Frequentist Statistics

Seung-Hoon Na
Chonbuk National University

Frequentist statistics

- **Classical statistics** or **orthodox statistics**
- Based on the concept of a **sampling distribution**
  - The distribution of an estimator when applied to multiple data sets sampled from the true but unknown distribution
  - *Normal*: Sample mean $\bar{X}$ from samples of size *n*: $\bar{X} \sim N(\mu, \frac{\sigma^2}{n})$
  - *Bernoulli*: Sample proportion of "successful trials“ $\bar{X}$

Sampling distribution of an estimator

- View the parameter as fixed and the data as random
- Can measure the uncertainty in the parameter estimate

Sample distribution: 무수한 sample dataset 에 대한 추정값들의 확률 분포

θ^*: the true parameter

Sampling many different data sets given θ^*

$$x_i^s \sim p(\cdot|\theta^*)$$

apply the estimator $\hat{\theta}$

$$\mathcal{D}^{(s)} = \{x_i^{(s)}\}_{i=1}^N \Rightarrow \{\hat{\theta}(\mathcal{D}^{(s)})\}$$

The sampling distribution of the estimator:
the distribution induced on $\hat{\theta}(\cdot)$ as we let $S \to \infty$

Bootstrap

- A simple Monte Carlo technique to approximate the sampling distribution

  만약 True parameter θ^*를 알 경우, $p(\cdot|\theta^*)$를 통해 수많은 fake datasets을 생성이 가능하다. 이러한 각 fake dataset에 대한 estimates들을 평균하여 sampling distribution을 계산

  ➔ 이와 유사하게, 다만 θ^*를 모르므로, Boostrap은 이를 근사하기 위해 $\hat{\theta}(D)$ 또는 D로부터 fake datasets을 생성

- **Parametric bootstrap**
  - Generate the samples using $\hat{\theta}(D)$ instead, since θ is unknown
- **Non-parametric bootstrap**
  - Sample the x_i^S (with replacement) from the original data *D*, and then compute the induced distribution as before

Parameteric Bootstrap

- The *N* data cases $D = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^{N}$ were generated from $Ber(\theta = 0.7)$
- $B = 10{,}000$ bootstrap samples

N=10



N=100



Large sample theory for the MLE

- Under certain conditions, as the sample size tends to infinity, the sampling distribution of the MLE becomes Gaussian.
- Mean: The center of the Gaussian will be the MLE $\hat{\theta}$
- Variance
  - The variance is the related to the curvature of the likelihood surface
  - If the curvature is large, the peak will be “sharp”, and the variance low
  - The curvature is small, the peak will be nearly “flat”, so the variance is high

Large sample theory for the MLE

$$\mathcal{D} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_N)$$

- **Score function:** The gradient of the log likelihood evaluated at some point $\hat{\theta}$

$$\mathbf{s}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \triangleq \nabla \log p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})|_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}$$

- **Observed information matrix**

$$\mathbf{J}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathcal{D})) \triangleq -\nabla \mathbf{s}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = -\nabla^2_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log p(\mathcal{D}|\boldsymbol{\theta})|_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}$$

  – a measure of curvature of the log-likelihood function at $\hat{\theta}$

- **Fisher information matrix**

$$\mathbf{I}_N(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}\left[\mathbf{J}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}|\mathcal{D})\right]$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}\left[\mathbf{f}(\mathcal{D})\right] \triangleq \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_i) p(\mathbf{x}_i|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$$

Fisher Information

- (Fisher information). The Fisher information $I_X(\theta)$ of a random variable X about θ is defined as:

$$I_X(\theta) = \begin{cases} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\theta} \log f(x \mid \theta) \right)^2 p_\theta(x) & \text{if } X \text{ is discrete} \\ \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\theta} \log f(x \mid \theta) \right)^2 p_\theta(x) \mathrm{d}x & \text{if } X \text{ is continuous.} \end{cases}$$

- Under mild regularity conditions Fisher information is equivalently defined as:

$$I_X(\theta) = -E\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}\theta^2} \log f(X \mid \theta) \right) = \begin{cases} -\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}\theta^2} \log f(x \mid \theta) \right) p_\theta(x) & \text{if } X \text{ is discrete} \\ -\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}\theta^2} \log f(x \mid \theta) \right) p_\theta(x) \mathrm{d}x & \text{if } X \text{ is continuous} \end{cases}$$

https://arxiv.org/pdf/1705.01064.pdf

Fisher Information

- Fisher information

$$I_\theta := \mathbb{E}_\theta\left[\nabla_\theta \log p_\theta(X) \nabla \log p_\theta(X)^\top\right] = \mathbb{E}_\theta[\dot{\ell}_\theta \dot{\ell}_\theta^\top]$$

$$\dot{\ell}_\theta = \nabla_\theta \log p_\theta(x)$$ ← Score function

Given conditions on the densities p_θ that derivatives pass through expectations, we have an alternate definition of Fisher information as the negative expected hessian of $\log p_\theta(X)$:

$$\nabla^2 \log p_\theta(x) = \frac{\nabla^2 p_\theta(x)}{p_\theta(x)} - \frac{\nabla p_\theta(x) \nabla p_\theta(x)^\top}{p_\theta(x)^2} = \frac{\nabla^2 p_\theta(x)}{p_\theta(x)} - \dot{\ell}_\theta \dot{\ell}_\theta^\top$$

$$I_\theta = \mathbb{E}_\theta[\dot{\ell}_\theta \dot{\ell}_\theta^\top] = -\int p_\theta(x) \nabla^2 \log p_\theta(x) dx + \int \nabla^2 p_\theta(x) dx$$

$$= -\mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 \log p_\theta(x)] + \nabla^2 \underbrace{\int p_\theta(x) dx}_{=1} = -\mathbb{E}[\nabla^2 \log p_\theta(x)]$$

$$I_\theta = \mathbb{E}_\theta[\dot{\ell}_\theta \dot{\ell}_\theta] = -\mathbb{E}_\theta[\nabla^2 \log p_\theta(X)]$$

https://web.stanford.edu/class/stats311/Lectures/lec-09.pdf

Large sample theory for the MLE

- Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \triangleq \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{mle}(\mathcal{D})$ where $\mathcal{D} \sim \boldsymbol{\theta}^*$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{I}_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^{-1})$$

$$I_N(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) = \sum \nabla^2_\theta \log p(\boldsymbol{x}_i|\boldsymbol{\theta})\Big|_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} p(\boldsymbol{x}_i|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$

➔ The sampling distribution of the MLE is **asymptotically normal**

Frequentist decision theory

- No prior and hence no posterior or posterior expected loss
  - No automatic way of deriving an optimal estimator, unlike the Bayesian case
- Instead, in the frequentist approach, we are free to choose any estimator or decision procedure $\delta : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ we want.

  Frequentist 의 경우 최적 estimator를 유도하는 것이 아니라, estimator를 자유롭게 선택할 수 있다 ➔ 일단 estimator가 선택되면 해당 **risk**를 정의
- Having chosen an estimator, define its expected loss or **risk**:

$$R(\theta^*, \delta) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{p(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}|\theta^*)}\left[L(\theta^*, \delta(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}))\right] = \int L(\theta^*, \delta(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}))p(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}|\theta^*)d\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$$

- In contrast, the Bayesian posterior expected loss:

$$\rho(a|\mathcal{D}, \pi) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{p(\theta|\mathcal{D},\pi)}\left[L(\theta, a)\right] = \int_{\Theta} L(\theta, \mathbf{a})p(\theta|\mathcal{D}, \pi)d\theta$$

Bayesian 방법에서는 θ상에서 평균, Frequentist 방법은 $\tilde{D}$상에서 평균을 취함

Bayes Risk

- Then, how do we choose amongst estimators?
- Need some way to convert $R(\theta^*, \delta)$ to $R(\delta)$
- **Bayes risk**: Putting a prior on θ^*

$$R_B(\delta) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{p(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)}\left[R(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \delta)\right] = \int R(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \delta) p(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) d\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$$

  - Also called **Integrated risk** or **preposterior risk**

- **Bayes estimator (Bayes decision rule)**

$$\delta_B \triangleq \operatorname*{argmin}_{\delta} R_B(\delta)$$

Bayes Risk

- **Theorem.** ***A Bayes estimator can be obtained by minimizing the posterior expected loss for each x***

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_B(\delta) &= \int \left[\sum_{\mathbf{x}} \sum_{y} L(y, \delta(\mathbf{x})) p(\mathbf{x}, y | \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \right] p(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) d\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \\
&= \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \sum_{y} \int_{\Theta} L(y, \delta(\mathbf{x})) p(\mathbf{x}, y, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) d\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \\
&= \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \left[\sum_{y} L(y, \delta(\mathbf{x})) p(y | \mathbf{x}) dy \right] p(\mathbf{x}) \\
&= \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \rho(\delta(\mathbf{x}) | \mathbf{x}) \; p(\mathbf{x})
\end{aligned}
$$

- *To minimize $R_B(\delta)$, minimize the term inside each $\boldsymbol{x}$*

$$\delta_B(\mathbf{x}) = \underset{a \in \mathcal{A}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \, \rho(a | \mathbf{x})$$

Frequentist접근: 데이터전체에 대한 평균 최적
==
Bayesian접근: 데이터별 Case-by-case로 최적 action을 선택

Bayes Risk

- **Theorem** (Wald, 1950)**.** *Every admissable decision rule is a Bayes decision rule with respect to some, possibly improper, prior distribution.*

➔ *the best way to minimize frequentist risk is to be Bayesian!*

모든 admissable한 decision rule은 특정 prior상에서의 Bayesian decision rule

Minimax Risk

- The **maximum risk** of an estimator:

$$R_{max}(\delta) \triangleq \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}^*} R(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \delta)$$

- **Minimax rule**

$$\delta_{MM} \triangleq \operatorname*{argmin}_{\delta} R_{max}(\delta)$$

- Minimax decision rule is very pessimistic
- All minimax estimators are equivalent to Bayes estimators under a **least favorable prior**
- In most statistical situations (excluding game theoretic ones), assuming nature is an adversary is not a reasonable assumption.

Minimax Risk

Risk functions for two decision procedures, δ_1 and δ_2.



Since δ_1 has lower worst case risk, it is the minimax estimator, even though δ_2 has lower risk for most values of θ.
Thus minimax estimators are overly conservative.

Admissible estimators

- Some estimators are worse than others regardless of the value of θ^* ➔ Admissibility concept

- δ_1 **dominates** δ_2: if $R(\theta, \delta_1) \leq R(\theta, \delta_2)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$

- An estimator is said to be **admissible** if it is not strictly dominated by any other estimator.

Admissible estimator는 어떠한 다른 estimator에 의해서도 dominated되지 않은 estimator이다

Admissible estimators: Example

- Consider the problem of estimating the mean of a Gaussian

$$x_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta^*, \sigma^2 = 1)$$

$$L(\theta, \hat{\theta}) = (\theta - \hat{\theta})^2$$

- $\delta_1(\mathbf{x}) = \overline{x}$: the sample mean
- $\delta_2(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$: the sample median
- $\delta_3(\mathbf{x}) = \theta_0$: a fixed value
- $\delta_\kappa(\mathbf{x})$: the posterior mean under $\mathcal{N}(\theta|\theta_0, \sigma^2/\kappa)$ prior

$$\delta_\kappa(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{N}{N+\kappa}\overline{x} + \frac{\kappa}{N+\kappa}\theta_0 = w\overline{x} + (1-w)\theta_0$$

Admissible estimators: Example

$$MSE(\hat{\theta}(\cdot)|\theta^*) = \text{var}\left[\hat{\theta}\right] + \text{bias}^2(\hat{\theta})$$

$$MSE(\delta_1|\theta^*) = \text{var}\left[\overline{x}\right] = \frac{\sigma^2}{N}$$

$$MSE(\delta_2|\theta^*) = \frac{\pi}{2N}$$

$$MSE(\delta_3|\theta^*) = (\theta^* - \theta_0)^2$$

$$\begin{aligned} MSE(\delta_\kappa|\theta^*) &= \mathbb{E}\left[(w\overline{x} + (1-w)\theta_0 - \theta^*)^2\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[(w(\overline{x} - \theta^*) + (1-w)(\theta_0 - \theta^*))^2\right] \\ &= w^2\frac{\sigma^2}{N} + (1-w)^2(\theta_0 - \theta^*)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{(N+\kappa)^2}\left(N\sigma^2 + \kappa^2(\theta_0 - \theta^*)^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

Admissible estimators: Example



Admissible estimators: Example



Stein's paradox

- Suppose that $X_i \sim N(\theta_i, 1)$, & the goal is to estimate θ_i
- MLE: $\hat{\theta}_i = x_i$
- However, MLE is an inadmissible estimator when $N \geq 4$
- The James-Stein estimator:

$$\hat{\theta}_i = \hat{B}\overline{x} + (1 - \hat{B})x_i = \overline{x} + (1 - \hat{B})(x_i - \overline{x})$$

  - This is better than MLE, with lower MSE than the MLE for $N \geq 4$

➔**Stein's paradox**

Stein's paradox:
각각의 독립된 대상에 대한 estimation 이
전체의 global mean에 의존할때 MSE가 감소되는 현상

- Stein's paradox
  - A better estimation for θ_i depend on global mean
  - Suppose that θ_i is the "true" IQ of student i and X_i is the test score
    - Why should my estimate of θi depend on the global mean x?

Stein's paradox

- If your goal is to estimate just θ_i, you cannot do better than using x_i
- But, if the goal is to estimate the whole vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and you use squared error as your loss function, then shrinkage helps
- Suppose we want to estimate $||\boldsymbol{\theta}||_2^2$ from $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{I})$
- A simple estimate: $||\mathbf{x}||_2^2$ ➔ overestimate the results

$$\mathbb{E}\left[||\mathbf{x}||_2^2\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_i x_i^2\right] = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(1 + \theta_i^2\right) = N + ||\boldsymbol{\theta}||_2^2$$

- To reduce our estimation risk, we can use pooling information, even from unrelated sources, and shrinking towards the overall mean.

➔Stein's paradox presents the motivating hypothesis behind **multi-task learning**: that leveraging data from multiple tasks can yield superior performance over learning from each task independently

http://www.jmlr.org/papers/volume15/feldman14a/feldman14a.pdf

Admissibility is not enough

- Admissible estimators are easy to construct
  - Even a constant estimator is admissible

- **Theorem.** *Let* $X \sim N(\theta, 1)$*, and consider estimating* θ *under squared loss. Let* $\delta_1(x) = \theta_0$*, a constant* independent of the data*. This is an admissible estimator*

Desirable Properties of Estimators

- Frequentist decision theory doesn't provide an automatic way to choose the best estimator

- Instead, we can specify some properties that we would like estimators to have:

- **Consistent estimators**
- **Unbiased estimators**
- **Minimum variance estimators**

Consistent Estimators

- An estimator is said to be **consistent** if it eventually recovers the true parameters that generated the data as the sample size goes to infinity, $\hat{\theta}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \theta^* \text{ as } |\mathcal{D}| \rightarrow \infty$

- MLE is a consistent estimator
  - Maximizing likelihood is equivalent to minimizing KL

$$\mathbb{KL}\left(p(\cdot|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)||p(\cdot|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\right)$$

  - KL divergence is 0 when $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^*$

Unbiased estimators

- The **bias** of an estimator:

$$\text{bias}(\hat{\theta}(\cdot)) = \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathcal{D}|\theta_*)}\left[\hat{\theta}(\mathcal{D}) - \theta_*\right]$$

- The **unbiased** estimator: when the bias is zero
- MLE for a Gaussian mean is unbiased

$$\text{bias}(\hat{\mu}) = \mathbb{E}\left[\overline{x}\right] - \mu = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i\right] - \mu = \frac{N\mu}{N} - \mu = 0$$

- MLE for a Gaussian variance is **not** unbiased

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\hat{\sigma}^2\right] = \frac{N-1}{N}\sigma^2$$

- The unbiased estimator for a Gaussian variance:

$$\hat{\sigma}^2_{N-1} = \frac{N}{N-1}\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{N-1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(x_i - \overline{x})^2$$

Minimum variance estimators

- Being unbiased is not enough:
  - Dataset: $D = \{x_1, \cdots, x_N\}$
  - Estimate a Gaussian mean: $\hat{\theta}(D) = x_1$
  - But, $\text{bias}(x_1) = E[x_1] - \mu = 0$: Unbiased
- **Cramer-Rao lower bound**:
  - *Let* $X_1, \ldots, X_n \sim p(X|\theta_0)$ *and* $\hat{\theta} = \hat{\theta}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ *be unbiased estimator of* θ_0*. Then, under various smoothness assumption on* $P(X|\theta_0)$*, we have:*

$$\text{var}\left[\hat{\theta}\right] \geq \frac{1}{nI(\theta_0)}$$

  - The MLE achieves the Cramer Rao lower bound
    ➔ MLE is **asymptotically optimal**

The bias-variance tradeoff

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[(\hat{\theta} - \theta^*)^2\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left[(\hat{\theta} - \overline{\theta}) + (\overline{\theta} - \theta^*)\right]^2\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\hat{\theta} - \overline{\theta}\right)^2\right] + 2(\overline{\theta} - \theta^*)\mathbb{E}\left[\hat{\theta} - \overline{\theta}\right] + (\overline{\theta} - \theta^*)^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\hat{\theta} - \overline{\theta}\right)^2\right] + (\overline{\theta} - \theta^*)^2 \\
&= \mathrm{var}\left[\hat{\theta}\right] + \mathrm{bias}^2(\hat{\theta})
\end{aligned}
$$

MSE = variance + bias^2

The bias-variance tradeoff: An example

- $D = \{x_1, \cdots, x_N\}, \qquad x_i \sim N(\theta^* = 1, \sigma^2)$
- We want to estimate θ^*
- MLE: a bias of 0 and a variance of $\text{var}\left[\overline{x}|\theta^*\right] = \dfrac{\sigma^2}{N}$
- MAP with a prior of $N(\theta_0, \sigma^2/\kappa_0)$:

$$\tilde{x} \triangleq \frac{N}{N+\kappa_0}\overline{x} + \frac{\kappa_0}{N+\kappa_0}\theta_0 = w\overline{x} + (1-w)\theta_0$$

  - With the bias and variance of:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{x}\right] - \theta^* = \quad w\theta_0 + (1-w)\theta_0 - \theta^* = (1-w)(\theta_0 - \theta^*)$$

$$\text{var}\left[\tilde{x}\right] \quad = \quad w^2\frac{\sigma^2}{N}$$

➔ MAP is biased, having lower variance

The bias-variance tradeoff: An example



$\theta^* = 1$, but $\theta_0 = 0$
with different κ

The bias-variance tradeoff: An example



The bias-variance tradeoff: An example in Ridge regression





The bias-variance tradeoff: An example in Ridge regression





Empirical risk minimization

- Instead of $\delta(D)$, consider the response-oriented form of loss $L(y, \delta(\boldsymbol{x}))$:

nature's distribution

$$R(p_*, \delta) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x},y)\sim p_*}\left[L(y, \delta(\mathbf{x})\right]$$
$$= \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \sum_{y} L(y, \delta(\mathbf{x})) p_*(\mathbf{x}, y)$$

- **Empirical risk**
  - Use the empirical distribution to approximate p*

$$p_*(\mathbf{x}, y) \approx p_{\text{emp}}(\mathbf{x}, y) \triangleq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}(\mathbf{x}) \delta_{y_i}(y)$$

  - So, it is defined as:

$$R_{emp}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}) \triangleq R(p_{\text{emp}}, \delta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} L(y_i, \delta(\mathbf{x}_i))$$

Empirical risk minimization

- Empirical risk minimization (ERM)

$$\delta_{ERM}(\mathcal{D}) = \underset{\delta}{\operatorname{argmin}}\, R_{emp}(\mathcal{D}, \delta)$$

- In the unsupervised case, use the reconstruction error
  - $L\big(\boldsymbol{x}, \delta(\boldsymbol{x})\big) = \|\boldsymbol{x} - \delta(\boldsymbol{x})\|$
  - $\delta(\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathrm{decode}\big(\mathrm{encode}(\mathbf{x})\big)$

$$R_{emp}(\mathcal{D}, \delta) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} L(\mathbf{x}_i, \delta(\mathbf{x}_i))$$

  - Used in vector quantization, PCA, or auto-encoder

Regularized risk minimization

- The empirical risk is equal to the Bayes risk
  - if our prior about "nature's distribution" is that it is exactly equal to the empirical distribution

$$\mathbb{E}\left[R(p_*, \delta)|p_* = p_{\text{emp}}\right] = R_{emp}(\mathcal{D}, \delta)$$

  - Typically result in overfitting
- Regularized risk minimization (RRM)

$$R'(\mathcal{D}, \delta) = R_{emp}(\mathcal{D}, \delta) + \lambda C(\delta)$$

  - Equivalent to MAP estimation under some conditions
  - Issue 1) how do we measure complexity ?
    issue 2) how do we pick λ ?

Structural risk minimization

$$\hat{\delta}_\lambda = \underset{\delta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left[R_{emp}(\mathcal{D}, \delta) + \lambda C(\delta) \right]$$

- Structural risk minimization
  - Use an estimate of the risk, $\hat{R}$

$$\hat{\lambda} = \underset{\lambda}{\operatorname{argmin}} \hat{R}(\hat{\delta}_\lambda)$$

  - How to estimate the structural risk?
    - 1) Cross-validation
    - 2) Theoretical upper bounds on the risk

Estimating the risk using cross-validation

$$\hat{\lambda} = \arg \min_{\lambda \in [\lambda_{min}, \lambda_{max}]} R(\lambda, \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, K)$$

- The *K*-fold CV estimate of the risk of using λ:

$$R(\lambda, \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, K) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}|} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_k} L(y_i, f_\lambda^k(\mathbf{x}_i))$$

The one standard error rule

- Consider measure of uncertainty as the standard error of the mean

$$se = \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{N}} = \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{N}}$$

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(L_i - \overline{L})^2, \quad L_i = L(y_i, f_m^{k(i)}(\mathbf{x}_i)) \quad \overline{L} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} L_i$$

- The one standard error rule
  - pick the value which corresponds to the simplest model whose risk is no more than one standard error above the risk of the best model

Estimating the risk using cross-validation



Estimating the risk using cross-validation



Upper bounding the risk

- Statistical learning theory
- **Theorem.** *For any data distribution p_*, and any dataset D of size N drawn from p_*, the probability that our estimate of the error rate will be more than ϵ wrong, in the worst case, is upper bounded as follows:*

$$P\left(\max_{h\in\mathcal{H}} |R_{emp}(\mathcal{D},h) - R(p_*,h)| > \epsilon\right) \leq 2\dim(\mathcal{H})e^{-2N\epsilon^2}$$

Upper bounding the risk

- This bound tells us that the optimism of the training error increases with $\dim(H)$ but decreases with $N = |D|$
- $\dim(H)$: Related to the model capacity
  - $\dim(H) = |\mathrm{H}|$ when H is finite
  - $\dim(H)$: **VC (Vapnik-Chervonenkis) dimension** when H is infinite
- VC-based risk bound:
  - Pros: The computation of bounds on the risk are quicker than using CV
  - Cons: Hard to compare VC dim for many models, the upper bounds are very loose

VC Dimension

- **Shattered**: If $|\Pi_C(S)| = 2^m$ then S is considered shattered by C. In other words, S is shattered by C if C realizes all possible dichotomies of S

	$\mathbf{x}_1$	$\mathbf{x}_2$	$\mathbf{x}_3$
c_1	1	1	1
c_2	0	1	1
c_3	1	0	0
c_4	0	0	0

$\Pi_C(\{\mathbf{x}_1\}) = \{(0), (1)\}$ shattered

$\Pi_C(\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_3\}) = \{(0,0), (0,1), (1,0), (1,1)\}$ shattered

$\Pi_C(\{\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3\}) = \{(0,0), (1,1)\}$ not shattered

http://www.cs.huji.ac.il/~shashua/papers/class11-PAC2.pdf

VC Dimension

- The VC dimension of C, noted as $VCdim(C)$, is the cardinality d of the largest set S shattered by C. If all sets S (arbitrarily large) can be shattered by C, then $VCdim(C) = \infty$.

$$VCdim(C) = \max\{d \mid \exists |S| = d, \ and \ |\Pi_C(S)| = 2^d\}$$

VC Dimension: Examples

- Linear classifiers: a linear threshold unit
  - VCdim: $n + 1$
- Neural networks:
  - an arbitrary feedforward neural net with w weights that consists of linear threshold gates
  - VCdim: $O(w \log w)$

https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/5307/2edcceb505388b86d0448f43325008ad96d5.pdf

http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.145.5491&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Pathologies of frequentist statistics

- Frequentist statistics exhibits various forms of weird and undesirable behaviors, i.e., **pathologies**.

- 1) **Counter-intuitive behavior of confidence intervals**
- 2) **p-values considered harmful**
- 3) **violates the likelihood principle**

Bayesian vs. Frequentist

- **Why isn't everyone a Bayesian? (Efron '86)**

The title is a reasonable question to ask on at least two counts. First of all, everone used to be a Bayesian. Laplace whole heatedly endorsed Bayes's formulation of the inference problem, and most 19th-century scientists followed suit. This included Gauss, whose statistical work is usually presented in frequentist terms.

A second and more important point is the cogency of the Bayesian argument. Modern statisticians, following the lead of Savage and de Finetti, have advanced powerful theoretical arguments for preferring Bayesian inference. A byproduct of this work is a disturbing catalogue of inconsistencies in the frequentist point of view.

Nevertheless, everyone is not a Bayesian. The current era (1986) is the first century in which statistics has been widely used for scientific reporting, and in fact, 20th-century statistics is mainly non-Bayesian. However, Lindley (1975) predicts a change for the 21st century.