

# HW 3

## CS156, Kai Chang

### Question 1

Answer Choice: **B**, 1000

Reasoning: Given the generalization error

$$P[|E_{in}(g) - E_{out}(g)| > \epsilon] \leq 2Me^{-2\epsilon^2N}$$

and our values  $\epsilon = 0.05$ ,  $M = 1$  and we want to achieve a bound of 0.03, we can then solve for what  $N$  should be by algebraic manipulation.

So,  $0.03 = 2e^{-2*0.05^2*N}$  and by plugging into Mathematica yields  $N = 839.941$ , and we then need the minimum choice bigger than this value to yield a bound of 0.03 (or at least get close to it). Anything smaller than this  $N$  yields to a bound greater than 0.03.

Note what I used for Mathematica was `Solve[0.03 == 2 Exp[-20.05^2N], N]`

### Question 2

Answer Choice: **C**, 1500

Reasoning: Plugging into Mathematica for the  $M = 10$  case, we get  $N = 1300.46$

### Question 3

Answer Choice: **D**, 2000

Reasoning: Plugging into Mathematica for the  $M = 100$  case, we get  $N = 1760.98$ .

### Question 4

Answer Choice: **B**, 5

Reasoning: A break point is just the minimum number of points needed to be able to fail our classification model. In a Perceptron Model (more specifically a PLA), the decision boundary is linear and the decision are binary. So, in our 2D model, the classification boundary is a line. Thus, with four points, it is possible for us to fail our model (no matter how good it is). For a 3D model, our classification boundary is a plane. Thus, the number of points it takes to fail is 5.

*Note that as we increase dimensions, you see a pattern ongoing with classification and points. In a linear case, they are entirely tied to each other (VC + 1).*

Look at drawing.

*Also, in the case we have 3 points in a 2D case (ie line classification), you may think this is the break point. At first, I was confused and thought this was the break point. However, I realized you can have the line be part of the classification! Thus, with 3 points, you will have at most 3 classification intervals or decision bounds (or shatters).*

## Question 5

Answer Choice: **B**, i, ii, v

Reasoning: Look at growth formula (it fits a number of conditions, but most importantly  $m_H(N - 1) \leq m_H(N)$ ). This means that if there is a break point  $k$ , then the growth function is bounded by  $N^{k-1}$ . If there is no break point, the growth function is  $2^N$ .

- i) is a growth formula from slides (also  $< 2^N$ )
- ii) don't be fooled by that binomial, first section is positive interval + second section is positive ray
- iii) not classified in any of the 3 growth functions (ie. not  $2^N$  and not polynomial)
- iv) breaks at  $k=1$ . we get  $2^0 = 1 \leq 2^1 = 2$ , if  $N = 2$ , then  $2^1 = 2 > 2^{1-1} = 1$ .
- v) is a growth function!

## Question 6

Answer Choice: **C**, 5

Reasoning: This is almost similar to question 4, except now we are mapping or transforming on a new axis scale. Now we have 2 division boundaries but these division boundaries can be classified as subsets of essentially a singular boundary (ie. analogous to a  $R^3$ ), so it takes 5 points to break this hypothesis.

*One may wonder why (unlike question 4), we don't have 3 division boundaries for each one? Well, this is for a number of reasons. 1) the two intervals can share a boundary in between, so it does not double count, and 2) the intervals are inclusive (so unlike a line, which itself can be an interval), we physically have an established interval (with either physical bounds [the line in our 2D case] be either included in the interval or included in the outside).*

## Question 7

Answer Choice: **C**,  $\binom{N+1}{4} + \binom{N+1}{2} + 1$

Reasoning: We have 3 possibilities:

- 2 intervals at different locations and thus 4 decision bounds (boundary judging + or -),  $\binom{N+1}{4}$
- 2 intervals overlapping or touching, leaving 2 decision bounds,  $\binom{N+1}{2}$
- either the 2 intervals overlapping and spanning the entire space that the points can be in or spanning none of the entire space, 1

Thus, summing those possibilities up yield our growth function:  $\binom{N+1}{4} + \binom{N+1}{2} + 1$

*Note we place interval ends in  $n$  of  $N+1$  spots, giving us a  $N+1$  reasoning on the top of the binomial, and the  $n$  on the bottom of the binomial. For more information on these positive intervals and binomials, check out slide 12 of Yaser's CS156 Lecture slides #5.*

## Question 8

Answer Choice: **D**,  $2M + 1$

Reasoning: Now if we consider the  $M$ -interval model, we see that we can have at most  $M$  decision bounds, meaning we can have up to  $2M + 1$  areas if the areas within the intervals were  $+1$  and the outside were  $-1$ . However, in the case that we have the opposite in our hypothesis dataset, then this would break this learning model. It becomes impossible to classify correctly.

*Note if you have  $2M$ , you may think this is the smallest break point, but actually one can clearly see that a shift in our intervals (remember, it's just a general case) quickly solves our problem, making this possible to shatter.*

## Question 9

Answer Choice: **D**, 7

Reasoning: Now we deal with convex sets, the third in our possible growth functions. We can see with a triangle, there are essentially 3 boundary lines. However, because we are in a plane, I decided to map the intervals in a radial form (see paper) similar to that on slide 13 of Yaser's lecture slides 5.

We can see that it is possible to get 7 points in a triangle, as you have a very fat or very tall triangle. However, with 8 points, it becomes impossible to do such classifications (ie. our decision bounds have a  $(2m + 1) * 2$  max boundary. Thus, we can only shatter up to 7. You will find this relation works for all polygons (try square, pentagon).

## Question 10

Answer Choice: **B**,  $\binom{N+1}{2} + 1$

Reasoning: If we consider  $N$  points on  $R^2$ , there are  $N$  distances from  $(0,0)$  on those points. This question can be seen as selecting 2 intervals from  $N + 1$  intervals, adding the situation that all distances are  $-1$  not in  $a, b$ .