## Introduction to Machine Learning

Extending Linear Regression

#### Varun Chandola

Computer Science & Engineering State University of New York at Buffalo Buffalo, NY, USA chandola@buffalo.edu





University at Buffalo Department of Computer Science and Engineering School of Engering and Applied Sciences

Chandola@UB

E 474/574 1/

4 -

Shortcomings of Linear Models

Handling Non-linear Relationships Handling Overfitting via Regularization Elastic Net Regularization

Handling Outliers in Regression

1. Susceptible to outliers

Chandola@UR

- 2. Too simplistic Underfitting
- 3. No way to control overfitting
- 4. Unstable in presence of correlated input attributes
- 5. Gets "confused" by unnecessary attributes

- ► They are linear!!
- Real-world is usually non-linear
- How do learn non-linear fits or non-linear decision boundaries?
  - Basis function expansion
  - Kernel methods (will discuss this later)

4 / 14

• Replace **x** with non-linear functions  $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ 

$$y = \mathbf{w}^{\top} \phi(\mathbf{x})$$

- Model is still linear in w
- Also known as basis function expansion

### Example

$$\phi(x) = [1, x, x^2, \dots, x^p]$$

Increasing p results in more complex fits

- Always choose the simpler explanation
- Keep things simple
- Pluralitas non est ponenda sine neccesitate
- A general problem-solving philosophy

6 / 14

#### Use simpler models (linear instead of polynomial)

Might have poor results (underfitting)

Use regularized complex models

$$\widehat{\mathbf{\Theta}} = rgmin_{\mathbf{\Theta}} J(\mathbf{\Theta}) + \lambda R(\mathbf{\Theta}) \ \mathbf{\Theta}$$

 $\triangleright$  R() corresponds to the penalty paid for complexity of the model

## Ridge Regression

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}} = \mathop{\mathrm{arg\,min}}_{\mathbf{w}} J(\mathbf{w}) + rac{1}{2} \lambda \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2$$

#### Helps in reducing impact of correlated inputs

•  $\|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2$  is the square of the  $l_2$  norm of the vector  $\mathbf{w}$ :

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_{2}^{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{D} w_{i}^{2}$$

### Exact Loss Function

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{w}) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (y_i - \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_i)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda ||\mathbf{w}||_2^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \mathbf{w})^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda ||\mathbf{w}||_2^2 \end{split}$$

### Ridge Estimate of **w**

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\textit{Ridge}} = (\mathbf{X}^{ op} \mathbf{X} + \lambda \mathbf{I}_D)^{-1} \mathbf{X}^{ op} \mathbf{y}$$

▶  $I_D$  is a  $(D \times D)$  identity matrix.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < ○ < ○</li>
 CSE 474/574 9 / 14

## Using Gradient Descent with Ridge Regression

Very similar to OLE

Minimize the squared loss using Gradient Descent

$$J(\mathbf{w}) = rac{1}{2}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{w})^{ op}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}) + rac{1}{2}\lambda||\mathbf{w}||_2^2$$

$$\nabla J(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{d}{d\mathbf{w}} J(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d\mathbf{w}} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{w})^{\top} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda \frac{d}{d\mathbf{w}} ||\mathbf{w}||_{2}^{2}$$
$$= \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{y} + \lambda \mathbf{w}$$

Using the above result, one can perform repeated updates of the weights:

$$\mathbf{w} := \mathbf{w} - \eta \nabla J(\mathbf{w})$$

 < □ > < □ > < □ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ </td>
 > < ○ </td>

 CSE 474/574
 10 / 14

## Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator - LASSO

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\mathbf{w}} J(\mathbf{w}) + \lambda |\mathbf{w}|$$

- Helps in feature selection favors sparse solutions
- Optimization is not as straightforward as in Ridge regression
  - Gradient not defined for  $w_i = 0, \forall i$

< □ ▶	・日本 ・日本	- 4 ≣ ▶	- 2	200
CSE 474/574	11 / 14			

# LASSO vs. Ridge

- Both control overfitting
- Ridge helps reduce impact of correlated inputs, LASSO helps in feature selection
- Rule of thumb
  - If data has many features but only few are potentially useful, use LASSO
  - If data has potentially many correlated features, use Ridge

# LASSO vs. Ridge

- Both control overfitting
- Ridge helps reduce impact of correlated inputs, LASSO helps in feature selection
- Rule of thumb
  - If data has many features but only few are potentially useful, use LASSO
  - If data has potentially many correlated features, use Ridge

#### Elastic Net Regularization

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\mathbf{w}} J(\mathbf{w}) + \lambda_1 |\mathbf{w}| + \lambda_2 ||\mathbf{w}||_2^2$$

- The best of both worlds
- Again, optimizing for w is not straightforward

- Linear regression training gets impacted by the presence of outliers
- The square term in loss function is the culprit
- ▶ How to handle this (*Robust Regression*)?
  - Least absolute deviations instead of least squares

$$J(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} |y_i - \mathbf{w}^{ op} \mathbf{x}|$$

< □ ▶	▲ IPI ► < E ►	<≣>	三 つく	C
CSE 474/574	13 / 14			

## References