## Introduction to Machine Learning, Fall 2023

## Homework 1

(Due Thursday, Oct. 26 at 11:59pm (CST))

## October 25, 2023

- 1. [10 points] [Math review] Suppose  $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$  are random samples from a random variable X:
  - (a) Prove that the covariance of **X** is a semi positive definite matrix. [3 points]
  - (b) Assuming  $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$  which is a multivariate normal distribution, derive the the log-likelihood  $l(\mu, \Sigma)$ and MLE of  $\mu$  [4 points]
  - (c) Suppose  $\hat{\theta}$  is an unbiased estimator of  $\theta$  and  $Var(\hat{\theta}) > 0$ . Prove that  $(\hat{\theta})^2$  is not an unbiased estimator of  $\theta^2$ . [3 points]
  - (a)  $\Sigma = E[(\mathbf{X} \mu)(\mathbf{X} \mu)^T]$

$$y^T \mathbf{\Sigma} y = E[y^T (\mathbf{X} - \mu)(\mathbf{X} - \mu)^T y] = E[((\mathbf{X} - \mu)^T y)^T ((\mathbf{X} - \mu)^T y)] = E(\|(\mathbf{X} - \mu)^T y\|_2^2).$$
 since  $\|(\mathbf{X} - \mu)^T y\|_2^2 \ge 0$ , so  $E(\|(\mathbf{X} - \mu)^T y\|_2^2) \ge 0$ 

since 
$$\|(\mathbf{X} - \mu)^T y\|_2^2 \ge 0$$
, so  $E(\|(\mathbf{X} - \mu)^T y\|_2^2) \ge 0$ 

so  $\forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n, y^T \Sigma y \geq 0$ 

So  $\Sigma$  is a semi positive definite matrix.

(b) From what we have learned in class, the PDF of the multivariate normal distribution  $\mathbf{X}_i \sim N(\mu, \Sigma)$  is that  $Pr(\mathbf{X}_i; \mu, \mathbf{\Sigma}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{p}{2}} |\mathbf{\Sigma}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} exp(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{X}_i - \mu)^T \mathbf{\Sigma}(\mathbf{X}_i - \mu))$ , suppose that the dimension of  $\mathbf{X}$  is p. Since the sampling are independent, so the likelihood function is:

$$Pr(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n; \mu, \Sigma) = \prod_{i=1}^n Pr(\mathbf{X}_i; \mu, \Sigma)$$

$$Pr(\mathbf{X}_{1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{n}; \mu, \mathbf{\Sigma}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} Pr(\mathbf{X}_{i}; \mu, \mathbf{\Sigma})$$
Then the log-likelihood function is:
$$l(\mu, \mathbf{\Sigma}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log(\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{p}{2}} |\mathbf{\Sigma}|^{\frac{1}{2}}} exp(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{X}_{i} - \mu)^{T} \mathbf{\Sigma}(\mathbf{X}_{i} - \mu)))$$

$$= n \cdot \log(\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{p}{2}} |\mathbf{\Sigma}|^{\frac{1}{2}}}) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{X}_{i} - \mu)^{T} \mathbf{\Sigma}(\mathbf{X}_{i} - \mu)$$

And the MLE of 
$$\mu$$
 is:  $\hat{\mu} = \underset{\mu}{\operatorname{argmax}} Pr(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n; \mu, \Sigma) = \underset{\mu}{\operatorname{argmax}} l(\mu, \Sigma)$ 

Since  $l(\mu, \Sigma)$  is a concave function, so we can get the optimal solution by setting the derivative of  $l(\mu, \Sigma)$  to

0.
$$\frac{\partial l(\mu, \mathbf{\Sigma})}{\partial \mu} = \frac{\partial b \cdot \log(\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} |\mathbf{\Sigma}|^{\frac{1}{2}}})}{\partial \mu} - \frac{\partial \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{X}_{i} - \mu)^{T} \mathbf{\Sigma} (\mathbf{X}_{i} - \mu)}{\partial \mu}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} - \frac{\partial \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{X}_{i} - \mu)^{T} \mathbf{\Sigma} (\mathbf{X}_{i} - \mu)}{\partial \mu}$$

Since  $\Sigma$  is the covariance matrix, so  $\Sigma$  is a symmetric matrix, i.e.  $\Sigma = \Sigma^T$ .

So 
$$(\Sigma^{-1})^T = (\Sigma^T)^{-1} = \Sigma^{-1}$$
.

i.e.  $\Sigma$  is also a symmetric matrix.

So 
$$\frac{\partial l(\mu, \mathbf{\Sigma})}{\partial \mu} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} -\frac{\partial \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{X}_{i} - \mu)^{T} \mathbf{\Sigma} (\mathbf{X}_{i} - \mu)}{\partial \mu}$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} -\frac{\partial \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{X}_{i} - \mu)^{T} \mathbf{\Sigma} (\mathbf{X}_{i} - \mu)}{\partial (\mathbf{X}_{i} - \mu)} \frac{\partial (\mathbf{X}_{i} - \mu)}{\partial \mu}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} -\frac{1}{2} (2\Sigma(\mathbf{X} - \mu))(-1)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Sigma(\mathbf{X}_{i} - \mu)$$

$$= \Sigma(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{X}_{i} - n\mu)$$
So  $\frac{\partial l(\mu, \Sigma)}{\partial \mu} = 0 \Rightarrow \Sigma(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{X}_{i} - n\mu) = 0 \Rightarrow \hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{X}_{i}$ 

So above all, the log-likelihood function is 
$$l(\mu, \mathbf{\Sigma}) = n \cdot \log(\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{p}{2}}|\mathbf{\Sigma}|^{\frac{1}{2}}}) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{X}_i - \mu)^T \mathbf{\Sigma}(\mathbf{X}_i - \mu)$$
  
And the MLE of  $\mu$  is  $\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{X}_i$ 

(c)

2. [10 points] Consider real-valued variables X and Y, in which Y is generated conditional on X according to

$$Y = aX + b + \epsilon$$
, where  $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ .

Here  $\epsilon$  is an independent variable, called a noise term, which is drawn from a Gaussian distribution with mean 0, and variance  $\sigma^2$ . This is a single variable linear regression model, where a is the only weight parameter and b denotes the intercept. The conditional probability of Y has a distribution  $p(Y|X,a,b) \sim \mathcal{N}(aX+b,\sigma^2)$ , so it can be written as:

$$p(Y|X,a,b) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}(Y - aX - b)^2\right).$$

- (a) Assume we have a training dataset of n i.i.d. pairs  $(x_i, y_i)$ , i = 1, 2, ..., n, and the likelihood function is defined by  $L(a, b) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p(y_i|x_i, a, b)$ . Please write the Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) problem for estimating a and b. [3 points]
- (b) Estimate the optimal solution of a and b by solving the MLE problem in (a). [4 points]
- (c) Based on the result in (b), argue that the learned linear model f(X) = aX + b, always passes through the point  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ , where  $\bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i$  and  $\bar{y} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i$  denote the sample means. [3 points]
- (a)
- (b)
- (c)

- 3. [10 points] [Regression and Classification]
  - (a) When we talk about linear regression, what does 'linear' regard to? [2 points]
  - (b) Assume that there are n given training examples  $\{(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \cdots, (x_n, y_n)\}$ , where each input data point  $x_i$  has m real valued features. When m > n, the linear regression model is equivalent to solving an under-determined system of linear equations  $y = X\beta$ . One popular way to estimate  $\beta$  is to consider the so-called ridge regression:

$$\underset{\beta}{\operatorname{argmin}} ||\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta||_2^2 + \lambda ||\beta||_2^2$$

for some  $\lambda > 0$ . This is also known as Tikhonov regularization.

Show that the optimal solution  $\beta_*$  to the above optimization problem is given by

$$\beta_* = (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}$$

Hint: You need to prove that given  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} + \lambda \mathbf{I}$  is invertible. [5 points]

(c) Is the given data set linear separable? If yes, construct a linear hypothesis function to separate the given data set. If no, explain the reason. [3 points]

- (a) Linear
- (b) As we have learned in linear algebra, we know that the matrix  $X^TX$  must be similar and diagonalizable. i.e. there must exist a matrix P and a diagonal matrix  $\Lambda$  such that  $X^TX = P\Lambda P^{-1}$ .

Also 
$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$$
, we have  $x^T(\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X})x = (\mathbf{X}x)^T(\mathbf{X}x) = \|\mathbf{X}x\|_2^2 \ge 0$ .

So  $X^TX$  is positive semi-definite.

So all eigenvalues of  $X^TX$  are non-negative.

i.e. the diagonal matrix  $\Lambda$ 's elements are all positive.

And since  $\lambda > 0$ , so  $\lambda I$ 's all elements are all also non-negative, and  $\lambda I$  is also a diagonal matrix.

So 
$$X^TX + \lambda I = P\Lambda P^{-1} + \lambda PIP^{-1} = P(\Lambda + \lambda I)P^{-1}$$
.

Since  $\Lambda, \lambda I$  are all diagonal matrix, so  $\Lambda + \lambda I$  is also a diagonal matrix.

And all elements in  $\Lambda + \lambda I$  are all positive, this is because in Lambda, elements are non-nagetiva, in  $\lambda I$ , all elements are positive. So  $\Lambda + \lambda I$  is positive defined.

Since  $X^TX + \lambda I = P(\Lambda + \lambda I)P^{-1}$ , from the knowledge of similarity and diagonalizable, we could know that  $X^TX + \lambda I$  is also positive defined.

So  $X^TX + \lambda I$  is invertible.

And let  $f(\beta) = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\beta\|_2^2 = (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta)^T (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta) + \lambda \beta^T \beta = \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} - \beta^T \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{X}\beta + \beta^T \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}\beta + \lambda \beta^T \beta$ Since  $f(\beta)$  is convex, so we just need to set the derivative of  $f(\beta)$  to 0 to get the optimal solution.

$$\frac{\partial f(\beta)}{\partial \beta} = 2(-\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} \beta + \lambda \beta)$$

$$\frac{\frac{\partial f(\beta)}{\partial \beta}}{\frac{\partial f}{\partial \beta}} = 2(-\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X}\beta + \lambda\beta)$$
$$\frac{\frac{\partial f(\beta)}{\partial \beta}}{\frac{\partial f}{\partial \beta}} = 0 \Rightarrow (\mathbf{X}^{\mathbf{X}} + \lambda I)\beta = \mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{y} \Rightarrow \beta = (\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X} + \lambda I)^{-1}\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{y}$$

Since we have proved that  $X^TX + \lambda I$  is invertible, so  $(\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X} + \lambda I)^{-1}$  exists. So  $\beta * = (\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X} + \lambda I)^{-1}\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{y}$ 

So above all, the optimal solution  $\beta * = (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} + \lambda I)^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}$ .

(c)