Problem 1

[15] Let \( F_1, \ldots, F_n \) be families of real-valued functions on some space \( Z \), and let \( a_1, \ldots, a_n \) be arbitrary (fixed) real numbers. Let \( \mathcal{G} \) be the class of all functions \( g \) of the form

\[
g(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i f_i(z)
\]

where \( f_i \in F_i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). For any sample \( S \), find \( \hat{\mathcal{R}}_S(\mathcal{G}) \) exactly in terms of \( a_1, \ldots, a_n \), and \( \hat{\mathcal{R}}_S(F_1), \ldots, \hat{\mathcal{R}}_S(F_n) \). Be sure to justify your answer.

Problem 2

[15] Suppose, in the usual boosting set-up, that the weak learning condition is guaranteed to hold so that \( \epsilon_t \leq \frac{1}{2} - \gamma \) for some \( \gamma > 0 \) which is known before boosting begins. Describe a modified version of AdaBoost whose final classifier is a simple (unweighted) majority vote, and show that its training error is at most \( (1 - \frac{1}{4\gamma^2})^{T/2} \).

Problem 3

Let \( X_n = \{0,1\}^n \), and let \( \mathcal{G}_n \) be any class of boolean functions \( g : X_n \to \{-1,+1\} \). In this problem, we will see, roughly speaking, that if a function \( f \) can be written as a majority vote of polynomially many functions in \( \mathcal{G}_n \), then under any distribution, \( f \) can be weakly approximated by some function in \( \mathcal{G}_n \). But if \( f \) cannot be so written as a majority vote, then there exists some “hard” distribution under which \( f \) cannot be approximated by any function in \( \mathcal{G}_n \).

Let \( \mathcal{M}_{n,k} \) be the class of all boolean functions that can be written as a simple majority vote of \( k \) (not necessarily distinct) functions in \( \mathcal{G}_n \); that is, \( \mathcal{M}_{n,k} \) consists of all functions \( f \) of the form

\[
f(x) = \text{sign} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k} g_j(x) \right)
\]

for some \( g_1, \ldots, g_k \in \mathcal{G}_n \). Assume \( k \) is odd.

- [15] Show that if \( f \in \mathcal{M}_{n,k} \) then for all distributions \( D \) on \( X_n \), there exists a function \( g \in \mathcal{G}_n \) for which

\[
\Pr_{x \sim D} [f(x) \neq g(x)] \leq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k}.
\]

- [15] Show that if \( f \notin \mathcal{M}_{n,k} \) then there exists a distribution \( D \) on \( X_n \) such that for every \( g \in \mathcal{G}_n \),

\[
\Pr_{x \sim D} [f(x) \neq g(x)] > \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{n \ln 2}{2k}}.
\]
Problem 4 – Optional (Extra Credit)

[15] Consider the following “mini” boosting algorithm which runs for exactly three rounds:

- Given training data as in AdaBoost, let $D_1$, $h_1$, $\epsilon_1$, and $D_2$, $h_2$, $\epsilon_2$ be computed exactly as in AdaBoost on the first two rounds.
- Compute, for $i = 1, \ldots, m$:
  
  $$D_3(i) = \begin{cases} 
  D_1(i)/Z & \text{if } h_1(x_i) \neq h_2(x_i) \\
  0 & \text{else}
  \end{cases}$$

  where $Z$ is a normalization factor (chosen so that $D_3$ will be a distribution).
- Get weak hypothesis $h_3$.
- Output the final hypothesis:
  
  $$H(x) = \text{sign} \left( h_1(x) + h_2(x) + h_3(x) \right).$$

We will see that this three-round procedure can effect a small but significant boost in accuracy. As a side note (not shown in this problem), this technique can then be applied recursively to boost the accuracy to an arbitrary degree. This exact three-round approach was the main idea underlying the very first known provable boosting algorithm.

As usual, $\epsilon_t = \Pr_{i \sim D_t}[h_t(x_i) \neq y_i]$ is the error of $h_t$ on $D_t$. We assume $0 < \epsilon_t < \frac{1}{2}$ for $t = 1, 2, 3$. Let

$$b = \Pr_{i \sim D_2}[h_1(x_i) \neq y_i \land h_2(x_i) \neq y_i],$$

that is, $b$ is the probability with respect to $D_2$ that both $h_1$ and $h_2$ are incorrect.

a. In terms of $\epsilon_1$, $\epsilon_2$, $\epsilon_3$ and $b$, write exact expressions for each of the following:

- $\Pr_{i \sim D_1}[h_1(x_i) \neq y_i \land h_2(x_i) \neq y_i]$.
- $\Pr_{i \sim D_1}[h_1(x_i) \neq y_i \land h_2(x_i) = y_i]$.
- $\Pr_{i \sim D_1}[h_1(x_i) = y_i \land h_2(x_i) \neq y_i]$.
- $\Pr_{i \sim D_1}[h_1(x_i) \neq h_2(x_i) \land h_3(x_i) \neq y_i]$.
- $\Pr_{i \sim D_1}[H(x_i) \neq y_i]$.

b. Suppose $\epsilon = \max\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3\}$. Show that the training error of the final classifier $H$ is at most

$$3\epsilon^2 - 2\epsilon^3,$$

and show that this quantity is strictly less than $\epsilon$, the (worst) error of the weak hypotheses. Thus, the accuracy receives a boost which is small, but which turns out to be enough, when applied recursively, to achieve arbitrarily high accuracy.