Untitled

Amy Pitts

3/17/2022

Data import

This dataset has 569 rows and 32 columns. The outcome variable of interst is Diagnosis which takes on values benign or malignant cases. There are 357 benign cases and 212 malignant cases as seen below in Table 1. One variable is id and the rest 30 variables are the mean, sd and largest values of the following criteria.

- radius (mean of distances from center to points on the perimeter)
- texture (standard deviation of gray-scale values)
- perimeter
- area
- smoothness (local variation in radius lengths)
- compactness (perimeter^2 / area 1.0)
- concavity (severity of concave portions of the contour)
- concave points (number of concave portions of the contour)
- symmetry
- fractal dimension ("coastline approximation" 1)

Using this dataset models will be compared and compared on their ability to predict cancer diagnosis.

Characteristic	Benign , $N = 357$	Malignant, $N = 212$	p-value	
radius_mean	12.147 (1.781)	17.463 (3.204)	< 0.001	
texture_mean	17.915 (3.995)	21.605 (3.779)	< 0.001	
perimeter_mean	78.075 (11.807)	115.365 (21.855)	< 0.001	
area_mean	$462.790 \ (134.287)$	978.376 (367.938)	< 0.001	
$smoothness_mean$	0.092 (0.013)	$0.103 \ (0.013)$	< 0.001	
compactness_mean	$0.080 \ (0.034)$	$0.145 \ (0.054)$	< 0.001	
concavity_mean	$0.046 \ (0.043)$	$0.161\ (0.075)$	< 0.001	
concave.points_mean	$0.026 \ (0.016)$	$0.088 \; (0.034)$	< 0.001	
symmetry_mean	$0.174 \ (0.025)$	$0.193 \ (0.028)$	< 0.001	
fractal_dimension_mean	$0.063 \ (0.007)$	$0.063 \ (0.008)$	0.5	
radius_se	$0.284 \ (0.113)$	$0.609 \ (0.345)$	< 0.001	
texture_se	$1.220 \ (0.589)$	$1.211\ (0.483)$	0.6	
perimeter_se	2.000(0.771)	4.324(2.569)	< 0.001	
area_se	21.135 (8.843)	72.672 (61.355)	< 0.001	
$smoothness_se$	0.007 (0.003)	$0.007 \ (0.003)$	0.2	
compactness_se	$0.021\ (0.016)$	$0.032\ (0.018)$	< 0.001	
concavity_se	$0.026 \ (0.033)$	$0.042 \ (0.022)$	< 0.001	
concave.points_se	$0.010 \ (0.006)$	0.015 (0.006)	< 0.001	
symmetry_se	$0.021\ (0.007)$	$0.020 \ (0.010)$	0.028	
fractal_dimension_se	$0.004 \ (0.003)$	$0.004 \ (0.002)$	< 0.001	
radius_worst	$13.380\ (1.981)$	$21.135 \ (4.284)$	< 0.001	
$texture_worst$	23.515 (5.494)	29.318 (5.435)	< 0.001	
perimeter_worst	87.006 (13.527)	$141.370 \ (29.457)$	< 0.001	

Characteristic	Benign, $N = 357$	Malignant, $N = 212$	p-value
area_worst	558.899 (163.601)	1,422.286 (597.968)	< 0.001
$smoothness_worst$	0.125 (0.020)	$0.145 \ (0.022)$	< 0.001
$compactness_worst$	$0.183 \ (0.092)$	0.375 (0.170)	< 0.001
concavity_worst	0.166 (0.140)	$0.451 \ (0.182)$	< 0.001
concave.points_worst	$0.074 \ (0.036)$	$0.182\ (0.046)$	< 0.001
symmetry_worst	$0.270 \ (0.042)$	$0.323 \ (0.075)$	< 0.001
$fractal_dimension_worst$	$0.079 \ (0.014)$	$0.092 \ (0.022)$	< 0.001

Build a logistic model to classify the images into malignant/benign

Before building the model we need to first write down the likelihood function, its gradient and Hessian matrix. The likelihood function for our data which has a single binary response and 30 numerical explanatory variables is

$$\pi_i = P(Y_i = 1 | x_{i,1}, \dots x_{i,30}) = \frac{e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i,1} + \dots \beta_{30} x_{i,30}}}{1 + e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i,1} + \dots \beta_{30} x_{i,30}}} = \frac{e^{\beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{30} \beta_i x_{i,j}}}{1 + e^{\beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{30} \beta_i x_{i,j}}}$$

Where X_i represents the *i* observation of all 30 of our predictor variables. For the data give we have the likelihood is given by

$$L(\mathbf{X}|\beta) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left[\pi_i^{y_i} (1 - \pi_i)^{1 - y_i} \right]$$

Finding the log-likelihood we have

$$l(\mathbf{X}|\vec{\beta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[y_i \left(\beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{30} \beta_i x_{i,j} \right) - \log \left(1 + \exp \left(\beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{30} \beta_i x_{i,j} \right) \right) \right]$$

The gradient can then can be solved for. Observe

$$\nabla l(\mathbf{X}|\vec{\beta}) = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i - \pi_i \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i,1} (y_i - \pi) \quad \dots \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i,30} (y_i - \pi) \right]_{(1 \times 31)}^{T}$$

Finally, with the gradient we can derive our hessian. Note that due to the 30 predictor variables the hessian will be a 31 by 31 matrix.

$$\nabla^2 l(\mathbf{X}|\vec{\beta}) = -\sum_{i=1}^n \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ X \end{pmatrix} (1 \quad X) \, \pi_i (1 - \pi_i)$$
$$= - \begin{pmatrix} 1 & X \end{pmatrix} diag(\pi_i (1 - \pi_i)) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ X \end{pmatrix}$$

Where $X = (x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,30})$. Note that this matrix will always be negative definite at all parameters making the this a well behaved problem.

Develop a Newton-Raphson algorithm to estimate your model

Modifications: - I include half stepping in the Newton-Raphson method.

Want to include: - Assent direction

```
dat <- bc %>% select(-id) %>%
  rename(y = diagnosis) %>%
  mutate(y = ifelse(y=="B", 0, 1))
loglike_func <- function(dat, betavec){</pre>
  dat x = unname(as.matrix(dat[,-1]))
  u = dat_x%*%betavec
  pi \leftarrow exp(u) / (1+exp(u))
  # loglikelihood
  loglik \leftarrow sum(dat\$y*u - log(1 + exp(u)))
  #qradient
  grad \leftarrow t(dat_x)%*%(dat\$y - pi)
  # Hessian
  save_mat = matrix(0, nrow = dim(dat)[1], ncol = dim(dat)[1])
  diag(save mat) = pi*(1-pi)
  hess = -t(dat_x)%*% save_mat %*%(dat_x)
  return(list(
    loglik = loglik,
    grad = grad,
   hess = hess
  ))
}
\# loglike\_func(dat, betavec = c(rep(0.03, 30)))
```

This is not working right now....

```
NewtonRaphson <- function(dat, start, tol=100, maxiter = 20){</pre>
  cur = start
  stuff = loglike_func(dat, cur)
  res <- c(i=0, "loglik" = stuff$loglik, cur, "step" = 1)</pre>
  prevloglik <- -Inf # To make sure it iterates</pre>
  while(i < maxiter && abs(stuff$loglik - prevloglik) > tol) {
    step = 1
    i <- i + 1
    prevloglik <- stuff$loglik</pre>
    # ascent direct check
    eigen_vals = eigen(stuff$hess)
    if(max(eigen_vals$values) <= 0 ){ # we don't want neg def</pre>
      hess = stuff$hess
    } else{ # if it is neg def then need to adjust
      hess = stuff$hess - (max(eigen_vals$values) + 0.1)*diag(nrow(stuff$hess))
    }
```

```
<- prev - rep(step, length(prev))*(solve(stuff$hess) %*% stuff$grad)
    stuff <- loglike_func(dat, cur) # log-lik, gradient, Hessian</pre>
    # doing half stepping
    while(stuff$loglik < prevloglik){</pre>
      stuff <- loglike_func(dat, prev)</pre>
      step = step / 2 # this is where half steping happens
      cur <- prev - rep(step, length(prev))*(solve(stuff$hess) %*% stuff$grad)</pre>
      stuff = loglike_func(dat, cur)
    }
    # Add current values to results matrix
    res <- rbind(res, c(i, stuff$loglik, cur, step))</pre>
  }
  colnames(res) <- c(names(dat[,-1]), "i", "loglik", "step")</pre>
  return(res)
}
#Running the algorithm with good starting values:
\#betavec = rep(1, 31)
betavec = c(rep(0.02, 30))
ans <- NewtonRaphson(dat,betavec)</pre>
data.frame(
 i = data.frame(ans)$i,
  step = data.frame(ans)$step,
  loglik = data.frame(ans)$loglik
)
##
                                  loglik
              i
                         step
## 1
        0.02000 1.000000e+00
                                 0.02000
## 2 -15.40564 1.862645e-09
                               84.51468
## 3 104.03746 1.562500e-02 -903.33928
      12.17873 4.882812e-04
                                89.93042
## 5 -119.08307 1.250000e-01 -353.94531
```