WEBVTT

- 1.00:00:01.110 --> 00:00:04.980 < v Robert>Hey everybody, I've got noon, </v>
- $2\ 00:00:04.980 \longrightarrow 00:00:06.120$ so let's get started.
- 3 00:00:06.120 --> 00:00:09.627 So today I'm pleased to introduce Professor Yiwen Liu.
- $4\,00:00:10.500 \longrightarrow 00:00:13.260$ Professor Liu earned her BS and MS in Statistics
- 500:00:13.260 --> 00:00:16.320 from the Central University of Finance and Economics
- $6\ 00:00:16.320 --> 00:00:19.110$ in China and her PhD in Statistics
- $7\ 00:00:19.110 --> 00:00:20.940$ from the University of Georgia.
- 8 00:00:20.940 --> 00:00:22.920 Today, she's an Assistant Professor of Practice
- 9 00:00:22.920 --> 00:00:25.890 in the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics
- $10\ 00:00:25.890$ --> 00:00:29.040 at the Mel and Enid Zuckerberg, Zuckerman, sorry,
- $11\ 00:00:29.040 \dashrightarrow 00:00:32.243$ College of Public Health at the University of Arizona.
- $12\ 00:00:32.243 \dashrightarrow 00:00:34.950$ Her research primarily focuses on developing
- $13\ 00:00:34.950 \longrightarrow 00:00:36.540$ statistical methods and theory
- 14 00:00:36.540 --> 00:00:39.150 to harness a variety of issues in analyzing
- $15\ 00:00:39.150 --> 00:00:43.260$ the high dimensional data or the complex data set
- 16 00:00:43.260 --> 00:00:45.540 More specifically, her research interests
- $17\ 00:00:45.540 --> 00:00:48.300$ include developing model-free dimension reduction methods,
- $18\ 00:00:48.300 \longrightarrow 00:00:50.280$ which are high dimensional data regression
- $19~00:00:50.280 \mathrel{--}{>} 00:00:53.100$ and integration methods for multiple source data.
- $20\ 00:00:53.100 \longrightarrow 00:00:54.480$ Today, she's gonna talk to us
- $21\ 00:00:54.480 \longrightarrow 00:00:56.940$ about a model-free variable screening method
- $22\ 00:00:56.940 \longrightarrow 00:00:58.590$ based on leverage score.
- 23 00:00:58.590 --> 00:00:59.990 Let's welcome Professor Liu.
- 24 00:01:03.960 --> 00:01:04.793 <v Professor Liu>Thank you, Robert</v>

- $25\ 00:01:04.793$ --> 00:01:07.800 for your nice introduction and it's my great honor
- $26\ 00:01:07.800 \longrightarrow 00:01:12.060$ to be invited and present my work here.
- 27 00:01:12.060 --> 00:01:16.020 So in today's talk, I will introduce a model-free
- $28\ 00:01:16.020 \longrightarrow 00:01:18.720$ variable screening method based on leverage score,
- $29\ 00:01:18.720 \longrightarrow 00:01:22.290$ and we named the method as the weighted leverage score.
- $30\ 00:01:22.290 \longrightarrow 00:01:24.480$ So as we know, this is a joint work
- $31~00{:}01{:}24.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}27.480$ with Dr. Wenxuan Zhong from the University of Georgia
- 32 00:01:27.480 --> 00:01:30.633 and Dr. Peng Zeng from Auburn University.
- $33\ 00:01:31.530 \longrightarrow 00:01:35.700$ So as we know, as we've heard there's big data error,
- $34\ 00{:}01{:}35.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}39.750$ there are numerous data produced almost in every field
- 35 00:01:39.750 --> 00:01:42.030 of science including biology.
- $36\ 00{:}01{:}42.030$ --> $00{:}01{:}47.030$ So we are facing data extremely with high dimensionality
- $37\ 00:01:47.610 \longrightarrow 00:01:51.457$ and also data with really complex structures.
- $38\ 00:01:55.669 \longrightarrow 00:01:56.502$ Thank you.
- $39\ 00{:}01{:}57.776 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}00.450$ And we are facing data of extremely high dimensionality
- $40\ 00:02:00.450 \longrightarrow 00:02:02.320$ and really complex structures
- $41\ 00:02:03.780 \longrightarrow 00:02:06.750$ and how do we effectively extract information
- $42\ 00:02:06.750 \longrightarrow 00:02:10.020$ from such large and complex data
- $43\ 00:02:10.020 \longrightarrow 00:02:12.120$ pose new statistical challenge.
- $44\ 00:02:12.120$ --> 00:02:17.120 So to motivate my research, let us see an example first.
- 45 00:02:17.700 --> 00:02:19.710 So currently cancer has graduated
- $46\ 00:02:19.710 --> 00:02:23.103$ from the primary cause of death across the world.
- 47 00:02:24.270 --> 00:02:27.510 Nowadays cancer is diagnosed by an expert

- $48\ 00:02:27.510 \longrightarrow 00:02:31.384$ who has to look at the tissue samples under the microscope.
- $49\ 00:02:31.384 \longrightarrow 00:02:33.300$ You can imagine that there are millions
- $50\ 00:02:33.300 \longrightarrow 00:02:35.610$ of new cancer cases each year
- $51\ 00:02:35.610 --> 00:02:39.120$ and this often means that those doctors
- $52\ 00:02:39.120$ --> 00:02:43.800 will find themselves looking at hundreds of images each day.
- $53\ 00:02:43.800 \longrightarrow 00:02:48.150$ And this is really tedious work.
- $54\ 00:02:48.150 --> 00:02:51.900$ And because of, you may find that,
- $55~00:02:51.900 \dashrightarrow 00:02:54.870$ because of the shortage of qualified doctors,
- $56\ 00:02:54.870 \longrightarrow 00:02:56.580$ there could be a huge lag time
- $57\ 00:02:56.580 \longrightarrow 00:02:59.100$ before those doctors can even figure out
- $58\ 00:02:59.100 \longrightarrow 00:03:00.800$ what is going on with the patient.
- 59 00:03:02.130 --> 00:03:05.130 So detect cancer using only manpower,
- $60\ 00:03:05.130 --> 00:03:07.821$ looking at images is not enough.
- $61\ 00:03:07.821 \longrightarrow 00:03:11.520$ And we intend to build a statistical
- $62\ 00{:}03{:}11.520$ --> $00{:}03{:}15.963$ and mathematical model to identify, detect cancer
- 63 00:03:15.963 --> 00:03:19.357 in a more accurate, less expensive way.
- 64 00:03:22.104 --> 00:03:25.170 Okay, so the second generation sequencing
- $65\ 00:03:25.170 \longrightarrow 00:03:28.680$ makes this becomes possible and promising.
- $66\ 00:03:28.680 \longrightarrow 00:03:32.730$ And so a typical research,
- $67\ 00:03:32.730 \longrightarrow 00:03:35.790$ critical inference is to find the markers
- $68\ 00:03:35.790 \longrightarrow 00:03:37.590$ that related to cancer.
- 69 00:03:37.590 --> 00:03:39.420 Right now there's new sequencing technology
- 70 00:03:39.420 \rightarrow 00:03:41.797 called spatial transcriptomics.
- 71 00:03:41.797 --> 00:03:45.600 You know that for bulk I sequencing data,
- $72\ 00:03:45.600 \longrightarrow 00:03:47.490$ it just sequence the whole tissue
- $73~00:03:47.490 \longrightarrow 00:03:51.000$ and it generate a average the gene expression data.
- 74~00:03:51.000 --> 00:03:54.780 But with this new technology called spatial transcriptomic,

- $75\ 00:03:54.780 --> 00:03:57.420$ this kind of cancer tissue will be sliced
- $76\ 00:03:57.420 \longrightarrow 00:04:00.213$ into several thin sections.
- $77\ 00:04:01.320 \dashrightarrow 00:04:05.940$ And within each section, the grid point in the section
- $78\ 00:04:05.940 \longrightarrow 00:04:08.250$ will be sequenced simultaneously.
- $79\ 00:04:08.250 \longrightarrow 00:04:11.430$ So you can see that here we have two areas
- 80 00:04:11.430 --> 00:04:13.500 of invasive cancers, okay,
- $81\ 00:04:13.500 \longrightarrow 00:04:16.530$ all the dot points within these two sections
- $82\ 00:04:16.530 \longrightarrow 00:04:21.420$ will be invasive cancer areas for invasive cancer patients.
- $83\ 00:04:21.420 --> 00:04:25.320$ The other six areas, they are noninvasive cancer areas.
- $84\ 00:04:25.320 \longrightarrow 00:04:29.100$ The grid points in these locations
- 85 00:04:29.100 --> 00:04:32.071 will be noninvasive cancer areas,
- 86 00:04:32.071 --> 00:04:35.220 but for other parts, they're normal part, okay?
- $87\ 00:04:35.220 \longrightarrow 00:04:36.701$ And the data that we will have
- $88\ 00:04:36.701 \longrightarrow 00:04:39.510$ is because this new technology
- $89\ 00:04:39.510 \longrightarrow 00:04:41.763$ will sequence the whole tissue,
- 90 00:04:42.840 --> 00:04:45.480 all those grid points simultaneously.
- 91 00:04:45.480 --> 00:04:46.950 This data matrix that we will have,
- 92 00:04:46.950 --> 00:04:50.220 each row corresponds to a location
- 93 $00:04:50.220 \longrightarrow 00:04:53.220$ within the section and the other columns,
- $94\ 00:04:53.220 \longrightarrow 00:04:55.740$ each column corresponding to the expressions
- $95\ 00:04:55.740 \longrightarrow 00:04:57.123$ for certain genes.
- 96 00:04:58.980 --> 00:05:01.380 And the data matrix like this,
- $97\ 00:05:01.380 \longrightarrow 00:05:04.560$ the Y's are labels for those patients,
- 98 00:05:04.560 --> 00:05:07.290 the normal noninvasive or invasive.
- 99 00:05:07.290 --> 00:05:11.520 And we will get a gene expressions for all those P genes
- $100\ 00:05:11.520 \longrightarrow 00:05:14.610$ for each location, okay?
- $101\ 00:05:14.610 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.277$ So this is the data that we have

- $102\ 00:05:17.277 \longrightarrow 00:05:22.277$ and our goal then comes to identify marker genes
- $103\ 00{:}05{:}22.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}26.544$ for those noninvasive and invasive cancer areas.
- $104\ 00:05:26.544$ --> 00:05:31.544 As showed in this figure, this is the tissue sections.
- $105\ 00:05:33.420 \longrightarrow 00:05:37.170$ There are points, color dots here
- $106\ 00:05:37.170 --> 00:05:42.045$ with the color of the dots showing the expression levels.
- 107 00:05:42.045 --> 00:05:42.878 Okay?
- $108\ 00:05:43.920 \longrightarrow 00:05:47.490$ So the the dots with a yellow color
- $109\ 00:05:47.490 \longrightarrow 00:05:48.903$ shows a higher expression.
- $110\ 00:05:49.920 \longrightarrow 00:05:51.840$ We intended to build the models
- $111\ 00:05:51.840 \longrightarrow 00:05:55.200$ to identify such genes.
- $112\ 00:05:55.200 --> 00:05:57.623$ These genes are show remarkable
- $113\ 00:05:57.623 \longrightarrow 00:06:02.623$ differential express the levels across issue sections, okay?
- $114\ 00:06:03.090 \longrightarrow 00:06:05.820$ These two genes have higher expression
- $115\ 00:06:05.820 \longrightarrow 00:06:08.103$ in invasive cancer areas.
- $116\ 00:06:10.470 \longrightarrow 00:06:12.510$ Okay, we intended to build a status quo model
- 117 00:06:12.510 --> 00:06:14.490 to identify such genes
- $118\ 00:06:14.490 \longrightarrow 00:06:17.220$ but there exist several challenges here.
- 119 00:06:17.220 --> 00:06:19.860 Usually the data that we have,
- $120\ 00:06:19.860 \longrightarrow 00:06:21.720$ the samples or take the locations here
- $121\ 00:06:21.720 --> 00:06:25.271$ is only our label the data is only around hundreds,
- $122\ 00{:}06{:}25.271 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}29.704$ but the number of genes could be tens of thousands.
- $123\ 00:06:29.704 --> 00:06:33.543$ This is so-called a large piece modern problem.
- 124 00:06:35.010 --> 00:06:38.100 Usually for any traditional methods,
- $125\ 00{:}06{:}38.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}40.680$ there's no way to utilize those traditional methods
- 126 00:06:40.680 --> 00:06:42.273 to solve this problem.

- $127\ 00{:}06{:}43.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}46.140$ And the talk mentioned that there is a further layer
- $128\ 00{:}06{:}46.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}49.410$ of complication between the gene expression levels
- $129\ 00:06:49.410 \longrightarrow 00:06:52.800$ and the cancer or normal types, okay?
- $130\ 00:06:52.800 \longrightarrow 00:06:56.310$ Usually how the gene expression levels
- $131\ 00:06:56.310 \longrightarrow 00:06:59.730$ would influence, could affect different types of cancer,
- $132\ 00:06:59.730 \longrightarrow 00:07:01.940$ this mechanism is largely unknown
- $133\ 00{:}07{:}01.940 --> 00{:}07{:}05.730$ and the association between them is beyond linear.
- $134\ 00:07:05.730 \longrightarrow 00:07:09.000$ So these are the two challenges.
- $135\ 00:07:09.000 \longrightarrow 00:07:11.193$ That means that we're going to,
- $136\ 00:07:12.180 \longrightarrow 00:07:15.303$ what we need is a statistical methods
- $137\ 00:07:15.303 \longrightarrow 00:07:17.680$ that can do variable screening
- $138\ 00:07:18.900 \longrightarrow 00:07:21.303$ in a more general model set up.
- $139\ 00:07:25.980 \longrightarrow 00:07:29.310$ So we, to achieve this goal,
- $140\ 00:07:29.310 \longrightarrow 00:07:32.040$ we choose to build our efforts
- $141\ 00:07:32.040 --> 00:07:35.363$ under this so called general index model.
- $142\ 00:07:35.363 --> 00:07:40.050$ In a general index model it describes a scenario that Y-i
- 143 00:07:40.050 --> 00:07:41.254 which is the response
- 144 00:07:41.254 --> 00:07:46.254 will have relation to pay linear combinations of X-i.
- $145\ 00:07:46.890 \longrightarrow 00:07:49.230$ So that's beta one transpose X-I
- $146\ 00:07:49.230 \longrightarrow 00:07:51.330$ to beta K transpose X-I
- $147\ 00:07:51.330 --> 00:07:53.643$ through some anomaly function F.
- $148\ 00{:}07{:}54.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}57.480$ So this is the general index model
- $149\ 00:07:57.480 --> 00:08:02.480$ and we know that here, X-i is a P directional vector
- 150 00:08:03.480 --> 00:08:07.893 and if K is a value that is much smaller than P,
- $151\ 00:08:09.090 \dashrightarrow 00:08:13.320$ then we actually achieved the goal of vanishing reduction

- $152\ 00:08:13.320 \longrightarrow 00:08:16.213$ because the original P directional vector
- 153 00:08:16.213 --> 00:08:21.213 is projected onto a space of a pay dimensional,
- $154\ 00:08:21.570 --> 00:08:24.300$ pay beta one X, beta one transpose X-i
- $155\ 00:08:24.300 --> 00:08:25.713$ to beta eight transpose X-i.
- $156\ 00:08:27.360 \longrightarrow 00:08:29.730$ And we choose this general index model
- $157\ 00:08:29.730 \longrightarrow 00:08:33.877$ because it actually is a very general model framework.
- $158\ 00:08:33.877 \longrightarrow 00:08:38.460$ If we map this general index model to our problem here,
- $159\ 00:08:38.460 --> 00:08:42.003$ the Y-i could be the label for location i.
- 160 00:08:43.080 --> 00:08:47.223 And, for example, the non-invasive location.
- 161 00:08:48.070 --> 00:08:49.830 And then X-i is a key dimensional vector
- $162\ 00:08:49.830 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.177$ and could be the gene expression levels
- $163\ 00:08:52.177 \longrightarrow 00:08:54.760$ for location i of those P genes
- $164\ 00:08:56.610 \longrightarrow 00:08:58.470$ and then beta one transposed X-i
- 165 00:08:58.470 --> 00:09:00.660 to beta k transpose X-i
- $166\ 00:09:00.660 --> 00:09:04.800$ could be those K coregulated gene K groups
- $167\ 00:09:04.800 \longrightarrow 00:09:06.453$ of coregulated genes.
- 168 00:09:07.320 --> 00:09:10.140 And those K groups of coregulated genes
- $169\ 00:09:10.140 --> 00:09:14.313$ will affect the response through some anomaly function F.
- $170\ 00:09:16.350 \longrightarrow 00:09:19.803$ Okay so this is our general model setup.
- 171 00:09:24.480 --> 00:09:26.370 We utilize the general index model
- 172 00:09:26.370 --> 00:09:29.430 because it's a general model framework
- $173\ 00:09:29.430 \longrightarrow 00:09:32.746$ that encompasses many different model types.
- $174\ 00:09:32.746 \longrightarrow 00:09:35.340$ There is three special cases,
- $175\ 00{:}09{:}35.340 {\: \hbox{--}}{>}\ 00{:}09{:}39.840$ for example, the linear model is one special case.
- 176 00:09:39.840 --> 00:09:44.840 Here, KY-i, that is when K equals one
- $177\ 00:09:44.940$ --> 00:09:49.940 and F anomaly function acquires an identity form.
- $178\ 00:09:50.190 \longrightarrow 00:09:51.660$ Okay so this is the linear model

- $179\ 00:09:51.660 \longrightarrow 00:09:53.853$ and the error term is additive.
- $180\ 00:09:54.954$ --> 00:09:58.380 So linear model is one special case for it.
- 181 00:09:58.380 --> 00:10:01.320 The number per match model is another special case
- $182\ 00:10:01.320 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.850$ for the general index model.
- 183 00:10:02.850 --> 00:10:06.960 That is where K equal to P and beta one to beta P,
- 184 00:10:06.960 --> 00:10:09.483 it forms an identity matrix.
- $185~00{:}10{:}12.270 --> 00{:}10{:}13.860$ Thank you.
- 186 00:10:13.860 --> 00:10:15.000 And then the third one,
- $187\ 00:10:15.000 \longrightarrow 00:10:16.230$ the single index model
- $188\ 00:10:16.230 \dashrightarrow 00:10:20.520$ is another special case for the general index model
- $189\ 00:10:20.520 \longrightarrow 00:10:22.364$ that is when K equal to one
- $190\ 00:10:22.364 \longrightarrow 00:10:24.963$ and that error term is additive.
- $191\ 00:10:26.190 \longrightarrow 00:10:28.440$ So the reason that I show these three special cases,
- $192~00{:}10{:}28.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}31.680$ just to let everyone know that general index model
- $193\ 00:10:31.680 \longrightarrow 00:10:34.773$ is a very general model framework.
- 194 00:10:35.910 --> 00:10:39.150 In this case, using this model framework
- $195\ 00:10:39.150 \longrightarrow 00:10:43.323$ to do a variable screening or variable selection,
- $196\ 00:10:45.000 --> 00:10:49.650$ we can say for those, this is determined by the,
- $197\ 00:10:49.650 \longrightarrow 00:10:51.360$ whether we should screen
- $198\ 00:10:51.360 \longrightarrow 00:10:53.730$ or whether we should remove certain variables
- $199\ 00:10:53.730 --> 00:10:55.863$ is determined by the coefficients here.
- $200\ 00{:}10{:}56.820 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>\:} 00{:}11{:}01.820$ Say, for a specific variable, if the coefficient beta one,
- 201 00:11:01.863 --> 00:11:04.323 if it's coefficient across those K,
- 202 00:11:04.323 --> 00:11:07.770 that K different factors are all zero,
- $203\ 00{:}11{:}07.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}10.983$ then we say this value, this variable, is redundant.

- 204 00:11:12.990 --> 00:11:15.633 Okay so this is how we utilize the model
- $205\ 00:11:15.633 \longrightarrow 00:11:18.360$ in a estimated coefficient
- $206\ 00{:}11{:}18.360$ --> $00{:}11{:}21.183$ to do a variable screening or, say, variable selection.
- $207\ 00{:}11{:}26.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}30.000$ So the question becomes how can we estimate data
- 208 00:11:30.000 --> 00:11:31.890 under this model framework, right?
- $209\ 00:11:31.890 --> 00:11:34.170$ Just like made estimating beta
- $210\ 00{:}11{:}34.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}36.660$ in a simple linear refreshing model.
- 211 00:11:36.660 --> 00:11:38.640 So let's see a simple case.
- $212\ 00:11:38.640 \longrightarrow 00:11:43.640$ That is when F function can is invertible.
- 213 00:11:43.980 --> 00:11:45.090 So that is to say,
- $214\ 00:11:45.090 \longrightarrow 00:11:48.990$ we have the model becomes F inverse of Y-i
- $215\ 00:11:48.990 \longrightarrow 00:11:51.993$ equal to beta transposed X-i plus epsilon-i.
- $216\ 00{:}11{:}53.337 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}57.360$ Okay and this is very similar, looks similar model, right?
- $217\ 00:11:57.360 --> 00:11:59.130$ And if we want to estimate beta,
- $218\ 00:11:59.130 \longrightarrow 00:12:02.850$ we can just simply maximize the correlation
- $219\ 00:12:02.850 --> 00:12:07.440$ between inverse of Y-i and the equal transpose X-I.
- $220\ 00{:}12{:}07.440$ --> $00{:}12{:}12.440$ Using this optimization problem we can recover beta, okay,
- 221 00:12:12.570 --> 00:12:16.533 given that F is invertible and F function is known.
- 222 00:12:18.690 --> 00:12:21.190 But we know in real case, F function is unknown
- $223\ 00{:}12{:}23.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}26.130$ and sometimes it is unconvertible.
- $224\ 00:12:26.130 \longrightarrow 00:12:30.540$ And then what can we do to estimate beta
- 225 00:12:30.540 --> 00:12:31.983 when F function is unknown?
- 226 00:12:34.470 --> 00:12:36.600 So when F function is unknown,
- $227\ 00:12:36.600 \longrightarrow 00:12:39.600$ we can consider all the transformations of Y-i
- 228 00:12:39.600 --> 00:12:41.278 and we can solve beta
- $229\ 00:12:41.278 \longrightarrow 00:12:45.210$ through the following optimization problem.

- $230\ 00:12:45.210 \longrightarrow 00:12:47.940$ We consider all transformations of Y-i
- 231 00:12:47.940 --> 00:12:50.850 we know as E of Y-i
- $232\ 00:12:50.850 \longrightarrow 00:12:54.150$ and we define our square of eta
- 233 00:12:54.150 \rightarrow 00:12:58.950 which is a function of eta as the maximized correlation
- 234 00:12:58.950 --> 00:13:02.913 between NA tran E of Y-i and eta transposed X-i.
- 235 00:13:04.590 --> 00:13:07.154 And this maximization is taken over
- 236 00:13:07.154 --> 00:13:12.154 or any transformations E, okay?
- $237\ 00{:}13{:}13.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}17.430$ So using this function, beta basically is the solution
- $238\ 00:13:17.430 \longrightarrow 00:13:19.680$ for this maximization problem
- 239 00:13:19.680 --> 00:13:23.130 and with certain conditions satisfied,
- $240\ 00:13:23.130 \longrightarrow 00:13:26.730$ we can simplify this objective function
- 241 00:13:26.730 \rightarrow 00:13:31.730 with respect to eta, we can say R transform this.
- $242\ 00{:}13{:}33.510 {\:\hbox{--}}{>}\ 00{:}13{:}37.980$ R square of eta into a this really nice quadratic form.
- $243\ 00:13:37.980 \longrightarrow 00:13:42.980$ Okay, in the numerator, it's eta transposed times, okay,
- $244\ 00:13:43.080 --> 00:13:46.860$ this conditional variance times eta
- 245 00:13:46.860 --> 00:13:49.590 and in the denominator, it's either transposed
- $246\ 00:13:49.590 \longrightarrow 00:13:51.167$ the variance of X-i, eta.
- 247 00:13:52.357 --> 00:13:55.800 This is a very nice projected form.
- $248\ 00:13:55.800 \longrightarrow 00:14:00.800$ Basically, the solution of this, the solution beta
- 249 00:14:02.083 --> 00:14:06.420 is just taking factors, okay,
- $250\ 00:14:06.420 \longrightarrow 00:14:09.330$ corresponding to the pay largest taken values
- $251\ 00:14:09.330 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.863$ of this matrix in the middle.
- $252\ 00:14:12.960 \longrightarrow 00:14:15.183$ That's how we solve beta in this case.
- 253 00:14:16.260 --> 00:14:18.330 But as we know, as I mentioned,
- $254\ 00:14:18.330 \longrightarrow 00:14:21.330$ that there is a really like big challenges here.
- $255\ 00:14:21.330 \longrightarrow 00:14:24.200$ One is that we have really large P here

- $256\ 00:14:24.200 \longrightarrow 00:14:26.702$ in the sigma X is a P value matrix.
- 257 00:14:26.702 --> 00:14:29.763 Sigma X given Y is also P value matrix.
- $258\ 00:14:31.200 --> 00:14:33.540$ And we know that we are dealing with a case
- 259 00:14:33.540 --> 00:14:37.650 of P is larger than N, in this scenario,
- 260 00:14:37.650 --> 00:14:39.720 it would be really difficult
- $261\ 00{:}14{:}39.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}43.750$ to generate a consistent estimate based on a scenario
- $262\ 00:14:45.300 \longrightarrow 00:14:47.520$ when P is larger than N.
- $263\ 00:14:47.520 \longrightarrow 00:14:52.520$ And we also have this inverse here for a very large matrix,
- 264 00:14:52.920 --> 00:14:54.720 it would be really time consuming
- $265\ 00:14:54.720 \longrightarrow 00:14:56.763$ to produce an inverse of the matrix.
- $266\ 00:14:57.780 \longrightarrow 00:15:01.800$ That alone, this matrix is not a consistent estimate, okay?
- 267 00:15:01.800 --> 00:15:03.900 So this matrix in the middle,
- $268\ 00:15:03.900 \longrightarrow 00:15:05.580$ if we want to estimate that
- $269\ 00:15:05.580 \longrightarrow 00:15:08.312$ in the P brought up in this scenario,
- 270 00:15:08.312 --> 00:15:13.312 it would be really problematic, right?
- 271 00:15:13.320 --> 00:15:17.514 And in the following, I will show how we gonna use
- $272\ 00{:}15{:}17.514 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}21.330$ the weighted leverage score, the method that we proposed
- 273 00:15:21.330 --> 00:15:24.587 to bypass the estimation of these two matrix
- 274 00:15:24.587 --> 00:15:27.810 and then perform the variable selection
- $275\ 00{:}15{:}27.810 --> 00{:}15{:}32.163$ once again if the reduction under the general index model.
- $276~00{:}15{:}35.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}37.750$ So we call our method the weighted leverage score.
- $277\ 00{:}15{:}38.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}43.320$ Let us first take a look at what is leverage score
- 278 00:15:43.320 --> 00:15:46.260 and what is weighted leverage score, okay?
- 279 00:15:46.260 --> 00:15:49.110 So let's consider a simple case
- $280\ 00:15:49.110 --> 00:15:51.120$ that is the linear regression model

- 281 00:15:51.120 --> 00:15:54.540 and then the rhet D single value competition of X
- $282\ 00:15:54.540 \longrightarrow 00:15:58.023$ as X equal to U log to T-transpose.
- $283\ 00:15:59.280 --> 00:16:02.640$ This is the singular value competition X.
- 284 00:16:02.640 --> 00:16:04.740 And then, so in statistics,
- $285\ 00:16:04.740 --> 00:16:08.370$ the leverage score basically is defined as
- $286\ 00:16:08.370 \longrightarrow 00:16:11.603$ the diagonal element of the hat matrix.
- 287 00:16:14.429 --> 00:16:15.407 And then the hat matrix,
- $288\ 00:16:15.407 --> 00:16:18.360$ we use the further least the singular value competition.
- $289\ 00:16:18.360 \longrightarrow 00:16:20.973$ It can be simplified to UU transpose.
- $290\ 00{:}16{:}22.020$ --> $00{:}16{:}24.750$ And then which means that the diagonal element
- $291\ 00:16:24.750 \longrightarrow 00:16:29.430$ or the hat matrix basically is the real norm
- 292 00:16:29.430 --> 00:16:31.253 of the U matrix, okay?
- 293 00:16:33.840 --> 00:16:37.200 And then actually this leverage score
- $294\ 00:16:37.200 \longrightarrow 00:16:40.380$ has a very good interpretation.
- 295 $00:16:40.380 \longrightarrow 00:16:45.150$ It is the partial directive of Y-i hat with respect to Y-i.
- 296 00:16:45.150 --> 00:16:47.910 Okay, which means that if the leverage score
- 297 00:16:47.910 --> 00:16:50.730 is larger and closer to one,
- 298 00:16:50.730 --> 00:16:55.413 it would be more influential in predicting Y-i hat.
- $299\ 00:16:56.910 \longrightarrow 00:17:00.600$ So there is a recent work of Dr. Pima
- 300~00:17:00.600 --> 00:17:05.460 who's using this leverage score to do a subsampling
- $301\ 00:17:05.460 \longrightarrow 00:17:06.962$ in big data.
- $302\ 00:17:06.962 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.940$ As you can see that again,
- $303~00{:}17{:}08.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}12.510$ that message here is that if the U-i norm is larger,
- $304\ 00:17:12.510 \longrightarrow 00:17:13.980$ if the leverage score is larger
- $305\ 00:17:13.980 --> 00:17:16.923$ than we say this point is more influential.
- 306 00:17:18.990 --> 00:17:20.780 Think the motivating example is like this,

- 307 00:17:20.780 --> 00:17:24.505 in the first figure, this black dots,
- $308\ 00:17:24.505 \longrightarrow 00:17:28.330$ they are original data
- $309\ 00:17:29.310 \longrightarrow 00:17:33.603$ and the solid black is the actual model.
- $310\ 00:17:34.680 \longrightarrow 00:17:36.780$ And if we want to do a linear regression,
- 311 00:17:36.780 --> 00:17:39.210 usually sometimes if the really big data,
- $312\ 00:17:39.210 \longrightarrow 00:17:40.800$ the data is really large,
- $313\ 00:17:40.800 \longrightarrow 00:17:44.190$ so it is hardly possible to utilize all the data points
- $314\ 00:17:44.190 \longrightarrow 00:17:48.930$ to generate the line here.
- 315 00:17:48.930 --> 00:17:53.730 So a typical strategy is just to do sub-sampling
- $316\ 00:17:53.730 \longrightarrow 00:17:56.160$ from the such big data
- $317\ 00:17:56.160 \longrightarrow 00:17:58.460$ and then performing a linear regression model.
- 318 00:17:59.430 --> 00:18:02.435 Right now, you can see that the regression line
- 319 00:18:02.435 --> 00:18:07.435 produced by a random sub sample from the population,
- $320\ 00:18:07.650 \longrightarrow 00:18:11.640$ those data is represented by the screen crosses.
- $321\ 00:18:11.640 --> 00:18:16.623$ So we'll generate a linear regression line
- $322\ 00:18:16.623 --> 00:18:20.493$ that largely deviates from the true model.
- $323\ 00{:}18{:}21.390 \longrightarrow 00{:}18{:}26.390$ So that is when the random sampling does not work
- $324\ 00:18:26.670 \longrightarrow 00:18:27.780$ in this case.
- 325 00:18:27.780 --> 00:18:32.580 However, if we do a sub-sampling
- 326 00:18:32.580 --> 00:18:35.700 according to its leverage score, okay,
- 327 00:18:35.700 --> 00:18:38.471 you will see that, in the second graph,
- $328\ 00{:}18{:}38.471 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}43.471$ these red crosses on the data sub sample we're using
- 329 00:18:43.710 --> 00:18:47.700 utilize the so-called leverage score
- $330\ 00:18:47.700 --> 00:18:51.660$ and the red dashed line is the model
- 331 00:18:51.660 --> 00:18:55.440 attempt value in those sub samples, okay?
- $332\ 00{:}18{:}55.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}59.430$ So we can see that using the leverage score
- 333 00:18:59.430 --> 00:19:03.475 to the sub sample can help us to generate a line

- $334\ 00:19:03.475 --> 00:19:07.473$ that is very good, can approximate the true model.
- $335~00:19:08.790 \dashrightarrow 00:19:10.380$ So what I want to say using these graph
- 336 00:19:10.380 --> 00:19:14.430 is that the leverage score, the UI norm,
- $337\ 00:19:14.430 \longrightarrow 00:19:18.630$ can be used, say, as an indicator
- $338\ 00:19:18.630 --> 00:19:22.593$ of how you fully ensure the data point is to the prediction.
- 339 00:19:24.799 --> 00:19:29.799 Okay so UI is the role norm of the left single matrix
- $340\ 00:19:31.560 \longrightarrow 00:19:33.750$ but we are talking about variable selection.
- $341\ 00:19:33.750 \longrightarrow 00:19:37.887$ So UI norm can be used to select the roles.
- 342 00:19:37.887 --> 00:19:42.887 Intuitively, to select the columns of X,
- $343\ 00:19:43.110 \longrightarrow 00:19:45.150$ we can just do a transpose of X.
- $344\ 00:19:45.150 --> 00:19:48.840$ So X transpose equal to the VAU transpose.
- $345\ 00:19:48.840 \longrightarrow 00:19:50.530$ To select the columns of X
- $346\ 00:19:51.870 \longrightarrow 00:19:55.080$ basically is to select the roles of X transpose.
- 347~00:19:55.080 --> 00:19:59.190 Intuitively we can just use the rule map of V matrix,
- $348\ 00:19:59.190 \longrightarrow 00:20:03.240$ which is the right single matrix to do a selection,
- $349\ 00{:}20{:}03.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}07.770$ to select the influential columns effects, okay, right?
- $350\ 00:20:07.770 \longrightarrow 00:20:11.460$ And then, so we call the rho nu of U,
- $351\ 00:20:13.200 \longrightarrow 00:20:16.110$ we call the U as the left singular matrix
- $352\ 00:20:16.110 \longrightarrow 00:20:18.180\ V$ as the right singular matrix.
- $353\ 00{:}20{:}18.180 \dots > 00{:}20{:}23.180$ And we call the rho nu of U as the left leverage score,
- $354\ 00:20:24.090 \longrightarrow 00:20:25.983$ rho of B as the right leverage score.
- $355\ 00:20:29.820 \longrightarrow 00:20:33.100$ So I want to say, use the previous two slides
- 356 00:20:34.454 --> 00:20:36.090 is that basically, the raw information,
- 357 00:20:36.090 --> 00:20:39.600 intuitively, the raw information is contained in the U,
- $358\ 00:20:39.600 --> 00:20:41.100$ the column information of X

- $359\ 00:20:41.100 \longrightarrow 00:20:44.100$ is contained in the V matrix
- $360\ 00{:}20{:}44.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}46.590$ and we know that there is a fertile complication
- 361 00:20:46.590 --> 00:20:50.310 between X and Y, which is unknown link function F.
- $362\ 00{:}20{:}50.310 --> 00{:}20{:}54.330$ So how do we utilize the information from the column
- $363\ 00:20:54.330 \longrightarrow 00:20:57.300$ from the rho and also the anomaly function
- $364\ 00:20:57.300 \longrightarrow 00:21:01.405$ to generate a same method
- $365\ 00:21:01.405 --> 00:21:06.405$ that can help us to the variable selection
- $366\ 00:21:06.515 \longrightarrow 00:21:09.483$ that is to select influential columns for X.
- $367\ 00:21:12.930 \longrightarrow 00:21:15.750$ Okay so, let us get back to the matrix
- $368\ 00:21:15.750 --> 00:21:18.060$ we derived in the previous slides.
- $369\ 00{:}21{:}18.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}21.990$ We have the conditional variance in the denominator
- 370 00:21:21.990 --> 00:21:24.780 and we have variance X in the numerator
- $371\ 00:21:24.780 \longrightarrow 00:21:26.730$ and the variance of X in the denominator.
- 372 00:21:26.730 --> 00:21:29.310 And with simple statistics,
- $373\ 00{:}21{:}29.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}32.820$ this can be simplified to variants of expectation
- $374\ 00:21:32.820 \longrightarrow 00:21:37.600$ of Z given Y where Z is a standardized X.
- $375\ 00{:}21{:}37.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}41.292$ Okay, further we used a singular variety competition,
- 376 00:21:41.292 --> 00:21:45.600 Z can be simplified to UV transpose
- $377\ 00:21:45.600 \longrightarrow 00:21:47.820$ and then it's IJ element basically
- $378\ 00:21:47.820 \longrightarrow 00:21:51.363$ is in the product of Ui and Vj,
- $379\ 00:21:52.332 \longrightarrow 00:21:55.557$ so Vi basically contains both raw information
- $380\ 00:21:55.557 --> 00:21:57.690$ and column information.
- $381\ 00:21:57.690 \longrightarrow 00:22:00.870$ And then we proposed the weighted leverage score,
- $382\ 00:22:00.870 \longrightarrow 00:22:05.820$ which is defined in this equation.
- $383\ 00:22:05.820 \longrightarrow 00:22:08.730$ And the interpretation of the Wj,

- $384\ 00{:}22{:}08.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}12.480$ which is the weight leverage score for J's predictor
- $385\ 00:22:12.480 \longrightarrow 00:22:13.770$ is threefold.
- 386 00:22:13.770 --> 00:22:15.570 So first of all you can see it contains
- 387 00:22:15.570 --> 00:22:19.593 both the column information and the raw information of X.
- $388\ 00:22:20.535 \longrightarrow 00:22:25.535$ And we know and thus, in the second fold,
- $389\ 00:22:27.330 \longrightarrow 00:22:30.390$ you can see in the middle, basically contains
- 390 00:22:30.390 --> 00:22:32.760 the information from the unknown function F
- $391\ 00:22:32.760 \longrightarrow 00:22:35.670$ because we have the conditional expectation here,
- 392 00:22:35.670 --> 00:22:38.190 expectation of Ui given Y,
- $393\ 00:22:38.190 \longrightarrow 00:22:41.160$ basically it's a kind of a reflection
- $394\ 00:22:41.160 \longrightarrow 00:22:44.493$ of the anomaly function F.
- 395 00:22:46.414 --> 00:22:49.440 And third, this method is viewed
- 396 00:22:49.440 --> 00:22:51.210 under the general index model
- 397 00:22:51.210 --> 00:22:52.517 and it is model three,
- $398\ 00:22:52.517 --> 00:22:55.320$ in the case that the general index model
- $399\ 00:22:55.320 --> 00:22:57.933$ encompasses many different model types.
- $400\ 00:22:59.011 --> 00:23:03.570$ Okay so this is kind of a population version
- $401\ 00:23:03.570 \longrightarrow 00:23:05.610$ of the weighted leverage score.
- $402\ 00:23:05.610 \longrightarrow 00:23:07.467$ In terms of estimation,
- $403\ 00:23:07.467 -> 00:23:09.294$ you will see we only need to estimate
- $404\ 00:23:09.294 \longrightarrow 00:23:11.460$ in the matrix in the middle,
- $405~00{:}23{:}11.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}14.733$ which is the variance of the expectation of Ui given Y.
- $406\ 00:23:17.149 \longrightarrow 00:23:19.413$ To estimate this matrix,
- $407\ 00{:}23{:}20.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}24.030$ there's a, we can see that Ui is actually three dimensional
- $408\ 00{:}23{:}24.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}27.354$ because this is a directly single value composition.
- $409\ 00:23:27.354 \longrightarrow 00:23:28.920$ Ui is a three dimensional vector.

- $410\ 00:23:28.920 \longrightarrow 00:23:30.780\ Y$ is only one dimensional.
- $411\ 00:23:30.780 \longrightarrow 00:23:33.480$ This is a function of one dimensional variable.
- $412\ 00{:}23{:}33.480 \longrightarrow 00{:}23{:}38.400$ So it can be easily approximated by dividing, okay,
- $413\ 00:23:38.400 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.310$ the range of Y into h slices as much as h
- $414\ 00:23:43.200 \longrightarrow 00:23:45.570$ and within each slice, okay?
- $415\ 00:23:45.570 \longrightarrow 00:23:48.600$ Within each slice we calculate the slice mean
- $416\ 00:23:48.600 \longrightarrow 00:23:51.363$ for all roles of U.
- 417 00:23:53.663 --> 00:23:54.900 Lastly, illustrated inn this graph,
- 418 00:23:54.900 --> 00:23:58.830 we can first the slice into Y into edge slices
- $419\ 00:23:58.830 \longrightarrow 00:24:01.920$ and then within each slice, if those Yi
- $420\ 00:24:01.920 \longrightarrow 00:24:03.330$ fall into the same slice,
- $421\ 00:24:03.330 \longrightarrow 00:24:05.536$ we find out their corresponding use
- $422\ 00:24:05.536 \longrightarrow 00:24:10.536$ and then do, calculate its mean for each U.
- $423\ 00:24:13.890 \longrightarrow 00:24:16.424$ And in that way, we can simplify,
- $424\,00{:}24{:}16.424 \,\text{--}{>}\,00{:}24{:}20.610$ we can simply estimate expectation of Ui given Y.
- $425\ 00:24:20.610 --> 00:24:23.300$ And then further we can estimate the variance
- $426\ 00:24:23.300 \longrightarrow 00:24:25.533$ of those averages.
- 427 00:24:27.390 --> 00:24:30.480 Basically just taking that the variance of U one bar
- $428\ 00:24:30.480 \longrightarrow 00:24:32.283$ to U edge bar.
- $429\ 00:24:37.170 \longrightarrow 00:24:40.440$ So this is the way how we estimate the variance
- $430\ 00:24:40.440 \longrightarrow 00:24:42.693$ of the expectation of Ui given Y.
- $431\ 00{:}24{:}45.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}48.277$ Okay so in that way we actually generate our estimate
- $432\ 00:24:48.277 --> 00:24:49.909$ weighted leverage score
- $433\ 00:24:49.909 \longrightarrow 00:24:53.300$ we define as the right leverage score
- $434\ 00:24:53.300 \longrightarrow 00:24:55.803$ weighted by the matrix in the middle.
- $435\ 00{:}24{:}58.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}01.534$ Okay so first of all, this weighted leverage score
- 436 00:25:01.534 --> 00:25:06.534 is built, say, upon the general index model,

- $437\ 00:25:08.030 \longrightarrow 00:25:10.020$ it is considered as model free
- $438\ 00:25:10.020 \longrightarrow 00:25:14.474$ because Yi, the response is connected with
- 439 00:25:14.474 --> 00:25:18.660 hitting combination of X through anomaly function F.
- 440 00:25:18.660 --> 00:25:21.210 And this model is general to encompass
- $441\ 00:25:21.210 --> 00:25:22.920$ many different model types.
- $442\ 00:25:22.920 \longrightarrow 00:25:25.023$ So we can consider it as model free.
- $443\ 00{:}25{:}26.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}31.040$ And second, this to generate this weighted leverage score
- $444\ 00{:}25{:}31.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}36.171$ where there is no need to estimate the covariance matrix
- 445 00:25:36.171 --> 00:25:40.260 and there is no need to estimate anomaly function F.
- $446\ 00:25:40.260 \longrightarrow 00:25:43.000$ So we can bypass all those procedures
- $447\ 00:25:43.860 \longrightarrow 00:25:45.960$ to calculate this weighted leverage score.
- $448\ 00:25:51.810 --> 00:25:53.312$ So this weighted leverage score
- 449 00:25:53.312 --> 00:25:55.680 actually encompass a very good feature
- $450\ 00:25:55.680 \longrightarrow 00:25:57.450$ that is it is an indicator
- $451\ 00:25:57.450 \longrightarrow 00:26:00.530$ of how influential of the columns are
- $452\ 00:26:00.530 \longrightarrow 00:26:03.510$ and we can basically run our predictors
- $453\ 00:26:03.510 \longrightarrow 00:26:05.760$ according to the weighted leverage score.
- 454 00:26:05.760 --> 00:26:07.260 The higher the score is,
- $455\ 00:26:07.260 \longrightarrow 00:26:10.043$ the more influential the predictor will be.
- $456\ 00:26:10.043 \longrightarrow 00:26:14.160$ And later I will show why this ranking properties
- $457\ 00:26:14.160 \longrightarrow 00:26:17.307$ would help or even with the leverage score.
- $458\ 00:26:17.307 --> 00:26:20.340$ So this is a basic procedures
- 459 00:26:20.340 --> 00:26:21.720 for giving weighted leverage score
- $460\ 00:26:21.720 \longrightarrow 00:26:24.600$ to a variable selection or variable screening.
- 461 00:26:24.600 --> 00:26:27.630 So given that we have this matrix,
- $462\ 00:26:27.630 \longrightarrow 00:26:30.750$ which is an impart matrix and we have the responses,
- 463 00:26:30.750 --> 00:26:33.600 the labels, for each of the location,

- $464\ 00:26:33.600 \longrightarrow 00:26:38.600$ we only need one time singular value composition, okay?
- $465~00{:}26{:}39.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}42.810$ This is a rank D singular value composition of X.
- $466~00{:}26{:}42.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}45.210$ And then we can just calculate the weighted leverage score
- $467\ 00:26:45.210 \longrightarrow 00:26:48.240$ according to the equations,
- 468 00:26:48.240 --> 00:26:49.920 rank those weighted leverage score
- $469\ 00:26:49.920 \longrightarrow 00:26:51.870$ from the highest to the lowest.
- $470\ 00:26:51.870 \longrightarrow 00:26:53.850$ Select the predictor that we use,
- $471\ 00:26:53.850 --> 00:26:55.700$ the highest weighted leverage scores.
- 472 00:26:56.640 --> 00:26:58.770 This is the basic screening procedure
- $473\ 00:26:58.770 \longrightarrow 00:27:00.370$ using the weighted average score
- $474\ 00:27:01.470 \longrightarrow 00:27:03.480$ and there is still implementation issue
- $475\ 00:27:03.480 \longrightarrow 00:27:05.250$ that we will later address.
- $476\ 00:27:05.250 \longrightarrow 00:27:08.070$ First one, how can we determine the number of D?
- $477\ 00{:}27{:}08.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}11.133$ So given the data which is an IP, how can we determine,
- $478\ 00{:}27{:}12.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}17.340$ say, how many, say, spiked or how many singular values
- $479\ 00:27:17.340 \longrightarrow 00:27:18.740$ to be included in the model?
- $480\ 00:27:20.280 \longrightarrow 00:27:22.680$ And then the second implementation issue
- $481\ 00:27:22.680 \longrightarrow 00:27:25.290$ is determine the number of variables
- $482\ 00:27:25.290 \longrightarrow 00:27:26.853$ to be selected in the model.
- $483\ 00{:}27{:}29.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}31.740$ So you can see that the weight leverage score procedure
- 484 00:27:31.740 --> 00:27:34.020 is screening procedure only include
- $485\ 00:27:34.020 --> 00:27:37.263$ one type of singularity, competition is quite efficient.
- 486 00:27:41.130 --> 00:27:44.160 Okay so, in the next, let us using two slides
- 487 00:27:44.160 --> 00:27:47.070 to discuss a little but, basically just one slides
- 488 00:27:47.070 --> 00:27:48.930 to discuss the ranking properties

- $489\ 00:27:48.930 \longrightarrow 00:27:50.700$ of the weighted leverage score.
- $490\ 00:27:50.700 \longrightarrow 00:27:52.680$ So as I mentioned, the weighted leverage score
- 491 00:27:52.680 --> 00:27:54.570 has a very nice property.
- $492\ 00:27:54.570 \longrightarrow 00:27:58.290$ So it is guaranteed by the theorem here.
- $493\ 00:27:58.290 \longrightarrow 00:28:01.770$ We show that, given certain conditions are satisfied,
- $494~00{:}28{:}01.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}06.770$ we have the minimum value of the weighted leverage score
- $495\ 00:28:06.930 \longrightarrow 00:28:08.747$ from the true predictors
- $496~00:28:08.747 \longrightarrow 00:28:12.180$ will always rank higher than the maximum value,
- 497 00:28:12.180 --> 00:28:13.830 maximum weighted leverage score
- $498\ 00:28:13.830 \longrightarrow 00:28:15.603$ of those redundant predictors.
- $499\ 00{:}28{:}17.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}22.550$ And this holds for the population with leverage score.
- $500\ 00:28:24.150 --> 00:28:26.790$ In terms of the estimation weighted leverage score.
- $501~00{:}28{:}26.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}29.280$ we utilize the two step procedure.
- 502 00:28:29.280 --> 00:28:30.120 So first of all,
- $503~00:28:30.120 \dashrightarrow 00:28:33.660$ we show that the estimate weighted leverage score
- $504\ 00:28:33.660 --> 00:28:36.900$ is very close to the population version
- $505\ 00:28:36.900 \longrightarrow 00:28:38.671$ of the weighted leverage.
- $506~00{:}28{:}38.671 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}43.671$ Okay and then the estimated weighted leverage score
- 507 00:28:43.980 --> 00:28:46.090 will also have the ranking property
- $508\ 00:28:47.640 \longrightarrow 00:28:49.955$ that is the estimated weighted leverage score
- $509~00{:}28{:}49.955 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}53.773$ of the active predictors or important predictors
- $510~00{:}28{:}53.773 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}57.570$ ranks higher than the estimated weighted leverage score
- $511\ 00:28:57.570 \longrightarrow 00:29:01.653$ of the down predictors with probability turning to one.
- 512 00:29:04.740 --> 00:29:07.560 Okay so this, the ranking properties

- $513\ 00:29:07.560 \longrightarrow 00:29:09.090$ of the weighted leverage score
- $514~00{:}29{:}09.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}12.453$ basically is guaranteed by these two properties.
- $515\ 00:29:16.440 \longrightarrow 00:29:18.300$ And then further, we also know
- $516\ 00:29:18.300 \longrightarrow 00:29:20.670$ that there are two implementation issue.
- $517\ 00:29:20.670 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.020$ The first one is determine
- $518\ 00:29:22.020 --> 00:29:25.380$ the number of spiked singular values d.
- $519\ 00:29:25.380 \longrightarrow 00:29:29.190$ So how many single values we need to include in our model?
- 520 00:29:29.190 --> 00:29:32.496 This is a question and it's quite crucial
- $521~00{:}29{:}32.496 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}35.890$ because we need to know how many of the signals
- $522\ 00:29:37.230 \longrightarrow 00:29:39.930$ contain the data and we need to remove
- 523 00:29:39.930 --> 00:29:43.140 all those redundant or noise information.
- $524\ 00:29:43.140 --> 00:29:45.960$ Okay so here I develop a criterion
- $525\ 00:29:45.960 \longrightarrow 00:29:50.793$ based on the properties of those aken values.
- $526\ 00:29:52.367 \longrightarrow 00:29:56.070\ DR$ is a function of, R is the number of values
- $527\ 00:29:56.070 \longrightarrow 00:29:57.813$ to be included in a model.
- 528 00:29:58.964 --> 00:30:02.280 DR is a function of R and the theta I hat
- 529 00:30:02.280 --> 00:30:06.790 is the ratio between the highest aken value
- $530\ 00:30:07.950 \longrightarrow 00:30:11.523$ and the largest aken, value, number one hat.
- $531\ 00:30:12.360 --> 00:30:17.165$ And then, you can see that as we include more, say,
- $532\ 00:30:17.165 \longrightarrow 00:30:18.870$ single values in the model,
- $533\ 00:30:18.870 \longrightarrow 00:30:20.770$ this, the first term will decrease
- $534\ 00:30:22.080 \longrightarrow 00:30:24.030$ and then tier to some point.
- $535\ 00:30:24.030$ --> 00:30:27.690 The first, the decreasing of the first term
- $536\ 00:30:27.690$ --> 00:30:30.120 is smaller than the increasing of the second term.
- 537 00:30:30.120 --> 00:30:31.803 Then DR starts to increase.
- 538 00:30:33.810 --> 00:30:37.710 And then we can use the criterion to find D hat,

- $539\ 00:30:37.710 --> 00:30:40.173$ we show that we had is very close to a true D.
- 540 00:30:41.260 --> 00:30:42.780 Okay, you meet this criterion,
- $541\ 00:30:42.780 --> 00:30:46.953$ we can select the true number of signals in the model.
- $542\ 00:30:51.180 --> 00:30:53.400$ And the second implementation issue
- $543\ 00{:}30{:}53.400 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}30{:}58.230$ is about how many predictors, how many true predictors
- $544\ 00:30:58.230 \longrightarrow 00:31:00.570$ we need to include in our model.
- $545~00{:}31{:}00.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}04.330$ Okay again, we're ranking our weighted leverage scores
- 546 00:31:05.460 --> 00:31:09.630 and here we utilize the criterion here
- $547\ 00:31:09.630 \longrightarrow 00:31:12.240$ based on the properties of the weighted leverage score.
- $548\ 00:31:12.240 \longrightarrow 00:31:17.174$ Okay, as we include more predictors into the active set.
- 549 00:31:17.174 --> 00:31:19.680 the first term will decrease, okay?
- 550~00:31:19.680 --> 00:31:22.020 The summation of the weighted leverage score will increase,
- $551\ 00:31:22.020 \longrightarrow 00:31:24.580$ but the increment will decrease
- $552\ 00:31:24.580 --> 00:31:26.880$ and then the second term will increase, okay?
- $553\ 00:31:26.880 --> 00:31:31.563$ So, as we include more predictors in the model,
- 554 00:31:32.610 --> 00:31:35.070 there's some changing point
- $555\ 00:31:35.070$ --> 00:31:40.070 when the increment is smaller than the increment
- $556\ 00:31:42.547 \longrightarrow 00:31:45.840$ of the second penalty term.
- 557 00:31:45.840 --> 00:31:48.090 We show that, using this criteria,
- $558\ 00:31:48.090 --> 00:31:51.720$ the set we selected using this criteria,
- 559 00:31:51.720 --> 00:31:56.160 which is A, will always we'll say can include
- $560\ 00:31:56.160 --> 00:32:00.543$ all the true predictors with probability pending to one.
- $561\ 00:32:03.420 \longrightarrow 00:32:05.400$ Okay so that's how we using this criterion
- $562\ 00:32:05.400 --> 00:32:07.050$ to determine the number of predictors
- $563\ 00:32:07.050 \longrightarrow 00:32:08.450$ to be selected in the model.

- 564 00:32:10.290 --> 00:32:11.190 Okay in the next step,
- $565\ 00:32:11.190 --> 00:32:14.099$ let me show some empirical study results
- 566 00:32:14.099 --> 00:32:16.797 of using the weighted leverage score
- $567\ 00:32:16.797 \longrightarrow 00:32:19.803$ to do the variable selection in the model.
- 568 00:32:21.521 --> 00:32:23.880 In the example one, as I mentioned,
- $569\ 00:32:23.880 --> 00:32:27.510$ we are utilizing, we are proposing our method
- $570\ 00:32:27.510 --> 00:32:31.080$ under the general index model framework.
- $571\ 00:32:31.080 --> 00:32:33.783$ So the first model is the general index model.
- $572\ 00:32:34.620 --> 00:32:37.080$ Well why there's two directions?
- 573 00:32:37.080 --> 00:32:38.780 The first one is in the numerator,
- $574\ 00:32:39.660 \longrightarrow 00:32:42.870$ so this is so called a beta one transpose X.
- $575~00:32:42.870 \longrightarrow 00:32:45.240$ The second direction beta two transpose X
- $576\ 00:32:45.240 \longrightarrow 00:32:47.777$ is in the variable system,
- $577\ 00:32:48.900 \longrightarrow 00:32:50.070$ the term within the variant,
- $578\ 00:32:50.070 \longrightarrow 00:32:52.323$ this is beta two transpose X.
- $579\ 00:32:53.700 --> 00:32:55.971$ Okay so this is called a general index model
- $580\ 00:32:55.971 --> 00:33:00.190$ and we assume that X is generated from
- $581\ 00:33:03.000 \longrightarrow 00:33:05.250$ a very normal distribution
- $582\ 00{:}33{:}05.250 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}33{:}08.050$ and we submit our zero and covariant structure
- 583 00:33:09.300 --> 00:33:10.530 back in this way, okay?
- $584\ 00:33:10.530 \longrightarrow 00:33:12.810$ We let rho equal to 0.5
- $585\ 00:33:12.810$ --> 00:33:17.283 which will generate a matrix with moderate correlations.
- $586\ 00:33:20.820 \longrightarrow 00:33:23.920$ So in this way, we generate both X and Y,
- $587\ 00{:}33{:}23.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}28.860$ let's see how the performance of variable selection
- 588 00:33:28.860 --> 00:33:31.277 give you the weighted leverage score.
- $589\ 00:33:31.277 --> 00:33:34.200$ In our scenarios, we let N equal to 1000
- $590\ 00:33:34.200 \longrightarrow 00:33:35.300$ and the rho equal 0.5.
- $591\ 00:33:37.020$ --> 00:33:40.743 In example one, there are four different scenarios.

- $592\ 00:33:41.910 \longrightarrow 00:33:46.080$ For scenario one, we let P as 200
- $593\ 00:33:46.080 --> 00:33:48.780$ and then we increase P to 200, sorry 22,000 and 2.500.
- $594\ 00:33:54.120 \longrightarrow 00:33:58.260$ We also increase the variance of the error turn
- $595\ 00:33:58.260 \longrightarrow 00:33:59.977$ as 1.5 this now to 1.3.
- $596\ 00:34:02.010 \longrightarrow 00:34:04.378$ Okay, there are three criteria we used
- $597\ 00:34:04.378 \longrightarrow 00:34:08.160$ to evaluate the performance of the method.
- $598\ 00:34:08.160 --> 00:34:10.380$ The first one is the false positive.
- $599\ 00:34:10.380 --> 00:34:13.623$ So it means how many of the variables are falsely selected?
- $600~00{:}34{:}14.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}17.940$ False negative which shows how many variables
- 601 00:34:17.940 --> 00:34:20.880 falsely excluded, how many true predictors
- $602\ 00:34:20.880 --> 00:34:22.713$ are falsely excluded.
- $603\ 00:34:24.090 \longrightarrow 00:34:26.011$ The last one, the last criterion
- $604\ 00:34:26.011 \longrightarrow 00:34:29.670$ is because, is basically is our model size
- 605 00:34:29.670 --> 00:34:33.090 because we have this ranking properties
- $606\ 00:34:33.090 \longrightarrow 00:34:36.450$ of all the methods here, okay?
- $607\ 00:34:36.450 \longrightarrow 00:34:38.340$ All those methods have ranking properties.
- $608~00{:}34{:}38.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}42.780$ So I want to know how many variables I need to include
- $609\ 00:34:42.780 --> 00:34:45.132$ in the model so that all true predictors
- $610\ 00:34:45.132 --> 00:34:49.650$ are included because we have this ranking property, okay?
- 611 00:34:49.650 --> 00:34:51.790 You will see that weighted leverage score
- $612\ 00:34:53.670 --> 00:34:55.560$ basically have a better performance
- $613\ 00{:}34{:}55{.}560 {\: -->\:} 00{:}34{:}58{.}210$ in terms of the false positive and the false negative
- $614\ 00:35:00.600 \longrightarrow 00:35:02.493$ and also the model size.
- $615\ 00:35:05.490 \longrightarrow 00:35:09.080$ I want to say say a bit more about model size.
- $616\ 00:35:09.080 \longrightarrow 00:35:13.440$ We can see that when N is 1000, P is 200,
- $617\ 00:35:13.440 \longrightarrow 00:35:17.520$ the minimum model size is 6.14, meaning that we, in total,

- 618 00:35:17.520 --> 00:35:21.060 we only have six true predictors, okay?
- $619\ 00:35:21.060 \longrightarrow 00:35:23.040$ We only need to include the six variables
- $620\ 00:35:23.040 --> 00:35:28.040$ to 6.14 variables to encompass all true predictors.
- $621\ 00:35:28.740 \longrightarrow 00:35:31.980$ Basically all those six variables are rank higher
- $622\ 00:35:31.980 --> 00:35:35.430$ than all our other novel variables, right?
- $623\ 00:35:35.430 \longrightarrow 00:35:38.883$ In a second model, when P increases to 2,200,
- $624\ 00:35:40.200 \longrightarrow 00:35:42.600$ we only need seven predictors
- 625 00:35:42.600 --> 00:35:45.292 in order to, on average, in order to include
- $626\ 00:35:45.292 \longrightarrow 00:35:46.140$ all the true predictors.
- 627 00:35:46.140 --> 00:35:50.670 Meaning that overall, all the true predictors
- $628\ 00:35:50.670 \longrightarrow 00:35:53.103$ ranks higher than those redundant predictors.
- 629~00:35:54.570 --> 00:35:57.900 And then when sigma increases and when P increases,
- $630\ 00:35:57.900 --> 00:36:01.000$ we still need only the minimum number of variables
- $631\ 00:36:02.880 \longrightarrow 00:36:04.743$ just to include all true predictors.
- $632~00{:}36{:}06.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}08.880$ Okay so this is for the first example
- $633\ 00:36:08.880 \longrightarrow 00:36:12.060$ of the model index model.
- $634\ 00:36:12.060 \longrightarrow 00:36:13.800$ The second is more challenging,
- $635\ 00:36:13.800 \longrightarrow 00:36:17.010$ it's called a heteroscedastic model.
- 636 00:36:17.010 --> 00:36:19.271 You will find that, in the first model,
- 637 00:36:19.271 --> 00:36:23.580 the X, those active predictors only influence
- $638\ 00:36:23.580 \longrightarrow 00:36:25.590$ the main response, okay?
- $639\ 00:36:25.590 \longrightarrow 00:36:28.260$ Only influence Y in its means.
- $640\ 00:36:28.260 --> 00:36:30.870$ But here, you can see four different types
- $641\ 00:36:30.870 \longrightarrow 00:36:32.700$ for those variables, the average of Y,
- $642\ 00:36:32.700 \longrightarrow 00:36:34.050$ the mean of Y is zero
- $643\ 00:36:34.050 --> 00:36:36.130$ because error term is in the numerator
- 644 00:36:37.119 --> 00:36:41.640 and those X, those active predictors will influence Y
- $645\ 00:36:41.640 \longrightarrow 00:36:43.083$ in its variance.

- $646\ 00:36:44.730 --> 00:36:46.953$ So it's a much challenging case.
- $647\ 00:36:49.170 --> 00:36:52.260$ In this case, we also assume that X follows
- 648 00:36:52.260 --> 00:36:53.970 a very normal distribution,
- $649\ 00{:}36{:}53.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}58.970$ given mean is zero and a covariant structure like this.
- $650\ 00:36:59.580 \longrightarrow 00:37:01.680$ In our scenarios, we let N equal to 1,000.
- $651\ 00:37:03.030 \longrightarrow 00:37:05.880$ So let's see, in a heteroscedastic model,
- $652\ 00:37:05.880 \longrightarrow 00:37:10.383$ what are the behaviors of our methods?
- 653 00:37:11.397 --> 00:37:14.430 Okay, sorry, I forget to introduce the method
- $654~00{:}37{:}14.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}18.060$ that we are compare these with true independence ranking
- $655\ 00:37:18.060 \longrightarrow 00:37:20.130$ and screening and the distance correlation.
- $656\ 00:37:20.130 \longrightarrow 00:37:22.740$ So both of these methods can be utilized
- $657\ 00{:}37{:}22.740 {\: \hbox{--}}{>}\ 00{:}37{:}27.740$ to measure, say, the association between the response
- $658\ 00:37:28.077 \longrightarrow 00:37:30.090$ and the predictors.
- $659\ 00{:}37{:}30.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}33.780$ And both of the methods have the ranking properties.
- $660\ 00:37:33.780 \longrightarrow 00:37:36.330$ So we can compare the minimum model size
- $661\ 00:37:36.330 \longrightarrow 00:37:37.383$ for all the methods.
- $662\ 00{:}37{:}39.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}41.670$ Regards the false positive of these two methods,
- 663 00:37:41.670 --> 00:37:43.380 there's no criteria proposed
- $664\ 00:37:43.380 \longrightarrow 00:37:45.930$ to select the number of predictors.
- $665\ 00:37:45.930 \longrightarrow 00:37:47.670$ And in all those methods,
- $666\ 00:37:47.670 --> 00:37:49.860$ I just use a harder stretch holding
- $667\ 00:37:49.860 --> 00:37:52.320$ to select the number of predictors
- $668\ 00:37:52.320 \longrightarrow 00:37:54.990$ in order to be included in the model.
- 669 00:37:54.990 --> 00:37:58.200 Okay let's see, in a heteroscedastic model,
- $670\ 00{:}37{:}58.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}00.543$ what are the behaviors of those three methods?
- 671~00:38:02.910 --> 00:38:07.910 Okay, when we have N greater the number of predictors,

- $672~00:38:08.010 \longrightarrow 00:38:12.480$ P here, you will find that there are slightly larger,
- $673\ 00{:}38{:}12.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}15.540$ with false negative for the weighted leverage score.
- $674\ 00:38:15.540 \longrightarrow 00:38:19.920$ This is because both the methods within the our threshold.
- $675\ 00:38:19.920 \longrightarrow 00:38:24.570$ they select around 140, more than 140,
- 676 00:38:24.570 --> 00:38:29.010 true predictors out of 200 from the model.
- $677\ 00:38:29.010 \longrightarrow 00:38:32.970$ So that's why they have very small false negative,
- 678 00:38:32.970 --> 00:38:35.771 but if you look at the minimum model size,
- 679 00:38:35.771 --> 00:38:38.880 you will find that our weighted leverage score
- $680~00{:}38{:}38.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}41.610$ still maintains a very good performance.
- $681~00{:}38{:}41.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}46.080$ Okay, it has a smaller value of the minimum model size.
- 682 00:38:46.080 --> 00:38:48.690 Okay in general, we only need 46 variables
- $683\ 00{:}38{:}48.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}53.013$ in order to include our two predictors in the model.
- 684~00:38:55.025 --> 00:39:00.025 And then as P diverges, as CSP increased to 2,500,
- 685 00:39:00.668 --> 00:39:02.970 basically the weighted leverage score
- 686~00:39:02.970 --> 00:39:06.852 will measure 1.3 variable true predictors from the model
- $687\ 00:39:06.852 \longrightarrow 00:39:11.040$ and every method have a really hard time
- $688\ 00:39:11.040 \longrightarrow 00:39:14.010$ to identify all the true predictors.
- $689\ 00:39:14.010 --> 00:39:16.713$ They have really large minimum model size.
- $690\ 00{:}39{:}20.400 {\: -->\:} 00{:}39{:}25.167$ So this is basic a performance of the using with
- 691~00:39:25.167 --> 00:39:29.640 the leverage score to perform a variable screening
- $692\ 00:39:29.640 \longrightarrow 00:39:31.290$ under general index model.
- 693 00:39:31.290 --> 00:39:33.540 So I only present two examples here
- $694\ 00:39:33.540 \longrightarrow 00:39:35.730$ for interest in odd scenarios.
- $695\ 00:39:35.730 \longrightarrow 00:39:37.923$ We can talk about that at the top.

 $696\ 00:39:42.303 --> 00:39:45.483$ Okay so let's get back to our real data example.

697 00:39:46.650 --> 00:39:48.750 So in a motivating example, as I mentioned,

 $698\ 00:39:48.750 \longrightarrow 00:39:52.620$ we utilize this spatial transcriptomics data.

 $699\ 00{:}39{:}52.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}57.120$ We are sequencing the grid point within each section, okay?

 $700\ 00:39:57.120 \longrightarrow 00:40:01.650$ Basically these locations are invasive cancer areas,

 $701\ 00:40:01.650 \longrightarrow 00:40:05.550$ the other areas are the noninvasive cancer areas,

 $702\ 00:40:05.550 \longrightarrow 00:40:08.040$ and then these are the normal areas.

 $703\ 00:40:08.040 --> 00:40:11.400$ So how to determine the invasive, non-invasive

 $704\ 00:40:11.400 \longrightarrow 00:40:13.137$ and the normal area?

 $705\ 00:40:13.137 \longrightarrow 00:40:16.785$ These are determined by qualified doctors

 $706\ 00:40:16.785 \longrightarrow 00:40:20.160$ and they're utilizing some logical information

 $707\ 00:40:20.160 \longrightarrow 00:40:21.750$ of these locations.

708 00:40:21.750 --> 00:40:24.390 Okay in general, for these two sections,

 $709\ 00:40:24.390 \longrightarrow 00:40:28.320$ we have identified 518 locations,

 $710\ 00:40:28.320 \longrightarrow 00:40:33.320\ 64$ invasive areas and 73 are noninvasive areas.

 $711\ 00:40:33.720 --> 00:40:37.533$ And there are rest of the areas, 381, they are normal.

712 00:40:39.600 --> 00:40:44.600 And we have our gene, about 3,572 expressions,

 $713\ 00:40:46.350 \longrightarrow 00:40:50.580$ gene expressions across the section.

 $714\ 00:40:50.580$ --> 00:40:54.380 Okay so in general, basically we have our data matrix

715 00:40:54.380 --> 00:40:59.380 it is about 518 times 3,572.

716 00:40:59.730 --> 00:41:04.170 So we trying to identify biomarkers, okay,

 $717\ 00:41:04.170 \longrightarrow 00:41:06.060$ within those three genes

 $718\ 00:41:06.060 \longrightarrow 00:41:10.440$ that can help us discriminate between invasive cancer,

719 00:41:10.440 --> 00:41:12.423 non-invasive cancer and normal areas.

720 00:41:14.430 --> 00:41:17.676 So we utilize the weighted leverage score,

- 721 00:41:17.676 --> 00:41:20.310 we apply the weight leverage score screening procedure
- $722\ 00:41:20.310 \longrightarrow 00:41:21.810$ for this data set.
- 723 00:41:21.810 --> 00:41:26.810 And we identified around 225 genes
- $724\ 00:41:27.150 \longrightarrow 00:41:30.570$ among all those P genes.
- 725 00:41:30.570 --> 00:41:33.706 In the plot, a heat map here show the results
- 726 00:41:33.706 --> 00:41:37.260 because just for the ease of presentation,
- 727 00:41:37.260 --> 00:41:40.110 I only printed around 20 genes here
- $728\ 00:41:40.110 \longrightarrow 00:41:45.110$ and with the top, say, weighted leverage scores,
- 729~00:41:45.120 --> 00:41:47.640 you can see that there are certain patterns here.
- $730\ 00:41:47.640 --> 00:41:51.096$ This group of genes are more highly expressed
- 731 00:41:51.096 --> 00:41:54.210 for the non-invasive cancer area.
- $732\ 00:41:54.210 --> 00:41:57.360$ There are certain group of genes right here.
- $733\ 00:41:57.360 \longrightarrow 00:41:59.070$ They are more highly expressed
- $734\ 00:41:59.070 \longrightarrow 00:42:02.940$ in the invasive cancer areas.
- $735\ 00:42:02.940 \longrightarrow 00:42:06.540$ Okay so this is the gene expression patterns
- $736\ 00:42:06.540 \longrightarrow 00:42:09.123$ of those top 20 genes.
- $737\ 00{:}42{:}13.273 \dots > 00{:}42{:}18.273$ And then we also plot the expressions of those genes
- $738\ 00:42:20.220 \longrightarrow 00:42:22.380$ in these sections.
- $739\ 00:42:22.380 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.020$ Again, these are invasive areas,
- $740\ 00:42:25.020 \longrightarrow 00:42:27.300$ noninvasive and the normal areas.
- 741 00:42:27.300 --> 00:42:29.730 So we plot a group of genes,
- 742 00:42:29.730 --> 00:42:32.880 I can't remember exactly what our genes are,
- $743\ 00:42:32.880 \longrightarrow 00:42:36.600$ but these genes have, you can see,
- $744\ 00:42:36.600 --> 00:42:41.600$ have a higher expression on those noninvasive cancer areas.
- 745 00:42:41.610 --> 00:42:43.080 And we plug another group of genes,
- $746\ 00:42:43.080 \longrightarrow 00:42:45.300$ basically are these three genes,
- 747 00:42:45.300 --> 00:42:48.390 in the section, the expression shows a higher,

 $748\ 00:42:48.390 \longrightarrow 00:42:51.776$ this means that these three genes have higher expression,

749 00:42:51.776 --> 00:42:56.776 okay, in the invasive cancer areas, okay?

 $750~00{:}42{:}56.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}59.458$ Basically this means that the genes that we selected

 $751\ 00{:}42{:}59.458 {\dashrightarrow} 00{:}43{:}04.458$ show a remarkable spatially differential expressed patterns

 $752\ 00:43:05.699 \longrightarrow 00:43:07.623$ across the tissue sections.

 $753\ 00:43:11.070 \longrightarrow 00:43:16.070$ And later we do a, say, pathway analysis

 $754\ 00:43:19.290 \longrightarrow 00:43:24.290$ and see that there are 47 functional classes

 $755\ 00:43:24.420 \longrightarrow 00:43:28.290$ for those all those gene 225 gene that we have identified.

 $756\ 00:43:28.290 \longrightarrow 00:43:31.590$ And there are several cancer hallmarks, for example,

 $757\ 00:43:31.590 \longrightarrow 00:43:34.565\ 38$ of the genes that we identified

 $758\ 00:43:34.565 \longrightarrow 00:43:39.565$ enriched in the regulation of apoptotic process.

759 00:43:41.190 --> 00:43:44.130 This is a kind of cancer hallmark.

 $760~00{:}43{:}44.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}47.070$ And then another 41 gene that we have identified

 $761\ 00:43:47.070 --> 00:43:49.983$ are involved in the regulation of cell death.

 $762\ 00{:}43{:}51.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}54.420$ More specifically, because we are really interested

 $763\ 00:43:54.420 \longrightarrow 00:43:57.120$ in the invasive cancer,

764 00:43:57.120 --> 00:43:59.490 so we identified these three,

 $765\ 00:43:59.490 \longrightarrow 00:44:01.620$ there are like three genes for example,

766 00:44:01.620 --> 00:44:05.353 in the regulation of brain process,

767 00:44:05.353 --> 00:44:10.353 they have many relations with the breast cancer, okay?

768 00:44:11.370 --> 00:44:16.370 And later we can investigate or, say,

769 00:44:16.920 --> 00:44:20.293 even adaptation of those, those genes

 $770\ 00{:}44{:}20.293 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}24.303$ that are enriched in the revelation of apoptotic process.

 $771\ 00:44:31.890 \longrightarrow 00:44:36.150\ So$, in summary, that weighted leverage score

- $772\ 00:44:36.150 --> 00:44:39.767$ that we have developed is a variable screening method
- 773 00:44:39.767 --> 00:44:43.613 and it is developed under the general index model.
- $774\ 00:44:44.613 --> 00:44:48.628$ And this a very general model framework.
- $775\ 00{:}44{:}48.628 {\: -->\:} 00{:}44{:}52.120$ It can be used the two address the curse of dimensionality
- $776\ 00:44:52.120 --> 00:44:54.625$ in regression and also,
- 777 00:44:54.625 --> 00:44:58.607 because we utilize both the leverage score,
- 778 00:44:58.607 --> 00:45:01.157 the left leverage score and the right leverage score
- $779\ 00:45:01.157 --> 00:45:03.927$ to evaluate a predictor's importance
- $780\ 00:45:03.927 \longrightarrow 00:45:06.960$ in the general index model,
- 781 00:45:06.960 --> 00:45:10.496 we provide a theoretical underpinning
- $782\ 00{:}45{:}10.496 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}14.336$ to that objectify that you need both the leverage scores
- 783 00:45:14.336 --> 00:45:16.260 of both the left and right leverage scores,
- $784\ 00:45:16.260 \longrightarrow 00:45:18.930$ we can evaluate the predicts importance.
- 785 00:45:18.930 --> 00:45:21.090 Okay so this is kind of a new framework
- 786 00:45:21.090 --> 00:45:24.675 for analyzing those numerical properties,
- $787\ 00:45:24.675 --> 00:45:28.530$ especially for the single matrixes
- $788\ 00:45:28.530 \longrightarrow 00:45:30.093$ under the general index model.
- 789 00:45:31.590 --> 00:45:34.097 Okay so, this is basically a summary
- $790\ 00:45:34.097 \longrightarrow 00:45:36.150$ of the weighted leverage score
- 791 00:45:36.150 --> 00:45:41.150 and I wanna stop here and to see if anyone has any questions
- $792\ 00:45:41.610 \longrightarrow 00:45:43.983$ or comments about weighted leverage score.
- 793 00:45:56.280 --> 00:45:57.330 <v Robert>Questions?</v>
- 794 00:45:59.850 --> 00:46:01.973 Anybody on Zoom have questions?
- 795 00:46:03.855 --> 00:46:05.040 <v Student>Can I ask a quick question</v>
- 796 00:46:05.040 --> 00:46:07.440 regarding this weighted leverage score?
- $797\ 00:46:07.440 \longrightarrow 00:46:08.730$ So when we look at results,
- $798\ 00:46:08.730 --> 00:46:09.900$ this weighted leverage score

- $799\ 00:46:09.900 \longrightarrow 00:46:11.130$ has much better performance
- $800\ 00:46:11.130 \longrightarrow 00:46:14.430$ with less inverse regression regional one, right?
- 801 00:46:14.430 --> 00:46:17.340 So I wonder, is this correct
- $802\ 00:46:17.340 \longrightarrow 00:46:19.710$ that the reason why improves so much
- $803\ 00:46:19.710 \longrightarrow 00:46:22.830$ is because it utilize the information on the line,
- $804\ 00{:}46{:}22.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}25.710$ maybe, total make sense in a lot of applications
- $805\ 00:46:25.710 \longrightarrow 00:46:28.020$ that those important features,
- 806 00:46:28.020 --> 00:46:31.230 they may be like more contributing
- $807\ 00{:}46{:}31.230 --> 00{:}46{:}34.770$ to like also leading to like variation of other features
- $808~00{:}46{:}34.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}39.151$ and as a result, maybe could show up in the top
- $809\ 00:46:39.151 \longrightarrow 00:46:43.860$ as vectors in the design matrix.
- 810 00:46:43.860 --> 00:46:44.853 Is this correct?
- 811 00:46:45.690 --> 00:46:47.237 <v Professor Liu>Yeah, thank you very much</v>
- 812 00:46:47.237 --> 00:46:49.020 for your question, it's a very good question.
- 813 00:46:49.020 --> 00:46:52.263 So first of all, I want to clarify,
- $814\ 00:46:53.160 --> 00:46:55.023$ maybe I'm not very clear about SIRS.
- $815\ 00:46:55.950 \longrightarrow 00:46:58.140$ Basically this is representing
- 816 00:46:58.140 --> 00:47:00.930 the true independence ranking and screening.
- $817\ 00:47:00.930 \longrightarrow 00:47:02.250$ So it's also a method
- $818\ 00:47:02.250 \longrightarrow 00:47:05.596$ that is based on the slicing versus regression.
- $819\ 00{:}47{:}05.596 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}10.440$ So yeah, and the other one that why with the leverage score
- 820 00:47:10.440 --> 00:47:12.007 has a much better performance
- 821 00:47:12.007 --> 00:47:15.480 comparing these two methods is basically
- $822\ 00:47:15.480 --> 00:47:18.810$ because, one of the reason is because
- $823\ 00:47:18.810 \longrightarrow 00:47:22.513$ the true independent screening and the distance correlation,

- $824\ 00{:}47{:}22.513 --> 00{:}47{:}27.390$ they all just utilize the partial and partial correlation.
- $825\ 00:47:27.390 \longrightarrow 00:47:28.743$ So between X and Y.
- 826 00:47:30.000 --> 00:47:33.303 Okay so it does not utilize any of the information within X.
- 827 00:47:34.280 --> 00:47:37.590 It's kind of a marginal correlation
- 828 00:47:37.590 --> 00:47:41.130 between each variable X and then one, okay?
- $829\ 00:47:41.130 \longrightarrow 00:47:42.713$ However, the weighted leverage score
- $830\ 00:47:42.713 \longrightarrow 00:47:46.290$ will utilize both the raw information
- 831 $00:47:46.290 \longrightarrow 00:47:48.570$ and also the variance information,
- $832\ 00:47:48.570 \longrightarrow 00:47:52.143$ the correlation structure within the model,
- 833 00:47:53.880 --> 00:47:56.285 which is the V matrix, as I mentioned,
- $834\ 00:47:56.285 \longrightarrow 00:48:01.230$ is derived from the covariance structure of X.
- $835\ 00:48:01.230 \longrightarrow 00:48:03.107$ The V matrix basically is the vector
- 836 $00:48:03.107 \longrightarrow 00:48:06.420$ of the covariance structure, covariance of X.
- 837 00:48:06.420 --> 00:48:10.500 So it utilize the, say, kind of a correlation
- 838 00:48:10.500 --> 00:48:15.116 between all the X variables and a variable screening.
- 839 00:48:15.116 --> 00:48:17.880 So I'm not sure if this answers your question.
- 840 00:48:17.880 --> 00:48:18.947 <v Student>Yeah, thank you.</v>
- 841 00:48:18.947 --> 00:48:21.690 I think it is, you answered my question.
- $842\ 00{:}48{:}21.690 --> 00{:}48{:}25.153$ Essentially, I'm thinking like if those important features.
- $843\ 00:48:25.153 \longrightarrow 00:48:28.440$ they are actually not the top contributors
- $844\ 00:48:28.440 \longrightarrow 00:48:30.180$ to the top other lectures,
- $845\ 00{:}48{:}30.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}33.030$ then we wouldn't expect the weighted leverage score
- $846\ 00:48:33.030 \longrightarrow 00:48:33.863$ to aim true way.
- 847 00:48:35.850 --> 00:48:36.863 <v Professor Liu>Thank you.</v>
- 848 00:48:42.240 --> 00:48:43.320 <v Robert>Any other questions</v>
- 849 00:48:43.320 --> 00:48:45.687 anyone wants to bring up right now?
- 850 00:48:50.800 --> 00:48:53.800 (students mumbling)

```
851 00:48:56.280 --> 00:48:58.050 <v Vince>Can I ask naive question?</v>
```

- $852\ 00:48:58.050 --> 00:48:59.910 < v$ Professor Liu>Yes, Vince.</v>
- 853 00:48:59.910 --> 00:49:03.660 <
v Vince>So I'm wondering kind of, you know,</v>
- 854 00:49:03.660 --> 00:49:05.640 when I think about doing SVP on data,
- $855\ 00:49:05.640 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.921$ the first thing that I think of is easier
- 856 00:49:08.921 --> 00:49:12.870 and I keep coming back to that,
- 857 00:49:12.870 --> 00:49:15.563 and I can't tell if there's a relationship?
- $858\ 00:49:16.560 --> 00:49:18.720 < v$ Professor Liu>Yeah, basically, right, </v>
- 859 00:49:18.720 --> 00:49:22.105 we can generate U and V in many ways, right?
- 860 00:49:22.105 --> 00:49:23.986 We can using regression model,
- $861\ 00:49:23.986 \longrightarrow 00:49:26.790$ we can generate the U and V as well, right?
- $862\ 00:49:26.790 \longrightarrow 00:49:28.803$ We can generate, we can do a,
- $863\ 00:49:30.090 \longrightarrow 00:49:31.980$ so it's basically, I think a lot of inhibition
- $864\ 00{:}49{:}31.980 \longrightarrow 00{:}49{:}34.230$ is that the right score can generate the left and right
- $865~00{:}49{:}34.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}36.600$ singular vectors, so we can use many different ways
- $866\ 00:49:36.600 \longrightarrow 00:49:37.473$ to generate that.
- 867 00:49:38.940 --> 00:49:40.453 Yeah, it's not really.
- 868 00:49:40.453 --> 00:49:41.367 <v Robert>Thank you for that.</v>
- $869\ 00:49:41.367 --> 00:49:43.320$ All right, well then, if there's nothing further,
- $870\ 00:49:43.320 \longrightarrow 00:49:45.470$ let's thank the teacher again.
- 871 00:49:45.470 --> 00:49:46.770 <-v Professor Liu>Thank you everyone for having me on.</v>
- 872 00:49:50.803 --> 00:49:54.720 (students overlapping chatter)