

## 1 VC-dimension and Learnability

**Definition 1** *The Vapnik-Chervonenkis dimension of  $C$ , denoted as  $VCdim(C)$ , is the cardinality of the largest set  $S$  shattered by  $C$ . If arbitrarily large finite sets can be shattered by  $C$ , then  $VCdim(C) = \infty$ .*

Given a class  $H$ , define the class  $MAJ_k(H)$  to be the class of functions achievable by taking majority votes over  $k$  functions in  $H$ . For example, if  $H$  is the class of conjunctions and  $k = 3$  then a typical function in  $MAJ_k(H)$  might be “ $f(x) = 1$  if  $x$  satisfies at least two out of three of  $x_1x_4x_5$ ,  $x_2x_3x_4$ , and  $x_3x_7$ .” Let’s say we allow repetitions.

**Claim 1** *Let  $MAJ_k(H)$  is the class of functions achievable by taking majority votes over  $k$  functions in  $H$ . If the hypothesis class  $H$  has VC-dimension  $d$ , then the class  $MAJ_k(H)$  has VC-dimension  $O(kd \log kd)$ .*

*Proof:* Let  $D$  be the VC-dimension of  $MAJ_k(H)$ , so by definition, there must exist a set  $S$  of  $D$  points shattered by  $MAJ_k(H)$ . We know by Sauer’s lemma that there are at most  $D^D$  ways of partitioning the points in  $S$  using functions in  $H$ .

Now, since each function  $h$  in  $MAJ_k(H)$  is determined by some  $k$  functions  $h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k$  in  $H$ , this means that the partitioning of  $S$  induced by  $h$  is determined by the partitioning of  $S$  induced by  $h_1, \dots, h_k$ . Since there are at most  $(D^D)^k = D^{Dk}$  ways of selecting  $k$  partitions of  $S$  consistent with  $H$  (possibly with repetitions), this means there are at most  $D^{Dk}$  ways of partitioning the points in  $S$  using functions in  $MAJ_k(H)$ .

On the other hand, since  $S$  is shattered by  $MAJ_k(H)$ , we know all  $2^D$  partitionings are possible. We therefore must have  $2^D \leq D^{Dk}$ , and so  $D \leq 2kd \log(kd)$  (for  $kd \geq 4$ ). ■

### A General Upper Bound on the Sample Complexity

In previous lectures we have shown that the VC-dimension of a concept class gives an upper bound on the number of samples needed to learn concepts from the class.

For example, we have shown:

**Theorem 1** *Let  $C$  be an arbitrary hypothesis space of VC-dimension  $d$ . Let  $D$  be an arbitrary unknown probability distribution over the instance space and let  $c^*$  be an arbitrary unknown target function. For any  $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ , if we draw a sample  $S$  from  $D$  of size  $m$  satisfying*

$$m \geq \frac{8}{\epsilon} \left[ d \ln \left( \frac{16}{\epsilon} \right) + \ln \left( \frac{2}{\delta} \right) \right].$$

then with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , all the hypotheses in  $C$  with  $err_D(h) > \epsilon$  are inconsistent with the data, i.e.,  $err_S(h) \neq 0$ .

So it is possible to PAC-learn a class  $C$  of VC-dimension  $d$  with parameters  $\delta$  and  $\epsilon$  given that the number of samples  $m$  is at least  $m \geq c \left( \frac{d}{\epsilon} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)$  where  $c$  is a fixed constant. So, as long as  $VCdim(C)$  is finite, it is possible to PAC-learn concepts from  $C$  even though  $C$  might be infinite.

## A Lower Bound on the Sample Complexity

We show that this sample complexity result is tight within a factor of  $O(\log(1/\epsilon))$ .

**Theorem 2** *Any algorithm for PAC-learning a concept class of VC dimension  $d$  with parameters  $\epsilon$  and  $\delta \leq 1/15$  must use more than  $(d - 1)/(64\epsilon)$  examples in the worst case.*

*Proof:* Consider a concept class  $C$  with VC dimension  $d$ . Let  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$  be shattered by  $C$ . To show a lower bound we construct a particular distribution that forces any PAC algorithm to take that many examples. The support of this probability distribution is  $X$ , so we can assume WLOG that  $C = C(X)$ , so  $C$  is a finite class,  $|C| = 2^d$ . Note that we have arranged things such that for all possible labelings of the points in  $X$ , there is exactly one concept in  $C$  that induces that labeling. Thus, choosing the target concept uniformly at random from  $C$  is equivalent to flipping a fair coin  $d$  times to determine the labeling induced by  $c$  on  $X$ .

Let  $m = (d - 1)/(64\epsilon)$ , and  $A$  be an algorithm that uses at most  $m$  i.i.d. examples and then produces a hypothesis  $h$ . We need to show that there exist a distribution  $D$  on  $X$  and a concept  $c \in C$  such that the  $er(h) > \epsilon$  with probability at least  $1/15$ .

We first define  $D$  independently of  $A$ :

$$\begin{aligned} p(x_1) &= 1 - 16\epsilon \\ p(x_2) &= p(x_3) = \dots = p(x_d) = \frac{16\epsilon}{d - 1} \end{aligned}$$

In the following we assume that  $S$  is a random i.i.d sample from  $D$  of size  $m$ . We want to establish that there is a  $c$  so that  $\Pr_S[er(h) > \epsilon] > \frac{1}{15}$ .

Let  $X' = \{x_2, \dots, x_d\}$ . For any fixed  $c \in C$  and hypothesis  $h$ , let

$$er'(h) = \Pr[c(x) \neq h(x) \wedge x \in X'].$$

For technical reasons, it is easier to prove that  $\Pr_S[er'(h) > \epsilon] > 1/15$ , which is enough since  $er'(h) \leq er(h)$ .

We pick a random  $c \in C$  and show that with positive probability  $c$  is hard to learn for  $A$ , thereby showing that there must be some fixed  $c$  that is hard to learn for  $A$ .

Let us now define the event:

$B$ :  $S$  contains less than  $(d - 1)/2$  points in  $X'$ .

We have:

$$\Pr_S[B] \geq 1/2 \tag{1}$$

To see this, let  $Z$  be the number of points in  $S$  that are from  $X'$ . Clearly,  $E[Z] = 16\epsilon m = (d-1)/4$ . We have  $\Pr_S[B] \geq 1 - \Pr[Z \geq (d-1)/2] \geq 1/2$ , since by Markov's inequality we have  $\Pr[Z \geq (d-1)/2] \leq 1/2$ .

We can also show:

$$E_{c,S}[er'(h) \mid B] > 4\epsilon \tag{2}$$

Let  $S$  be the set of points that  $A$  gets. Choosing a random  $c$  is equivalent to flipping a fair coin for each point in  $X$  to determine its label. Since  $h$  is independent of the labeling of  $X' - S$ , the contribution to  $er'(h)$  is expected to be  $16\epsilon/(2(d-1))$  for each point in  $X' - S$ . When  $B$  occurs, we have  $|X' - S| > (d-1)/2$ ; thus the expected value of  $er'(h)$  given  $B$  is strictly greater than  $4\epsilon$ . Using (1) and (2) we get a lower bound on  $E_{c,S}[er'(h)]$ .

$$E_{c,S}[er'(h)] \geq \Pr_S[B] \cdot E_{c,S}[er'(h) \mid B] > \frac{1}{2} \cdot 4\epsilon = 2\epsilon.$$

So there must exist some  $c^* \in C$  such that  $E_S[er'(h)] > 2\epsilon$ . We take  $c^*$  as the target concept and show that  $A$  is likely to produce a hypothesis with high error rate.

Using the fact that for any  $h$  we have  $er'(h) \leq \Pr[x \in X'] = 16\epsilon$  we note that

$$E_S[er'(h) \mid er'(h) > \epsilon] \leq 16\epsilon \text{ for any fixed } c. \tag{3}$$

We have:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\epsilon &< E_S[er'(h)] \\ &= \Pr_S[er'(h) > \epsilon] \cdot E_S[er'(h) \mid er'(h) > \epsilon] \\ &\quad + (1 - \Pr_S[er'(h) > \epsilon]) \cdot E_S[er'(h) \mid er'(h) \leq \epsilon]. \end{aligned}$$

Next we apply (3) to get

$$\begin{aligned} 2\epsilon < E_S[er'(h)] &\leq \Pr_S[er'(h) > \epsilon] \cdot 16\epsilon + (1 - \Pr_S[er'(h) > \epsilon]) \cdot \epsilon \\ &= 15\epsilon \Pr_S[er'(h) > \epsilon] + \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which implies  $\Pr_S[er'(h) > \epsilon] > 1/15$ , as desired. ■