

1. Introduction

Online learning setting:

Learner %[| Pt] yt ...

where & E T (input), Pt & Y (prediction), yt & Y

Nature

Learner is a function A s.t. $P_{t+1} = A(X_{t+1}, P_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}, X_{t+1})$ [Definition 24] regret

(i) The regret of a learner w.r.t. an expert h:

Regret $(h) := \sum_{k=1}^{n} [l(y_k, p_k) - l(y_k, h(X_k))]$

(ii) The regret w.r.t. a class of experts H is:

Regret := max Regret (h) = \(\frac{7}{4-1}\ll(\frac{7}{4}, \beta_4) - \text{min} \(\frac{7}{4-1}\ll(\frac{7}{4}, \hlappa(\text{X4})\right)\)

2. Warm-up

[Example 24] negative result (Not suitable for online learning) $Y = \{-1, +1\}, \quad l(y_t, p_t) = l\{y_t \neq p_t\}. \text{ Assume } A \text{ is deterministic.}$ Claim: for all A, $\exists H$, $\chi_{i:T}$, $y_{i:T}$ s.t. Regref $\geqslant \frac{1}{2}$. Key point: adversary can choose y_t to be always different from p_t .

Then \(\frac{1}{4} \left(\text{9t}, \text{Pt} \right) = \tau.

Consider two experts $H = \{h_{-1}, h_{+1}\}$, where hy always predicts y. $\Rightarrow l(y_1, h_{-1}(x_{1}) + l(y_1, h_{+1}(x_{1})) = 1$,

therefore, $\min_{h \in H} \frac{1}{k_{-1}} l(y_1, h(x_{1})) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ $\Rightarrow Regret \geqslant \frac{1}{2}$.

LExample 29 1 positive result (learn with expert advice)

L(4. Pt) = 184+Pt)

[Assumption 3] relizable.

best $h^* \in \mathcal{H}$ s.t. $L(y_t, h^*(x_t)) = 0$ for all $t = 1, \dots, T$. [Algorithm 1] majority algorithm

- (1) Maintain a set V+ ⊆ > + of valid experts
- (2) On each t, predict p_t to be the majority vote over $\{h(x_t): h \in V_t\}$
- (3) Keep experts which were correct $V_{t+1} = \{h \in V_t : Y_t = h(x_t)\}$ Analysis:
- (i) On each mistake, at least half of the experts are eliminated. So $1 \le |V_{T+1}| \le |H| 2^{-M}$, where M is the number of mistakes.
 - (ii) M is the exactly the regret here.
 - (iii) Take logs: Regret = log2 141

Note: Realizability is too strong.

3. Online convex optimization. S: convex set [Definition 25] convexity

A function $f: S \to IR$ is convex iff for all points we S, there is some vector $z \in IR^d$ s.t.

 $f(u) \geqslant f(w) + z \cdot (u-w)$ for all $u \in S$. (1) [Definition 26] Subgradient

For each $W \in S$, the set of all z satisfying (1) are known as subgradients at W:

2f(w):= { ₹: f(u) > f(w) + ₹·(u-w) for all ues }

(i) If f is differentiable at w, $\partial f(w) = \{\nabla f(w)\}$ (ii) If $D \in \partial f(w)$, w is a global minimum of f.

Convex functions:

- (i) fiw) = W.Z , YZEIRd
- (ii) f(w) = wTAw, Y positive semidefinite A ∈ Rdxd
- (iii) Negative entropy: $f(w) = \frac{d}{2} w_i \log w_i$ on $w \in \Delta d$
- (iv) Sum: f+g if f and g are convex.
- (v) Scale: cf, Vc>0, fconvex
- (Vi) Supremum: supf where F is a family of convex functions.

Set up for online convex optimization:

- Iteration t=1,...,T
- (i) Learner chooses W+ e S
- (ii) Nature chooses convex loss function fe: 5→1R

Formally: Wt+1 = A (Wist, fist)

Regret(u) := = [ft(wt) - ft(u)] for NES

Regret := max Regret(u).

Now we show some examples of reducing online learning to online convex learning. [OL: online learner, OCO: online convex] [Example 26] linear regression

$$L(\gamma_t, p_t) = (p_t - \gamma_t)^2$$

On each iteration t = 1, -..., T:

OL receives Xx EIRA from nature.

OL asks OCO for a weight vector WEERA.

OL sends $P_t = w_t \cdot x_t$ to nature.

OL receives yt from nature.

OL relays feedback to OCO via fi(w) = (w.xt-yt)2

[Example 27] learning with expert advice.

Assume H is finite. Let H = Phi..., hay, l(ye,pe)=1fye pe).
Then neither l or H is convex.

Nonetheless, we can convexify the problem via randomization.

- * Formally, the reduction is as follows:
 - (i) OL receives χ_{t} .
 - (ii) OL asks OCO for We ∈ dd
 - (iii) OL samples an expert $j_t \sim W_t$ and send $p_t = h_{j_t}(x_t)$
 - (iv) OL receives yt
- (V) OL relays the feed back to OCO via $f_t(w) = w \cdot Z_t$, where $Z_t = [l(y_t, h_t(x_t)), \cdots, l(y_t, h_d(x_t))] \in {}^{60,1}^{d}$

Note: (i) The expected regret of OL is the same as the regret of Oco.

(iii) Another way is to use upper bound (hinge loss or logistic loss upper bound zero-one loss). However, minimising the convex upper bound doesn't guarantee minimizing the 0-1 loss.