Synthetic Volatility Forecasting

Preliminary Exam

David Lundquist[1]

February 24, 2024

[1]davidl11@ilinois.edu

A seemingly unprecedented event might provoke the questions

1. What does it resemble from the past?
2. What past events are most relevant?
3. Can we incorporate past events in a systematic, principled manner?

Yet we know the data can be interpolated by taking $p \geq n$ linearly independent covariates.

Punchline of the paper

In linear regression, under assumptions that will follow, near-perfect prediction is possible if **"the number of directions in θ that are unimportant for prediction significantly exceeds the sample size"**.

Thus, there are only two quantitites that matter here: Σ and n. Most of our attention will be on Σ.

Outline

Setting for the problem

- $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, a mean-zero, real-valued response to be predicted
- Mean-zero covariate vectors $x \in \mathbb{H}$, a Hilbert space, where $\mathbb{H}$ can be taken to be $\mathbb{R}^p$ for the sake of illustration
- We predict y using a linear function of the covariates X, but this is *not* an assumption about the data generating process. We do not assume $y = f(X) + \epsilon$, but y may contain exogenous noise (called "label noise" by the authors.)

Technical Specifications (many, but familiar)

- We define $\Sigma := \mathbb{E}[xx^T]$
- We define $\theta^* \in \mathbb{H}$ to be s.t. $\mathbb{E}[(y - x^T\theta^*)^2] = \min_\theta \mathbb{E}[(y - x^T\theta)^2]$
  - As defined here, not necessarily unique, which matters for this paper.
- $x = V\Lambda^{1/2}z$, where $\Sigma = V\Lambda V^T$ is the spectral decomposition of Σ and z is a vector of independent components, each subgaussian(σ_x), where $\sigma_x > 0$.
- The conditional noise variance $\mathbb{E}[(y - x^T\theta^*)^2|x]$ is bounded below by $\sigma^2 > 0$.
- $(y - x^T\theta^*)|x$ is subgaussian(σ_y)
- Almost surely, for any eigenvector v of Σ, $Proj_{v^T}(X)$ spans a space of dimension n.
  - Guaranteed when, for example, there exist p linearly independent covariates and $p > n$.

What's the goal here?

In this particular setting, excess risk of an estimator θ has the form

$$\begin{aligned} R(\theta) &= \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[(y - x^T\theta)^2 - (y - x^T\theta^*)^2] \\ &= (\theta - \theta^*)^T \Sigma (\theta - \theta^*) \end{aligned}$$

What's the method here?

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathbb{H}} \|\theta\|$$
$$s.t. \frac{1}{n} \|X^T \theta - y\|_2^2 \leq D$$

What's the method here?

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathbb{H}} \|\theta\|$$
$$s.t. \frac{1}{n} \|X^T \theta - y\|_2^2 \leq D$$

What's the method here?

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathbb{H}} \|\theta\|$$
$$s.t. \frac{1}{n}\|X^T\theta - y\|_2^2 \leq D$$

1. Heuristically speaking, overfitting means $D << \min_\theta \mathbb{E}(x^T\theta - y)^2$, where x, y are out of sample

What's the method here?

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathbb{H}} \|\theta\|$$
$$s.t. \frac{1}{n}\|X^T\theta - y\|_2^2 \leq D$$

1. Heuristically speaking, overfitting means $D << \min_\theta \mathbb{E}(x^T\theta - y)^2$, where x, y are out of sample
2. Of course, we're concerned with interpolation, i.e. $D = 0$.

Minimum Norm Estimator

Why did we just assume something very technical about $Proj_{v^T}(X)$? This condition implies multiple solutions to the equation $y = X\theta$.

"Almost surely, for any eigenvector v of Σ, $Proj_{v^T}(X)$ spans a space of dimension n."

Since we have more than one choice of θ, we choose the unique $\hat{\theta}$ with minimum norm:

$$\hat{\theta} := (X^T X)^{\dagger} X^T y$$

We don't have to do this, but the results that follow correspond to the minimum-norm solution. It's most interesting.

Rank of Matrix

We know the rank of a matrix $A \in M_{n \times p}(\mathbb{C})$ is

- The column rank of A (number of linearly independent columns)
- The row rank of A (number of linearly independent rows)
- The dimension of $im(A)$

However, this notion of rank is too rigid. It's integer-valued, and it tells us very little about the distribution of the eigenvalues.

Key Conceptual Innovation: Effective Rank

Definition

For a covariance operator Σ with the decreasing sequence of eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ...,$ if $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i < \infty$ and $\lambda_{k+1} > 0$, then for $k \geq 0$, define

$$r_k = \frac{\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i}{\lambda_{k+1}} \quad R_k = \frac{(\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i)^2}{\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i^2}$$

Key Conceptual Innovation: Effective Rank

Definition

For a covariance operator Σ with the decreasing sequence of eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ...,$ if $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i < \infty$ and $\lambda_{k+1} > 0$, then for $k \geq 0$, define

$$r_k = \frac{\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i}{\lambda_{k+1}} \quad R_k = \frac{(\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i)^2}{\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i^2}$$

Key Properties

Key Conceptual Innovation: Effective Rank

Definition

For a covariance operator Σ with the decreasing sequence of eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ...,$ if $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i < \infty$ and $\lambda_{k+1} > 0$, then for $k \geq 0$, define

$$r_k = \frac{\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i}{\lambda_{k+1}} \quad R_k = \frac{(\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i)^2}{\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i^2}$$

Key Properties

1. $r_k \in [1, p-k]$, assuming $p < \infty$

Key Conceptual Innovation: Effective Rank

Definition

For a covariance operator Σ with the decreasing sequence of eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ...,$ if $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i < \infty$ and $\lambda_{k+1} > 0$, then for $k \geq 0$, define

$$r_k = \frac{\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i}{\lambda_{k+1}} \quad R_k = \frac{(\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i)^2}{\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i^2}$$

Key Properties

1. $r_k \in [1, p-k]$, assuming $p < \infty$
2. $R_k \in [1, \infty)$

Key Conceptual Innovation: Effective Rank

Definition

For a covariance operator Σ with the decreasing sequence of eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots$, if $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i < \infty$ and $\lambda_{k+1} > 0$, then for $k \geq 0$, define

$$r_k = \frac{\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i}{\lambda_{k+1}} \quad R_k = \frac{(\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i)^2}{\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i^2}$$

Key Properties

1. $r_k \in [1, p-k]$, assuming $p < \infty$
2. $R_k \in [1, \infty)$
3. They can be understood in terms of ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 norms.

Key Conceptual Innovation: Effective Rank

Definition

For a covariance operator Σ with the decreasing sequence of eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ...$, if $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i < \infty$ and $\lambda_{k+1} > 0$, then for $k \geq 0$, define

$$r_k = \frac{\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i}{\lambda_{k+1}} \quad R_k = \frac{(\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i)^2}{\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i^2}$$

Key Properties

1. $r_k \in [1, p-k]$, assuming $p < \infty$
2. $R_k \in [1, \infty)$
3. They can be understood in terms of ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 norms.
4. $r_k(\Sigma^2) \leq r_k(\Sigma) \leq R_k(\Sigma) \leq r_k^2(\Sigma)$

Key Conceptual Innovation: Effective Rank

Definition

For a covariance operator Σ with the decreasing sequence of eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ...,$ if $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i < \infty$ and $\lambda_{k+1} > 0$, then for $k \geq 0$, define

$$r_k = \frac{\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i}{\lambda_{k+1}} \quad R_k = \frac{(\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i)^2}{\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i^2}$$

Key Properties

1. $r_k \in [1, p-k]$, assuming $p < \infty$
2. $R_k \in [1, \infty)$
3. They can be understood in terms of ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 norms.
4. $r_k(\Sigma^2) \leq r_k(\Sigma) \leq R_k(\Sigma) \leq r_k^2(\Sigma)$
5. For the result we now show, *bigger* values of r_k and R_k are better.

Main Result: Existence Proof, Dichotomy, and Bounds

Theorem

Define $k^* = min\{k \geq 0 : r_k(\Sigma) \geq bn\}$. *For any* σ_x, $\exists b, c, c_1 > 1$ *s.t.* $\forall \delta \in (0,1)$ *s.t.* $\log(1/\delta) < n/c$, *if* $k^* \geq n/c_1$, *then* $\mathbb{E}[R(\hat{\theta})] \geq \sigma^2/c$. *Otherwise,*

A $R(\hat{\theta}) \leq \underbrace{c\left(\|\theta^*\|^2 \|\Sigma\| max\{\sqrt{\frac{r_0(\Sigma)}{n}}, \frac{r_0(\Sigma)}{n}, \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}}\}\right)}_{\text{related to the bias}} + \underbrace{c \log(1/\delta)\sigma_y^2\left(\frac{k^*}{n} + \frac{n}{R_{k^*}(\Sigma)}\right)}_{\text{related to the noise}}$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

B $\mathbb{E}[R(\hat{\theta})] \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{c}\left(\frac{k^*}{n} + \frac{n}{R_{k^*}(\Sigma)}\right)$

Main Result: Existence Proof, Dichotomy, and Bounds

Theorem

Define $k^* = min\{k \geq 0 : r_k(\Sigma) \geq bn\}$. *For any* σ_x, $\exists b, c, c_1 > 1$ *s.t.* $\forall \delta \in (0,1)$ *s.t.* $\log(1/\delta) < n/c$, *if* $k^* \geq n/c_1$, *then* $\mathbb{E}[R(\hat{\theta})] \geq \sigma^2/c$. *Otherwise,*

A $R(\hat{\theta}) \leq \underbrace{c\left(\|\theta^*\|^2 \|\Sigma\| max\{\sqrt{\frac{r_0(\Sigma)}{n}}, \frac{r_0(\Sigma)}{n}, \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}}\}\right)}_{\text{related to the bias}} + \underbrace{c \log(1/\delta)\sigma_y^2\left(\frac{k^*}{n} + \frac{n}{R_{k^*}(\Sigma)}\right)}_{\text{related to the noise}}$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

B $\mathbb{E}[R(\hat{\theta})] \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{c}\left(\frac{k^*}{n} + \frac{n}{R_{k^*}(\Sigma)}\right)$

Remarks

Main Result: Existence Proof, Dichotomy, and Bounds

Theorem

Define $k^* = min\{k \geq 0 : r_k(\Sigma) \geq bn\}$. *For any* σ_x, $\exists b, c, c_1 > 1$ *s.t.* $\forall \delta \in (0,1)$ *s.t.* $\log(1/\delta) < n/c$, *if* $k^* \geq n/c_1$, *then* $\mathbb{E}[R(\hat{\theta})] \geq \sigma^2/c$. *Otherwise,*

A $R(\hat{\theta}) \leq \underbrace{c\left(\|\theta^*\|^2 \|\Sigma\| max\{\sqrt{\frac{r_0(\Sigma)}{n}}, \frac{r_0(\Sigma)}{n}, \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}}\}\right)}_{\text{related to the bias}} + \underbrace{c \log(1/\delta)\sigma_y^2\left(\frac{k^*}{n} + \frac{n}{R_{k^*}(\Sigma)}\right)}_{\text{related to the noise}}$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

B $\mathbb{E}[R(\hat{\theta})] \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{c}\left(\frac{k^*}{n} + \frac{n}{R_{k^*}(\Sigma)}\right)$

Remarks

1. A gives us a (high probability) upper bound on the excess risk.

Main Result: Existence Proof, Dichotomy, and Bounds

Theorem

Define $k^* = min\{k \geq 0 : r_k(\Sigma) \geq bn\}$. *For any* σ_x, $\exists b, c, c_1 > 1$ *s.t.* $\forall \delta \in (0,1)$ *s.t.* $\log(1/\delta) < n/c$, *if* $k^* \geq n/c_1$, *then* $\mathbb{E}[R(\hat{\theta})] \geq \sigma^2/c$. *Otherwise,*

A $R(\hat{\theta}) \leq \underbrace{c\big(\|\theta^*\|^2 \|\Sigma\| max\{\sqrt{\frac{r_0(\Sigma)}{n}}, \frac{r_0(\Sigma)}{n}, \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}}\}\big)}_{\text{related to the bias}} + \underbrace{c \log(1/\delta)\sigma_y^2\big(\frac{k^*}{n} + \frac{n}{R_{k^*}(\Sigma)}\big)}_{\text{related to the noise}}$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

B $\mathbb{E}[R(\hat{\theta})] \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{c}\big(\frac{k^*}{n} + \frac{n}{R_{k^*}(\Sigma)}\big)$

Remarks

1. A gives us a (high probability) upper bound on the excess risk.
2. B gives us a lower bound on its expectation.

Main Result: Existence Proof, Dichotomy, and Bounds

Theorem

Define $k^* = min\{k \geq 0 : r_k(\Sigma) \geq bn\}$. *For any* σ_x, $\exists b, c, c_1 > 1$ *s.t.* $\forall \delta \in (0,1)$ *s.t.* $\log(1/\delta) < n/c$, *if* $k^* \geq n/c_1$, *then* $\mathbb{E}[R(\hat{\theta})] \geq \sigma^2/c$. *Otherwise,*

A $R(\hat{\theta}) \leq \underbrace{c\left(\|\theta^*\|^2 \|\Sigma\| max\{\sqrt{\frac{r_0(\Sigma)}{n}}, \frac{r_0(\Sigma)}{n}, \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}}\}\right)}_{\text{related to the bias}} + \underbrace{c \log(1/\delta)\sigma_y^2\left(\frac{k^*}{n} + \frac{n}{R_{k^*}(\Sigma)}\right)}_{\text{related to the noise}}$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

B $\mathbb{E}[R(\hat{\theta})] \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{c}\left(\frac{k^*}{n} + \frac{n}{R_{k^*}(\Sigma)}\right)$

Remarks

1. A gives us a (high probability) upper bound on the excess risk.
2. B gives us a lower bound on its expectation.
3. The constants b, c, c_1 depend on σ_x, the subgaussian parameter corresponding to the covariates X.

Main Result: Existence Proof, Dichotomy, and Bounds

Theorem

Define $k^* = min\{k \geq 0 : r_k(\Sigma) \geq bn\}$. *For any* σ_x, $\exists b, c, c_1 > 1$ *s.t.* $\forall \delta \in (0,1)$ *s.t.* $\log(1/\delta) < n/c$, *if* $k^* \geq n/c_1$, *then* $\mathbb{E}[R(\hat{\theta})] \geq \sigma^2/c$. *Otherwise,*

A $R(\hat{\theta}) \leq \underbrace{c\left(\|\theta^*\|^2 \|\Sigma\| max\{\sqrt{\frac{r_0(\Sigma)}{n}}, \frac{r_0(\Sigma)}{n}, \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}}\}\right)}_{\text{related to the bias}} + \underbrace{c \log(1/\delta)\sigma_y^2\left(\frac{k^*}{n} + \frac{n}{R_{k^*}(\Sigma)}\right)}_{\text{related to the noise}}$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

B $\mathbb{E}[R(\hat{\theta})] \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{c}\left(\frac{k^*}{n} + \frac{n}{R_{k^*}(\Sigma)}\right)$

Remarks

1. A gives us a (high probability) upper bound on the excess risk.
2. B gives us a lower bound on its expectation.
3. The constants b, c, c_1 depend on σ_x, the subgaussian parameter corresponding to the covariates X.
4. Think of k^* as the number of dimensions we ignore when hiding the noise. We want k^* to be small compared to n, yet no smaller than it need be, obviously.

Main Result: Existence Proof, Dichotomy, and Bounds

Theorem

Define $k^* = min\{k \geq 0 : r_k(\Sigma) \geq bn\}$. *For any* σ_x, $\exists b, c, c_1 > 1$ *s.t.* $\forall \delta \in (0,1)$ *s.t.* $\log(1/\delta) < n/c$, *if* $k^* \geq n/c_1$, *then* $\mathbb{E}[R(\hat{\theta})] \geq \sigma^2/c$. *Otherwise,*

A $R(\hat{\theta}) \leq \underbrace{c\left(\|\theta^*\|^2 \|\Sigma\| max\{\sqrt{\frac{r_0(\Sigma)}{n}}, \frac{r_0(\Sigma)}{n}, \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}}\}\right)}_{\text{related to the bias}} + \underbrace{c \log(1/\delta)\sigma_y^2\left(\frac{k^*}{n} + \frac{n}{R_{k^*}(\Sigma)}\right)}_{\text{related to the noise}}$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

B $\mathbb{E}[R(\hat{\theta})] \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{c}\left(\frac{k^*}{n} + \frac{n}{R_{k^*}(\Sigma)}\right)$

Remarks

1. A gives us a (high probability) upper bound on the excess risk.
2. B gives us a lower bound on its expectation.
3. The constants b, c, c_1 depend on σ_x, the subgaussian parameter corresponding to the covariates X.
4. Think of k^* as the number of dimensions we ignore when hiding the noise. We want k^* to be small compared to n, yet no smaller than it need be, obviously.
5. Effective rank encodes how far the vectors x are from isotropy. Isotropy implies maximum effective rank, whereas small values of effective rank suggests (just like ordinary matrix rank) that many of the vectors generating Σ are irrelevant to the variation Σ houses.

So what do we want our eigenvalues to look like?

$$\Sigma = V \Lambda V^T =$$

$$V \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & & & & \\ & \lambda_2 & & 0 & \\ & & \lambda_3 & & \\ & 0 & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \lambda_p \end{pmatrix} V^T$$

So what do we want our eigenvalues to look like?

$$\Sigma = V \Lambda V^T =$$

$$V \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & & & & \\ & \lambda_2 & & 0 & \\ & & \lambda_3 & & \\ & 0 & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \lambda_p \end{pmatrix} V^T$$

Necessary Properties For Near-Perfect Accuracy

So what do we want our eigenvalues to look like?

$$\Sigma = V\Lambda V^T = V \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & & & & \\ & \lambda_2 & & 0 & \\ & & \lambda_3 & & \\ & 0 & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \lambda_p \end{pmatrix} V^T$$

Necessary Properties For Near-Perfect Accuracy

1. $r_0(\Sigma)$ should be small compared to n.

So what do we want our eigenvalues to look like?

$$\Sigma = V\Lambda V^T = V \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & & & & \\ & \lambda_2 & & 0 & \\ & & \lambda_3 & & \\ & 0 & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \lambda_p \end{pmatrix} V^T$$

Necessary Properties For Near-Perfect Accuracy

1. $r_0(\Sigma)$ should be small compared to n.
2. r_{k^*} and R_{k^*} should be large compared to n.

So what do we want our eigenvalues to look like?

$$\Sigma = V\Lambda V^T = V \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & & & \\ & \lambda_2 & & 0 \\ & & \lambda_3 & \\ & 0 & & \ddots \\ & & & & \lambda_p \end{pmatrix} V^T$$

Necessary Properties For Near-Perfect Accuracy

1. $r_0(\Sigma)$ should be small compared to n.
2. r_{k^*} and R_{k^*} should be large compared to n.
3. The sum of the λ_i should be small compared to n (to make k^* smaller).

So what do we want our eigenvalues to look like?

$$\Sigma = V\Lambda V^T = V \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & & & & \\ & \lambda_2 & & 0 & \\ & & \lambda_3 & & \\ & 0 & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \lambda_p \end{pmatrix} V^T$$

Necessary Properties For Near-Perfect Accuracy

1. $r_0(\Sigma)$ should be small compared to n.
2. r_{k^*} and R_{k^*} should be large compared to n.
3. The sum of the λ_i should be small compared to n (to make k^* smaller).
4. The number of non-zero eigenvalues should be large compared to n.

Two Very Simple Examples

Consider $\Sigma = I_p$ (which is induced by isotropy):

$$r_0(\Sigma) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i}{\lambda_1} = \frac{p}{1} = p = \frac{p^2}{p} = R_0(\Sigma)$$

Next consider infinite-dimensional Σ with spectral decomposition

$$V \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & & & & \\ & \frac{1}{2} & & 0 & \\ & & \frac{1}{4} & & \\ & 0 & & \frac{1}{8} & \\ & & & & \ddots \end{pmatrix} V^T$$

$$r_0(\Sigma) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{p} 2^{-i}}{\lambda_1} = \frac{\lambda_1 + 1}{\lambda_1} \qquad R_0(\Sigma) = \frac{(\lambda_1 + 1)^2}{\lambda_1^2 - 1 + \sum_{i=1} 4^{-i}} = \frac{(\lambda_1 + 1)^2}{\lambda_1^2 + 1/3}$$

Two Very Simple Examples

Consider $\Sigma = I_p$ (which is induced by isotropy):

$$r_0(\Sigma) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i}{\lambda_1} = \frac{p}{1} = p = \frac{p^2}{p} = R_0(\Sigma)$$

Next consider infinite-dimensional Σ with spectral decomposition

$$V \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & & & & \\ & \frac{1}{2} & & 0 & \\ & & \frac{1}{4} & & \\ & 0 & & \frac{1}{8} & \\ & & & & \ddots \end{pmatrix} V^T$$

$$r_0(\Sigma) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{p} 2^{-i}}{\lambda_1} = \frac{\lambda_1 + 1}{\lambda_1} \qquad R_0(\Sigma) = \frac{(\lambda_1 + 1)^2}{\lambda_1^2 - 1 + \sum_{i=1} 4^{-i}} = \frac{(\lambda_1 + 1)^2}{\lambda_1^2 + 1/3}$$

Which of these two cases will be good for benign overfitting?

Two Very Simple Examples

Consider $\Sigma = I_p$ (which is induced by isotropy):

$$r_0(\Sigma) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i}{\lambda_1} = \frac{p}{1} = p = \frac{p^2}{p} = R_0(\Sigma)$$

Next consider infinite-dimensional Σ with spectral decomposition

$$V \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & & & & \\ & \frac{1}{2} & & 0 & \\ & & \frac{1}{4} & & \\ & 0 & & \frac{1}{8} & \\ & & & & \ddots \end{pmatrix} V^T$$

$$r_0(\Sigma) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{p} 2^{-i}}{\lambda_1} = \frac{\lambda_1 + 1}{\lambda_1} \qquad R_0(\Sigma) = \frac{(\lambda_1 + 1)^2}{\lambda_1^2 - 1 + \sum_{i=1} 4^{-i}} = \frac{(\lambda_1 + 1)^2}{\lambda_1^2 + 1/3}$$

Which of these two cases will be good for benign overfitting?

Neither!

A more benign example

Example (Coverging at the slowest rate possible)

Fix $\alpha = 1, \beta > 1$. Let $\lambda_i = \frac{1}{i \log^{\beta}(i+1)}$.

What's the point of all this?

- In training, we observe both X and y, but not the noise. We then derive $\hat{\theta}$, a *noisy, imperfect* guess at θ^*.
- In prediction, we do not observe y or the noise; we're given x; we're hostage to the random object $\hat{\theta}$ we've just fit.

What's the point of all this?

- In training, we observe both X and y, but not the noise. We then derive $\hat{\theta}$, a *noisy, imperfect* guess at θ^*.
- In prediction, we do not observe y or the noise; we're given x; we're hostage to the random object $\hat{\theta}$ we've just fit.

The Magic

What's the point of all this?

- In training, we observe both X and y, but not the noise. We then derive $\hat{\theta}$, a *noisy, imperfect* guess at θ^*.
- In prediction, we do not observe y or the noise; we're given x; we're hostage to the random object $\hat{\theta}$ we've just fit.

The Magic

- Not all of the coordinates (directions) in $\hat{\theta}$ matter for prediction.

What's the point of all this?

- In training, we observe both X and y, but not the noise. We then derive $\hat{\theta}$, a *noisy, imperfect* guess at θ^*.
- In prediction, we do not observe y or the noise; we're given x; we're hostage to the random object $\hat{\theta}$ we've just fit.

The Magic

- Not all of the coordinates (directions) in $\hat{\theta}$ matter for prediction.
- In fact, some are nearly irrelevant for prediction.

What's the point of all this?

- In training, we observe both X and y, but not the noise. We then derive $\hat{\theta}$, a *noisy, imperfect* guess at θ^*.
- In prediction, we do not observe y or the noise; we're given x; we're hostage to the random object $\hat{\theta}$ we've just fit.

The Magic

- Not all of the coordinates (directions) in $\hat{\theta}$ matter for prediction.
- In fact, some are nearly irrelevant for prediction.
- Key insight: if there are enough of these unimportant directions, they can store the 'badness' of $\hat{\theta}$ that has been induced by the label noise.

What's the point of all this?

- In training, we observe both X and y, but not the noise. We then derive $\hat{\theta}$, a *noisy, imperfect* guess at θ^*.
- In prediction, we do not observe y or the noise; we're given x; we're hostage to the random object $\hat{\theta}$ we've just fit.

The Magic

- Not all of the coordinates (directions) in $\hat{\theta}$ matter for prediction.
- In fact, some are nearly irrelevant for prediction.
- Key insight: if there are enough of these unimportant directions, they can store the 'badness' of $\hat{\theta}$ that has been induced by the label noise.
  - $\hat{\theta}$ can be bad by being biased

What's the point of all this?

- In training, we observe both X and y, but not the noise. We then derive $\hat{\theta}$, a *noisy, imperfect* guess at θ^*.
- In prediction, we do not observe y or the noise; we're given x; we're hostage to the random object $\hat{\theta}$ we've just fit.

The Magic

- Not all of the coordinates (directions) in $\hat{\theta}$ matter for prediction.
- In fact, some are nearly irrelevant for prediction.
- Key insight: if there are enough of these unimportant directions, they can store the 'badness' of $\hat{\theta}$ that has been induced by the label noise.
  - $\hat{\theta}$ can be bad by being biased
  - $\hat{\theta}$, as a random object, can be bad by being a noisy stand-in for θ^*

What's the point of all this?

- In training, we observe both X and y, but not the noise. We then derive $\hat{\theta}$, a *noisy, imperfect* guess at θ^*.
- In prediction, we do not observe y or the noise; we're given x; we're hostage to the random object $\hat{\theta}$ we've just fit.

The Magic

- Not all of the coordinates (directions) in $\hat{\theta}$ matter for prediction.
- In fact, some are nearly irrelevant for prediction.
- Key insight: if there are enough of these unimportant directions, they can store the 'badness' of $\hat{\theta}$ that has been induced by the label noise.
  - $\hat{\theta}$ can be bad by being biased
  - $\hat{\theta}$, as a random object, can be bad by being a noisy stand-in for θ^*

So let's examine the punchline: how exactly can noise by hidden in unimportant directions?

How noise is hidden just right

Recall

$$\hat{\theta} := (X^T X)^\dagger X^T y = (X^T X)^\dagger X^T (\epsilon + f(X)) = (X^T X)^\dagger X^T (noise + signal)$$

Zero-in on the left action of the operator X^T. In any direction $i, 1 \leq i \leq p$, it scales the noise from ϵ by $n\lambda_i$.

Ultimately, for any direction $i, 1 \leq i \leq p$, we can bound the prediction error in direction i by $\frac{n\lambda_i^2}{(\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i)^2}$. If we sum these terms, what do we get?

After all of this waiting, we formalize the notion under discussion.

Definition (Asymptotically Benign)

We say that Σ_n is asymptotically benign iff

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left(bias(\theta^*, \Sigma_n, n) + \frac{k_n^*}{n} + \frac{n}{R_{k_n^*}(\Sigma_n)} \right) = 0$$

Some things to think about with papers like this

- Has little practical value, at present. It's a conceptual piece.
- The interpretations that the authors give the phenomenon are a little fuzzy. There's a gap between what the math says and what the authors say it does.
- Theorems change between the Arxiv paper, PNAS paper, early presentations, and later presentations!

Some things to think about with papers like this

- Has little practical value, at present. It's a conceptual piece.
- The interpretations that the authors give the phenomenon are a little fuzzy. There's a gap between what the math says and what the authors say it does.
- Theorems change between the Arxiv paper, PNAS paper, early presentations, and later presentations!

Some things to think about with papers like this

- Has little practical value, at present. It's a conceptual piece.
- The interpretations that the authors give the phenomenon are a little fuzzy. There's a gap between what the math says and what the authors say it does.
- Theorems change between the Arxiv paper, PNAS paper, early presentations, and later presentations!

Some things to think about with papers like this

- Has little practical value, at present. It's a conceptual piece.
- The interpretations that the authors give the phenomenon are a little fuzzy. There's a gap between what the math says and what the authors say it does.
- Theorems change between the Arxiv paper, PNAS paper, early presentations, and later presentations!

We analyze the real-world example with Brexit included.

Bibliography