**Problem 2.1.** Given a training set  $S = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, f(\mathbf{x}_i))\}_{i=1}^m \subset (\mathbb{R}^d \bigotimes \{0, 1\})^m$ , show that there exists a polynomial  $p_s$  such that  $p(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  if and only if  $h_s(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ .

Solution: Let  $\mathbf{z_1}, \mathbf{z_2}, ..., \mathbf{z_k}$  be all of the training examples in S so that  $\forall 1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $h(\mathbf{z_i}) = 1$ . Then, we can define the polynomial  $p_s : \mathbb{R}^d \to \{0,1\}$  in the following manner:

$$p_s(\mathbf{x}) = p_s(x_1, ..., x_d) = -\prod_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^d (x_j - \mathbf{z_{ij}})^2$$

Now, it's clear that  $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $p_s(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$  since  $\prod_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^d (x_j - \mathbf{z_{ij}})^2 \geq 0$ , no matter our choice of  $\mathbf{x}$ . Next, we must show that  $p(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  if and only if  $h_s(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ . Pick  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  arbitrarily. If  $p(\mathbf{x})$  then  $\prod_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^d (x_j - \mathbf{z_{ij}})^2 = \sum_{j=1}^d (x_j - \mathbf{z_{1j}})^2 \dots \sum_{j=1}^d (x_j - \mathbf{z_{kj}})^2 = 0$ . Now, fix a  $p \in [k]$ . Then,  $\sum_{j=1}^d (x_j - \mathbf{z_{pj}})^2 = 0$  iff  $x_j = \mathbf{z_{pj}}$ ,  $\forall 1 \leq j \leq d$ , as  $(x_j - \mathbf{z_{pj}})^2 > 0$  if  $x_j \neq \mathbf{z_{pj}}$ . Hence, in order for  $p_s(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ , we must have that  $\exists \alpha \in [k]$  so that  $\mathbf{z}_\alpha = \mathbf{x}$ . Now, if  $h_s(\mathbf{x}) = 1$  then  $\exists \beta \in [k]$  so that  $\mathbf{z}_\beta = \mathbf{x}$  by the construction of  $\mathbf{z_1}, \mathbf{z_2}, \dots, \mathbf{z_k}$ . Furthermore,  $p_s(\beta) = 0$  by construction. So,  $p_s$  satisfies our criteria. Thus, the hypothesis class of thresholded polynomials may lead to overfitting.

**Problem 2.2.** Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a class of binary classifiers over a domain  $\mathcal{X}$ . Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be an unknown distribution over  $\mathcal{X}$ , and let f be the target hypothesis in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Fix some  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ . Show that  $\mathbb{E}_{S|_{x} \sim \mathcal{D}^{m}}[L_{S}(h)] = L_{(\mathcal{D},f)}(h)$ .

Solution: First, note that for some sample S,  $L_S(h) = \frac{|i \in [m]: h(x_i) \neq y_i|}{m}$ . It then follows that  $\mathbb{E}_{S|_x \sim \mathcal{D}^m}[L_S(h)] = \mathbb{E}_{S|_x \sim \mathcal{D}}[\frac{|i \in [m]: h(x_i) \neq y_i|}{m}]$ . Now,

$$\frac{|i \in [m] : h(x_i) \neq y_i|}{m} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{1}_{h(x_i) \neq f(x_i)}$$

which implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_{S|_{x} \sim \mathcal{D}^{m}} \left[ \frac{|i \in [m] : h(x_{i}) \neq y_{i}|}{m} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{S|_{x} \sim \mathcal{D}^{m}} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{1}_{h(x_{i}) \neq f(x_{i})} \right]$$

Now, since  $\mathcal{D}$  is iid and  $S|_x \sim D^m$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{S|_{x} \sim \mathcal{D}^{m}} \left[ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{1}_{h(x_{i}) \neq f(x_{i})} \right] = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{E}_{x_{i} \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \mathbb{1}_{h(x_{i}) \neq f(x_{i})} \right]$$

Furthermore, since since each  $x_i \sim \mathcal{D}$  is identical,

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim \mathcal{D}}[\mathbb{1}_{h(x_i) \neq f(x_i)}] = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[\mathbb{1}_{h(x_i) \neq f(x_i)}]$$

Now, by definition,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[\mathbb{1}_{h(x_i) \neq f(x_i)}] = \mathbb{P}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}}[h(x) \neq f(x)] = L_{(\mathcal{D}, f)}(h)$$

so 
$$\mathbb{E}_{S|_x \sim \mathcal{D}^m}[L_S(h)] = L_{(\mathcal{D},f)}(h)$$
 as desired.