

appear only in dot products, so we can again compute the dot products in feature space, replacing  $\langle \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle$  by  $k(x_i, x_j)$  (where the  $x_i$  belong to the input domain  $\mathcal{X}$ , and the  $\mathbf{x}_i$  in the feature space  $\mathcal{H}$ ).

As Figure 5.5 shows, the VC dimension bound, using the radius  $R$  computed in this way, gives a rather good prediction of the error on an independent test set.

## 5.7 Summary

In this chapter, we introduced the main ideas of statistical learning theory. For learning processes utilizing empirical risk minimization to be successful, we need a version of the law of large numbers that holds uniformly over all functions the learning machine can implement. For this uniform law to hold true, the capacity of the set of functions that the learning machine can implement has to be “well-behaved.” We gave several capacity measures, such as the VC dimension, and illustrated how to derive bounds on the test error of a learning machine, in terms of the training error and the capacity. We have, moreover, shown how to bound the capacity of margin classifiers, a result which will later be used to motivate the Support Vector algorithm. Finally, we described an application in which a uniform convergence bound was used for model selection.

Whilst this discussion of learning theory should be sufficient to understand most of the present book, we will revisit learning theory at a later stage. In Chapter 12, we will present some more advanced material, which applies to kernel learning machines. Specifically, we will introduce another class of generalization error bound, building on a concept of *stability* of algorithms minimizing regularized risk functionals. These bounds are proven using concentration-of-measure inequalities, which are themselves generalizations of Chernoff and Hoeffding type bounds. In addition, we will discuss *leave-one-out* and *PAC-Bayesian* bounds.

## 5.8 Problems

**5.1 (No Free Lunch in Kernel Choice ••)** Discuss the relationship between the “no-free-lunch Theorem” and the statement that there is no free lunch in kernel choice.

**5.2 (Error Counting Estimate [136] •)** Suppose you are given a test set with  $n$  elements to assess the accuracy of a trained classifier. Use the Chernoff bound to quantify the probability that the mean error on the test set differs from the true risk by more than  $\epsilon > 0$ . Argue that the test set should be as large as possible, in order to get a reliable estimate of the performance of a classifier.

**5.3 (The Tainted Die ••)** A con-artist wants to taint a die such that it does not generate any ‘6’ when cast. Yet he does not know exactly how. So he devises the following scheme: