

Machine Learning


10-701/15-781, Fall 2011

Overfitting and Model Selection

Eric Xing

Lecture 7, October 3, 2011

Reading:



© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

1

Outline

- Overfitting
 - kNN
 - Regression
- Bias-variance decomposition
- Generalization Theory and Structural Risk Minimization
- The battle against overfitting:

each learning algorithm has some "free knobs" that one can "tune" (i.e., heck) to make the algorithm generalizes better to test data.


But is there a more principled way?

 - Cross validation
 - Regularization
 - Feature selection
 - ...

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

2

Overfitting: kNN




© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

3

Another example:



- Regression




© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011


4

Overfitting, con'd

- The models:




- Test errors:




© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

5


What is a good model?



Low Robustness



Low quality /High Robustness



Robust Model

LEGEND

- Model built
- Known Data
- New Data


© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

6

Bias-variance decomposition



- Now let's look more closely into two sources of errors in an functional approximator:



- Let $h(x) = E[t/x]$ be the **optimal** predictor, and $y(x)$ our actual predictor:

$$E_D[(y(x; D) - h(x))^2] = (E_D[y(x; D)] - h(x))^2 + E_D[(y(x; D) - E_D[y(x; D)])^2]$$

- expected loss = (bias)² + variance + noise

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

7

Four Pillars for SLT



- Consistency (guarantees generalization)
 - Under what conditions will a model be consistent ?
- Model convergence speed (a measure for generalization)
 - How does generalization capacity improve when sample size L grows?
- Generalization capacity control
 - How to control in an efficient way model generalization starting with the only given information we have: our sample data?
- A strategy for good learning algorithms
 - Is there a strategy that guarantees, measures and controls our learning model generalization capacity ?

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011



8

Consistency



A learning process (model) is said to be **consistent** if model error, measured on new data sampled from the same underlying probability laws of our original sample, **converges**, when original sample size increases, towards model error, measured on original sample.

Consistent training?



Vapnik main theorem



- **Q** : Under which conditions will a learning model be consistent?
- **A** : A model will be **consistent** if and only if the function h that defines the model comes from a family of functions H with **finite VC dimension d**
- A finite VC dimension d not only guarantees a generalization capacity (consistency), but to pick h in a family H with finite VC dimension d is the only way to build a model that generalizes.


Model convergence speed (generalization capacity)



- **Q** : What is the **nature** of model error difference between learning data (sample) and test data, for a sample of finite size **m** ?
- **A** : This difference is **no greater** than a **limit** that **only** depends on the **ratio** between VC dimension **d** of model functions family **H** , and sample size **m** , i.e., **d/m**

This statement is a new theorem that belongs to Kolmogorov-Smirnov way for results, i.e., theorems that **do not depend** on data's underlying probability law.

Model convergence speed



© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

13

How to control model generalization capacity

Risk Expectation = Empirical Risk + Confidence Interval

- To minimize Empirical Risk alone will not always give a good generalization capacity: one will want to minimize the sum of Empirical Risk and Confidence Interval
- What is important is **not** the **numerical value** of the Vapnik limit, most often too large to be of any practical use, it is the fact that this limit is a **non decreasing function** of model family function “richness”

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

14

Empirical Risk Minimization



- With probability $1-\delta$, the following inequality is true:

$$\int (y - f(x, w^0))^2 dP(x, y) < \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (y_i - f(x_i, w^0))^2 + \sqrt{\frac{d(\ln(2m/d) + 1) - \ln \delta}{m}}$$

- where w^0 is the parameter w value that minimizes Empirical Risk:

$$E(W) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (y_i - f(x_i, w))^2$$


© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

15

Structural Risk Minimization



- Which hypothesis space should we choose?
- Bias / variance tradeoff



- SRM: choose H to minimize bound on true error!

$$\epsilon(h) \leq \hat{\epsilon}(h) + O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d}{m} \log \frac{m}{d}} - \frac{1}{m} \log \delta\right)$$

unfortunately a somewhat loose bound...

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

16

SRM strategy (1)



- With probability $1 - \delta$,

$$\epsilon(h) \leq \hat{\epsilon}(h) + O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d}{m} \log \frac{m}{d} - \frac{1}{m} \log \delta}\right)$$

- When m/d is small (d too large), second term of equation becomes large
- SRM basic idea for strategy is to minimize simultaneously both terms standing on the right of above majoring equation for $\epsilon(h)$
- To do this, one has to make d a controlled parameter

SRM strategy (2)



- Let us consider a sequence $H_1 < H_2 < \dots < H_n$ of model family functions, with respective growing VC dimensions

$$d_1 < d_2 < \dots < d_n$$

- For each family H_i of our sequence, the inequality


$$\epsilon(h) \leq \hat{\epsilon}(h) + O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d}{m} \log \frac{m}{d} - \frac{1}{m} \log \delta}\right)$$

is valid

- That is, for each subset, we must be able either to compute d , or to get a bound on d itself.
- SRM then consists of finding that subset of functions which minimizes the bound on the actual risk.

SRM strategy (3)

SRM : find i such that expected risk $\varepsilon(h)$ becomes minimum, for a specific $d^*=d_i$, relating to a specific family H_i of our sequence; build model using h from H_i



© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

19

Putting SRM into action: linear models case (1)

- There are many SRM-based strategies to build models:
- In the case of linear models

$$y = \theta^T x + b,$$

one wants to make $\|w\|$ a controlled parameter: let us call H_C the linear model function family satisfying the constraint:

$$\|d\| < C$$

Vapnik Major theorem:

When C decreases, $d(H_C)$ decreases

$$\|x\| < R$$

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

20

Putting SRM into action: linear models case (2)



- To control $\|\theta\|$, one can envision two routes to model:

- Regularization/Ridge Regression, ie min. over w and b

$$RG(\theta, b) = S\{(y_i - \theta |x_i| - b)^2 | i=1, \dots, L\} + \lambda \|\theta\|^2$$

- Support Vector Machines (SVM), ie solve directly an optimization problem (classif. SVM, separable data)

Minimize $\|\theta\|^2$,
with $(y_i = \pm 1)$
and $y_i(\theta |x_i| + b) \geq 1$ for all $i=1, \dots, L$

Regularized Regression




- Recall linear regression: $y = \mathbf{X}^T \theta + \epsilon$


$$\begin{aligned} \theta^* &= \arg \max_{\theta} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}^T \theta)^T (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}^T \theta) \\ &= \arg \max_{\theta} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}^T \theta\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

- Regularized LR:


- L2-regularized LR: $\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}^T \theta\|^2 + \lambda \|\theta\|^2$



- L1-regularized LR: $\theta^* = \arg \max_{\theta} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}^T \theta\|^2 + \lambda \|\theta\|$



Bias-variance tradeoff



- λ is a "regularization" terms in LR, the smaller the λ , is more complex the model (why?)

- Simple (highly regularized) models have low variance but high bias.
- Complex models have low bias but high variance.


- You are inspecting an empirical average over 100 training sets.

- The actual E_D can not be computed

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

23

Bias²+variance vs regularizer



- Bias²+variance predicts (shape of) test error quite well.
- However, bias and variance cannot be computed since it relies on knowing the true distribution of x and t (and hence $h(x) = E[t/x]$).

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

24

The battle against overfitting



© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

25

Model Selection

- Suppose we are trying select among several different models for a learning problem.
- Examples:

1. polynomial regression

$$h(x; \theta) = g(\theta_0 + \theta_1 x + \theta_2 x^2 + \dots + \theta_k x^k)$$

- Model selection: we wish to **automatically** and **objectively** decide if k should be, say, 0, 1, ..., or 10.

2. locally weighted regression,

- Model selection: we want to automatically choose the bandwidth parameter τ .

3. Mixture models and hidden Markov model,

- Model selection: we want to decide the number of hidden states

- The Problem:

- Given model family $F = \{M_1, M_2, \dots, M_I\}$, find $M_i \in F$ s.t.

$$M_i = \arg \max_{M \in F} J(D, M)$$

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

26

1. Cross Validation



- We are given training data D and test data D_{test} , and we would like to fit this data with a model $p_i(x; \theta)$ from the family F (e.g., an LR), which is indexed by i and parameterized by θ .
- K -fold cross-validation (CV)
 - Set aside αN samples of D (where $N = |D|$). This is known as the **held-out data** and will be used to evaluate different values of i .
 - For each candidate model i , fit the optimal hypothesis $p_i(x; \theta^*)$ to the remaining $(1-\alpha)N$ samples in D (i.e., hold i fixed and find the best θ).
 - Evaluate each model $p_i(x; \theta^*)$ on the held-out data using some pre-specified risk function.
 - Repeat the above **K times**, choosing a **different** held-out data set each time, and the scores are averaged for each model $p_i(\cdot)$ over all held-out data set. This gives an estimate of the risk curve of models over different i .
 - For the model with the lowest risk, say $p_{i^*}(\cdot)$, we use all of D to find the parameter values for $p_{i^*}(x; \theta^*)$.


© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

27


Example:



- When $\alpha=1/N$, the algorithm is known as **Leave-One-Out-Cross-Validation (LOOCV)**



$MSELOOCV(M_1)=2.12$



$MSELOOCV(M_2)=0.962$

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

28

Practical issues for CV



- How to decide the values for K and α
 - Commonly used $K = 10$ and $\alpha = 0.1$.
 - when data sets are small relative to the number of models that are being evaluated, we need to decrease α and increase K
 - K needs to be large for the variance to be small enough, but this makes it time-consuming.
- Bias-variance trade-off
 - Small α usually lead to low bias. In principle, $LOOCV$ provides an almost unbiased estimate of the generalization ability of a classifier, especially when the number of the available training samples is severely limited; but it can also have high variance.
 - Large α can reduce variance, but will lead to under-use of data, and causing high-bias.
- One important point is that the test data D_{test} is never used in CV, because doing so would result in overly (indeed dishonest) optimistic accuracy rates during the testing phase.

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

29

2. Regularization



- Maximum-likelihood estimates are not always the best (James and Stein showed a counter example in the early 60's)
- Alternative: we "regularize" the likelihood objective (also known as penalized likelihood, shrinkage, smoothing, etc.), by adding to it a penalty term:

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{shrinkage}} = \arg \max_{\theta} [l(\theta; D) + \lambda \|\theta\|]$$

where $\lambda > 0$ and $\|\theta\|$ might be the L_1 or L_2 norm.

- The choice of norm has an effect
 - using the L_2 norm pulls directly towards the origin,
 - while using the L_1 norm pulls towards the coordinate axes, i.e it tries to set some of the coordinates to 0.
 - This second approach can be useful in a feature-selection setting.

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

30

Recall Bayesian and Frequentist



- Frequentist interpretation of probability
 - Probabilities are objective properties of the real world, and refer to limiting relative frequencies (e.g., number of times I have observed heads). Hence one cannot write $P(\text{Katrina could have been prevented}|D)$, since the event will never repeat.
 - Parameters of models are *fixed, unknown constants*. Hence one cannot write $P(\theta|D)$ since θ does not have a probability distribution. Instead one can only write $P(D|\theta)$.
 - One computes point estimates of parameters using various *estimators*, $\theta^* = f(D)$, which are designed to have various desirable qualities when *averaged over future data* D (assumed to be drawn from the “true” distribution).
- Bayesian interpretation of probability
 - Probability describes degrees of belief, not limiting frequencies.
 - Parameters of models are *hidden variables*, so one can compute $P(\theta|D)$ or $P(f(\theta)|D)$ for some function f .
 - One estimates parameters by computing $P(\theta|D)$ using Bayes rule:

$$p(\theta|D) = \frac{p(D|\theta)p(\theta)}{p(D)}$$

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

31

Bayesian interpretation of regulation



- Regularized Linear Regression
 - Recall that using squared error as the cost function results in the LMS estimate
 - And assume iid data and Gaussian noise, LMS is equivalent to MLE of θ

$$l(\theta) = n \log \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta^T \mathbf{x}_i)^2$$

- Now assume that vector θ follows a normal prior with 0-mean and a diagonal covariance matrix

$$\theta \sim N(0, \tau^2 I)$$

- What is the posterior distribution of θ ?

$$p(\theta|D) \propto p(D, \theta)$$

$$= p(D|\theta)p(\theta) = (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-n/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta^T \mathbf{x}_i)^2\right\} \times C \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\tau^2} \theta^T \theta\right\}$$

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

32

Bayesian interpretation of regulation, con'd



- The posterior distribution of θ

$$p(\theta|D) \propto \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta^T \mathbf{x}_i)^2\right\} \times \exp\left\{-\theta^T \theta / 2\tau^2\right\}$$

- This leads to a now objective

$$\begin{aligned} l_{MAP}(\theta; D) &= -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta^T \mathbf{x}_i)^2 - \frac{1}{\tau^2} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \theta_k^2 \\ &= l(\theta; D) + \lambda \|\theta\| \end{aligned}$$

- This is L_2 regularized LR! --- a MAP estimation of θ
- What about L_1 regularized LR! (homework)
- How to choose λ .
 - cross-validation!

3. Feature Selection




- Imagine that you have a supervised learning problem where the number of features d is very large (perhaps $d \gg \text{\#samples}$), but you suspect that there is only a small number of features that are "**relevant**" to the learning task.
- VC-theory can tell you that this scenario is likely to lead to high generalization error – the learned model will potentially overfit unless the training set is fairly large.
- So lets get rid of useless parameters!

How to score features


- How do you know which features can be pruned?
 - Given labeled data, we can compute some simple score $S(i)$ that measures how informative each feature x_i is about the class labels y .
 - Ranking criteria:
 - Mutual Information: score each feature by its mutual information with respect to the class labels

$$MI(x_i, y) = \sum_{x_i \in \{0,1\}} \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}} p(x_i, y) \log \frac{p(x_i, y)}{p(x_i)p(y)}$$
 - Bayes error:

gene 109



gene 1902





 - Redundancy (Markov-blank score) ...
 - We need estimate the relevant $p()$'s from data, e.g., using MLE

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

35

Feature Ranking

- Bayes error of each gene
- information gain for each genes with respect to the given partition
- KL of each removal gene w.r.t. to its MB



© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

36

Feature selection schemes



- Given n features, there are 2^n possible feature subsets (why?)
- Thus feature selection can be posed as a model selection problem over 2^n possible models.
- For large values of n , it's usually too expensive to explicitly enumerate over and compare all 2^n models. Some heuristic search procedure is used to find a good feature subset.
- Three general approaches:
 - Filter: i.e., direct feature ranking, but taking no consideration of the subsequent learning algorithm
 - add (from empty set) or remove (from the full set) features one by one based on $S(i)$
 - Cheap, but is subject to local optimality and may be unrobust under different classifiers
 - Wrapper: determine the (inclusion or removal of) features based on performance under the learning algorithms to be used. See next slide
 - Simultaneous learning and feature selection.
 - E.x. L_1 regularized LR, Bayesian feature selection (will not cover in this class), etc.





© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

37

Case study [Xing et al, 2001]



- The case:
 - 7130 genes from a microarray dataset
 - 72 samples
 - 47 type I Leukemias (called ALL) and 25 type II Leukemias (called AML)
- Three classifier:
 - kNN
 - Gaussian classifier
 - Logistic regression




© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

38

Regularization vs. Feature Selection



- Explicit feature selection often outperform regularization



39

4. Information criterion



- Suppose we are trying select among several different models for a learning problem.
- The Problem:
 - Given model family $F = \{M_1, M_2, \dots, M_I\}$, find $M_i \in F$ s.t.

$$M_i = \arg \max_{M \in F} J(D, M)$$
- We can design J that not only reflect the predictive loss, but also the amount of information M_k can hold

Model Selection via Information Criteria



- Let $f(x)$ denote the truth, the underlying distribution of the data
- Let $g(x, \theta)$ denote the model family we are evaluating
 - $f(x)$ does not necessarily reside in the model family
 - $\theta_{ML}(y)$ denote the MLE of model parameter from data y
- Among early attempts to move beyond Fisher's *Maximum Likelihood* framework, **Akaike** proposed the following information criterion:

$$E_y [D(f \parallel g(x | \theta_{ML}(y)))]$$

which is, of course, intractable (because $f(x)$ is unknown)

AIC and TIC



- AIC (An information criterion, not **Akaike** information criterion)

$$A = \log g(x | \hat{\theta}(y)) - k$$

where k is the number of parameters in the model

- TIC (Takeuchi information criterion)

$$A = \log g(x | \hat{\theta}(y)) - \text{tr}(I(\theta_0)\Sigma)$$

where

$$\theta_0 = \arg \min_{\theta} D(f \parallel g(\cdot | \theta)) \quad I(\theta_0) = -E_x \left[\frac{\partial^2 \log g(x | \theta)}{\partial \theta \partial \theta^T} \right] \Big|_{\theta=\theta_0} \quad \Sigma = E_y (\hat{\theta}(y) - \theta_0)(\hat{\theta}(y) - \theta_0)^T$$

- We can approximate these terms in various ways (e.g., using the bootstrap)
- $\text{tr}(I(\theta_0)\Sigma) \approx k$

5. Bayesian Model Averaging



- Recall the Bayesian Theory: (e.g., for data D and model M)

$$P(M|D) = P(D|M)P(M)/P(D)$$

- the posterior equals to the likelihood times the prior, up to a constant.
- Assume that $P(M)$ is uniform and notice that $P(D)$ is constant, we have the following criteria:

$$P(D|M) = \int_{\theta} P(D|\theta, M)P(\theta|M)d\theta$$

- A few steps of approximations (you will see this in advanced ML class in later semesters) give you this:

$$P(D|M) \approx \log P(D|\hat{\theta}_{ML}) - \frac{k}{2} \log N$$

where N is the number of data points in D .

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

43

Summary



- Structural risk minimization
- Bias-variance decomposition
- The battle against overfitting:
 - Cross validation
 - Regularization
 - Feature selection
 - Information criteria
 - Model averaging
 - The Bayesian-frequentist debate
 - Bayesian learning (weight models by their posterior probabilities)

© Eric Xing @ CMU, 2006-2011

44