STATISTICAL LEARNING SYSTEMS LECTURE 1: LINEAR REGRESSION MODELS REVISITED

Jacek Koronacki

Institute of Computer Science, Polish Academy of Sciences

Ph. D. Program 2013/2014







イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

3

We are given n observations, each with p explanatory variables (predictors),

 $(x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \ldots, x_{ip}),$

and one response variable, Y_i ,

 $Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \ldots + \beta_p x_{i,p} + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n,$

where ε_i are i.i.d. random errors with mean 0 and unknown variance σ^2 , and β_0, \ldots, β_p are unknown parameters.







◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三 シのので

In matrix notation,

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon},$$

where $\mathbf{Y}' = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n),$
 $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}' = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_n)$

$$oldsymbol{arepsilon}' = (arepsilon_1, arepsilon_2, \dots, arepsilon_n), \ oldsymbol{eta}' = (eta_0, eta_1, \dots, eta_p) \ {
m and}$$

$$\mathbf{X} = (x_{ij}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_{11} & \dots & x_{1,p} \\ 1 & x_{21} & \dots & x_{2,p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & x_{n1} & \dots & x_{n,p} \end{pmatrix}$$

٠

UNIA EUROPEJSKA

EUROPEJSKI FUNDUSZ SPOŁECZNY

A D > A D > A D > A D >

э





KAPITAŁ LUDZKI

We estimate the unknown $\beta' = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)$ by least squares (LS), i.e., by minimizing the residual sum of squares:

$$RSS(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^{p} x_{ij}\beta_j)^2 = (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta})'(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}).$$

Upon differentiating w.r.t. eta and equating the derivative to zero we get

$$\mathbf{X}'(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}) = 0$$

and assuming that X has full rank, we obtain the unique solution

KAPITAŁ LUDZKI

$$\mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{y}.$$



イロト イポト イヨト イヨト







The project is co-financed by the European Union within the framework of European Social Fund

・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト ・ヨト

For a univariate model with no intercept, we have

$$b = rac{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}
angle}{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}
angle},$$

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}b.$$

If the multiple inputs are orthogonal, then it is easy to see that

$$b_j = rac{<\mathbf{x}_j,\mathbf{y}>}{<\mathbf{x}_j,\mathbf{x}_j>}$$

for each $j = 1, \ldots, p$.

UNIA EUROPEJSKA EUROPEJSKI FUNDUSZ SPOŁECZNY

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

3

Now, if we have a single input, but we have an intercept,

$$b_1 = rac{<\mathbf{x}-ar{x}\mathbf{1},\mathbf{y}>}{<\mathbf{x}-ar{x}\mathbf{1},\mathbf{x}-ar{x}\mathbf{1}>}$$

In turn, if there are multiple inputs which are not orthogonal, as is most often the case, we can orthogonalize them step by step:

- Initialize $\mathbf{z}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{1}$.
- For *j* = 1, 2, . . . , *p*
 - Regress \mathbf{x}_j on $\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{j-1}$ to produce coefficients $\hat{\gamma}_{\ell j} = \langle \mathbf{z}_{\ell}, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle / \langle \mathbf{z}_{\ell}, \mathbf{z}_{\ell} \rangle$, $\ell = 0, \dots, j-1$ and residual $\mathbf{z}_j = \mathbf{x}_j \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \hat{\gamma}_{kj} \mathbf{z}_k$.
- Regress **y** on the residual \mathbf{z}_p to give the estimate b_p .



Let us restate the algorithm (known as the Gram-Schmidt procedure)

- Initialize $\mathbf{z}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{1}$.
- For *j* = 1, 2, . . . , *p*
 - Regress \mathbf{x}_j on $\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{j-1}$ to produce coefficients $\hat{\gamma}_{\ell j} = \langle \mathbf{z}_{\ell}, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle / \langle \mathbf{z}_{\ell}, \mathbf{z}_{\ell} \rangle$, $\ell = 0, \dots, j-1$ and residual $\mathbf{z}_j = \mathbf{x}_j \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} \hat{\gamma}_{kj} \mathbf{z}_k$.
- Regress **y** on the residual \mathbf{z}_p to give the estimate b_p .

to note that each of the \mathbf{x}_j is a linear combination of the \mathbf{z}_k , $k \leq j$, all the \mathbf{z}_j are orthogonal (hence they form a basis for the column space of \mathbf{X} and the LS projection onto this subspace is $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$), and

 $b_p = <{\sf z}_p, {\sf y}>/<{\sf z}_p, {\sf z}_p>$ is indeed the multiple regression coefficient of ${\sf y}$ on ${\sf x}_p.$







By rearranging the \mathbf{x}_j we get that each *j*th multiple regression coefficient is the univariate regression coefficient of \mathbf{y} on the residual after regressing \mathbf{x}_j on $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{j-1}, \mathbf{x}_{j+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p$.

We can write the 2nd step of the Gram-Schmidt procedure in matrix form:

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{\Gamma},$$

where **Z** has as columns the z_j and Γ is the upper triangular matrix with entries $\hat{\gamma}_{kj}$. Introducing the diagonal matrix $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}\{||\mathbf{z}_0||, \dots, ||\mathbf{z}_p||\}$, we get

$$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R},$$

the so-called *QR* decomposition of **X** with an $n \times (p+1)$ orthogonal **Q** and $(p+1) \times (p+1)$ upper triangular **R**.







イロト イボト イヨト イヨト

Linear regression models revisited - subset selection

Often needed to improve prediction accuracy (overfitting may occur, resulting in poor prediction accuracy by estimators which have low bias but large variance) and/or interpretation (given a large number of predictors we would like to determine a smaller subset which exhibits the strongest effect on the response).

- Best-subset selection (choose the smallest model that minimizes an estimate of the expected prediction error)
- Forward-stepwise selection (start with the intercept, then add the predictor that most improves the fit; n > p)
- Backward-stepwise selection (delete the predictor that has the least impact on the fit)
- Forwad-stagewise regression (center predictors and start with the intercept equal to \bar{y} ; then identify the predictor most correlated with the current residual; n > p).







Another way out of trouble is via regularization.

Ridge regression (henceforth we assume that the inputs are centered and $\hat{\beta}_0$ is estimated by \bar{y}):

$$\hat{\beta}^{\text{RIDGE}} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^{p} x_{ij}\beta_j)^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_j^2$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a parameter, and $\lambda \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_{j}^{2}$ is the penalty for large magnitude of coefficients. The above is equivalent to (and is the Lagrangian for) the minimization of

$$\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^{p}x_{ij}\beta_j)^2\}$$

subject to

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_j^2 \leqslant s \quad \text{for some } s = s(\lambda).$$







Writing the penalized residual sum of squares in matrix form,

$$(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta})' (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \lambda \boldsymbol{\beta}' \boldsymbol{\beta}$$

one easily obtains

$$\hat{\beta}^{\text{RIDGE}} = (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X} + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{Y}.$$

- That is, we add λ to the diagonal of **X'X** before inverting it (what helps when **X'X** is almost singular i.e. explanatory variables are approx. linearly dependent (collinear).

- One needs to standardize explanatory variables before applying ridge regression.

- Parameter λ is usually chosen by cross-validation.







ヘロン 人間 とくほと くほど

The ridge approach makes $\hat{y} = (\hat{\beta}^{\text{RIDGE}})' \mathbf{x}$ more sensitive to directions in which the \mathbf{x}_i are varying most.

To see this recall that by the singular value decomposition (SVD) any $n \times p$ matrix **X** can be written as

$\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{V}'$

where **U** is an $n \times p$ column-orthogonal matrix and **V** is a $p \times p$ orthogonal matrix, with the columns of **U** spanning the column space of **X**, and the columns of **V** spanning the row space; $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}\{d_1, \dots, d_p\}, d_1 \ge d_2 \ge \dots \ge d_p$.







・ロト ・ 一下・ ・ ヨト・

3

Now, we can write the LS fitted vector as

$$\mathbf{X}\mathbf{b}=\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}'\mathbf{y},$$

and the ridge solutions as

$$\mathbf{X}\hat{\beta}^{\mathrm{RIDGE}} = \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X} + \lambda\mathbf{I})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{D}^2 + \lambda\mathbf{I})^{-1}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{U}'\mathbf{y}$$
 and, finally,

$$\mathbf{X}\hat{eta}^{\mathrm{RIDGE}} = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \mathbf{u}_{j} \frac{d_{j}^{2}}{d_{j}^{2} + \lambda} \mathbf{u}_{j}' \mathbf{y}.$$

Regarding shrinking, the question remains what it means that a d_j^2 is small.



The project is co-financed by the European Union within the framework of European Social Fund

・ロト ・ 同ト ・ ヨト ・ ヨト

3

For the centered ${\bf X},$ the sample covariance matrix is ${\bf S}={\bf X}'{\bf X}/n.$ We have

$$\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{D}^2\mathbf{V}'$$

which is the eigendecomposition of $\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}$.

It is well known (we shall come back to it in detail later) that the columns of **V**, \mathbf{v}_j are the so-called principal components of **X** and, more importantly, that the 1st principal component direction \mathbf{v}_1 has the property that $\mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{v}_1$ has the largest sample variance amongst all normalized linear combinations of the columns of **X**, the 2nd principal component direction \mathbf{v}_2 has the property that $\mathbf{z}_2 = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{v}_2$ has largest sample variance amongst all normalized linear combinations of the columns of the columns of the columns of **X** which are orthogonal to the 1st principal component direction, etc.







・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ 日 ・

э

It is easily seen that $\mathbf{z}_j = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{v}_j = \mathbf{u}_j d_j$ and that the sample variance of \mathbf{z}_j is equal to d_j^2/n .

Hence the small singular values d_j correspond to directions in the column space of **X** which have small variance, and ridge regression shrinks these directions the most. (Recall that

$$\mathbf{X}\hat{\beta}^{\text{RIDGE}} = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \mathbf{u}_{j} \frac{d_{j}^{2}}{d_{j}^{2} + \lambda} \mathbf{u}_{j}' \mathbf{y}.)$$

We call

$$\operatorname{tr}[\boldsymbol{\mathsf{X}}(\boldsymbol{\mathsf{X}}'\boldsymbol{\mathsf{X}}+\lambda\boldsymbol{\mathsf{I}})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mathsf{X}}'] = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \frac{d_{j}^{2}}{d_{j}^{2}+\lambda}$$

the effective degrees of freedom of the ridge regression fit.



・ロト ・ 同ト ・ ヨト ・ ヨト

э.

The Lasso:

$$\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^{p}x_{ij}\beta_j)^2\}$$

 $\sum_{j=1}^{r} |\beta_j| \leqslant t.$

subject to

The Lasso, in contrast to ridge regression, eliminates for small t some variables from the model. It can thus be used as a feature selection method.

It happens that the least angle regression (LAR), to be discussed in a moment, is not only intimately connected with the lasso, but also provides an efficient algorithm for computing the entire lasso path (for all values of t).







However, before introducing LAR, let us present a simple comparison of the following approaches to restricting the linear regression model: subset selection, ridge regression and the lasso. In the discussion below we confine ourselves to the case of an orthonormal columns of X:

- For the best subset selection (of size *M*), the LS $\hat{\beta}_j$ are transformed to $\hat{\beta}_j \cdot I(|\hat{\beta}_j| \ge |\hat{\beta}_{(M)}|)$
- For ridge regression, they are transformed to $\hat{eta}_j/(1+\lambda)$
- And for the lasso, to $\operatorname{sign}(\hat{\beta}_j)(|\hat{\beta}_j| \lambda)_+$.

Introducing the elastic-net penalty

$$\lambda \sum_{j=1}^{p} (\alpha \beta_j^2 + (1-\alpha)|\beta_j|)$$

with, say, $\alpha = 0.2$, leads to some compromise between ridge and lasso.

Least Angle Regression (LAR):

- Standardize the predictors. Start with the residual $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{y} \bar{\mathbf{y}}$, $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \cdots = \beta_p = \mathbf{0}$.
- Find the predictor \mathbf{x}_j most correlated with \mathbf{r} .
- Move β_j from 0 towards its LS coefficient < x_j, r >, until some other competitor x_k has as much correlation with the current residual as does x_j.
- Move β_j and β_k in the direction defined by their joint LS coefficient of the current residual on x_j, x_k, until some other x_ℓ has as much correlation with the current residual.
- Continue until all p predictors have been entered. After min(n-1, p) steps, we arrive at the full LS solution.







◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ ミ ▶ ◆ ミ ▶ ● ○ ○ ○ ○

Suppose \mathcal{A}_k is the active set of predictors at the beginning of the *k*th step, and let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{A}_k}$ be the coefficient vector for these predictors. If $\mathbf{r}_k = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{A}_k} \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{A}_k}$ is the current residual, then the direction for this step is

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}_{k} = (\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{A}_{k}}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{A}_{k}})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{A}_{k}}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{r}_{k}.$$

The coefficient profile then evolves as $\beta_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\alpha) = \beta_{\mathcal{A}_k} + \alpha \delta_k$. It can be shown that this keeps the correlations tied and decreasing.

If the fit vector at the beginning of this step is $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_k$, then it evolves as

$$\hat{\mathbf{f}}_k(\alpha) = \hat{\mathbf{f}}_k + \alpha \mathbf{u}_k,$$

where $\mathbf{u}_k = \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{A}_k} \boldsymbol{\delta}_k$ is the new fit direction (hence the name of the method).





・ロト ・ 一下・ ・ ヨト・

э

It has been observed that the lasso and LAR coefficient profiles are almost identical until for the first time one coefficient passes back through zero.

Thus, the following modification (the so-called lasso modification) has been proposed to the LAR algorithm, which gives the entire lasso path (both the lasso and LAR coefficient profiles are piecewise linear and for the latter the exact step length can be calculated at the beginning of each step):

LAR(lasso) modification:

If a non-zero coefficient hits zero, drop its variable from the active set of variables and recompute the current joint LS direction.







・ロト ・ 同 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

Heuristics behind the similarity between the lasso and the LAR:

Suppose A is the active set of variables for the LAR, tied in their absolute inner-product with the current residuals $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta$:

$$\mathbf{x}_j'(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{eta}) = \gamma \cdot \mathbf{s}_j$$

for each $j \in A$, where $s_j \in \{-1, 1\}$. Note that $|\mathbf{x}'_k(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta)| \leq \gamma$ for each $k \notin A$. Now consider the lasso criterion,

$$R(\boldsymbol{eta}) = rac{1}{2}||\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{eta}||_2^2 + \lambda||\boldsymbol{eta}||_1.$$

Let \mathcal{B} be the active set of variables in the solution for a given λ . The stationarity conditions for $R(\beta)$ give

$$\mathbf{x}'_j(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \lambda \cdot \operatorname{sign}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j)$$

for each $j \in B$, in full analogy to the LAR solution as long as the sings match.







Before we present another LAR-like algorithm, let us discuss the Incremental Forward Stagewise Regression algorithm (FS_{ε}):

- Standardize all the predictors and start with residual $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{y} \bar{\mathbf{y}}$ and $\beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_p = 0$.
- Find the predictor **x**_i most correlated with **r**.
- Update $\beta_j \leftarrow \beta_j + \delta_j$, where $\delta_j = \varepsilon \cdot \operatorname{sign}[\langle \mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{r} \rangle]$ and ε is a small step size, and set $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbf{r} \delta_j \mathbf{x}_j$.
- Repeat steps 2 and 3, until the residuals are uncorrelated with all the predictors.

Let $\varepsilon \to 0$ to obtain the Infinitesimal Forward Stagewise Regression (FS₀).







The following modification of the LAR algorithm implements FS_0 :

• Find the new direction by solving the constrained LS problem

 $\min_{\mathbf{b}} ||\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{b}||_2^2$

subject to $b_j s_j \ge 0$ for all $j \in A$, where s_j is the sign of $\langle \mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{r} \rangle$.

That is, the modification consists in replacing the LS fit by a non-negative LS fit. (Recall that steps 4 and 5 of the original LAR read: 4. move β_j and β_k in the direction defined by their joint LS coefficient of the current residual on $\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_k$, until some other \mathbf{x}_ℓ has as much correlation with the current residual. 5. Continue until all p predictors have been entered.)



イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト 二日

It can be shown that if the LAR profiles are monotone, then all three methods - LAR, lasso, and $\rm FS_0$ - give identical profiles. If the profiles are not monotone but do not cross the zero axis, then LAR and lasso are identical.



