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## Last Time

- Supervised learning via naive Bayes
- Use MLE to estimate a distribution
- Classify by looking at the conditional distribution, $p(y \mid x)$
- Today: logistic regression


## Naïve Bayes

- Naïve Bayes assumes that the underlying distribution that generated the data satisfies the following conditional independence assumption

$$
p\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m} \mid y\right)=\prod_{i=1}^{m} p\left(x_{i} \mid y\right)
$$

- Use MLE to learn the "best" model that satisfies this assumption
- Classify via

$$
\begin{aligned}
y^{*} & =\arg \max _{y} p(y) p\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m} \mid y\right) \\
& =\arg \max _{y} p(y) \prod_{i}^{m} p\left(x_{i} \mid y\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## MLE for the Parameters of NB

- Given dataset, count occurrences for all pairs
$-\operatorname{Count}\left(X_{i}=x_{i}, Y=y\right)$ is the number of samples in which $X_{i}=x_{i}$ and $Y=y$
- MLE for discrete NB

$$
\begin{gathered}
p(Y=y)=\frac{\operatorname{Count}(Y=y)}{\sum_{y^{\prime}} \operatorname{Count}\left(Y=y^{\prime}\right)} \\
p\left(X_{i}=x_{i} \mid Y=y\right)=\frac{\operatorname{Count}\left(X_{i}=x_{i}, Y=y\right)}{\sum_{x_{i}^{\prime}} \operatorname{Count}\left(X_{i}=x_{i}^{\prime}, Y=y\right)}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Naïve Bayes Calculations

| Day | Outlook | Temperature | Humidity | Wind | PlayTennis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | Sunny | Hot | High | Weak | No |
| D2 | Sunny | Hot | High | Strong | No |
| D3 | Overcast | Hot | High | Weak | Yes |
| D4 | Rain | Mild | High | Weak | Yes |
| D5 | Rain | Cool | Normal | Weak | Yes |
| D6 | Rain | Cool | Normal | Strong | No |
| D7 | Overcast | Cool | Normal | Strong | Yes |
| D8 | Sunny | Mild | High | Weak | No |
| D9 | Sunny | Cool | Normal | Weak | Yes |
| D10 | Rain | Mild | Normal | Weak | Yes |
| D11 | Sunny | Mild | Normal | Strong | Yes |
| D12 | Overcast | Mild | High | Strong | Yes |
| D13 | Overcast | Hot | Normal | Weak | Yes |
| D14 | Rain | Mild | High | Strong | No |

## Logistic Regression

- Learn $p(Y \mid X)$ directly from the data
- Assume a particular functional form, e.g., a linear classifier $p(Y=1 \mid x)=1$ on one side and 0 on the other
- Not differentiable...
- Makes it difficult to learn
- Can't handle noisy labels


## Logistic Regression

- Learn $p(y \mid x)$ directly from the data
- Assume a particular functional form

$$
\begin{gathered}
p(Y=-1 \mid x)=\frac{1}{1+\exp \left(w^{T} x+b\right)} \\
p(Y=1 \mid x)=\frac{\exp \left(w^{T} x+b\right)}{1+\exp \left(w^{T} x+b\right)}
\end{gathered}
$$



## Logistic Function in $m$ Dimensions



$$
p(Y=-1 \mid x)=\frac{1}{1+\exp \left(w^{T} x+b\right)}
$$

Can be applied to discrete and continuous features

## Functional Form: Two classes

- Given some $w$ and $b$, we can classify a new point $x$ by assigning the label 1 if $p(Y=1 \mid x)>p(Y=-1 \mid x)$ and - 1 otherwise
- This leads to a linear classification rule:
- Classify as a 1 if $w^{T} x+b>0$
- Classify as a -1 if $w^{T} x+b<0$


## Learning the Weights

- To learn the weights, we maximize the conditional likelihood

$$
\left(w^{*}, b^{*}\right)=\arg \max _{w, b} \prod_{i=1}^{N} p\left(y^{(i)} \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right)
$$

- This is the not the same strategy that we used in the case of naive Bayes
- For naive Bayes, we maximized the log-likelihood, not the conditional log-likelihood


## Generative vs. Discriminative Classifiers

## Generative classifier: (e.g., Naïve Bayes)

- Assume some functional form for $p(x \mid y), p(y)$
- Estimate parameters of $p(x \mid y)$, $p(y)$ directly from training data
- Use Bayes rule to calculate $p(y \mid x)$
- This is a generative model
- Indirect computation of $p(Y \mid X)$ through Bayes rule
- As a result, can also generate a sample of the data, $p(x)=\Sigma_{y} p(y) p(x \mid y)$

Discriminative classifiers:
(e.g., Logistic Regression)

- Assume some functional form for $p(y \mid x)$
- Estimate parameters of $p(y \mid x)$ directly from training data
- This is the discriminative model
- Directly learn $p(y \mid x)$
- But cannot obtain a sample of the data as $p(x)$ is not available
- Useful for discriminating labels


## Learning the Weights

$$
\begin{aligned}
\ell(w, b) & =\ln \prod_{i=1}^{N} p\left(y^{(i)} \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{N} \ln p\left(y^{(i)} \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{y^{(i)}+1}{2} \ln p\left(Y=1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right)+\left(1-\frac{y^{(i)}+1}{2}\right) \ln p\left(Y=-1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{y^{(i)}+1}{2} \ln \frac{p\left(Y=1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right)}{p\left(Y=-1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right)}+\ln p\left(Y=-1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{y^{(i)}+1}{2}\left(w^{T} x^{(i)}+b\right)-\ln \left(1+\exp \left(w^{T} x^{(i)}+b\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Learning the Weights

$$
\begin{aligned}
\ell(w, b) & =\ln \prod_{i=1}^{N} p\left(y^{(i)} \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{N} \ln p\left(y^{(i)} \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{y^{(i)}+1}{2} \ln p\left(Y=1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right)+\left(1-\frac{y^{(i)}+1}{2}\right) \ln p\left(Y=-1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{y^{(i)}+1}{2} \ln \frac{p\left(Y=1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right)}{p\left(Y=-1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right)}+\ln p\left(Y=-1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{y^{(i)}+1}{2}\left(w^{T} x^{(i)}+b\right)-\ln \left(1+\exp \left(w^{T} x^{(i)}+b\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

This is concave in over $w$ and $b$ : take derivatives and solve!

## Learning the Weights

$$
\begin{aligned}
\ell(w, b) \quad & =\ln \prod_{i=1}^{N} p\left(y^{(i)} \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{N} \ln p\left(y^{(i)} \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{y^{(i)}+1}{2} \ln p\left(Y=1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right)+\left(1-\frac{y^{(i)}+1}{2}\right) \ln p\left(Y=-1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{y^{(i)}+1}{2} \ln \frac{p\left(Y=1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right)}{p\left(Y=-1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right)}+\ln p\left(Y=-1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{y^{(i)}+1}{2}\left(w^{T} x^{(i)}+b\right)-\ln \left(1+\exp \left(w^{T} x^{(i)}+b\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

No closed form solution : $:$

## Learning the Weights

- Can apply gradient ascent to maximize the conditional likelihood

$$
\begin{gathered}
\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial b}=\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[\frac{y^{(i)}+1}{2}-p\left(Y=1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right)\right] \\
\frac{\partial \ell}{\partial w_{j}}=\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_{j}^{(i)}\left[\frac{y^{(i)}+1}{2}-p\left(Y=1 \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right)\right]
\end{gathered}
$$

## Priors

- Can define priors on the weights and bias to prevent overfitting
- Normal distribution, zero mean, identity covariance

$$
p(w)=\prod_{j} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi \sigma^{2}}} \exp \left(-\frac{w_{j}^{2}}{2 \sigma^{2}}\right)
$$

- "Pushes" parameters towards zero
- Regularization
- Helps avoid very large weights and overfitting


## Priors as Regularization

- The log-MAP objective with this Gaussian prior is then

$$
\ln \prod_{i=1}^{N} p\left(y^{(i)} \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right) p(w) p(b)=\left[\sum_{i}^{N} \ln p\left(y^{(i)} \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right)\right]-\frac{\lambda}{2}\left(\|w\|_{2}^{2}+b^{2}\right)
$$

- Quadratic penalty: drives weights towards zero
- Adds a negative linear term to the gradients
- Different priors can produce different kinds of regularization


## Priors as Regularization

- The log-MAP objective with this Gaussian prior is then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \ln \prod_{i=1}^{N} p\left(y^{(i)} \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right) p(w) p(b)=\left[\sum_{i}^{N} \ln p\left(y^{(i)} \mid x^{(i)}, w, b\right)\right]-\frac{\lambda}{2}\left(\|w\|_{2}^{2}+b^{2}\right) \\
& \text { - Quadratic penalty: drives weights towards zero }
\end{aligned}
$$

Somtimes called an $\ell_{2}$

- Adds a negative linear term to the gradients regularizer
- Different priors can produce different kinds of regularization


## Regularization


$\ell_{1}$

$\ell_{2}$

## Naïve Bayes vs. Logistic Regression

- Generative vs. Discriminative classifiers
- Non-asymptotic analysis (for Gaussian NB)
- Convergence rate of parameter estimates, ( $m=$ \# of attributes in $X$ )
- Size of training data to get close to infinite data solution
- Naïve Bayes needs $O(\log m)$ samples
- NB converges quickly to its (perhaps less helpful) asymptotic estimates
- Logistic Regression needs $O(m)$ samples
- LR converges slower but makes no independence assumptions (typically less biased)


## NB vs. LR (on UCI datasets)


——Naïve bayes
...... Logistic Regression

## Sample size $m$

[Ng \& Jordan, 2002]

## LR in General

- Suppose that $y \in\{1, \ldots, R\}$, i.e., that there are $R$ different class labels
- Can define a collection of weights and biases as follows
- Choose a vector of biases and a matrix of weights such that for $y \neq R$

$$
p(Y=k \mid x)=\frac{\exp \left(b_{k}+\sum_{i} w_{k i} x_{i}\right)}{1+\sum_{j<R} \exp \left(b_{j}+\sum_{i} w_{j i} x_{i}\right)}
$$

and

$$
p(Y=R \mid x)=\frac{1}{1+\sum_{j<R} \exp \left(b_{j}+\sum_{i} w_{j i} x_{i}\right)}
$$

