

Slides adapted from Mohri

Classification

Jordan Boyd-Graber University of Maryland WEIGHTED MAJORITY

Beyond Binary Classification

Before we've talked about combining weak predictor (boosting)

Beyond Binary Classification

- Before we've talked about combining weak predictor (boosting)
 - What if you have strong predictors?

Beyond Binary Classification

- Before we've talked about combining weak predictor (boosting)
 - What if you have strong predictors?
- How do you make inherently binary algorithms multiclass?
- How do you answer questions like ranking?

General Online Setting

- For t=1 to T:
 - □ Get instance $x_t \in X$
 - □ Predict $\hat{y}_t \in Y$
 - Get true label $y_t \in Y$
 - □ Incur loss $L(\hat{y}_t, y_t)$
- Classification: $Y = \{0, 1\}, L(y, y') = |y' y|$
- Regression: $Y \subset \mathbb{R}$, $L(y, y') = (y' y)^2$

General Online Setting

- For t = 1 to T:
 - □ Get instance $x_t \in X$
 - □ Predict $\hat{y}_t \in Y$
 - □ Get true label $y_t \in Y$
 - □ Incur loss $L(\hat{y}_t, y_t)$
- Classification: $Y = \{0, 1\}, L(y, y') = |y' y|$
- Regression: $Y \subset \mathbb{R}$, $L(y, y') = (y' y)^2$
- **Objective**: Minimize total loss $\sum_t L(\hat{y}_t, y_t)$

Prediction with Expert Advice

- For t = 1 to T:
 - □ Get instance $x_t \in X$ and advice $a_t, i \in Y, i \in [1, N]$
 - □ Predict $\hat{y}_t \in Y$
 - □ Get true label $y_t \in Y$
 - □ Incur loss $L(\hat{y}_t, y_t)$

Prediction with Expert Advice

- For t = 1 to T:
 - Get instance $x_t \in X$ and advice $a_t, i \in Y, i \in [1, N]$
 - □ Predict $\hat{y}_t \in Y$
 - □ Get true label $y_t \in Y$
 - □ Incur loss $L(\hat{y}_t, y_t)$
- Objective: Minimize regret, i.e., difference of total loss vs. best expert

$$Regret(T) = \sum_{t} L(\hat{y}_t, y_t) - \min_{i} \sum_{t} L(a_{t,i}, y_t)$$
 (1)

Mistake Bound Model

 Define the maximum number of mistakes a learning algorithm L makes to learn a concept c over any set of examples (until it's perfect).

$$M_L(c) = \max_{x_1, \dots, x_T} |\mathsf{mistakes}(L, c)| \tag{2}$$

lacktriangledown For any concept class C, this is the max over concepts c.

$$M_L(C) = \max_{c \in C} M_L(c) \tag{3}$$

Mistake Bound Model

 Define the maximum number of mistakes a learning algorithm L makes to learn a concept c over any set of examples (until it's perfect).

$$M_L(c) = \max_{x_1, \dots, x_T} |\mathsf{mistakes}(L, c)| \tag{2}$$

For any concept class C, this is the max over concepts c.

$$M_L(C) = \max_{c \in C} M_L(c) \tag{3}$$

 In the expert advice case, assumes some expert matches the concept (realizable)

Halving Algorithm

```
\begin{split} H_1 &\leftarrow H; \\ \textbf{for } \underbrace{t \leftarrow 1 \dots T}_{} \textbf{do} \\ & | \text{Receive } x_t; \\ & \hat{y}_t \leftarrow \text{Majority}(H_t, \vec{a}_t, x_t); \\ & \text{Receive } y_t; \\ & | \textbf{if } \hat{y}_t \neq y_t \textbf{ then} \\ & | H_{t+1} \leftarrow \{a \in H_t : a(x_t) = y_t\}; \\ & \textbf{return } \underbrace{H_{T+1}}_{} & \textbf{Algorithm 1: The Halving Algorithm (Mitchell, 1997)} \end{split}
```

Halving Algorithm Bound (Littlestone, 1998)

For a finite hypothesis set

$$M_{\mathsf{Halving}(H)} \le \lg |H|$$
 (4)

After each mistake, the hypothesis set is reduced by at least by half

Halving Algorithm Bound (Littlestone, 1998)

For a finite hypothesis set

$$M_{\mathsf{Halving}(H)} \le \lg |H|$$
 (4)

- After each mistake, the hypothesis set is reduced by at least by half
- Consider the optimal mistake bound opt(H). Then

$$VC(H) \le opt(H) \le M_{\mathsf{Halving}(H)} \le \lg |H|$$
 (5)

 For a fully shattered set, form a binary tree of mistakes with height VC(H)

Halving Algorithm Bound (Littlestone, 1998)

For a finite hypothesis set

$$M_{\mathsf{Halving}(H)} \le \lg |H|$$
 (4)

- After each mistake, the hypothesis set is reduced by at least by half
- Consider the optimal mistake bound opt(H). Then

$$VC(H) \le opt(H) \le M_{\mathsf{Halving}(H)} \le \lg|H|$$
 (5)

- For a fully shattered set, form a binary tree of mistakes with height VC(H)
- What about non-realizable case?

```
for t \leftarrow 1 \dots N do
     w_{1,i} \leftarrow 1;
for t \leftarrow 1 \dots T do
      Receive x_t:
      \hat{y}_t \leftarrow \mathbb{1} \left[ \sum_{v_{t,i}=1} w_t \ge \sum_{v_{t,i}=0} w_t \right];
      Receive y_t;
      if \hat{\gamma}_t \neq \gamma_t then
             for t \leftarrow 1...N do
                   if \hat{y}_t \neq y_t then
                   | w_{t+1,i} \leftarrow \beta w_{t,i};
                    else
                         w_{t+1,i} \leftarrow w_{t,i}
return w_{T+1}
```

- Weights for every expert
- Classifications in favor of side with higher total weight (y ∈ {0,1})
- Experts that are wrong get their weights decreased (β ∈ [0,1])
- If you're right, you stay unchanged

```
for t \leftarrow 1 \dots N do
      w_{1,i} \leftarrow 1;
for t \leftarrow 1 \dots T do
      Receive x_t:
      \hat{y}_t \leftarrow \mathbb{1}\left[\sum_{v_t = 1} w_t \ge \sum_{v_t = 0} w_t\right];
      Receive y_t;
      if \hat{\gamma}_t \neq \gamma_t then
            for t \leftarrow 1...N do
                   if \hat{y}_t \neq y_t then
                   w_{t+1,i} \leftarrow \beta w_{t,i};
                   else
                         w_{t+1,i} \leftarrow w_{t,i}
return w_{T+1}
```

- Weights for every expert
- Classifications in favor of side with higher total weight $(y \in \{0,1\})$
- Experts that are wrong get their weights decreased (β ∈ [0,1])
- If you're right, you stay unchanged

```
for t \leftarrow 1 \dots N do
      w_{1,i} \leftarrow 1;
for t \leftarrow 1 \dots T do
      Receive x_t:
      \hat{y}_t \leftarrow \mathbb{1} \left[ \sum_{v_{t,i}=1} w_t \ge \sum_{v_{t,i}=0} w_t \right];
      Receive y_t;
      if \hat{\gamma}_t \neq \gamma_t then
            for t \leftarrow 1...N do
                   if \hat{y}_t \neq y_t then
                   w_{t+1,i} \leftarrow \beta w_{t,i};
                   else
                         w_{t+1,i} \leftarrow w_{t,i}
return w_{T+1}
```

- Weights for every expert
- Classifications in favor of side with higher total weight $(y \in \{0,1\})$
- Experts that are wrong get their weights decreased (β ∈ [0, 1])
- If you're right, you stay unchanged

```
for t \leftarrow 1 \dots N do
      w_{1,i} \leftarrow 1;
for t \leftarrow 1 \dots T do
      Receive x_t:
      \hat{y}_t \leftarrow \mathbb{1} \left[ \sum_{v_{t,i}=1} w_t \ge \sum_{v_{t,i}=0} w_t \right];
      Receive y_t;
      if \hat{v}_t \neq v_t then
            for t \leftarrow 1...N do
                  if \hat{y}_t \neq y_t then
                   w_{t+1,i} \leftarrow \beta w_{t,i};
                   else
                        w_{t+1,i} \leftarrow w_{t,i}
return w_{T+1}
```

- Weights for every expert
- Classifications in favor of side with higher total weight $(y \in \{0,1\})$
- Experts that are wrong get their weights decreased (β ∈ [0,1])
- If you're right, you stay unchanged

Weighted Majority

- Let m_t be the number of mistakes made by WM until time t
- Let m_t* be the best expert's mistakes until time t
- N is the number of experts

$$m_t \le \frac{\log N + m_t^* \log \frac{1}{\beta}}{\log \frac{2}{1+\beta}} \tag{6}$$

- Thus, mistake bound is O(log N) plus the best expert
- Halving algorithm $\beta = 0$

Potential function is the sum of all weights

$$\Phi_t \equiv \sum_i w_{t,i} \tag{7}$$

We'll create sandwich of upper and lower bounds

Potential function is the sum of all weights

$$\Phi_t \equiv \sum_i w_{t,i} \tag{7}$$

- We'll create sandwich of upper and lower bounds
- For any expert i, we have lower bound

$$\Phi_t \ge w_{t,i} = \beta^{m_t,i} \tag{8}$$

Potential function is the sum of all weights

$$\Phi_t \equiv \sum_i w_{t,i} \tag{7}$$

- We'll create sandwich of upper and lower bounds
- For any expert i, we have lower bound

$$\Phi_t \ge w_{t,i} = \beta^{m_t,i} \tag{8}$$

Weights are nonnegative, so $\sum_{i} w_{t,i} \ge w_{t,i}$

Potential function is the sum of all weights

$$\Phi_t \equiv \sum_i w_{t,i} \tag{7}$$

- We'll create sandwich of upper and lower bounds
- For any expert i, we have lower bound

$$\Phi_t \ge w_{t,i} = \beta^{m_t,i} \tag{8}$$

Each error multiplicatively reduces weight by eta

If an algorithm makes an error at round t

$$\Phi_{t+1} \le \frac{\Phi_t}{2} + \frac{\beta \Phi_t}{2} \tag{9}$$

If an algorithm makes an error at round t

$$\Phi_{t+1} \le \frac{\Phi_t}{2} + \frac{\beta \Phi_t}{2} \tag{9}$$

Half (at most) of the experts by weight were right

If an algorithm makes an error at round t

$$\Phi_{t+1} \le \frac{\Phi_t}{2} + \frac{\beta \Phi_t}{2} \tag{9}$$

Half (at least) of the experts by weight were wrong

If an algorithm makes an error at round t

$$\Phi_{t+1} \le \frac{\Phi_t}{2} + \frac{\beta \Phi_t}{2} = \left[\frac{1+\beta}{2}\right] \Phi_t \tag{9}$$

If an algorithm makes an error at round t

$$\Phi_{t+1} \le \frac{\Phi_t}{2} + \frac{\beta \Phi_t}{2} = \left[\frac{1+\beta}{2} \right] \Phi_t \tag{9}$$

Initially potential function sums all weights, which start at 1

$$\Phi_1 = N \tag{10}$$

If an algorithm makes an error at round t

$$\Phi_{t+1} \le \frac{\Phi_t}{2} + \frac{\beta \Phi_t}{2} = \left[\frac{1+\beta}{2}\right] \Phi_t \tag{9}$$

Initially potential function sums all weights, which start at 1

$$\Phi_1 = N \tag{10}$$

After m_T mistakes after T rounds

$$\Phi_T \le \left[\frac{1+\beta}{2}\right]^{m_T} N \tag{11}$$

Weighted Majority Proof

Put the two inequalities together, using the best expert

$$\beta^{m_T^*} \le \Phi_T \le \left[\frac{1+\beta}{2}\right]^{m_T} N \tag{12}$$

Weighted Majority Proof

Put the two inequalities together, using the best expert

$$\beta^{m_T^*} \le \Phi_T \le \left[\frac{1+\beta}{2}\right]^{m_T} N \tag{12}$$

Take the log of both sides

$$m_T^* \log \beta \le \log N + m_T \log \left[\frac{1+\beta}{2} \right]$$
 (13)

Weighted Majority Proof

Put the two inequalities together, using the best expert

$$\beta^{m_T^*} \le \Phi_T \le \left[\frac{1+\beta}{2}\right]^{m_T} N \tag{12}$$

Take the log of both sides

$$m_T^* \log \beta \le \log N + m_T \log \left[\frac{1+\beta}{2} \right]$$
 (13)

Solve for m_T

$$m_T \le \frac{\log N + m_T^* \log \frac{1}{\beta}}{\log \left[\frac{2}{1+\beta}\right]} \tag{14}$$

Weighted Majority Recap

- Simple algorithm
- No harsh assumptions (non-realizable)
- Depends on best learner
- Downside: Takes a long time to do well in worst case (but okay in practice)
- Solution: Randomization