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## Ensemble's Key Power

- Cancellation of errors effect If the errors are independent, they average out

Our contributions

- Second order PAC-Bayesian generalization bound for the weighted majority vote
- Minimization of the bound guides weighting of ensemble members and does not deteriorate the test error
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Issues

- Ignores correlation of errors (the key power)
- Minimization of the corresponding PAC-Bayes bound degrades the test error (Lorenzen et al., 2019)


## Prior second order analysis

The C-bounds (Lacasse et al., 2007, Germain et al., 2015, Laviolette et al., 2017)
Based on Chebyshev-Cantelli inequality
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Based on Chebyshev-Cantelli inequality

$$
\mathbb{P}(X \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[X^{2}\right]-\mathbb{E}[X]^{2}}{\mathbb{E}\left[X^{2}\right]-\mathbb{E}[X]+\varepsilon^{2}}
$$

## Issues

- $\mathbb{E}\left[X^{2}\right]$ and $\mathbb{E}[X]$ in the denominator make empirical estimation hard
- Empirically weaker than the first order bound (Lorenzen et al., 2019)
- Impossible to optimize the weighting except in very restrictive cases
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Second-order Markov's inequality $\mathbb{P}(X \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}} \mathbb{E}\left[X^{2}\right]$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
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- Tandem loss counts an error if both $h$ and $h^{\prime}$ err on a sample
- Second order oracle bound: $L\left(\mathrm{MV}_{\rho}\right) \leq 4 \mathbb{E}_{\rho^{2}}\left[L\left(h, h^{\prime}\right)\right]$


## A specialized oracle bound for binary classification
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Specialized oracle bound for binary classification

$\mathbb{D}\left(h, h^{\prime}\right)$ only depends on unlabeled data!!
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PAC-Bayes- $\lambda$ (Thiemann et al., 2017):
For $\pi$ independent of $S$, with probability at least $1-\delta$ for all $\rho$ and $\lambda \in(0,2)$ and $\gamma>0$

$$
\mathbb{E}_{\rho}[L(h)] \leq \underbrace{\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\rho} \rho(\hat{L}(h, S)]}{1-\frac{\lambda}{2}}+\frac{\operatorname{KL}(\rho \| \pi)+\ln (2 \sqrt{n} / \delta)}{\lambda\left(1-\frac{\lambda}{2}\right) n}}_{\text {PAC-Bayesian upper bound }}
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$$
\mathbb{E}_{\rho}[L(h)] \geq \underbrace{\left(1-\frac{\gamma}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\rho}[\hat{L}(h, S)]-\frac{\mathrm{KL}(\rho \| \pi)+\ln (2 \sqrt{n} / \delta)}{\gamma n}}_{\text {PAC-Bayesian lower bound }}
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## Advantages

- Takes correlation of errors into account
- Easy to minimize and tight
- Minimization of the bound does not degrade the test error


## Second-order PAC-Bayesian bound for binary classification

Expected loss of majority vote

> Expected Disagreement
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## Second-order PAC-Bayesian bound for binary classification

$$
\begin{aligned}
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\text { majority vote }
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## Second-order PAC-Bayesian bound for binary classification



- It can exploit unlabeled data


## Empirical evaluation

- Test error of optimized majority vote over uniformly weighted baseline for first order [FO] and new second order [TND] bound (the lower the better)



## Empirical evaluation

- The optimized weights $\rho^{\star}$ generated by the first order [FO] and the new second order [TND] bound.


Pendigits
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