

PATHOLOGICAL REGULARIZATION REGIMES IN CLASSIFICATION TASKS

MAXIMILIAN WIESMANN AND PAUL LARSEN

ABSTRACT. In this paper we demonstrate the possibility of a trend reversal in binary classification tasks between the dataset and a classification score obtained from a trained model. This trend reversal occurs for certain choices of the regularization parameter for model training, namely, if the parameter is contained in what we call the *pathological regularization regime*. For ridge regression, we give necessary and sufficient algebraic conditions on the dataset for the existence of a pathological regularization regime. Moreover, our results provide a data science practitioner with a hands-on tool to avoid hyperparameter choices suffering from trend reversal. We furthermore present numerical results on pathological regularization regimes for logistic regression. Finally, we draw connections to datasets exhibiting Simpson’s paradox, providing a natural source of pathological datasets.

Keywords. Ridge Regression, Logistic Regression, Simpson’s Paradox, Pathological Datasets

MSC2020. 62J07, 62J12, 62R07

1. INTRODUCTION

While adversarial datasets are hand-crafted examples designed to trick a machine learning algorithm (see for example in [GSS14]), naturally occurring datasets can similarly confuse these algorithms. These datasets would affect unsuspecting data scientists with the bad luck to be given a prediction or classification task for such a dataset. Rather than an attack by an adversary, such datasets would more closely resemble diseases that can be avoided or whose impact can be mitigated, hence we refer to them as “pathological” datasets.

In this paper, we demonstrate a family of binary classification random processes that are pathological for ridge and logistic regression. For ridge regression, we give precise, algebraic conditions for a dataset to be pathological. More precisely, for any three-dimensional binary dataset, we give an exact range of regularization hyperparameters that result in the fitted classification algorithm getting the data trends exactly wrong.

Datasets showing this pathological behavior occur with positive probability. Moreover, there exists an intriguing connection to Simpson’s paradox: the proportion of pathological datasets among those exhibiting Simpson’s paradox is particularly high. In the case of logistic regression we even conjecture that all Simpson datasets are pathological.

It should be noted that Simpson’s paradox does occur in nature, for example in university admissions [BHO75], clinical trials [AKSST92] and death-penalty judgments [ND15]. Note that these domains—access to education, medical research and judicial decisions—all fall under “high risk AI” as defined by the EU’s AI Act [Eur21].

MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS IN THE SCIENCES, INSELSTR. 22,
04103 LEIPZIG, GERMANY

FODOJ GMBH, PRINZREGENTENSTRASSE 54, 80538 MUNICH, GERMANY

E-mail addresses: wiesmann@mis.mpg.de, paul@mkdev.me.

1.1. Illustrating Example. We illustrate our findings in the following fictitious example of loan default prediction: given a bank loan, what is the probability that the customer will default, i.e. not repay the loan? A real-world example is presented in §3.3.

Logistic regression is the main approach to default prediction [CO13]; we will consider it in §4. Ridge regression is less common, but has the benefit of more interpretable feature importance; this is the setup for our main theoretical results in §3.

We take the simple setup of two binary features, gender and occupation group. Example counts of default outcomes by the four subpopulation groups are shown in the following contingency table:

Gender	Occupation Group	Default	
		No	Yes
Female	A	15	15
	B	10	14
Male	A	16	5
	B	27	8

Though an artificial example, we nevertheless explain its connection to actual default prediction practice. Regarding occupation groups, it is a common practice, especially in the face of smaller sample sizes, to reduce the cardinality of categorical values by binning them into a smaller number of statistically coherent groups. About gender, in the EU and United States, financial institutions are prohibited from explicitly using gender in making loan decisions [Eur04]. Nevertheless, practitioners can and do use proxy variables to reconstruct gender even when absent from a dataset [Fra23].

To obtain information about causes of default one might wish to perform a ridge regression on this dataset (see §2.2 for a detailed description of the setup). Ridge regression depends on a choice of regularization parameter c . This choice is notoriously difficult, see e.g. [HTF09, §7]. We show that a wrong choice can actually lead to dramatically wrong conclusions. Suppose one chooses $c = 5$. Using the encoding described in §2.1 with $X_1 = 0$ denoting female, $X_2 = 1$ denoting the occupation category B etc., one obtains regression coefficients (see (2) below)

$$\hat{\beta} \approx (0.023 \quad 0.331)^T.$$

For a classification output we compute a *trend indicator* with respect to the first variable X_1 , similar to the relative risk, as described in §2.4:

$$\mathcal{T}_{X_2=j} = (0 \ j) \cdot \hat{\beta} - (1 \ j) \cdot \hat{\beta} \approx -2.31\%,$$

The trend indicator being below zero suggests that in both occupation groups females are less likely to cause default events. However, this conclusion is at least questionable, if not wrong. For example, running ordinary linear regression with least squares minimization one obtains

$$\hat{\beta}_{MLS} = (-0.001 \quad 0.374)^T,$$

leading to a positive trend indicator $\mathcal{T}_{X_2=j} \approx 0.1\%$, suggesting that females are more likely to cause default. This coincides with the trend in the dataset itself.

We have seen that a bad choice for the regularization parameter leads to a wrong conclusion in a binary classification. In fact, one would obtain the wrong conclusion for




FIGURE 1. The trend indicator from the credit score example with respect to the regularization parameter c . The interval marked in red is the pathological regularization regime.

any $c > \frac{3}{13} \approx 0.23$. We call the interval $(\frac{3}{13}, \infty)$ the pathological regularization regime \mathcal{P}_2 for this dataset. An informal definition follows, with a precise definition in §2.5.

Definition 1 (informal). A *pathological regularization regime* for a given dataset and a choice of regularized regression model is a set of regularization parameters such that for any such parameter, the trend obtained from the regression is reversed compared to the “true trend” of the dataset.

In our main result, Theorem 10, we give an easily verifiable if-and-only-if condition for a dataset arising from a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ contingency table to have a non-empty pathological regularization regime for ridge regression and, if existent, precisely specify it. This result should be seen as a warning to data science practitioners: one should not choose a regularization parameter contained in the pathological regularization regime.

It should be noted that the case of $2 \times 2 \times 2$ contingency tables is the smallest case in which pathological regularization regimes occur. However, it is not restricted to this case, the phenomenon also appears for higher dimensional data. See §3.4 for a discussion on this.

In §3.3 we study how likely it is to stumble upon such datasets with pathological regularization regimes in practice and draw connections to Simpson’s paradox: Conjecture 16 posits that every dataset exhibiting Simpson’s paradox is pathological for logistic regression with intercept.

Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- definition of pathological regularization regimes (§2.5);
- proof of existence and characterization of pathological regularization regimes for ridge regression with and without intercept (§3.1 & §3.2);
- study probability of occurrence of pathological regularization regimes and relations to Simpson’s paradox (§3.3);
- conjecture that all Simpson datasets have pathological regularization regimes for logistic regression; this is supported by numerical evidence (§4).

1.2. **Prior Work.** Using regression for classification tasks is a well-studied subject, see for example [HP03, KB14, NTB10] for linear regression and [DOM02, LRC+03, NJ01] for logistic regression. Some work can be found on how regularization influences the regression, e.g. [SAH19]. However, to the best of our knowledge, there does not exist any work on how regularization causes trend reversals in classification tasks similar

to Simpson’s paradox [Sim51]. In [CBH09] the authors study a trend reversal between (unregularized) direct and reverse linear regression and relate it to Simpson’s paradox. The blog post [Pro18] also demonstrates potential pathologies along regularization curves for ridge regression.

A key ingredient in our analysis is the study of non-monotonicity of regularization paths. While it is widely known that regularization paths need not be monotone, see e.g. [vW15, §1.3], we are not aware of any precise analysis when and where non-monotonicity occurs.

In the case of ℓ^1 -regularization, discontinuities of regularization paths or their derivatives have been studied, e.g. to find good regularization parameters [SNMM⁺07] or to determine the complexity of learning algorithms [BTJ04]; note that in this paper we consider ℓ^2 -regularization and thus regularization paths will be smooth.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We first explain how to encode a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ contingency table into a design matrix X and a response variable Y suitable for application of regression (§2.1). Fundamentals of ridge regression are presented in §2.2, basics of logistic regression are recalled in §2.3. Finally, in §2.4 we introduce the trend indicator, converting the regression output into a score practical for classification.

2.1. Data. In this work we are concerned with binary classification problems for two binary subpopulations. The input data is presented as a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ contingency table D . Let N be the sample size, i.e. the sum of all entries in D . Then we can also represent the data D as a tuple (Y, X) where Y is an N -dimensional vector, referred to as *response variable*, and X is an $N \times 2$ matrix, called *design matrix*.

To pass from D to (Y, X) an *encoding* is needed. In the forthcoming we will use the following encoding: let the entries of D be labeled by $(i, j, k) \in \{0, 1\}^3$. If the (i, j, k) th entry of D is d , this will be encoded by d entries of i in Y and d rows of (j, k) in X . An example for such an encoding would be as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c|cc}
 \hline
 X_1 & X_2 & Y = 0 & Y = 1 \\
 \hline
 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 \\
 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
 1 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\
 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
 \hline
 \end{array}
 \quad \xrightarrow{\text{encoding}} \quad
 \begin{array}{l}
 Y = (0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1)^T \\
 X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^T.
 \end{array}$$

Note, however, that all the results in this paper also hold true if we replace the $(0, 1)$ -encoding by an (a, b) -encoding for positive real numbers $a \neq b$.

2.2. Ridge Regression. Ridge regression is a version of linear regression introducing a penalization term for the parameters to prevent overfitting [HTF09, §3.4.1]. Concretely, assume that the design matrix X is of size $N \times p$ and Y is an N -dimensional response variable; the *regression estimator* is a p -dimensional vector $\hat{\beta}$ solving the optimization problem

$$(1) \quad \hat{\beta}(c) = \underset{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p}{\operatorname{argmin}} \ ||Y - X\beta||_2^2 + c||\beta||_2^2.$$




FIGURE 2. Two typical examples of regularization paths. In general, regularization paths need not be monotone; this leads to pathological regularization regimes.

Here, $c \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is the *regularization parameter* controlling the strength of the regularization. In the limit case $c \rightarrow 0$, ridge regression becomes ordinary linear regression. There exists the following well-known closed form solution for $\hat{\beta}$, see e.g. [HTF09, (3.44)].

Proposition 2. *The ridge regression estimator is given by*

$$(2) \quad \hat{\beta}(c) = (X^T X + c \mathbf{1}_p)^{-1} X^T Y,$$

where $\mathbf{1}_p$ denotes the $p \times p$ identity matrix.

The following concept is of central importance to this paper.

Definition 3. The *regularization paths* for a ridge regression with design matrix X and response variable Y are the functions $\hat{\beta}_i: \mathbb{R}_{>0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $c \mapsto \hat{\beta}_i(c)$ for $i = 1, \dots, p$.

The limit behavior of regularization paths is well-known, see e.g. [HTF09, §3.4.1].

Lemma 4. *The limits of the regularization paths are given by*

$$\lim_{c \downarrow 0} \hat{\beta}(c) = \hat{\beta}_{MLS} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}(c) = 0,$$

where $\hat{\beta}_{MLS}$ is the minimum least squares estimator, the sum-of-squares minimizer of minimal length, i.e.

$$\hat{\beta}_{MLS} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \|Y - X\beta\|_2^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{\beta}_{MLS}\|_2^2 < \|\beta\|_2^2$$

for all β with $\|Y - X\beta\|_2^2 = \|Y - X\hat{\beta}_{MLS}\|_2^2$.

Oftentimes, regularization paths have the shape as the ones displayed in Figure 2 (or mirrored along the c -axis). However, it is *not* always the case that regularization paths are monotone. This non-monotonicity is the reason behind the existence of pathological regularization regimes (see §2.5).

One might introduce an *intercept term* into the regression, as is for example done in the standard implementation of ridge regression in the `scikit-learn` Python library

[skl]. This amounts to centralizing the data [HTF09, §3.4.1]. Our main results also extend to ridge regression with intercept; we make this precise in §3.2. For simplicity, if not otherwise mentioned, we use ridge regression without intercept.

2.3. Logistic Regression. In §4 we will consider logistic regression; therefore, let us briefly recall the basics. See for instance [FHT10, §3] for more details.

The logit model is of the form

$$f(X') = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-(\beta_0 + \beta \cdot X'))},$$

where in our case X' is a 2-dimensional vector, β is a 2-dimensional parameter and $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ is the intercept term. For an $N \times 2$ input matrix X and an N -dimensional response variable Y as obtained in §2.1, the intercept and parameter estimates $\hat{\beta}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}$ are given by the maximum likelihood estimate

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\beta}_0(c), \hat{\beta}(c)) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^2} & -\frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N Y_j \log \left(\frac{1}{1 + \exp(-(\beta_0 + \beta \cdot X_j^T))} \right) \right) \\ & + (1 - Y_j) \log \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-(\beta_0 + \beta \cdot X_j^T))} \right) \Big) + c \|\beta\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where X_j denotes the j^{th} row of X . Here, we are using again an ℓ^2 -regularization scaled by c . Note that, contrary to ridge regression, there does not exist a general closed form solution for the parameter estimate.

2.4. Trend Indicator. To use regression models for binary classification, we interpret its outputs as a score indicative of an input vector X belonging to target output Y . The trend indicator is the difference between the scores obtained from distinct binary inputs. In an application, one can infer from the trend indicator statements of the form “subgroup A is more likely to cause Y than subgroup B”.

More concretely, let (Y, X) be a dataset obtained from a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ contingency table, representing binary random variables X_1, X_2 and Y , as in §2.1. For a regression model f_β with weights β , let $\hat{\beta}$ be the weight estimate. For binary input events $(X_1 = j, X_2 = k)$, we obtain a score by evaluating $f_{\hat{\beta}}$ at the vector $(j \ k)^T$ and denote it by $f_{\hat{\beta}}(X_1 = j, X_2 = k)$.

Definition 5. The *trend indicator* for the input event $X_i = j$ (for $i \in \{1, 2\}$) is

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{T}_{X_i=j} := f_{\hat{\beta}}(X_i = j, X_{\bar{i}} = 0) - f_{\hat{\beta}}(X_i = j, X_{\bar{i}} = 1).$$

Here, \bar{i} denotes the value in $\{1, 2\}$ different from i .

Remark 6. If the parameter estimate $\hat{\beta}$ depends on a regularization parameter c we emphasize this dependency in the trend indicator by writing

$$\mathcal{T}_{X_i=j}(c) = f_{\hat{\beta}(c)}(X_i = j, X_{\bar{i}} = 0) - f_{\hat{\beta}(c)}(X_i = j, X_{\bar{i}} = 1).$$

Remark 7. In the case of ridge regression, the trend indicator simplifies as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{X_1=j}(c) &= (j \ 0)^T \cdot \hat{\beta}(c) - (j \ 1)^T \cdot \hat{\beta}(c) = -\hat{\beta}_2(c) \\ \mathcal{T}_{X_2=j}(c) &= (0 \ j)^T \cdot \hat{\beta}(c) - (1 \ j)^T \cdot \hat{\beta}(c) = -\hat{\beta}_1(c). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the trend indicator does not depend on the specific input j , and we might simply write \mathcal{T}_i instead of $\mathcal{T}_{X_i=j}$.

2.5. Pathological Regularization Regimes. In this subsection we define the main object of this paper, the pathological regularization regime. The idea is that for a hyperparameter choice in this regime there will occur a trend reversal between the trained model and the actual dataset.

Let $\hat{\beta}(c)$ be a model estimate with regularization parameter c ; for the purpose of this paper, this will either be ridge or logistic regression with ℓ^2 -regularization scaled by c . In the limit case, $\lim_{c \downarrow 0} \hat{\beta}(c)$, the estimate approaches the model estimate without regularization, i.e. linear regression or ordinary logistic regression, confer Lemma 4. The trend in this limit case, as obtained from the trend indicator (3), is what we refer to as the *true trend*. Note that, by consistency of the estimates for linear and logistic regression (see [Moo50, §3.3]), for large enough datasets the true trend should coincide with the trend directly obtained from the dataset.

Definition 8. Given a dataset (Y, X) obtained from a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ contingency table, the *pathological regularization regime* $\mathcal{P}_{i,j}$ for the outcome $X_i = j$ (for $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$) is the (possibly empty) subset $\mathcal{P}_{i,j} \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that for any $c \in \mathcal{P}_{i,j}$, the sign of the trend indicator $\text{sgn}(\mathcal{T}_{X_i=j}(c))$ is reversed compared to the true trend $\text{sgn}(\lim_{c \downarrow 0} \mathcal{T}_{X_i=j}(c'))$.

We say that the dataset (Y, X) has a pathological regularization regime if there exist $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $\mathcal{P}_{i,j}$ is non-empty. For ridge regression, the trend indicators do not depend on j (see Remark 7) and we omit it from notation by simply writing \mathcal{P}_i .

3. MAIN RESULTS

We first give an if-and-only-if condition on the existence of a pathological regularization regime for ridge regression and, if existent, describe it precisely in §3.1. In §3.3 we explain how the probability to observe pathological regularization regimes and their range change with the sample size and draw a connection to Simpson's paradox.

3.1. Existence and Description of Pathological Regularization Regimes. The following Lemma is the crucial ingredient in proving Theorem 10.

Lemma 9. *Let X be an $N \times 2$ design matrix and let Y be an N -dimensional response variable. The regularization path $\hat{\beta}_i$ for a ridge regression on (Y, X) has a positive zero if and only if the inequality*

$$(4) \quad \left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,1} x_{j,2} \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,\bar{i}} y_j \right) > \left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,\bar{i}}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,i} y_j \right)$$

is satisfied. In this case, the zero is given by

$$(5) \quad \left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,i} y_j \right)^{-1} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,1} x_{j,2} \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,\bar{i}} y_j \right) - \left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,\bar{i}}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,i} y_j \right) \right],$$

and, moreover, $\hat{\beta}_i$ has a unique positive critical point. Here, \bar{i} denotes the value in $\{1, 2\}$ different from i .

Proof. To simplify notation, any sum will range over $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Expanding the expression (2) for the parameter estimate, we get

$$\hat{\beta}(c) = \frac{1}{D(c)} \left(c \left(\sum x_{j,1} y_j \right) + \left(\sum x_{j,2}^2 \right) \left(\sum x_{j,1} y_j \right) - \left(\sum x_{j,1} x_{j,2} \right) \left(\sum x_{j,2} y_j \right) \right),$$




FIGURE 3. The shape of a regularization path satisfying inequality (4) according to Lemmas 4 and 9. The regime marked in red contributes to pathological behavior.

where $D(c) = c^2 + c(\sum x_{j,1}^2 + x_{j,2}^2) + (\sum x_{j,1}^2)(\sum x_{j,2}^2) - (\sum x_{j,1}x_{j,2})^2$. As all entries of X and Y are non-negative, we see that $\hat{\beta}_i(c)$ has a unique positive root if and only if (4) is satisfied. Clearly, this root is given by (5). Moreover, we find that $\frac{\partial \hat{\beta}_i(c)}{\partial c} = 0$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} & c^2 \left(-\sum x_{j,i}y_j \right) + 2c \left[\left(\sum x_{j,1}x_{j,2} \right) \left(\sum x_{j,\bar{i}}y_j \right) - \left(\sum x_{j,\bar{i}}^2 \right) \left(\sum x_{j,i}y_j \right) \right] \\ & + \left(\sum x_{j,i}y_j \right) \left[\left(\sum x_{j,1}^2 \right) \left(\sum x_{j,2}^2 \right) - \left(\sum x_{j,1}x_{j,2} \right)^2 \right] \\ & - \left(\sum x_{j,1}^2 + x_{j,2}^2 \right) \left[\left(\sum x_{j,1}x_{j,2} \right) \left(-\sum x_{j,\bar{i}}y_j \right) + \left(\sum x_{j,\bar{i}}^2 \right) \left(\sum x_{j,i}y_j \right) \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

For non-negative data, the leading coefficient is always negative. The linear coefficient is positive if and only if (4) is satisfied. In this case, the constant term is also positive, by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality applied to the first constant term. Hence, by Descartes’ Rule of Signs [Des37], this quadratic equation has precisely one positive root if and only if (4) is satisfied which concludes the claim. \square

Figure 3 describes what a regularization path obtained from a dataset satisfying inequality (4) heuristically looks like.

Theorem 10. *Binary classification ridge regression on data (Y, X) has a pathological regularization regime if and only if there exists $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that*

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,1}x_{j,2} \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,\bar{i}}y_j \right) > \left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,\bar{i}}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,i}y_j \right).$$

In this case, the pathological regularization regime \mathcal{P}_i is given by $\mathcal{P}_i = (\gamma, \infty)$ with

$$\gamma = \left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,i}y_j \right)^{-1} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,1}x_{j,2} \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,\bar{i}}y_j \right) - \left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,\bar{i}}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,i}y_j \right) \right].$$

Proof. The trend indicator $\mathcal{T}_i(c) = -\hat{\beta}_i(c)$ exhibits a trend reversal if and only if there exists a regularization parameter regime $\mathcal{P}_i \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that if $c \in \mathcal{P}_i$ then

$$(6) \quad \text{sgn}(\hat{\beta}_i(c)) = -\text{sgn}\left(\lim_{c' \downarrow 0} \hat{\beta}_i(c')\right),$$

where sgn is the sign function. This implies the existence of a positive root γ of $\hat{\beta}_i(c)$. By Lemma 9, such a zero implies the existence of a unique critical point. From the limit behavior in Lemma 4 we conclude that this critical point must be contained in (γ, ∞) . Hence, there must be a unique sign change of $\hat{\beta}_i$. Therefore, the sign change (6) is equivalent to the existence of a positive root of $\hat{\beta}_i$. The rest of the statement is then a direct consequence of Lemma 9. \square

3.2. Ridge Regression with Intercept. It is common practice to introduce an *intercept* β_0 into the regression so that the model becomes $Y = X\beta + (\beta_0 \ \beta_0 \cdots \beta_0)^T$. Typically, this intercept is not penalized in the ridge regression. The estimate can then be expressed as follows, see [HTF09, §3.4.1]: the intercept estimate is $\hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{y} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N y_j$. The remaining parameters get estimated via the closed form expression for ridge regression without intercept (2), replacing the entries of X with centered inputs $x_{j,i} \mapsto \tilde{x}_{j,i} := x_{j,i} - \sum_{j'=1}^N x_{j',i}$. Note that no longer all $\tilde{x}_{j,i}$ need to be positive. However, we can modify Theorem 10 as follows.

Theorem 10'. *Binary classification ridge regression with intercept on data (Y, X) has a pathological regularization regime if and only if there exists $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that*

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{x}_{j,i} y_j\right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{x}_{j,1} \tilde{x}_{j,2}\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{x}_{j,\bar{i}} y_j\right) > \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{x}_{j,i} y_j\right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{x}_{j,\bar{i}}^2\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{x}_{j,i} y_j\right).$$

In this case, the pathological regularization regime \mathcal{P}_i is given by $\mathcal{P}_i = (\gamma, \infty)$ with

$$\gamma = \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{x}_{j,i} y_j\right)^{-1} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{x}_{j,1} \tilde{x}_{j,2}\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{x}_{j,\bar{i}} y_j\right) - \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{x}_{j,\bar{i}}^2\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{x}_{j,i} y_j\right) \right].$$

Here, $\tilde{x}_{j,i}$ denotes the centered entry of the design matrix. (Note that the inequality above is equivalent to the inequality in Theorem 10 except for a possible sign change caused by the factor $\sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{x}_{j,i} y_j$.)

Proof. Realizing that the trend indicator with intercept

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{X_1=j}(c) &= \left((j \ 0)^T \cdot \hat{\beta}(c) + \beta_0\right) - \left((j \ 1)^T \cdot \hat{\beta}(c) + \beta_0\right) = -\hat{\beta}_2(c) \\ \mathcal{T}_{X_2=j}(c) &= \left((0 \ j)^T \cdot \hat{\beta}(c) + \beta_0\right) - \left((1 \ j)^T \cdot \hat{\beta}(c) + \beta_0\right) = -\hat{\beta}_1(c). \end{aligned}$$

is equal to the trend indicator without intercept, the proof is analogous to the proofs of Lemma 9 and Theorem 10. \square

3.3. Sample Size and Simpson's Paradox. Two natural questions to consider are how likely it is to “stumble” over a dataset having a pathological regularization regime and whether this depends on the sample size N . We address these questions in this section. Moreover, we show how the pathological regularization regime changes with increasing sample size.

First note the following result.

Proposition 11. *If X and Y are matrices of size $N \times 2$ resp. $N \times 1$ with entries sampled from $\text{Ber}(0.5)$ then the probability that the dataset (Y, X) has a pathological regularization regime for ridge regression converges to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. Note that the expected value of $\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,1}x_{j,2}$ is $N/4$ whereas the expected value of $\sum_{j=1}^N x_{j,\bar{i}}^2$ is $N/2$. Then the result follows from Theorem 10 and the law of large numbers. \square

However, sampling the entries of X and Y randomly from $\{0, 1\}$ is *not* equivalent to sampling uniformly from $2 \times 2 \times 2$ contingency tables with a fixed sample size. We are now considering this setup.

Let

$$\mathcal{D}_N := \{(d_{ijk})_{ijk} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{2 \times 2 \times 2} \mid d_{+++} = N\}$$

be the set of all $2 \times 2 \times 2$ contingency tables with sample size N ; here, “+” denotes summation over all possible values for the respective index, e.g. $d_{0+1} = d_{001} + d_{011}$.

Theorem 12. *Let D be sampled uniformly from \mathcal{D}_N and let (Y, X) be the response variable and design matrix obtained from D . Then the probability that (Y, X) has a pathological regularization regime for ridge regression converges to a constant $\delta > 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.*

Remark 13. We numerically compute $\delta \approx 0.21$ via Monte Carlo simulation, see Figure 5.

Proof. W.l.o.g. we show the statement for the pathological regularization regime \mathcal{P}_2 . Rewriting inequality (4) in terms of D (for $i = 1$) leads to

$$d_{+11}d_{1+1} > d_{++1}d_{11+}.$$

Let $\bar{d}_{ijk} = \frac{d_{ijk}}{N}$ denote the normalized entries of D . For $N \rightarrow \infty$, the sampling process for \bar{d}_{ijk} weakly converges to a Dirichlet $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ distribution on the simplex (see [DGS17] for how to make this precise) and hence amounts to uniformly sampling a probability distribution $(p_{ijk})_{ijk}$ from the probability simplex

$$\Delta = \{(p_{ijk})_{ijk} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^8 \mid p_{+++} = 1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^8.$$

The quadratic equation $p_{+11}p_{1+1} - p_{++1}p_{11+} = 0$ cuts out a hypersurface inside \mathbb{R}^8 ; on one side of this hypersurface there will be all points $(p_{ijk})_{ijk}$ satisfying $p_{+11}p_{1+1} > p_{++1}p_{11+}$. We need to show that the intersection of this region with the probability simplex Δ is full-dimensional, i.e. has positive Lebesgue measure. But this is clear as for example a small enough ball around the empirical probability distribution from the introductory example in §1.1 will lie in this intersection. This shows $\delta > 0$. \square

While the probability to draw a dataset having a pathological regularization regime is constant with respect to the sample size, the regime typically shifts to the right, i.e. datasets with large sample sizes typically only show pathological regularization behavior for large regularization parameter, thus making it less likely one would accidentally choose such a bad parameter. In Figure 4 below we show the average value of γ , the left bound of the pathological regularization regime $\mathcal{P}_i = (\gamma, \infty)$, for different sample sizes.

In practical applications, the general heuristic is to prefer stronger regularization for smaller datasets, as the risk of overfitting is higher. Combined with the above observations, the danger of choosing a pathological regularization parameter is especially high for smaller datasets.




FIGURE 4. The average value of γ among 10^4 datasets uniformly drawn from \mathcal{D}_N having a pathological regularization regime.

Interestingly, if one only samples from datasets exhibiting *Simpson's paradox* the probability of obtaining a dataset having a pathological regularization regime is increased to $\sim 32\%$. This might seem surprising as the probability of sampling a probability distribution exhibiting Simpson's paradox is less than $\frac{1}{12}$, see [Had98].¹ However, it is well-known that datasets exhibiting Simpson's paradox appear frequently in practice, e.g. [AKSST92, BHO75, ND15, Wag82], thereby providing a natural source for datasets with pathological regularization regimes. Let us recall some basics of Simpson's paradox.

Let $p_{ijk} = \mathbb{P}(Y = i, X_1 = j, X_2 = k)$ be the joint probability distribution on three binary random variables Y, X_1 and X_2 . We say that $(p_{ijk})_{ijk}$ exhibits Simpson's paradox (or simply, is Simpson) if there is a trend reversal in the Y variable between all subpopulations and the overall population. More formally, $(p_{ijk})_{ijk}$ is Simpson if one of the following two sets of inequalities is satisfied:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} p_{101}p_{+00} - p_{100}p_{+01} < 0 \\ p_{111}p_{+10} - p_{110}p_{+11} < 0 \\ p_{1+1}p_{++0} - p_{1+0}p_{++1} > 0 \end{array} \right. \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} p_{101}p_{+00} - p_{100}p_{+01} > 0 \\ p_{111}p_{+10} - p_{110}p_{+11} > 0 \\ p_{1+1}p_{++0} - p_{1+0}p_{++1} < 0 \end{array} \right.$$

We say that a dataset (Y, X) exhibits Simpson's paradox if the corresponding empirical probabilities satisfy either of the sets of inequalities above.

By sampling datasets (Y, X) with different sample-sizes N with uniformly distributed entries from $\{0, 1\}$ and checking the Simpson inequalities above, we sample 10^5 datasets exhibiting Simpson's paradox for each sample size under consideration. For each of these datasets we apply Theorem 10 to check for the existence of a pathological regularization regime and observe the following (also see Figure 5).

Observation 14. *Among datasets exhibiting Simpson's paradox, the proportion of those having a pathological regularization regime stays constant at $\sim 32\%$ regardless of the sample size N .*

¹In fact, a Monte Carlo simulation shows that the probability is about 1.66%.




FIGURE 5. Proportion of datasets having pathological regularization regimes for different sample sizes if uniformly sampled from arbitrary contingency tables (orange) or from those exhibiting Simpson’s paradox (blue).

Hence, datasets exhibiting Simpson’s paradox provide a natural source for datasets with pathological regularization regimes. As it is commonly known that those datasets appear in practice, this should be seen as a warning that many real-world datasets might have pathological regularization regimes. We conclude this section with the following famous example taken from [Rad81].

The data summarizes death sentences in Florida counties between 1976 and 1977 depending on the race of the defendant and the victim.

Victim	Defendant	Death Penalty		Defendant	Death Penalty	
		No	Yes		No	Yes
White	White	132	19	White	141	19
	Black	52	11		Black	149
Black	White	9	0			
	Black	97	6			

For any race of the victim, white defendants are less likely to receive the death penalty (left table). However, when aggregated over the victims, white defendants are more likely to receive the death penalty. Hence, this is an instance of Simpson’s paradox. Indeed, this dataset also has a pathological regularization regime: from Theorem 10 we obtain that $\mathcal{P}_2 = (125\frac{5}{6}, \infty)$.

3.4. Beyond $2 \times 2 \times 2$ Contingency Tables. We emphasize that the consideration of $2 \times 2 \times 2$ contingency tables is merely for illustrative purposes and that pathological regularization regimes also exist in higher dimensional settings.

More concretely, consider a $p \times 2 \times 2$ contingency table D . This encodes the outcome of p binary random variables X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p and a binary random variable Y . From ridge




FIGURE 6. A regularization path arising from a $5 \times 2 \times 2$ contingency table; the pathological regularization regime (marked in red) is bounded.

regression, one now obtains p regularization paths $\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_2, \dots, \hat{\beta}_p$. Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$; it is now possible to define a trend indicator as follows: for $j \in J := \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{i\}$, specify outcomes $X_j = x_j$, where $x_j \in \{0, 1\}$. Then, for a regression model f_β with weights β and weight estimate $\hat{\beta}$, we define

$$\mathcal{T}_{\{X_j = x_j\}_{j \in J}}(c) := f_{\hat{\beta}(c)}(\{X_j = x_j\}_{j \in J}, X_i = 0) - f_{\hat{\beta}(c)}(\{X_j = x_j\}_{j \in J}, X_i = 1).$$

Analogously to Remark 7, we notice that in the case of ridge regression, the trend indicator simplifies to $\mathcal{T}_{\{X_j = x_j\}_{j \in J}}(c) = -\hat{\beta}_i(c)$. It is now easy to see from the closed form formula of the ridge regression estimator (2) that pathological regularization regimes also exist for $p \times 2 \times 2$ tables: take any pair (Y, X) arising from a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ dataset D having a pathological regularization regime according to Theorem 10. W.l.o.g. assume that the regularization path $\hat{\beta}_1$ has a zero. Now append $p - 2$ zero columns to the design matrix X , turning it into an $N \times p$ matrix; this is a design matrix arising from a $p \times 2 \times 2$ contingency table D' . The new regularization paths $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ are unchanged, hence a trend reversal still occurs with respect to the first random variable X_1 , so D' has a pathological regularization regime.

In principle, it is still possible to derive inequalities in the entries of X and Y that provide necessary and sufficient conditions for a $p \times 2 \times 2$ dataset having a pathological regularization regime, using Descartes' Rule of Signs [Des37]. However, this would require a large case distinction and we do not find it instructive to list these inequalities here for $p > 2$. It should be noted that the shape of pathological regularization regimes may change. In particular, they can be bounded or even disconnected. An example of the former in the case $p = 5$ is presented in Figure 6.

4. LOGISTIC REGRESSION

In this section we study pathological regularization regimes for logistic regression. Unlike ridge regression, the logistic regression estimate does not admit closed form maximum likelihood solutions, so we mainly focus on numerical experiments.




FIGURE 7. Trend curve for $X_2 = 0$ from a Simpson dataset with $N = 400$ with intercept fitting.

Indeed, pathological regularization regimes also exist for logistic regression. A typical example for such a trend reversal can be found in Figure 7.

It turns out that for logistic regression, datasets exhibiting Simpson’s paradox play an even more peculiar role than for ridge regression.

4.1. Pathological Ratios. The goal of this section is to define and outline the estimation of *pathological ratios* for logistic regression. The purpose of a pathological ratio is to quantify the percentage of a collection of datasets (e.g. $2 \times 2 \times 2$ Simpson datasets of sample-size 200) that have a non-trivial pathological regularization regime for some classification algorithm, e.g. logistic regression.

Definition 15. Given a collection of $2 \times 2 \times 2$ binary datasets U , and a classification model with parametrized regularization, the *pathological ratio* of U and the classification model f is the probability that a generic $(Y, X) \in U$ has a non-trivial pathological regularization regime for the fitted model $f_{\hat{\beta}}$.

In the case of finite collections U , the pathological ratio is just the count of (Y, X) that have at least one pathological regularization parameter divided by the cardinality of U .

We have already seen pathological ratios in Proposition 11, where the statement can be reformulated to say that the pathological ratio of datasets (Y, X) of size N sampled uniformly from $\text{Ber}(0.5)$ goes to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$ for ridge regression with intercept. Theorem 12 says that the pathological ratio stays constant over sample sizes N for ridge regression without intercept for datasets derived from uniformly sampled contingency tables.

4.2. Generating Simpson and non-Simpson Datasets. To make conclusions about pathological regularization regimes for logistic regression, we require a way to produce statistically meaningful Simpson and non-Simpson datasets in bulk. Our basic approach is to use rejection sampling from the Dirichlet distribution, as introduced in §3.3.

For a (dataset) sample size N , we want to uniformly generate M Simpson and M non-Simpson datasets, which we will then use to fit logistic regression for a range of regularization parameters to check if any of them is pathological. For such a regularization parameter c exhibiting trend reversal we therefore have a proof that the given dataset has a non-trivial pathological regularization regime. See Algorithm 1 for pseudocode.

Our implementation of Algorithm 1 can be found in the script `generate-data.py` in the repository [LW24].

4.3. Numerical Computation of Pathological Ratios for Logistic Regression. Once we have a collection of uniformly sampled Simpson and non-Simpson datasets

Algorithm 1 Sampling of M Simpson datasets of size N

```

1: Initialize container SIMPSON_DATASETS = {}
2: while |SIMPSON_DATASETS| <  $M$  do
3:   Sample  $p \in \Delta_7 \subset \mathbb{R}^8$  from the Dirichlet distribution
4:   Scale up  $p$  to a contingency table  $D$  by  $D = \text{round}(p \cdot N)$ 
5:   if  $\Sigma D \neq N$ , i.e. rounding doesn't yield a dataset with  $N$  records then
6:     Return to line 3
7:   end if
8:   Convert contingency table  $D$  into a dataset  $(Y, X)$  as per §2.1
9:   if  $(Y, X)$  is Simpson then
10:    Append  $(Y, X)$  to SIMPSON_DATASETS
11:   end if
12: end while

```

across a range of sample-sizes N per dataset, we use Monte Carlo sampling to estimate pathological ratios by fitting logistic regression to these datasets. To test for the existence of non-empty pathological regularization regimes, we run this logistic regression across a range of regularization parameters c . If one such parameter for a fixed subpopulation of the dataset (Y, X) leads to trend reversal, then the dataset is considered pathological for logistic regression. In the current work, we always include the intercept term when fitting. Algorithm 2 provides pseudocode for this approach.

For the sake of concreteness, we refer to subpopulations of our 2×2 feature space as in the running example from §1.1, namely the first variable X_1 gives the gender of a bank loan holder, while the second variable X_2 gives the occupation group, A ($X_2 = 0$) or B ($X_2 = 1$).

We estimate the pathological ratios by Monte Carlo simulation, as described in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Logistic regression model fitting for pathological ratios

```

1: Given  $M'$  datasets  $U$ , classification algorithm  $f$ , and collection of regularization parameters  $c \in C$ , where  $0 \in C$  for no-regularization
2: Initialize container PATHOLOGICALS = {}
3: for each  $(Y, X) \in U$  do
4:   for each  $c \in C$  do
5:     Fit  $f$  to  $(Y, X)$  with regularization  $c$ , obtain  $f_{\hat{\beta}}$ 
6:     Calculate trend indicator  $\mathcal{T}_{X_2=j}(c)$  for each occupation value  $j \in \{0, 1\}$ 
7:   end for
8:   if there exists  $\text{sgn}(\mathcal{T}_{X_2=j}(c)) \neq \text{sgn}(\mathcal{T}_{X_2=j}(c))$  for some  $c > 0$  (trend-reversal) then
9:     Append  $(Y, X)$  to PATHOLOGICALS
10:   end if
11: end for

```

In our experiments, we chose based on theoretical and empirical grounds:

- ℓ^2 regularization to match the ridge regression sections above;
- sample sizes of $N = 200, 600$ and 2400 ;
- the optimizer `newton-cholesky` of `scikit-learn` [PVG⁺11]; and

- regularization parameter grid with values c chosen as
 - 10 evenly log-spaced values between 10^{-8} and 10^{-1} ,
 - 150 evenly log-spaced values between 10^{-1} and 10^6 ,
 - 40 evenly log-spaced values between 10^6 and 10^8 .

We will give more details and analyses for these choices in a follow-up paper, but remark briefly on the choice of numerical solver and regularization parameter grid. The optimizer `newton-cholesky` is suited to ℓ^2 regularization with small- to medium-sized datasets. Moreover, it gave smoother trend-vs-regularization parameter curves than both the `scikit-learn` default `lbfgs` solver and the `sag` solver.

Regarding the choice of regularization parameter grid, we chose the stated grid by first considering an even finer log-spaced grid between 10^{-8} and 10^8 for a collection of datasets, and then plotted the histogram distribution of the most pathological c values (i.e. corresponding to the highest trend-reversal) per dataset. In our observations, most pathological c values occurred between 1 and 10^4 . We put the largest (log-)concentration of grid points between 10^{-1} and 10^6 to ensure coverage of the observed most pathological c 's, with a smaller number of grid points for very weak regularization and very strong regularization. Note that—given fixed hardware and parallelization—the run-time scales linearly with the number of regularization grid points. On the other hand, insufficient sampling of regularization values runs the risk of misclassifying pathological datasets / model combinations as non-pathological.

4.4. Numerical Results and Conjecture. Our main result about logistic regression is shown in Table 1, where we have taken $M = 1250$ uniformly sampled Simpson and non-Simpson datasets for sample sizes $N = 200, 600$ and 2400 . For logistic regression with intercept, every Simpson dataset is pathological, and approximately 6.5% of non-Simpson datasets are.

TABLE 1. Mean pathological ratios for Simpson and non-Simpson datasets for different sample sizes

Sample size	Simpson mean pathological ratio	Non-Simpson mean pathological ratio
200	1.0000	0.0632
600	1.0000	0.0680
2400	1.0000	0.0648

Based on these numerical results, we conjecture that all Simpson datasets have a non-trivial pathological regularization regime.

Conjecture 16. *All $2 \times 2 \times 2$ datasets strictly exhibiting Simpson’s paradox are pathological for logistic regression with an intercept term.*

Additional evidence using larger Monte Carlo samples, as well as different numerical solvers will appear in the aforementioned follow-up paper. In particular, the confidence intervals for the non-Simpson pathological ratios in Table 1 were not sufficient with $M = 1250$ datasets to conjecture a constant pathological ratio, though the above plus not-yet-reported experiments confirm a ratio of approximately 6.5%.

4.5. Pathological Datasets for Logistic Regression in Practice. We have shown that non-trivial pathological regularization regimes can occur “in-the-wild” for both

ridge and logistic regression by demonstrating families of datasets for which at least one regularization parameter c exists resulting in trend reversal.

In practice, there are heuristics for finding good regularization values given a dataset, such as the one previously mentioned of regularizing more for small datasets and less for larger datasets. A more quantitative approach is to pick the regularization value c that optimizes your classification problem’s chosen success metric, e.g. accuracy.

The process of selecting an optimal c given a dataset should not be carried out using the entire dataset, however, as this practice tends to cause overfitting, hence worsening generalization error; see e.g. [HTF09, §7].

In the case of smaller sample-sizes, the classic "train-validate-test" splitting of available data is often abandoned in favor of *k-fold cross validation*, in which the available data is more or less chunked into k -subsets. The classification model is then trained on a choice of $k - 1$ of these subsets for different c values, with evaluation taking place using the hold-out k th subset. These different evaluations results are then combined to find an optimal c for the k -fold split; see [HTF09, §7.10].

Perhaps the most worrisome pathological datasets for logistic regression would be if following the above “best-practice” procedure yields a regularization parameter c in the pathological regime. In this section, we give an example of such a dataset, but save a more systematic study of this phenomenon for later work.

Consider the default dataset with 600 samples used in the trend-vs-regularization figure above, Figure 7. This data can be viewed and downloaded from [data/pathological-default-for-x-validation.csv](#) of the repository [LW24].

The dataset satisfies Simpson’s paradox, with total population gender default trend of 0.45 (to two decimal places throughout), with subpopulation trends of -0.23 for both occupation groups.

We use scikit learn’s [PVG⁺11] implementation of [logistic regression with cross validation](#), changing the numerical solver to `newton-cholesky` as discussed above; see the code notebook [notebooks/cross-validation.ipynb](#) of [LW24] for the precise code.

Recalling that the value of X_2 corresponds to our two occupation groups, the “true trends” obtained by no regularization are (rounding to three decimal places)

$$\mathcal{T}_{X_2=0}(c = 0) = -0.196 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_{X_2=1}(c = 0) = -0.234,$$

whereas after fitting with cross validation as described above, the trends are

$$\mathcal{T}_{X_2=0}(c = \hat{c}) = 0.003 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_{X_2=1}(c = \hat{c}) = 0.003,$$

resulting in a slight pathological trend reversal by following the best-practice of using k -fold cross validation.

It is straightforward to show that Simpson’s paradox can only arise when subpopulation cardinalities differ, meaning that Simpson datasets are necessarily unbalanced. In such cases, one common approach is to weight the data samples, giving more weight to rare samples, and less to the frequent ones; see e.g. [KZ01]. The effect of different mitigation approaches deserves more attention than we will give here, but we again use the default approach of scikit learn, namely specifying `class_weight='balanced'` with [logistic regression with cross validation](#) [PVG⁺11].

For this dataset, addressing the class imbalances actually worsens the trend reversal:

$$\mathcal{T}_{X_2=0}(c = \hat{c}) = 0.132 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_{X_2=1}(c = \hat{c}) = 0.117.$$

This underscores that common best-practice procedures do not necessarily prevent pathological choices of regularization parameters.

5. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

In this paper, we introduced the notion of a pathological regularization regime. For a regularization hyperparameter choice in this regime one observes a trend reversal in binary classification tasks between the dataset and a regression model. In the case of ridge regression we give a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of such a regime and describe it explicitly. This can be used as a hands-on tool for a practitioner to avoid these bad regularization choices. We draw connections to Simpson’s paradox by noticing that the probability of observing datasets having pathological regularization regimes is particularly high among datasets exhibiting Simpson’s paradox. This also suggests that datasets having pathological regularization regimes appear frequently in real-world contexts. We show that pathological regularization regimes also exist for logistic regression and conjecture, based on numerical evidence, that all Simpson datasets are pathological for logistic regression with intercept term. Finally, we demonstrate that common best-practice procedures might not prevent pathological regularization parameter choices.

For future work it would be interesting to quantify pathological regularization regimes more precisely for logistic regression. This could lead to a deeper understanding of Conjecture 16. Moreover, the phenomenon should be investigated for different types of regularization, e.g. lasso techniques, and potentially be extended to generalized linear models.

Acknowledgments. We are thankful to Alexander Kreiß, Guido Montúfar and Martin Wahl for providing comments on an earlier draft of this article, and to Christopher Prohm for many valuable discussions.

REFERENCES

- [AKSST92] Norman S Abramson, Sheryl F Kelsey, Peter Safar, and Kim Sutton-Tyrrell. Simpson’s paradox and clinical trials: What you find is not necessarily what you prove. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 21(12):1480–1482, 1992.
- [BHO75] P. J. Bickel, E. A. Hammel, and J. W. O’Connell. Sex Bias in Graduate Admissions: Data from Berkeley. *Science*, 187(4175):398–404, 1975.
- [BTJ04] Francis Bach, Romain Thibaux, and Michael Jordan. Computing regularization paths for learning multiple kernels. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 17, 2004.
- [CBH09] Aiyou Chen, Thomas Bengtsson, and Tin Kam Ho. A regression paradox for linear models: Sufficient conditions and relation to simpson’s paradox. *The American Statistician*, 63(3):218–225, 2009.
- [CO13] Raffaella Calabrese and Silvia Angela Osmetti. Modelling small and medium enterprise loan defaults as rare events: the generalized extreme value regression model. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 40(6):1172–1188, 2013.
- [Des37] René Descartes. La géométrie. 1637.
- [DGS17] Bertram Düring, Nicos Georgiou, and Enrico Scalas. A stylised model for wealth distribution. *Economic Foundations for Social Complexity Science: Theory, Sentiments, and Empirical Laws*, pages 135–157, 2017.
- [DOM02] Stephan Dreiseitl and Lucila Ohno-Machado. Logistic regression and artificial neural network classification models: a methodology review. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 35(5-6):352–359, 2002.
- [Eur04] European Parliament and Council. [Implementing the principle of equal treatment between men and women in the access to and supply of goods and services](#). Official Journal of the European Union, 2004.
- [Eur21] European Parliament and Council. [Regulation on Artificial Intelligence \(AI Act\)](#). Official Journal of the European Union, 2021.

- [FHT10] Jerome Friedman, Trevor Hastie, and Rob Tibshirani. Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent. *Journal of statistical software*, 33(1):1, 2010.
- [Fra23] Frazer-Nash Consultancy. Algorithmic bias: A technical study on the feasibility of using proxy methods for algorithmic bias monitoring in a privacy preserving way. UK Government Asset Publishing, 2023.
- [GSS14] Ian J Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6572*, 2014.
- [Had98] Petros Hadjicostas. The asymptotic proportion of subdivisions of a 2×2 table that result in simpson’s paradox. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 7(4):387–396, 1998.
- [HP03] Xiaohong Huang and Wei Pan. Linear regression and two-class classification with gene expression data. *Bioinformatics*, 19(16):2072–2078, 2003.
- [HTF09] Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, and Jerome H Friedman. *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*, volume 2. Springer, 2009.
- [KB14] Mehmet Koç and Atalay Barkana. Application of linear regression classification to low-dimensional datasets. *Neurocomputing*, 131:331–335, 2014.
- [KZ01] Gary King and Langche Zeng. Logistic regression in rare events data. *Political analysis*, 9(2):137–163, 2001.
- [LRC⁺03] Stephenie C Lemon, Jason Roy, Melissa A Clark, Peter D Friedmann, and William Rakowski. Classification and regression tree analysis in public health: methodological review and comparison with logistic regression. *Annals of behavioral medicine*, 26:172–181, 2003.
- [LW24] Paul Larsen and Maximilian Wiesmann. [Pathological Regularization Regimes](#), 2024. Accessed: 2024-06-18.
- [Moo50] Alexander McFarlane Mood. Introduction to the theory of statistics. 1950.
- [ND15] H James Norton and George Divine. Simpson’s paradox... and how to avoid it. *Significance*, 12(4):40–43, 2015.
- [NJ01] Andrew Ng and Michael Jordan. On discriminative vs. generative classifiers: A comparison of logistic regression and naive bayes. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 14, 2001.
- [NTB10] Imran Naseem, Roberto Togneri, and Mohammed Bennamoun. Linear regression for face recognition. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 32(11):2106–2112, 2010.
- [Pro18] Christopher Prohm. [Causality and function approximations](#), 2018. Accessed: 2024-06-20.
- [PVG⁺11] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2825–2830, 2011.
- [Rad81] Michael L Radelet. Racial characteristics and the imposition of the death penalty. *American Sociological Review*, pages 918–927, 1981.
- [SAH19] Fariborz Salehi, Ehsan Abbasi, and Babak Hassibi. The impact of regularization on high-dimensional logistic regression. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [Sim51] Edward H Simpson. The interpretation of interaction in contingency tables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 13(2):238–241, 1951.
- [skl] Scikit-learn linear model ridge page. https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.linear_model.Ridge.html. Accessed: 2024-03-20.
- [SNMM⁺07] Mark Schmidt, Alexandru Niculescu-Mizil, Kevin Murphy, et al. Learning graphical model structure using l1-regularization paths. In *AAAI*, volume 7, pages 1278–1283, 2007.
- [vW15] Wessel N van Wieringen. Lecture notes on ridge regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.09169*, 2015.
- [Wag82] Clifford H Wagner. Simpson’s paradox in real life. *The American Statistician*, 36(1):46–48, 1982.