

X : Domain set

Y : Label set

Let D be a distribution over $X \times Y$. ~~Let D_x be the marginal distribution over X~~

We will assume that samples are drawn $(x, y) \sim D$

Let the risk be given by

$$L_D(h) := \mathbb{P}_{(x,y) \sim D} (h(x) \neq y) = D(\{(x,y): h(x) \neq y\})$$

Lemma (Optimal Bayes predictor)

The classifier w/ minimum risk is

$$f_D(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } P(y=1|x) \geq \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

pf

Note

$$L_D(f_D) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim D} \mathbb{1}_{\{f_D(x) \neq y\}}$$

$$(*) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_x} \left(\underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{y \sim D_{y|x}} (\mathbb{1}_{\{f_D(x) \neq y\}} | X=x)}_{\text{Sub, this } P(f_D(x) \neq y | X=x)} \right)$$

$$\text{Let } \alpha_x = P(Y=1 | X=x)$$

$$\begin{aligned} P(f_D(X) \neq y | X=x) &= \underbrace{P(f_D(X)=0 | X=x)}_{\in \{0,1\}} (1-\alpha_x) + \underbrace{P(f_D(X)=1 | X=x)}_{\in \{0,1\}} \alpha_x \\ &= \min((1-\alpha_x), \alpha_x) \end{aligned}$$

But also, Suppose g is any other classifier, possibly stochastic. Then

$$P(g(\mathbf{X}) \neq Y | \mathbf{X} = x) = P(g(\mathbf{X}) = 1 | \mathbf{X} = x) P(Y = 0 | \mathbf{X} = x) \\ + P(g(\mathbf{X}) = 0 | \mathbf{X} = x) P(Y = 1 | \mathbf{X} = x)$$

$$= P(g(\mathbf{X}) = 1 | \mathbf{X} = x)(1 - \alpha_x) + P(g(\mathbf{X}) = 0 | \mathbf{X} = x) \alpha_x$$

$$\geq \min \{ (1 - \alpha_x), \alpha_x \}$$

Hence, ~~$E(1_{\{g(\mathbf{X}) \neq Y\}})$~~
 going back to (*) we see that $E(1_{\{g(\mathbf{X}) \neq Y\}} | \mathbf{X} = x) \leq E(1_{\{g(\mathbf{X}) \neq Y\}} | \mathbf{X} = x)$
 $\forall x$

~~$$(*) = E_{\mathbf{X} \sim D_x} \min(\alpha_x, 1 - \alpha_x)$$~~

$$(*) \leq E_{\mathbf{X} \sim D_x} (E_{\mathbf{Y} \sim P_{Y|\mathbf{X}}} (1_{\{g(\mathbf{X}) \neq Y\}} | \mathbf{X} = x))$$

$$= E_{(\mathbf{X}, Y) \sim D} (1_{\{g(\mathbf{X}) \neq Y\}})$$

□

Def (Agnostic PAC learnability)

Hypothesis class \mathcal{H} is agnostic PAC learnable if $\exists m_H: (0,1)^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ & learning algo A s.t. : $\forall \epsilon, \delta \in (0,1)$ & every distrib \mathcal{D} over \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} , running A on $m \geq m_H(\epsilon, \delta)$ i.i.d samples from \mathcal{D} , A returns a hypothesis h s.t. w.p. at least $1-\delta$

$$L_D(h) \leq \min_{h' \in \mathcal{H}} L_D(h') + \epsilon,$$

where $L_D(h) = \mathbb{E}_{z \sim \mathcal{D}} \lambda(h, z)$

Note: Above, we consider general loss func λ . e.g.

$$\lambda_{0,1}(h, (x, y)) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } h(x) = y \\ 1 & h(x) \neq y \end{cases}$$

$$\lambda_{sq}(h, (x, y)) := (h(x) - y)^2$$

Uniform Convergence

Def (ϵ -rep. sample) A training set S is called ϵ -representative if

$$|L_S(h) - L_D(h)| < \epsilon \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}$$

Lemma Assume S is $\epsilon/2$ -rep. Then any $h_S \in \text{ERM}_{\mathcal{H}}(S)$ satisfies

$$L_D(h_S) \leq \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} L_D(h) + \epsilon$$

pf
 $\forall h, \quad L_D(h_S) \stackrel{\epsilon\text{-rep}}{\leq} L_S(h_S) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \stackrel{\downarrow h_S \in \text{ERM}}{\leq} L_S(h) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \leq L_D(h) + \epsilon.$
 Minimizing over h completes the proof.

Def (uniform convergence) We say a hypothesis class \mathcal{H} has the uniform conv. property if $\exists m_{\mathcal{H}}: (0,1) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $\forall \epsilon, \delta \in (0,1)$ & \forall prob. distrib. D over Z , if S is a sample of $m \geq m_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon, \delta)$ i.i.d. draws, then w.p. at least $(1-\delta)$ S is ϵ -f.p.

Note If \mathcal{H} has uniform conv. property w/ func. $m_{\mathcal{H}}^{uc}$, then \mathcal{H} is ϵ -approx PAC learnable w/ sample complexity $m_{\mathcal{H}}(\epsilon, \delta) \leq m_{\mathcal{H}}^{uc}(\frac{\epsilon}{2}, \delta)$. Also, the ERM paradigm is a successful ϵ -approx PAC learner for \mathcal{H} .

Claim Let \mathcal{H} be a finite hypothesis class, Z be a domain, & let $\lambda: \mathcal{H} \times Z \rightarrow [0,1]$ be a loss function. Then \mathcal{H} has the uniform conv. property w/ sample complexity

$$m_{\mathcal{H}}^{uc}(\epsilon, \delta) \leq \frac{\log(2|\mathcal{H}|/\delta)}{2\epsilon^2}$$

Fix ϵ, δ w.l.o.g.

$$D^m(\{S: \forall h \in \mathcal{H}, |L_S(h) - L_D(h)| \leq \epsilon\}) \geq 1 - \delta$$

equivalently,

$$D^m(\{S: \exists h \in \mathcal{H}, |L_S(h) - L_D(h)| > \epsilon\}) < \delta$$

w.r.t.

$$\{S: \exists h \in \mathcal{H}, |L_S(h) - L_D(h)| > \epsilon\} = \bigcup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \{S: |L_S(h) - L_D(h)| > \epsilon\}$$

union bound gives

$$D^m(\{S: \exists h \in \mathcal{H}, |L_S(h) - L_D(h)| > \epsilon\}) \leq \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} D^m(\{S: |L_S(h) - L_D(h)| > \epsilon\}) \quad (*)$$

Now, just want to bound terms inside sum. Note that

$$L_S(h) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \underbrace{l(h, z_i)}_{\text{has}}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{z \sim D} (l(h, z)) =: L_D(h)$$

$$\text{for } \mathbb{E}(L_S(h)) = L_D(h).$$

Recall Hoeffding inequality: (θ_i) i.i.d w/ $\mathbb{E} \theta_i = \mu$ &
 $P(a \leq \theta_i \leq b) = 1$. Then $\forall \varepsilon > 0$,

$$P\left(\left|\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \theta_i - \mu\right| > \varepsilon\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-2m\varepsilon^2}{(b-a)^2}\right).$$

Applying Hoeffding we see

$$D^m(\{S: |L_S(h) - L_D(h)| > \varepsilon\}) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-2m\varepsilon^2}{1}\right)$$

Hence, w/ (*) this implies

$$\begin{aligned} D^m(\{S: \exists h \in \mathcal{H}, |L_S(h) - L_D(h)| > \varepsilon\}) &\leq \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} 2e^{-2m\varepsilon^2} \\ &\leq 2|\mathcal{H}| e^{-2m\varepsilon^2} \end{aligned}$$