64.	Consider the bias and variance of a learning machine, f(x, 0), trained on the mindem data set
	D={CXn, Yn} EIRd x IR3, Yn~ + (Xn)+ En
	Assume En~ N(O, OE). Then
	The variance of the trained model at ZEIRd 3 MANTHUMAN
	$E_{\mathcal{D}}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(x, \mathcal{D}) - E(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}(x, \mathcal{D}))^2)$
	The beas of the trained model at 20 E IRd IS
	$E_{\infty}(\hat{f}(x, x)) - f(x)$
	The expected error of the trained model at x & IRd J
	Ea ((f(x)) - f(0)))2)
	The irreducible error of the tree model at 21 kd is
	$E_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}})^2 = E_{\mathcal{D}}(Y - f(x))^2$
	the Irreducible error of the true model at I EIRd does not depend on X EIRd because an does not depend on Xn E IRd.
	The variance of the trained model at I EIR does dopend on I EIR and Is a real number.
	The expected value of Xn Is I'm = En (Xn), is a d-indimensional vector.

(2)

- Suppose you train two prediction algorithms, Algorithmo and Algorithm 1, and are looking for evidence that Algorithm 1 produces a better prediction rule than Algorithm 0.

- Your null hypothesis is that the prediction rule produced by Algorithm 1 is not better than the one

produced by Algorithm O.

- you apply the two prediction rules to the same dataset, and the results are summarized in the following contingency table:

Algorithm O correct 189 0

Algorithm O wrong 5 23

- There is evidence that the prediction rule produced by Algorithm I is better. The evidence is statistically significant at level 5%. The evidence is not highly statistically significant (i.e., statistically significant (i.e., statistically significant at level 1%).

Alow consider the null hypothesis that the prediction rule produced by the two algorithms have some error probability, the alternative being that their error probabilities are different. In this situation, the same contingency table does not allow you to reject this hypothesis at Louel 5%. And it does not allow you to reject this reject this hypothesis at Louel 5%.

