

## Assignment 4

This assignment is due back by Tuesday May 4. You can hand it in the main CS/ECE office in my mailbox.

*Note:* Make sure you write and justify all your statements in a precise, formal way.

### Problem 1

Suppose the leaves of a 1-decision list are replaced by other 1-decision lists. Call such a structure a rank-2 1-decision list. Describe a polynomial time Occam algorithm for learning rank-2 1-decision lists with hypotheses in rank-2 1-decision lists and prove its correctness.

### Problem 2

(i) Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the class of conjunctions over  $n$  Boolean variables. Show that the size of any set shattered by  $\mathcal{C}$  is at most  $n$ .

(ii) Let  $\mathcal{D}_k$  be the class of  $k$ -term DNF expressions over  $n$  Boolean variables. Show that there is a set of size  $k(n - \log k)$  which is shattered by  $\mathcal{D}_k$ .

### Problem 3

An axis parallel rectangle (with two sides parallel to the  $x$ -axis and two sides parallel to the  $y$ -axis) represents a concept over the domain  $\mathbb{R}^2$  where the positive examples are those points inside the rectangle (see Section 1.1 of the text by Kearns and Vazirani).

The class  $\text{NDAPR}_k$  of nested difference of  $k$  axis parallel rectangles is composed of concepts expressible as  $(A_1 \setminus (A_2 \setminus \dots (A_{k-1} \setminus A_k) \dots))$  where all  $A_i$  are axis parallel rectangles.

Show that the VC dimension of  $\text{NDAPR}_k$  is exactly  $4k$ .

*Hint:* You may want to use induction; the base case appears in the text.

### Problem 4

Describe a polynomial time PAC learning algorithm for  $\text{NDAPR}_k$  and prove its correctness.

*Hint:* By Problem 4 it suffices to find a consistent hypothesis in  $\text{NDAPR}_k$ .

## Problem 5

For  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  let  $t(x) = \bigwedge_{x_i=1} x_i$ . For example for  $x = 101$ ,  $t(x) = x_1x_3$ . For two assignments  $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,  $x \wedge y$  denotes their bitwise AND. For example for  $x = 101$  and  $y = 110$ ,  $x \wedge y = 100$ . Show that the following algorithm efficiently learns the class of monotone DNF expressions and give bounds for the numbers of equivalence and membership queries.

1. Initialize  $S = \emptyset$  and  $h = 0$ .
2. While  $EQ(h)$  provides a (positive) counterexample  $x$ 
  - (a) For each element  $s$  in  $S$  do:
    - if  $MQ(s \wedge x)$  returns “positive” then replace  $s$  with  $s \wedge x$  and quit for loop.
  - (b) if no element was replaced then add  $x$  to  $S$ .
  - (c) Let  $h = \bigvee_{s \in S} t(s)$
3. Output  $h$

**Hint:** Argue that two elements of  $S$  cannot satisfy the same term of the target. Then try to quantify how you make “progress” after every counter example.

## Problem 6 (extra credit)

Define a notion of reducibility appropriate for learning from Equivalence and Membership Queries. Using this notion show that if  $C^1$  reduces to  $C^2$  and  $C^2$  is efficiently learnable from Equivalence and Membership Queries then  $C^1$  is efficiently learnable from Equivalence and Membership Queries. Note that you would want this notion of reducibility to be useful in the next problem.

## Problem 7 (extra credit)

A read-3 DNF formula over  $\{0, 1\}^n$  is a DNF formula using literals in  $x_1, \dots, x_n, \overline{x_1}, \dots, \overline{x_n}$  in which every variable appears at most 3 times (whether negated or unnegated). For example  $x_1x_2\overline{x_3}x_5 \vee \overline{x_2}x_4\overline{x_5} \vee x_3x_4x_5 \vee \overline{x_1} \overline{x_2} \overline{x_4}$  is read-3 but  $x_1x_2\overline{x_3}x_5 \vee \overline{x_2}x_4\overline{x_5} \vee x_3x_4x_5 \vee \overline{x_1} \overline{x_2} \overline{x_5}$  is not (since  $x_5$  appears 4 times). The class of read-3 DNF is composed of the union of such formulae for  $n \geq 1$ .

Let  $p()$  be any polynomial and let  $C$  be a sub-class of DNF formulae. We say that  $C$  is  $p()$ -bounded if every formulae  $c \in C$  over  $\{0, 1\}^n$  has at most  $p(n)$  terms. Show that if  $C$  is  $p()$ -bounded then it reduces to read-3 DNF (using reducibility of the previous question).