

# Assignment 11

## Mathematics for Machine Learning

Submission due Friday **17.01.2025, 23:59** via Ilias

Justify all your claims.

**Exercise 1 (Convergence of random variables, 3+2+2 points).**

- a) Consider the probability space  $([0, 1], \mathcal{B}, \lambda)$ , where  $\mathcal{B}$  denotes the Borel- $\sigma$  algebra on  $[0, 1]$  and  $\lambda$  the Lebesgue measure. For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exist unique  $h, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  with  $0 \leq k < 2^h$  such that  $n = 2^h + k$ . We define a sequence of random variables  $X_n$  using these  $h, k$  as

$$X_n(\omega) = \mathbb{1}_{\left[\frac{k}{2^h}, \frac{k+1}{2^h}\right]}(\omega) = \begin{cases} 1, & \omega \in \left[\frac{k}{2^h}, \frac{k+1}{2^h}\right] \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \forall \omega \in [0, 1].$$

Prove that  $X_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in probability and in  $L^1$ , but not almost surely.

- b) Consider a sequence of random variables  $X, X_1, X_2, \dots$  that satisfies  $X_n \rightarrow X$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Prove that there exists a subsequence  $(X_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  for which  $X_{n_k} \rightarrow X$  almost surely as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .
- c) Find such a subsequence for the sequence given in a).

**Exercise 2 (Limit theorems, 2+3 points).**

- a) A laundry bag contains one black and one white sock. Now Tom keeps throwing socks into the laundry bag. Every sock he throws is either black with probability  $p \in [0, 1)$  or white with probability  $1 - p$ , independently of the previous socks. Let  $X_n$  be the fraction of black socks to total amount of socks and  $Y_n$  the fraction of black to white socks after  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  throws. Prove that
- (a)  $X_n \rightarrow p$  almost surely as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,
- (b)  $Y_n \rightarrow \frac{p}{1-p}$  almost surely as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .
- b) Consider an i.i.d. sequence of real-valued random variables  $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X_1] \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}[X_1] < \infty$ . Define  $S_n := \sum_{k=1}^n X_k$  and let  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $a < b$ . Use the central limit theorem to prove

$$P(a \leq S_n \leq b) = \Phi\left(\frac{b - n\mu}{\sqrt{n}\sigma}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{a - n\mu}{\sqrt{n}\sigma}\right) + o(1),$$

where  $\Phi$  denotes the cumulative distribution function (cdf) of the standard normal distribution and  $o(1)$  satisfies  $o(1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Hint: You may use the characterization*

$$X_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} X \text{ in distribution} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad F_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} F \text{ uniformly on } D_F,$$

where  $F_n$  and  $F$  denote the cdf's of  $X_n$  and  $X$ , and  $D_F = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid F \text{ is continuous at } x\}$ .

**Exercise 3. (Estimation error in learning theory, 3+2+2+1 points)**

Let  $(X, Y), (X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$  be i.i.d. random variables  $\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$  and consider a finite set  $\mathcal{H}$  of measurable prediction functions  $h : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

For a measurable loss function  $l : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  we define the empirical risk of a predictor  $h$  as

$$R_n(h) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n l(h(X_i), Y_i)$$

and its true risk by

$$R(h) := \mathbb{E}(l(h(X), Y)).$$

- a) Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Prove that for the event  $A_n := \{\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} |R_n(h) - R(h)| \geq \varepsilon\}$  it holds

$$P(A_n) \leq M \cdot e^{-2n\varepsilon^2}$$

for some constant  $M > 0$ .

- b) Let  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  be fixed. Prove that  $R_n(h) \rightarrow R(h)$  almost surely as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

- c) Define

$$h_n := \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} R_n(h) \quad \text{and} \quad h^* := \arg \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} R(h).$$

Prove that  $R(h_n) \rightarrow R(h^*)$  almost surely as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Hint: Show and use that*

$$R(h_n) - R(h^*) \leq 2 \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} |R_n(h) - R(h)|.$$

- d) The result of [c](#)) does not hold any more in general if  $\mathcal{H}$  is not finite. Explain why.