

IEMS 402 Statistical Learning - 2025 Winter

HW1

Tuorui Peng¹

Exercise 1 Design of Loss Function

1.(a)

Consider decomposing $m(X)$ as follows:

$$m(X) := \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x] + \delta(X),$$

i.e. with $\delta(X)$ being the deviation of the true conditional expectation from the model. Then the expected ℓ_2 error can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(Y - m(X))^2] &= \mathbb{E}[(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x] - \delta(X))^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x])^2] + \mathbb{E}[\delta^2(X)] - 2\mathbb{E}[(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x])\delta(X)] \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \mathbb{E}[(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x])^2] + \mathbb{E}[\delta^2(X)] \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\geq} \mathbb{E}[(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x])^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus proved that the expected ℓ_2 error is minimized by the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}[Y|X = x]$. Here in the proof, (i) is due to the fact that $\mathbb{E}_{Y|X=x}[Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x]|X = x] = 0$, and (ii) is due to the non-negativity of $\mathbb{E}[\delta^2(X)]$, and equality holds if and only if $\delta(X) = 0$ almost surely.

1.(b)

The expected ℓ_1 error can be written as:

$$\mathbb{E}[|Y - m(X)|] = \mathbb{E}_X \left[\int_{Y|X=x} |Y - m(x)| \, dF(y|X = x) \right]$$

taking variation with respect to $m(X)$, we have (here δ refers to the variation operator):

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \mathbb{E}[|Y - m(X)|] &= \mathbb{E}_X \left[\int_{Y|X=x} \delta m(x) \cdot \text{sgn}(Y - m(x)) \, dF(y|X = x) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_X \left[\delta m(x) \int_{Y|X=x} \text{sgn}(Y - m(x)) \, dF(y|X = x) \right] \end{aligned}$$

To minimize the expected ℓ_1 error, we require the variation taking value of zero, i.e.:

$$0 = \delta \mathbb{E}[|Y - m(X)|] = \mathbb{E}_X \left[\delta m(x) \int_{Y|X=x} \text{sgn}(Y - m(x)) \, dF(y|X = x) \right], \quad \forall \delta m(\cdot)$$

which requires choosing $m(\cdot)$ s.t. $\int_{Y|X=x} \text{sgn}(Y - m(x)) \, dF(y|X = x) = \mathbb{E}_{Y|X=x}[\text{sgn}(Y - m(x))|X = x] = 0$ almost surely. This is equivalent to using the conditional median as the prediction function $m(x) = \text{median}(Y|X = x)$.

¹TuoruiPeng2028@u.northwestern.edu

1.(c)

Similarly we write the following differentiation w.r.t. β

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \mathbb{E} [(Y - \beta' X)^2] = - \mathbb{E} [-2X(Y - \beta' X)]$$

and set it to zero, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= - \mathbb{E} [-2X(Y - \beta' X)] \\ &\Rightarrow \beta_* = \mathbb{E} [XX']^{-1} \mathbb{E} [XY] \end{aligned}$$

1.(d)

We consider the following function:

$$s_\alpha(y, \hat{y}) := \begin{cases} \alpha, & \text{if } y - \hat{y} > 0 \\ \alpha - 1, & \text{if } y - \hat{y} < 0 \end{cases}$$

and notice that $s_\alpha(y, \hat{y}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \alpha \cdot \text{sgn}(y - \hat{y})$ ². Then we can write the deviation of expected ℓ_α error as:

$$\delta \mathbb{E} [\rho_\alpha(y, m(x))] = \mathbb{E}_X \left[\delta m(x) \int_{Y|X=x} s_\alpha(y, m(x)) dF(y|X=x) \right]$$

minimizing the ρ_α loss function requires the variation to be zero for any δm , i.e.:

$$0 = \mathbb{E}_{Y|X=x} [s_\alpha(y, m(x)) | X = x] \Rightarrow m(x) = q_\alpha(x)$$

where $q_\alpha(x)$ is the α -quantile of Y given $X = x$.

Exercise 2 Central Limit Theorem

2.(a)

First by SLLN we definitely have $\bar{X} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \mathbb{E} [X] = \mu$.

Then we re-write the expression of s_n^2 as:

$$\begin{aligned} s_n^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 - \bar{X}^2 \end{aligned}$$

²Omitting the discontinuity at $y - \hat{y} = 0$, which won't be a big problem if we have continuous and strictly increasing loss function.

Then we notice that:

$$\text{by LLN: } \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 \xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E}[X^2]$$

$$\text{by LLN and continuous mapping theorem: } \bar{X}^2 \xrightarrow{p} (\mathbb{E}[X])^2$$

thus we have by slusky's theorem:

$$s_n^2 \xrightarrow{d} \mathbb{E}[X^2] - (\mathbb{E}[X])^2 = \sigma^2$$

2.(b)

Note that $s_n^2 \xrightarrow{d} \sigma^2$ which is a constant, thus we also have $s_n \xrightarrow{p} \sigma$. Then by Slutsky's theorem and CLT, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n - \mu)}{\sigma} &\xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1) \\ \frac{s_n}{\sigma} &\xrightarrow{p} 1 \\ \Rightarrow \frac{\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n - \mu)}{s_n} &\xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1) \end{aligned}$$

Exercise 3 Curse of Dimensionality: Asymptotic scaling of nearest neighbor distances

3.(a)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|x_{i(X_0)} - x_0\| > \delta) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n \{\|x_i - x_0\|_2 > \delta\}\right) \\ &= \int dP_{x_0} \int dP_{x_1^n} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\|x_i - x_0\|_2 > \delta} \\ &= \int (1 - P(B_d(x, \delta)))^n dP(x) \end{aligned}$$

3.(b)

We can construct the partition as follows: at each dimension, construct cutting points $\{-kr, (-k+1)r, \dots, (k-1)r, kr\}$ where k chosen s.t. $k = \lceil \frac{R}{\delta/d} \rceil \leq 2Rd/\delta$ and $r = \delta/d$. And each U is constructed by the combination of the cutting points. Then we have number of partition

$$N(\delta) = (2k+1)^d \leq \frac{8(Rd)^d}{\delta^d} = \frac{c}{\delta^d}$$

in this way, each "block" of the partition is at most a hypercube with side length r , and diameter $\text{diam} = r\sqrt{d} < \delta$.

3.(c)

Since the partition $U_1^{N(\delta)}$ has diameter at most δ , we consider THE block U_i that contains x for each given x . Then we have:

$$U_i \subseteq B_d(x, \delta) \Rightarrow P(U_i) \leq P(B_d(x, \delta))$$

thus we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|x_{i(X_0)} - x_0\| > \delta) &= \int (1 - P(B_d(x, \delta)))^n dP(x) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{N(\delta)} \int_{U_i} (1 - P(P(U_i)))^n dP(x) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N(\delta)} (1 - P(P(U_i)))^n P(U_i) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{c}{en\delta^d}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus finished the proof. Here in the proof, (i) is due to the fact that $x \mapsto x(1-x)^n$ reaches maximum at $x = 1/(n+1)$, with maximum value

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n+1}\right)^n = \frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n+1}\right)^{n+1} \leq \frac{1}{en}.$$

3.(d)

With the probabilistic bound, we note that to maintain the bound at $O(1)$, we should choose $\delta \asymp n^{-1/d}$ (so that $c/en\delta^d = O(1)$). Which indicates that

$$\mathbb{P}(\|x_{i(X_0)} - x_0\| \lesssim n^{-1/d}) \geq 1 - C$$

i.e. with certain minimal probability, the nearest neighbor distance is at most $\lesssim n^{-1/d}$.

Exercise 4

4.(a)

Note that $f_\theta(x) = 0$ is a hyper plane in \mathbb{R}^d , the distance from $x^{(i)}$ to which is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{distance} &= \frac{|\theta'x^{(i)} + \theta_0|}{\|\theta\|} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{|\theta'x^{(i)} + \theta_0|}{\|\theta\|}, & \text{if } \theta'x^{(i)} + \theta_0 > 0 \\ -\frac{|\theta'x^{(i)} + \theta_0|}{\|\theta\|}, & \text{if } \theta'x^{(i)} + \theta_0 < 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

further for hard margin SVM, $\theta'x^{(i)} + \theta_0$ has the same sign as $y^{(i)}$, thus we have:

$$\text{distance} = \frac{y^{(i)}(\theta'x^{(i)} + \theta_0)}{\|\theta\|} = \gamma^{(i)}$$

4.(b)

Optimization problem for hard margin SVM can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \min_{\theta, \theta_0} & \frac{1}{2} \|\theta\|^2 \\ \text{w.r.t.} & y^{(i)}(\theta'x^{(i)} + \theta_0) \geq 1 \end{aligned}$$

and note that the decision boundary is determined by the (θ, θ_0) , which has an extra degree of freedom w.r.t. scale transformation. We cancel this degree of freedom by setting a constraint $\|\theta\| = \frac{1}{M}$.

The Lagrangian can be written as:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \theta_0, \alpha_1^n) = \frac{1}{2} \|\theta\|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \left(y^{(i)}(\theta'x^{(i)} + \theta_0) - 1 \right)$$

and the optimization problem can be solved by minimizing the Lagrangian w.r.t. θ, θ_0

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta} &= \theta - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i y^{(i)} x^{(i)} = 0 \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta_0} &= - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i y^{(i)} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

to get the dual problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_D(\alpha) &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j y^{(i)} y^{(j)} x^{(i)'} x^{(j)} + \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \\ \text{s.t.} & \alpha_i \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i y^{(i)} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

The dual problem is usually easier to solve because we can see that the dual problem has less (non-trivial) constraints.