Background: Generative and Discriminative Classifiers
Logistic Regression

Important analytic tool in natural and social sciences

Baseline supervised machine learning tool for classification

Is also the foundation of neural networks
Generative and Discriminative Classifiers

Naive Bayes is a **generative** classifier

by contrast:

Logistic regression is a **discriminative** classifier
Generative and Discriminative Classifiers

Suppose we're distinguishing cat from dog images
Generative Classifier:

- Build a model of what's in a cat image
  - Knows about whiskers, ears, eyes
  - Assigns a probability to any image:
    - how cat-y is this image?

Also build a model for dog images

Now given a new image:

Run both models and see which one fits better
Discriminative Classifier

Just try to distinguish dogs from cats

Oh look, dogs have collars!
Let's ignore everything else
Finding the correct class $c$ from a document $d$ in Generative vs Discriminative Classifiers

**Naive Bayes**

$$\hat{c} = \arg \max_{c \in C} \left\{ P(d|c) \cdot P(c) \right\}$$

**Logistic Regression**

$$\hat{c} = \arg \max_{c \in C} P(c|d)$$
Components of a probabilistic machine learning classifier

Given $m$ input/output pairs $(x^{(i)}, y^{(i)})$:

1. A **feature representation** of the input. For each input observation $x^{(i)}$, a vector of features $[x_1, x_2, ..., x_n]$. Feature $j$ for input $x^{(i)}$ is $x_j$, more completely $x_j^{(i)}$, or sometimes $f_j(x)$.

2. A **classification function** that computes $\hat{y}$, the estimated class, via $p(y|x)$, like the **sigmoid** or **softmax** functions.

3. An objective function for learning, like **cross-entropy loss**.

4. An algorithm for optimizing the objective function: **stochastic gradient descent**.
The two phases of logistic regression

**Training**: we learn weights $w$ and $b$ using **stochastic gradient descent** and **cross-entropy loss**.

**Test**: Given a test example $x$ we compute $p(y|x)$ using learned weights $w$ and $b$, and return whichever label ($y = 1$ or $y = 0$) is higher probability.
Background: Generative and Discriminative Classifiers
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Classification in Logistic Regression
Classification Reminder

Positive/negative sentiment
Spam/not spam
Authorship attribution (Hamilton or Madison?)

Alexander Hamilton
Text Classification: definition

Input:
- a document $x$
- a fixed set of classes $C = \{c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_J\}$

Output: a predicted class $\hat{y} \in C$
Binary Classification in Logistic Regression

Given a series of input/output pairs:
- \((x^{(i)}, y^{(i)})\)

For each observation \(x^{(i)}\)
- We represent \(x^{(i)}\) by a **feature vector** \([x_1, x_2, ..., x_n]\)
- We compute an output: a predicted class \(\hat{y}^{(i)} \in \{0,1\}\)
Features in logistic regression

- For feature $x_i$, weight $w_i$ tells is how important is $x_i$
  - $x_i =$"review contains ‘awesome’": $w_i = +10$
  - $x_j =$"review contains ‘abysmal’": $w_j = -10$
  - $x_k =$“review contains ‘mediocre’": $w_k = -2$
Logistic Regression for one observation \( x \)

Input observation: vector \( x = [x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n] \)

Weights: one per feature: \( W = [w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n] \)

- Sometimes we call the weights \( \theta = [\theta_1, \theta_2, \ldots, \theta_n] \)

Output: a predicted class \( \hat{y} \in \{0, 1\} \)

(multinominal logistic regression: \( \hat{y} \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\} \))
How to do classification

For each feature $x_i$, weight $w_i$ tells us importance of $x_i$
  ◦ (Plus we'll have a bias $b$)

We'll sum up all the weighted features and the bias

$$z = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i x_i \right) + b$$

$$z = w \cdot x + b$$

If this sum is high, we say $y=1$; if low, then $y=0$
But we want a probabilistic classifier

We need to formalize “sum is high”.
We’d like a principled classifier that gives us a probability, just like Naive Bayes did.
We want a model that can tell us:

\[ p(y=1|x; \theta) \]
\[ p(y=0|x; \theta) \]
The problem: \( z \) isn't a probability, it's just a number!

\[ z = w \cdot x + b \]

Solution: use a function of \( z \) that goes from 0 to 1

\[ y = s(z) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-z}} = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-z)} \]
The very useful sigmoid or logistic function

\[ y = s(z) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-z}} \]
Idea of logistic regression

We’ll compute $w \cdot x + b$

And then we’ll pass it through the sigmoid function:

$$\sigma(w \cdot x + b)$$

And we'll just treat it as a probability
Making probabilities with sigmoids

\[ P(y = 1) = \sigma(w \cdot x + b) \]

\[ = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-(w \cdot x + b))} \]

\[ P(y = 0) = 1 - \sigma(w \cdot x + b) \]

\[ = 1 - \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-(w \cdot x + b))} \]

\[ = \frac{\exp(-(w \cdot x + b))}{1 + \exp(-(w \cdot x + b))} \]
By the way:

\[
P(y = 0) = 1 - \sigma(w \cdot x + b) = \sigma(-(w \cdot x + b))
\]

\[
= 1 - \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-(w \cdot x + b))}
\]

\[
= \frac{\exp(-(w \cdot x + b))}{1 + \exp(-(w \cdot x + b))}
\]

Because

\[1 - \sigma(x) = \sigma(-x)\]
Turning a probability into a classifier

\[ \hat{y} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } P(y = 1|x) > 0.5 \\
0 & \text{otherwise} 
\end{cases} \]

0.5 here is called the decision boundary
The probabilistic classifier $P(y=1) = \sigma(w \cdot x + b)$

$= \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(w \cdot x + b)}}$
Turning a probability into a classifier

\[ \hat{y} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } P(y = 1|x) > 0.5 \\
0 & \text{otherwise} 
\end{cases} \]

if \( w \cdot x + b > 0 \)

if \( w \cdot x + b \leq 0 \)
Logistic Regression

Classification in Logistic Regression
Logistic Regression: a text example on sentiment classification
Sentiment example: does y=1 or y=0?

It's hokey. There are virtually no surprises, and the writing is second-rate. So why was it so enjoyable? For one thing, the cast is great. Another nice touch is the music. I was overcome with the urge to get off the couch and start dancing. It sucked me in, and it'll do the same to you.
It's hokey. There are virtually no surprises, and the writing is second-rate. So why was it so enjoyable? For one thing, the cast is great. Another nice touch is the music. I was overcome with the urge to get off the couch and start dancing. It sucked me in, and it'll do the same to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Value in Fig. 5.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x_1$</td>
<td>count(positive lexicon) ∈ doc</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_2$</td>
<td>count(negative lexicon) ∈ doc</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_3$</td>
<td>$\begin{cases} 1 &amp; \text{if &quot;no&quot; ∈ doc} \ 0 &amp; \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_4$</td>
<td>count(1st and 2nd pronouns ∈ doc)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_5$</td>
<td>$\begin{cases} 1 &amp; \text{if &quot;!&quot; ∈ doc} \ 0 &amp; \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_6$</td>
<td>log(word count of doc)</td>
<td>ln(66) = 4.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Classifying sentiment for input $x$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Val</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x_1$</td>
<td>count(positive lexicon) $\in$ doc</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_2$</td>
<td>count(negative lexicon) $\in$ doc</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_3$</td>
<td>$\begin{cases} 1 &amp; \text{if &quot;no&quot; } \in \text{doc} \ 0 &amp; \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_4$</td>
<td>count(1st and 2nd pronouns $\in$ doc)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_5$</td>
<td>$\begin{cases} 1 &amp; \text{if &quot;!&quot; } \in \text{doc} \ 0 &amp; \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_6$</td>
<td>log(word count of doc)</td>
<td>$\ln(66) = 4.19$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suppose $w = [2.5, -5.0, -1.2, 0.5, 2.0, 0.7]$

$b = 0.1$
Classifying sentiment for input $x$

\[ p(+) | x) = P(Y = 1| x) = s(w \cdot x + b) \]
\[ = s([2.5, -5.0, -1.2, 0.5, 2.0, 0.7] \cdot [3, 2, 1, 3, 0, 4.19] + 0.1) \]
\[ = s(0.833) \]
\[ = 0.70 \]

\[ p(-) | x) = P(Y = 0| x) = 1 - s(w \cdot x + b) \]
\[ = 0.30 \]
We can build features for logistic regression for any classification task: period disambiguation

This ends in a period.
The house at 465 Main St. is new.

\[
x_1 = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } \text{Case}(w_i) = \text{Lower} \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
x_2 = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } w_i \text{ 2 AcronymDict} \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
x_3 = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } w_i = \text{St.} \& \text{Case}(w_{i-1}) = \text{Cap} \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]
Classification in (binary) logistic regression: summary

Given:

- a set of classes: (+ sentiment, - sentiment)
- a vector $\mathbf{x}$ of features $[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]$
  - $x_1 = \text{count( "awesome" )}$
  - $x_2 = \log(\text{number of words in review})$
- A vector $\mathbf{w}$ of weights $[w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n]$
  - $w_i$ for each feature $f_i$

$$P(y = 1) = \sigma(w \cdot x + b)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(w \cdot x + b)}}$$
Logistic Regression: a text example on sentiment classification
Logistic Regression

Learning: Cross-Entropy Loss
Wait, where did the W’s come from?

Supervised classification:
• We know the correct label $y$ (either 0 or 1) for each $x$.
• But what the system produces is an estimate, $\hat{y}$.

We want to set $w$ and $b$ to minimize the distance between our estimate $\hat{y}^{(i)}$ and the true $y^{(i)}$.
• We need a distance estimator: a loss function or a cost function.
• We need an optimization algorithm to update $w$ and $b$ to minimize the loss.
Learning components

A loss function:
  ◦ cross-entropy loss

An optimization algorithm:
  ◦ stochastic gradient descent
The distance between $\hat{y}$ and $y$

We want to know how far is the classifier output:

$$\hat{y} = \sigma(w \cdot x + b)$$

from the true output:

$$y \quad [= \text{either 0 or 1}]$$

We'll call this difference:

$$L(\hat{y}, y) = \text{how much } \hat{y} \text{ differs from the true } y$$
Intuition of **negative log likelihood loss**
= **cross-entropy loss**

A case of conditional maximum likelihood estimation

We choose the parameters $w, b$ that maximize

- the log probability
- of the true $y$ labels in the training data
- given the observations $x$
Deriving cross-entropy loss for a single observation $x$

**Goal**: maximize probability of the correct label $p(y|x)$

Since there are only 2 discrete outcomes (0 or 1) we can express the probability $p(y|x)$ from our classifier (the thing we want to maximize) as

$$ p(y|x) = \hat{y}^y (1 - \hat{y})^{1-y} $$

noting:

- if $y=1$, this simplifies to $\hat{y}$
- if $y=0$, this simplifies to $1-\hat{y}$
Deriving cross-entropy loss for a single observation $x$

**Goal:** maximize probability of the correct label $p(y|x)$

Maximize: $p(y|x) = \hat{y}^y (1 - \hat{y})^{1-y}$

Now take the log of both sides (mathematically handy)

Maximize: $\log p(y|x) = \log [\hat{y}^y (1 - \hat{y})^{1-y}]$

$\quad = y \log \hat{y} + (1 - y) \log (1 - \hat{y})$

Whatever values maximize $\log p(y|x)$ will also maximize $p(y|x)$
Deriving cross-entropy loss for a single observation $x$

**Goal:** maximize probability of the correct label $p(y|x)$

Maximize:  
$$\log p(y|x) = \log [\hat{y}^y (1 - \hat{y})^{1-y}]$$  
$$= y \log \hat{y} + (1 - y) \log (1 - \hat{y})$$

Now flip sign to turn this into a loss: something to minimize

**Cross-entropy loss** (because is formula for cross-entropy($y, \hat{y}$))

Minimize:  
$$L_{CE}(\hat{y}, y) = -\log p(y|x) = -[y \log \hat{y} + (1 - y) \log (1 - \hat{y})]$$

Or, plugging in definition of $\hat{y}$:

$$L_{CE}(\hat{y}, y) = -[y \log \sigma(w \cdot x + b) + (1 - y) \log (1 - \sigma(w \cdot x + b))]$$
Let's see if this works for our sentiment example

We want loss to be:

• smaller if the model estimate is close to correct
• bigger if model is confused

Let's first suppose the true label of this is $y=1$ (positive)

It's hokey. There are virtually no surprises, and the writing is second-rate. So why was it so enjoyable? For one thing, the cast is great. Another nice touch is the music. I was overcome with the urge to get off the couch and start dancing. It sucked me in, and it'll do the same to you.
Let's see if this works for our sentiment example

True value is $y=1$. How well is our model doing?

$$p(+ | x) = P(Y = 1 | x) = s(w \cdot x + b)$$
$$= s([2.5, -5.0, -1.2, 0.5, 2.0, 0.7] \cdot [3, 2, 1, 3, 0, 4.19] + 0.1)$$
$$= s(0.833)$$
$$= 0.70$$

(5.6)

Pretty well! What's the loss?

$$L_{CE}(\hat{y}, y) = -[y \log \sigma(w \cdot x + b) + (1 - y) \log (1 - \sigma(w \cdot x + b))]$$
$$= -[\log \sigma(w \cdot x + b)]$$
$$= -\log(0.70)$$
$$= 0.36$$
Let's see if this works for our sentiment example

Suppose true value instead was \( y=0 \).

\[
p(- \mid x) = P(Y = 0 \mid x) = 1 - s(w \cdot x + b)
\]
\[
= 0.30
\]

What's the loss?

\[
L_{CE}(\hat{y}, y) = - \left[ y \log \sigma(w \cdot x + b) + (1 - y) \log (1 - \sigma(w \cdot x + b)) \right]
\]
\[
= - \left[ \log (1 - \sigma(w \cdot x + b)) \right]
\]
\[
= - \log (.30)
\]
\[
= 1.2
\]
Let's see if this works for our sentiment example.

The loss when model was right (if true $y=1$):

$$L_{CE}(\hat{y}, y) = -[y \log \sigma(w \cdot x + b) + (1 - y) \log (1 - \sigma(w \cdot x + b))]$$

$$= -[\log \sigma(w \cdot x + b)]$$

$$= -\log(.70)$$

$$= .36$$

Is lower than the loss when model was wrong (if true $y=0$):

$$L_{CE}(\hat{y}, y) = -[y \log \sigma(w \cdot x + b) + (1 - y) \log (1 - \sigma(w \cdot x + b))]$$

$$= -[\log (1 - \sigma(w \cdot x + b))]$$

$$= -\log (.30)$$

$$= 1.2$$

Sure enough, loss was bigger when model was wrong!
Logistic Regression

Cross-Entropy Loss
Logistic Regression

Stochastic Gradient Descent
Our goal: minimize the loss

Let's make explicit that the loss function is parameterized by weights \( \theta = (w, b) \)

- And we’ll represent \( \hat{y} \) as \( f(x; \theta) \) to make the dependence on \( \theta \) more obvious

We want the weights that minimize the loss, averaged over all examples:

\[
\hat{\theta} = \arg\min_\theta \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} L_{CE}(f(x^{(i)}; \theta), y^{(i)})
\]
Intuition of gradient descent

How do I get to the bottom of this river canyon?

Look around me 360°
Find the direction of steepest slope down
Go that way
Our goal: minimize the loss

For logistic regression, loss function is **convex**

- A convex function has just one minimum
- Gradient descent starting from any point is guaranteed to find the minimum
  - (Loss for neural networks is non-convex)
Let's first visualize for a single scalar $w$

Q: Given current $w$, should we make it bigger or smaller?
A: Move $w$ in the reverse direction from the slope of the function.
Let's first visualize for a single scalar $w$

Q: Given current $w$, should we make it bigger or smaller?
A: Move $w$ in the reverse direction from the slope of the function

So we'll move positive.
Let's first visualize for a single scalar $w$

Q: Given current $w$, should we make it bigger or smaller?
A: Move $w$ in the reverse direction from the slope of the function

![Graph showing the relationship between loss and $w$. The slope of loss at $w^1$ is negative, indicating a descent movement to $w^{\min}$, which is the goal. So we'll move positive.]
Gradients

The **gradient** of a function of many variables is a vector pointing in the direction of the greatest increase in a function.

**Gradient Descent**: Find the gradient of the loss function at the current point and move in the **opposite** direction.
How much do we move in that direction?

- The value of the gradient (slope in our example) $\frac{d}{dw} L(f(x; w), y)$ weighted by a learning rate $\eta$
- Higher learning rate means move $w$ faster

\[ w^{t+1} = w^t - h \frac{d}{dw} L(f(x; w), y) \]
Now let's consider N dimensions

We want to know where in the N-dimensional space (of the $N$ parameters that make up $\theta$) we should move.

The gradient is just such a vector; it expresses the directional components of the sharpest slope along each of the $N$ dimensions.
Imagine 2 dimensions, \( w \) and \( b \)

Visualizing the gradient vector at the red point

It has two dimensions shown in the x-y plane
Real gradients

Are much longer; lots and lots of weights

For each dimension $w_i$, the gradient component $i$ tells us the slope with respect to that variable.

- “How much would a small change in $w_i$ influence the total loss function $L$?”
- We express the slope as a partial derivative $\partial$ of the loss $\partial w_i$

The gradient is then defined as a vector of these partials.
The gradient

We’ll represent $\hat{y}$ as $f(x; \theta)$ to make the dependence on $\theta$ more obvious:

$$\nabla_\theta L(f(x; \theta), y) = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial w_1} L(f(x; \theta), y) \right]$$

The final equation for updating $\theta$ based on the gradient is thus

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t - \eta \nabla L(f(x; \theta), y)$$
What are these partial derivatives for logistic regression?

The loss function

\[ L_{\text{CE}}(\hat{y}, y) = -[y \log \sigma(w \cdot x + b) + (1 - y) \log (1 - \sigma(w \cdot x + b))] \]

The elegant derivative of this function (see textbook 5.8 for derivation)

\[ \frac{\partial L_{\text{CE}}(\hat{y}, y)}{\partial w_j} = [\sigma(w \cdot x + b) - y]x_j \]
function **STOCHASTIC GRADIENT DESCENT**($L()$, $f()$, $x$, $y$) returns $\theta$

# where: $L$ is the loss function
# $f$ is a function parameterized by $\theta$
# $x$ is the set of training inputs $x^{(1)}$, $x^{(2)}$, ..., $x^{(m)}$
# $y$ is the set of training outputs (labels) $y^{(1)}$, $y^{(2)}$, ..., $y^{(m)}$

$\theta \leftarrow 0$

repeat til done  

For each training tuple $(x^{(i)}, y^{(i)})$ (in random order)

1. Optional (for reporting):  
   # How are we doing on this tuple?
   Compute $\hat{y}^{(i)} = f(x^{(i)}; \theta)$  
   # What is our estimated output $\hat{y}$?
   Compute the loss $L(\hat{y}^{(i)}, y^{(i)})$  
   # How far off is $\hat{y}^{(i)}$ from the true output $y^{(i)}$?

2. $g \leftarrow \nabla_\theta L(f(x^{(i)}; \theta), y^{(i)})$  
   # How should we move $\theta$ to maximize loss?

3. $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \eta \; g$  
   # Go the other way instead

return $\theta$
Hyperparameters

The learning rate $\eta$ is a hyperparameter
- too high: the learner will take big steps and overshoot
- too low: the learner will take too long

Hyperparameters:
- Briefly, a special kind of parameter for an ML model
- Instead of being learned by algorithm from supervision (like regular parameters), they are chosen by algorithm designer.
Logistic Regression

Stochastic Gradient Descent