

FOSML: Lecture 12

Recall our set-up

- $\Phi(u)$ is a convex, non-decreasing function with $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} \Phi(u) = 0$ $\forall u \in \mathbb{R}$.
- The Φ -loss of $h: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \{-1, 1\}$ is $\Phi(-yh(x))$, and the expected loss

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\Phi}(h) &= \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} (\Phi(-yh(x))) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_x} (\eta(x) \Phi(-h(x)) + (1-\eta(x)) \Phi(h(x))). \end{aligned}$$

• For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, let $u \mapsto L_{\Phi}(x, u)$ be the function $L_{\Phi}(x, u) = \eta(x) \Phi(-u) + (1-\eta(x)) \Phi(u)$,

so that $\mathcal{L}_{\Phi}(h) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_x} (L_{\Phi}(x, h(x)))$.

Define $h_{\Phi}^{\dagger}(x) = \arg \min_{u \in [-\infty, \infty]} L_{\Phi}(x, u) = \arg \min_{u \in [-\infty, \infty]} \eta(x) \Phi(-u) + (1-\eta(x)) \Phi(u)$.

This is not unique, so just pick one. Let $\mathcal{L}_{\Phi}^{\dagger} = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{D}} (\Phi(-yh_{\Phi}^{\dagger}(x)))$.

Proposition: Let Φ be a convex and non-decreasing function that is differentiable at 0 and satisfying $\Phi'(0) > 0$. Then the minimizer of Φ defines the ~~Bayes~~ Bayes classifier, i.e. for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $h_{\Phi}^{\dagger}(x) > 0$, $h_{\Phi}^{\dagger}(x) = 0$
 \Updownarrow \Updownarrow
 $h^*(x) > 0$ $h^*(x) = 0$.

In particular, $\mathcal{L}_{\Phi}^{\dagger} = R^*$.

Proof: Fix $x \in X$. If $\eta(x) = 0$, then $h^*(x) = -\frac{1}{2}$ and $h_{\Phi}^*(x) = -\infty$, so that $\text{sgn}(h^*(x)) = \text{sgn}(h_{\Phi}^*(x))$. Similarly, if $\eta(x) = 1$, then $h^*(x) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $h_{\Phi}^*(x) = +\infty$, so that $\text{sgn}(h^*(x)) = \text{sgn}(h_{\Phi}^*(x))$ in this case as well.

Let u^* be the minimizer defining $h_{\Phi}^*(x)$. Recall that u^* is a minimizer of $u \mapsto L_{\Phi}(x, u) \iff$ the subdifferential of this function at u^* contains 0. More precisely, taking the subdifferential at u^* yields

$$\partial L_{\Phi}(x, u) = -\eta(x) \partial \Phi(-u^*) + (1-\eta(x)) \partial \Phi(u^*).$$

Then u^* is a minimizer $\iff \exists v_1 \in \partial \Phi(-u^*), \exists v_2 \in \partial \Phi(u^*)$ s.t.

$$\eta(x)v_1 = (1-\eta(x))v_2.$$

If $u^* = 0$, then since $\Phi'(0)$ exists and is greater than 0, we have $v_1 = v_2 = \Phi'(0) > 0 \implies \eta(x) = \frac{1}{2} \implies h^*(x) = 0$. This yields $h_{\Phi}^*(x) = 0 \implies h^*(x) = 0$.

To see the converse, suppose $h^*(x) = 0$, i.e. $\eta(x) = \frac{1}{2}$. Then by definition of Φ being convex, $\frac{1}{2}\Phi(-u) + \frac{1}{2}\Phi(u) \geq \Phi(u+u) = \Phi(0) \quad \forall u \implies h_{\Phi}^*(x) = 0$ as well.

We may now assume WLOG that $\eta(x) \notin \{0, 1, \frac{1}{2}\}$. We first show that for any $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $u_1 < u_2$, and any two subgradients $v_1 \in \partial \Phi(u_1), v_2 \in \partial \Phi(u_2)$, we have $v_1 \leq v_2$. Indeed, by definition of subgradient, we may bound

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \Phi(u_2) - \Phi(u_1) &\geq v_1(u_2 - u_1) \\ \Phi(u_1) - \Phi(u_2) &\geq v_2(u_1 - u_2) \end{aligned} \right\} \implies \begin{aligned} v_2(u_2 - u_1) &\geq v_1(u_2 - u_1) \\ v_2 &\geq v_1. \end{aligned}$$

Now, if $u^* > 0$, then clearly $-u^* < u^*$. By the above argument, $v_1 \leq v_2$, where v_1, v_2 are the subgradient elements associated with $-u^*, u^*$, respectively.

We cannot have $V_1 = V_2 \neq 0$, since this would imply by $\eta(x)V_1 = (1-\eta(x))V_2$ ③ that $\eta(x) = \frac{1}{2}$. Moreover, we cannot have $V_1 = V_2 = 0$, since ~~we know~~ we can know $V_2 \geq \Phi'(0) > 0$. So, we must have $V_2 > V_1$ with $V_2 > 0$.

This implies $\eta(x) > 1-\eta(x)$, so that $\eta(x) > \frac{1}{2}$ and thus $h^*(x) > 0$.

Conversely, suppose $h^*(x) > 0$; we want to show $u^* > 0$. Well, $h^*(x) > 0 \Rightarrow \eta(x) > 1-\eta(x)$. As shown, we cannot have $V_1 = V_2 = 0$ or $V_1 = V_2 \neq 0$; since we also ~~know~~ know $\eta(x) \neq 1$, it follows that $V_1 < V_2$. Thus, $-u^* \leq u^* \Rightarrow u^* > 0$. Moreover, since $u^* = 0 \Rightarrow h^*(x) = 0$, we have $u^* > 0$.

• We may finally state and prove our main result.

Theorem: Let Φ be a convex, non-decreasing function. Suppose $\exists s \geq 1$ and $c > 0$ such that

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{X}, |h^*(x)|^s = \left| \eta(x) - \frac{1}{2} \right|^s \leq c^s \left[L_\Phi(x, 0) - L_\Phi(x, h_\Phi^*(x)) \right]$$

Then, for any hypothesis h ,

$$R(h) - R^* \leq 2c \left[L_\Phi(h) - L_\Phi^* \right]^{\frac{1}{s}}$$

Proof: By convexity of Φ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(-2h^*(x)h(x)) &\leq \eta(x)\Phi(-h(x)) + (1-\eta(x))\Phi(h(x)) \\ &= L_\Phi(x, h(x)). \end{aligned}$$

By our earlier Lemma, Jensen's inequality, and $h^*(x) = \eta |x|^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$, we have that (4)

$$\begin{aligned}
 R(h) - R^* &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_x} \left(|2\eta(x) - 1| \mathbb{1}_{h(x)h^*(x) \leq 0} \right) \\
 &\leq \mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_x} \left(|2\eta(x) - 1|^s \mathbb{1}_{h(x)h^*(x) \leq 0} \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \\
 &\leq 2c \mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_x} \left(\left| \Phi(0) - L_{\Phi}(x, h_{\Phi}^*(x)) \right| \mathbb{1}_{h(x)h^*(x) \leq 0} \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \\
 &\leq 2c \mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_x} \left(\left| \Phi(-2h^*(x)h(x)) - L_{\Phi}(x, h_{\Phi}^*(x)) \right| \mathbb{1}_{h(x)h^*(x) \leq 0} \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \\
 &\leq 2c \mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_x} \left(\left| L_{\Phi}(x, h(x)) - L_{\Phi}(x, h_{\Phi}^*(x)) \right| \mathbb{1}_{h(x)h^*(x) \leq 0} \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \\
 &\leq 2c \mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_x} \left(\left| L_{\Phi}(x, h(x)) - L_{\Phi}(x, h_{\Phi}^*(x)) \right| \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \\
 &= 2c \left[\mathcal{L}_{\Phi}(h) - \mathcal{L}_{\Phi}^* \right]^{\frac{1}{s}}. \quad \blacksquare
 \end{aligned}$$