0.1 VC Dimension

1. Exercise 2.2 (B)

Does there excist a hypothesis set for which $m_H(N) = N + 2^{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor}$ where $\lfloor N/2 \rfloor$ is the largest integer < N/2?

From Theorem 2.4, we know that if $m_{1}(k) < 2^{k}$ be some value k, then $m_{1}(N) < \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} {N \choose i}$ for all N. The RHS is polynomial in N of degree k-1.

=> $m_{H}(N) = N + 2^{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor}$? $\stackrel{!}{\underset{i=p}{\xi}} (N)$ for all NIn this case, k = 3 $(m_{H}(3) = 5 < 2^{3})$ => $m_{H}(N)$? $\frac{N^{2}}{2} + \frac{N}{2} + 1$ The inequality non't hold for all N because LHSexperiences exponential quowth while RHS experiences polynomial quow th => the hypothesis set does not exist

2. Exercise 2.6

400 training examples 1000 hypothers doo test examples $\delta = 0.05$

a)
$$Eout(g) \leqslant Ein(g) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2N} \ln \frac{2M}{\delta}}$$

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{2N}\ln\frac{z_{\text{ell}}}{\delta}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2.400}\ln\frac{2.1000}{0.05}} \approx 0.115$$

For test set, we have only one hypothess (final hypothess produced by training)

$$Eart(g) \leq Etest(g) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2N} ln \frac{2M}{\delta}}$$

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{2N} \ln \frac{2U}{8}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2000 \ln \frac{21}{0.05}}} \approx 0.096$$

6) Yes, if we rever even more examples for testing, we will use lever examples for training that are important to lind a good hypothesis

3. Problem 2.316)

From example 2.2, we know that for positive intervals the maximum number of dichotomies $m_H(N) = \frac{1}{2}N^2 + \frac{1}{2}N + 1$ For negative intervals, we have $\binom{N-1}{2}$ additional dichotomies

$$\binom{N-1}{2} = \frac{(N-1)!}{2!(N-3)!} = \frac{(N-2)(N-1)}{2} = \frac{N^2 - 3N + 2}{2}$$

=> Total number of max dicholomies; mn(N) = $\frac{1}{2}N^2 + \frac{1}{2}N + 1 + \frac{1}{2}N^2 + \frac{3}{2}N + 1$ = $N^2 - N + 2$

 $m_{H}(3) = S = 2^{3}$ and $m_{H}(4) = 14 < 2^{4} = 2$ due = 3

For
$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2} h_c | h_c(x) = sign \left(\frac{\Re}{2} c_i c_i^{i} \right) \int_{i=0}^{\Re} c_i^{i} c_i^{i}$$

prove that the VC dimension of H is exactly (D+1)

a) Construct a square matrix with (D+1) x (D+1) dimensions;

where $x_0, x_1, ..., x_D$ are D+1 points in \mathbb{R}

det X ≠ D since ock are all different

Arabitrary dichotomy:
$$y = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} \in 2-1,+15^{n+1}$$

Let
$$C = \begin{bmatrix} C & C \\ C & C \\ C & C \end{bmatrix} = X^{-1}y = X^{-1}y$$

=>
$$hc(x_k) = sign(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_i x_k^i) = y_k$$
 let all $k = 0, ..., \infty$

=> 2+1 points xo, x1,..., XD can be shattered by the hypothesis set H

b) If we consider
$$\mathfrak{D}+2$$
 points in \mathbb{R} $(X_0,X_1,...,X_0,X_0)+1$ and $\mathbb{D}+2$ vectors in the lorn $[X_0^k,x_0^l,...,X_0^k]$ for $k=0,...,\mathbb{D}+1$, there vectors will be lin dependent

=> some vector is a linear combination of all other vectors:

$$[X_{\ell}^{\circ}, X_{\ell}^{\dagger}, \dots, X_{\ell}^{\mathfrak{A}}] = \underset{k \neq \ell}{\leq} a_{k} (X_{k}^{\circ}, X_{k}^{\dagger}, \dots, X_{k}^{\mathfrak{A}}]$$

(D+1 coefficients are not all equal to zero)

Choose dichotomy y:
$$y_k = sign(a_k)$$
 if $a_k \neq 0$
and $y_l = -1$

let
$$C = \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \\ c_0 \end{bmatrix} =>$$

$$[Xe', Xe', \dots xe] \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Xk, Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots, xk']}_{k \neq l} \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq l} [Cak Xk', Xk', \dots$$

Assume that Mere exists
$$C \in \mathbb{R}^{D+1}$$
 st

 $y_k = h_c(x_k) = sign(\sum_{i=0}^{D} Ci X_k^i)$ for all k ($a_k \neq 0$)

 $y_k = h_c(x_k) = sign(\sum_{i=0}^{D} Ci X_k^i)$

=>
$$sign(ak) = yk = sign(\sum_{i=0}^{D} Ci \times k)$$

=>
$$\sum_{i=0}^{D} c_i a_k x_k^i > 0$$
 for any $k(a_k \neq 0)$ because of multiplication. With the same signs

$$=> \underbrace{\sum_{k \neq \ell}^{\mathfrak{D}} C_{i} a_{k} x_{k}^{i}}_{k \neq \ell} = \underbrace{\sum_{i=0}^{\mathfrak{D}} C_{i} x_{\ell}^{i} x_{\ell}^{i} ..., x_{\ell}^{\mathfrak{D}}}_{k \neq \ell} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} c_{0} \\ c_{1} \\ c_{\mathfrak{D}} \end{bmatrix}}_{i=0} = \underbrace{\sum_{i=0}^{\mathfrak{D}} c_{i} x_{\ell}^{i}}_{i=0} > 0$$

But we chose $ye=-1 \Rightarrow$ there is a dicholomy that cannot be implemented \Rightarrow there are no D+2 points which are shattered by H.

From a and b, VC dimension of H is exactly D+1.

5. Problem 2.18

Prove that the Collowing hypothesis set for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ has an infinite VC dimension;

$$\mathcal{H} = 2 ha | ha(x) = (-1)^{Lax}$$
, where $a \in \mathbb{R}$

where LAJ is the Biggest integer & A

Consider N points x_1, \dots, x_N where $x_n = 10^n$

Arbitrary dichotomy; y1,...,yN E 2-1,+13"

If we choose d = 0, $a_1 a_2 \dots a_N$ with ai = 1 if yi = -1 (even)

=> $h_{d}(x_{n}) = (-1)^{Ld \cdot 10^{n}} = y_{n}$ for all n = 1, ..., N

 \Rightarrow $\mathcal{H}(x_{1,...}, x_{N}) = 2^{-1}, +15^{N} \Rightarrow m_{H}(N) = 2^{N}$ for all N

=> the hypothesis set has an infinite VC dimension

0.2 Perceptron Dimension verus VC Dimension

1. Exercise 2.4(a)

Injust space IL = 815 x Rd (including 200 = 1)

Show that the VC dimension of the perception (with d+1 parameters counting wo) is exactly d+1

a) Construct nonsingular (d+1) x (d+1) matrix:

$$\mathcal{IC} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x_{01} & \dots & x_{0d} \\ 1 & x_{11} & \dots & x_{1d} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & & \\ 1 & x_{d1} & \dots & x_{dd} \end{bmatrix}$$

 $(x_{ko} = 1)$

where x_0, x_1, \dots, x_d are d+1 distinct points in \mathbb{R}^d

det X = D since och are all different

Dichotomy:
$$y = \begin{bmatrix} y_0 \\ y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_d \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{E}^{-1}, 15^{d+1}$$

Let
$$w = \begin{bmatrix} w_0 \\ w_1 \\ \vdots \\ w_d \end{bmatrix} = x^{-1}y \implies xw = y$$

=>
$$h_w(x_k) = sign\left(\sum_{i=0}^d w_i x_{ki}\right) = y_k$$
 for all $k = 0, ..., d$

- => Perception can shatter xo,..., xd => mu(d+1) = 2 d+1
- => drc > d+1
- 2. Exercise 2.416)
- b) If we consider d+2 points represented by a vector of length d+1, these vectors will be linearly dependent
- => some vector is a lin, combination of all other vectors:

$$[x_b, x_{e_1}, \dots x_{e_d}] = \sum_{k \neq l} a_k (x_{ko}, x_{k_1}, \dots, x_{k_d}]$$

(d+1 coefficients ar not all equal to zero)

Theore dichotomy
$$y$$
: $y_k = sign(a_k)$ if $a_k \neq 0$ and $y_k = -1$ let $w = [w_0, w_1, ..., w_d]^{\top} = >$

$$[x_{0}, x_{0}, x_{1}, x_{2}][w_{0}] = \sum_{k \neq l} a_{k}[x_{k_{0}}, x_{k_{1}}, x_{k_{0}}][w_{0}] = \begin{bmatrix} w_{0} \\ w_{l} \end{bmatrix}$$

Assume that there exists
$$w \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$$
 s.t.

 $y_k = h(x_k) = sign(\sum_{i=0}^{d} w_i x_{ki})$ for all k (ak $\neq 0$)

$$yl = h(xl) = sign(\sum_{i=0}^{d} w_i x_{i})$$

=>
$$sign(a_k) = y_k = sign(\sum_{i=0}^{d} w_i x_{ki})$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{i=0}^{d} w_i a_k x_{ki} > 0 \quad \text{for any } k \quad (a_k \neq 0) \quad \text{because of multiplication}$$

$$u_i h \quad \text{the same signs}$$

$$= \sum_{k \neq \ell} \underbrace{\sum_{i=0}^{d} w_i a_k x_{ki}}_{k \neq \ell} = \underbrace{\sum_{i=0}^{d} w_i x_{ki}}_{k \neq \ell} = \underbrace{\sum_{i=0}^{d} w_i x_{ki}}_{i \neq 0} = \underbrace{\sum_{i=0}^{d} w_i x_{ki}}_{i \neq 0} > 0$$

=>
$$ye = sign \left(\sum_{i=0}^{d} w_i x_{i}^2 \right) = +1$$

But we chose $ye = -1 \implies there is a dichotomy that cannot be implemented <math>\implies$ for $N \ge d + 2 = m_H(N) < 2^N = 7 \text{ duc} \le d + 1$

0.3 The Upper Bound

1. Exercise 2.7 (a)

For binary target Bunchions, show that $P[h(x) \neq f(x)]$ can be written as an expected value of a mean squared error measure if the convention used for the binary function is 0 or 1.

There are 4 cases: $h(x) \mid f(x)$ wobalify at each east

There are 4 cases;
$$h(x)$$
 $f(x)$

0
0
1
1
1
1

probability of each ease is if

Experted value of a mean squared error meanine!

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(h(x) - f(x)\right)^{2}\right] = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left(0 - 0\right)^{2} + \frac{1}{4} \left(0 - 1\right)^{2} + \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - 0\right)^{2} + \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - 1\right)^{2} = \frac{1}{4}$$

$$P[h(x) \neq f(x)] = P('h(x)=0, f(x)=1') \cup (h(x)=1, f(x)=0') = P('h(x)=0, f(x)=1') + P('h(x)=1, f(x)=0) = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{2}$$

$$\Rightarrow$$
 $P[h(x) \neq f(x)] = E[(h(x) - f(x))^2]$

Also, algebraically;

$$P[h(x) \neq f(x)] = P[h(x) \neq f(x)] \cdot 1 + P[h(x) = f(x)] \cdot D =$$

$$P[h(x) \neq f(x)] (h(x) - f(x))^{2} + P[h(x) = f(x)](h(x) - f(x))^{2} =$$

$$E[(h(x) - f(x))^{2}]$$

2. Exercise 2.716)

The convention used for the binary function is ±1.

There are 4 cases
$$h(x)$$
 $f(x)$ $f(x$

Expected value of a mean squared measure:

$$E[(|h(x)-f(x)|)^{2}] = \frac{1}{4}(1-1)^{2} + \frac{1}{4}(1-(-1))^{2} + \frac{1}{4}(-1-1)^{2} + \frac{1}{4}(1-(-1))^{2} + \frac{1}{4}(1-(-1))^{2} = 2$$

$$P[h(x) \neq f(x)] = P(h(x) = +1, f(x) = -1)' U'h(x) = -1, f(x) = +1') = P(h(x) = +1, f(x) = -1') + P(h(x) = -1, f(x) = +1) = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{2}$$

$$\Rightarrow$$
 $P[h(x) \neq f(x)] = \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E}[(h(x) - f(x))^2]$

Alm, algebraically;

$$P[h(x) \neq f(x)] = \frac{1}{4} P[h(x) \neq f(x)] \cdot 4 + \frac{1}{4} P[h(x) = f(x)] \cdot 0 =$$

$$\frac{1}{4} |P[h(x) \neq f(x)] (h(x) - f(x))^{2} + \frac{1}{4} |P[h(x) = f(x)] (h(x) - f(x))^{2} =$$

$$\frac{1}{4}$$
 $\mathbb{E}\left[\left(h(x) - f(x)\right)^2\right]$

3. Problem 2.8

Which of the bellowing are possible growth functions mxIN) for some hypothess set:

$$1+N$$
, $1+N+\frac{N(N-1)}{2}$, 2^N , $2^{L\sqrt{N}}$, $2^{LN/2}$

$$1 + N + \frac{N(N-1)(N-2)}{6}$$

mmIN) is upper-Sounded by 2"

If
$$dic = \infty$$
, $mn(N) = 2^N$ for all N

1. If
$$m_H(N) = 1 + N$$
, $m_H(1) = 2 = 2^1$ and $m_H(2) = 3 < 2^2$

$$\Rightarrow$$
 duc = 1 \Rightarrow mr(N) \leq N'+1 (this is true \Rightarrow lor all N

 $m_H(N) = 1 + N$ is a possible growth function.)

2. If
$$m_{H}(N) = 1 + N + \frac{N(N-1)}{2} = 1 + \frac{N}{2} + \frac{N^2}{2}$$
, $m_{H}(2) = 4 = 2^2$ and $m_{H}(3) = 7 < 2^3 = > dvc = 2 = >$
 $m_{H}(N) \leq N^2 + 1$ for all N (this is true => $m_{H}(N) = 1 + N + \frac{N(N-1)}{2}$ is a panible growth benchion)

3. If $m_{H}(N) = 2^{N}$, $d_{VC} = \infty$ and $m_{H}(N) = 2^{N}$ for all N (this is true => $m_{H}(N) = 2^{N}$ is a possible guowth function)

4. If
$$m_{H}(N) = 2^{\lfloor \sqrt{N} \rfloor}$$
, $m_{H}(1) = 2 = 2^{1}$ and $m_{H}(2) = 2^{\lfloor \sqrt{2} \rfloor} = 2 < 2^{2} \implies d_{N}c = 1 \implies m_{H}(N) < N^{1} + 1$ for all N (this is not true for all N (e.g. if $N = 25$, $2^{\lfloor \sqrt{25} \rfloor} = 32 \times 26$) => $m_{H}(N) = 2^{\lfloor \sqrt{N} \rfloor}$ is not a possible growth function)

5. If $m_{H}(N) = 2^{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor}$ $m_{H}(0) = 1 = 2^{\circ}$ and $MH(1) = 2^{11/2} = 1 < 2^{1} = 0 = 0$ $m_H(N) \leq N^{\circ} + 1 = 2$ for all N (this is not true for all N (starting from N=4) => mu(N) = $2^{LN/2}$, S not a possible quonth lunction) 6, If $\min(N) = 1 + N + \frac{N(N-1)(N-2)}{6} = \frac{N^3}{6} - \frac{N^2}{2} + \frac{4N}{3} + 1$ $m_{H}(1) = \lambda = \lambda^{1}$ and $m_{H}(2) = 3 < 2^{2} \implies dvc = 1 \implies$ $m_{\mathcal{L}}(N) \leq N^{4}+1$ for all N (this is not true for all N (starting from N=3) => $m_{\nu}(N) = 1+N+\frac{N(N-1)(N-2)}{C}$ is

not a possible growth lunction