# Logistic Regression

Aarti Singh

Co-instructor: Barnabas Poczos

Machine Learning 10-401
Jan 28, 2016

# Discriminative Classifiers

Optimal Classifier:

$$f^*(x) = \arg\max_{Y=y} P(Y = y|X = x)$$
$$= \arg\max_{Y=y} P(X = x|Y = y)P(Y = y)$$

Why not learn P(Y|X) directly? Or better yet, why not learn the decision boundary directly?

- Assume some functional form for P(Y|X) or for the decision boundary
- Estimate parameters of functional form directly from training data

Today we will see one such classifier – **Logistic Regression**

# Logistic Regression

Not really regression

Assumes the following functional form for P(Y|X):

$$P(Y=0|X) = \frac{1}{1+\exp(w_0 + \sum_i w_i X_i)}$$

Logistic function applied to a linear function of the data

**Logistic function (or Sigmoid):**

$$\frac{1}{1+exp(-z)}$$




**Features can be discrete or continuous!**

# Logistic Regression is a Linear Classifier!

Assumes the following functional form for P(Y|X):

$$P(Y=0|X) = \frac{1}{1+\exp(w_0 + \sum_i w_i X_i)}$$

Decision boundary: Note - Labels are 0,1

$$P(Y=0|X) \underset{1}{\overset{0}{\gtrless}} P(Y=1|X)$$

$$w_0 + \sum_i w_i X_i \underset{0}{\overset{1}{\gtrless}} 0$$

(Linear Decision Boundary)



# Logistic Regression is a Linear Classifier!

Assumes the following functional form for P(Y|X):

$$P(Y=0|X) = \frac{1}{1+\exp(w_0 + \sum_i w_i X_i)}$$

$$\Rightarrow P(Y=1|X) = \frac{\exp(w_0 + \sum_i w_i X_i)}{1+\exp(w_0 + \sum_i w_i X_i)}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{P(Y=1|X)}{P(Y=0|X)} = \exp(w_0 + \sum_i w_i X_i) \underset{0}{\overset{1}{\gtrless}} 1$$

$$\Rightarrow w_0 + \sum_i w_i X_i \underset{0}{\overset{1}{\gtrless}} 0$$

# Training Logistic Regression

**How to learn the parameters $w_0, w_1, \ldots w_d$?** (d features)

Training Data $\{(X^{(j)}, Y^{(j)})\}_{j=1}^{n}$ $X^{(j)} = (X_1^{(j)}, \ldots, X_d^{(j)})$

Maximum Likelihood Estimates

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{MLE} = \arg\max_{\mathbf{w}} \prod_{j=1}^{n} P(X^{(j)}, Y^{(j)} \mid \mathbf{w})$$

**But there is a problem …**

Don't have a model for P(X) or P(X|Y) – only for P(Y|X)

# Training Logistic Regression

**How to learn the parameters $w_0$, $w_1$, … $w_d$?** (d features)

Training Data $\{(X^{(j)}, Y^{(j)})\}_{j=1}^{n}$ $X^{(j)} = (X_1^{(j)}, \ldots, X_d^{(j)})$

Maximum (Conditional) Likelihood Estimates

$$\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{MCLE} = \arg\max_{\mathbf{w}} \prod_{j=1}^{n} P(Y^{(j)} \mid X^{(j)}, \mathbf{w})$$

Discriminative philosophy – Don't waste effort learning P(X), focus on P(Y|X) – that's all that matters for classification!

# Expressing Conditional log Likelihood

$$P(Y = 0|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{1 + exp(w_0 + \sum_i w_i X_i)}$$

$$P(Y = 1|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{w}) = \frac{exp(w_0 + \sum_i w_i X_i)}{1 + exp(w_0 + \sum_i w_i X_i)}$$

$$\begin{aligned} l(\mathbf{w}) &\equiv \ln \prod_j P(y^j|\mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w}) \\ &= \sum_j \left[ y^j (w_0 + \sum_i^d w_i x_i^j) - \ln(1 + exp(w_0 + \sum_i^d w_i x_i^j)) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Bad news: no closed-form solution to maximize *l*(**w**)

Good news: *l*(**w**) is concave function of **w !**

concave functions easy to maximize (unique maximum)

# Concave function




A function l(w) is called **concave** if the line joining two points $f(w_1)$,$f(w_2)$ on the function does not go above the function on the interval $[w_1,w_2]$

(Strictly) Concave functions have a unique maximum!



Convex



Both Concave & Convex



Neither

# Optimizing concave function

- Conditional likelihood for Logistic Regression is concave
- Maximum of a concave function can be reached by

**Gradient Ascent Algorithm**




**Initialize:** Pick **w** at random

**Gradient:**

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{w}} l(\mathbf{w}) = [\frac{\partial l(\mathbf{w})}{\partial w_0}, \ldots, \frac{\partial l(\mathbf{w})}{\partial w_{\mathbf{d}}}]'$$

Learning rate, η>0

**Update rule:**

$$\Delta \mathbf{w} = \eta \nabla_{\mathbf{w}} l(\mathbf{w})$$

$$w_i^{(t+1)} \leftarrow w_i^{(t)} + \eta \left. \frac{\partial l(\mathbf{w})}{\partial w_i} \right|_t$$

# Gradient Ascent for Logistic Regression

Gradient ascent rule for $w_0$:

$$w_0^{(t+1)} \leftarrow w_0^{(t)} + \eta \left. \frac{\partial l(\mathbf{w})}{\partial w_0} \right|_t$$

$$l(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_j \left[ y^j (w_0 + \sum_i^d w_i x_i^j) - \ln(1 + exp(w_0 + \sum_i^d w_i x_i^j)) \right]$$

$$\frac{\partial l(\mathbf{w})}{\partial w_0} = \sum_j \left[ y^j - \underbrace{\frac{1}{1 + exp(w_0 + \sum_i^d w_i x_i^j)} \cdot exp(w_0 + \sum_i^d w_i x_i^j)}_{} \right]$$

$$w_0^{(t+1)} \leftarrow w_0^{(t)} + \eta \sum_j [y^j - \hat{P}(Y^j = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w}^{(t)})]$$

# Gradient Ascent for Logistic Regression

Gradient ascent algorithm: iterate until change < $\varepsilon$

$$w_0^{(t+1)} \leftarrow w_0^{(t)} + \eta \sum_j [y^j - \hat{P}(Y^j = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w}^{(t)})]$$

For i=1,…,d,

$$w_i^{(t+1)} \leftarrow w_i^{(t)} + \eta \sum_j x_i^j [y^j - \hat{P}(Y^j = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w}^{(t)})]$$

repeat

Predict what current weight thinks label Y should be

- Gradient ascent is simplest of optimization approaches
  - e.g., Newton method, Conjugate gradient ascent, IRLS (see Bishop 4.3.3)

# Effect of step-size η




Large η => Fast convergence but larger residual error
Also possible oscillations

Small η => Slow convergence but small residual error

# That's all M(C)LE. How about M(C)AP?

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

- Define priors on **w**
  - Common assumption: Normal distribution, zero mean, identity covariance
  - "Pushes" parameters towards zero

$$p(\mathbf{w}) = \prod_i \frac{1}{\kappa\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{\frac{-w_i^2}{2\kappa^2}}$$

**Zero-mean Gaussian prior**

- M(C)AP estimate $\mathbf{w}^* = \arg\max_{\mathbf{w}} \ln \left[ p(\mathbf{w}) \prod_{j=1}^{n} P(y^j \mid \mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w}) \right]$

$$\mathbf{w}^* = \arg\max_{\mathbf{w}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln P(y^j \mid \mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w}) - \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{w_i^2}{2\kappa^2}$$

Still concave objective!

Penalizes large weights

# M(C)AP – Gradient

- Gradient

$$p(\mathbf{w}) = \prod_i \frac{1}{\kappa\sqrt{2\pi}} \; e^{\frac{-w_i^2}{2\kappa^2}}$$

**Zero-mean Gaussian prior**

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w_i} \ln \left[ p(\mathbf{w}) \prod_{j=1}^{n} P(y^j \mid \mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w}) \right]$$

$$\underbrace{\frac{\partial}{\partial w_i} \ln p(\mathbf{w})}_{\propto \frac{-w_i}{\kappa^2}} + \underbrace{\frac{\partial}{\partial w_i} \ln \left[ \prod_{j=1}^{n} P(y^j \mid \mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w}) \right]}_{\text{Same as before}}$$

Extra term Penalizes large weights

# M(C)LE vs. M(C)AP

- Maximum conditional likelihood estimate

$$\mathbf{w}^* = \arg\max_{\mathbf{w}} \ln \left[ \prod_{j=1}^{n} P(y^j \mid \mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w}) \right]$$

$$w_i^{(t+1)} \leftarrow w_i^{(t)} + \eta \sum_j x_i^j [y^j - P(Y = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w}^{(t)})]$$

- Maximum conditional a posteriori estimate

$$\mathbf{w}^* = \arg\max_{\mathbf{w}} \ln \left[ p(\mathbf{w}) \prod_{j=1}^{n} P(y^j \mid \mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w}) \right]$$

$$w_i^{(t+1)} \leftarrow w_i^{(t)} + \eta \left\{ -\frac{1}{\kappa^2} w_i^{(t)} + \sum_j x_i^j [y^j - P(Y = 1 \mid \mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{w}^{(t)})] \right\}$$

# Logistic Regression for more than 2 classes

- Logistic regression in more general case, where $Y \in \{y_1,\ldots,y_K\}$

for $k<K$

$$P(Y = y_k|X) = \frac{\exp(w_{k0} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} w_{ki}X_i)}{1 + \sum_{j=1}^{K-1} \exp(w_{j0} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} w_{ji}X_i)}$$

for $k=K$ (normalization, so no weights for this class)

$$P(Y = y_K|X) = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j=1}^{K-1} \exp(w_{j0} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} w_{ji}X_i)}$$

Predict $f^*(x) = \arg\max_{Y=y} P(Y = y|X = x)$

Is the decision boundary still linear?

# Comparison with Gaussian Naïve Bayes

# Decision Boundary of Bayes & Naïve Bayes Classifiers

- Binary classification with continuous features

  decision boundary is set of points x: P(Y=1|X=x) = P(Y=0|X=x)

If class conditional feature distribution P(X=x|Y=y) is 2-dim Gaussian $N(\mu_y,\Sigma_y)$



# Gaussian Naïve Bayes vs. Logistic Regression

**Set of Gaussian Naïve Bayes parameters (feature variance independent of class label)**

**Set of Logistic Regression parameters**

- Representation equivalence (both yield linear decision boundaries)
  - **But only in a special case!!!** (GNB with class-independent variances)
  - **LR makes no assumptions about** P(**X**|Y) **in learning**!!!
  - **Optimize different functions (MLE/MCLE) ! Obtain different solutions**

# Gaussian Naïve Bayes vs. Logistic Regression

Consider Y boolean, $X_i$ continuous, $X=<X_1 \ldots X_d>$

Number of parameters:

- NB: 4d +1 $\theta, (\mu_{1,y}, \mu_{2,y}, \ldots, \mu_{d,y}), (\sigma^2_{1,y}, \sigma^2_{2,y}, \ldots, \sigma^2_{d,y})$ y = 0,1
  3d +1 if class independent variances
- LR: d+1 $w_0, w_1, \ldots, w_d$

Estimation method:

- NB parameter estimates are uncoupled
- LR parameter estimates are coupled

# Generative vs Discriminative

[Ng & Jordan, NIPS 2001]

Given **infinite data** (asymptotically),

If conditional independence assumption holds,
Discriminative LR and generative NB perform similar.

$$\epsilon_{\mathrm{Dis},\infty} \sim \epsilon_{\mathrm{Gen},\infty}$$

If conditional independence assumption does NOT holds,
Discriminative LR outperforms generative NB.

$$\epsilon_{\mathrm{Dis},\infty} < \epsilon_{\mathrm{Gen},\infty}$$

# Generative vs Discriminative

Given **finite data** (n data points, d features), [Ng & Jordan, NIPS 2001]

$$\epsilon_{\text{Dis},n} \leq \epsilon_{\text{Dis},\infty} + O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d}{n}}\right)$$

$$\epsilon_{\text{Gen},n} \leq \epsilon_{\text{Gen},\infty} + O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}}\right)$$

Naïve Bayes (generative) requires n ~ log d to converge to its asymptotic error, whereas Logistic regression (discriminative) requires n ~ d.

Why? "Independent class conditional densities"

* parameter estimates not coupled – each parameter is learnt independently, not jointly, from training data.

# Naïve Bayes vs Logistic Regression

## Verdict

Both learn a linear boundary (assuming class-ind feature variance)

Naïve Bayes makes more restrictive assumptions and has higher asymptotic error,

BUT

converges faster to its less accurate asymptotic error.

# Experimental Comparison (Ng-Jordan'01)

UCI Machine Learning Repository 15 datasets, 8 continuous features, 7 discrete features




More in Paper…

—— Naïve Bayes ----- Logistic Regression

# What you should know

- LR is a linear classifier
- LR optimized by maximizing conditional likelihood or conditional posterior
  - no closed-form solution
  - concave ! global optimum with gradient ascent
- Gaussian Naïve Bayes with class-independent variances representationally equivalent to LR
  - Solution differs because of objective (loss) function
- In general, NB and LR make different assumptions
  - NB: Features independent given class ! assumption on $P(\mathbf{X}|Y)$
  - LR: Functional form of $P(Y|\mathbf{X})$, no assumption on $P(\mathbf{X}|Y)$
- Convergence rates
  - GNB (usually) needs less data
  - LR (usually) gets to better solutions in the limit