## B9145: Problem Set 1

Due: Feb 17, 11:59pm

Carefully follow submission instructions announced on Canvas.

**Question 1.1** (Tail bound for sub-Gaussian RVs and Lasso): For a class of functions  $\mathcal{H} \subset \{h : \mathcal{Z} \to \mathbb{R}\}$ , recall the definition of (empirical) Rademacher complexity

$$\mathfrak{R}_n(\mathcal{H}) := \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{h\in\mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i h(Z_i) \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_n\right],$$

where  $\varepsilon_i$ 's are i.i.d. random signs (Rademacher variables), independent of everything else.

(a) Let  $X_j$  be sub-Gaussian random variables with parameter  $c_j^2$  for j = 1, ..., N. Show that for any  $N \ge 3$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\max_{1 \le j \le N} X_j] \le \max_{1 \le j \le N} c_j \cdot \sqrt{2 \log N}.$$

- (b) For any finite  $\mathcal{H}$ , show that  $\mathfrak{R}_n(\mathcal{H}) \leq \left(\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h(Z_i)^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{2\log|\mathcal{H}|}{n}}.$
- (c) Consider  $L^1$ -regularized linear models  $\mathcal{H}_s := \{z \mapsto \theta^\top z : \|\theta\|_1 \leq s\}$ . Assume there exists  $C_\infty > 0$  such that  $\|Z\|_\infty \leq C_\infty$  almost surely. Derive the following scale-sensitive bound

$$\mathfrak{R}_n(\mathcal{H}_s) \le sC_\infty \sqrt{\frac{2\log(2d)}{n}}.$$

**Hint** For finite  $\mathcal{G}$ ,  $\mathfrak{R}_n(\mathcal{G}) = \mathfrak{R}_n(\text{convex-hull}(\mathcal{G}))$ .

Question 1.2 (Two-layer neural networks): Consider a neural network with two layers and activation function  $a : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be an input vector with  $||Z||_2 \leq R_2$  almost surely, and let  $a : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  be a 1-Lipschitz activation function with a(0) = 0. For example, the rectified linear unit (ReLU)  $a(x) := \max(x, 0)$ , or hyperbolic tangent  $a(x) := \tanh(x)$  are common choices that satisfy this condition.

Let *m* be the number of hidden units in the two-layer neural network. We denote by  $w_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$  the weights of the first layer connecting to the *j*-th hidden unit, for  $j = 1, \ldots, m$ , and use  $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$  to denote the weights of the second layer. Consider  $L^2$ -regularized two-layer neural networks

$$\mathcal{H} := \left\{ z \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^{m} v_j a(w_j^\top z) : \|v\|_2 \le C_{2,v}, \text{ and } \|w_j\|_2 \le C_{2,w} \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, m \right\}.$$

Show the scale-sensitive bound  $\mathfrak{R}_n(\mathcal{H}) \leq 2R_2 C_{2,v} C_{2,w} \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}$ .

**Hint** Use the contraction principle: for a 1-Lipschitz function  $a : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  with a(0) = 0,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{h\in\mathcal{H}}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\varepsilon_{i}a(h(Z_{i}))\right| \mid Z_{1},\ldots,Z_{n}\right] \leq 2\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{h\in\mathcal{H}}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\varepsilon_{i}h(Z_{i})\right| \mid Z_{1},\ldots,Z_{n}\right].$$

**Question 1.3** (Fast rates under curvature): In this problem, we will show losses with curvature achieves faster rates of convergence. To do this, we study a localized Rademacher process around the population optimum.

Let  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a compact, convex set, and let  $\ell(\cdot; z) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$  be a convex function for Palmost surely all z. We assume that the population optimum  $\theta^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta; Z)]$  is unique. Consider Lipschitz losses (in some norm  $\|\cdot\|$ ) that grow sufficiently fast near the optimum: for constants r, c, L > 0, and all  $\theta, \theta'$  satisfying  $\|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq r, \|\theta' - \theta^*\| \leq r$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\ell(\theta; z) - \ell(\theta'; z)\right| &\leq L \left\|\theta - \theta'\right\| \quad \text{for } P\text{-almost surely all } z, \\ \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta; Z)] &\geq \mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta^*; Z)] + \frac{c}{2} \left\|\theta - \theta^*\right\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

(e.g. think about a linear regression problem with bounded data.)

Define the set of empirical and population approximate optimizers

$$\widehat{S}_{\epsilon} := \left\{ \theta \in \Theta : \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ell(\theta; Z_i) \leq \inf_{\theta' \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ell(\theta'; Z_i) + \epsilon \right\}$$
$$S_{\epsilon} := \left\{ \theta \in \Theta : \mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta; Z)] \leq \inf_{\theta' \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta'; Z)] + \epsilon \right\}.$$

Let  $0 < \epsilon \leq cr^2/4$  in the following.

(a) Argue that  $\widehat{S}_{\epsilon} \not\subseteq S_{2\epsilon}$  implies

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_{2\epsilon}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta; Z) - \ell(\theta^*; Z)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\ell(\theta; Z_i) - \ell(\theta^*; Z_i)\right) \right\} \ge \epsilon.$$

Hint Construct a  $\theta \in \Theta$  with  $\mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta; Z)] = \mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta^*; Z)] + 2\epsilon, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta; Z_i) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\theta^*; Z_i) + \epsilon.$ 

(b) Using results from class, prove that with probability at least  $1 - e^{-t}$ ,

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_{2\epsilon}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta; Z) - \ell(\theta^{\star}; Z)] - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\ell(\theta; Z_i) - \ell(\theta^{\star}; Z_i)\right) \right\}$$
$$\leq 2\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\theta \in S_{2\epsilon}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \varepsilon_i \left(\ell(\theta; Z_i) - \ell(\theta^{\star}; Z_i)\right)\right] + 2L \sqrt{\frac{2t\epsilon}{cn}}.$$

(c) Show the following: for some numerical constant C > 0,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\theta\in S_{2\epsilon}}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\varepsilon_{i}\left(\ell(\theta;Z_{i})-\ell(\theta^{\star};Z_{i})\right)\mid Z_{1},\ldots,Z_{n}\right]\leq CL\sqrt{\frac{d\epsilon}{cn}}.$$

(You don't need to find the constant.)

(d) Conclude that for a numerical constant C > 0 (which may differ from the one above), setting  $\epsilon_t = CL^2 \frac{d+t}{cn}$  yields  $\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{S}_{\epsilon_t} \not\subseteq S_{2\epsilon_t}\right) \leq e^{-t}$ .