## Short problems

1. [Several correct answers are possible.] Let $\mathcal{H}=\left\{h_{\theta}\right\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ be a hypothesis class such that $\operatorname{VCdim}(\mathcal{H})=+\infty$. Then the set of parameters $\Theta$ :
(a) is finite
(b) can be countable
(c) can be uncountable
(d) can be finite, countable or uncountable
2. Consider some hypothesis class $\mathcal{H}$. Which of the following is true? Why or why not?
(a) If $|\mathcal{H}|$ is infinite, it is not PAC learnable.
(b) If $\mathcal{H}$ is PAC learnable, it has finite VC dimension.
(c) If $\mathcal{H}$ is specified by a finite number of parameters, it has finite VC dimension.
(d) If $\mathcal{H}=\mathcal{H}_{1} \cup \mathcal{H}_{2}$, where $\mathcal{H}_{1}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{2}$ are some hypothesis classes that are PAC learnable, then $\mathcal{H}$ is also PAC learnable.

## VC dimension of unbiased neurons

Let $\mathcal{H}=\left\{h_{\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}}(\mathbf{x}): \alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2} \in \mathbb{R}\right\}$ with

$$
h_{\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}}(\mathbf{x})=\mathbb{I}\left(\tanh \left(\alpha_{1} x_{1}+\alpha_{2} x_{2}\right)>0\right)
$$

1. What is $\operatorname{VCdim}(\mathcal{H})$ ? Call your answer $d$.
2. Show that $\operatorname{VCdim}(\mathcal{H}) \geq d$ ?
3. Show that $\operatorname{VCdim}(\mathcal{H}) \leq d$ ?

## VC dimension of union

Let $\mathcal{H}_{1}, \mathcal{H}_{2}, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_{r}$ be hypothesis classes over some fixed domain set $\mathcal{X}$. Let $d=\max _{i} \operatorname{VCdim}\left(\mathcal{H}_{i}\right)$ and assume that $d>2$.
Prove that:

1. $\operatorname{VCdim}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{r} \mathcal{H}_{i}\right) \leq \frac{4 d}{\log (2)} \log \left(\frac{2 d}{\log (2)}\right)+\frac{2 \log (r)}{\log (2)}$.

Hint: Use Sauer's lemma for bounding the growth function and the inequality
"Let $a \geq 1$ and $b>0$. If $x \leq a \log (x)+b$ then $x \leq 4 a \log (2 a)+2 b$."
2. For $r=2$ the bound can be strengthen to $\operatorname{VCdim}\left(\mathcal{H}_{1} \cup \mathcal{H}_{2}\right) \leq 2 d+1$.

Hint: $\sum_{i=0}^{k}\binom{k}{i}=2^{k}$

## Stability implies Generalization

Let $S=\left\{\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right),\left(x_{2}, y_{2}\right), \ldots,\left(x_{n}, y_{n}\right)\right\}$ be a training dataset composed of $n$ i.i.d. samples drawn from $\mathcal{D}$. As usual, we denote $L_{\mathcal{D}}(h)=E_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}}[l(h(x), y)]$ and $L_{\mathcal{S}}(h)=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} l\left(h\left(x_{i}\right), y_{i}\right)$ the true and empirical risks of a hypothesis $h$, respectively. For simplicity, let us denote by $h_{S}$ the output of a learning algorithm when trained with dataset $S$.

An important property of learning algorithms is their ability to generalize, i.e., the true and empirical risks of the output hypothesis should be close in expectation. Formally, we say that a learning algorithm $\mathcal{A} \epsilon$-generalizes in expectation if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|E_{S}\left[L_{S}\left(h_{S}\right)-L_{\mathcal{D}}\left(h_{S}\right)\right]\right|<\epsilon . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

An interesting connection arises when we investigate the stability of a learning algorithm. Formally, we call a learning algorithm e-uniformly stable if $\forall S, S^{\prime}$ datasets of size $n$ that differ in at most one example we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{(x, y)} l\left(h_{S}(x), y\right)-l\left(h_{S^{\prime}}(x), y\right)<\epsilon . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notations: $\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right),\left(x_{2}, y_{2}\right), \ldots,\left(x_{n}, y_{n}\right),\left(\widetilde{x}_{1}, \widetilde{y}_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(\widetilde{x}_{n}, \widetilde{y}_{n}\right)$ are $2 n$ independently sampled training examples. We define $S=\left\{\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(x_{n}, y_{n}\right)\right\}, \widetilde{S}=\left\{\left(\widetilde{x}_{1}, \widetilde{y}_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(\widetilde{x}_{n}, \widetilde{y}_{n}\right)\right\}$ and $S^{(i)}=\left\{\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(x_{i-1}, y_{i-1}\right),\left(\widetilde{x}_{i}, \widetilde{y}_{i}\right),\left(x_{i+1}, y_{i+1}\right), \ldots,\left(x_{n}, y_{n}\right)\right\}$.
Prove that:

1. $L_{\mathcal{D}}\left(h_{S}\right)=E_{\widetilde{S}}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} l\left(h_{S}\left(\widetilde{x}_{i}\right), \widetilde{y}_{i}\right)\right]$.
2. $E_{S, \widetilde{S}}\left[l\left(h_{S}\left(\widetilde{x}_{i}\right), \widetilde{y}_{i}\right)\right]=E_{S, S^{(i)}}\left[l\left(h_{S^{(i)}}\left(x_{i}\right), y_{i}\right)\right]$.
3. An $\epsilon$-uniformly stable learning algorithm $\epsilon$-generalizes in expectation.

## VC dimension of decision trees with binary features

In this problem, we consider the class $\mathcal{H}_{\text {btree }}$ of decision trees with binary features and binary labels. We have a set of samples $x^{(1)}, \ldots, x^{(m)}$, where $x^{(i)} \in\{0,1\}^{d}$. A decision tree is a classifier that returns the binary label $y$ for a sample $x$ after performing a series of tests of the type " $x_{i}=0$ ?" for $0 \leq i<d$, which are organized in a binary tree-like manner. Nodes of this tree correspond to the tests and leaves to the returned label values. Note that it is allowed to return the same label value from both branches.

1. Consider the subclass $\mathcal{H}_{1}$ of trees with a single decision node (see Fig. 1). Show that

$$
\mathrm{VCdim} \mathcal{H}_{1} \leq\left\lfloor\log _{2}(d+1)\right\rfloor+1
$$

2. Show that

$$
\mathrm{VCdim} \mathcal{H}_{1} \geq\left\lfloor\log _{2}(d+1)\right\rfloor+1
$$

3. Consider the subclass $\mathcal{H}_{\text {deg, } N}$ of degenerate trees. Now the tree has $N$ decision nodes but each node except the bottom one has a single child node (see Fig. 2). Prove that

$$
\mathrm{VCdim} \mathcal{H}_{\operatorname{deg}, N} \geq\left\lfloor\log _{2}(d-N+2)\right\rfloor+N
$$

Hint: Start from the case $N=1$. What changes when we add another node to the tree?


Figure 1: Example of single-node decision tree


Figure 2: Example of degenerate tree with $N=3$ nodes.

