Data Science for Actuaries (ACT6100)

Arthur Charpentier

Supervisé # 1 (Concepts Fondamentaux - 5)

automne 2020

https://github.com/freakonometrics/ACT6100/

Assume that training and validation data are drawn i.i.d. from \mathbb{P} , or $(Y, X) \sim F$

Consider $y \in \{-1, +1\}$. The true risk of a classifier is

$$\mathcal{R}(m) = \mathbb{P}_{(Y,\boldsymbol{X}) \sim F}(m(\boldsymbol{X}) \neq Y)) = \mathbb{E}_{(Y,\boldsymbol{X}) \sim F}(\ell(m(\boldsymbol{X}), Y))$$

Bayes classifier is

$$b(\mathbf{x}) = \operatorname{sign}\left(\mathbb{E}_{(Y,\mathbf{X})\sim F}\left[Y|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}\right]\right)$$

which satisfies $\mathcal{R}(b) = \inf_{m \in \mathcal{H}} \{\mathcal{R}(m)\}$ (in the class \mathcal{H} of all measurable functions), called Bayes risk.

The empirical risk is

$$\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(m) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(y_i, m(\mathbf{x}_i))$$





One might think of using regularized empirical risk minimization,

$$\widehat{m}_n \in \operatorname*{argmin}_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(m) + \lambda \|m\| \right\}$$

in a class of models \mathcal{M} , where regularization term will control the complexity of the model to prevent overfitting.

Let m_0 denote the oracale model in \mathcal{M} , $m_0 = \operatorname{argmin} \{\mathcal{R}(m)\}$

$$\mathcal{R}(\widehat{m}_n) - \mathcal{R}(b) = \underbrace{\mathcal{R}(\widehat{m}_n) - \mathcal{R}(m_0)}_{ ext{estimation error}} + \underbrace{\mathcal{R}(m_0) - \mathcal{R}(b)}_{ ext{approximation error}}$$

Since
$$\mathcal{R}(\widehat{m}_n) = \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(\widehat{m}_n) + [\mathcal{R}(\widehat{m}_n) - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(\widehat{m}_n)]$$
, we can write
$$\mathcal{R}(\widehat{m}_n) \leq \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(\widehat{m}_n)) + \text{something}(m, \mathcal{M})$$

To quantify this something (m, \mathcal{F}) , we need Hoeffding inequality, see Hoeffding (1963, Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables)

Let $g(\mathbf{x}, y) = \ell(m(\mathbf{x}), y)$, for some model m. Let

$$\mathcal{G} = \{g: (\textbf{\textit{x}}, \textit{\textit{y}}) \mapsto \ell(\textit{\textit{m}}(\textbf{\textit{x}}), \textit{\textit{y}}), \textit{\textit{m}} \in \mathcal{M}\}$$

If
$$Z = (Y, X)$$
, set $\mathcal{R}(g) = \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim F}(g(Z))$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(g) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(z_i)$.

Hoeffding inequality

If Z_1, \dots, Z_n are i.i.d. and if h is a bounded function (in [a, b]), then, $\forall \epsilon > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}_n\left[\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n h(Z_i) - \mathbb{E}_F[h(Z)]\right| \ge \epsilon\right] \le 2\exp\left(\frac{-2n\epsilon^2}{(b-a)^2}\right)$$

or equivalently (let δ denote the upper bound)

$$\mathbb{P}_n\left[\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n h(Z_i) - \mathbb{E}_F[h(Z)]\right| \geq (b-a)\sqrt{\frac{-1}{2n}\log(2\delta)}\right] \leq \delta$$

We can actually derive a one side majoration, and with probability (at least) $1-\delta$

$$\mathcal{R}(g) \leq \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(g) + \sqrt{\frac{-1}{2n}\log\delta}$$

$$\mathcal{R}(m) - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(m)$$

For a fixed $m \in \mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{R}(m) - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(m) \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$

But it doesn't help much, we need uniform deviations (or worst deviation).

Consider a finite set of models. Define the set of bad samples

$$\mathcal{Z}_j = \left\{ (z_1, \cdots, z_n) : \mathcal{R}(g_j) - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(g_j) \geq 0 \right\}$$

 $\mathbb{P}[(Z_1,\cdots,Z_n)\in\mathcal{Z}_1\cap\mathcal{Z}_1]<\mathbb{P}[(Z_1,\cdots,Z_n)\in\mathcal{Z}_1]+\mathbb{P}[(Z_1,\cdots,Z_n)\in\mathcal{Z}_2]$

so that $\mathbb{P}[(Z_1,\cdots,Z_n)\in\mathcal{Z}_i]\leq\delta$, and then

so that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[(Z_1,\cdots,Z_n)\in\bigcap_{i=1}^{\nu}\mathcal{Z}_j\right]\leq\sum_{i=1}^{\nu}\mathbb{P}[(Z_1,\cdots,Z_n)\in\mathcal{Z}_j]\leq\nu\delta$$

Hence.

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists g \in \{g_1, \cdots, g_{\nu}\} : \mathcal{R}(g) - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(g) > \epsilon] < \nu \cdot \mathbb{P}[R(g) - \widehat{R}_n(g) > \epsilon] < \nu \cdot \exp(-\frac{1}{2} |g| + \epsilon)$$

If $\delta = \nu \exp[-2n\epsilon^2]$, we can write ϵ and with probability (at least) $1-\delta$

$$\forall g \in \{g_1, \cdots, g_{\nu}\}, \mathcal{R}(g) - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(g) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} (\log \nu - \log \delta)}$$

Thus, we can write, for a finite set of models $\mathcal{M} = \{m_1, \dots, m_{\nu}\}$,

$$\forall m \in \{m_1, \cdots, m_{\nu}\}, \mathcal{R}(m) \leq \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(m) + \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}(\log \nu - \log \delta)}$$

$$\mathcal{R}(m) - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(m)$$
 - \mathcal{M} finite, $u = |\mathcal{M}|$

For the worst case scenario

$$\sup_{m \in \mathcal{M}_{\nu}} \left\{ \mathcal{R}(m) - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(m) \right\} \sim \frac{\log \nu}{\sqrt{n}}$$

Now, what if \mathcal{M} is infinite?

Write Hoeffding's inequality as

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mathcal{R}(g) - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(g) \geq \sqrt{\frac{-1}{2n}\log\delta_g}\right] \leq \delta_g$$

so that, we a countable set \mathcal{G}

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\exists g \in \mathcal{G} : \mathcal{R}(g) - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(g) \ge \sqrt{\frac{-1}{2n} \log \delta_g}\right] \le \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \delta_g$$

If $\delta_g = \delta \cdot \mu(g)$ where μ is some measure on \mathcal{G} , with probability (at least) $1 - \delta$.

$$\forall g \in \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{R}(g) \leq \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(g) + \sqrt{\frac{-1}{2n}[\log \delta + \log \mu(g)]}$$

(see previous computations with $\mu(g) = \nu^{-1}$)

More generally, given a sample $\mathbf{z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$, let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{z}}$ denote the set of classification that can be obtained,

$$\mathcal{M}_{z} = \{(m(z_1), \cdots, m(z_n))\}$$

The growth function is the maximum number of ways into which npoints can be classified by the function class \mathcal{M}

$$G_{\mathcal{M}}(n) = \sup_{\mathbf{z}} \left\{ \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{z}} \right\}$$

Vapnik-Chervonenkis: with (at least) probability $1 - \delta$,

$$\forall m \in \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{R}(m) \leq \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(m) + 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}[\log G_{\mathcal{M}}(2n) - \log(4\delta)]}$$

The VC (Vapnik-Chervonenkis) dimension is the largest n such that $G_{\mathcal{M}}(n) = 2^n$. It will be denoted VC(\mathcal{M}). Observe that $G_{M}(n) \leq 2^{n}$

 $n \leq VC(\mathcal{M}): n \mapsto G_{\mathcal{M}}(n)$ increases exponentially $G_{\mathcal{M}}(n) = 2^n$ $n \geq VC(\mathcal{M}): n \mapsto G_{\mathcal{M}}(n)$ increases at power speed $G_{\mathcal{M}}(n) \leq \left(\frac{en}{VC(\mathcal{M})}\right)^{VC(\mathcal{M})}$

Vapnik-Chervonenkis : with (at least) probability $1-\delta$,

$$\forall m \in \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{R}(m) \leq \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(m) + 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}[\mathsf{VC}(\mathcal{M})\log\left(\frac{en}{\mathsf{VC}(\mathcal{M})}\right) - \log(4\delta)]$$

$\mathcal{R}(m) - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(m)$ - \mathcal{M} infinite

For the worst case scenario $\sup_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ \mathcal{R}(m) - \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_n(m) \right\} \sim \sqrt{\frac{\mathsf{VC}(\mathcal{M}) \cdot \log n}{n}}$

To go further, see Bousquet, Boucheron & Lugosi (2005, Introduction to Learning Theory)