

# A Risk Comparison of Ordinary Least Squares vs Ridge Regression

**Paramveer S. Dhillon**

DHILLON@CIS.UPENN.EDU

*Department of Computer and Information Science  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA*

**Dean P. Foster**

FOSTER@WHARTON.UPENN.EDU

*Department of Statistics  
Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA*

**Sham M. Kakade**

SKAKADE@MICROSOFT.COM

*Microsoft Research  
One Memorial Drive  
Cambridge, MA 02142, USA*

**Lyle H. Ungar**

UNGAR@CIS.UPENN.EDU

*Department of Computer and Information Science  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA*

**Editor:** Gabor Lugosi

## Abstract

We compare the risk of ridge regression to a simple variant of ordinary least squares, in which one simply projects the data onto a finite dimensional subspace (as specified by a principal component analysis) and then performs an ordinary (un-regularized) least squares regression in this subspace. This note shows that the risk of this ordinary least squares method (PCA-OLS) is within a constant factor (namely 4) of the risk of ridge regression (RR).

**Keywords:** risk inflation, ridge regression, pca

## 1. Introduction

Consider the fixed design setting where we have a set of  $n$  vectors  $\mathcal{X} = \{X_i\}$ , and let  $\mathbf{X}$  denote the matrix where the  $i^{th}$  row of  $\mathbf{X}$  is  $X_i$ . The observed label vector is  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Suppose that:

$$Y = \mathbf{X}\beta + \epsilon,$$

where  $\epsilon$  is independent noise in each coordinate, with the variance of  $\epsilon_i$  being  $\sigma^2$ .

The objective is to learn  $\mathbb{E}[Y] = \mathbf{X}\beta$ . The expected loss of a vector  $\beta$  estimator is:

$$L(\beta) = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}}[\|Y - \mathbf{X}\beta\|^2],$$

Let  $\hat{\beta}$  be an estimator of  $\beta$  (constructed with a sample  $Y$ ). Denoting

$$\Sigma := \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X},$$

we have that the risk (i.e., expected excess loss) is:

$$\text{Risk}(\hat{\beta}) := \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\beta}}[L(\hat{\beta}) - L(\beta)] = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\beta}}\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{\Sigma}^2,$$

where  $\|x\|_{\Sigma} = x^T \Sigma x$  and where the expectation is with respect to the randomness in  $Y$ .

We show that a simple variant of ordinary (un-regularized) least squares always compares favorably to ridge regression (as measured by the risk). This observation is based on the following bias variance decomposition:

$$\text{Risk}(\hat{\beta}) = \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\beta} - \bar{\beta}\|_{\Sigma}^2}_{\text{Variance}} + \underbrace{\|\bar{\beta} - \beta\|_{\Sigma}^2}_{\text{Prediction Bias}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\bar{\beta} = \mathbb{E}[\hat{\beta}]$ .

### 1.1 The Risk of Ridge Regression (RR)

Ridge regression or Tikhonov Regularization (Tikhonov, 1963) penalizes the  $\ell_2$  norm of a parameter vector  $\beta$  and “shrinks” it towards zero, penalizing large values more. The estimator is:

$$\hat{\beta}_{\lambda} = \underset{\beta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{\|Y - \mathbf{X}\beta\|^2 + \lambda\|\beta\|^2\}.$$

The closed form estimate is then:

$$\hat{\beta}_{\lambda} = (\Sigma + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}^T Y \right).$$

Note that

$$\hat{\beta}_0 = \hat{\beta}_{\lambda=0} = \underset{\beta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{\|Y - \mathbf{X}\beta\|^2\},$$

is the ordinary least squares estimator.

Without loss of generality, rotate  $\mathbf{X}$  such that:

$$\Sigma = \operatorname{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p),$$

where the  $\lambda_i$ 's are ordered in decreasing order.

To see the nature of this shrinkage observe that:

$$[\hat{\beta}_{\lambda}]_j := \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j + \lambda} [\hat{\beta}_0]_j,$$

where  $\hat{\beta}_0$  is the ordinary least squares estimator.

Using the bias-variance decomposition, (Equation 1), we have that:

**Lemma 1**

$$\text{Risk}(\hat{\beta}_{\lambda}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \sum_j \left( \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j + \lambda} \right)^2 + \sum_j \beta_j^2 \frac{\lambda_j}{(1 + \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda})^2}.$$

The proof is straightforward and is provided in the appendix.

## 2. Ordinary Least Squares with PCA (PCA-OLS)

Now let us construct a simple estimator based on  $\lambda$ . Note that our rotated coordinate system where  $\Sigma$  is equal to  $\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p)$  corresponds the PCA coordinate system.

Consider the following ordinary least squares estimator on the “top” PCA subspace — it uses the least squares estimate on coordinate  $j$  if  $\lambda_j \geq \lambda$  and 0 otherwise

$$[\hat{\beta}_{PCA,\lambda}]_j = \begin{cases} [\hat{\beta}_0]_j & \text{if } \lambda_j \geq \lambda \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

The following claim shows this estimator compares favorably to the ridge estimator (for every  $\lambda$ )— no matter how the  $\lambda$  is chosen e.g., using cross validation or any other strategy.

Our main theorem (Theorem 2) bounds the Risk Ratio/Risk Inflation<sup>1</sup> of the PCA-OLS and the RR estimators.

**Theorem 2** (*Bounded Risk Inflation*) *For all  $\lambda \geq 0$ , we have that:*

$$0 \leq \frac{\text{Risk}(\hat{\beta}_{PCA,\lambda})}{\text{Risk}(\hat{\beta}_\lambda)} \leq 4,$$

*and the left hand inequality is tight.*

**Proof** Using the bias variance decomposition of the risk we can write the risk as:

$$\text{Risk}(\hat{\beta}_{PCA,\lambda}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \sum_j \mathbb{1}_{\lambda_j \geq \lambda} + \sum_{j: \lambda_j < \lambda} \lambda_j \beta_j^2.$$

The first term represents the variance and the second the bias.

The ridge regression risk is given by Lemma 1. We now show that the  $j^{\text{th}}$  term in the expression for the PCA risk is within a factor 4 of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  term of the ridge regression risk. First, let’s consider the case when  $\lambda_j \geq \lambda$ , then the ratio of  $j^{\text{th}}$  terms is:

$$\frac{\frac{\sigma^2}{n}}{\frac{\sigma^2}{n} \left( \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j + \lambda} \right)^2 + \beta_j^2 \frac{\lambda_j}{(1 + \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda})^2}} \leq \frac{\frac{\sigma^2}{n}}{\frac{\sigma^2}{n} \left( \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j + \lambda} \right)^2} = \left( 1 + \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_j} \right)^2 \leq 4.$$

Similarly, if  $\lambda_j < \lambda$ , the ratio of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  terms is:

$$\frac{\lambda_j \beta_j^2}{\frac{\sigma^2}{n} \left( \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j + \lambda} \right)^2 + \beta_j^2 \frac{\lambda_j}{(1 + \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda})^2}} \leq \frac{\lambda_j \beta_j^2}{\frac{\lambda_j \beta_j^2}{(1 + \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda})^2}} = \left( 1 + \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda} \right)^2 \leq 4.$$

Since, each term is within a factor of 4 the proof is complete. ■

It is worth noting that the converse is not true and the ridge regression estimator (RR) can be arbitrarily worse than the PCA-OLS estimator. An example which shows that the left hand inequality is tight is given in the Appendix.

---

1. Risk Inflation has also been used as a criterion for evaluating feature selection procedures (Foster and George, 1994).

### 3. Experiments

First, we generated synthetic data with  $p = 100$  and varying values of  $n = \{20, 50, 80, 110\}$ . The data was generated in a fixed design setting as  $Y = \mathbf{X}\beta + \epsilon$  where  $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n$ . Furthermore,  $\mathbf{X}_{n \times p} \sim \text{MVN}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$  where  $\text{MVN}(\mu, \Sigma)$  is the Multivariate Normal Distribution with mean vector  $\mu$ , variance-covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  and  $\beta_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, p$ .

The results are shown in Figure 1. As can be seen, the risk ratio of PCA (PCA-OLS) and ridge regression (RR) is never worse than 4 and often its better than 1 as dictated by Theorem 2.

Next, we chose two real world datasets, namely USPS ( $n=1500, p=241$ ) and BCI ( $n=400, p=117$ )<sup>2</sup>.

Since we do not know the true model for these datasets, we used all the  $n$  observations to fit an OLS regression and used it as an estimate of the true parameter  $\beta$ . This is a reasonable approximation to the true parameter as we estimate the ridge regression (RR) and PCA-OLS models on a small subset of these observations. Next we choose a random subset of the observations, namely  $0.2 \times p$ ,  $0.5 \times p$  and  $0.8 \times p$  to fit the ridge regression (RR) and PCA-OLS models.

The results are shown in Figure 2. As can be seen, the risk ratio of PCA-OLS to ridge regression (RR) is again within a factor of 4 and often PCA-OLS is better i.e., the ratio  $< 1$ .

### 4. Conclusion

We showed that the risk inflation of a particular ordinary least squares estimator (on the “top” PCA subspace) is within a factor 4 of the ridge estimator. It turns out the converse is not true — this PCA estimator may be arbitrarily better than the ridge one.

### Appendix A.

#### Proof of Lemma 1.

**Proof** We analyze the bias-variance decomposition in Equation 1. For the variance,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_Y \|\hat{\beta}_\lambda - \bar{\beta}_\lambda\|_\Sigma^2 &= \sum_j \lambda_j \mathbb{E}_Y ([\hat{\beta}_\lambda]_j - [\bar{\beta}_\lambda]_j)^2 \\
&= \sum_j \frac{\lambda_j}{(\lambda_j + \lambda)^2} \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \mathbb{E}[Y_i]) [X_i]_j \sum_{i'=1}^n (Y_{i'}' - \mathbb{E}[Y_{i'}']) [X_{i'}']_j \right] \\
&= \sum_j \frac{\lambda_j}{(\lambda_j + \lambda)^2} \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(Y_i) [X_i]_j^2 \\
&= \sum_j \frac{\lambda_j}{(\lambda_j + \lambda)^2} \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [X_i]_j^2 \\
&= \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \sum_j \frac{\lambda_j^2}{(\lambda_j + \lambda)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

---

2. The details about the datasets can be found here: <http://olivier.chapelle.cc/ssl-book/benchmarks.html>.




Figure 1: Plots showing the risk ratio as a function of  $\lambda$ , the regularization parameter and  $n$ , for the synthetic dataset.  $p=100$  in all the cases. The error bars correspond to one standard deviation for 100 such random trials.




Figure 2: Plots showing the risk ratio as a function of  $\lambda$ , the regularization parameter and  $n$ , for two real world datasets (BCI and USPS-top to bottom).

Similarly, for the bias,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\bar{\beta}_\lambda - \beta\|_\Sigma^2 &= \sum_j \lambda_j ([\bar{\beta}_\lambda]_j - [\beta]_j)^2 \\
 &= \sum_j \beta_j^2 \lambda_j \left( \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j + \lambda} - 1 \right)^2 \\
 &= \sum_j \beta_j^2 \frac{\lambda_j}{(1 + \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda})^2},
 \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. ■

**The risk for RR can be arbitrarily worse than the PCA-OLS estimator.**

Consider the standard OLS setting described in Section 1 in which  $\mathbf{X}$  is  $n \times p$  matrix and  $Y$  is a  $n \times 1$  vector.

Let  $\mathbf{X} = \text{diag}(\sqrt{1+\alpha}, 1, \dots, 1)$ , then  $\Sigma = \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} = \text{diag}(1+\alpha, 1, \dots, 1)$  for some  $(\alpha > 0)$  and also choose  $\beta = [2 + \alpha, 0, \dots, 0]$ . For convenience let's also choose  $\sigma^2 = n$ .

Then, using Lemma 1, we get the risk of RR estimator as

$$\text{Risk}(\hat{\beta}_\lambda) = \underbrace{\left( \frac{1+\alpha}{1+\alpha+\lambda} \right)^2}_{\text{I}} + \underbrace{\frac{(p-1)}{(1+\lambda)^2}}_{\text{II}} + \underbrace{(2+\alpha)^2 \times \frac{(1+\alpha)}{(1+\frac{1+\alpha}{\lambda})^2}}_{\text{III}}.$$

Let's consider two cases

- **Case 1:**  $\lambda < (p-1)^{1/3} - 1$ , then  $II > (p-1)^{1/3}$ .
- **Case 2:**  $\lambda > 1$ , then  $1 + \frac{1+\alpha}{\lambda} < 2 + \alpha$ , hence  $III > (1+\alpha)$ .

Combining these two cases we get  $\forall \lambda, \text{Risk}(\hat{\beta}_\lambda) > \min((p-1)^{1/3}, (1+\alpha))$ . If we choose  $p$  such that  $p-1 = (1+\alpha)^3$ , then  $\text{Risk}(\hat{\beta}_\lambda) > (1+\alpha)$ .

The PCA-OLS risk (From Theorem 2) is:

$$\text{Risk}(\hat{\beta}_{PCA,\lambda}) = \sum_j \mathbb{1}_{\lambda_j \geq \lambda} + \sum_{j: \lambda_j < \lambda} \lambda_j \beta_j^2.$$

Considering  $\lambda \in (1, 1+\alpha)$ , the first term will contribute 1 to the risk and rest everything will be 0. So the risk of PCA-OLS is 1 and the risk ratio is

$$\frac{\text{Risk}(\hat{\beta}_{PCA,\lambda})}{\text{Risk}(\hat{\beta}_\lambda)} \leq \frac{1}{(1+\alpha)}.$$

Now, for large  $\alpha$ , the risk ratio  $\approx 0$ .

## References

- D. P. Foster and E. I. George. The risk inflation criterion for multiple regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1947–1975, 1994.
- A. N. Tikhonov. Solution of incorrectly formulated problems and the regularization method. *Soviet Math Dokl* 4, pages 501–504, 1963.