

VC-Dimension Summary

Pingbang Hu

University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

May 30, 2024





Intuitively, *VC-dimension* $VC(\mathcal{H})$ of a hypothesis class \mathcal{H} is defined as

- ▶ largest size of a subset C of \mathcal{X} that can be binary labeled **arbitrarily**¹ (*shattered*) by \mathcal{H} .

Another useful way to think about this is by its original (combinatorial) formulation:

- ▶ Think about *sets*: binary-labeling $C \Leftrightarrow$ **partitioning** C into two subsets.
- ▶ Relate back to our formulation: the vector $(h(c_1), \dots, h(c_m))$ is an *indication vector*.
- ▶ *Shattering* then means \mathcal{H} can partition C arbitrarily.

Intuition

The complexity of \mathcal{H} on \mathcal{X} is determined by $VC(\mathcal{H})$.

¹In general, for \mathbb{R} -valued functions, one may consider the *fat-shattering dimension*.



$VC(\mathcal{H})$ characterizes *PAC learnability* of \mathcal{H} since:

- ▶ If $VC(\mathcal{H}) = \infty$: observing any finitely many samples and their labeling doesn't help.
- ▶ If $VC(\mathcal{H}) < \infty$: effectively there's only $O(|S|^{VC(\mathcal{H})})$ possibilities for $S \subseteq \mathcal{X}$:
 - \Rightarrow Uniform convergence is guaranteed: polynomial blow-up of complexity is slow enough.
 - $\Rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is PAC learnable.

In view of the uniform convergence proof, $VC(\mathcal{H})$ also characterizes the *sample complexity*:

- ▶ By bounding the *Rademacher complexity*; more on that later.
- ▶ Effectively measures the same thing as $VC(\cdot)$, but in a **probabilistic way**.

Remark

Even $|\mathcal{H}| = \infty$, as long as $VC(\mathcal{H}) < \infty$, it's PAC learnable.



Lemma (Pajor's lemma)

For any $C \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ with $|C| = m$, $|\mathcal{H}_C| \leq |\{B \subseteq C: \mathcal{H} \text{ shatters } B\}|$.

Proof idea.

Induction works since we can divide \mathcal{H} into two class based on their values on, a particular one element. This reduces the problem to a smaller size, where the induction hypothesis applies. \square

This leads to the following.

Lemma (Sauer-Shelah-Perles lemma)

Let \mathcal{H} be a hypothesis class with $\text{VC}(\mathcal{H}) = d < \infty$. Then, for all m , $\tau_{\mathcal{H}}(m) \leq \sum_{i=0}^d \binom{m}{i}$.

Proof idea.

With Pajor's lemma, by counting the results follow. \square



Lemma (Uniform convergence for finite VC-Dimension)

For every \mathcal{D} and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$|L_{\mathcal{D}}(h) - L_S(h)| \leq \frac{4 + \sqrt{\log(\tau_{\mathcal{H}}(2m))}}{\delta\sqrt{2m}}.$$

Proof idea.

Standard inequality techniques like Jensen's inequality and the *symmetrization trick*, where:

- ▶ we realize that we can *swap* S and S' (introduced by $L_{\mathcal{D}}$)
- ▶ result is *symmetric*, so we can write everything into one (i.i.d.) quantity with σ_i 's.

Then Hoeffding's inequality bounds the probability, hence the expectation as we want. □

This with Sauer's lemma leads to the fundamental theorem of statistical learning theory.

We note that the quantity we're bounding is the so-called *Rademacher complexity*:

$$\mathbb{E}_{S, S' \sim \mathcal{D}, \sigma \sim U_{\pm}^m} \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{m} \left| \sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i (\ell(h, z'_i) - \ell(h, z_i)) \right| \right].$$

This is the central object in statistical learning theory. More generally:

- ▶ It's in the form of the *expectation of supremum* of an *empirical process*.

Remark (General theory of empirical process)

More general treatments can be given under the empirical process framework.

- ▶ *Involving ϵ -packing/covering, bracketing bound, Dudley's integral bound, etc.*



- [SB14] Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Shai Ben-David. *Understanding Machine Learning: From Theory to Algorithms*. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press, May 19, 2014. ISBN: 978-1-107-05713-5 978-1-107-29801-9. DOI: [10.1017/CB09781107298019](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09781107298019). URL: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/9781107298019/type/book> (visited on 09/03/2023).