# **Sharp Rates in Dependent Learning Theory: Avoiding Sample Size Deflation for the Square Loss** George J. Pappas (Penn), Nikolai Matni (Penn) Ingvar Ziemann (Penn), Stephen Tu (USC),





### Introduction

Given: Dependent ( $\beta$ -mixing) data  $Z_{1:n} = (X, Y)_{1:n}$  and a hypothesis class  $\mathscr F$ Output: a predictor  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  that "minimizes":

**Main:** establish instance optimal rates for ERM

Distinguish between:

 ${\bf Realizability:}\ \ Y_i = f_\star(X_i) \!+\! \, W_i,$  for some MDS "white noise"  $W_{1:n}$ **Agnostic:** no general relation between  $X$  and  $Y \Rightarrow$  life is significantly harder

• Can still define  $W_{1:n}$  via  $f_{\star} \in \text{argmin}_{f \in \mathcal{F}} E_{X,Y} ||f(X) - Y||^2$  and  $W_i \triangleq Y_i$ 

− *f* <sup>⋆</sup>(*Xi* )

 $E$ RM for  $\beta$ -mixing stationary data  $(X,Y)_{1:n}$  . Suppose further that:

$$
\mathbf{ER}(\hat{f}) \triangleq \mathbf{E}_{X,Y} ||\hat{f}(X) - Y||^2 - \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbf{E}_{X,Y} ||f(X) - Y||^2
$$

*f* ∈ argmin*f*∈ℱ



### Motivation



IID learning is very well understood— rich theory:

- **•**  $||f||_{\Psi_p} \le L ||f||_{L^2}^{\eta}$  for some  $\eta \in (0,1]$  where ≤ *L*∥*f*∥*<sup>η</sup>*  $\frac{\eta}{L^2}$  for some  $\eta \in (0,1]$  where  $\|f\|_{\Psi_p}$
- 

We have that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ :

• Well-known asymptotics, sharp rates for ERM, lots of algorithmic results **Key issue:** temporal dependence in data not allowed in IID learning!



̂

 $\sigma^2 \triangleq \lim$ *n*→∞ sup *g*∈(ℱ−ℱ)∩*o*(1)*SL*<sup>2</sup> **Var**  $\sqrt{2}$ 1 *n n* ∑  $\sum_{i=1}$   $\langle W_i$ 

We also show that the weak subG class condition holds

- For finite hypothesis classes
- For smooth (in the input) hypothesis cla
- For parametric hypothesis classes (Loja)

- **The crux** is to control  $M_{n,\epsilon}(f)$  carefully. We combine:
	- **•** A version of Bernstein's inequality (Maurer and Pontil 2021)

- Localization  $(||f||_{L^2} = r)$
- Balances both RHS terms  $\Rightarrow$  reintroduces the mixing time in the rate **•** The weak subG class condition
- **•** Breaks the balance and makes the variance term dominant again **•** Tail bounds via generic chaining (Dirksen 2015) for local unif. control
	-

**First** since  $\mathscr F$  is convex or realizable  $\mathrm{ER}(f) \leq \mathrm{E}_X ||f(X) - f$ ine the *quadratic* process: ̂ ̂ ⋆(*X*)∥<sup>2</sup>

**Goal:** can we build a sharp theory for dependent learning? **Problem:** Blocking typically deflates the sample size Blocking transforms *n* dep. samples  $m = n/t_{mix}$  independent "blocks"  $Z_{1:n} \Rightarrow Z_{1:t_{\sf mix}}, Z_{k+1:2t_{\sf mix}}, Z_{2k+1:3t_{\sf mix}}, \ldots$  (*m* independent blocks) Can now apply standard results for independent data to the "blocks" Generically employed, deflates rate of converge by a factor  $t_{mix}$ ... Classical asymptotics tell us this is **not instance-optimal!** ˜  $1:$  $t_{\text{mix}}$ ,  $Z$ ˜  $k+1:2t_{\text{mix}}, Z$ ˜  $2k+1:3t_{\text{mix}}$ , ... (*m* 



Sharp Rates\* without Realizability. (\* up to a logarithm)



### Contribution **Proof Strategy**

### **Stable GLM, numerical ERM experiment**

 $GLM: Y_t \triangleq X_{t+1} = \phi(A_\star X_t) + W_t$ , w/  $\phi$  a known link function (here leaky relu),  $W_t \sim N(0,\sigma_W^2)$  iid Dependency ( $\rho = \rho(A_\star)$ ) doesn't seem to hurt (at least not for large  $T = n$ ):

## **Dependency Deflation?**



Key takeaway: Under realizability (i.e.,  $\mathbf{E}[Y_t \mid X_t] = f_\star(X_t)$ ), the leading variance proxy term tends to the same variance as in the independent case In other words: dependence only hurts without realizability and the degradation is graceful

$$
Q_{n,\epsilon}(f) \triangleq \mathbf{E}_{X} ||f(X) - f_{\star}(X)||^{2} - \frac{1+\epsilon}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||f(X_{i}) - f_{\star}(X_{i})||^{2}
$$

On the event  $\{Q_{n,\epsilon}(f) \leq 0 : \forall f \in \mathscr{F} \backslash rS_{L^2}\}$  we have:

• For 
$$
V_i(f) \triangleq (1 - \mathbf{E}')(W_i, f(X_i) - f_{\star}(X_i))
$$
 with  $||f||_{L^2} = r$ :  

$$
\int_{\mathbf{V}} \mathbf{V}(\overline{V}) \ln(1/\delta) = \int_{\mathbf{V}} \int_{\mathbf{V}} |\nabla u| \cdot \mathbf{V}(\overline{V}) \ln(1/\delta) = \int_{\mathbf{V}} \int_{\mathbf{V}} |\nabla u| \cdot \mathbf{V}(\overline{V}) \cdot \mathbf{V}(\overline{V}) \cdot \mathbf{V}(\overline{V})
$$

$$
\hat{f}(X) - f_{\star}(X)\|^{2} \le r + \frac{1+\epsilon}{rn} \sum_{i=1}^{n} 2(1 - \mathbf{E}') \Bigg\langle W_{i}, \frac{r[\hat{f}(X_{i}) - f_{\star}(X_{i})]}{\|\hat{f}(X_{i}) - f_{\star}(X_{i})\|_{L^{2}}}\Bigg\rangle
$$

ine the *multiplier* process:

$$
M_{n,\epsilon}(f) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{n} 2(1 - \mathbf{E}') \langle W_i, f(X_i) - f_{\star}(X_i) \rangle
$$

**Hence:** the proof boils down to unif. controlling  $\mathcal{Q}_{n,\epsilon}(f)$  and  $M_{n,\epsilon}(f)$  over the localized class  $(\mathscr{F}-\mathscr{F})\cap rS_{L^2}$  and:

complexity( $\mathcal{F}$ ): soln. to  $r \asymp$  sup  $f\in(\mathscr{F}-\mathscr{F})\cap rS_{12}$  $\sup M_{n,\epsilon}(f)$ 

**Insight** from Mendelson (2014),  $Q_{n,\epsilon}(f)$  does not affect the rate, but only the burn-in  $\Rightarrow$  can freely block to control  $\mathcal{Q}_{n,\epsilon}(f)$ 

$$
\frac{1}{N}V_i \lesssim 2\sqrt{\frac{V(\bar{V})\ln(1/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{t_{\text{mix}}\|V\|_{\Psi_p}\log(1/\delta)}{n} \qquad \bar{V} = \frac{1}{t_{\text{mix}}}\sum_{i=1}^k V_i
$$