

Answers

1. Let

S = the patient has strep throat

$\neg S$ = the patient does not have strep throat

Y = a positive test result

N = a negative test result

The prior is $\Pr(S) = 0.6$. The lab test has the following properties:

$$\Pr(Y|S) = 0.7 \quad \Pr(N|S) = 0.3$$

$$\Pr(Y|\neg S) = 0.1 \quad \Pr(N|\neg S) = 0.9.$$

We need to find $\Pr(S|YNYNY)$.

$$\Pr(YNYNY|S) = 0.7 \cdot 0.3 \cdot 0.7 \cdot 0.3 \cdot 0.7 = 0.03087$$

$$\Pr(YNYNY|\neg S) = 0.1 \cdot 0.9 \cdot 0.1 \cdot 0.9 \cdot 0.1 = 0.00081.$$

From Bayes rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(S|YNYNY) &= \frac{\Pr(S) \Pr(YNYNY|S)}{\Pr(S) \Pr(YNYNY|S) + \Pr(\neg S) \Pr(YNYNY|\neg S)} \\ &= \frac{0.6 \cdot 0.03087}{0.6 \cdot 0.03087 + 0.4 \cdot 0.00081} \\ &= 0.018522/0.018846 = 0.98 \end{aligned}$$

2. The proof can be found on pages 670-672 of the textbook. Two steps are required. We first need to establish that it is always possible to find a decision list consistent with any given data. A simple greedy algorithm that iteratively picks out pure subsets of the data works.

We know from Section 18.5 of the textbook that a learning algorithm that always return a consistent hypothesis requires

$$N \geq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\ln \frac{1}{\delta} + \ln |H| \right) \quad (1)$$

examples to achieve error lower than ϵ with probability $1 - \delta$. It is now a straightforward matter of working out $|k\text{-DL}(n)|$ and plugging that into (1) to see that the number of samples needed is a polynomial in the relevant parameters.

3. This is a reading exercise.
4. The ensemble makes an error if more than $\lceil M/2 \rceil$ hypotheses in the ensemble makes an error. This happens with probability

$$\sum_{i=\lceil M/2 \rceil}^M \binom{M}{i} \epsilon^i (1 - \epsilon)^{M-i}.$$

For example, given $M = 5$ and $\epsilon = 0.1$, the error probability of the ensemble is

$$\binom{5}{3} 0.1^3 0.9^2 + \binom{5}{4} 0.1^4 0.9 + \binom{5}{5} 0.1^5 = 0.00856$$

5. The following is the derivation from the relevant slide.

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(B|j, m) \\ &= \alpha \Pr(B) \sum_e \Pr(e) \sum_a \Pr(a|B, e) \Pr(j|a) \Pr(m|a) \\ &= \alpha \Pr(B) \sum_e \Pr(e) \sum_a f_A(a, b, e) f_J(a) f_M(a) \\ &= \alpha \Pr(B) \sum_e \Pr(e) f_{\bar{A}JM}(b, e) \quad (\text{sum out } A) \\ &= \alpha \Pr(B) f_{\bar{E}\bar{A}JM}(b) \quad (\text{sum out } E) \\ &= \alpha f_B(b) \times f_{\bar{E}\bar{A}JM}(b) \end{aligned}$$

The different factors are given below.

$$f_M(a) = \text{if } a = \top \text{ then } 0.7 \text{ else } 0.01$$

$$f_J(a) = \text{if } a = \top \text{ then } 0.9 \text{ else } 0.05$$

$$\begin{aligned} f_A(a, b, e) = & \\ & \text{if } b = \top \wedge e = \top \text{ then (if } a = \top \text{ then } 0.95 \text{ else } 0.05) \\ & \text{else if } b = \top \wedge e = \perp \text{ then (if } a = \top \text{ then } 0.94 \text{ else } 0.06) \\ & \text{else if } b = \perp \wedge e = \top \text{ then (if } a = \top \text{ then } 0.29 \text{ else } 0.71) \\ & \text{else (if } a = \top \text{ then } 0.001 \text{ else } 0.999) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& f_{\bar{A}JM}(b, e) \\
&= f_A(\top, b, e)f_J(\top)f_M(\top) + f_A(\perp, b, e)f_J(\perp)f_M(\perp) \\
&= (\text{if } b = \top \wedge e = \top \text{ then } 0.95 \\
&\quad \text{else if } b = \top \wedge e = \perp \text{ then } 0.94 \\
&\quad \text{else if } b = \perp \wedge e = \top \text{ then } 0.29 \\
&\quad \text{else } 0.001) \cdot 0.9 \cdot 0.7 \\
&+ \\
&(\text{if } b = \top \wedge e = \top \text{ then } 0.05 \\
&\quad \text{else if } b = \top \wedge e = \perp \text{ then } 0.06 \\
&\quad \text{else if } b = \perp \wedge e = \top \text{ then } 0.71 \\
&\quad \text{else } 0.999) \cdot 0.05 \cdot 0.01 \\
&= \text{if } b = \top \wedge e = \top \text{ then } 0.60 \\
&\quad \text{else if } b = \top \wedge e = \perp \text{ then } 0.59 \\
&\quad \text{else if } b = \perp \wedge e = \top \text{ then } 0.18 \\
&\quad \text{else } 0.001
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& f_{\bar{E}\bar{A}JM}(b) = \\
&= \Pr(e = \top)f_{\bar{A}JM}(b, \top) + \Pr(e = \perp)f_{\bar{A}JM}(b, \perp) \\
&= 0.002 \cdot (\text{if } b = \top \text{ then } 0.6 \text{ else } 0.18) \\
&\quad + 0.998 \cdot (\text{if } b = \top \text{ then } 0.59 \text{ else } 0.001) \\
&= \text{if } b = \top \text{ then } 0.59 \text{ else } 0.0014
\end{aligned}$$

$$f_B(b) = \text{if } b = \top \text{ then } 0.001 \text{ else } 0.999$$

6. It's easy to see that given the model M of a prediction suffix tree, $\Pr(x_{1:t}|M) = \prod_{l \in L(M)} \Pr_{kt}(x_{1:t|l}|M)$, where $L(M)$ denotes the leaf nodes of M .

Proposition 1. *Let D be the depth of the context tree. For each node n in the context tree at depth d , we have*

$$P_w^n(x_{1:t|n}) = \sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}_{D-d}} 2^{-T_{D-d}(M)} P(x_{1:t|n}|M).$$

Proof. The proof proceeds by induction on d . The statement is clearly true for the leaf nodes at depth D . Assume now the statement is true for all nodes at depth $d + 1$, where $0 \leq d < D$. Consider a node n at depth d . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_w^n(x_{1:t|n}) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}P_{kt}(x_{1:t|n}) + \frac{1}{2}P_w^{n_l}(x_{1:t|n_l})P_w^{n_r}(x_{1:t|n_r}) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}P_{kt}(x_{1:t|n}) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}_{D-d-1}} 2^{-T_{D-d-1}(M)} P(x_{1:t|n_l}|M)\right) \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\left(\sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}_{D-d-1}} 2^{-T_{D-d-1}(M)} P(x_{1:t|n_r}|M)\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}P_{kt}(x_{1:t|n}) + \\
&\qquad\qquad\sum_{M_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{D-d-1}} \sum_{M_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{D-d-1}} 2^{-(T_{D-d-1}(M_1)+T_{D-d-1}(M_2)+1)} P(x_{1:t|n_l}|M_1)P(x_{1:t|n_r}|M_2) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}P_{kt}(x_{1:t|n}) + \sum_{(M_1, M_2) \in \mathcal{M}_{D-d}} 2^{-T_{D-d}((M_1, M_2))} P(x_{1:t|n} | (M_1, M_2)) \\
&= \sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}_{D-d}} 2^{-T_{D-d}(M)} P(x_{1:t|n} | M),
\end{aligned}$$

where (M_1, M_2) denotes the tree in \mathcal{M}_{D-d} whose left and right subtrees are M_1 and M_2 respectively. \square

There are plenty of material on arithmetic coding on the web.