Statistical Learning

Szu-Chi Chung

Department of Applied Mathematics, National Sun Yat-sen University

What is Statistical Learning?

y=某產品在200家商店的銷售量



- Shown are *Sales* vs. *TV*, *Radio* and *Newspaper*, with a blue linear-regression line fit separately to each.
- Can we predict Sales using these three? Perhaps we can do better using a model $Sales \approx f(TV, Radio, Newspaper)$

Notation

- Here, *Sales* is a response, or dependent variable, or target that we wish to predict. We generically refer to the response as Y.
- *TV* is a feature, or, independent variable, or input, or predictor; we name it X_1. Likewise, name *Radio* as X_2, and so on.
  - We can refer to the input vector collectively as

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} X_1 \\ X_2 \\ X_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

- Now, we write our model as

$$Y = f(X) + \epsilon$$

where ϵ captures measurement errors and other discrepancies.

Notation

- Vectors are represented as a column vector

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} X_1 \\ X_2 \\ X_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

- We will use n to represent the number of distinct data points or observations
- We will let p denote the number of variables that are available for predictions
  - A general design matrix or input matrix can be written as an $n \times p$ matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & \cdots & x_{1p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{n1} & \cdots & x_{np} \end{pmatrix}$$

  - Y is usually a scalar in our example; if we have n observations, it can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_n \end{pmatrix}$$

What is $f(X)$ good for?

- With a good f, we can make predictions of Y at new points $X = x$.
  - We can understand which components of $X = (X_1, X_1, \ldots, X_p)$ are important in explaining Y, and which are irrelevant. e.g., *Seniority* and *Years of Education* have a big impact on *Income*, but *Marital Status* typically does not.
  - Depending on the complexity of f, we may be able to understand how each component X_j of X affects Y.
- In essence, statistical learning refers to a set of approaches for estimating f.





Why estimating f

- Prediction: In many situations, a set of inputs X are readily available, but the output Y cannot be easily obtained; we can then use $\hat{f}$ as follows

$$\hat{Y} = \hat{f}(X)$$

  - In this setting, $\hat{f}(X)$ is often treated as a black box
  - There will be reducible and irreducible error
    - Reducible error can be potentially improved by using the most appropriate statistical learning technique to estimate f
    - Irreducible error may contain unmeasured variables that are useful in predicting Y: since we don't measure them, f cannot use them for its prediction. It may also contain unmeasurable variation
  - We will focus on the part of the reducible error

Why estimating f

- Inference: We are often interested in understanding the association between Y and $X_1, \ldots, X_P$. In this situation, we wish to estimate f, but our goal is not necessarily to make predictions for Y.
  - Which predictors are associated with the response?
  - What is the relationship between the response and each predictor?
  - Can the relationship between Y and each predictor be adequately summarized using a linear equation, or is the relationship more complicated?
- We will see a number of examples that fall into the prediction setting, the inference setting, or a combination of the two.

How to estimating f

- g is the distribution of data which is unknown
  - We have training set $\{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)\}$



1. Choose a model f_θ
   - Parametric
     - Explicit assumption
     - Estimating a fix set of parameters
   - Non-parametric
     - No explicit assumption
     - Need a large number of observations
2. Choose a quality measure (objective function) for fitting
   - Mean square error (Maximum likelihood)…
3. Optimization (fitting) to chose best θ
   - Calculus to find close form solution, gradient descent, expectation-maximization…

Supervised vs Unsupervised learning

- Supervised Learning problem
  - In the regression problem, Y is quantitative (e.g., price, blood pressure).
  - In the classification problem, Y takes values in a finite, unordered set (survived/died, digit 0-9, cancer class of tissue sample).
  - We have training data $(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)$. These are observations (examples, instances) of these measurements.
- Unsupervised Learning problem
  - No outcome variable, just a set of predictors (features) measured on a set of samples.
  - Objective is fuzzier - find groups of samples that behave similarly, find features that behave similarly, find linear combinations of features with the most variation.
- Semi-supervised learning problem
  - Only for m of the observations ($m < n$), we have the response.



- Is there an ideal $f(X)$? In particular, what is a good value for $f(X)$ at any selected value of X, say $X = 4$? There can be many Y values at $X = 4$. A good value is

$$f(4) = E(Y|X = 4)$$

  - $E(Y|X = 4)$ means expected value (average) of Y given $X = 4$. This ideal $f(x) = E(Y|X = x)$ is called the regression function.

The regression function $f(x)$

- Also defined for vector X; e.g.

$$f(x) = f(x1, x2, x3) = E(Y \,|X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2, X_3 = x_3)$$

  - The ideal or optimal predictor of Y with regard to mean-squared prediction error: $f(x) = E(Y|X = x)$ is the function that minimizes $E[(Y - f(X))^2|X = x]$ over all functions f at all points $X = x$.
  - $\epsilon = Y - f(x)$ is the irreducible error — i.e. even if we knew $f(x)$, we would still make errors in prediction, since at each $X = x$ there is typically a distribution of possible Y values.

- For any estimate $\hat{f}(x)$ of $f(x)$, we have

$$E\left[\left(Y - f(x)\right)^2 \middle| X = x\right] = [\hat{f}(x) - f(x)]^2 + Var(\epsilon)$$

How to estimate f

- Typically, we have few if any data points with $X = 4$ exactly.
  - So we cannot compute $E(Y|X = x)$!
  - Relax the definition and let

$$\hat{f}(x) = Ave(Y|X \in N(x))$$

where $N(x)$ is some neighborhood of x.



The curse of dimensionality

- Nearest neighbor averaging can be pretty good for small p i.e. $p \leq 4$ and large n.
  - We will discuss smoother versions, such as kernel and spline smoothing later in the course.
- Nearest neighbor methods can be lousy when p is large. Reason: the curse of dimensionality. Nearest neighbors tend to be far away in high dimensions.
  - We need to get a reasonable fraction of the n values of y_i to average to bring the variance down — e.g., 10%.
  - A 10% neighborhood in high dimensions need no longer be local, so we lose the spirit of estimating $E(Y|X = x)$ by local averaging.

The curse of dimensionality





The curse of dimensionality



https://www.oreilly.com/library/view/hands-on-machine-learning/9781492032632/

p	1	2	3	4	5	6
(a) Ball with radius R	2R	πR^2	$\frac{4}{3}\pi R^3$	$\frac{\pi^2}{2}R^4$	$\frac{8\pi^2}{15}R^5$	$\frac{\pi^3}{6}R^6$
(b) Hypercube with volume 2^p	2	4	8	16	32	64
$r = (a)/(b)$	R	$\frac{\pi R^2}{4}$	$\frac{\pi R^3}{6}$	$\frac{\pi^2 R^4}{32}$	$\frac{\pi^2 R^5}{60}$	$\frac{\pi^3 R^6}{384}$

$S_p = \frac{\pi^{\frac{p}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{p}{2}+1)}R^p$, it turns out that if we ant to cover a fraction of r of the hypercube, we will need a ball with radius $\frac{2}{\pi^{\frac{1}{2}}}[r\Gamma(\frac{p}{2}+1)]^{\frac{1}{p}}$

See chapter 2 of Foundations of Data Science

Parametric and structured models

- The linear model is an important example of a parametric model:

$$f_L(X) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \cdots + \beta_p X_p$$

  - A linear model is specified in terms of $p + 1$ parameters $\beta_0, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_p$
  - We estimate the parameters by fitting the model to training data.
  - Although it is almost never correct, a linear model often serves as a good and interpretable approximation to the unknown true function $f(X)$.

- A linear model $f_L(X) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X$ gives a reasonable fit here



- A quadratic model $f_Q(X) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \beta_2 X^2$ fits slightly better





- Simulated example. Red points are simulated values for income from the model

$$income = f(education, seniority) + \epsilon$$

f is the blue surface.



- Linear regression model fit to the simulated data

$$\hat{f}_L(education, seniority) = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 \times education + \hat{\beta}_2 \times seniority$$



- More flexible regression model $\hat{f}_s(education, seniority)$ fit to the simulated data. Here we use a technique called a thin-plate spline to fit a flexible surface. We control the roughness of the fit (chapter 7).



- Even more flexible spline regression model $\hat{f}_s(education, seniority)$ fit to the simulated data. Here the fitted model makes no errors on the training data! Also known as overfitting.

Some trade-offs

- Prediction accuracy versus interpretability
  - Linear models are easy to interpret; thin-plate splines are not.
- Good fit versus over-fit or under-fit
  - How do we know when the fit is just right?
- Parsimony versus black-box
  - We often prefer a simpler model involving fewer variables over a black-box predictor involving them all.


Subset Selection
Lasso
Least Squares
Generalized Additive Models
Trees
Bagging, Boosting
Support Vector Machines
Deep Learning
High
Low
Interpretability
Low
High
Flexibility

Assessing Model Accuracy

- Suppose we fit a model $\hat{f}(x)$ to some training data $Tr = \{x_i, y_i\}, i = 1 \ldots n$, and we wish to see how well it performs
  - We could compute the average squared prediction error over Tr:

$$MSE_{Tr} = Ave_{i \in Tr}[y_i - \hat{f}(y_i)]^2$$

- This may be biased toward more overfit models
  - Instead we should, if possible, compute it using fresh test data $Te = \{x_i, y_i\}, i = 1 \ldots m$,

$$MSE_{Te} = Ave_{i \in Te}[y_i - \hat{f}(y_i)]^2$$



- The black curve is truth. Red curve on right is MSE_{Te}, grey curve is MSE_{Tr}. Orange, blue and green curves/squares correspond to fits of different flexibility



- Here the truth is smoother, so the smoother fit and linear model do really well





- Here the truth is wiggly and the noise is low, so the more flexible fits do the best.
- Proof of testing error is usually larger than training error

Bias-Variance Trade-off

- Suppose we have fit a model $\hat{f}(x)$ to some training data Tr, and let (x_0, y_0) be a test observation drawn from the population. If the true model is $Y = f(X) + \epsilon$ (with $f(x) = E(Y|X = x)$), then

$$E\left[\left(y_0 - \hat{f}(x_0)\right)^2\right] = Bias_{Tr}[\hat{f}(x_0, Tr)]^2 + Var_{Tr}\left[\hat{f}(x_0, Tr)\right] + \text{Var}(\epsilon)$$

- The expectation averages over the variability of y_0 as well as the variability in Tr. Note that $Bias_{Tr}\left[\hat{f}(x_0, Tr)\right] = E\left[\hat{f}(x_0, Tr)\right] - f(x_0)$. Typically as the flexibility of $\hat{f}$ increases, its variance increases, and its bias decreases. So choosing the flexibility based on average test error amounts to a bias-variance trade-off.
  - Proof of the decomposition



https://nvsyashwanth.github.io/machinelearningmaster/bias-variance/

Bias-variance trade-off for the three examples



Classification Problems

- Here the response variable Y is qualitative — e.g. email is one of $C = (spam, ham)$ $(ham = good\ email)$, digit class is one of $C = \{0, 1, \ldots, 9\}$. Our goals are to:
  - Build a classifier $C(X)$ that assigns a class label from C to a future unlabeled observation X.
  - What is an optimal classifier.
  - Understand how the flexibility affects the classification.



The orange/blue marks indicate the response Y, either 0 or 1.

- Is there an ideal $C(X)$? Suppose the K elements in C are numbered $1, 2, \ldots, K$. Let

$$p_k(x) = \Pr(Y = k | X = x), k = 1, 2, \ldots, K.$$

  - These are the conditional class probabilities at x; e.g. see little barplot at $x = 5$. Then the Bayes optimal classifier at x is $C(x) = j$ if $p_j(x) = \max\{p_1(x), p_2(x), \ldots, p_k(x)\}$



- Nearest-neighbor averaging can be used as before. It also breaks down as dimension grows. However, the impact on $\hat{C}(x)$ is less than on $\hat{p}_k(x)$, k = 1, . . . , K.

Classification: some details

- Typically we measure the performance of $\hat{C}(x)$ using the misclassification error rate:

$$Err_{Te} = Ave_{i \in Te} I[y_i \neq \hat{C}(x_i)]$$

  - The Bayes classifier (using the true $\hat{p}_k(x)$) has the smallest error (in the population).
  - Support-vector machines build structured models for $C(x)$.
  - We will also build structured models for representing the $p_k(x)$. e.g. Logistic regression, generalized additive models.

Example: K-nearest neighbors in two dimensions



Example: K-nearest neighbors in two dimensions



Example: K-nearest neighbors in two dimensions

KNN: K=1



KNN: K=100



Example: K-nearest neighbors in two dimensions



Appendix

The Bias-variance tradeoff

- $f = f(x), \hat{f} = \hat{f}(x, Tr),\ Var(X) = E(X^2) - E[X]^2$
- $y = f + \epsilon \rightarrow E(y) = E(f) = f$ (f is deterministic, independent of $Tr$and $\hat{f}$ is independent of ϵ)
- $Var[y] = E\left[\left(y - E(y)\right)^2\right] = E[(y - f)^2] = E[\epsilon^2] = Var[\epsilon] + E[\epsilon]^2 = \sigma^2$
- $E\left[\left(y - \hat{f}\right)^2\right] = E\left[\left(f + \epsilon - \hat{f} + E[\hat{f}] - E[\hat{f}]\right)^2\right]$

$= E\left[\left(f - E[\hat{f}]\right)^2\right] + \mathrm{E}[\epsilon^2] + E\left[\left(E[\hat{f}] - \hat{f}\right)^2\right] + 2\mathrm{E}\left[\left(f - E[\hat{f}]\right)\epsilon\right] + 2\mathrm{E}\left[\epsilon\left(E[\hat{f}] - \hat{f}\right)\right]$

$+ 2E\left[\left(E[\hat{f}] - \hat{f}\right)\left(f - E[\hat{f}]\right)\right] = \left(f - E[\hat{f}]\right)^2 + \mathrm{E}[\epsilon^2] + E\left[\left(E[\hat{f}] - \hat{f}\right)^2\right]$

$= Bias[\hat{f}]^2 + Var\left[\hat{f}\right] + \sigma^2$

- $MSE = E_x[Bias_{Tr}[\hat{f}(x, Tr)]^2 + Var_D\left[\hat{f}(x, Tr)\right]] + \sigma^2$ (Taking expectation over x)