# Regression

#### Ahmed Bou-Rabee and Stephen Boyd

#### EE103 Stanford University

November 2, 2016

# Outline

Regression model

Example

Feature engineering

Regression model

# **Regression model**

- we assume there is an approximate relation between *n*-vector x and scalar y:  $y \approx f(x)$
- ► x is called *feature vector* or *regressor*
- y is called outcome or dependent variable
- regression model is affine function of x given by

$$\hat{y} = \hat{f}(x) = x^T \beta + v$$

where  $\beta \in \mathbf{R}^n, v \in \mathbf{R}$  are model parameters

- *n*-vector  $\beta$  is weight vector, scalar v is offset
- the regressors x<sub>i</sub> are typically shifted and scaled to be on approximately the same scale (say, with a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1)

#### Measurements/data

▶ we have *N* samples or examples

$$(x_1,y_1),\ldots,(x_N,y_N)$$

- define  $n \times N$  matrix  $X = [x_1 \cdots x_N]$  and N-vector  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_N)$
- ▶ define N-vector  $\hat{y} = (\hat{f}(x_1), \dots, \hat{f}(x_N))$  (predicted outcomes)

can express predictions as

$$\hat{y} = X^T \beta + v \mathbf{1}$$

prediction error N-vector (on data) is

$$\hat{y} - y = X^T \beta + v \mathbf{1} - y$$

#### Regression model

#### Regression

• choose  $\beta$ , v to minimize sum square prediction error

$$\left\|X^{T}\beta + v\mathbf{1} - y\right\|^{2} = \left\|\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{1} \ X^{T}\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}v\\\beta\end{bmatrix} - y\right\|^{2}$$

 $\blacktriangleright$  a least squares problem with variables  $\beta,\,v$ 

solution

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} \\ \hat{\beta} \end{bmatrix} = \left( \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1} \ X^T \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1} \ X^T \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1} \ X^T \end{bmatrix}^T y$$

#### Regression model

# Validation

- we want  $y \approx \hat{f}(x)$  on *new*, *unseen data*
- when this happens, we say model generalizes
- to check this, we reserve some of the data as a *test set*, leaving the rest of the data as a *training set*
- we fit the model by regression on the training set
- we test the model on the test data set
- if the RMS prediction error on the test set is similar to the RMS prediction on the training set, we have (some) confidence in the regression model
- if the RMS test prediction error is much larger than the RMS training error, the model is *over-fit*, and we don't trust it

# Outline

Regression model

#### Example

Feature engineering

# Wine quality/rating

- ▶ 1599 red wines
- ▶ 11-feature-vector x
- outcome y is median of expert ratings (integer between 1 and 10)

• 
$$avg(y) = 5.6$$
,  $std(y) = 0.8$ 

▶ split data into training set (1279 samples) and test set (320 samples)

### Regressors

fixed acidity  $x_1$ volatile acidity  $x_2$ citric acid  $x_3$ residual sugar  $x_4$ chlorides  $x_5$  $x_6$  free sulfur dioxide total sulfur dioxide  $x_7$ density  $x_8$ pН  $x_9$ sulphates  $x_{10}$ alcohol  $x_{11}$ 

(regressors are shifted and scaled so mean pprox 0, std. dev. pprox 1)

# Results

model	RMS train error	RMS test error
constant	0.80	0.83
regression	0.65	0.64

# Results



### **Regression model parameters**

$x_1$	fixed acidity	0.06
$x_2$	volatile acidity	-0.18
$x_3$	citric acid	-0.03
$x_4$	residual sugar	0.02
$x_5$	chlorides	-0.07
$x_6$	free sulfur dioxide	0.05
$x_7$	total sulfur dioxide	-0.09
$x_8$	density	-0.05
$x_9$	pН	-0.06
$x_{10}$	sulphates	0.15
$x_{11}$	alcohol	0.30
1	(constant)	5.62

### 5-fold validation

- divide data (1599 samples) into 5 *folds* (each with  $\approx 320$  samples)
- for  $i = 1, \ldots, 5$  train on all folds except i
- $\blacktriangleright$  then test regression model on fold i
- results:

test fold	train RMS	test RMS
1	0.65	0.64
2	0.64	0.68
3	0.65	0.62
4	0.64	0.66
5	0.64	0.66

 $\blacktriangleright$  suggests regression model can predict quality on new wines with an RMS error around  $0.66~{\rm or}$  so

# Outline

Regression model

Example

Feature engineering

## **Modifying features**

- ▶ idea: replace feature  $x_i$  with some function of  $x_i$
- standarizing: replace  $x_i$  with  $(x_i b_i)/a_i$ 
  - $b_i$  is (approximately) mean of  $x_i$  across data set
  - $a_i$  is (approximately) standard deviation of  $x_i$  across data set

(modified features have mean near zero, standard deviation near one) this is almost always done

• winsorizing: 'trim' values of  $x_i$  outside some range: replace  $x_i$  with

$$\begin{cases} 3 & x_i > 3 \\ x_i & |x_i| \le 3 \\ -3 & x_i < -3 \end{cases}$$

helps when there are some values that are 'outliers'

# **Modifying features**

- log transform: replace  $x_i$  with  $\log x_i$  (for  $x_i > 0$ )
  - $-\,$  good for features that vary over large range
  - variation for  $x_i \ge 0$ : replace  $x_i$  with  $\log(x_i + 1)$

- Q: is transforming features a good idea?
- A: if RMS error on validation set is smaller

# **Augmenting features**

- idea: augment original features with new functions of them
- high/low values: augment feature  $x_i$  with two new features

$$-x_i^{\rm hi} = \max\{x_i - 1, 0\}$$

- $-x_i^{\rm lo} = \min\{x_i + 1, 0\}$
- *interactions*: add features of form  $x_i x_j$
- custom augmented features are common in applications
  - last high/low price
  - price/earnings ratio

- synthetic data set, with 1000 samples, 4 features
- divide into training set (800) and test set (200)
- first fit simple models, using zero or one regressor:

model	train RMS	test RMS
1	1.85	1.84
$1, x_1$	1.76	1.74
$1, x_2$	1.82	1.79
$1, x_{3}$	1.46	1.47
$1, x_4$	1.54	1.60

#### $\hat{y}$ versus y, constant model

(test set)



### $\hat{y}$ versus y, single regressor models

(test set)



### **Basic regression**

#### (regression with all features)

model	train RMS	test RMS
1	1.85	1.84
$x_1$	1.76	1.74
$x_2$	1.82	1.79
$x_3$	1.46	1.47
$x_4$	1.54	1.60
$1, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4$	0.88	0.92

# $\hat{y}$ versus y, basic regression



#### train and test sets

#### **Augmenting features**

- ▶ add new features  $\max\{x_i 1, 0\}$ ,  $\min\{x_i + 1, 0\}$ , i = 1, ..., 4
- augmented model has 13 features total

model	train RMS	test RMS
1	1.85	1.84
$1, x_1$	1.76	1.74
$1, x_2$	1.82	1.79
$1, x_{3}$	1.46	1.47
$1, x_4$	1.54	1.60
$1, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4$	0.88	0.92
augmented	0.46	0.48

### $\hat{y}$ versus $y_{\text{-}}$ augmented regression



with augmented features on train and test sets

#### **Regression model with augmented features**

- $\hat{y} = \beta_1 + (\beta_2 x_1 + \beta_6 \max\{x_1 1, 0\} + \beta_{10} \min\{x_1 + 1, 0\}) + \cdots$
- $\hat{y}$  is a sum of piecewise linear functions of  $x_i$
- called a generalized additive model

