Bias and Variance Tradeoff

Zhe Li

November 4, 2014

1 Bias and Variance tradeoff

First of all, Let me say this truth that I have been thinking and struggling this topic for a long time. For this topic, the basic assumption is that data is generated from an underlying distribution $(x,y) \sim p(x,y)$. We consider the square loss function $\ell(f;x,y) = (f(x) - y)^2$, So the expected loss:

$$E[\ell(f)] = E_{x,y}[(f(x) - y)^2] = \int \int (f(x) - y)^2 p(x,y) dx dy$$
 (1)

Intuiatively, we want the expected loss $E[\ell(f)]$ to be minimum. In order to get the minimum of $E[\ell(f)]$, we compute the gradient of $E[\ell(f)]$ w.r.t f(x). It is better to write Eq. (1) in the following way:

$$E[\ell(f)] = E_{x,y}[(f(x) - y)^2]$$

$$= \int (f(x_1) - y)^2 p(x_1, y) dy + \int (f(x_2) - y)^2 p(x_2, y) dy + \dots + \int (f(x_n) - y)^2 p(x_n, y) dy$$

Then computing gradient of $E[\ell(f)]$ w.r.t f(x) and setting it to zero:

$$\frac{\partial E[\ell(f)]}{\partial f(x)} = 2 \int (f(x) - y)p(x, y)dy = 0 \tag{2}$$

Rearranging the above equation, it gives

$$f^*(x) = \frac{\int y p(x, y) dy}{p(x)} = E_{y|x}[y]$$
 (3)

Here, it is very important to notice that $E_{y|x}[y]$ is independent to y, and it is the function of x. The above gives you the mathametic derivation of optimal $f^*(x)$, which is hard to understand. However, $E_{y|x}[y]$ is nothing more than the "average" of target y given the specific x. For example, for given x_1 , maybe there are several data points corresponding

to x_1 such as $\{(x_1, y_{1,1}), (x_1, y_{1,2}), \dots, (x_1, y_{1,m})\}$, assume that those points have same probability drawing from p(x, y), then the optimal $f^*(x_1)$ is

$$f^*(x_1) = \frac{1}{m}(y_{1,1} + y_{1,2} + \dots + y_{1,m})$$
(4)

Decompose the expected loss using optimal solution $f^*(x)$,

$$(f(x) - y)^{2} = (f(x) - E_{y|x}[y] + E_{y|x}[y] - y)^{2}$$

$$= (f(x) - E_{y|x}[y])^{2} + (E_{y|x}[y] - y)^{2} + 2(f(x) - E_{y|x}[y])(E_{y|x}[y] - y)$$

Keep in mind that $E_{y|x}[y]$ does not dependent on y. For example, for this specific point (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) , we have

$$(f(\hat{x}) - \hat{y})^2 = (f(\hat{x}) - E_{y|\hat{x}}[y] + E_{y|\hat{x}}[y] - y)^2$$

= $(f(\hat{x}) - E_{y|\hat{x}}[y])^2 + (E_{y|\hat{x}}[y] - y)^2 + 2(f(\hat{x}) - E_{y|\hat{x}}[y])(E_{y|\hat{x}}[y] - y)$

Since (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) are drawn from p(x, y), take the expectation to both side of the equation, specifically for the last term,

$$E_{x,y}\Big\{(f(\hat{x}) - E_{y|\hat{x}}[y])(E_{y|\hat{x}}[y] - y)\Big\}$$
 (5)

Notice that

$$E_{x,y}\{E_{y|\hat{x}}[y]\} = E_{x,y}[y] \tag{6}$$

That gives us that

$$E_{x,y}\Big\{(f(\hat{x}) - E_{y|\hat{x}}[y])(E_{y|\hat{x}}[y] - y)\Big\} = 0$$

So the expected loss,

$$E[(f(x) - y)^{2}] = E[(f(x) - E_{y|x}[y])^{2}] + E[(E_{y|x}[y] - y)^{2}]$$
(7)

In Eq. (7), the last term does not involve with f(x), that is to say, no matter what the predictive function f(x) is, the last term is always there, even you have the best predictive function $f^*(x)$. We called this term is *noise* and that noise is from data itself or depends on p(x, y), so we have no any power to control this noise term.

In the above, we only concern one function f(x) from an underlying distribution p(x, y). The fact is in reality what we have is data \mathcal{D} . Different data \mathcal{D} will lead to different functions f(x), which brings the uncertainty in f(x). Here you can consider that there are lots of functions f(x). Based on the above, we can take expected loss over f(x). Here I did not agree the notation in the book, for which they used the notation $E_{\mathcal{D}}\{E[\ell(f)]\}$, I think it might be more clear to use the notation $E_f\{E[\ell(f)]\}$. But on the other hand, the notation

 $E_{\mathcal{D}}\{E[\ell(f)]\}$ also makes sense, sinse different data \mathcal{D} will leads to different function f(x), as said before. Put that formally,

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}\{E[\ell(f)]\} = E_{\mathcal{D}}\left\{ [E[(f(x) - E_{y|x}[y])^2] + noise \right\}$$
(8)

If we decompose expected loss with $E_{\mathcal{D}}[f(x;\mathcal{D})]$,

$$(f(x; \mathcal{D}) - E_{x,y}[y])^2 = (f(x; \mathcal{D}) - E_{\mathcal{D}}[f(x; \mathcal{D})])^2 + (E_{\mathcal{D}}[f(x; \mathcal{D})] - E_{y|x}[y])^2 + 2(f(x; \mathcal{D}) - E_{\mathcal{D}}[f(x; \mathcal{D})])(E_{\mathcal{D}}[f(x; \mathcal{D})] - E_{y|x}[y])$$

Taking the expectation on both sides of the above equation on \mathcal{D} , and first consider the last term of RHS,

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}\Big\{ (f(x;\mathcal{D}) - E_{\mathcal{D}}[f(x;\mathcal{D})]) \Big\} = 0$$
(9)

If one does not understand the above equation, think of E[p - E[p]] = 0, which is similar to the above equation. Note that

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}\left\{ (E_{\mathcal{D}}[f(x;\mathcal{D})] - E_{y|x}[y])^2 \right\} = (bias)^2$$
(10)

and

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}\left\{ (f(x;\mathcal{D}) - E_{\mathcal{D}}[f(x;\mathcal{D})])^2 \right\} = Variance \tag{11}$$

finally, we reach the end,

$$Expected\ loss = (Bias)^2 + Variance + Noise \tag{12}$$

In summary, for understanding Bias, you can consider $E_{y|x}[y]$ is the "underlying standard", Bias measures how far the overall predictive function $f(x, \mathcal{D})$ is away from this "underlying standard". For understanding Variance, variance measures how much the predictive function $f(x, \mathcal{D})$ varies from the "average" prediction function $E_{\mathcal{D}}[f(x; \mathcal{D})]$. For noise, just as said before, it has nothing with predictive function $f(x, \mathcal{D})$, only depends on the data itself.