Online Bounds for Bayesian Algorithms

Sham Kakade University of Pennsylvania

Joint work with Andrew Ng

Methodologies

Bayesian:

- often make strong assumptions (in the prior) on the data generation process

- optimality guaranteed here

Online Learning:

 adversarial setting (against Nature) where there is no data generation process

- weaker notion of optimality

Motivation

How do Bayesian algorithms fare in a more adversarial setting?

- Often Bayesian methods make assumptions we don't believe (eg i.i.d. assumptions)
- Often models chosen for computational tractability
- Bayes rule looks like an 'expert' algorithm so we would expect it to perform well.

Outline

The Setup

A General Online Bound

Bounds for Bayesian Model Averaging

Bounds for Maximum Aposteriori estimation

The Setup

The Setting

- Inputs x in \mathbb{R}^n and outputs y in \mathbb{R}
- \odot sequence of examples $S = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_T, y_T)\}$
 - not specifying generative model for S
 - S_{t} is the subsequence from time 1 to t

Using a model,

_ at time t, we predict with $p(y|x_t, S_{t-1})$

The Model

Consider a generalized linear model:

 $p(y|x,\theta) = p(y|\theta^T x)$

Sor example,

- linear least squares: $p(y|x,\theta) \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta^T x, \sigma^2)$
- logistic regression: $p(y|x,\theta) \sim \sigma(\theta^T x)^y (1 \sigma(\theta^T x))^{1-y}$

• Assume a prior: $p(\theta) \sim \mathcal{N}(\vec{0}, v^2 I_n)$

Loss at a Timestep

 \oslash at time *t*-1, we have a posterior $-\log p(\theta|S_{t-1})$

Bayesian Model Averaging:

 $p(y|x_t, S_{t-1}) = \int_{\theta} p(y|x_t, \theta) p(\theta|S_{t-1}) d\theta$

at time t, our loss is $-\log p(y_t | x_t, S_{t-1})$

Total Losses

Our loss:

$$L_{BMA}(S) = \sum_{t=1}^{T} -\log p(y_t | x_t, S_{t-1})$$

Second Strain Strain

$$L_{\theta}(S) = \sum_{t=1}^{I} -\log p(y_t|x_t, \theta)$$

Another loss w.r.t. Q:

 $L_Q(S) = \int_{\theta} Q(\theta) L_{\theta}(S) d\theta$

A Useful Bound

A General Online Bound

Theorem: For all sequences S and distributions Q: $L_{BMA}(S) \le L_Q(S) + KL(Q||p)$

Proof:

- similar to Freund & Schapire
- show that:

 $L_{BMA}(S) = L_Q(S) + KL(Q||p) - KL(Q||p(\theta|S_T))$

Bounds for BMA

An Upper Bound Suppose $|\partial^2 \log p(y|\theta^T x)/(\partial \theta^T x)^2| \le c$ - for linear regression $c = 1/\sigma^2$ - for logistic regression c=1Theorem: Then $L_{BMA}(S) \le L_{\theta}(S) + \frac{1}{2\nu^2} ||\theta||^2 + \frac{n}{2} \log\left(1 + \frac{T c \nu^2}{n}\right)$ - the second term is a penalty from our prior - the log term is how fast the loss grows

Proof Idea

Recall

 $L_{BMA}(S) \leq L_Q(S) + KL(Q||p)$

• For Q, choose $N(\theta, \varepsilon^2 I_n)$

Then use derivative bound to show $L_Q(S)$ is close to $L_{\theta}(S)$

Optimize 8

A Lower Bound

- Theorem: For linear regression, the upper bound is tight.
- Proof: exhibit a "worst case" sequence
 - We can restrict Nature to use a generative model for <u>S</u> that is i.i.d.
 - Nature uses a $p(y|x_t)$ that is in our model
 - in this sense, the worst case isn't much different than an average case

Bounds for MAP

MAP Estimation

- Solution
 Solution</
 - the loss is $-logp(y_t|x_t, \hat{\theta}_{t-1})$
 - recall BMA has loss $-logp(y_t|x_t, S_{t-1})$
- In practice, MAP often used (computational reasons?)
- We consider both cases of linear and logistic regression.

Ridge Regression

O Use the squared loss:

$$L_{MAP}(S) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{T} (y_t + \hat{\theta}_{t-1}^T x_t)^2$$

- which is essentially just the sum log loss

Corollary: The MAP loss is a multiplicative factor of $v^2 + \sigma^2$ worse.

Vovk has a better bound for this case

- the algorithm is related to ridge regression (but it is nonlinear)

Why is MAP worse?

Theorem (Lower Bound): The upper bound for MAP cannot have a multiplicative factor of 1.

Compare

- BMA's loss $L_{BMA}(S) = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{1}{2s_t^2} (y_t - \hat{\theta}_{t-1}^T x_t)^2 + \log \sqrt{2\pi s_t^2}$

- to MAP's loss

$$L_{MAP}(S) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{T} (y_t + \hat{\theta}_{t-1}^T x_t)^2$$

MAP for logistic regression

- BMA is intractable
- MAP is widely used
 - essentially regularized logistic regression
 - involves solving a convex program
- Theorem: The loss for MAP is multiplicatively worse by a factor of 4.



Some Bayesian algorithms perform well in an adversarial setting

Open Problem: Can the dimensionality dependence on the bounds be removed with further assumptions?