

1

Over such a thin shell of thickness ϵ , we can assume the density function to be roughly constant. Then, evaluating the density function at any point x with norm r gives

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(\frac{-1}{2}x^T\sigma^{-2}Ix\right) = \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(\frac{-r^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

The hypervolume of the surface of the sphere is $S_d r^{d-1}$ (since it's a $d-1$ -dimensional set), so the volume of the shell is approximately $\epsilon S_d r^{d-1}$. The integral of the density over the shell is approximately the volume of the shell times the value of the density, or

$$\epsilon \frac{S_d r^{d-1}}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(\frac{-r^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

To find the maximum of f , differentiate it by r to obtain

$$\frac{(d-1)S_d r^{d-2}}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(\frac{-r^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) - \frac{S_d r^d}{\sigma^2 (2\pi\sigma^2)^{d/2}} \exp\left(\frac{-r^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

Setting this equal to 0 and canceling gives

$$0 = (d-1) - \frac{r^2}{\sigma^2} \implies r = \pm\sigma\sqrt{d-1}$$

Now, to check that this is a maximum, taking the second derivative gives us a common, positive multiplier times the following:

$$(d-1)(d-2) - \frac{r^2}{\sigma^2}(2d-1) + \frac{r^4}{\sigma^4}$$

Plugging in the previously obtained value for the stationary point, we have

$$d^2 - 3d + 2 - (d-1)(2d-1) + (d-1)^2 = -2d + 2$$

which becomes negative for large d . Thus, the point is a maximum, and we can estimate it by $\sigma\sqrt{d}$ for large d .

0.1 2

By the AM-GM inequality, we have $\frac{a+b}{2} \leq \sqrt{ab}$. Since the minimum of a and b is bounded above by the arithmetic mean, we thus also have $\min(a, b) \leq \sqrt{ab}$.

Now, we have that $P(\text{error}) = P(\text{error}|Y=1)P(Y=1) + P(\text{error}|Y=2)P(Y=2)$. If we let Σ_i be the set which the classifier classifies as $\hat{Y}=i$, then the above is equal to

$$\int_{\Sigma_2} P(x|Y=1)P(Y=1)dx + \int_{\Sigma_1} P(x|Y=2)P(Y=2)dx$$

Over Σ_1 , we have that $P(x|Y=1)P(Y=1) \leq P(x|Y=2)P(Y=2)$ by the form of the Bayes classifier, and vice versa for Σ_2 . Thus, the integrals above are bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_2} P(x|Y=1)P(Y=1) + P(x|Y=2)P(Y=2)dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_1} P(x|Y=1)P(Y=1) + P(x|Y=2)P(Y=2)dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} P(x|Y=1)P(Y=1) + P(x|Y=2)P(Y=2)dx \end{aligned}$$

if we replace the integrands with the average of the two integrands. Now, using the AM-GM inequality, we have that this is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sqrt{P(x|Y=1)P(Y=1)P(x|Y=2)P(Y=2)} dx &= \sqrt{P(Y=1)P(Y=2)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sqrt{P(x|Y=1)P(x|Y=2)} dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sqrt{P(x|Y=1)P(x|Y=2)} dx \end{aligned}$$

by another application of AM-GM to $\sqrt{P(Y=1)P(Y=2)}$, noting that the average of $P(Y=1)$ and $P(Y=2)$ is $\frac{1}{2}$.

3

a

The decision boundary is the point at which $P(x|Y=1)P(Y=1) = P(x|Y=2)P(Y=2)$, or $\pi_1 \exp((x - \mu_1)^2/(2\sigma^2)) = \pi_2 \exp((x - \mu_2)^2/(2\sigma^2))$. Solving for x , we have

$$x^* = \frac{2\sigma \log \frac{\pi_1}{\pi_2} + \mu_2^2 - \mu_1^2}{2(\mu_2 - \mu_1)}$$

b

The error probability is

$$\int_{-\infty}^{x^*} P(x|Y=2)P(Y=2)dx + \int_{x^*}^{\infty} P(x|Y=1)P(Y=1)dx = \pi_2 \Phi\left(\frac{x^* - \mu_2}{\sigma}\right) + \pi_1 - \pi_1 \Phi\left(\frac{x^* - \mu_1}{\sigma}\right)$$

Rewrite $x^* - \mu_2 = \frac{2\sigma \log \frac{\pi_1}{\pi_2}}{2(\mu_2 - \mu_1)} + \frac{\mu_2 + \mu_1}{2} - \mu_2$. Then, dividing this by σ produces a term constant in σ and a term that goes to $-\infty$ as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$. Thus, the π_2 term in the error vanishes. Similarly, $\frac{x^* - \mu_1}{\sigma}$ goes to ∞ as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, which means that the overall error term approaches $\pi_1 - \pi_1 = 0$.

c

As $\pi_1 \rightarrow 0$, the log term in the decision boundary approaches $-\infty$, dragging the decision boundary with it, as all other things are fixed. In this case, always classifying things as class 2 would produce an error rate of π_1 , which is known to be small.

d

Let S_1 be the set of points in class 1 and S_2 the same for class 2. If we predict class 1, the expected loss is $E_X(L_{2,1}P(Y=2|X))$. If we predict class 2, then it is $E_X(L_{1,2}P(Y=1|X))$. If we minimize this pointwise, we should predict class 1 when $L_{2,1}P(Y=2|X) \leq L_{1,2}P(Y=1|X)$, and class 2 otherwise.

Rewriting the conditional probabilities, the prediction is then $\operatorname{argmax}(L_{2,1}P(X|Y=2)P(Y=2), L_{1,2}P(X|Y=1)P(Y=1))$. Setting these equal to find the boundary, we have

$$L_{2,1}\pi_2 \exp((x - \mu_2)^2/(2\sigma^2)) = L_{1,2}\pi_1 \exp((x - \mu_1)^2/(2\sigma^2))$$

Solving for x , we obtain

$$x^* = \frac{2\sigma \log \frac{L_{1,2}\pi_1}{L_{2,1}\pi_2} + \mu_2^2 - \mu_1^2}{2(\mu_2 - \mu_1)}$$

Now, if we choose $L_{1,2}$ to be proportional to π_1^{-1} and choose $L_{2,1}$ to be proportional to π_2^{-1} (possibly with different constants), we will avoid the degeneracy problem.

e

Using these values, we have that $x^* = 1$, so plugging into the expression for the error rate from (b) gives $0.5\Phi(-1) + 0.5 - 0.5\Phi(1) = 0.1587$

4

The expected loss of some decision function \hat{H} is $E_{X,Y}(L(\hat{H}(x), Y))$. Writing out the integral gives

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{k=1}^K L(\hat{H}(x), k) p(x, k) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} p(x) \sum_{k=1}^K L(\hat{H}(x), k) P(k|x) dx$$

Define R_i as $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | \hat{H}(x) = i\}$. Then, suppose that there exists some subset of nonzero measure A of R_i such that $\sum_{k=1}^K L(i, k) P(k|x) \geq \sum_{k=1}^K L(j, k) P(k|x)$. Decompose the above integral as

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n - A} p(x) \sum_{k=1}^K L(\hat{H}(x), k) P(k|x) dx + \int_A p(x) \sum_{k=1}^K L(i, k) P(k|x) dx$$

Then, changing the class of A from i to j will result in a strict decrease in the expected loss, which means that the optimal decision rule must satisfy, for each i , $\sum_{k=1}^K L(i, k) P(k|x) \geq \sum_{k=1}^K L(j, k) P(k|x)$ for all $j \neq i$ and almost all $x \in R_i$. The rule given satisfies this condition, and since there are a finite number of classes, changing the rule on a set of measure zero from the region associated with each class will not result in a change in the expected loss. Thus, the rule given is optimal.

5

a

We have $\text{cov}(X_2, X_2) = v_2$, so writing $X_2 = \alpha X_1 + Z$ gives

$$\text{cov}(\alpha X_1 + Z, \alpha X_1 + Z) = \text{cov}(\alpha X_1, \alpha X_1) + 0 + \text{cov}(Z, Z) = \alpha^2 v_1 + \text{var}(Z) = v_2$$

In addition, using $\text{cov}(X_1, X_2) = a$ gives us

$$a = \text{cov}(X_1, \alpha X_1 + Z) = \alpha v_1 + 0 \implies \alpha = \frac{a}{v_1}$$

Substituting into the first equation gives us $\text{var}(Z) = v_2 - \frac{a^2}{v_1}$

Finally, since $E(X_1) = E(X_2) = 0$, we must also have $E(Z) = 0$.

b

We know that Z is Gaussian because we can express Z as the sum of two Gaussians, $X_2 - \alpha X_1$. Thus, it is independent from X_1 because their covariance is zero. The variance was derived above.

c

We have $E(X_2|X_1 = x) = E(\alpha x + Z) = \alpha x$ and $\text{var}(X_2|X_1 = x) = \text{var}(\alpha x + Z) = \text{var}(Z)$.

d

Since the samples are all independent, the cross terms in the formula for the variance of a sum disappear and we get

$$\text{var}(\hat{a}) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{var}(X_{i1} X_{i2}) = \frac{1}{n} \text{var}(X_1 X_2)$$

Then, we have $\text{var}(X_1 X_2) = E((X_1 X_2)^2) - E(X_1 X_2)^2 = E((X_1 X_2)^2) - a^2$, since the means are zero.

To obtain the first term, note that it is a cross moment and can be obtained by applying $\frac{\partial^4}{\partial x_1^2 \partial x_2^2}$ to the mgf of the distribution and evaluating at zero. The mgf itself is

$$\exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_1 & a \\ a & v_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}(x_1^2 v_1 + 2x_1 x_2 a + x_2^2 v_2)\right)$$

Differentiating this wrt x_1 twice and wrt x_2 once gives

$$a x_1 v_1 T + x_1 v_1 (x_1 v_1 + x_2 a) (x_2 v_2 + x_1 a) T + v_1 (x_2 v_2 + x_1 a) T$$

where T is the exponential term from above. Then, taking the derivatives and then evaluating gives $v_1 v_2$, so the variance of \hat{a} is $\frac{1}{n}(v_1 v_2 - a^2)$.

