Frontier Topics in Empirical Economics: Week 3 Machine Learning and Model Selection

Zibin Huang¹

¹College of Business, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics

November 30, 2023

<ロト <回ト < 目ト < 目ト < 目ト のへの 1/50

- In the last lecture, we learn some non-parametric and semi-parametric methods
 We now have many tools in our box beyond linear regression
 - Kernel regression, local polynomial regression
 - Series regression, partial linear regression
 - etc..
- Which method should we choose?

In the last lecture, we learn some non-parametric and semi-parametric methods

- We now have many tools in our box beyond linear regression
 - Kernel regression, local polynomial regression
 - Series regression, partial linear regression

etc...

Which method should we choose?

- In the last lecture, we learn some non-parametric and semi-parametric methods
- We now have many tools in our box beyond linear regression
 - Kernel regression, local polynomial regression
 - Series regression, partial linear regression
 - etc...
- Which method should we choose?

- In the last lecture, we learn some non-parametric and semi-parametric methods
- We now have many tools in our box beyond linear regression
 - Kernel regression, local polynomial regression
 - Series regression, partial linear regression
 - etc...
- Which method should we choose?

- In the last lecture, we learn some non-parametric and semi-parametric methods
- We now have many tools in our box beyond linear regression
 - Kernel regression, local polynomial regression
 - Series regression, partial linear regression

etc...

• Which method should we choose?

- In the last lecture, we learn some non-parametric and semi-parametric methods
- We now have many tools in our box beyond linear regression
 - Kernel regression, local polynomial regression
 - Series regression, partial linear regression
 - etc...
- Which method should we choose?

- In the last lecture, we learn some non-parametric and semi-parametric methods
- We now have many tools in our box beyond linear regression
 - Kernel regression, local polynomial regression
 - Series regression, partial linear regression
 - etc...
- Which method should we choose?

- Even for a given method, such as simple regression
- The functional form is still flexible
 - w Why linear? Simple? Why not $y = hx + x^2 + e^2$
 - What covariates to include?
 - In Mincer equation, we regression wage on $edu_i exp_i$ and exp^2 . Why not $edu^2 T$

Even for a given method, such as simple regression

The functional form is still flexible

- Why linear? Simple? Why not $y = \ln x + x^3 + e$?
- What covariates to include?
 - In Mincer equation, we regression wage on edu, exp, and exp². Why not edu³?

Even for a given method, such as simple regression

The functional form is still flexible

- Why linear? Simple? Why not $y = lnx + x^3 + e$?
- What covariates to include?

In Mincer equation, we regression wage on edu, exp, and exp^2 . Why not edu^3 ?

- Even for a given method, such as simple regression
- The functional form is still flexible
 - Why linear? Simple? Why not $y = lnx + x^3 + e$?
 - What covariates to include?

In Mincer equation, we regression wage on edu, exp, and exp^2 . Why not edu^3 ?

- Even for a given method, such as simple regression
- The functional form is still flexible
 - Why linear? Simple? Why not $y = lnx + x^3 + e$?
 - What covariates to include?

In Mincer equation, we regression wage on edu, exp, and exp^2 . Why not edu^3 ?

- Model selection issue has been ignored in applied economics for such a long time
- More due to data availability issue
- Nowadays, more and more datasets are available with huge sizes
- BIG DATA! More chances!
- We should seriously consider model selection issue
- Let's first introduce a major statistical concept: Bias-variance tradeoff

Model selection issue has been ignored in applied economics for such a long time

- More due to data availability issue
- Nowadays, more and more datasets are available with huge sizes
- BIG DATA! More chances!
- We should seriously consider model selection issue
- Let's first introduce a major statistical concept: Bias-variance tradeoff

- Model selection issue has been ignored in applied economics for such a long time
- More due to data availability issue
- Nowadays, more and more datasets are available with huge sizes
- BIG DATA! More chances!
- We should seriously consider model selection issue
- Let's first introduce a major statistical concept: Bias-variance tradeoff

- Model selection issue has been ignored in applied economics for such a long time
- More due to data availability issue
- Nowadays, more and more datasets are available with huge sizes
- BIG DATA! More chances!
- We should seriously consider model selection issue
- Let's first introduce a major statistical concept: Bias-variance tradeoff

- Model selection issue has been ignored in applied economics for such a long time
- More due to data availability issue
- Nowadays, more and more datasets are available with huge sizes
- BIG DATA! More chances!
- We should seriously consider model selection issue
- Let's first introduce a major statistical concept: Bias-variance tradeoff

- Model selection issue has been ignored in applied economics for such a long time
- More due to data availability issue
- Nowadays, more and more datasets are available with huge sizes
- BIG DATA! More chances!
- We should seriously consider model selection issue
- Let's first introduce a major statistical concept: Bias-variance tradeoff

- Model selection issue has been ignored in applied economics for such a long time
- More due to data availability issue
- Nowadays, more and more datasets are available with huge sizes
- BIG DATA! More chances!
- We should seriously consider model selection issue
- Let's first introduce a major statistical concept: Bias-variance tradeoff

A traditional linear model

$$y = x\beta + \epsilon \tag{1}$$

A model with quadratic term

$$y = x\beta + x^2\alpha + \epsilon \tag{2}$$

A non-parametric model

$$y = g(x) + \epsilon \tag{3}$$

A traditional linear model

$$y = x\beta + \epsilon \tag{1}$$

A model with quadratic term

$$y = x\beta + x^{2}\alpha + \epsilon \tag{2}$$

A non-parametric model

$$y = g(x) + \epsilon \tag{3}$$

A traditional linear model

$$y = x\beta + \epsilon \tag{1}$$

A model with quadratic term

$$y = x\beta + x^2\alpha + \epsilon \tag{2}$$

A non-parametric model

$$y = g(x) + \epsilon \tag{3}$$

A traditional linear model

$$y = x\beta + \epsilon \tag{1}$$

A model with quadratic term

$$y = x\beta + x^2\alpha + \epsilon \tag{2}$$

A non-parametric model

$$y = g(x) + \epsilon \tag{3}$$

A traditional linear model

$$y = x\beta + \epsilon \tag{1}$$

A model with quadratic term

$$y = x\beta + x^2\alpha + \epsilon \tag{2}$$

A non-parametric model

$$y = g(x) + \epsilon \tag{3}$$

Model A

$$y = x_1'\beta + \epsilon \qquad (4)$$
Model B

$$y = x_1'\beta_1 + x_2'\beta_2 + \epsilon \qquad (5)$$

- Why not always the second one?
- Always better to have a more complicated model?

Model A

$$y = x_1'\beta + \epsilon \tag{4}$$

Model B

$$y = x_1'\beta_1 + x_2'\beta_2 + \epsilon \tag{5}$$

- Why not always the second one?
- Always better to have a more complicated model?

Model A

$$y = x_1'\beta + \epsilon \tag{4}$$

Model B

$$y = x_1'\beta_1 + x_2'\beta_2 + \epsilon \tag{5}$$

Why not always the second one?

Always better to have a more complicated model?

<ロト < 団ト < 臣ト < 臣ト < 臣ト 三日日 のへで 6/50

Model A

$$y = x_1'\beta + \epsilon \tag{4}$$

Model B

$$y = x_1'\beta_1 + x_2'\beta_2 + \epsilon \tag{5}$$

- Why not always the second one?
- Always better to have a more complicated model?

Model A

$$y = x_1'\beta + \epsilon \tag{4}$$

Model B

$$y = x_1'\beta_1 + x_2'\beta_2 + \epsilon \tag{5}$$

- Why not always the second one?
- Always better to have a more complicated model?

Model Selection: Bias vs. Variance Assume that:

 $Y = f(X) + \epsilon$

- f(x) is a model trained by some data
- It will be changed when sample is changed: $\hat{f}^1(x), \hat{f}^2(x)...$
- Expectation $E[\hat{f}(x)]$ is taken over different samples
- How good is the model?

$$Y = f(X) + \epsilon$$

- $\hat{f}(x)$ is a model trained by some data
- It will be changed when sample is changed: $\hat{f}^1(x), \hat{f}^2(x)...$
- Expectation $E[\hat{f}(x)]$ is taken over different samples
- How good is the model?

Model Selection: Bias vs. Variance Assume that:

$$Y = f(X) + \epsilon$$

• $\hat{f}(x)$ is a model trained by some data

It will be changed when sample is changed: $\hat{f}^1(x), \hat{f}^2(x)...$

- Expectation $E[\hat{f}(x)]$ is taken over different samples
- How good is the model?

$$Y = f(X) + \epsilon$$

- $\hat{f}(x)$ is a model trained by some data
- It will be changed when sample is changed: $\hat{f}^1(x), \hat{f}^2(x)...$
- Expectation $E[\hat{f}(x)]$ is taken over different samples
- How good is the model?

$$Y = f(X) + \epsilon$$

- $\hat{f}(x)$ is a model trained by some data
- It will be changed when sample is changed: $\hat{f}^1(x), \hat{f}^2(x)...$
- Expectation $E[\hat{f}(x)]$ is taken over different samples
- How good is the model?

$$Y = f(X) + \epsilon$$

- $\hat{f}(x)$ is a model trained by some data
- It will be changed when sample is changed: $\hat{f}^1(x), \hat{f}^2(x)...$
- Expectation $E[\hat{f}(x)]$ is taken over different samples
- How good is the model?
■ The prediction error at some point x₀:

 $E[(Y - \hat{f}(x_0))^2 | X = x_0] = \sigma_{\epsilon}^2 + [E\hat{f}(x_0) - f(x_0)]^2 + E[\hat{f}(x_0) - E\hat{f}(x_0)]^2$ = irreducible error + Bias² + Variance

- Model complexity ⇒ Bias ↓, Variance ↑
- Super complicated model ⇒ Variance ↑↑↑ (very sensitive when data change)
- Overfit current data \Rightarrow Poor out-of-sample prediction

■ The prediction error at some point *x*₀:

$$E[(Y - \hat{f}(x_0))^2 | X = x_0] = \sigma_{\epsilon}^2 + [E\hat{f}(x_0) - f(x_0)]^2 + E[\hat{f}(x_0) - E\hat{f}(x_0)]^2$$

= irreducible error + Bias² + Variance

- Model complexity ⇒ Bias ↓, Variance ↑
- Super complicated model ⇒ Variance ↑↑↑ (very sensitive when data change)
- Overfit current data \Rightarrow Poor out-of-sample prediction

■ The prediction error at some point *x*₀:

$$E[(Y - \hat{f}(x_0))^2 | X = x_0] = \sigma_{\epsilon}^2 + [E\hat{f}(x_0) - f(x_0)]^2 + E[\hat{f}(x_0) - E\hat{f}(x_0)]^2$$

= irreducible error + Bias² + Variance

• Model complexity \Rightarrow Bias \downarrow , Variance \uparrow

■ Super complicated model ⇒ Variance ↑↑↑ (very sensitive when data change)

■ Overfit current data ⇒ Poor out-of-sample prediction

■ The prediction error at some point *x*₀:

$$E[(Y - \hat{f}(x_0))^2 | X = x_0] = \sigma_{\epsilon}^2 + [E\hat{f}(x_0) - f(x_0)]^2 + E[\hat{f}(x_0) - E\hat{f}(x_0)]^2$$

= irreducible error + Bias² + Variance

- Model complexity ⇒ Bias ↓, Variance ↑
- Super complicated model ⇒ Variance ↑↑↑ (very sensitive when data change)
- Overfit current data \Rightarrow Poor out-of-sample prediction

■ The prediction error at some point *x*₀:

$$E[(Y - \hat{f}(x_0))^2 | X = x_0] = \sigma_{\epsilon}^2 + [E\hat{f}(x_0) - f(x_0)]^2 + E[\hat{f}(x_0) - E\hat{f}(x_0)]^2$$

= irreducible error + Bias² + Variance

- Model complexity ⇒ Bias ↓, Variance ↑
- Super complicated model \Rightarrow Variance $\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow$ (very sensitive when data change)
- Overfit current data ⇒ Poor out-of-sample prediction

Consider a data generating process

 $Y = 1 + 1.5X + \epsilon$ $\epsilon \sim N(0, 100)$

- Simulate 30 observations from this process
- Let's start to fit it with different polynomials
- Green line is the true DGP
- Red line is the fitting function

Consider a data generating process

 $Y = 1 + 1.5X + \epsilon$ $\epsilon \sim N(0, 100)$

- Simulate 30 observations from this process
- Let's start to fit it with different polynomials
- Green line is the true DGP
- Red line is the fitting function

Consider a data generating process

 $Y = 1 + 1.5X + \epsilon$ $\epsilon \sim N(0, 100)$

It is a noisy process.

Simulate 30 observations from this process

Let's start to fit it with different polynomials

Green line is the true DGP

Red line is the fitting function

Consider a data generating process

 $Y = 1 + 1.5X + \epsilon$ $\epsilon \sim N(0, 100)$

- Simulate 30 observations from this process
- Let's start to fit it with different polynomials
- Green line is the true DGP
- Red line is the fitting function

Consider a data generating process

 $Y = 1 + 1.5X + \epsilon$ $\epsilon \sim N(0, 100)$

- Simulate 30 observations from this process
- Let's start to fit it with different polynomials
- Green line is the true DGP
- Red line is the fitting function

Consider a data generating process

 $Y = 1 + 1.5X + \epsilon$ $\epsilon \sim N(0, 100)$

- Simulate 30 observations from this process
- Let's start to fit it with different polynomials
- Green line is the true DGP
- Red line is the fitting function

Figure: First Order (Linear) Fitting



3 2

< E

Figure: Second Order (Quadratic) Fitting



 $11 \, / \, 50$

Figure: Third Order (Cubic) Fitting



 $12 \, / \, 50$

3 2

< E

Figure: Fourth Order Fitting



13 / 50

3 2

4 B 6 4 B

Figure: Fifth Order Fitting



14 / 50

3 2

4 B 6 4 B

Figure: Sixth Order Fitting



15 / 50

3 2

4 B 6 4 B

Figure: Twentieth Order Fitting



3 2



High order polynomials: Picking up noises, not signals!!! Bad out-of-sample prediction!!!

- We have actually learned two kinds of overfitting
- Runge phenomenon and Gibbs phenomenon



There are many ways to measure the goodness of fit, considering overfitting

- Adjusted R-squared: the proportion of explained variations in y Still remember why we need to adjust for the number of regressors?
- AIC: Akaike Information Criterion AIC = 2k + nln(RSS/n), k is the number of regressors
- BIC: Bayesian Information Criterion This is motivated by the Bayesian approach to a

There are many ways to measure the goodness of fit, considering overfitting

- Adjusted R-squared: the proportion of explained variations in y Still remember why we need to adjust for the number of regressors?
- AIC: Akaike Information Criterion
 AIC = 2k + nln(RSS/n), k is the number of regressors
- BIC: Bayesian Information Criterion
 This is motivated by the Bayesian approach to model selectic

There are many ways to measure the goodness of fit, considering overfitting

- Adjusted R-squared: the proportion of explained variations in y Still remember why we need to adjust for the number of regressors?
- AIC: Akaike Information Criterion AIC = 2k + nln(RSS/n), k is the number of regressors
- BIC: Bayesian Information Criterion

This is motivated by the Bayesian approach to model selection

There are many ways to measure the goodness of fit, considering overfitting

- Adjusted R-squared: the proportion of explained variations in y Still remember why we need to adjust for the number of regressors?
- AIC: Akaike Information Criterion AIC = 2k + nln(RSS/n), k is the number of regressors
- BIC: Bayesian Information Criterion

This is motivated by the Bayesian approach to model selection

There are many ways to measure the goodness of fit, considering overfitting

- Adjusted R-squared: the proportion of explained variations in y Still remember why we need to adjust for the number of regressors?
- AIC: Akaike Information Criterion AIC = 2k + nln(RSS/n), k is the number of regressors
- BIC: Bayesian Information Criterion

This is motivated by the Bayesian approach to model selection

- The basic idea is to separate all samples into training sample and validation sample
- Training sample is used to train (estimate) the model
- Validation sample is then used to check the "out-of-sample" prediction
- We delibrately leave some observations out of estimation
- They can be used to check the model fit and avoid overfitting

- The basic idea is to separate all samples into training sample and validation sample
- Training sample is used to train (estimate) the model
- Validation sample is then used to check the "out-of-sample" prediction
- We delibrately leave some observations out of estimation
- They can be used to check the model fit and avoid overfitting

- The basic idea is to separate all samples into training sample and validation sample
- Training sample is used to train (estimate) the model
- Validation sample is then used to check the "out-of-sample" prediction
- We delibrately leave some observations out of estimation
- They can be used to check the model fit and avoid overfitting

- The basic idea is to separate all samples into training sample and validation sample
- Training sample is used to train (estimate) the model
- Validation sample is then used to check the "out-of-sample" prediction
- We delibrately leave some observations out of estimation
- They can be used to check the model fit and avoid overfitting

- The basic idea is to separate all samples into training sample and validation sample
- Training sample is used to train (estimate) the model
- Validation sample is then used to check the "out-of-sample" prediction
- We delibrately leave some observations out of estimation
- They can be used to check the model fit and avoid overfitting

- The basic idea is to separate all samples into training sample and validation sample
- Training sample is used to train (estimate) the model
- Validation sample is then used to check the "out-of-sample" prediction
- We delibrately leave some observations out of estimation
- They can be used to check the model fit and avoid overfitting

- The basic idea is to separate all samples into training sample and validation sample
- Training sample is used to train (estimate) the model
- Validation sample is then used to check the "out-of-sample" prediction
- We delibrately leave some observations out of estimation
- They can be used to check the model fit and avoid overfitting

Here is the process of CV

1	2	3	4	5
Train	Train	Validation	Train	Train

- First, we separate all samples into K parts
- Each time, we choose K-1 parts to train (estimate) the model
- We then use the remaining one part k to calculate the mean squared predicted error MSE_k
- We rotate the samples K times so that each part is used as the validation sample once, and have K pieces of MSE_k
- We take the average of them to have: $CV = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{k=1}^{K} MSE_k$
- This is called "K-fold Cross-Validation

Here is the process of $\ensuremath{\mathsf{CV}}$

1	2	3	4	5
Train	Train	Validation	Train	Train

- First, we separate all samples into K parts
- Each time, we choose K-1 parts to train (estimate) the model
- We then use the remaining one part k to calculate the mean squared predicted error MSE_k
- We rotate the samples K times so that each part is used as the validation sample once, and have K pieces of MSE_k
- We take the average of them to have: $CV = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{k=1}^{K} MSE_k$
- This is called "K-fold Cross-Validation"

Here is the process of $\ensuremath{\mathsf{CV}}$

1	2	3	4	5
Train	Train	Validation	Train	Train

- First, we separate all samples into K parts
- Each time, we choose K-1 parts to train (estimate) the model
- We then use the remaining one part k to calculate the mean squared predicted error MSE_k
- We rotate the samples K times so that each part is used as the validation sample once, and have K pieces of MSE_k
- We take the average of them to have: $CV = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{k=1}^{K} MSE_k$
- This is called "K-fold Cross-Validation"

Here is the process of $\ensuremath{\mathsf{CV}}$

1	2	3	4	5
Train	Train	Validation	Train	Train

- First, we separate all samples into K parts
- Each time, we choose K-1 parts to train (estimate) the model
- We then use the remaining one part k to calculate the mean squared predicted error MSE_k
- We rotate the samples K times so that each part is used as the validation sample once, and have K pieces of MSE_k
- We take the average of them to have: $CV = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{k=1}^{K} MSE_k$
- This is called "K-fold Cross-Validation"
Here is the process of $\ensuremath{\mathsf{CV}}$

1	2	3	4	5
Train	Train	Validation	Train	Train

- First, we separate all samples into K parts
- Each time, we choose K-1 parts to train (estimate) the model
- We then use the remaining one part k to calculate the mean squared predicted error MSE_k
- We rotate the samples K times so that each part is used as the validation sample once, and have K pieces of MSE_k
- We take the average of them to have: $CV = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{k=1}^{K} MSE_k$
- This is called "K-fold Cross-Validation"

Here is the process of $\ensuremath{\mathsf{CV}}$

1	2	3	4	5
Train	Train	Validation	Train	Train

- First, we separate all samples into K parts
- Each time, we choose K-1 parts to train (estimate) the model
- We then use the remaining one part k to calculate the mean squared predicted error MSE_k
- We rotate the samples K times so that each part is used as the validation sample once, and have K pieces of MSE_k

• We take the average of them to have: $CV = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{k=1}^{K} MSE_k$

This is called "K-fold Cross-Validation"

Here is the process of $\ensuremath{\mathsf{CV}}$

1	2	3	4	5
Train	Train	Validation	Train	Train

- First, we separate all samples into K parts
- Each time, we choose K-1 parts to train (estimate) the model
- We then use the remaining one part k to calculate the mean squared predicted error MSE_k
- We rotate the samples K times so that each part is used as the validation sample once, and have K pieces of MSE_k

• We take the average of them to have: $CV = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{k=1}^{K} MSE_k$ • This is called "K-fold Cross-Validation"

<ロト < 回 ト < 目 ト < 目 ト 三日 の < 0</p>

Here is the process of $\ensuremath{\mathsf{CV}}$

1	2	3	4	5
Train	Train	Validation	Train	Train

- First, we separate all samples into K parts
- Each time, we choose K-1 parts to train (estimate) the model
- We then use the remaining one part k to calculate the mean squared predicted error MSE_k
- We rotate the samples K times so that each part is used as the validation sample once, and have K pieces of MSE_k
- We take the average of them to have: $CV = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{k=1}^{K} MSE_k$
- This is called "K-fold Cross-Validation"

- CV measures the goodness of the out-of-sample prediction
- It mimics a situation when you have some data that is not used in the estimation to check your estimation validity
- It helps you to determine which model fits better to the data, in terms of out-of-sample prediction
- Smaller CV means better fitting

CV measures the goodness of the out-of-sample prediction

- It mimics a situation when you have some data that is not used in the estimation to check your estimation validity
- It helps you to determine which model fits better to the data, in terms of out-of-sample prediction
- Smaller CV means better fitting

- CV measures the goodness of the out-of-sample prediction
- It mimics a situation when you have some data that is not used in the estimation to check your estimation validity
- It helps you to determine which model fits better to the data, in terms of out-of-sample prediction
- Smaller CV means better fitting

- CV measures the goodness of the out-of-sample prediction
- It mimics a situation when you have some data that is not used in the estimation to check your estimation validity
- It helps you to determine which model fits better to the data, in terms of out-of-sample prediction
- Smaller CV means better fitting

- CV measures the goodness of the out-of-sample prediction
- It mimics a situation when you have some data that is not used in the estimation to check your estimation validity
- It helps you to determine which model fits better to the data, in terms of out-of-sample prediction
- Smaller CV means better fitting

- Now we have some measures of goodness
- That is, the "standard" of what is a "good" model
- Would that be possible to have an automatic algorithm to find a good model for us?
- This is what machine learning is all about

Now we have some measures of goodness

- That is, the "standard" of what is a "good" model
- Would that be possible to have an automatic algorithm to find a good model for us?
- This is what machine learning is all about

- Now we have some measures of goodness
- That is, the "standard" of what is a "good" model
- Would that be possible to have an automatic algorithm to find a good model for us?
- This is what machine learning is all about

- Now we have some measures of goodness
- That is, the "standard" of what is a "good" model
- Would that be possible to have an automatic algorithm to find a good model for us?
- This is what machine learning is all about

- Now we have some measures of goodness
- That is, the "standard" of what is a "good" model
- Would that be possible to have an automatic algorithm to find a good model for us?
- This is what machine learning is all about

- What is machine learning?
 - "Machine learning (ML) is an umbrella term for solving problems for which development of algorithms by human programmers would be cost-prohibitive, and instead the problems are solved by helping machines 'discover' their 'own' algorithms, without needing to be explicitly told what to do by any human-developed algorithms." from Wikipedia

What is machine learning?

"Machine learning (ML) is an umbrella term for solving problems for which development of algorithms by human programmers would be cost-prohibitive, and instead the problems are solved by helping machines 'discover' their 'own' algorithms, without needing to be explicitly told what to do by any human-developed algorithms." from Wikipedia

- Main target: How complicated the model should be? How to predict Y given X?
- When Y is discrete: Classification
- When Y is continuous: Prediction
- There are so many machine learning algorithms
- We briefly introduce three of them: Penalized regression, Tree-based method, Neural network

- Main target: How complicated the model should be? How to predict Y given X?
- When Y is discrete: Classification
- When Y is continuous: Prediction
- There are so many machine learning algorithms
- We briefly introduce three of them: Penalized regression, Tree-based method, Neural network

- Main target: How complicated the model should be? How to predict Y given X?
- When Y is discrete: Classification
- When Y is continuous: Prediction
- There are so many machine learning algorithms
- We briefly introduce three of them: Penalized regression, Tree-based method, Neural network

- Main target: How complicated the model should be? How to predict Y given X?
- When Y is discrete: Classification
- When Y is continuous: Prediction
- There are so many machine learning algorithms
- We briefly introduce three of them: Penalized regression, Tree-based method, Neural network

- Main target: How complicated the model should be? How to predict Y given X?
- When Y is discrete: Classification
- When Y is continuous: Prediction
- There are so many machine learning algorithms
- We briefly introduce three of them: Penalized regression, Tree-based method, Neural network

- Main target: How complicated the model should be? How to predict Y given X?
- When Y is discrete: Classification
- When Y is continuous: Prediction
- There are so many machine learning algorithms
- We briefly introduce three of them: Penalized regression, Tree-based method, Neural network

- Main target: How complicated the model should be? How to predict Y given X?
- When Y is discrete: Classification
- When Y is continuous: Prediction
- There are so many machine learning algorithms
- We briefly introduce three of them: Penalized regression, Tree-based method, Neural network

- Let's consider a linear regression
- What if I have so many potential regressors?
- For instance, you have a household survey with 1000 questions
- Is there an automatic way to select the best predictors?

Let's consider a linear regression

- What if I have so many potential regressors?
- For instance, you have a household survey with 1000 questions
- Is there an automatic way to select the best predictors?

- Let's consider a linear regression
- What if I have so many potential regressors?
- For instance, you have a household survey with 1000 questions
- Is there an automatic way to select the best predictors?

- Let's consider a linear regression
- What if I have so many potential regressors?
- For instance, you have a household survey with 1000 questions
- Is there an automatic way to select the best predictors?

- Let's consider a linear regression
- What if I have so many potential regressors?
- For instance, you have a household survey with 1000 questions
- Is there an automatic way to select the best predictors?

- Linear function: $y_i = x_i^{\prime}\beta + \epsilon_i$
- OLS: $\hat{\beta}^{OLS} = \operatorname{argmin} \sum_{i} (y_i x_i^{\dagger} \beta)^2$
 - All regressors x play roles
- We estimate β by minimizing SSR \Rightarrow More β means smaller SSR
- We need a mechanism to penalize the usage of β

- Linear function: $y_i = x'_i\beta + \epsilon_i$
- OLS: $\hat{\beta}^{OLS} = \operatorname{argmin} \sum_{i} (y_i x'_i \beta)^2$ All regressors x play roles.
- We estimate β by minimizing SSR \Rightarrow More β means smaller SSR
- \blacksquare We need a mechanism to penalize the usage of β

- Linear function: y_i = x'_iβ + ε_i
 OLS: β̂^{OLS} = argmin Σ_i(y_i x'_iβ)² All regressors x play roles.
- We estimate β by minimizing SSR \Rightarrow More β means smaller SSR
- \blacksquare We need a mechanism to penalize the usage of β

- Linear function: y_i = x'_iβ + ε_i
 OLS: β̂^{OLS} = argmin∑_i(y_i x'_iβ)² All regressors x play roles.
- We estimate β by minimizing SSR \Rightarrow More β means smaller SSR
- \blacksquare We need a mechanism to penalize the usage of β

- Linear function: $y_i = x'_i\beta + \epsilon_i$
- OLS: $\hat{\beta}^{OLS} = \operatorname{argmin} \sum_{i} (y_i x'_i \beta)^2$ All regressors x play roles.
- We estimate β by minimizing SSR \Rightarrow More β means smaller SSR
- \blacksquare We need a mechanism to penalize the usage of β

- Penalized: $\hat{\beta}^{Pen} = \operatorname{argmin} \sum_{i} (y_i x'_i \beta)^2 + \lambda (\|\beta\|_p)^p$
 - p=1: Lasso regression, drop some x with small prediction power p=2: Ridge regression, shrink some x with small prediction powe
- λ : tuning parameter, how strong we penalize additional "x"
- How to choose λ ? Cross-validation
- Combination: Elastic Net

 $\hat{\beta}^{Pen} = \operatorname{argmin} \sum_{i} (y_i - x'_i \beta)^2 + \lambda(\alpha \|\beta\|_1 + (1 - \alpha)(\|\beta\|_2)^2)$

- Penalized: $\hat{\beta}^{Pen} = \operatorname{argmin} \sum_{i} (y_i x_i^{\prime} \beta)^2 + \lambda (||\beta||_p)^p$
 - p=1: Lasso regression, drop some x with small prediction power p=2: Ridge regression, shrink some x with small prediction power
- λ : tuning parameter, how strong we penalize additional "x"
- How to choose λ ? Cross-validation
- Combination: Elastic Net $\hat{\beta}^{Pen} = \operatorname{argmin} \sum_{i} (y_i - x'_i \beta)^2 + \lambda(\alpha ||\beta||_1 + (1 - \alpha)(||\beta||_2)^2$

- Penalized: $\hat{\beta}^{Pen} = \operatorname{argmin} \sum_{i} (y_i x'_i \beta)^2 + \lambda (||\beta||_p)^p$
 - p=1: Lasso regression, drop some x with small prediction power p=2: Ridge regression, shrink some x with small prediction power
- λ: tuning parameter, how strong we penalize additional "x"
- How to choose λ ? Cross-validation
- Combination: Elastic Net

 $\hat{\beta}^{Pen} = \operatorname{argmin} \sum_{i} (y_i - x_i^{I} \beta)^2 + \lambda(\alpha ||\beta||_1 + (1 - \alpha)(||\beta||_2)^2)$
Machine Learning and Model Selection: Penalized Regressions

- Penalized: $\hat{\beta}^{Pen} = \operatorname{argmin} \sum_{i} (y_i x'_i \beta)^2 + \lambda (||\beta||_p)^p$
 - p=1: Lasso regression, drop some x with small prediction power
 - p=2: Ridge regression, shrink some x with small prediction power
- λ : tuning parameter, how strong we penalize additional "x"
- How to choose λ ? Cross-validation
- Combination: Elastic Net $\hat{\beta}^{Pen} = \operatorname{argmin} \sum_{i} (y_i - x'_i \beta)^2 + \lambda(\alpha ||\beta||_1 + (1 - \alpha)(||\beta||_2)^2)$

Machine Learning and Model Selection: Penalized Regressions

- Penalized: $\hat{\beta}^{Pen} = \operatorname{argmin} \sum_{i} (y_i x'_i \beta)^2 + \lambda (||\beta||_p)^p$
 - $p{=}1{:}$ Lasso regression, drop some ${\times}$ with small prediction power
 - p=2: Ridge regression, shrink some x with small prediction power
- λ: tuning parameter, how strong we penalize additional "x"
- How to choose λ ? Cross-validation
- Combination: Elastic Net $\hat{\beta}^{Pen} = \operatorname{argmin} \sum_{i} (y_i - x'_i \beta)^2 + \lambda(\alpha ||\beta||_1 + (1 - \alpha)(||\beta||_2)^2)$

- Tree-based methods partition the feature (X) space into a set of rectangles, and then fit a simple model (constant) in each one.
- Classification and Regression Tree (CART)
- Partition into regions $R_1, R_2...R_M$, assign average value in a region as the predicted value
 - $f(x_i) = \sum_{m=1}^{m} c_m I(x \in R_m)$
- How to partition (Grow the tree)?

- Tree-based methods partition the feature (X) space into a set of rectangles, and then fit a simple model (constant) in each one.
- Classification and Regression Tree (CART)
- Partition into regions $R_1, R_2...R_M$, assign average value in a region as the predicted value $\hat{f}(x_i) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} c_m I(x \in R_m)$
- How to partition (Grow the tree)?

- Tree-based methods partition the feature (X) space into a set of rectangles, and then fit a simple model (constant) in each one.
- Classification and Regression Tree (CART)
- Partition into regions $R_1, R_2...R_M$, assign average value in a region as the predicted value $\hat{f}(x_i) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} c_m I(x \in R_m)$
- How to partition (Grow the tree)?

- Tree-based methods partition the feature (X) space into a set of rectangles, and then fit a simple model (constant) in each one.
- Classification and Regression Tree (CART)
- Partition into regions $R_1, R_2...R_M$, assign average value in a region as the predicted value $\hat{f}(x_i) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} c_m I(x \in R_m)$
- How to partition (Grow the tree)?

- Tree-based methods partition the feature (X) space into a set of rectangles, and then fit a simple model (constant) in each one.
- Classification and Regression Tree (CART)
- Partition into regions $R_1, R_2...R_M$, assign average value in a region as the predicted value $\hat{f}(x_i) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} c_m I(x \in R_m)$
- How to partition (Grow the tree)?

• We use recursive binary partitions • $(X_1, t_1) \rightarrow ((X_2, t_2), (X_1, t_3)) \rightarrow (X_2, t_4)$



30 / 50

We use recursive binary partitions

 $(X_1, t_1) \to ((X_2, t_2), (X_1, t_3)) \to (X_2, t_4)$



We use recursive binary partitions

$$(X_1, t_1) \to ((X_2, t_2), (X_1, t_3)) \to (X_2, t_4)$$



- Two choices: continue partitioning or stop + where to partition
- Greedy algorithm
- For each region R_m (leaf), we define:

Size (# of obs):
$$N_m = \{x_i \in R_m\}$$

Fitted value (mean as fit): $\hat{c}_m = \frac{1}{N_m} \sum_{x \in R_m} y_i$
SSE (error in leaf): $Q_m(T) = \frac{1}{N_m} \sum_{x \in R_m} (y_i - \hat{c}_m)^2$

Two choices: continue partitioning or stop + where to partition

Greedy algorithm

• For each region R_m (leaf), we define:

Size (# of obs):
$$N_m = \{x_i \in R_m\}$$

Fitted value (mean as fit): $\hat{c}_m = \frac{1}{N_m} \sum_{x \in R_m} y_i$
SSE (error in leaf): $Q_m(T) = \frac{1}{N_m} \sum_{x \in R_m} (y_i - \hat{c}_m)^2$

- Two choices: continue partitioning or stop + where to partition
- Greedy algorithm

• For each region R_m (leaf), we define:

Size (# of obs):
$$N_m = \{x_i \in R_m\}$$

Fitted value (mean as fit): $\hat{c}_m = \frac{1}{N_m} \sum_{x \in R_m} y_i$
SSE (error in leaf): $Q_m(T) = \frac{1}{N_m} \sum_{x \in R_m} (y_i - \hat{c}_m)^2$

- Two choices: continue partitioning or stop + where to partition
- Greedy algorithm
- For each region R_m (leaf), we define:

Size (# of obs):
$$N_m = \{x_i \in R_m\}$$

Fitted value (mean as fit): $\hat{c}_m = \frac{1}{N_m} \sum_{x \in R_m} y_i$
SSE (error in leaf): $Q_m(T) = \frac{1}{N_m} \sum_{x \in R_m} (y_i - \hat{c}_m)^2$

- First, conditional on continuing grow, how to determine partition?
- For *j* − *th* predictor, cut position *s*
- Define half plane $R_1(j, s) = \{X | X_j \le s\}, R_2(j, s) = \{X | X_j > s\}$
- How to find (j,s) in each branch? Minimize SSE (Easy)

$$\min_{j,s} \left[\min_{c_1} \sum_{x_i \in R_1(j,s)} (y_i - c_1)^2 + \min_{c_2} \sum_{x_i \in R_2(j,s)} (y_i - c_2)^2 \right]$$

Here c₁ and c₂ are conditional means (in leaf 1 and 2)

First, conditional on continuing grow, how to determine partition?

- For j th predictor, cut position s
- Define half plane $R_1(j,s) = \{X | X_j \le s\}, R_2(j,s) = \{X | X_j > s\}$
- How to find (j,s) in each branch? Minimize SSE (Easy)

$$\min_{j,s} \left[\min_{c_1} \sum_{x_i \in R_1(j,s)} (y_i - c_1)^2 + \min_{c_2} \sum_{x_i \in R_2(j,s)} (y_i - c_2)^2 \right]$$

- First, conditional on continuing grow, how to determine partition?
- For j th predictor, cut position s
- Define half plane $R_1(j, s) = \{X | X_j \le s\}, R_2(j, s) = \{X | X_j > s\}$
- How to find (j,s) in each branch? Minimize SSE (Easy)

$$\min_{j,s} \left[\min_{c_1} \sum_{x_i \in R_1(j,s)} (y_i - c_1)^2 + \min_{c_2} \sum_{x_i \in R_2(j,s)} (y_i - c_2)^2 \right]$$

- First, conditional on continuing grow, how to determine partition?
- For j th predictor, cut position s
- Define half plane $R_1(j, s) = \{X | X_j \le s\}, R_2(j, s) = \{X | X_j > s\}$

How to find (j,s) in each branch? Minimize SSE (Easy)

$$\min_{j,s} \left[\min_{c_1} \sum_{x_i \in R_1(j,s)} (y_i - c_1)^2 + \min_{c_2} \sum_{x_i \in R_2(j,s)} (y_i - c_2)^2 \right]$$

- First, conditional on continuing grow, how to determine partition?
- For j th predictor, cut position s
- Define half plane $R_1(j, s) = \{X | X_j \le s\}, R_2(j, s) = \{X | X_j > s\}$
- How to find (j,s) in each branch? Minimize SSE (Easy)

$$\min_{j,s} [\min_{c_1} \sum_{x_i \in R_1(j,s)} (y_i - c_1)^2 + \min_{c_2} \sum_{x_i \in R_2(j,s)} (y_i - c_2)^2]$$

- First, conditional on continuing grow, how to determine partition?
- For j th predictor, cut position s
- Define half plane $R_1(j, s) = \{X | X_j \le s\}, R_2(j, s) = \{X | X_j > s\}$
- How to find (j,s) in each branch? Minimize SSE (Easy)

$$\min_{j,s} [\min_{c_1} \sum_{x_i \in R_1(j,s)} (y_i - c_1)^2 + \min_{c_2} \sum_{x_i \in R_2(j,s)} (y_i - c_2)^2]$$

- Second, how to choose to continue growing the tree or stop?
- \blacksquare Too large \rightarrow Overfitting; Too small \rightarrow Losing information
- Grow a big tree T_0 , then prune it!
 - Step 1: Grow To when some minimum node size is reached (say 10).
 - * Step 2: Pruning. Choose the tree $T \in T_0$ with the lowest cost function $C_0(T)$.
 - T C T₀ means any tree T that can be obtained by collapsing any number of internal nodes in T₀.

Second, how to choose to continue growing the tree or stop?

- Too large \rightarrow Overfitting; Too small \rightarrow Losing information
- Grow a big tree T_0 , then prune it!
 - Step 1: Grow T_0 when some minimum node size is reached (say 10)
 - Step 2: Pruning. Choose the tree $T \in T_0$ with the lowest cost function $C_{\alpha}(T)$.
 - T \subset T_0 means any tree T that can be obtained by collapsing any number of internal nodes in T_0

- Second, how to choose to continue growing the tree or stop?
- Too large \rightarrow Overfitting; Too small \rightarrow Losing information
- Grow a big tree T_0 , then prune it!
 - Step 1: Grow T_0 when some minimum node size is reached (say 10)
 - Step 2: Pruning. Choose the tree $T \in T_0$ with the lowest cost function $C_{\alpha}(T)$.
 - $T \subset T_0$ means any tree T that can be obtained by collapsing any number of internal nodes in T_0

- Second, how to choose to continue growing the tree or stop?
- Too large \rightarrow Overfitting; Too small \rightarrow Losing information
- Grow a big tree T_0 , then prune it!
 - Step 1: Grow T_0 when some minimum node size is reached (say 10)
 - Step 2: Pruning. Choose the tree $T \in T_0$ with the lowest cost function $C_{\alpha}(T)$.
 - $T \subset T_0$ means any tree T that can be obtained by collapsing any number of internal nodes in T_0

- Second, how to choose to continue growing the tree or stop?
- Too large \rightarrow Overfitting; Too small \rightarrow Losing information
- Grow a big tree T_0 , then prune it!
 - Step 1: Grow T_0 when some minimum node size is reached (say 10)
 - Step 2: Pruning. Choose the tree T ⊂ T₀ with the lowest cost function C_α(T).
 T ⊂ T₀ means any tree T that can be obtained by collapsing any number of internal
 - nodes in T_0

- Second, how to choose to continue growing the tree or stop?
- Too large \rightarrow Overfitting; Too small \rightarrow Losing information
- Grow a big tree T_0 , then prune it!
 - Step 1: Grow T_0 when some minimum node size is reached (say 10)
 - Step 2: Pruning. Choose the tree $T \subset T_0$ with the lowest cost function $C_{\alpha}(T)$.
 - $T \subset T_0$ means any tree T that can be obtained by collapsing any number of internal nodes in T_0

- Second, how to choose to continue growing the tree or stop?
- Too large \rightarrow Overfitting; Too small \rightarrow Losing information
- Grow a big tree T_0 , then prune it!
 - Step 1: Grow T_0 when some minimum node size is reached (say 10)
 - Step 2: Pruning. Choose the tree $T \subset T_0$ with the lowest cost function $C_{\alpha}(T)$.
 - $T \subset T_0$ means any tree T that can be obtained by collapsing any number of internal nodes in T_0

$$C_{\alpha}(T) = \sum_{m=1}^{|T|} N_m Q_m(T) + \alpha |T|$$

lpha as the tuning parameter; $|\mathcal{T}|$ as number of terminal nodes

- Total SSE (bias) + Size penalty
- α determines how hard to penalize tree size

$$C_{\alpha}(T) = \sum_{m=1}^{|T|} N_m Q_m(T) + \alpha |T|$$

 α as the tuning parameter; $|\mathcal{T}|$ as number of terminal nodes

■ Total SSE (bias) + Size penalty

• α determines how hard to penalize tree size

$$C_{\alpha}(T) = \sum_{m=1}^{|T|} N_m Q_m(T) + \alpha |T|$$

 α as the tuning parameter; $|\mathcal{T}|$ as number of terminal nodes

- Total SSE (bias) + Size penalty
- $\blacksquare \ \alpha$ determines how hard to penalize tree size

- Using sub-sampling or bagging to reduce variance of a single tree
- Draw a lot of different samples (1,2,...B) with sub-sampling (n < N) (Jackknife) or bagging (n = N) (Bootstrap)
- De-correlation: In each split, randomly select *m* variables to do the partition

$$\hat{f}^{B}(x) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^{B} T_{b}(x)$$
$$V(\hat{f}) \approx \rho \sigma^{2} + \frac{1-\rho}{B} \sigma^{2}$$

Random Forests = Tree Method + Sampling average (Many De-correlated Trees)
 To reduce V(f̂): B↑ (more sampling), ρ↓ (smaller correlation)

Using sub-sampling or bagging to reduce variance of a single tree

- Draw a lot of different samples (1,2,...B) with sub-sampling (n < N) (Jackknife) or bagging (n = N) (Bootstrap)
- De-correlation: In each split, randomly select *m* variables to do the partition

$$\hat{f}^{B}(x) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^{B} T_{b}(x)$$
$$V(\hat{f}) \approx \rho \sigma^{2} + \frac{1-\rho}{B} \sigma^{2}$$

Random Forests = Tree Method + Sampling average (Many De-correlated Trees)
 To reduce V(f̂): B↑ (more sampling), ρ↓ (smaller correlation)

- Using sub-sampling or bagging to reduce variance of a single tree
- Draw a lot of different samples (1,2,...B) with sub-sampling (n < N) (Jackknife) or bagging (n = N) (Bootstrap)

De-correlation: In each split, randomly select *m* variables to do the partition

$$\hat{f}^{B}(x) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^{B} T_{b}(x)$$
$$V(\hat{f}) \approx \rho \sigma^{2} + \frac{1-\rho}{B} \sigma^{2}$$

Random Forests = Tree Method + Sampling average (Many De-correlated Trees)
 To reduce V(f̂): B↑ (more sampling), ρ↓ (smaller correlation)

- Using sub-sampling or bagging to reduce variance of a single tree
- Draw a lot of different samples (1,2,...B) with sub-sampling (n < N) (Jackknife) or bagging (n = N) (Bootstrap)
- De-correlation: In each split, randomly select m variables to do the partition

$$\hat{f}^{B}(x) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^{B} T_{b}(x)$$
$$V(\hat{f}) \approx \rho \sigma^{2} + \frac{1-\rho}{B} \sigma^{2}$$

Random Forests = Tree Method + Sampling average (Many De-correlated Trees)
 To reduce V(f̂): B↑ (more sampling), ρ↓ (smaller correlation)

- Using sub-sampling or bagging to reduce variance of a single tree
- Draw a lot of different samples (1,2,...B) with sub-sampling (n < N) (Jackknife) or bagging (n = N) (Bootstrap)
- De-correlation: In each split, randomly select *m* variables to do the partition

$$\hat{f}^{B}(x) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^{B} T_{b}(x)$$
$$V(\hat{f}) \approx \rho \sigma^{2} + \frac{1-\rho}{B} \sigma^{2}$$

Random Forests = Tree Method + Sampling average (Many De-correlated Trees)
 To reduce V(f̂): B↑ (more sampling), ρ↓ (smaller correlation)

- Using sub-sampling or bagging to reduce variance of a single tree
- Draw a lot of different samples (1,2,...B) with sub-sampling (n < N) (Jackknife) or bagging (n = N) (Bootstrap)
- De-correlation: In each split, randomly select m variables to do the partition

$$\hat{f}^{B}(x) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^{B} T_{b}(x)$$
$$V(\hat{f}) \approx \rho \sigma^{2} + \frac{1-\rho}{B} \sigma^{2}$$

Random Forests = Tree Method + Sampling average (Many De-correlated Trees)
 To reduce V(f̂): B↑ (more sampling), ρ↓ (smaller correlation)
Algorithm 15.1 Random Forest for Regression or Classification.

1. For b = 1 to B:

- (a) Draw a bootstrap sample \mathbf{Z}^* of size N from the training data.
- (b) Grow a random-forest tree T_b to the bootstrapped data, by recursively repeating the following steps for each terminal node of the tree, until the minimum node size n_{min} is reached.
 - i. Select m variables at random from the p variables.
 - ii. Pick the best variable/split-point among the m.
 - iii. Split the node into two daughter nodes.
- 2. Output the ensemble of trees $\{T_b\}_1^B$.

To make a prediction at a new point x:

Regression: $\hat{f}_{rf}^B(x) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B T_b(x).$

Classification: Let $\hat{C}_b(x)$ be the class prediction of the *b*th random-forest tree. Then $\hat{C}_{rf}^B(x) = majority \ vote \{\hat{C}_b(x)\}_{rf}^B$.

- We reduce the variance by bagging (B) and de-correlation (ρ)
- This is a method similar to kernels and nearest-neighbor method Making predictions using weighted averages of "nearby" observations
- Difference: Weighting scheme
 - Nearest Neighbor: Not adaptive; Random Forests: Adaptive
- An important application of Random Forests in Economics is Causal Forests

• We reduce the variance by bagging (B) and de-correlation (ρ)

This is a method similar to kernels and nearest-neighbor method Making predictions using weighted averages of "nearby" observations

Difference: Weighting scheme Nearest Neighbor: Not adaptive; Random Forests: Adaptive

An important application of Random Forests in Economics is Causal Forests

- We reduce the variance by bagging (B) and de-correlation (ρ)
- This is a method similar to kernels and nearest-neighbor method Making predictions using weighted averages of "nearby" observations
- Difference: Weighting scheme
 Nearest Neighbor: Not adaptive; Random Forests: Adaptive
- An important application of Random Forests in Economics is Causal Forests

- We reduce the variance by bagging (B) and de-correlation (ρ)
- This is a method similar to kernels and nearest-neighbor method Making predictions using weighted averages of "nearby" observations
- Difference: Weighting scheme
 Nearest Neighbor: Not adaptive; Random Forests: Adaptive
- An important application of Random Forests in Economics is Causal Forests

- We reduce the variance by bagging (B) and de-correlation (ρ)
- This is a method similar to kernels and nearest-neighbor method Making predictions using weighted averages of "nearby" observations
- Difference: Weighting scheme
 Nearest Neighbor: Not adaptive; Random Forests: Adaptive
- An important application of Random Forests in Economics is Causal Forests

- Main topic in causal inference: Treatment effect Mostly ATE, LATE etc.
- Heterogeneous Treatment Effect Cherry picking? ⇒ Institutional restrictions on trials
- Unexpected heterogeneity
- Wager and Athey develop a machine learning tool, Causal Forests (An extension of Random Forests)
- To reveal the true underlying heterogeneous treatment effects

Main topic in causal inference: Treatment effect Mostly ATE, LATE etc.

- Heterogeneous Treatment Effect Cherry picking? ⇒ Institutional restrictions on trials
- Unexpected heterogeneity
- Wager and Athey develop a machine learning tool, Causal Forests (An extension of Random Forests)
- To reveal the true underlying heterogeneous treatment effects

- Main topic in causal inference: Treatment effect Mostly ATE, LATE etc.
- Heterogeneous Treatment Effect Cherry picking? ⇒ Institutional restrictions on trials
- Unexpected heterogeneity
- Wager and Athey develop a machine learning tool, Causal Forests (An extension of Random Forests)
- To reveal the true underlying heterogeneous treatment effects

- Main topic in causal inference: Treatment effect Mostly ATE, LATE etc.
- Heterogeneous Treatment Effect Cherry picking? ⇒ Institutional restrictions on trials
- Unexpected heterogeneity
- Wager and Athey develop a machine learning tool, Causal Forests (An extension of Random Forests)
- To reveal the true underlying heterogeneous treatment effects

- Main topic in causal inference: Treatment effect Mostly ATE, LATE etc.
- Heterogeneous Treatment Effect Cherry picking? ⇒ Institutional restrictions on trials
- Unexpected heterogeneity
- Wager and Athey develop a machine learning tool, Causal Forests (An extension of Random Forests)
- To reveal the true underlying heterogeneous treatment effects

- Main topic in causal inference: Treatment effect Mostly ATE, LATE etc.
- Heterogeneous Treatment Effect Cherry picking? ⇒ Institutional restrictions on trials
- Unexpected heterogeneity
- Wager and Athey develop a machine learning tool, Causal Forests (An extension of Random Forests)
- To reveal the true underlying heterogeneous treatment effects

It tells us how to divide groups to get the "real" heterogeneous TE
Data of (X_i, Y_i, W_i), W_i is treatment assignment. L as a leaf (region).
Treatment effect: τ(x) = E[Y_i⁽¹⁾ - Y_i⁽⁰⁾ | X_i = x]
Unconfoundness: {Y_i⁽⁰⁾, Y_i⁽¹⁾} ⊥ W_i | X_i

It tells us how to divide groups to get the "real" heterogeneous TE
Data of (X_i, Y_i, W_i), W_i is treatment assignment. L as a leaf (region).
Treatment effect: τ(x) = E[Y_i⁽¹⁾ - Y_i⁽⁰⁾ | X_i = x]
Unconfoundness: {Y_i⁽⁰⁾, Y_i⁽¹⁾} ⊥ W_i | X_i

It tells us how to divide groups to get the "real" heterogeneous TE
Data of (X_i, Y_i, W_i), W_i is treatment assignment. L as a leaf (region).
Treatment effect: τ(x) = E[Y_i⁽¹⁾ - Y_i⁽⁰⁾ | X_i = x]
Unconfoundness: {Y_i⁽⁰⁾, Y_i⁽¹⁾} ⊥ W_i | X_i

- It tells us how to divide groups to get the "real" heterogeneous TE
- Data of (X_i, Y_i, W_i) , W_i is treatment assignment. L as a leaf (region).
- Treatment effect: $\tau(x) = E[Y_i^{(1)} Y_i^{(0)}|X_i = x]$
- Unconfoundness: $\{Y_i^{(0)}, Y_i^{(1)}\} \perp W_i | X_i$

- It tells us how to divide groups to get the "real" heterogeneous TE
- Data of (X_i, Y_i, W_i) , W_i is treatment assignment. L as a leaf (region).
- Treatment effect: $\tau(x) = E[Y_i^{(1)} Y_i^{(0)}|X_i = x]$
- Unconfoundness: $\{Y_i^{(0)}, Y_i^{(1)}\} \perp W_i | X_i$

Estimation of TE: Given x in leaf L(x), the difference of the average outcome Y for treated/non-treated group

$$\hat{\tau}(x) = \frac{1}{|\{i: W_i = 1, X_i \in L\}|} \sum_{\{i: W_i = 1, X_i \in L\}}^{Y_i} Y_i - \frac{1}{|\{i: W_i = 0, X_i \in L\}|} \sum_{\{i: W_i = 0, X_i \in L\}}^{Y_i} Y_i$$

Implement the Random Forests using a criterion: maximizing variance of $\hat{\tau}(X_i)$

Estimation of TE: Given x in leaf L(x), the difference of the average outcome Y for treated/non-treated group

$$\hat{\tau}(x) = \frac{1}{|\{i:W_i=1, X_i \in L\}|} \sum_{\{i:W_i=1, X_i \in L\}}^{Y_i} Y_i - \frac{1}{|\{i:W_i=0, X_i \in L\}|} \sum_{\{i:W_i=0, X_i \in L\}}^{Y_i} Y_i$$

Implement the Random Forests using a criterion: maximizing variance of $\hat{\tau}(X_i)$

Estimation of TE: Given x in leaf L(x), the difference of the average outcome Y for treated/non-treated group

$$\hat{\tau}(x) = \frac{1}{|\{i:W_i=1, X_i \in L\}|} \sum_{\{i:W_i=1, X_i \in L\}}^{Y_i} Y_i - \frac{1}{|\{i:W_i=0, X_i \in L\}|} \sum_{\{i:W_i=0, X_i \in L\}}^{Y_i} Y_i$$

Implement the Random Forests using a criterion: maximizing variance of $\hat{\tau}(X_i)$

- A tree is honesty, if for each training example i, it is either used to estimate τ or used to decide splits
- Double-Sample Trees: Averagely divide samples into two parts I and J. Grow the tree using I and then estimate τ in each leaf using J.
- Honest Causal Forests is consistent and asymptotically normal.

- A tree is honesty, if for each training example *i*, it is either used to estimate τ or used to decide splits
- Double-Sample Trees: Averagely divide samples into two parts I and J. Grow the tree using I and then estimate τ in each leaf using J.
- Honest Causal Forests is consistent and asymptotically normal

- A tree is honesty, if for each training example *i*, it is either used to estimate τ or used to decide splits
- Double-Sample Trees: Averagely divide samples into two parts I and J. Grow the tree using I and then estimate τ in each leaf using J.
- Honest Causal Forests is consistent and asymptotically normal

- A tree is honesty, if for each training example *i*, it is either used to estimate τ or used to decide splits
- Double-Sample Trees: Averagely divide samples into two parts I and J. Grow the tree using I and then estimate τ in each leaf using J.
- Honest Causal Forests is consistent and asymptotically normal

Machine Learning and Model Selection: Application of Causal Forests

- Paper report
 - Levy (2021) Social Media, News Consumption, and Polarization: Evidence from a Field Experiment
- Please also read Online Appendix C.5

Machine Learning and Model Selection: Application of Causal Forests

Paper report

Levy (2021) Social Media, News Consumption, and Polarization: Evidence from a Field Experiment

Please also read Online Appendix C.5

Machine Learning and Model Selection: Application of Causal Forests

Paper report

Levy (2021) Social Media, News Consumption, and Polarization: Evidence from a Field Experiment

Please also read Online Appendix C.5

- Another widely used machine learning method is Neural Networks
- It attracts people's attention during these days in media
- Al, AlphaGo...Sky Net (kidding)

Another widely used machine learning method is Neural Networks

It attracts people's attention during these days in media

Al, AlphaGo...Sky Net (kidding)

- Another widely used machine learning method is Neural Networks
- It attracts people's attention during these days in media
- Al, AlphaGo...Sky Net (kidding)

- Another widely used machine learning method is Neural Networks
- It attracts people's attention during these days in media
- AI, AlphaGo...Sky Net (kidding)

• Consider a single layer classification model, where Y_k refers to each choice/class



FIGURE 11.2. Schematic of a single hidden layer, feed-forward neural network.

X - Input; Z- Hidden layer/unit; Y - Output

• Consider a single layer classification model, where Y_k refers to each choice/class



FIGURE 11.2. Schematic of a single hidden layer, feed-forward neural network.

X - Input; Z- Hidden layer/unit; Y - Output

• Consider a single layer classification model, where Y_k refers to each choice/class



FIGURE 11.2. Schematic of a single hidden layer, feed-forward neural network.

X - Input; Z- Hidden layer/unit; Y - Output

Step 1: from input X to hidden unit Z

$$Z_m = \sigma(\alpha_{0m} + \alpha_m^T X), m = 1, ..., M$$

σ is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)
 Step 2: from hidden unit Z to output Y

$$T_{k} = \beta_{0k} + \beta_{k}^{T} Z, k = 1, ..., K$$
$$f_{k}(X) = g_{k}(T), k = 1, ..., K$$

■ g is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)

Step 1: from input X to hidden unit Z

$$Z_m = \sigma(\alpha_{0m} + \alpha_m^T X), m = 1, ..., M$$

• σ is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)

Step 2: from hidden unit Z to output Y

$$T_{k} = \beta_{0k} + \beta_{k}^{T} Z, k = 1, ..., K$$
$$f_{k}(X) = g_{k}(T), k = 1, ..., K$$

■ g is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)
Step 1: from input X to hidden unit Z

$$Z_m = \sigma(\alpha_{0m} + \alpha_m^T X), m = 1, ..., M$$

• σ is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)

Step 2: from hidden unit Z to output Y

$$T_{k} = \beta_{0k} + \beta_{k}^{T} Z, k = 1, ..., K$$
$$f_{k}(X) = g_{k}(T), k = 1, ..., K$$

■ g is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)

Step 1: from input X to hidden unit Z

$$Z_m = \sigma(\alpha_{0m} + \alpha_m^T X), m = 1, ..., M$$

- σ is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)
- Step 2: from hidden unit Z to output Y

$$T_{k} = \beta_{0k} + \beta_{k}^{T} Z, k = 1, ..., K$$

$$f_{k}(X) = g_{k}(T), k = 1, ..., K$$

■ g is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)

Step 1: from input X to hidden unit Z

$$Z_m = \sigma(\alpha_{0m} + \alpha_m^T X), m = 1, ..., M$$

- σ is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)
- Step 2: from hidden unit Z to output Y

$$T_{k} = \beta_{0k} + \beta_{k}^{T} Z, k = 1, ..., K$$

$$f_{k}(X) = g_{k}(T), k = 1, ..., K$$

■ g is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)

45 / 50

- Why do we call this Neural Networks?
- Because it was first developed as models for the human brain
- Each unit represents a neuron
- Connections are synapses
- There can be multiple layers
- When step function is used for σ and g, neurons fire when signal passed to the unit (α_{0m} + α^T_mX) exceeds some threshold

Why do we call this Neural Networks?

- Because it was first developed as models for the human brain
- Each unit represents a neuron
- Connections are synapses
- There can be multiple layers
- When step function is used for σ and g, neurons fire when signal passed to the unit (α_{0m} + α^T_mX) exceeds some threshold

- Why do we call this Neural Networks?
- Because it was first developed as models for the human brain
- Each unit represents a neuron
- Connections are synapses
- There can be multiple layers
- When step function is used for σ and g, neurons fire when signal passed to the unit (α_{0m} + α^T_mX) exceeds some threshold

- Why do we call this Neural Networks?
- Because it was first developed as models for the human brain
- Each unit represents a neuron
- Connections are synapses
- There can be multiple layers
- When step function is used for σ and g, neurons fire when signal passed to the unit (α_{0m} + α^T_mX) exceeds some threshold

- Why do we call this Neural Networks?
- Because it was first developed as models for the human brain
- Each unit represents a neuron
- Connections are synapses
- There can be multiple layers
- When step function is used for σ and g, neurons fire when signal passed to the unit (α_{0m} + α^T_mX) exceeds some threshold

- Why do we call this Neural Networks?
- Because it was first developed as models for the human brain
- Each unit represents a neuron
- Connections are synapses
- There can be multiple layers
- When step function is used for σ and g, neurons fire when signal passed to the unit (α_{0m} + α^T_mX) exceeds some threshold

- Why do we call this Neural Networks?
- Because it was first developed as models for the human brain
- Each unit represents a neuron
- Connections are synapses
- There can be multiple layers
- When step function is used for σ and g, neurons fire when signal passed to the unit (α_{0m} + α^T_mX) exceeds some threshold

- How to estimate this model?
- Simply nonlinear Least Square
- How to avoid overfitting?
- **Regularize** the optimization problem min $R(\theta)$ with a penalty term:

$$\min R(\theta) + \lambda J(\theta)$$
$$J(\theta) = \sum_{km} \beta_{km}^2 + \sum_{ml} \alpha_{mp}^2$$

How to estimate this model?

- Simply nonlinear Least Square
- How to avoid overfitting?
- **Regularize** the optimization problem min $R(\theta)$ with a penalty term:

$$\min R(\theta) + \lambda J(\theta)$$
$$J(\theta) = \sum_{km} \beta_{km}^2 + \sum_{ml} \alpha_{mp}^2$$

- How to estimate this model?
- Simply nonlinear Least Square
- How to avoid overfitting?
- Regularize the optimization problem min $R(\theta)$ with a penalty term:

$$\min R(\theta) + \lambda J(\theta)$$
$$J(\theta) = \sum_{km} \beta_{km}^2 + \sum_{ml} \alpha_{mp}^2$$

- How to estimate this model?
- Simply nonlinear Least Square
- How to avoid overfitting?
- Regularize the optimization problem min $R(\theta)$ with a penalty term:

$$\min R(\theta) + \lambda J(\theta)$$
$$J(\theta) = \sum_{km} \beta_{km}^2 + \sum_{ml} \alpha_{mp}^2$$

- How to estimate this model?
- Simply nonlinear Least Square
- How to avoid overfitting?
- Regularize the optimization problem min $R(\theta)$ with a penalty term:

$$\min R(\theta) + \lambda J(\theta)$$
$$J(\theta) = \sum_{km} \beta_{km}^2 + \sum_{ml} \alpha_{mp}^2$$

- How to estimate this model?
- Simply nonlinear Least Square
- How to avoid overfitting?
- Regularize the optimization problem min $R(\theta)$ with a penalty term:

$$\min R(\theta) + \lambda J(\theta)$$
$$J(\theta) = \sum_{km} \beta_{km}^2 + \sum_{ml} \alpha_{mp}^2$$

• λ is a tuning parameter

- Model complexity is double-edged: Bias-variance tradeoff
- In general, there are many standards to evaluate model's goodness-of-fit CV, AIC, BIC
- Machine learning gives you automatic algorithms to select model Penalized regression, Tree-based method (Random Forests), Neural Networks
- An important new application in economics is Causal Forests Can be used to detect heterogeneous treatment effect

Model complexity is double-edged: Bias-variance tradeoff

- In general, there are many standards to evaluate model's goodness-of-fit CV, AIC, BIC
- Machine learning gives you automatic algorithms to select model
 Penalized regression, Tree-based method (Random Forests), Neural Networks
- An important new application in economics is Causal Forests
 Can be used to detect heterogeneous treatment effect

- Model complexity is double-edged: Bias-variance tradeoff
- In general, there are many standards to evaluate model's goodness-of-fit CV, AIC, BIC
- Machine learning gives you automatic algorithms to select model
 Penalized regression, Tree-based method (Random Forests), Neural Networks
- An important new application in economics is Causal Forests
 Can be used to detect heterogeneous treatment effect

- Model complexity is double-edged: Bias-variance tradeoff
- In general, there are many standards to evaluate model's goodness-of-fit CV, AIC, BIC
- Machine learning gives you automatic algorithms to select model
 Penalized regression, Tree-based method (Random Forests), Neural Networks
- An important new application in economics is Causal Forests
 Can be used to detect heterogeneous treatment effect

- Model complexity is double-edged: Bias-variance tradeoff
- In general, there are many standards to evaluate model's goodness-of-fit CV, AIC, BIC
- Machine learning gives you automatic algorithms to select model
 Penalized regression, Tree-based method (Random Forests), Neural Networks
- An important new application in economics is Causal Forests Can be used to detect heterogeneous treatment effect

- But remember, these are only statistical tools
- The most important method is still your ECONOMIC intuition!
- Never exclude education from a wage equation, even if AIC/BIC told you so!

But remember, these are only statistical tools

- The most important method is still your ECONOMIC intuition!
- Never exclude education from a wage equation, even if AIC/BIC told you so!

- But remember, these are only statistical tools
- The most important method is still your ECONOMIC intuition!
- Never exclude education from a wage equation, even if AIC/BIC told you so!

- But remember, these are only statistical tools
- The most important method is still your ECONOMIC intuition!
- Never exclude education from a wage equation, even if AIC/BIC told you so!

- In this lecture, we focus on model selection conditional on Unconfoundness assumption
- Thus, we discuss more on model prediction but not causal structure
- Next lecture, we will turn to variable (model) selection based on our proposed causal structure
- We will introduce a new tool to deal with this issue: Causal Graph

In this lecture, we focus on model selection conditional on Unconfoundness assumption

- Thus, we discuss more on model prediction but not causal structure
- Next lecture, we will turn to variable (model) selection based on our proposed causal structure
- We will introduce a new tool to deal with this issue: Causal Graph

- In this lecture, we focus on model selection conditional on Unconfoundness assumption
- Thus, we discuss more on model prediction but not causal structure
- Next lecture, we will turn to variable (model) selection based on our proposed causal structure
- We will introduce a new tool to deal with this issue: Causal Graph

- In this lecture, we focus on model selection conditional on Unconfoundness assumption
- Thus, we discuss more on model prediction but not causal structure
- Next lecture, we will turn to variable (model) selection based on our proposed causal structure
- We will introduce a new tool to deal with this issue: Causal Graph

- In this lecture, we focus on model selection conditional on Unconfoundness assumption
- Thus, we discuss more on model prediction but not causal structure
- Next lecture, we will turn to variable (model) selection based on our proposed causal structure
- We will introduce a new tool to deal with this issue: Causal Graph



Levy, Ro'ee. 2021. "Social Media, News Consumption, and Polarization: Evidence from a Field Experiment." American Economic Review 111 (3):831–870.