

Ridge Regression; Dimensionality Reduction; and Feature Selection

Instructor: Sham Kakade

1 Ridge Regression

1.1 Bias Variance in the Fixed Design Setting

Lemma 1.1. (*bias-variance for risk*) We can decompose the expected risk as:

$$\begin{aligned} R(\hat{\beta}) &= \mathbb{E}_Y \|\hat{\beta} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\beta}]\|_{\Sigma}^2 + \|\mathbb{E}[\hat{\beta}] - \beta\|_{\Sigma}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_Y \|\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}] - \hat{Y}\|^2 + \frac{1}{n} \|Y^* - \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}]\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we have that:

$$(average) \text{ variance} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_Y \|X\hat{\beta} - X\mathbb{E}[\hat{\beta}]\|^2 = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_Y \|\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}] - \hat{Y}\|^2$$

and

$$\text{prediction bias vector} = X\beta - X\mathbb{E}[\hat{\beta}] = Y^* - \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}]$$

1.2 Ridge Regression and the Bias-Variance Tradeoff

The ridge regression estimator using an outcome Y is just:

$$\hat{\beta}_{\lambda} = \arg \min_w \frac{1}{n} \|Y - Xw\|^2 + \lambda \|w\|^2$$

The estimator is then:

$$\hat{\beta}_{\lambda} = (\Sigma + \lambda I)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n} X^{\top} Y \right) = (\Sigma + \lambda I)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum Y_i X_i^{\top} \right)$$

For simplicity, let us rotate X such that:

$$\Sigma := \frac{1}{n} X^{\top} X = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d)$$

(note this rotation does not alter the predictions of rotationally invariant algorithms). With this choice, we have that:

$$[\hat{\beta}_{\lambda}]_j = \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i [X_i]_j}{\lambda_j + \lambda}$$

It is straightforward to see that:

$$\beta = \mathbb{E}[\hat{\beta}_0]$$

and it follows that:

$$[\mathbb{E}[\hat{\beta}]_{\lambda}]_j := \mathbb{E}[\hat{\beta}_{\lambda}]_j = \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j + \lambda} \beta_j$$

by just taking expectations.

Lemma 1.2. (Risk Bound) If $\text{Var}(Y_i) = \sigma^2$, we have that:

$$R(\hat{\beta}_\lambda) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \sum_j \left(\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j + \lambda} \right)^2 + \sum_j \beta_j^2 \frac{\lambda_j}{(1 + \lambda_j/\lambda)^2}$$

The above is an equality if $\text{Var}(Y_i) \leq \sigma^2$.

Proof. Note that in our coordinate system we have $X = UD^\top$ (from the thin SVD), since $X^\top X$ is diagonal. Here, the diagonal entries are $\sqrt{n\lambda_j}$. Letting η be the noise:

$$Y = \mathbb{E}[Y] + \eta$$

and

$$\Sigma_\lambda = \Sigma + \lambda I,$$

so that $\hat{\beta}_\lambda = \frac{1}{n} \Sigma_\lambda X^\top Y$. We have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_Y \|\hat{\beta}_\lambda - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\beta}]_\lambda\|_\Sigma^2 &= \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E}_\eta [\eta^\top X \Sigma_\lambda \Sigma \Sigma_\lambda X \eta] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E}_\eta [\eta^\top U \text{Diag}(\dots, \frac{n\lambda_j^2}{(\lambda_j + \lambda)^2}, \dots) U^\top \eta] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_j \frac{\lambda_j^2}{(\lambda_j + \lambda)^2} \mathbb{E}_\eta [U^\top \eta]_j^2 \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \sum_j \frac{\lambda_j^2}{(\lambda_j + \lambda)^2} \end{aligned}$$

This holds with equality if $\text{Var}(Y_i) = 1$. For the bias term,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\beta}_\lambda - \beta\|_\Sigma^2 &= \sum_j \lambda_j ([\bar{\beta}_\lambda]_j - [\beta]_j)^2 \\ &= \sum_j \beta_j^2 \lambda_j \left(\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j + \lambda} - 1 \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_j \beta_j^2 \lambda_j \left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_j + \lambda} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows from algebraic manipulations. □

1.3 Margin Based Bound

There following bound characterizes the risk for two natural settings for λ .

Theorem 1.3. Assume $\text{Var}(Y_i) \leq 1$

- (Finite Dims) For $\lambda = 0$,

$$R(\hat{\beta}_\lambda) \leq \frac{d}{n}$$

And if $\text{Var}(Y_i) = 1$, then $R(\hat{\beta}_\lambda) = \frac{d}{n}$.

- (Infinite Dims) For $\lambda = \frac{\sqrt{\|\Sigma\|_{\text{trace}}}}{\|\beta\|\sqrt{n}}$, then:

$$R(\hat{\beta}_\lambda) \leq \frac{\|\beta\| \sqrt{\|\Sigma\|_{\text{trace}}}}{2\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{\|\beta\| \|\mathcal{X}\|}{2\sqrt{n}}$$

where the trace norm is the sum of the singular values and $\|\mathcal{X}\| = \max_i \|X_i\|$. Furthermore, for all n there exists a distribution $\Pr[Y]$ and an X such that the $\inf_\lambda R(\hat{\beta}_\lambda)$ is $\Omega^*(\frac{\|\beta\| \|\mathcal{X}\|}{\sqrt{n}})$ (so the above bound is tight up to log factors in n).

Conceptually, the second bound is ‘dimension free’, i.e. it does not depend explicitly on d , which could be infinite. And we are effectively doing regression in a large (potentially) infinite dimensional space.

Proof. The $\lambda = 0$ case follows directly from the previous lemma. Using that $(a + b)^2 \geq 2ab$, we can bound the variance term for general λ as follows:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_j \left(\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j + \lambda} \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_j \frac{\lambda_j^2}{2\lambda_j \lambda} = \frac{\sum_j \lambda_j}{2n\lambda}$$

Again, using that $(a + b)^2 \geq 2ab$, the bias term is bounded as:

$$\sum_j \beta_j^2 \frac{\lambda_j}{(1 + \lambda_j/\lambda)^2} \leq \sum_j \beta_j^2 \frac{\lambda_j}{2\lambda_j/\lambda} = \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\beta\|^2$$

So we have that:

$$R(\hat{\beta}_\lambda) \leq \frac{\|\Sigma\|_{\text{trace}}}{2n\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\beta\|^2$$

and using the choice of λ completes the proof.

To see the above bound is tight, consider the following problem. Let $X_i = \sqrt{\frac{n}{i}}$ and $\beta_i = \sqrt{\frac{1}{i}}$ and let $Y = X\beta + \eta$ where η is unit variance. Here, we have that $\lambda_i = \frac{1}{i}$ so $\sum_j \lambda_j \leq \log n$ and $\|\beta\|^2 \leq \log n$, so the upper is $\frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}}$. Now one can write the risk as:

$$R(\hat{\beta}_\lambda) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_j \left(\frac{\frac{1}{j}}{\frac{1}{j} + \lambda} \right)^2 + \sum_j \frac{\frac{1}{j^2}}{(1 + \frac{1}{j\lambda})^2} \quad (1)$$

$$= \sum_j \frac{\frac{1}{n} + \lambda^2}{(1 + i\lambda)^2} \quad (2)$$

$$\geq \int_1^n \frac{\frac{1}{n} + \lambda^2}{(1 + x\lambda)^2} dx \quad (3)$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{n} + \lambda^2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{\lambda(1 + \lambda)} - \frac{1}{\lambda(1 + n\lambda)} \right) \quad (4)$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{n\lambda} + \lambda \right) \left(\frac{1}{1 + \lambda} - \frac{1}{1 + n\lambda} \right) \quad (5)$$

$$(6)$$

and this is $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$, for all λ . □

2 PCA Projections and MLEs

Fix some λ . Consider the following ‘keep or kill’ estimator, which uses the MLE estimate if $\lambda_i \geq \lambda$ and 0 otherwise:

$$[\hat{\beta}_{PCA,\lambda}]_j = \begin{cases} [\hat{\beta}_0]_j & \text{if } \lambda_i \geq \lambda \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

where $\hat{\beta}_0$ is the MLE estimator. This estimator is 0 for the small values of λ_i (those in which we are effectively regularizing more anyways).

Theorem 2.1. (*Risk Inflation of $\hat{\beta}_{PCA,\lambda}$*)

Assume $\text{Var}(Y_i) = 1$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_Y[R(\hat{\beta}_{PCA,\lambda})] \leq 4\mathbb{E}_Y[R(\hat{\beta}_\lambda)]$$

Note that the the actual risk (not just an upper bound) of the simple PCA estimate is within a factor of 4 of the ridge regression risk on a wide class of problems.

Proof. Recall that:

$$\mathbb{E}_Y[R(\hat{\beta}_\lambda)] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_j \left(\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j + \lambda} \right)^2 + \sum_j \beta_j^2 \frac{\lambda_j}{(1 + \lambda_j/\lambda)^2}$$

Since we can write the risk as:

$$\mathbb{E}_Y[R(\hat{\beta})] = \mathbb{E}_Y[\|\hat{\beta} - \bar{\beta}\|_\Sigma^2 + \|\bar{\beta} - \beta\|_\Sigma^2]$$

we have that:

$$\mathbb{E}_Y[R(\hat{\beta}_{PCA,\lambda})] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_j \mathbb{I}(\lambda_j > \lambda) + \sum_{j:\lambda_j < \lambda} \lambda_j \beta_j^2$$

where \mathbb{I} is the indicator function.

We now show that each term in the risk of $\hat{\beta}_{PCA,\lambda}$ is within a factor of 4 for each term in $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$. If $\lambda_j > \lambda$, then the ratio of the j -th terms is:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\frac{1}{n}}{\frac{1}{n} \left(\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j + \lambda} \right)^2 + \beta_j^2 \frac{\lambda_j}{(1 + \lambda_j/\lambda)^2}} &\leq \frac{\frac{1}{n}}{\frac{1}{n} \left(\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j + \lambda} \right)^2} \\ &= \frac{(\lambda_j + \lambda)^2}{\lambda_j^2} \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_j} \right)^2 \\ &\leq 4 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $\lambda_j \leq \lambda$, then the ratio of the j -th terms is:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda_j \beta_j^2}{\frac{1}{n} \left(\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j + \lambda} \right)^2 + \frac{\lambda_j \beta_j^2}{(1 + \lambda_j/\lambda)^2}} &\leq \frac{\lambda_j \beta_j^2}{\frac{\lambda_j \beta_j^2}{(1 + \lambda_j/\lambda)^2}} \\ &= (1 + \lambda_j/\lambda)^2 \\ &\leq 4 \end{aligned}$$

Since each term is within a factor of 4, the proof is completed. \square