**On Inferences from Completed Data** J. Haddock<sup>\*</sup>, D. Molitor<sup>\*</sup>, D. Needell<sup>\*</sup>, S. Sambandam<sup>\*</sup>, J. Song<sup>†</sup>, S. Sun<sup>‡</sup> \* University of California, Los Angeles † Tsinghua University <sup>‡</sup> Peking University



# Objectives

We study the effects of sampling and data completion techniques on simple statistical inferences. We compare results of inferences on complete data and data that has been subsampled and then completed.

**Sampling Techniques** 

(1) Begin with complete matrix M either artificial or extracted from real data. (We take this as the ground truth.)

Methodology

(2) Use either uniform or structured sampling strategy to obtain an incomplete observed matrix,  $M_{\Omega}$ . (The values of p and  $p_0, p_1$  used for sampling are noted in each experiment.)

(3) Recover  $\widetilde{M}$  via either NNM or  $\ell_1$ -NNM.

 $\triangleright$  For  $M_{\Omega}$  sampled uniformly, we recover  $\widetilde{M}$  via NNM.  $\triangleright$  For  $M_{\Omega}$  sampled via structured sampling, we recover  $\widetilde{M}$  via  $\ell_1$ -NNM. • We choose the regularization parameter  $\alpha$  optimally from among  $\{0.05, 0.1, 0.2, ..., 0.5\}$  to minimize the resulting error  $||M - \overline{M}||_F$ . (4) Compute either the entrywise mean or the row mean.

## **Theoretical Results**

Together our two theoretical results offer a bound on the inference recovery errors even if the matrix recovery is not exact.

**Theorem 1:** Let  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  be the entrywise and row mean operators respectively. Then

 $\left|\bar{\lambda}(M) - \bar{\lambda}(\widetilde{M})\right| \le (mn)^{-\frac{1}{q}} \|M - \widetilde{M}\|_{q}$ 

**Uniform sampling:** Sample each entry with equal probability  $p \in (0, 1)$ .

Structured sampling: Sample entries equal to zero with probability  $p_0$ , and nonzero entries with probability  $p_1$ , where  $p_0 < p_1$ .

The sampled entries are denoted  $\Omega$  and the subsampled matrix is denoted  $M_{\Omega}$ .

**Completion Techniques** 

Nuclear-norm minimization:

- $\underset{X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|X\|_*$ (NNM) s.t.  $M_{ij} = X_{ij}$  for all  $(i, j) \in \Omega$ .
- $\ell_1$ -Regularized NNM:
- $\underset{X \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|X\|_* + \alpha \|X_{\Omega^C}\|_1 \quad (\ell_1 \operatorname{NNM})$ s.t.  $M_{ij} = X_{ij}$  for all  $(i, j) \in \Omega$

(5) Plot recovery and inference errors. (Plotted results are averaged over 10 trials.)

## **Experimental Results**

In the figures below, we plot matrix and inference recovery errors on a  $30 \times 30$ rank 5 synthetic matrix and a complete  $30 \times 16$  submatrix of the MyLymeData health survey data; the figures differ by the choice of zero sampling probability  $p_0$ for the structured sampling strategy and the data type. Errors are plotted versus the proportion of observed entries  $\omega$ . In each of the groups of four plots below, we plot optimal regularization parameter  $\alpha$  in the upper left; normalized matrix recovery errors E in upper right; normalized row mean errors  $E_{\mu}$  in lower left; absolute entrywise mean errors  $E_{\bar{\lambda}}$  in lower right.





Figure 4: Averages of 400 sampled inference recovery errors and the derived upper bounds for uniform observation sampling probabilities from 0 to 1. Left: entrywise mean error; right: row mean error.

**Theorem 2:** Let  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ ,  $\Omega$ , and  $\overline{M}$  be computed via NNM. Let  $r = \operatorname{rank}(M)$  denote the rank of M, and denote the singular values of Mby  $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_r$  in decreasing

with regularization parameter  $\alpha > 0$ . The  $\ell_1$ -regularization in the objective of  $\ell_1$ -NNM encourages unobserved entries of the recovered matrix to be near 0 [1].

# Inference Techniques

Entrywise mean:

$$\bar{\lambda}(A) := \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ij}$$

Row mean:

$$\mu(A) := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \vec{a}_i$$

In our application to health survey data, these inferences could be an average "wellness" score for a patient group (entrywise mean) or the average responses of a patient group (row mean).

Figure 1: Recovery errors for unif. sampling with NNM and structured sampling with  $p_0 = 0$  (no entries equal to zero are sampled) and  $\ell_1$ -NNM on left: synthetic data; right: MyLymeData.



Figure 2: Recovery errors for unif. sampling with NNM and structured sampling with  $p_0 = 0.2$ and  $\ell_1$ -NNM on left: synthetic data; right: MyLymeData.



#### order. Then

and

$$M - \widetilde{M}\|_F \le 2\sqrt{r^2\sigma_1^2 - \|M_\Omega\|_F^2}.$$

### Conclusion

numerical experiments demon-Our strate that simple inferences such as the entrywise mean or the row mean can be recovered accurately even when errors are introduced by the matrix recovery. We prove bounds on the inference recovery error in terms of the matrix recovery error for the entrywise mean and the row mean. Additionally, we prove an analytical bound on the matrix recovery error which applies even when the matrix cannot be recovered exactly.

## References

#### **Error Measurements**

Norm. matrix recovery error:  $E(M, \widetilde{M}) := ||M - \widetilde{M}||_F / ||M||_F$ Abs. entrywise mean error:

 $E_{\bar{\lambda}}(M, \widetilde{M}) := |\bar{\lambda}(M) - \bar{\lambda}(\widetilde{M})|$ 

#### Norm. row mean error:

 $E_{\mu}(M, \widehat{M}) := \frac{\|\mu(M) - \mu(\widehat{M})\|_2}{\|\mu(M)\|_2}$ 

The matrix recovery error measures the error introduced by sampling and data completion, while the inference errors measure the error introduced into the inference by these processes.

Figure 3: Recovery errors for uniform sampling with NNM and structured sampling with  $p_0 = 0.4$ and  $\ell_1$ -NNM on left: synthetic data; right: MyLymeData.

Acknowledgements

DN, JH, and DM are grateful to and were partially supported by NSF CAREER DMS #1348721 and NSF BIGDATA DMS #1740325. This work is based upon work completed at the UCLA CAM REU during Summer 2018 which was funded by NSF DMS #1659676. The authors would like to thank CEO Lorraine Johnson, LymeDisease.org, and the patients who participated in the MyLymeData survey. Additionally, they thank Dr. Anna Ma for her assistance with this data, and Prof. Andrea Bertozzi and the UCLA Applied and Computational Math REU program for their support.

[1] D. Molitor and D. Needell. Matrix completion for structured observations. arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.09657, 2018. [2] LymeDisease.org. Lymedisease.org, 2018. https://www.lymedisease.org, Last accessed on 2018-08-17.

## **Contact Information**

Web: www.math.ucla.edu/~jhaddock/ Email: jhaddock@math.ucla.edu