#### Decompositions of the Prediction Error

Stephen Vardeman Analytics Iowa LLC ISU Statistics and IMSE

#### Quantifying the performance of a predictor

- We suppose that training cases (x<sub>i</sub>, y<sub>i</sub>) for i = 1, 2, ..., N and test case (x, y) are iid from distribution P and that predictor f̂ is built using the training set T
- Then expected prediction loss (alternatively called the "prediction error," "test error," and "generalization error") suffered using  $\hat{f}$  is

$$\mathrm{Err} \equiv \mathbf{E}^{T} \mathbf{E}^{(\boldsymbol{x}, y)} \left[ L\left( \hat{f}\left( \boldsymbol{x} \right), y \right) \right]$$

 Two decompositions of this help make clear what must be controlled in order to make prediction error small

### General decomposition of prediction error

- Use the notation
  - f for the (theoretically) optimal predictor
  - S for a class of functions g from which a predictor can be chosen

 $\hat{f} = g_{\mathbf{T}}$  for the training-set-dependent element of  $\mathcal{S}$  used for prediction

- $g^*$  for a (fixed) element of  $\mathcal S$  with minimum expected prediction loss
- The situation can then be pictured as below in terms of the optimal, restricted optimal, and fitted predictors



#### General decomposition of prediction error

- The optimal f is potentially (typically) outside  ${\cal S}$
- The "closest" (in terms of prediction error) one can get to it inside  ${\cal S}$  is  $\,g^{*}$
- For any fixed training set  $\hat{f} = g_{T}$  can be no better than  $g^{*}$
- As the training set varies randomly, how much better  $g^{*}$  is than  $\hat{f}$  varies randomly

# General decomposition of prediction error

- So since here  $\operatorname{Err} = \operatorname{E}^{T} \operatorname{E}^{(x,y)} L\left(\widehat{f}(x), y\right) = \operatorname{E}^{T} \operatorname{E}^{(x,y)} L\left(g_{T}(x), y\right)$ we have  $\operatorname{Err} = \operatorname{E}^{(x,y)} L\left(f\left(x\right), y\right) + \left(\operatorname{E}^{(x,y)} L\left(g^{*}\left(x\right), y\right) - \operatorname{E}^{(x,y)} L\left(f\left(x\right), y\right)\right)$   $+ \left(\operatorname{E}^{T} \operatorname{E}^{(x,y)} L\left(g_{T}(x), y\right) - \operatorname{E}^{(x,y)} L\left(g^{*}\left(x\right), y\right)\right)$
- This can be thought of as

Err = minimum expected loss possible + modeling penalty

+ fitting penalty

- A more detailed and illuminating decomposition of Err is possible for SEL
- Begin with a measure of prediction performance at input vector x

$$\operatorname{Err}(\boldsymbol{x}) \equiv \operatorname{E}^{\boldsymbol{T}} \operatorname{E}\left[\left(\hat{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) - y\right)^2 | \boldsymbol{x}\right]$$

(noting that  $Err = E^{x} Err(x)$ )

• Then  $\operatorname{Err} \left( \boldsymbol{x} \right) = \operatorname{E}^{T} \left\{ \left( \hat{f}\left( \boldsymbol{x} \right) - \operatorname{E} \left[ \boldsymbol{y} | \boldsymbol{x} \right] \right)^{2} + \operatorname{E} \left[ \left( \boldsymbol{y} - \operatorname{E} \left[ \boldsymbol{y} | \boldsymbol{x} \right] \right)^{2} | \boldsymbol{x} \right] \right\}$   $= \operatorname{E}^{T} \left\{ \left( \hat{f}\left( \boldsymbol{x} \right) - \operatorname{E}^{T} \hat{f}\left( \boldsymbol{x} \right) \right)^{2} + \left( \operatorname{E}^{T} \hat{f}\left( \boldsymbol{x} \right) - \operatorname{E} \left[ \boldsymbol{y} | \boldsymbol{x} \right] \right)^{2} \right\} + \operatorname{Var} \left[ \boldsymbol{y} | \boldsymbol{x} \right]$   $= \operatorname{Var}^{T} \left( \hat{f}\left( \boldsymbol{x} \right) \right) + \left( \operatorname{E}^{T} \hat{f}\left( \boldsymbol{x} \right) - \operatorname{E} \left[ \boldsymbol{y} | \boldsymbol{x} \right] \right)^{2} + \operatorname{Var} \left[ \boldsymbol{y} | \boldsymbol{x} \right]$ 

- $\operatorname{Var}^{\mathbf{T}}(\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}))$  is the variance of prediction at  $\mathbf{x}$
- $\left( E^{T} \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) E[y | \mathbf{x}] \right)^{2}$  is a kind of squared bias of prediction at  $\mathbf{x}$
- Var[y | x] is an unavoidable variance in outputs at x
- Clearly then

$$\operatorname{Err} = \operatorname{E}^{\mathbf{x}}\operatorname{Var}^{\mathbf{T}}\left(\hat{f}(\mathbf{x})\right) + \operatorname{E}^{\mathbf{x}}\left(\operatorname{E}^{\mathbf{T}}\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \operatorname{E}[y | \mathbf{x}]\right)^{2} + \operatorname{E}^{\mathbf{x}}\operatorname{Var}[y | \mathbf{x}]$$

and SEL prediction error is a sum of averages (against the marginal of  $\mathbf{x}$ ) of the three quantities at fixed inputs

- Further analysis of  $E^{\mathbf{x}} \left( E^{\mathbf{T}} \hat{f}(x) E[y | x] \right)^2$  provides additional insight
- Suppose that **T** is used to select a function  $g_{\mathbf{T}}$  from some linear subspace S of the the space of functions h with  $\mathsf{E}^{\mathsf{x}} (h(\mathsf{x}))^2 < \infty$  and  $\hat{f} = g_{\mathbf{T}}$ . Further, let

$$g^{*}\left(\mathbf{x}\right) = \underset{g \in \mathcal{S}}{\arg\min} \mathsf{E}^{\mathbf{x}}\left(g\left(\mathbf{x}\right) - \mathsf{E}\left[y|\mathbf{x}\right]\right)^{2}$$

(the best approximation to the optimal predictor in S and projection of  $E[y|\mathbf{x}]$  onto S).

• It's then possible to argue that

$$\mathbf{E}^{\boldsymbol{x}}\left(\mathbf{E}^{\boldsymbol{T}}\hat{f}\left(\boldsymbol{x}\right)-\mathbf{E}\left[\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}\right]\right)^{2}=\mathbf{E}^{\boldsymbol{x}}\left(\mathbf{E}^{\boldsymbol{T}}\hat{f}\left(\boldsymbol{x}\right)-\boldsymbol{g}^{*}\left(\boldsymbol{x}\right)\right)^{2}+\mathbf{E}^{\boldsymbol{x}}\left(\mathbf{E}\left[\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{x}\right]-\boldsymbol{g}^{*}\left(\boldsymbol{x}\right)\right)^{2}$$

- The first term on the right is an average (across inputs) squared fitting bias
- The second term is an average (across inputs) squared model bias
- So ultimately for SEL  $Err = E^{x} Var[y|x] + E^{x} (E[y|x] - g^{*}(x))^{2} + E^{x} (E^{T} \hat{f}(x) - g^{*}(x))^{2} + E^{x} Var^{T} (\hat{f}(x))$

• The SEL decomposition is related to the general one in that minimum expected loss possible = expected (across x) response variance =  $E^x Var[y|x]$ ,

> modeling penalty = expected (across  $\boldsymbol{x}$ ) squared model bias =  $\mathbf{E}^{\boldsymbol{x}} \left( \mathbf{E} \left[ \boldsymbol{y} | \boldsymbol{x} \right] - \boldsymbol{g}^* \left( \boldsymbol{x} \right) \right)^2$ ,

fitting penalty = 
$$\begin{pmatrix} \text{expected } (\operatorname{across} x) \\ \text{squared fitting bias} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \text{expected } (\operatorname{across} x) \\ \text{prediction variance} \end{pmatrix}$$
  
=  $\mathbf{E}^{x} \left( \mathbf{E}^{T} \hat{f}(x) - g^{*}(x) \right)^{2} + \mathbf{E}^{x} \operatorname{Var}^{T} \left( \hat{f}(x) \right)$ 

- The facts that
  - the modeling and fitting penalties have elements of both bias and variance
  - complex predictors tend to have low bias and high variance in comparison to simple ones

lead to the necessity of balancing these elements in predictor development and the so-called **variance-bias trade-off** 

 Once more, in qualitative terms, it is the matching of predictor complexity to real information content of a training set that is at issue here