^T\mathbf{\Phi})^{-1}\mathbf{\Phi}^T\mathbf{t} \\ &= \beta\mathbf{S}_N\mathbf{\Phi}^T\mathbf{t}\end{aligned}$$

Note that if $\alpha \to 0$ the prior tends to have infinite variance, and we have minimum information on $\mathbf{w}$ before the training set is consider. In this case,

$$\mathbf{m}_N \to (\mathbf{\Phi}^T\beta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{\Phi})^{-1}(\mathbf{\Phi}^T\beta\mathbf{I}\mathbf{t}) = (\mathbf{\Phi}^T\mathbf{\Phi})^{-1}(\mathbf{\Phi}^T\mathbf{t})$$

that is $\mathbf{w}_{ML}$, the ML estimation of $\mathbf{w}$.

Maximum a Posteriori

- Given the posterior distribution $p(\mathbf{w}|\Phi, \mathbf{t}, \alpha, \beta)$, we may derive the value of $\mathbf{w}_{MAP}$ which makes it maximum (the mode of the distribution)
- This is equivalent to maximizing its logarithm

$$\log p(\mathbf{w}|\Phi, \mathbf{t}, \alpha, \beta) = \log p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{w}, \Phi, \beta) + \log p(\mathbf{w}|\alpha) - \log p(\mathbf{t}|\Phi, \beta)$$

and, since $p(\mathbf{t}|\Phi, \beta)$ is a constant wrt $\mathbf{w}$

$$\mathbf{w}_{MAP} = \underset{\mathbf{w}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \log p(\mathbf{w}|\Phi, \mathbf{t}, \alpha, \beta) = \underset{\mathbf{w}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \left(\log p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{w}, \Phi, \beta) + \log p(\mathbf{w}|\alpha)\right)$$

that is,

$$\mathbf{w}_{MAP} = \underset{\mathbf{w}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left(-\log p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{\Phi}, \mathbf{w}, \beta) - \log p(\mathbf{w}|\alpha)\right)$$

Derivation of MAP

By considering the assumptions on prior and likelihood,

$$w_{MAP} = \underset{\mathbf{w}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left(\frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (t_i - \mathbf{w}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i))^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} w_i^2 + \text{constants} \right)$$

$$= \underset{\mathbf{w}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} (t_i - \mathbf{w}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i))^2 + \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} w_i^2 \right)$$

this is equivalent to considering a cost function

$$E_{MAP}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \mathbf{w}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}(x_i)) + \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}$$

that is to a regularized min square function with $\lambda = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}$

Sequential learning

- The bayesian approach can be applied when the training set is acquired incrementally (sequential learning).
- Fundamental property: if prior and likelihood are gaussians, the posterior is gaussian too.
- Let T_1, T_2 be two independent training sets, acquired one after the other. Then

$$p(\mathbf{w}|T_1, T_2) \propto p(T_1, T_2|\mathbf{w})p(\mathbf{w}) = p(T_2|\mathbf{w})p(T_1|\mathbf{w})p(\mathbf{w}) \propto p(T_2|\mathbf{w})p(\mathbf{w}|T_1)p(\mathbf{w})$$

Sequential learning

- The posterior after observing T_1 can be used as a prior for the next training set acquired.
- In general, for a sequence $T_1, \ldots, T_n$ of training sets,

$$p(\mathbf{w}|T_1, \ldots T_n) \propto p(T_n|\mathbf{w})p(\mathbf{w}|T_1, \ldots T_{n-1})$$
$$p(\mathbf{w}|T_1, \ldots T_{n-1}) \propto p(T_{n-1}|\mathbf{w})p(\mathbf{w}|T_1, \ldots T_{n-2})$$
$$\ldots$$
$$p(\mathbf{w}|T_1) \propto p(T_1|\mathbf{w})p(\mathbf{w})$$

Example

- Input variable x, target variable t, linear regression $y(x, w_0, w_1) = w_0 + w_1 x$.
- Dataset generated by applying function $y = a_0 + a_1 x$ (with $a_0 = -0.3$, $a_1 = 0.5$) to values uniformly sampled in $[-1, 1]$, with added gaussian noise ($\mu = 0$, $\sigma = 0.2$).
- Assume the prior distribution $p(w_0, w_1)$ is a bivariate gaussian with $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I} = 0.04\mathbf{I}$





Left, prior distribution of w_0, w_1; right, 6 lines sampled from the distribution.

Example

After observing item (x_1, y_1) (circle in right figure).



Left, posterior distribution $p(w_0, w_1|x_1, y_1)$; right, 6 lines sampled from the distribution.

Esempio

After observing items $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)$ (circles in right figure).





Left, posterior distribution $p(w_0, w_1|x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2)$; right, 6 lines sampled from the distribution.

Example

After observing a set of n items $(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$ (circles in right figure).





Left, posterior distribution $p(w_0, w_1 | x_i, y_i, i = 1, \ldots, n)$; right, 6 lines sampled from the distribution.

Example

- As the number of observed items increases, the distribution of parameters w_0, w_1 tends to concentrate (variance decreases to 0) around a mean point a_0, a_1.
- As a consequence, sampled lines are concentrated around $y = a_0 + a_1 x$.

Approaches to prediction in linear regression

Classical

- A value $\mathbf{w}_{LS}$ for $\mathbf{w}$ is learned through a point estimate, performed by minimizing a quadratic cost function, or equivalently by maximizing likelihood (ML) under the hypothesis of gaussian noise; regularization can be applied to modify the cost function to limit overfitting
- Given any $\mathbf{x}$, the obtained value $\mathbf{w}_{LS}$ is used to predict the corresponding t as $y = \overline{\mathbf{x}}^T \mathbf{w}_{LS}$, where $\overline{\mathbf{x}}^T = (1, \mathbf{x})^T$, or, in general, as $y = \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})^T \mathbf{w}_{LS}$

Bayesian point estimation

- The posterior distribution $p(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{\Phi}, \alpha, \beta)$ is derived and a point estimate is performed from it, computing the mode $\mathbf{w}_{MAP}$ of the distribution (MAP)
- Equivalent to the classical approach, as $\mathbf{w}_{MAP}$ corresponds to $\mathbf{w}_{LS}$ if $\lambda = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}$
- The prediction, for a value $\mathbf{x}$, is a gaussian distribution $p(y|\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})^T\mathbf{w}_{MAP}, \beta)$ for y, with mean $\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})^T\mathbf{w}_{MAP}$ and variance β^{-1}
- The distribution is not derived directly from the posterior $p(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{\Phi}, \alpha, \beta)$: it is built, instead, as a gaussian with mean depending from the expectation of the posterior, and variance given by the assumed noise.

Fully bayesian

- The real interest is not in estimating $\mathbf{w}$ or its distribution $p(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{\Phi}, \alpha, \beta)$, but in deriving the predictive distribution $p(y|\mathbf{x})$. This can be done through expectation of the probability $p(y|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, \beta)$ predicted by a model instance wrt model instance distribution $p(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{\Phi}, \alpha, \beta)$, that is

$$p(y|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{\Phi}, \alpha, \beta) = \int p(y|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, \beta) p(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{\Phi}, \alpha, \beta) d\mathbf{w}$$

- $p(y|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, \beta)$ is assumed gaussian, and $p(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{\Phi}, \alpha, \beta)$ is gaussian by the assumption that the likelihood $p(\mathbf{t}|\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{\Phi}, \beta)$ and the prior $p(\mathbf{w}|\alpha)$ are gaussian themselves and by their being conjugate

$$p(y|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, \beta) = \mathcal{N}(y|\mathbf{w}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}), \beta)$$
$$p(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{\Phi}, \alpha, \beta) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{w}|\beta \mathbf{S}_N \mathbf{\Phi}^T \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{S}_N)$$

  where $\mathbf{S}_N = (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \beta \mathbf{\Phi}^T \mathbf{\Phi})^{-1}$

Approaches to prediction in linear regression

Fully bayesian

Under such hypothesis, $p(y|\mathbf{x})$ is gaussian

$$p(y|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{\Phi}, \alpha, \beta) = \mathcal{N}(y|m(\mathbf{x}), \sigma^2(\mathbf{x}))$$

with mean

$$m(\mathbf{x}) = \beta \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})^T \mathbf{S}_N \mathbf{\Phi}^T \mathbf{t}$$

and variance

$$\sigma^2(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})^T \mathbf{S}_N \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})$$

- $\frac{1}{\beta}$ is a measure of the uncertainty intrinsic to observed data (noise)
- $\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})^T \mathbf{S}_N \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})$ is the uncertainty wrt the values derived for the parameters $\mathbf{w}$
- as the noise distribution and the distribution of $\mathbf{w}$ are independent gaussians, their variances add
- $\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})^T \mathbf{S}_N \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, and the only uncertainty remaining is the one intrinsic into data observation

Example

- predictive distribution for $y = \sin 2\pi x$, applying a model with 9 gaussian base functions and training sets of 1, 2, 4, 25 items, respectively
- left: items in training sets (sampled uniformly, with added gaussian noise); expectation of the predictive distribution (red), as function of x; variance of such distribution (pink shade within 1 standard deviation from mean), as a function of x
- right: items in training sets, 5 possible curves approximating $y = \sin 2\pi x$, derived through sampling from the posterior distribution $p(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{\Phi}, \alpha, \beta)$

Example

$n = 1$



$n = 2$



Example

$n = 4$



$n = 25$



Equivalent kernel

- The expectation of the predictive distribution can be written also as

$$y(\mathbf{x}) = \beta\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})^T\mathbf{S}_N\boldsymbol{\Phi}^T\mathbf{t} = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\beta\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})^T\mathbf{S}_N\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}_i)t_i$$

- The prediction can then be seen as a linear combination of the target values t_i of items in the training set, with weights dependent from the item values $\mathbf{x}_i$ (and from $\mathbf{x}$)

$$y(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\kappa(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)t_i$$

  The weight function $\kappa(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \beta\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})^T\mathbf{S}_N\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}')$ is said *equivalent kernel* or linear smoother

Equivalent kernel

Right: plot on the plane (x, x_i) of a sample equivalent kernel, in the case of gaussian basis functions.

Left: plot as a function of x_i for three different values of x



In deriving y, the equivalent kernel tends to assign greater relevance to the target values t_i corresponding to items x_i near to x.

Equivalent kernel

The same localization property holds also for different base functions.



Left, $\kappa(0, x')$ in the case of polynomial basis functions.

Right, $\kappa(0, x')$ in the case of gaussian basis functions.

Equivalent kernel

Some properties:

- It is possible to prove that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \kappa(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) = 1$ for any $\mathbf{x}$
- The covariance between $y(\mathbf{x})$ and $y(\mathbf{x}')$ is given by

$$\text{cov}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \text{cov}(\boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})^T \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}')) = \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\mathbf{x})^T \mathbf{S}_N \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x}') = \frac{1}{\beta} \kappa(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$$

  predicted values are highly correlated at nearby points.
- Instead of introducing base functions which results into a kernel, we may define a localized kernel directly and use it to make predictions (gaussian processes)
- The equivalent kernel can be expressed as inner product $\kappa(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{x})^T \boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{x}')$ of a suitable set of functions

$$\boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{x}) = \beta^{1/2} \mathbf{S}_N^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\phi}(\mathbf{x})$$

Alternative approach to linear regression

- First approach: define a set of base functions
  - used to derive $\mathbf{w}$
  - or (by means of the resulting equivalent kernel) to directly computing $y(\mathbf{x})$ as a linear combination of training set items
- New approach: a suitable kernel is defined and used to compute $y(\mathbf{x})$