Data-driven penalties for model selection

Sylvain Arlot

$^{1}\mathrm{C}\mathrm{NRS}$

²École Normale Supérieure (Paris), LIENS, WILLOW Team

Mathematical Statistics Seminar, WIAS, Berlin, 22/04/2009



Shape of the penalty 0000000000

Conclusion

Statistical framework: regression on a random design

$(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ i.i.d. $(X_i, Y_i) \sim P$ unknown

$Y = s(X) + \sigma(X)\epsilon$ $X \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $Y \in \mathcal{Y} = [0; 1]$ or \mathbb{R}

noise ϵ : $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon|X] = 0$ $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon^2|X] = 1$ noise level $\sigma(X)$

predictor $t: \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{Y}$?



Shape of the penalty 0000000000

Conclusion

Statistical framework: regression on a random design

$(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ i.i.d. $(X_i, Y_i) \sim P$ unknown

$Y = s(X) + \sigma(X)\epsilon$ $X \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $Y \in \mathcal{Y} = [0; 1]$ or \mathbb{R}

noise ϵ : $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon|X] = 0$ $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon^2|X] = 1$ noise level $\sigma(X)$

predictor $t: \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{Y}$?



Data-driven penalties for model selection

Shape of the penalty 0000000000

Conclusion

Statistical framework: regression on a random design

$$(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n) \in \mathcal{X} imes \mathcal{Y}$$
 i.i.d. $(X_i, Y_i) \sim P$ unknown

$$Y = s(X) + \sigma(X)\epsilon$$
 $X \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $Y \in \mathcal{Y} = [0; 1]$ or \mathbb{R}

noise ϵ : $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon|X] = 0$ $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon^2|X] = 1$ noise level $\sigma(X)$

predictor $t: \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{Y}$?



Data-driven penalties for model selection

Shape of the penalty 0000000000

Conclusion

Statistical framework: regression on a random design

$$(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n) \in \mathcal{X} imes \mathcal{Y}$$
 i.i.d. $(X_i, Y_i) \sim P$ unknown

$$Y = s(X) + \sigma(X)\epsilon$$
 $X \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $Y \in \mathcal{Y} = [0; 1]$ or \mathbb{R}

noise ϵ : $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon|X] = 0$ $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon^2|X] = 1$ noise level $\sigma(X)$

predictor $t: \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{Y}$?



Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

Loss function, least-square estimator

• Least-square risk:

 $\mathbb{E}\gamma(t,(X,Y)) = P\gamma(t,\cdot)$ with $\gamma(t,(x,y)) = (t(x) - y)^2$

• Empirical risk minimizer on S_m (= model):

$$\widehat{s}_m \in rgmin_{t \in S_m} P_n \gamma(t, \cdot) = rgmin_{t \in S_m} rac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (t(X_i) - Y_i)^2$$
.

$$\widehat{s}_m = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_m} \widehat{eta}_\lambda \mathbf{1}_{I_\lambda} \qquad \widehat{eta}_\lambda = rac{1}{\mathsf{Card}\{X_i \in I_\lambda\}} \sum_{X_i \in I_\lambda} Y_k$$



Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty 0000000000

Conclusion

Loss function, least-square estimator

• Loss function:

 $\ell(s,t) = P\gamma(t,\cdot) - P\gamma(s,\cdot) = \mathbb{E}\left[(t(X) - s(X))^2\right]$ with $\gamma(t,(x,y)) = (t(x) - y)^2$

• Empirical risk minimizer on S_m (= model):

$$\widehat{s}_m \in rgmin_{t \in S_m} P_n \gamma(t, \cdot) = rgmin_{t \in S_m} rac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (t(X_i) - Y_i)^2$$
.

$$\widehat{s}_m = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_m} \widehat{eta}_\lambda \mathbf{1}_{I_\lambda} \qquad \widehat{eta}_\lambda = rac{1}{\mathsf{Card}\{X_i \in I_\lambda\}} \sum_{X_i \in I_\lambda} Y_k$$



Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

Loss function, least-square estimator

Loss function:

$$\ell(s,t) = P\gamma(t,\cdot) - P\gamma(s,\cdot) = \mathbb{E}\left[(t(X) - s(X))^2\right]$$

with $\gamma(t,(x,y)) = (t(x) - y)^2$

• Empirical risk minimizer on S_m (= model):

$$\widehat{s}_m \in \arg\min_{t\in S_m} P_n\gamma(t,\cdot) = \arg\min_{t\in S_m} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (t(X_i) - Y_i)^2$$
.

$$\widehat{s}_m = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_m} \widehat{\beta}_{\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{I_{\lambda}} \qquad \widehat{\beta}_{\lambda} = \frac{1}{\operatorname{Card}\{X_i \in I_{\lambda}\}} \sum_{X_i \in I_{\lambda}} Y_i$$

Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty 0000000000

Conclusion

Loss function, least-square estimator

Loss function:

$$\ell(s,t) = P\gamma(t,\cdot) - P\gamma(s,\cdot) = \mathbb{E}\left[(t(X) - s(X))^2\right]$$

with $\gamma(t,(x,y)) = (t(x) - y)^2$

• Empirical risk minimizer on S_m (= model):

$$\widehat{s}_m \in \arg\min_{t\in S_m} P_n\gamma(t,\cdot) = \arg\min_{t\in S_m} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (t(X_i) - Y_i)^2$$
.

$$\widehat{s}_m = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_m} \widehat{\beta}_{\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{I_{\lambda}} \qquad \widehat{\beta}_{\lambda} = \frac{1}{\mathsf{Card}\{X_i \in I_{\lambda}\}} \sum_{X_i \in I_{\lambda}} Y_i \,.$$

Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty 0000000000

Model selection



Goals:

Oracle inequality (in expectation, or with a large probability):

 $\ell(s,\widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}}) \leq C \inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \{\ell(s,\widehat{s}_m) + R(m,n)\}$

 Adaptivity (provided (S_m)_{m∈M_n} is well chosen), e.g., to the smoothness of s or to the variations of σ

Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty 0000000000

Model selection



Goals:

• Oracle inequality (in expectation, or with a large probability):

$$\ell(s, \widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}}) \leq C \inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \{\ell(s, \widehat{s}_m) + R(m, n)\}$$

 Adaptivity (provided (S_m)_{m∈M_n} is well chosen), e.g., to the smoothness of s or to the variations of σ



Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty 0000000000

Model selection



Goals:

• Oracle inequality (in expectation, or with a large probability):

$$\ell(s,\widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}}) \leq C \inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \{\ell(s,\widehat{s}_m) + R(m,n)\}$$

 Adaptivity (provided (S_m)_{m∈M_n} is well chosen), e.g., to the smoothness of s or to the variations of σ

Calibration of penaltie

Shape of the penalty 0000000000

Conclusion

Penalization





Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

Penalization

$$\widehat{m} \in \arg\min_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \{P_n \gamma(\widehat{s}_m) + \operatorname{pen}(m)\}$$

$$\operatorname{pen}(m) = \frac{2\sigma^2 D_m}{n} \qquad (\text{Mallows 1973})$$

$$\operatorname{pen}(m) = \frac{2\widehat{\sigma}^2 D_m}{n} \quad \text{or} \quad \widehat{K} D_m$$

And several other penalties (global or local Rademacher complexities, bootstrap or resampling penalties, *etc.*)

$$\Rightarrow$$
 Ideal penalty: pen_{id} $(m) = (P - P_n)(\gamma(\widehat{s}_m, \cdot))$

Calibration of penaltie

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

Penalization

$$\widehat{m} \in \arg \min_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \{P_n \gamma(\widehat{s}_m) + \operatorname{pen}(m)\}$$

$$\operatorname{pen}(m) = \frac{2\sigma^2 D_m}{n} \qquad (\text{Mallows 1973})$$

$$\operatorname{pen}(m) = \frac{2\widehat{\sigma}^2 D_m}{n} \quad \text{or} \quad \widehat{K} D_m$$

And several other penalties (global or local Rademacher complexities, bootstrap or resampling penalties, *etc.*)

 \Rightarrow Ideal penalty: pen_{id} $(m) = (P - P_n)(\gamma(\widehat{s}_m, \cdot))$

Shape of the penalty 00000000000

Conclusion

Data-driven calibration of the penalty

Assume that we know (or have estimated) pen_0 such that

 $K^{\star} \operatorname{pen}_{0}(m) \approx \mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{pen}_{\mathrm{id}}(m)\right] \qquad (K^{\star} \operatorname{unknown})$

Examples: $pen_0(m) = D_m$, Rademacher complexity, *etc.*

 $\widehat{m}(K) \in \arg\min_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} \{P_n \gamma(\widehat{s}_m) + K \operatorname{pen}_0(m)\}$

 \Rightarrow how to choose *K*?



Shape of the penalty 00000000000

Conclusion

Data-driven calibration of the penalty

Assume that we know (or have estimated) pen₀ such that

 $K^* \operatorname{pen}_0(m) \approx \mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{pen}_{\operatorname{id}}(m)\right] \qquad (K^* \operatorname{unknown})$

Examples: $pen_0(m) = D_m$, Rademacher complexity, *etc.*

 $\widehat{m}(K) \in \arg\min_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} \{P_n \gamma(\widehat{s}_m) + K \operatorname{pen}_0(m)\}$

 \Rightarrow how to choose *K*?



Shape of the penalty 00000000000

Conclusion

Data-driven calibration of the penalty

Assume that we know (or have estimated) pen₀ such that

$$K^* \operatorname{pen}_0(m) \approx \mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{pen}_{\operatorname{id}}(m)\right] \qquad (K^* \operatorname{unknown})$$

Examples: $pen_0(m) = D_m$, Rademacher complexity, *etc.*

$$\widehat{m}(K) \in \arg\min_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} \{P_n \gamma(\widehat{s}_m) + K \operatorname{pen}_0(m)\}$$

 \Rightarrow how to choose *K*?

Shape of the penalty 0000000000

Conclusion

Dimension jump



Data-driven penalties for model selection

Sylvain Arlot

Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

Efficiency as a function of K



Data-driven penalties for model selection

Sylvain Arlot

Shape of the penalty 00000000000

Conclusion

Algorithm (Birgé, Massart 2007; A., Massart, JMLR 2009)

• for every K > 0, compute

$$\widehat{m}(K) \in \arg\min_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} \left\{ P_n \gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m\right) + K \operatorname{pen}_0(m) \right\}$$

If ind \widehat{K}_{\min} such that $D_{\widehat{m}(K)}$ is "very large" when $K < \widehat{K}_{\min}$ and "reasonably small" when $K > \widehat{K}_{\min}$

$$\bullet$$
 choose the model $\widehat{m} = \widehat{m} \left(2\widehat{K}_{\min} \right)$







-0.02

30

25



dimension







dimension

Shape of the penalty 0000000000

Conclusion

The slope heuristics: informal argument



Shape of the penalty

Two theorems

- Histograms; "small" number of models $(Card(\mathcal{M}_n) \leq \Diamond n^{\Diamond})$
- Bounded data: $\|Y\|_{\infty} \leq A < \infty$
- Noise-level lower bounded: $0 < \sigma_{\min} \leq \sigma(X)$
- Smooth s: non-constant, α -hölderian

Theorem (Minimal penalty; A. and Massart, JMLR 2009)

If $0 \le K < K^*/2$, with probability at least $1 - \Diamond n^{-2}$,

$$\ell(s, \widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}(K)}) \ge \ln(n) \inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \{\ell(s, \widehat{s}_m)\} \text{ and } D_{\widehat{m}(K)} \ge \frac{\Diamond n}{\ln(n)}$$

17/32 Sylvain Arlot

Shape of the penalty 0000000000

Two theorems

Theorem (Optimal penalty; A. and Massart, JMLR 2009)

If $K > K^*/2$, with probability at least $1 - \Diamond n^{-2}$,

 $\ell(s,\widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}(K)}) \leq C_n(K) \inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ \ell(s,\widehat{s}_m) \right\} \quad \textit{and} \quad D_{\widehat{m}(K)} \leq n^{1-\eta}$

where $C_n(K) \leq C(K)$, $C_n(K^*) \leq 1 + \ln(n)^{-1/5}$ and $\eta > 0$ may depend on the smoothness of s.

Theorem (Minimal penalty; A. and Massart, JMLR 2009)

If $0 \le K < K^*/2$, with probability at least $1 - \Diamond n^{-2}$,

$$\ell(s, \widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}(K)}) \ge \ln(n) \inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \{\ell(s, \widehat{s}_m)\} \text{ and } D_{\widehat{m}(K)} \ge \frac{\Diamond n}{\ln(n)}$$

32

Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

The slope heuristics: sketch of proof

prediction error
$$P\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_{m}
ight)=P\gamma\left(s_{m}
ight)+P\left(\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_{m}
ight)-\gamma\left(s_{m}
ight)
ight)$$

empirical risk $P_n\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m\right) = P_n\gamma\left(s_m\right) - \left(P_n\left(\gamma\left(s_m\right) - \gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m\right)\right)\right)$

$$P_n\left(\gamma\left(s_m\right) - \gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m\right)\right) \approx P\left(\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m\right) - \gamma\left(s_m\right)\right)$$

- estimation of the expectations
- concentration inequalities



Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

The slope heuristics: sketch of proof

prediction error
$$P\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_{m}
ight)=P\gamma\left(s_{m}
ight)+P\left(\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_{m}
ight)-\gamma\left(s_{m}
ight)
ight)$$

empirical risk
$$P_n\gamma(\widehat{s}_m) = P_n\gamma(s_m) - (P_n(\gamma(s_m) - \gamma(\widehat{s}_m)))$$

$$P_n(\gamma(s_m) - \gamma(\widehat{s}_m)) \approx P(\gamma(\widehat{s}_m) - \gamma(s_m))$$

- estimation of the expectations
- concentration inequalities



Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

The slope heuristics: sketch of proof

prediction error
$$P\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_{m}
ight) = P\gamma\left(s_{m}
ight) + \frac{P\left(\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_{m}
ight) - \gamma\left(s_{m}
ight)
ight)}{r}$$

empirical risk
$$P_n\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m\right) = P_n\gamma\left(s_m\right) - \left(\frac{P_n\left(\gamma\left(s_m\right) - \gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m\right)\right)}{\left(\frac{S_m}{2}\right)}\right)$$

 $P_n(\gamma(s_m) - \gamma(\widehat{s}_m)) \approx P(\gamma(\widehat{s}_m) - \gamma(s_m))$

- estimation of the expectations
- concentration inequalities



Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

The slope heuristics: sketch of proof

prediction error
$$P\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_{m}
ight)=P\gamma\left(s_{m}
ight)+P\left(\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_{m}
ight)-\gamma\left(s_{m}
ight)
ight)$$

empirical risk
$$P_n\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m\right) = P_n\gamma\left(s_m\right) - \left(P_n\left(\gamma\left(s_m\right) - \gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m\right)\right)\right)$$

$$P_n\left(\gamma\left(s_m\right)-\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m\right)\right) pprox P\left(\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m\right)-\gamma\left(s_m\right)\right)$$

- estimation of the expectations
- concentration inequalities



Illustration: $s(x) = \sin(\pi x)$, n = 200, $\sigma \equiv 1$





$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\ell(s,\widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}})\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\inf_{m\in\mathcal{M}}\left\{\ell(s,\widehat{s}_{m})\right\}\right]}$$

computed over 1000 samples.

Model selection method	Efficiency
Mallows (σ)	2.03 ± 0.04
Mallows $(\widehat{\sigma})$	1.93 ± 0.04
Slope (threshold)	1.88 ± 0.03
Slope (maximal jump)	2.01 ± 0.04

19/32Sylvain Arlot

Related results

- Birgé and Massart (2007): similar theoretical results when the noise is Gaussian homoscedastic (either polynomial or exponential collections of models).
 Successfully applied to change-point detection (Lebarbier, 2005).
- The slope heuristics experimentally works in several other frameworks:
 - mixture models (Maugis and Michel, 2008),
 - clustering (Baudry, 2007),
 - spatial statistics (Verzelen, 2008),
 - estimation of oil reserves (Lepez, 2002),
 - genomics (Villers, 2007).
Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

Limitations of linear penalties: illustration

$$Y = X + (1 + \mathbb{1}_{X \le 1/2}) \epsilon \qquad n = 1000 \text{ data points}$$

Regular histograms on $[0; \frac{1}{2}]$ ($D_{m,1}$ pieces), then regular histograms on $[\frac{1}{2}; 1]$ ($D_{m,2}$ pieces).



Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

Limitations of linear penalties: illustration

$$Y = X + ig(1 + \mathbbm{1}_{X \leq 1/2}ig) \epsilon$$
 $n = 1000$ data points

The ideal penalty is not a linear function of the dimension.



Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

Limitations of linear penalties: illustration



22/32 Sylvain Arlot

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

Limitations of linear penalties: illustration



22/32 Sylvain Arlot

Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

Limitations of linear penalties: $\widehat{m}(K^{\star}) \neq m^{\star}$

Density of $(D_{\widehat{m}(K^*),1}, D_{\widehat{m}(K^*),2})$ and $(D_{m^*,1}, D_{m^*,2})$ according to N = 1000 samples



Sylvain Arlot

Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

Limitations of linear penalties: theory

$$Y = X + \sigma(X)\epsilon \quad \text{with} \quad X \sim \mathcal{U}([0;1]) ,$$
$$\mathbb{E}[\epsilon|X] = 0 \quad \mathbb{E}[\epsilon^2|X] = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^{1/2} (\sigma(x))^2 \, dx \neq \int_{1/2}^1 (\sigma(x))^2 \, dx$$

Regular histograms on $[0; \frac{1}{2}]$ $(1 \le D_{m,1} \le n/(2 \ln(n)^2) \text{ pieces})$, then regular histograms on $[\frac{1}{2}; 1]$ $(1 \le D_{m,2} \le n/(2 \ln(n)^2) \text{ pieces})$.

Theorem (A. 2008, arXiv:0812.3141)

There exist absolute constants $C, \eta > 0$ and an event of probability at least $1 - Cn^{-2}$ on which

$$orall K > 0, \, orall \widehat{m}(K) \in rg \min_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} \left\{ P_n \gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m\right) + K D_m
ight\} \ ,$$

 $\ell(s, \widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}(K)}) \ge (1 + \eta) \inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} \left\{ \ell(s, \widehat{s}_m)
ight\} \ .$

Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

Resampling heuristics (bootstrap, Efron 1979)



$$pen_{id}(m) = (P - P_n)\gamma(\widehat{s}_m) = F(P, P_n)$$



Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

Resampling heuristics (bootstrap, Efron 1979)



$$\operatorname{pen}_{\operatorname{id}}(m) = (P - P_n)\gamma(\widehat{s}_m) = F(P, P_n)$$



Shape of the penalty

Resampling heuristics (bootstrap, Efron 1979)



0000000

 $(P - P_n)\gamma(\widehat{s}_m) = F(P, P_n) \longrightarrow F(P_n, P_n^W) = (P_n - P_n^W)\gamma(\widehat{s}_m^W)$



Introduction Calibration of penalties Shape of the penalty Cocoocococococococo Resampling heuristics (bootstrap, Efron 1979)



Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

V-fold penalization

• Ideal penalty:

$$(P-P_n)(\gamma(\widehat{s}_m))$$

• *V*-fold penalty:

$$\operatorname{pen}(m) = \frac{C}{V} \sum_{j=1}^{V} \left[(P_n - P_n^{(-j)})(\gamma(\widehat{s}_m^{(-j)})) \right]$$

$$\widehat{s}_m^{(-j)} \in \arg\min_{t\in S_m} P_n^{(-j)} \gamma(t)$$

with $C \ge V - 1$ to be chosen C = V - 1 for estimating (almost) unbiasedly the ideal penalty

• The final estimator is $\hat{s}_{\hat{m}}$ with

$$\widehat{m} \in \arg\min_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \{P_n \gamma(\widehat{s}_m) + \operatorname{pen}(m)\}$$



Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

V-fold penalization

• Ideal penalty:

$$(P-P_n)(\gamma(\widehat{s}_m))$$

• *V*-fold penalty:

$$pen(m) = \frac{C}{V} \sum_{j=1}^{V} \left[(P_n - P_n^{(-j)})(\gamma(\widehat{s}_m^{(-j)})) \right]$$
$$\widehat{s}_m^{(-j)} \in \arg\min_{t \in S_m} P_n^{(-j)} \gamma(t)$$

with $C \ge V-1$ to be chosen C = V-1 for estimating (almost) unbiasedly the ideal penalty

• The final estimator is $\hat{s}_{\widehat{m}}$ with

 $\widehat{m} \in \arg\min_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \{P_n \gamma(\widehat{s}_m) + \operatorname{pen}(m)\}$



Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

V-fold penalization

• Ideal penalty:

$$(P-P_n)(\gamma(\widehat{s}_m))$$

• *V*-fold penalty:

$$pen(m) = \frac{C}{V} \sum_{j=1}^{V} \left[(P_n - P_n^{(-j)})(\gamma(\widehat{s}_m^{(-j)})) \right]$$
$$\widehat{s}_m^{(-j)} \in \arg\min_{t \in S_m} P_n^{(-j)} \gamma(t)$$

with $C \ge V - 1$ to be chosen C = V - 1 for estimating (almost) unbiasedly the ideal penalty

• The final estimator is $\widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}}$ with

$$\widehat{m} \in \arg\min_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \{P_n \gamma(\widehat{s}_m) + \operatorname{pen}(m)\}$$



Non-asymptotic pathwise oracle inequality

• Fixed V or V = n

• $C \approx V - 1$

- Histograms; "small" number of models (Card $(\mathcal{M}_n) \leq \Diamond n^{\Diamond})$
- Bounded data: $||Y||_{\infty} \le A < \infty$
- Noise-level lower bounded: $0 < \sigma_{\min} \leq \sigma(X)$
- Smooth s: non-constant, α-hölderian

Theorem (A. 2008, arXiv:0802.0566)

Under a "reasonable" set of assumptions on P, with probability at least $1 - \Diamond n^{-2}$,

$$\ell(s,\widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}}) \leq \left(1 + \ln(n)^{-1/5}\right) \inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{\ell(s,\widehat{s}_m)\right\}$$

32

Non-asymptotic pathwise oracle inequality

• Fixed V or V = n

•
$$C \approx V - 1$$

- Histograms; "small" number of models (Card(\mathcal{M}_n) $\leq \Diamond n^{\Diamond}$)
- Bounded data: $||Y||_{\infty} \le A < \infty$
- Noise-level lower bounded: $0 < \sigma_{\min} \leq \sigma(X)$
- Smooth s: non-constant, α -hölderian

Theorem (A. 2008, arXiv:0802.0566)

Under a "reasonable" set of assumptions on P, with probability at least $1 - \Diamond n^{-2}$,

$$\ell(s,\widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}}) \leq \left(1 + \ln(n)^{-1/5}\right) \inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{\ell(s,\widehat{s}_m)\right\}$$

Non-asymptotic pathwise oracle inequality

• Fixed V or V = n

• $C \approx V - 1$

- Histograms; "small" number of models $(Card(\mathcal{M}_n) \leq \Diamond n^{\Diamond})$
- Bounded data: $||Y||_{\infty} \le A < \infty$
- Noise-level lower bounded: $0 < \sigma_{\min} \leq \sigma(X)$
- Smooth s: non-constant, α -hölderian

Theorem (A. 2008, arXiv:0802.0566)

Under a "reasonable" set of assumptions on P, with probability at least $1 - \Diamond n^{-2}$,

$$\ell(s,\widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}}) \leq \left(1 + \ln(n)^{-1/5}\right) \inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{\ell(s,\widehat{s}_m)\right\}$$

Non-asymptotic pathwise oracle inequality

- Fixed V or V = n
- $C \approx V 1$
- Histograms; "small" number of models $(Card(\mathcal{M}_n) \leq \Diamond n^{\Diamond})$
- Bounded data: $\|Y\|_{\infty} \leq A < \infty$
- Noise-level lower bounded: $0 < \sigma_{\min} \leq \sigma(X)$
- Smooth s: non-constant, α -hölderian

Theorem (A. 2008, arXiv:0802.0566)

Under a "reasonable" set of assumptions on P, with probability at least $1 - \Diamond n^{-2}$,

$$\ell(s,\widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}}) \leq \left(1 + \ln(n)^{-1/5}\right) \inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{\ell(s,\widehat{s}_m)\right\}$$

Simulation framework

$$Y_i = s(X_i) + \sigma(X_i)\epsilon_i$$
 $X_i \sim^{\text{i.i.d.}} \mathcal{U}([0;1])$ $\epsilon_i \sim^{\text{i.i.d.}} \mathcal{N}(0,1)$

 \mathcal{M}_n : histograms regular on [0, 1/2] (D_1 pieces), and on [1/2, 1] (D_2 pieces), with $1 \leq D_1, D_2 \leq \frac{n}{2\log(n)}$.

 \Rightarrow Benchmark:

 $C_{\text{classical}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\ell(s, \widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}})]}{\mathbb{E}[\inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \ell(s, \widehat{s}_m)]}$

computed with N = 1000 samples



Shape of the penalty

Simulation framework

$$Y_i = s(X_i) + \sigma(X_i)\epsilon_i$$
 $X_i \sim^{\text{i.i.d.}} \mathcal{U}([0;1])$ $\epsilon_i \sim^{\text{i.i.d.}} \mathcal{N}(0,1)$

 \mathcal{M}_n : histograms regular on [0, 1/2] (D_1 pieces), and on [1/2, 1] (D_2 pieces), with $1 \leq D_1$, $D_2 \leq \frac{n}{2 \log(n)}$.

 \Rightarrow Benchmark:

$$C_{\text{classical}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\ell(s, \widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}})]}{\mathbb{E}[\inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \ell(s, \widehat{s}_m)]}$$

computed with N = 1000 samples

Shape of the penalty

Simulations: sin, n = 200, $\sigma(x) = x$, 2 bin sizes



Mallows	3.69 ± 0.07
2-fold	2.54 ± 0.05
5-fold	2.58 ± 0.06
10-fold	2.60 ± 0.06
20-fold	2.58 ± 0.06
leave-one-out	2.59 ± 0.06
pen 2-f	3.06 ± 0.07
pen 5-f	2.75 ± 0.06
pen 10-f	2.65 ± 0.06
pen Loo	2.59 ± 0.06
Mallows $\times 1.25$	3.17 ± 0.07
pen 2-f $\times 1.25$	2.75 ± 0.06
pen 5-f $ imes$ 1.25	2.38 ± 0.06
pen 10-f $\times 1.25$	2.28 ± 0.05
pen Loo $\times 1.25$	$2.21 \pm 0.05 \ 29/32$

Calibration of penalties

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

Other resampling-based penalties

• Efron's bootstrap penalties (Efron 1983, Shibata 1997):

$$\mathsf{pen}(m) = \mathbb{E}\left[(P_n - P_n^W)(\gamma(\widehat{s}_m^W)) \middle| (X_i, Y_i)_{1 \le i \le n}\right]$$

- General resampling penalties (A. 2008, hal-00262478)
- Rademacher complexities (Koltchinskii 2001 ; Bartlett, Boucheron, Lugosi 2002): subsampling

$$\mathsf{pen}_{\mathrm{id}}(m) \leq \mathsf{pen}_{\mathrm{id}}^{\mathrm{glo}}(m) = \sup_{t \in S_m} (P - P_n) \gamma(t, \cdot)$$

- idem with general exchangeable weights (Fromont 2004)
- Local Rademacher complexities (Bartlett, Bousquet, Mendelson 2004 ; Koltchinskii 2004)

Shape of the penalty

Cross-validation procedures

- Hold-out, Cross-validation, Leave-one-out, V-fold cross-validation: $I \subset \{1, ..., n\}$ random sub-sample of size q (VFCV: $q = \frac{n(V-1)}{V}$).
- V-fold cross-validation is biased \Rightarrow suboptimal model selection when V is fixed as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (A. 2008, arXiv:0802.0566)
- V-fold penalization with C = V − 1
 ⇔ Burman's corrected V-fold cross-validation (1989).



Shape of the penalty

Cross-validation procedures

• Hold-out, Cross-validation, Leave-one-out, V-fold cross-validation:

$$I \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$$
 random sub-sample of size q (VFCV:
 $q = \frac{n(V-1)}{V}$).

- V-fold cross-validation is biased \Rightarrow suboptimal model selection when V is fixed as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (A. 2008, arXiv:0802.0566)
- V-fold penalization with C = V − 1
 ⇔ Burman's corrected V-fold cross-validation (1989).



Cross-validation procedures

• Hold-out, Cross-validation, Leave-one-out, V-fold cross-validation:

$$I \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$$
 random sub-sample of size q (VFCV:
 $q = \frac{n(V-1)}{V}$).

- V-fold cross-validation is biased \Rightarrow suboptimal model selection when V is fixed as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (A. 2008, arXiv:0802.0566)
- V-fold penalization with C = V 1 \Leftrightarrow Burman's corrected V-fold cross-validation (1989).

Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

Conclusion

- Shape of the penalty: estimated by resampling (*V*-fold, bootstrap, exchangeable bootstrap...)
 - \Rightarrow adaptation to unknown variations of the noise-level
- Multiplying constant: estimated thanks to the slope heuristics (model-selection based estimator)
 ⇒ oracle inequalities with constant 1 + ε_n, even when pen₀(m) is a V-fold or resampling penalty, inside the slope heuristics algorithm
- Cross-validation and resampling penalties can also be used for change-point detection, i.e., for detecting changes in the mean of an heteroscedastic sequence (joint work with A. Celisse, arXiv:0902.3977)



Shape of the penalty 0000000000

Conclusion

Conclusion

- Shape of the penalty: estimated by resampling (V-fold, bootstrap, exchangeable bootstrap...)
 ⇒ adaptation to unknown variations of the noise-level
- Multiplying constant: estimated thanks to the slope heuristics (model-selection based estimator)
 ⇒ oracle inequalities with constant 1 + ε_n, even when pen₀(m) is a V-fold or resampling penalty, inside the slope heuristics algorithm
- Cross-validation and resampling penalties can also be used for change-point detection, i.e., for detecting changes in the mean of an heteroscedastic sequence (joint work with A. Celisse, arXiv:0902.3977)



Shape of the penalty

Conclusion

- Shape of the penalty: estimated by resampling (V-fold, bootstrap, exchangeable bootstrap...)
 ⇒ adaptation to unknown variations of the noise-level
- Multiplying constant: estimated thanks to the slope heuristics (model-selection based estimator)
 ⇒ oracle inequalities with constant 1 + ε_n, even when pen₀(m) is a V-fold or resampling penalty, inside the slope heuristics algorithm
- Cross-validation and resampling penalties can also be used for change-point detection, i.e., for detecting changes in the mean of an heteroscedastic sequence (joint work with A. Celisse, arXiv:0902.3977)



Change-point detection via cross-validation

 $\forall 1 \leq i \leq n, \qquad Y_i = s(t_i) + \sigma(t_i)\epsilon_i \qquad \text{with} \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\epsilon_i\right] = 0 \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\epsilon_i^2\right] = 1$

- Goal: detect changes in the mean s of the signal Y
 ⇒ model selection
- No assumption on the variance $\sigma(t_i)^2$

• Birgé and Massart's penalty (assumes $\sigma(t_i) \equiv \sigma$):

$$pen(m) = \frac{CD_m}{n} \left(5 + 2 \log \left(\frac{n}{D_m} \right) \right)$$



Change-point detection via cross-validation

 $\forall 1 \leq i \leq n, \qquad Y_i = s(t_i) + \sigma(t_i)\epsilon_i \qquad \text{with} \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\epsilon_i\right] = 0 \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\epsilon_i^2\right] = 1$

- Goal: detect changes in the mean s of the signal Y
 ⇒ model selection
- No assumption on the variance $\sigma(t_i)^2$
- Birgé and Massart's penalty (assumes $\sigma(t_i) \equiv \sigma$):

$$\operatorname{pen}(m) = \frac{CD_m}{n} \left(5 + 2 \log \left(\frac{n}{D_m} \right) \right)$$



Change-point detection

Cross-validation

Fixed D, Homoscedastic data; n = 100, $\sigma = 0.25$, D = 4



Sylvain Arlot

34/32

Change-point detection

Cross-validation

Fixed D, Heteroscedastic; n = 100, $||\sigma|| = 0.30$, D = 6



Sylvain Arlot

35/32

Change-point detection

Cross-validation

Fixed D, Heteroscedastic; n = 100, $||\sigma|| = 0.30$, D = 6



Sylvain Arlot

36/32

Cross-validation

Homoscedastic data: loss as a function of D



Data-driven penalties for model selection

Change-point detection

Cross-validation

Heteroscedastic data: loss as a function of D



Homoscedastic data: estimation of the loss for every D



Heteroscedastic data: estimation of the loss for every D



40/32 Sylvain Arlot
A family of two-steps change-point detection algorithms

• $\forall D \in \{1, \ldots, D_{\max}\}$, select a model $\widehat{m}(D)$ of dimension D:

$$\widehat{m}(D) \in \arg\min_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n, D_m = D} \left\{ \operatorname{crit}_1(m; (t_i, Y_i)_i) \right\}$$

Examples of $crit_1$: empirical risk, leave-*p*-out or *V*-fold estimators of the risk

2 Select \widehat{D}

$$\widehat{D} \in \arg\min_{D \in \{1, \dots, D_{\max}\}} \left\{ \operatorname{crit}_2(D; (t_i, Y_i)_i; \operatorname{crit}_1(\cdot)) \right\}$$

Examples of $crit_2$: penalized empirical criterion, V-fold cross-validation estimator of the risk

Cross-validation

Simulation results

Deterministic (s, σ) :

σ	$[Emp, VF_5]$	$[Loo, VF_5]$	$[Lpo_{20}, VF_5]$	[Emp, BM]
cst	4.41 ± 0.02	4.54 ± 0.02	4.62 ± 0.02	$\textbf{4.39} \pm 0.01$
p-c	6.32 ± 0.02	$\textbf{5.74} \pm 0.02$	5.81 ± 0.02	8.47 ± 0.03
sine	5.97 ± 0.02	$\textbf{5.72} \pm 0.02$	5.86 ± 0.02	7.59 ± 0.03

Random (s, σ) :

σ	$[Emp, VF_5]$	$[Loo, VF_5]$	$[Lpo_{20}, VF_5]$	[Emp, BM]
Α	4.78 ± 0.03	$\textbf{4.65} \pm 0.03$	4.78 ± 0.03	6.82 ± 0.03
В	5.09 ± 0.03	$\textbf{4.88} \pm 0.03$	$\textbf{4.91} \pm 0.03$	7.21 ± 0.04
С	7.17 ± 0.05	6.61 ± 0.05	$\textbf{6.49} \pm 0.05$	13.49 ± 0.07

Bias of cross-validation

Ideal criterion: $P\gamma(\widehat{s}_m)$

Regression on a model of histograms with D_m pieces ($\sigma(X) \equiv \sigma$ for simplicity):

$$\mathbb{E}\left[P\gamma(\widehat{s}_m)\right] \approx P\gamma(s_m) + \frac{D_m\sigma^2}{n}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[P_n^{(j)}\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m^{(-j)}\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[P\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m^{(-j)}\right)\right] \approx P\gamma(s_m) + \frac{V}{V-1}\frac{D_m\sigma^2}{n}$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{ bias if } V \text{ is fixed ("overpenalization")}$$

Bias of cross-validation

Ideal criterion: $P\gamma(\widehat{s}_m)$

Regression on a model of histograms with D_m pieces ($\sigma(X) \equiv \sigma$ for simplicity):

$$\mathbb{E}\left[P\gamma(\widehat{s}_m)\right] \approx P\gamma(s_m) + \frac{D_m\sigma^2}{n}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[P_n^{(j)}\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m^{(-j)}\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[P\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m^{(-j)}\right)\right] \approx P\gamma(s_m) + \frac{V}{V-1}\frac{D_m\sigma^2}{n}$$

 \Rightarrow bias if V is fixed ("overpenalization")

Data-driven penalties for model selection

Bias of cross-validation

Ideal criterion: $P\gamma(\widehat{s}_m)$

Regression on a model of histograms with D_m pieces ($\sigma(X) \equiv \sigma$ for simplicity):

$$\mathbb{E}\left[P\gamma(\widehat{s}_m)\right] \approx P\gamma(s_m) + \frac{D_m\sigma^2}{n}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[P_n^{(j)}\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m^{(-j)}\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[P\gamma\left(\widehat{s}_m^{(-j)}\right)\right] \approx P\gamma(s_m) + \frac{V}{V-1}\frac{D_m\sigma^2}{n}$$

 \Rightarrow bias if V is fixed ("overpenalization")

Suboptimality of V-fold cross-validation

- $Y = X + \sigma \epsilon$ with ϵ bounded and $\sigma > 0$
- \mathcal{M} : family of regular histograms on $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]$
- V fixed

Theorem (A. 2008)

With probability at least $1 - \Diamond n^{-2}$,

$$\ell(s,\widehat{s}_{\widehat{m}}) \geq (1+\kappa(V)) \inf_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \{\ell(s,\widehat{s}_m)\}$$

with $\kappa(V) > 0$.



Change-point detection

Cross-validation

Simulations: sin, n = 200, $\sigma(x) = x$, 2 bin sizes



Mallows	3.69 ± 0.07		
2-fold	2.54 ± 0.05		
5-fold	2.58 ± 0.06		
10-fold	2.60 ± 0.06		
20-fold	2.58 ± 0.06		
leave-one-out	2.59 ± 0.06		



Data-driven penalties for model selection

Change-point detection

Cross-validation

Simulations: HeaviSine, n = 2048, $\sigma \equiv 1$



Models: dyadic regular histograms

2-fold 5-fold 10-fold 20-fold leave-one-out $\begin{array}{c} 1.002 \pm 0.003 \\ 1.014 \pm 0.003 \\ 1.021 \pm 0.003 \\ 1.029 \pm 0.004 \\ 1.034 \pm 0.004 \end{array}$



Data-driven penalties for model selection

• optimal performance when $V = V^*$: trade-off variability-bias (difficult to find V^* from the data)

• SNR large:

- \Rightarrow $V^{\star} \rightarrow \infty$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$ (suboptimality result if V fixed)
- \Rightarrow V^{\star} too large for computations
- SNR small:
 - $\Rightarrow V^* = 2$ is possible
 - \Rightarrow unsatisfactory (highly variable)
- V should be chosen according to computation time also

- optimal performance when $V = V^*$: trade-off variability-bias (difficult to find V^* from the data)
- SNR large:
 - \Rightarrow $V^{\star} \rightarrow \infty$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$ (suboptimality result if V fixed)
 - \Rightarrow V^{\star} too large for computations
- SNR small:

 $\Rightarrow V^* = 2$ is possible

 \Rightarrow unsatisfactory (highly variable)

• V should be chosen according to computation time also

- optimal performance when $V = V^*$: trade-off variability-bias (difficult to find V^* from the data)
- SNR large:
 - \Rightarrow $V^{\star} \rightarrow \infty$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$ (suboptimality result if V fixed)
 - \Rightarrow V^{\star} too large for computations
- SNR small:
 - \Rightarrow $V^{\star} = 2$ is possible
 - \Rightarrow unsatisfactory (highly variable)
- $\bullet~V$ should be chosen according to computation time also



- optimal performance when $V = V^*$: trade-off variability-bias (difficult to find V^* from the data)
- SNR large:
 - \Rightarrow $V^{\star} \rightarrow \infty$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$ (suboptimality result if V fixed)
 - \Rightarrow V^{\star} too large for computations
- SNR small:
 - \Rightarrow $V^{\star} = 2$ is possible
 - \Rightarrow unsatisfactory (highly variable)
- V should be chosen according to computation time also