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

#### Zibin Huang<sup>1</sup>

 $^{1}$ College of Business, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics

Spetember 27, 2024

**KO KARK KE K KE K EIE KAAR** 1 / 52

- -
	-
- 

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

- We now have many tools in our box beyond linear regression
	-
	-
- 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
- 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
- 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

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
- Which method should we choose?

- 
- -
	- -

#### Even for a given method, such as simple regression

#### **The functional form is still flexible**

- 
- -

#### Even for a given method, such as simple regression

#### $\blacksquare$  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<sup>3</sup>?

- Even for a given method, such as simple regression
- $\blacksquare$  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<sup>3</sup>?

- Even for a given method, such as simple regression
- $\blacksquare$  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<sup>3</sup>?

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

#### $\blacksquare$  Model selection issue has been ignored in applied economics for such a long time

- **Nore 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

- $\blacksquare$  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

- $\blacksquare$  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

- $\blacksquare$  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

- $\blacksquare$  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

- 
- 
- 
- 

- Data driven method (Machine learning)
- **Prior causal structure (DAG)**
- Data driven method focus on using purely data to determine the model without prior information
- **Prior causal structure means that we determine the model with assumed causal** links and economic knowledge

- Data driven method (Machine learning)
- **Prior causal structure (DAG)**
- Data driven method focus on using purely data to determine the model without prior information
- **Prior causal structure means that we determine the model with assumed causal** links and economic knowledge

- Data driven method (Machine learning)
- **Prior causal structure (DAG)**
- Data driven method focus on using purely data to determine the model without prior information
- **Prior causal structure means that we determine the model with assumed causal** links and economic knowledge

- Data driven method (Machine learning)
- **Prior causal structure (DAG)**
- **Data driven method focus on using purely data to determine the model without** prior information
- **Prior causal structure means that we determine the model with assumed causal** links and economic knowledge

- There are two approaches to choose a model
	- Data driven method (Machine learning)
	- **Prior causal structure (DAG)**
- **Data driven method focus on using purely data to determine the model without** prior information
- **Prior causal structure means that we determine the model with assumed causal** links and economic knowledge

- 
- 
- 
- 

#### ■ Today, we will discuss the data driven model selection method first

- **Ne select models only using data**
- We do not put our economic knowledge into the process
- **Let's first introduce a major statistical concept: Bias-variance tradeoff**

- Today, we will discuss the data driven model selection method first
- We select models only using data
- We do not put our economic knowledge into the process
- **Let's first introduce a major statistical concept: Bias-variance tradeoff**

- Today, we will discuss the data driven model selection method first
- We select models only using data
- We do not put our economic knowledge into the process
- Let's first introduce a major statistical concept: Bias-variance tradeoff

- Today, we will discuss the data driven model selection method first
- We select models only using data
- We do not put our economic knowledge into the process
- **Let's first introduce a major statistical concept: Bias-variance tradeoff**

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

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

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

#### 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

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

Why not always the second or the third one?

#### 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

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

Why not always the second or the third one?

#### 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

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

**Now** My not always the second or the third one?

#### 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

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

Why not always the second or the third one?

■ Model A  
\n
$$
y = x_1^f \beta + \epsilon
$$
\n■ Model B  
\n
$$
y = x_1^f \beta_1 + x_2^f \beta_2 + \epsilon
$$
\n(4)

- 
- 

#### 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?

K ロ ▶ K 何 ▶ K ヨ ▶ K ヨ ▶ 『ヨ ヨ イ 이 Q () 8 / 52
Model A

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

■ 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?

K ロ ▶ K 何 ▶ K ヨ ▶ K ヨ ▶ 『ヨ ヨ イ 이 Q () 8 / 52

Model A

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

■ 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?

K ロ ▶ K 何 ▶ K ヨ ▶ K ヨ ▶ 『ヨ ヨ イ 이 Q () 8 / 52

Model A

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

■ 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:

 $Y = f(X) + \epsilon$ 

- $\hat{f}(x)$  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?

#### **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?

**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?

**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?

- 
- 

 $\blacksquare$  The prediction mean squared 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 + Bias<sup>2</sup> + Variance

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

 $\blacksquare$  The prediction mean squared 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 + Bias<sup>2</sup> + Variance

#### ■ Model complexity ⇒ Bias ↓, Variance ↑

■ Super complicated model  $\Rightarrow$  Variance  $\uparrow \uparrow$  (very sensitive when data change) ■ Overfit current data ⇒ Poor out-of-sample prediction

 $\blacksquare$  The prediction mean squared 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 + Bias<sup>2</sup> + 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

 $\blacksquare$  The prediction mean squared 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 + Bias<sup>2</sup> + 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
- $\blacksquare$  Let's start to fit it with different polynomials
- Green line is the true DGP
- $\blacksquare$  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

 $\blacksquare$  Let's start to fit it with different polynomials

Green line is the true DGP

 $\blacksquare$  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
- $\blacksquare$  Let's start to fit it with different polynomials
- Green line is the true DGP
- $\blacksquare$  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
- $\blacksquare$  Let's start to fit it with different polynomials
- Green line is the true DGP
- $\blacksquare$  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
- $\blacksquare$  Let's start to fit it with different polynomials
- Green line is the true DGP
- $\blacksquare$  Red line is the fitting function

Figure: First Order (Linear) Fitting



 $Q$ 12 / 52

격대

Figure: Second Order (Quadratic) Fitting



크 님

Figure: Third Order (Cubic) Fitting



 $\Omega$   $\Omega$ 14 / 52

크 님

Figure: Fourth Order Fitting



 $\Omega$   $\Omega$ 15 / 52

드바람

Figure: Fifth Order Fitting



 $\alpha$ 16 / 52

그녀님

Figure: Sixth Order Fitting



 $Q \cap$ 17 / 52

드바람

Figure: Twentieth Order Fitting



 $\Omega$   $\Omega$ 18 / 52

격대

э



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

- 
- 
- -

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

- 
- 
- 

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  $AIC = 2k + nIn(RSS/n)$ , 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  $\gamma$ Still remember why we need to adjust for the number of regressors?
- **AIC:** Akaike Information Criterion  $AIC = 2k + nIn(RSS/n)$ , 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  $AIC = 2k + nIn(RSS/n)$ , k is the number of regressors
- **BIC: Bayesian Information Criterion** This is motivated by the Bayesian approach to model selection

#### Another important measure is Cross-Validation (CV)

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

#### Another important measure is Cross-Validation (CV)

- 
- 
- 
- 
-
- **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
- $\blacksquare$  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
- $\blacksquare$  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
- $\blacksquare$  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
- $\blacksquare$  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
- $\blacksquare$  They can be used to check the model fit and avoid overfitting

Here is the process of CV



- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

Here is the process of CV



- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

Here is the process of CV



#### First, we separate all samples into  $K$  parts

- $\blacksquare$  Each time, we choose K-1 parts to train (estimate) the model
- $\blacksquare$  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 CV



- First, we separate all samples into  $K$  parts
- Each time, we choose  $K-1$  parts to train (estimate) the model
- $\blacksquare$  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 CV



- First, we separate all samples into  $K$  parts
- Each time, we choose  $K-1$  parts to train (estimate) the model
- $\blacksquare$  We then use the remaining one part k to calculate the mean squared predicted error  $MSE<sub>k</sub>$
- 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 CV



- First, we separate all samples into  $K$  parts
- Each time, we choose  $K-1$  parts to train (estimate) the model
- $\blacksquare$  We then use the remaining one part k to calculate the mean squared predicted error  $MSE<sub>k</sub>$
- 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 CV



- First, we separate all samples into  $K$  parts
- Each time, we choose  $K-1$  parts to train (estimate) the model
- $\blacksquare$  We then use the remaining one part k to calculate the mean squared predicted error  $MSE<sub>k</sub>$
- 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 CV



- First, we separate all samples into  $K$  parts
- Each time, we choose  $K-1$  parts to train (estimate) the model
- $\blacksquare$  We then use the remaining one part k to calculate the mean squared predicted error  $MSE<sub>k</sub>$
- 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

- You have some data that is not used in the estimation and use it to check your estimation validity
- $\blacksquare$  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
- **Not** You have some data that is not used in the estimation and use it to check your estimation validity
- $\blacksquare$  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
- **Not** You have some data that is not used in the estimation and use it 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
- **Not** You have some data that is not used in the estimation and use it 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
- **This is where machine learning kicks in**

- 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
- **This is where machine learning kicks in**

- 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 where machine learning kicks in**

- 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 where machine learning kicks in

- -

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?
- **Nhen Y** is discrete: Classification
- **No. 8 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  $X$ ?
- **Nhen Y** is discrete: Classification
- **No. 2.5 Million** 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  $X$ ?
- **Nhen Y** is discrete: Classification
- **No. 8 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  $X$ ?
- **No. 2.5 Million** When Y is discrete: Classification
- **Notable 19 Million** 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  $X$ ?
- **Nhen Y** is discrete: Classification
- **Notable 19 Million** 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  $X$ ?
- **Nhen Y** is discrete: Classification
- **Notable 19 Million** 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

## Machine Learning and Model Selection: Penalized Regressions

- 
- 
- 
- 

## Machine Learning and Model Selection: Penalized Regressions

#### Let's consider a linear regression

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

## Machine Learning and Model Selection: Penalized Regressions

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

- 
- -
- 
- 

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

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

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

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

- -
- 
- 
- 

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 
- 
- 
- 

- 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**  $R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_M$ **, assign average value in a region as the** predicted value  $\hat{f}(x_i) = \sum_{m=1}^{M}$  $_{m=1}^{M} c_m I(x \in R_m)$
- $\blacksquare$  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  $\hat{f}(x_i) = \sum_{m=1}^{M}$  $_{m=1}^{M} c_m I(x \in R_m)$
- $\blacksquare$  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  $\hat{f}(x_i) = \sum_{m=1}^{M}$  $_{m=1}^{M}$   $c_m$ *I*( $x \in R_m$ )
- $\blacksquare$  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  $\hat{f}(x_i) = \sum_{m=1}^{M}$  $_{m=1}^{M}$   $c_m$ *I*( $x \in R_m$ )
- $\blacksquare$  How to partition (Grow the tree)?



 $299$ 32 / 52

#### ■ We use recursive binary partitions

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



つへへ 32 / 52

We use recursive binary partitions

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



32 / 52

 $\Omega$   $\Omega$ 

- 
- 
- 

Size (# of obs):

\n
$$
N_m = \{x_i \in R_m\}
$$
\nFitted value (mean as fit):

\n
$$
\hat{c}_m = \frac{1}{N_m} \sum_{x \in R_m} y_i
$$
\n SSE (error in leaf):

\n
$$
Q_m(T) = \frac{1}{N_m} \sum_{x \in R_m} (y_i - \hat{c}_m)^2
$$

#### $\blacksquare$  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):  $Q_m(T) = \frac{1}{N_m} \sum_{x \in R_m} (y_i - \hat{c}_m)^2$ 

K ロ ▶ K @ ▶ K 평 ▶ K 평 ▶ (평) 동생이 좋아요. 33 / 52

- $\blacksquare$  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):  $Q_m(T) = \frac{1}{N_m} \sum_{x \in R_m} (y_i - \hat{c}_m)^2$ 

K ロ > K 何 > K ヨ > K ヨ > [ ヨ | ヨ ^ 9 Q ^ 33 / 52

- $\blacksquare$  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):  $Q_m(T) = \frac{1}{N_m} \sum_{x \in R_m} (y_i - \hat{c}_m)^2$ 

- 
- 
- 
- 

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

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

- For  $j th$  predictor, cut position s
- **■** Define half plane  $R_1(j,s) = \{X | X_i \leq s\}, R_2(j,s) = \{X | X_i > s\}$
- $\blacksquare$  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  $R_1(j,s) = \{X | X_i \leq s\}, R_2(j,s) = \{X | X_i > s\}$
- $\blacksquare$  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  $i th$  predictor, cut position s
- Define half plane  $R_1(j, s) = \{X | X_i \le s\}, R_2(j, s) = \{X | X_i > s\}$

 $\blacksquare$  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  $R_1(j, s) = \{X | X_i \le s\}, R_2(j, s) = \{X | X_i > s\}$

How to find  $(i,s)$  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  $R_1(j,s) = \{X | X_i \leq s\}, R_2(j,s) = \{X | X_i > s\}$

How to find  $(i,s)$  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?

- Too large  $\rightarrow$  Overfitting: Too small  $\rightarrow$  Losing information
- Grow a big tree  $T_0$ , then prune it!
	-
	-
	-

- 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!
	-
	-
	-

- 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  $C_{\alpha}(T)$ .
	- $\blacksquare$  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  $C_{\alpha}(T)$ .
	- $\blacksquare$  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  $T \n\subset T_0$  with the lowest cost function  $C_{\alpha}(T)$ .
	- $\blacksquare$  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  $T \n\subset T_0$  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  $T_0$

$$
C_{\alpha}(\mathcal{T})=\sum_{m=1}^{\left|\mathcal{T}\right|}N_{m}Q_{m}(\mathcal{T})+\alpha\left|\mathcal{T}\right|
$$

 $\alpha$  as the tuning parameter; | T| as number of terminal nodes

- 
- 

$$
C_{\alpha}(\mathcal{T})=\sum_{m=1}^{\left|\mathcal{T}\right|}N_{m}Q_{m}(\mathcal{T})+\alpha\left|\mathcal{T}\right|
$$

 $\alpha$  as the tuning parameter; | T| as number of terminal nodes

 $\blacksquare$  Total SSE (bias) + Size penalty

 $\bullet$   $\alpha$  determines how hard to penalize tree size

$$
C_{\alpha}(\mathcal{T})=\sum_{m=1}^{\left|\mathcal{T}\right|}N_{m}Q_{m}(\mathcal{T})+\alpha\left|\mathcal{T}\right|
$$

 $\alpha$  as the tuning parameter; | T| as number of terminal nodes

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

- 
- 
- 

$$
\hat{t}^{B}(x) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^{B} T_b(x)
$$

$$
V(\hat{t}) \approx \rho \sigma^2 + \frac{1 - \rho}{B} \sigma^2
$$

#### 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)
- $\blacksquare$  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  $V(\hat{f})$ :  $B \uparrow$  (more sampling),  $\rho \downarrow$  (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)

 $\blacksquare$  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  $V(\hat{f})$ :  $B \uparrow$  (more sampling),  $\rho \downarrow$  (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  $V(\hat{f})$ :  $B \uparrow$  (more sampling),  $\rho \downarrow$  (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**  $V(\hat{f})$ **:** B  $\uparrow$  (more sampling),  $\rho \downarrow$  (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**  $V(\hat{f})$ **:**  $B \uparrow$  (more sampling),  $\rho \downarrow$  (smaller correlation)

Algorithm 15.1 Random Forest for Regression or Classification

1. For  $b=1$  to B:

- (a) Draw a bootstrap sample  $\mathbb{Z}^*$  of size N from the training data.
- (b) Grow a random-forest tree  $T<sub>b</sub>$  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:  $\hat{f}_{\text{rf}}^B(x) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{h=1}^B T_b(x)$ .

*Classification:* Let  $\hat{C}_b(x)$  be the class prediction of the bth random-forest tree. Then  $\hat{C}_{\text{rf}}^B(x) = \text{majority vote } \{\hat{C}_b(x)\}_{1}^B$ .

- 
- 
- -
- 

#### We reduce the variance by bagging  $(B)$  and de-correlation  $(\rho)$

**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  $(\rho)$
- 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  $(\rho)$
- 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  $(\rho)$
- 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?  $\Rightarrow$  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?  $\Rightarrow$  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?  $\Rightarrow$  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?  $\Rightarrow$  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?  $\Rightarrow$  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

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

- If 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:  $\tau(x) = E[Y_i^{(1)} Y_i^{(0)}]$  $\int_{i}^{(0)} |X_i = x]$
- Unconfoundness:  $\{Y_i^{(0)}\}$  $Y_j^{(0)},Y_j^{(1)}$  $\{Y_i^{(1)}\}\perp W_i|X_i$
- **Tips:** We assume unconfoundness here, which means that causal forests is not a method to deal with endogeneity issue

- If 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:  $\tau(x) = E[Y_i^{(1)} Y_i^{(0)}]$  $\int_{i}^{(0)} |X_i = x]$
- Unconfoundness:  $\{Y_i^{(0)}\}$  $Y_j^{(0)},Y_j^{(1)}$  $\{Y_i^{(1)}\}\perp W_i|X_i$
- **Tips:** We assume unconfoundness here, which means that causal forests is not a method to deal with endogeneity issue

- If 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:  $\tau(x) = E[Y_i^{(1)} Y_i^{(0)}]$  $\int_{i}^{(0)} |X_i = x]$
- Unconfoundness:  $\{Y_i^{(0)}\}$  $Y_j^{(0)},Y_j^{(1)}$  $\{Y_i^{(1)}\}\perp W_i|X_i$
- Tips: We assume unconfoundness here, which means that causal forests is not a method to deal with endogeneity issue

- If 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:  $\tau(x) = E[Y_i^{(1)} Y_i^{(0)}]$  $\int_{i}^{(0)} |X_i = x]$
- Unconfoundness:  $\{Y_i^{(0)}\}$  $\gamma^{(0)}_i,\gamma^{(1)}_i$  $\{Y_i^{(1)}\}\perp W_i|X_i$
- **Tips:** We assume unconfoundness here, which means that causal forests is not a method to deal with endogeneity issue

- If 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:  $\tau(x) = E[Y_i^{(1)} Y_i^{(0)}]$  $\int_{i}^{(0)} |X_i = x]$
- Unconfoundness:  $\{Y_i^{(0)}\}$  $\gamma^{(0)}_i,\gamma^{(1)}_i$  $\{Y_i^{(1)}\}\perp W_i|X_i$
- **Tips:** We assume unconfoundness here, which means that causal forests is not a method to deal with endogeneity issue

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

**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 sample i, it is either used to estimate  $\tau$  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  $\tau$  in each leaf using J.
- **Honest Causal Forests is consistent and asymptotically normal**

- A tree is honesty, if for each training sample i, it is either used to estimate  $\tau$  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  $\tau$  in each leaf using J.
- **Honest Causal Forests is consistent and asymptotically normal**

- A tree is honesty, if for each training sample i, it is either used to estimate  $\tau$  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  $\tau$  in each leaf using J.
- Honest Causal Forests is consistent and asymptotically normal

# Machine Learning and Model Selection: Application of Causal Forests

- -
-
# Machine Learning and Model Selection: Application of Causal Forests

### ■ Paper report [Levy \(2021\)](#page-224-0) 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 \(2021\)](#page-224-0) 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

 $\blacksquare$  It attracts people's attention during these days in media

**Al, Chatgpt, AlphaGo...Sky Net** 

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

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



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

Gonsider 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.

 $\blacksquare$  X - Input; Z- Hidden layer/unit; Y - Output

Gonsider 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.

 $\blacksquare$  X - Input; Z- Hidden layer/unit; Y - Output

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

Step 1: from input X to hidden unit Z

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

 $\bullet$   $\sigma$  is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)

**This nonlinearity is important: make NN differ from linear regression** 

 $\blacksquare$  It is called the activation function

Step 2: from hidden unit Z to output Y

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

$$
f_k(X) = g_k(T), k = 1, ..., K
$$

Step 1: from input X to hidden unit Z

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

### $\sigma$  is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)

**This nonlinearity is important: make NN differ from linear regression** 

 $\blacksquare$  It is called the activation function

Step 2: from hidden unit Z to output Y

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

$$
f_k(X) = g_k(T), k = 1, ..., K
$$

Step 1: from input X to hidden unit Z

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

 $\sigma$  is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)

**This nonlinearity is important: make NN differ from linear regression** 

 $\blacksquare$  It is called the activation function

Step 2: from hidden unit Z to output Y

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

$$
f_k(X) = g_k(T), k = 1, ..., K
$$

Step 1: from input X to hidden unit Z

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

- $\sigma$  is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)
- **This nonlinearity is important: make NN differ from linear regression**
- $\blacksquare$  It is called the activation function

■ Step 2: from hidden unit Z to output Y

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

$$
f_k(X) = g_k(T), k = 1, ..., K
$$

Step 1: from input X to hidden unit Z

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

- $\sigma$  is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)
- **This nonlinearity is important: make NN differ from linear regression**
- $\blacksquare$  It is called the activation function
- Step 2: from hidden unit Z to output Y

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

$$
f_k(X) = g_k(T), k = 1, ..., K
$$

Step 1: from input X to hidden unit Z

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

- $\sigma$  is a nonlinear function (Step or Logit)
- **This nonlinearity is important: make NN differ from linear regression**
- $\blacksquare$  It is called the activation function
- Step 2: from hidden unit Z to output Y

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

$$
f_k(X) = g_k(T), k = 1, ..., K
$$

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

### 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  $\sigma$  and  $g$ , neurons fire when signal passed to the unit  $(\alpha_{0m} + \alpha_m^T X)$  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  $\sigma$  and  $g$ , neurons fire when signal passed to the unit  $(\alpha_{0m} + \alpha_m^T X)$  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
- $\blacksquare$  There can be multiple layers
- When step function is used for  $\sigma$  and  $g$ , neurons fire when signal passed to the unit  $(\alpha_{0m} + \alpha_m^T X)$  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  $\sigma$  and  $g$ , neurons fire when signal passed to the unit  $(\alpha_{0m} + \alpha_m^T X)$  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  $\sigma$  and  $g$ , neurons fire when signal passed to the unit  $(\alpha_{0m} + \alpha_m^T X)$  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
- $\blacksquare$  There can be multiple layers
- When step function is used for  $\sigma$  and  $g$ , neurons fire when signal passed to the unit  $(\alpha_{0m}+\alpha_{m}^{\mathcal{T}}X)$  exceeds some threshold

- 
- 
- 
- 

$$
\min_{\mathbf{M}} R(\theta) + \lambda J(\theta)
$$

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

### $\blacksquare$  How to estimate this model?

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

$$
\min_{k} R(\theta) + \lambda J(\theta)
$$

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

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

$$
\min_{k} R(\theta) + \lambda J(\theta)
$$

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

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

$$
\min_{k} R(\theta) + \lambda J(\theta)
$$

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

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

$$
\min_{k} R(\theta) + \lambda J(\theta)
$$

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

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

$$
\min_{k} R(\theta) + \lambda J(\theta)
$$

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

- 
- 
- 
- 

### **Model complexity is double-edged: Bias-variance tradeoff**

- In general, there are many standards to evaluate model's goodness-of-fit CV, AIC, BIC
- **Nachine 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
- **Nachine 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!

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

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

- **Thus, we discuss more on model prediction but not causal structure**
- $\blacksquare$  This is a totally data driven method with no prior knowledge in economics
- 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**
- $\blacksquare$  This is a totally data driven method with no prior knowledge in economics
- 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**
- $\blacksquare$  This is a totally data driven method with no prior knowledge in economics
- 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**
- $\blacksquare$  This is a totally data driven method with no prior knowledge in economics
- **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**
- $\blacksquare$  This is a totally data driven method with no prior knowledge in economics
- **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.