Simple Model Selection
Cross Validation
Regularization
Neural Networks

Machine Learning – 10701/15781

Carlos Guestrin

Carnegie Mellon University

February 13th, 2007

OK… now we'll learn to pick those darned parameters…

- **Selecting features (or basis functions)**
  - Linear regression
  - Naïve Bayes
  - Logistic regression
- **Selecting parameter value**
  - Prior strength
    - Naïve Bayes, linear and logistic regression
  - Regularization strength
    - Naïve Bayes, linear and logistic regression
  - Decision trees
    - MaxpChance, depth, number of leaves
  - Boosting
    - Number of rounds
- More generally, these are called **Model Selection** Problems
- Today:
  - Describe basic idea
  - Introduce very important concept for tuning learning approaches: **Cross-Validation**

Test set error as a function of model complexity



Simple greedy model selection algorithm

- Pick a dictionary of features
  - e.g., polynomials for linear regression
- Greedy heuristic:
  - Start from empty (or simple) set of features $F_0 = \varnothing$
  - Run learning algorithm for current set of features F_t
    - Obtain h_t
  - Select **next best feature X_j**
    - e.g., X_j that results in lowest training error learner when learning with $F_t \cup \{X_j\}$
  - $F_{t+1} \leftarrow F_t \cup \{X_j\}$
  - Recurse

Greedy model selection

- Applicable in many settings:
  - Linear regression: Selecting basis functions
  - Naïve Bayes: Selecting (independent) features $P(X_i|Y)$
  - Logistic regression: Selecting features (basis functions)
  - Decision trees: Selecting leaves to expand
- Only a heuristic!
  - But, sometimes you can prove something cool about it
    - e.g., [Krause & Guestrin '05]: Near-optimal in some settings that include Naïve Bayes
- There are many more elaborate methods out there

Simple greedy model selection algorithm

- Greedy heuristic:
  - …
  - Select **next best feature X_j**
    - e.g., X_j that results in lowest training error learner when learning with $F_t \cup \{X_j\}$
  - $F_{t+1} \leftarrow F_t \cup \{X_j\}$
  - Recurse

When do you stop???

- When training error is low enough? $\leq \varepsilon$



Simple greedy model selection algorithm

- Greedy heuristic:
  - …
  - Select **next best feature X_i**
    - e.g., X_j that results in lowest training error learner when learning with $F_t \cup \{X_j\}$
  - $F_{t+1} \leftarrow F_t \cup \{X_i\}$
  - Recurse

When do you stop???

- ~~When training error is low enough?~~
- When test set error is low enough?

never, never!!



Validation set

- Thus far: Given a dataset, **randomly** split it into two parts:
  - Training data – $\{\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots, \mathbf{x}_{Ntrain}\}$
  - Test data – $\{\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots, \mathbf{x}_{Ntest}\}$



- But **Test data must always remain independent**!
  - Never ever ever ever learn on test data, including for model selection
- Given a dataset, **randomly** split it into three parts:
  - Training data – $\{\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots, \mathbf{x}_{Ntrain}\}$
  - Validation data – $\{\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots, \mathbf{x}_{Nvalid}\}$
  - Test data – $\{\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots, \mathbf{x}_{Ntest}\}$



- Use validation data for tuning learning algorithm, e.g., model selection
  - Save test data for very final evaluation

Simple greedy model selection algorithm

- Greedy heuristic:
  - …
  - Select **next best feature X_i**
    - e.g., X_j that results in lowest training error learner when learning with $F_t \cup \{X_j\}$
  - $F_{t+1} \leftarrow F_t \cup \{X_i\}$
  - Recurse

When do you stop???

- ~~When training error is low enough?~~
- ~~When test set error is low enough?~~
- When validation set error is low enough?

Simple greedy model selection algorithm

- Greedy heuristic:
  - …
  - Select **next best feature X_i**
    - e.g., X_j that results in lowest training error learner when learning with $F_t \cup \{X_j\}$
  - $F_{t+1} \leftarrow F_t \cup \{X_i\}$
  - Recurse

When do you stop???

- ~~When training error is low enough?~~
- ~~When test set error is low enough?~~
- ~~When validation set error is low enough?~~
- Man!!! OK, should I just repeat until I get tired???
  - I am tired now…
  - **No, "There is a better way!"**

(LOO) Leave-one-out cross validation

- Consider a **validation set with 1 example**:
  - *D* – training data
  - *D*\i – training data with *i* th data point moved to validation set
- **Learn classifier $h_{D\backslash i}$ with *D*\i dataset**
- **Estimate true error** as:
  - 0 if $h_{D\backslash i}$ classifies *i* th data point correctly
  - 1 if $h_{D\backslash i}$ is wrong about *i* th data point
  - Seems really bad estimator, but wait!
- **LOO cross validation**: Average over all data points *i*:
  - **For each data point you leave out, learn a new classifier $h_{D\backslash i}$**
  - **Estimate error** as:

$$error_{LOO} = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{1}\left(h_{\mathcal{D}\backslash i}(\mathbf{x}^i) \neq y^i\right)$$

$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}\left(h_{D/i}(x_i) \neq y^i\right)\right] = error_{true}$ → unbiased estimate of true error of $h_{D/i}$

does $h_{D/i}$ predict x_i correctly

train examples

LOO cross validation is (almost) unbiased estimate of true error!

- When computing **LOOCV error, we only use *m-1* data points**
  - So it's not estimate of true error of learning with *m* data points!
  - Usually pessimistic, though – learning with less data typically gives worse answer
- **LOO is almost unbiased**!
  - Let $error_{true,m-1}$ be true error of learner when you only get *m-1* data points
  - In homework, you'll prove that LOO is unbiased estimate of $error_{true,m-1}$:

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}[error_{LOO}] = error_{true,m-1}$$

- **Great news!**
  - **Use LOO error for model selection!!!**

Simple greedy model selection algorithm

- Greedy heuristic:
  - …
  - Select **next best feature X_i**
    - e.g., X_j that results in lowest training error learner when learning with $F_t \cup \{X_j\}$
  - $F_{t+1} \leftarrow F_t \cup \{X_i\}$
  - Recurse

When do you stop???

- ~~When training error is low enough?~~
- ~~When test set error is low enough?~~
- ~~When validation set error is low enough?~~
- **STOP WHEN $error_{LOO}$ IS LOW!!!**

Using LOO error for model selection

Computational cost of LOO

- Suppose you have 100,000 data points
- You implemented a great version of your learning algorithm
  - Learns in only 1 second
- Computing LOO will take about 1 day!!!
  - If you have to do for each choice of basis functions, it will take fooooooreeeve'!!!
- Solution 1: Preferred, but not usually possible
  - Find a cool trick to compute LOO (e.g., see homework)

Solution 2 to complexity of computing LOO:

(More typical) **Use *k*-fold cross validation**

- Randomly **divide training data into *k* equal parts**
  - $D_1,\ldots,D_k$
- For each *i*
  - **Learn classifier $h_{D\setminus Di}$ using data point not in D_i**
  - **Estimate error of $h_{D\setminus Di}$ on validation set D_i:**

$$error_{\mathcal{D}_i} = \frac{k}{m} \sum_{(\mathbf{x}^j, y^j) \in \mathcal{D}_i} 1\left(h_{\mathcal{D}\setminus\mathcal{D}_i}(\mathbf{x}^j) \neq y^j\right)$$

- ***k*-fold cross validation error is average** over data splits:

$$error_{k-fold} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} error_{\mathcal{D}_i}$$

- *k*-fold cross validation properties:
  - **Much faster to compute** than LOO
  - **More (pessimistically) biased** – using much less data, only *m(k-1)/k*
  - Usually, **k = 10** ☺

Regularization – Revisited

- Model selection 1: **Greedy**
  - Pick subset of features that have yield low LOO error
- Model selection 2: **Regularization**
  - Include **all possible features!** $\{1, x, \ldots, x^m\}$
  - **Penalize "complicated" hypothesis**

Regularization in linear regression

- Overfitting usually leads to very large parameter choices, e.g.:

-2.2 + 3.1 X – 0.30 X^2



-1.1 + 4,700,910.7 X – 8,585,638.4 X^2 + …



pick

- Regularized least-squares (a.k.a. ridge regression), for $\lambda \geq 0$:

$$\mathbf{w}^* = \arg\min_{\mathbf{w}} \sum_j \left(t(\mathbf{x}_j) - \sum_i w_i h_i(\mathbf{x}_j) \right)^2 + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{k} w_i^2$$

training error

penalty for large w_i

λ regularization term

Other regularization examples

- **Logistic regression** regularization
  - Maximize data likelihood minus **penalty for large parameters**

$$\arg\max_{\mathbf{w}} \sum_j \ln P(y^j|\mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w}) - \lambda \sum_i w_i^2$$

conditional log likelihood ↑ regularization

  - **Biases towards small parameter values**

- **Naïve Bayes** regularization (smoothing)
  - **Prior** over likelihood of features
  - **Biases away from zero probability** outcomes

- **Decision tree** regularization
  - Many possibilities, e.g., **Chi-Square test and MaxPvalue** parameter
  - **Biases towards smaller trees**

How do we pick magic parameter?

Cross Validation!!!!



λ in Linear/Logistic Regression
(analogously for # virtual examples in Naïve Bayes, MaxPvalue in Decision Trees)

Regularization and Bayesian learning

$$p(\mathbf{w} \mid Y, \mathbf{X}) \propto P(Y \mid \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{w}) p(\mathbf{w})$$

- We already saw that **regularization for logistic regression** corresponds to **MAP for zero mean, Gaussian prior** for **w**
- Similar interpretation for other learning approaches:
  - **Linear regression**: Also zero mean, Gaussian prior for **w**
  - **Naïve Bayes**: Directly defined as prior over parameters
  - **Decision trees**: Trickier to define… but we'll get back to this

Occam's Razor

- William of Ockham (1285-1349) *Principle of Parsimony*:
  - "One should not increase, beyond what is necessary, the number of entities required to explain anything."
- Regularization penalizes for *"complex explanations"*
- Alternatively (but pretty much the same), use *Minimum Description Length (MDL) Principle*:
  - minimize *length*(misclassifications) + *length*(hypothesis)
- *length*(misclassifications) – e.g., #wrong training examples
- *length*(hypothesis) – e.g., size of decision tree

Minimum Description Length Principle

- MDL prefers small hypothesis that fit data well:

$$h_{MDL} = \arg\min_h L_{C_1}(\mathcal{D} \mid h) + L_{C_2}(h)$$

  - $L_{C1}(D|h)$ – description length of data under code C_1 given h
    - Only need to describe points that h doesn't explain (classify correctly)
  - $L_{C2}(h)$ – description length of hypothesis h
- Decision tree example
  - $L_{C1}(D|h)$ – #bits required to describe data given h
    - If all points correctly classified, $L_{C1}(D|h) = 0$
  - $L_{C2}(h)$ – #bits necessary to encode tree
  - Trade off quality of classification with tree size

Bayesian interpretation of MDL Principle

- MAP estimate

$$\begin{aligned} h_{MAP} &= \arg\max_h [P(\mathcal{D} \mid h) P(h)] \\ &= \arg\max_h [\log_2 P(\mathcal{D} \mid h) + \log_2 P(h)] \\ &= \arg\min_h [-\log_2 P(\mathcal{D} \mid h) - \log_2 P(h)] \end{aligned}$$

- **Information theory fact**:
  - Smallest code for event of probability p requires $-\log_2 p$ bits
- MDL interpretation of MAP:
  - $-\log_2 P(D|h)$ – length of D under hypothesis h
  - $-\log_2 P(h)$ – length of hypothesis h (there is hidden parameter here)
  - MAP prefers simpler hypothesis:
    - minimize *length*(misclassifications) + *length*(hypothesis)
- **In general, Bayesian approach usually looks for simpler hypothesis** – Acts as a regularizer

What you need to know about Model Selection, Regularization and Cross Validation

- Cross validation
  - (Mostly) Unbiased estimate of true error
  - LOOCV is great, but hard to compute
  - *k*-fold much more practical
  - Use for selecting parameter values!
- Model selection
  - Search for a model with low cross validation error
- Regularization
  - Penalizes for complex models
  - Select parameter with cross validation
  - Really a Bayesian approach
- Minimum description length
  - Information theoretic interpretation of regularization
  - Relationship to MAP

Logistic regression



- P(Y|X) represented by:

$$P(Y=1 \mid x, W) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-(w_0+\sum_i w_i x_i)}} = g(w_0+\sum_i w_i x_i)$$

- Learning rule – MLE:

Compute derivative

$$\frac{\partial \ell(W)}{\partial w_i} = \sum_j x_i^j [y^j - P(Y^j=1 \mid x^j, W)] = \sum_j x_i^j [y^j - g(w_0+\sum_i w_i x_i^j)]$$

learning rate

$$w_i^{(t+1)} \leftarrow w_i^{(t)} + \eta \sum_j x_i^j \delta^j$$

truth prediction

$$\delta^j = y^j - g(w_0+\sum_i w_i x_i^j)$$

Sigmoid

$$g(w_0 + \sum_i w_i x_i) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(w_0 + \sum_i w_i x_i)}}$$

w_0=2, w_1=1



w_0=0, w_1=1



w_0=0, w_1=0.5



Perceptron as a graph





$$g(w_0 + \sum_i w_i x_i) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(w_0 + \sum_i w_i x_i)}}$$

Linear perceptron classification region



$$g(w_0 + \sum_i w_i x_i) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(w_0 + \sum_i w_i x_i)}}$$



Optimizing the perceptron

- Trained to minimize sum-squared error

$$\ell(W) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{m}[y^j - g(w_0 + \sum_i w_i x_i^j)]^2$$

squared

j: datapoints; y^j: truth; $g(w_0 + \sum_i w_i x_i^j)$: prediction

Derivative of sigmoid

$$\frac{\partial \ell(W)}{\partial w_i} = -\sum_j [y^j - g(w_0 + \sum_i w_i x_i^j)]\ x_i^j\ g'(w_0 + \sum_i w_i x_i^j)$$

$$g(x) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-x}}$$

The perceptron learning rule

$$w_i \leftarrow w_i + \eta \sum_j x_i^j \delta^j$$

$$\delta^j = [y^j - g(w_0 + \sum_i w_i x_i^j)] g^j (1 - g^j)$$

$$g^j = g(w_0 + \sum_i w_i x_i^j)$$

- Compare to MLE:

$$w_i \leftarrow w_i + \eta \sum_j x_i^j \delta^j \qquad \delta^j = [y^j - g(w_0 + \sum_i w_i x_i^j)]$$

Percepton, linear classification, Boolean functions

- Can learn $x_1 \vee x_2$
- Can learn $x_1 \wedge x_2$
- Can learn any conjunction or disjunction

Percepton, linear classification, Boolean functions

- Can learn majority
- Can perceptrons do everything?

Going beyond linear classification

- Solving the XOR problem

Hidden layer

- Perceptron: $out(\mathbf{x}) = g(w_0 + \sum_i w_i x_i)$
- 1-hidden layer:

$$out(\mathbf{x}) = g\left(w_0 + \sum_k w_k g(w_0^k + \sum_i w_i^k x_i)\right)$$

Example data for NN with hidden layer



A target function:

Input		Output
10000000	→	10000000
01000000	→	01000000
00100000	→	00100000
00010000	→	00010000
00001000	→	00001000
00000100	→	00000100
00000010	→	00000010
00000001	→	00000001

Can this be learned??

37

Learned weights for hidden layer

A network:



Learned hidden layer representation:

Input		Hidden Values				Output
10000000	→	.89	.04	.08	→	10000000
01000000	→	.01	.11	.88	→	01000000
00100000	→	.01	.97	.27	→	00100000
00010000	→	.99	.97	.71	→	00010000
00001000	→	.03	.05	.02	→	00001000
00000100	→	.22	.99	.99	→	00000100
00000010	→	.80	.01	.98	→	00000010
00000001	→	.60	.94	.01	→	00000001

38

NN for images



Typical input images

90% accurate learning head pose, and recognizing 1-of-20 faces

Weights in NN for images





Typical input images