

## 3.1 Learning Decision Lists

### 3.1.1 Decision Lists

A decision list (DL) is a boolean functions of the form “If  $l_1$  then output  $b_1$ , else if  $l_2$  then output  $b_2$ , ..., else  $b_{k+1}$ ”, where  $l_i$  is the literal (a variable or its negation). The length of decision list is the number of literals that are tested in the worst-case.

Obviously, every conjunction/disjunction can be expressed as a decision list.

Without loss of generality, any decision list has length  $\leq n$ . Having  $x_i$  and  $\bar{x}_i$  simultaneously is not meaningful in decision list.

### 3.1.2 Online Learning Algorithm for Decision Lists

We will consider length  $r$  ( $1 \leq r \leq n$ ) decision lists over  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . Our learning algorithm uses “generalized decision lists”, where each level can have multiple “if  $l$  then output  $b$ ” rules (even conflicting ones). In each step/trial, go through levels 1,2,... until we find a level, with some rule  $(l, b)$ , where  $l$  is satisfied by  $x$ , output  $b$ . If two or more conflicting rules apply, pick arbitrarily. For the initial  $h$ , put all possible rules in level 1. There are total  $4n+2$  possible rules. ( $l \rightarrow 2n, b \rightarrow 2, 0/1$  (the else cases)  $\rightarrow$ ). And, update the hypothesis  $h$  given example  $x$ .

- If  $h(x) = c(x)$ , do nothing.
- If  $h(x) \neq c(x)$ , take the rule that we used to predict  $x$ , and move it to the next level.

**Theorem 3.1.1** *The described algorithm above makes  $O(nr)$  mistakes on any sequence of examples if true concept  $c$  is a length- $r$  decision list over  $n$  boolean variable.*

**Proof:** Suppose that true target concept  $c = (l_1, b_1), \dots, (l_r, b_r)$ . First rule  $(l_1, b_1)$  is never moved to level 2 in the hypothesis maintained by our algorithm. If  $l_1$  holds, then the output of  $c$  is  $b_1$  by definition. By induction on  $i$  for  $2 \leq i \leq r$ , the rule  $(l_i, b_i)$  never gets sent to level  $j > i$ . Then, no rule in level  $r+2$  is ever consulted, so no rule is ever sent to level  $r+3$ . Every mistake moves a rule on level. The total number of levels moved by all rules is less than  $(4n+2)(r+1)$ , which leads to the mistake bound  $O(nr)$ . Note that computation time per example/trial is  $O(n^2)$ , which is also good. ■

## 3.2 Learning Sparse Disjunctions with Winnow Algorithms

Consider learning sparse disjunctions, for example,  $n = 10^6$ , but  $c(x) = x_{7145} \vee x_{11146} \vee x_{218342}$ . Elimination algorithm takes mistake bound  $n$ . We will show winnow algorithm learns length- $k$

disjunctions with mistake bound  $O(k \log n)$ .

Winnow algorithm uses linear threshold functions (LTFs) as hypotheses, i.e.  $(w_1, \dots, w_n, \theta)$  and

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^n w_i x_i \geq \theta \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Note that LTFs can express disjunctions and conjunctions as following examples.

1) Disjunction example

$$x_1 \vee \dots \vee x_k$$

$$\Rightarrow w_1 = w_2 = \dots = w_k = 1, \theta = 1/2$$

$$\Rightarrow x_1 + \dots + x_k \geq 1/2$$

2) Conjunction example

$$x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_k$$

$$\Rightarrow x_1 + \dots + x_k \geq k - 1/2$$

**Theorem 3.2.1** *Any decision list can be expressed as a linear threshold function.*