Problem 1

In class, we discussed a version of the winnow algorithm that makes few mistakes when examples $\mathbf{x}, y$ are such that $y(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{x}) > 0$ for some unknown vector $\mathbf{u}$. Effectively, the inner product $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{x}$ is being compared to the threshold 0 to determine $\mathbf{x}$'s classification. In this problem, we will consider the case in which some threshold other than 0 is to be used. Thus, we now suppose that examples are such that

$$y(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{x} - b) > 0$$

for some known threshold $b \in \mathbb{R}$, and some unknown vector $\mathbf{u}$.

To be more precise, as in class, assume $\mathbf{x}_t \in [-1, +1]^N$ and $y_t \in \{-1, +1\}$. Assume further that there exists $\delta > 0$, $\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^N$ with $||\mathbf{u}||_1 = 1$ such that

$$y_t(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{x}_t - b) \geq \delta$$

where $b \in \mathbb{R}$ is known. To learn, we use the following variant of winnow: Initially, $w_{1,i} = 1/N$ (as usual). On each round t, if $y_t(\mathbf{w}_t \cdot \mathbf{x}_t - b) > 0$ (no mistake), then we do nothing (i.e., $\mathbf{w}_{t+1} = \mathbf{w}_t$). Otherwise, we update $\mathbf{w}_t$ as follows:

$$\text{if } y_t = +1 \text{ then } \quad w_{t+1,i} = \frac{w_{t,i} \exp\left(\bar{\eta} x_{t,i}\right)}{Z_t}$$

$$\text{if } y_t = -1 \text{ then } \quad w_{t+1,i} = \frac{w_{t,i} \exp\left(-\underline{\eta} x_{t,i}\right)}{Z_t}$$

where Z_t is a normalization constant, and where $\bar{\eta} > 0$ and $\underline{\eta} > 0$ are parameters of the algorithm.

Let m^+ and m^- be the number of mistakes made by this algorithm on rounds on which $y_t = +1$ and $y_t = -1$, respectively. Thus, $m^+ + m^-$ is the total number of mistakes.

a. [12] Use a potential argument as in class to prove that

$$m^+ \overline{C} + m^- \underline{C} \leq \ln N$$

where

$$\overline{C} = \bar{\eta}(\delta + b) - \ln\left[\frac{e^{\bar{\eta}} + e^{-\bar{\eta}}}{2} + \frac{e^{\bar{\eta}} - e^{-\bar{\eta}}}{2}b\right]$$

$$\underline{C} = \underline{\eta}(\delta - b) - \ln\left[\frac{e^{\underline{\eta}} + e^{-\underline{\eta}}}{2} - \frac{e^{\underline{\eta}} - e^{-\underline{\eta}}}{2}b\right]$$

b. [8] Show how to choose $\bar{\eta}$ and $\underline{\eta}$ as functions of δ and b to prove that

$$m^+ \, \mathrm{RE}\left(\frac{1+b+\delta}{2} \, \| \, \frac{1+b}{2}\right) + m^- \, \mathrm{RE}\left(\frac{1+b-\delta}{2} \, \| \, \frac{1+b}{2}\right) \leq \ln N.$$

c. [5] Suppose $\mathbf{x}_t \in \{-1, +1\}^N$ and that there exists a set of indices $S \subseteq \{1, \ldots, N\}$ such that $y_t = +1$ if and only if $x_{t,i} = +1$ for at least one of the indices $i \in S$. In other words, y_t is a disjunction of the variables indexed by S. Assume $k = |S|$ is known. Show how the winnow algorithm and analysis *given in class* (and therefore with $b = 0$) can be applied to this case and that the number of mistakes is at most $O(k^2 \ln N)$. On this and the following problem, you do not have to use the given representation, as long as you achieve the stated mistake bound. (In other words, it is okay to map each vector $\mathbf{x}_t$ to some other vector $\mathbf{x}'_t$, and then to apply winnow.) However, whatever algorithm you end up with should run on each round in time polynomial in N, even when k is not considered a constant (so the running time should not be exponential in k).

d. [5] Now show how the version of winnow developed in parts (a) and (b) can be applied to this problem to obtain a mistake bound of $O(k \ln N)$. (For this problem, you may freely approximate $\ln(1 + \epsilon)$ by ϵ when $|\epsilon|$ is small.)

Problem 2

In class, we proved that the loss of the Widrow-Hoff (WH) algorithm is at most

$$\min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left(pL_{\mathbf{u}} + q\|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 \right) \tag{1}$$

for constants $p = 1/(1 - \eta)$ and $q = 1/\eta$. In this problem, we will show that these constants are the best possible, in other words, that no algorithm can achieve a bound that is strictly better.

Let A be *any* deterministic, online learning algorithm (not necessarily WH or even a weight-update algorithm), and assume that the cumulative loss of A,

$$L_A = \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{y}_t - y_t)^2$$

is at most the bound given in Eq. (1). Here, as usual, $\hat{y}_t \in \mathbb{R}$ is the prediction of algorithm A on round t, and also,

$$L_{\mathbf{u}} = \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{x}_t - y_t)^2.$$

Consider training A on the following examples $(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1), \ldots, (\mathbf{x}_T, y_T)$: each $\mathbf{x}_t$ is a unit vector with a 1 in the t-th coordinate, and 0's in all other coordinates. (Thus, $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ where $n \geq T$.) The y_t's are all in $\{-1, +1\}$ and can be chosen adversarially.

a. [8] Show how an adversary can choose the y_t's to ensure that $L_A \geq T$.

b. [12] Show that, regardless of how the y_t's are chosen in (a), the upper bound on L_A in Eq. (1) is equal to:

$$\frac{pq}{p + q} T.$$

c. [5] Combine parts (a) and (b) to show that

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} \leq 1.$$

Show how this implies that the bounds for WH are the best possible, i.e., that it cannot be the case that $p < 1/(1 - \eta)$ and simultaneously $q < 1/\eta$ for any $\eta \in (0, 1)$.