

Search Improves Label for Active Learning

Alina Beygelzimer^{*1}, Daniel Hsu^{†2}, John Langford^{‡3}, and Chicheng Zhang^{§4}

¹Yahoo Research, New York, NY

²Columbia University, New York, NY

³Microsoft Research, New York, NY

⁴University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA

October 25, 2016

Abstract

We investigate active learning with access to two distinct oracles: `LABEL` (which is standard) and `SEARCH` (which is not). The `SEARCH` oracle models the situation where a human searches a database to seed or counterexample an existing solution. `SEARCH` is stronger than `LABEL` while being natural to implement in many situations. We show that an algorithm using both oracles can provide exponentially large problem-dependent improvements over `LABEL` alone.

1 Introduction

Most active learning theory is based on interacting with a `LABEL` oracle: An active learner observes unlabeled examples, each with a label that is initially hidden. The learner provides an unlabeled example to the oracle, and the oracle responds with the label. Using `LABEL` in an active learning algorithm is known to give (sometimes exponentially large) problem-dependent improvements in label complexity, even in the agnostic setting where no assumption is made about the underlying distribution [e.g., Balcan et al., 2006, Hanneke, 2007, Dasgupta et al., 2007, Hanneke, 2014].

A well-known deficiency of `LABEL` arises in the presence of rare classes in classification problems, frequently the case in practice [Attenberg and Provost, 2010, Simard et al., 2014]. Class imbalance may be so extreme that simply finding an example from the rare class can exhaust the labeling budget. Consider the problem of learning interval functions in $[0, 1]$. Any `LABEL`-only active learner needs at least $\Omega(1/\epsilon)$ `LABEL` queries to learn an arbitrary target interval with error at most ϵ [Dasgupta, 2005]. Given any positive example from the interval, however, the query complexity of learning intervals collapses to $O(\log(1/\epsilon))$, as we can just do a binary search for each of the end points.

A natural approach used to overcome this hurdle in practice is to search for known examples of the rare class [Attenberg and Provost, 2010, Simard et al., 2014]. Domain experts are often adept at finding examples of a class by various, often clever means. For instance, when building a hate speech filter, a simple web search can readily produce a set of positive examples. Sending a random batch of unlabeled text to `LABEL` is unlikely to produce any positive examples at all.

Another form of interaction common in practice is providing counterexamples to a learned predictor. When monitoring the stream filtered by the current hate speech filter, a human editor may spot a clear-cut

^{*}beygel@yahoo-inc.com

[†]djhhsu@cs.columbia.edu

[‡]jcl@microsoft.com

[§]chichengzhang@ucsd.edu

example of hate speech that seeped through the filter. The editor, using all the search tools available to her, may even be tasked with searching for such counterexamples. The goal of the learning system is then to interactively restrict the searchable space, guiding the search process to where it is most effective.

Counterexamples can be ineffective or misleading in practice as well. Reconsidering the intervals example above, a counterexample on the boundary of an incorrect interval provides no useful information about any other examples. What is a good counterexample? What is a natural way to restrict the searchable space? How can the intervals problem be generalized?

We define a new oracle, `SEARCH`, that provides counterexamples to version spaces. Given a set of possible classifiers H mapping unlabeled examples to labels, a *version space* $V \subseteq H$ is the subset of classifiers still under consideration by the algorithm. A *counterexample* to a version space is a labeled example which every classifier in the version space classifies incorrectly. When there is no counterexample to the version space, `SEARCH` returns nothing.

How can a counterexample to the version space be used? We consider a nested sequence of hypothesis classes of increasing complexity, akin to Structural Risk Minimization (SRM) in passive learning [see, e.g., Vapnik, 1982, Devroye et al., 1996]. When `SEARCH` produces a counterexample to the version space, it gives a proof that the current hypothesis class is too simplistic to solve the problem effectively. We show that this guided increase in hypothesis complexity results in a radically lower `LABEL` complexity than directly learning on the complex space. Sample complexity bounds for model selection in `LABEL`-only active learning were studied by Balcan et al. [2010], Hanneke [2011].

`SEARCH` can easily model the practice of seeding discussed earlier. If the first hypothesis class has just the constant always-negative classifier $h(x) = -1$, a seed example with label +1 is a counterexample to the version space. Our most basic algorithm uses `SEARCH` just once before using `LABEL`, but it is clear from inspection that multiple seeds are not harmful, and they may be helpful if they provide the proof required to operate with an appropriately complex hypothesis class.

Defining `SEARCH` with respect to a version space rather than a single classifier allows us to formalize “counterexample far from the boundary” in a general fashion which is compatible with the way `LABEL`-based active learning algorithms work.

Related work. The closest oracle considered in the literature is the Class Conditional Query (CCQ) [Balcan and Hanneke, 2012] oracle. A query to CCQ specifies a finite set of unlabeled examples and a label while returning an example in the subset with the specified label, if one exists.

In contrast, `SEARCH` has an implicit query set that is an entire region of the input space rather than a finite set. Simple searches over this large implicit domain can more plausibly discover relevant counterexamples: When building a detector for penguins in images, the input to CCQ might be a set of images and the label “penguin”. Even if we are very lucky and the set happens to contain a penguin image, a search amongst image tags may fail to find it in the subset because it is not tagged appropriately. `SEARCH` is more likely to discover counterexamples—surely there are many images correctly tagged as having penguins.

Why is it natural to define a query region implicitly via a version space? There is a practical reason—it is a concise description of a natural region with an efficiently implementable membership filter [Beygelzimer et al., 2010, 2011, Huang et al., 2015]. (Compare this to an oracle call that has to explicitly enumerate a large set of examples. The algorithm of Balcan and Hanneke [2012] uses samples of size roughly $d\nu/\epsilon^2$.)

The use of `SEARCH` in this paper is also substantially different from the use of CCQ by Balcan and Hanneke [2012]. Our motivation is to use `SEARCH` to assist `LABEL`, as opposed to using `SEARCH` alone. This is especially useful in any setting where the cost of `SEARCH` is significantly higher than the cost of `LABEL`—we hope to avoid using `SEARCH` queries whenever it is possible to make progress using `LABEL` queries. This is consistent with how interactive learning systems are used in practice. For example, the Interactive Classification and Extraction system of Simard et al. [2014] combines `LABEL` with search in a production environment.

The final important distinction is that we require `SEARCH` to return the label of the optimal predictor in the nested sequence. For many natural sequences of hypothesis classes, the Bayes optimal classifier is eventually in the sequence, in which case it is equivalent to assuming that the label in a counterexample is the most probable one, as opposed to a randomly-drawn label from the conditional distribution (as in CCQ

and LABEL).

Is this a reasonable assumption? Unlike with LABEL queries, where the labeler has no choice of what to label, here the labeler *chooses* a counterexample. If a human editor finds an unquestionable example of hate speech that seeped through the filter, it is quite reasonable to assume that this counterexample is consistent with the Bayes optimal predictor for any sensible feature representation.

Organization. Section 2 formally introduces the setting. Section 3 shows that SEARCH is at least as powerful as LABEL. Section 4 shows how to use SEARCH and LABEL jointly in the realizable setting where a zero-error classifier exists in the nested sequence of hypothesis classes. Section 5 handles the agnostic setting where LABEL is subject to label noise, and shows an amortized approach to combining the two oracles with a good guarantee on the total cost.

2 Definitions and Setting

In active learning, there is an underlying distribution D over $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, where \mathcal{X} is the instance space and $\mathcal{Y} := \{-1, +1\}$ is the label space. The learner can obtain independent draws from D , but the label is hidden unless explicitly requested through a query to the LABEL oracle. Let $D_{\mathcal{X}}$ denote the marginal of D over \mathcal{X} .

We consider learning with a nested sequence of hypotheses classes $H_0 \subset H_1 \subset \dots \subset H_k \dots$, where $H_k \subseteq \mathcal{Y}^{\mathcal{X}}$ has VC dimension d_k . For a set of labeled examples $S \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, let $H_k(S) := \{h \in H_k : \forall (x, y) \in S, h(x) = y\}$ be the set of hypotheses in H_k consistent with S . Let $\text{err}(h) := \Pr_{(x,y) \sim D}[h(x) \neq y]$ denote the error rate of a hypothesis h with respect to distribution D , and $\text{err}(h, S)$ be the error rate of h on the labeled examples in S . Let $h_k^* = \arg \min_{h \in H_k} \text{err}(h)$ breaking ties arbitrarily and let $k^* := \arg \min_{k \geq 0} \text{err}(h_k^*)$ breaking ties in favor of the smallest such k . For simplicity, we assume the minimum is attained at some finite k^* . Finally, define $h^* := h_{k^*}^*$, the optimal hypothesis in the sequence of classes. The goal of the learner is to learn a hypothesis with error rate not much more than that of h^* .

In addition to LABEL, the learner can also query SEARCH with a version space.

Oracle $\text{SEARCH}_H(V)$ (where $H \in \{H_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$)

input: Set of hypotheses $V \subset H$

output: Labeled example $(x, h^*(x))$ s.t. $h(x) \neq h^*(x)$ for all $h \in V$, or \perp if there is no such example.

Thus if $\text{SEARCH}_H(V)$ returns an example, this example is a *systematic* mistake made by all hypotheses in V . (If $V = \emptyset$, we expect SEARCH to return some example, i.e., not \perp .)

Our analysis is given in terms of the *disagreement coefficient* of Hanneke [2007], which has been a central parameter for analyzing active learning algorithms. Define the *region of disagreement* of a set of hypotheses V as $\text{Dis}(V) := \{x \in \mathcal{X} : \exists h, h' \in V \text{ s.t. } h(x) \neq h'(x)\}$. The *disagreement coefficient of V at scale r* is $\theta_V(r) := \sup_{h \in V, r' \geq r} \Pr_{D_{\mathcal{X}}}[\text{Dis}(\text{B}_V(h, r'))]/r'$, where $\text{B}_V(h, r') = \{h' \in V : \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}}[h'(x) \neq h(x)] \leq r'\}$ is the ball of radius r' around h .

The $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ notation hides factors that are polylogarithmic in $1/\delta$ and quantities that do appear, where δ is the usual confidence parameter.

3 The Relative Power of the Two Oracles

Although SEARCH cannot always implement LABEL efficiently, it is as effective at reducing the region of disagreement. The clearest example is learning threshold classifiers $H := \{h_w : w \in [0, 1]\}$ in the realizable case, where $h_w(x) = +1$ if $w \leq x \leq 1$, and -1 if $0 \leq x < w$. A simple binary search with LABEL achieves an exponential improvement in query complexity over passive learning. The agreement region of any set of threshold classifiers with thresholds in $[w_{\min}, w_{\max}]$ is $[0, w_{\min}] \cup [w_{\max}, 1]$. Since SEARCH is allowed to return any counterexample in the agreement region, there is no mechanism for forcing SEARCH to return the label of a particular point we want. However, this is not needed to achieve logarithmic query complexity with

SEARCH: If binary search starts with querying the label of $x \in [0, 1]$, we can query $\text{SEARCH}_H(V_x)$, where $V_x := \{h_w \in H : w < x\}$ instead. If **SEARCH** returns \perp , we know that the target $w^* \leq x$ and can safely reduce the region of disagreement to $[0, x)$. If **SEARCH** returns a counterexample $(x_0, -1)$ with $x_0 \geq x$, we know that $w^* > x_0$ and can reduce the region of disagreement to $(x_0, 1]$.

This observation holds more generally. In the proposition below, we assume that $\text{LABEL}(x) = h^*(x)$ for simplicity. If $\text{LABEL}(x)$ is noisy, the proposition holds for any active learning algorithm that doesn't eliminate any $h \in H : h(x) = \text{LABEL}(x)$ from the version space.

Proposition 1. *For any call $x \in \mathcal{X}$ to **LABEL** such that $\text{LABEL}(x) = h^*(x)$, we can construct a call to **SEARCH** that achieves a no lesser reduction in the region of disagreement.*

Proof. For any $V \subseteq H$, let $H_{\text{SEARCH}}(V)$ be the hypotheses in H consistent with the output of $\text{SEARCH}_H(V)$: if $\text{SEARCH}_H(V)$ returns a counterexample (x, y) to V , then $H_{\text{SEARCH}}(V) := \{h \in H : h(x) = y\}$; otherwise, $H_{\text{SEARCH}}(V) := V$. Let $H_{\text{LABEL}}(x) := \{h \in H : h(x) = \text{LABEL}(x)\}$. Also, let $V_x := H_{+1}(x) := \{h \in H : h(x) = +1\}$. We will show that V_x is such that $H_{\text{SEARCH}}(V_x) \subseteq H_{\text{LABEL}}(x)$, and hence $\text{Dis}(H_{\text{SEARCH}}(V_x)) \subseteq \text{Dis}(H_{\text{LABEL}}(x))$.

There are two cases to consider: If $h^*(x) = +1$, then $\text{SEARCH}_H(V_x)$ returns \perp . In this case, $H_{\text{LABEL}}(x) = H_{\text{SEARCH}}(V_x) = H_{+1}(x)$, and we are done. If $h^*(x) = -1$, $\text{SEARCH}(V_x)$ returns a valid counterexample (possibly $(x, -1)$) in the region of agreement of $H_{+1}(x)$, eliminating all of $H_{+1}(x)$. Thus $H_{\text{SEARCH}}(V_x) \subset H \setminus H_{+1}(x) = H_{\text{LABEL}}(x)$, and the claim holds also. \square

As shown by the problem of learning intervals on the line, **SEARCH** can be exponentially more powerful than **LABEL**.

4 Realizable Case

We now turn to general active learning algorithms that combine **SEARCH** and **LABEL**. We focus on algorithms using *both* **SEARCH** and **LABEL** since **LABEL** is typically easier to implement than **SEARCH** and hence should be used where **SEARCH** has no significant advantage. (Whenever **SEARCH** is less expensive than **LABEL**, Section 3 suggests a transformation to a **SEARCH**-only algorithm.)

This section considers the realizable case, in which we assume that the hypothesis $h^* = h_{k^*}^* \in H_{k^*}$ has $\text{err}(h^*) = 0$. This means that **LABEL**(x) returns $h^*(x)$ for any x in the support of $D_{\mathcal{X}}$.

4.1 Combining **LABEL** and **SEARCH**

Our algorithm (shown as Algorithm 1) is called **LARCH**, because it combines **LABEL** and **SEARCH**. Like many selective sampling methods, **LARCH** uses a version space to determine its **LABEL** queries.

For concreteness, we use (a variant of) the algorithm of Cohn et al. [1994], denoted by **CAL**, as a subroutine in **LARCH**. The inputs to **CAL** are: a version space V , the **LABEL** oracle, a target error rate, and a confidence parameter; and its output is a set of labeled examples (implicitly defining a new version space). **CAL** is described in Appendix B; its essential properties are specified in Lemma 1.

LARCH differs from **LABEL**-only active learners (like **CAL**) by first calling **SEARCH** in Step 3. If **SEARCH** returns \perp , **LARCH** checks to see if the last call to **CAL** resulted in a small-enough error, halting if so in Step 6, and decreasing the allowed error rate if not in Step 8. If **SEARCH** instead returns a counterexample, the hypothesis class H_k must be impoverished, so in Step 12, **LARCH** increases the complexity of the hypothesis class to the minimum complexity sufficient to correctly classify all known labeled examples in S . After the **SEARCH**, **CAL** is called in Step 14 to discover a sufficiently low-error (or at least low-disagreement) version space with high probability.

When **LARCH** advances to index k (for any $k \leq k^*$), its set of labeled examples S may imply a version space $H_k(S) \subseteq H_k$ that can be actively-learned more efficiently than the whole of H_k . In our analysis, we quantify this through the disagreement coefficient of $H_k(S)$, which may be markedly smaller than that of the full H_k .

Algorithm 1 LARCH

input: Nested hypothesis classes $H_0 \subset H_1 \subset \dots$; oracles LABEL and SEARCH; learning parameters $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$

- 1: **initialize** $S \leftarrow \emptyset$, (index) $k \leftarrow 0, \ell \leftarrow 0$
- 2: **for** $i = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
- 3: $e \leftarrow \text{SEARCH}_{H_k}(H_k(S))$
- 4: **if** $e = \perp$ **then** # no counterexample found
- 5: **if** $2^{-\ell} \leq \epsilon$ **then**
- 6: **return** any $h \in H_k(S)$
- 7: **else**
- 8: $\ell \leftarrow \ell + 1$
- 9: **end if**
- 10: **else** # counterexample found
- 11: $S \leftarrow S \cup \{e\}$
- 12: $k \leftarrow \min\{k' : H_{k'}(S) \neq \emptyset\}$
- 13: **end if**
- 14: $S \leftarrow S \cup \text{CAL}(H_k(S), \text{LABEL}, 2^{-\ell}, \delta/(i^2 + i))$
- 15: **end for**

The following theorem bounds the oracle query complexity of Algorithm 1 for learning with both SEARCH and LABEL in the realizable setting. The proof is in section 4.2.

Theorem 1. *Assume that $\text{err}(h^*) = 0$. For each $k' \geq 0$, let $\theta_{k'}(\cdot)$ be the disagreement coefficient of $H_{k'}(S_{[k']})$, where $S_{[k']}$ is the set of labeled examples S in LARCH at the first time that $k \geq k'$. Fix any $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$. If LARCH is run with inputs hypothesis classes $\{H_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$, oracles LABEL and SEARCH, and learning parameters ϵ, δ , then with probability at least $1 - \delta$: LARCH halts after at most $k^* + \log_2(1/\epsilon)$ for-loop iterations and returns a classifier with error rate at most ϵ ; furthermore, it draws at most $\tilde{O}(k^* d_{k^*}/\epsilon)$ unlabeled examples from D_X , makes at most $k^* + \log_2(1/\epsilon)$ queries to SEARCH, and at most $\tilde{O}((k^* + \log(1/\epsilon)) \cdot (\max_{k' \leq k^*} \theta_{k'}(\epsilon)) \cdot d_{k^*} \cdot \log^2(1/\epsilon))$ queries to LABEL.*

Union-of-intervals example. We now show an implication of Theorem 1 in the case where the target hypothesis h^* is the union of non-trivial intervals in $\mathcal{X} := [0, 1]$, assuming that D_X is uniform. For $k \geq 0$, let H_k be the hypothesis class of the union of up to k intervals in $[0, 1]$ with H_0 containing only the always-negative hypothesis. (Thus, h^* is the union of k^* non-empty intervals.) The disagreement coefficient of H_1 is $\Omega(1/\epsilon)$, and hence LABEL-only active learners like CAL are not very effective at learning with such classes. However, the first SEARCH query by LARCH provides a counterexample to H_0 , which must be a positive example $(x_1, +1)$. Hence, $H_1(S_{[1]})$ (where $S_{[1]}$ is defined in Theorem 1) is the class of intervals that contain x_1 with disagreement coefficient $\theta_1 \leq 4$.

Now consider the inductive case. Just before LARCH advances its index to a value k (for any $k \leq k^*$), SEARCH returns a counterexample $(x, h^*(x))$ to the version space; every hypothesis in this version space (which could be empty) is a union of fewer than k intervals. If the version space is empty, then S must already contain positive examples from at least k different intervals in h^* and at least $k - 1$ negative examples separating them. If the version space is not empty, then the point x is either a positive example belonging to a previously uncovered interval in h^* or a negative example splitting an existing interval. In either case, $S_{[k]}$ contains positive examples from at least k distinct intervals separated by at least $k - 1$ negative examples. The disagreement coefficient of the set of unions of k intervals consistent with $S_{[k]}$ is at most $4k$, independent of ϵ .

The VC dimension of H_k is $O(k)$, so Theorem 1 implies that with high probability, LARCH makes at most $k^* + \log(1/\epsilon)$ queries to SEARCH and $\tilde{O}((k^*)^3 \log(1/\epsilon) + (k^*)^2 \log^3(1/\epsilon))$ queries to LABEL.

4.2 Proof of Theorem 1

The proof of Theorem 1 uses the following lemma regarding the CAL subroutine, proved in Appendix B. It is similar to a result of Hanneke [2011], but an important difference here is that the input version space V is not assumed to contain h^* .

Lemma 1. *Assume $\text{LABEL}(x) = h^*(x)$ for every x in the support of $D_{\mathcal{X}}$. For any hypothesis set $V \subseteq \mathcal{Y}^{\mathcal{X}}$ with VC dimension $d < \infty$, and any $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$, the following holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$. $\text{CAL}(V, \text{LABEL}, \epsilon, \delta)$ returns labeled examples $T \subseteq \{(x, h^*(x)) : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ such that for any h in $V(T)$, $\Pr_{(x,y) \sim D}[h(x) \neq y \wedge x \in \text{Dis}(V(T))] \leq \epsilon$; furthermore, it draws at most $\tilde{O}(d/\epsilon)$ unlabeled examples from $D_{\mathcal{X}}$, and makes at most $\tilde{O}(\theta_V(\epsilon) \cdot d \cdot \log^2(1/\epsilon))$ queries to LABEL .*

We now prove Theorem 1. By Lemma 1 and a union bound, there is an event with probability at least $1 - \sum_{i \geq 1} \delta/(i^2 + i) \geq 1 - \delta$ such that each call to CAL made by LARCH satisfies the high-probability guarantee from Lemma 1. We henceforth condition on this event.

We first establish the guarantee on the error rate of a hypothesis returned by LARCH. By the assumed properties of LABEL and SEARCH, and the properties of CAL from Lemma 1, the labeled examples S in LARCH are always consistent with h^* . Moreover, the return property of CAL implies that at the end of any loop iteration, with the present values of S , k , and ℓ , we have $\Pr_{(x,y) \sim D}[h(x) \neq y \wedge x \in \text{Dis}(H_k(S))] \leq 2^{-\ell}$ for all $h \in H_k(S)$. (The same holds trivially before the first loop iteration.) Therefore, if LARCH halts and returns a hypothesis $h \in H_k(S)$, then there is no counterexample to $H_k(S)$, and $\Pr_{(x,y) \sim D}[h(x) \neq y \wedge x \in \text{Dis}(H_k(S))] \leq \epsilon$. These consequences and the law of total probability imply $\text{err}(h) = \Pr_{(x,y) \sim D}[h(x) \neq y \wedge x \in \text{Dis}(H_k(S))] \leq \epsilon$.

We next consider the number of for-loop iterations executed by LARCH. Let S_i , k_i , and ℓ_i be, respectively, the values of S , k , and ℓ at the start of the i -th for-loop iteration in LARCH. We claim that if LARCH does not halt in the i -th iteration, then one of k and ℓ is incremented by at least one. Clearly, if there is no counterexample to $H_{k_i}(S_i)$ and $2^{-\ell_i} > \epsilon$, then ℓ is incremented by one (Step 8). If, instead, there is a counterexample (x, y) , then $H_{k_i}(S_i \cup \{(x, y)\}) = \emptyset$, and hence k is incremented to some index larger than k_i (Step 12). This proves that $k_{i+1} + \ell_{i+1} \geq k_i + \ell_i + 1$. We also have $k_i \leq k^*$, since $h^* \in H_{k^*}$ is consistent with S , and $\ell_i \leq \log_2(1/\epsilon)$, as long as LARCH does not halt in for-loop iteration i . So the total number of for-loop iterations is at most $k^* + \log_2(1/\epsilon)$. Together with Lemma 1, this bounds the number of unlabeled examples drawn from $D_{\mathcal{X}}$.

Finally, we bound the number of queries to SEARCH and LABEL. The number of queries to SEARCH is the same as the number of for-loop iterations—this is at most $k^* + \log_2(1/\epsilon)$. By Lemma 1 and the fact that $V(S' \cup S'') \subseteq V(S')$ for any hypothesis space V and sets of labeled examples S' , S'' , the number of LABEL queries made by CAL in the i -th for-loop iteration is at most $\tilde{O}(\theta_{k_i}(\epsilon) \cdot d_{k_i} \cdot \ell_i^2 \cdot \text{polylog}(i))$. The claimed bound on the number of LABEL queries made by LARCH now readily follows by taking a max over i , and using the facts that $i \leq k^*$ and $d_{k'} \leq d_{k^*}$ for all $k' \leq k$. \square

4.3 An Improved Algorithm

LARCH is somewhat conservative in its use of SEARCH, interleaving just one SEARCH query between sequences of LABEL queries (from CAL). Often, it is advantageous to advance to higher complexity hypothesis classes quickly, as long as there is justification to do so. Counterexamples from SEARCH provide such justification, and a \perp result from SEARCH also provides useful feedback about the current version space: outside of its disagreement region, the version space is in complete agreement with h^* (even if the version space does not contain h^*). Based on these observations, we propose an improved algorithm for the realizable setting, which we call SEABEL. Due to space limitations, we present it in Appendix C. We prove the following performance guarantee for SEABEL.

Theorem 2. *Assume that $\text{err}(h^*) = 0$. Let $\theta_k(\cdot)$ denote the disagreement coefficient of $V_i^{k_i}$ at the first iteration i in SEABEL where $k_i \geq k$. Fix any $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$. If SEABEL is run with inputs hypothesis classes $\{H_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$, oracles SEARCH and LABEL, and learning parameters $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$, then with probability $1 - \delta$:*

SEABEL halts and returns a classifier with error rate at most ϵ ; furthermore, it draws at most $\tilde{O}((d_{k^*} + \log k^*)/\epsilon)$ unlabeled examples from $D_{\mathcal{X}}$, makes at most $k^* + O(\log(d_{k^*}/\epsilon) + \log \log k^*)$ queries to SEARCH, and at most $\tilde{O}(\max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(2\epsilon) \cdot (d_{k^*} \log^2(1/\epsilon) + \log k^*))$ queries to LABEL.

It is not generally possible to directly compare Theorems 1 and 2 on account of the algorithm-dependent disagreement coefficient bounds. However, in cases where these disagreement coefficients are comparable (as in the union-of-intervals example), the SEARCH complexity in Theorem 2 is slightly higher (by additive log terms), but the LABEL complexity is smaller than that from Theorem 1 by roughly a factor of k^* . For the union-of-intervals example, SEABEL would learn target union of k^* intervals with $k^* + O(\log(k^*/\epsilon))$ queries to SEARCH and $\tilde{O}((k^*)^2 \log^2(1/\epsilon))$ queries to LABEL.

5 Non-Realizable Case

In this section, we consider the case where the optimal hypothesis h^* may have non-zero error rate, i.e., the non-realizable (or agnostic) setting. In this case, the algorithm LARCH, which was designed for the realizable setting, is no longer applicable. First, examples obtained by LABEL and SEARCH are of different quality: those returned by SEARCH always agree with h^* , whereas the labels given by LABEL need not agree with h^* . Moreover, the version spaces (even when $k = k^*$) as defined by LARCH may always be empty due to the noisy labels.

Another complication arises in our SRM setting that differentiates it from the usual agnostic active learning setting. When working with a specific hypothesis class H_k in the nested sequence, we may observe high error rates because (i) the finite sample error is too high (but additional labeled examples could reduce it), or (ii) the current hypothesis class H_k is impoverished. In case (ii), the best hypothesis in H_k may have a much larger error rate than h^* , and hence lower bounds [Kääriäinen, 2006] imply that active learning on H_k instead of H_{k^*} may be substantially more difficult.

These difficulties in the SRM setting are circumvented by an algorithm that adaptively estimates the error of h^* . The algorithm, A-LARCH (Algorithm 5), is presented in Appendix D.

Theorem 3. *Assume $\text{err}(h^*) = \nu$. Let $\theta_k(\cdot)$ denote the disagreement coefficient of $V_i^{k_i}$ at the first iteration i in A-LARCH where $k_i \geq k$. Fix any $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$. If A-LARCH is run with inputs hypothesis classes $\{H_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$, oracles SEARCH and LABEL, learning parameter δ , and unlabeled example budget $\tilde{O}((d_{k^*} + \log k^*)(\nu + \epsilon)/\epsilon^2)$, then with probability $1 - \delta$: A-LARCH returns a classifier with error rate $\leq \nu + \epsilon$; it makes at most $k^* + O(\log(d_{k^*}/\epsilon) + \log \log k^*)$ queries to SEARCH, and $\tilde{O}(\max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(2\nu + 2\epsilon) \cdot (d_{k^*} \log^2(1/\epsilon) + \log k^*) \cdot (1 + \nu^2/\epsilon^2))$ queries to LABEL.*

The proof is in Appendix D. The LABEL query complexity is at least a factor of k^* better than that in Hanneke [2011], and sometimes exponentially better thanks to the reduced disagreement coefficient of the version space when consistency constraints are incorporated.

5.1 AA-Larch: an Opportunistic Anytime Algorithm

In many practical scenarios, termination conditions based on quantities like a target excess error rate ϵ are undesirable. The target ϵ is unknown, and we instead prefer an algorithm that performs as well as possible until a cost budget is exhausted. Fortunately, when the primary cost being considered are LABEL queries, there are many LABEL-only active learning algorithms that readily work in such an “anytime” setting [see, e.g., Dasgupta et al., 2007, Hanneke, 2014].

The situation is more complicated when we consider both SEARCH and LABEL: we can often make substantially more progress with SEARCH queries than with LABEL queries (as the error rate of the best hypothesis in $H_{k'}$ for $k' > k$ can be far lower than in H_k). AA-LARCH (Algorithm 2) shows that although these queries come at a higher cost, the cost can be amortized.

AA-LARCH relies on several subroutines: SAMPLE-AND-LABEL, ERROR-CHECK, PRUNE-VERSION-SPACE and UPGRADE-VERSION-SPACE (Algorithms 6, 7, 8, and 9). The detailed descriptions are deferred to

Algorithm 2 AA-LARCH

input: Nested hypothesis set $H_0 \subseteq H_1 \subseteq \dots$; oracles LABEL and SEARCH; learning parameter $\delta \in (0, 1)$; SEARCH-to-LABEL cost ratio τ , dataset size upper bound N .

output: hypothesis \tilde{h} .

- 1: Initialize: consistency constraints $S \leftarrow \emptyset$, counter $c \leftarrow 0$, $k \leftarrow 0$, verified labeled dataset $\tilde{L} \leftarrow \emptyset$, working labeled dataset $L_0 \leftarrow \emptyset$, unlabeled examples processed $i \leftarrow 0$, $V_i \leftarrow H_k(S)$.
- 2: **loop**
- 3: Reset counter $c \leftarrow 0$.
- 4: **repeat**
- 5: **if** ERROR-CHECK(V_i, L_i, δ_i) **then**
- 6: $(k, S, V_i) \leftarrow \text{UPGRADE-VERSION-SPACE}(k, S, \emptyset)$
- 7: $V_i \leftarrow \text{PRUNE-VERSION-SPACE}(V_i, \tilde{L}, \delta_i)$
- 8: $L_i \leftarrow \tilde{L}$
- 9: **continue loop**
- 10: **end if**
- 11: $i \leftarrow i + 1$
- 12: $(L_i, c) \leftarrow \text{SAMPLE-AND-LABEL}(V_{i-1}, \text{LABEL}, L_{i-1}, c)$
- 13: $V_i \leftarrow \text{PRUNE-VERSION-SPACE}(V_{i-1}, L_i, \delta_i)$
- 14: **until** $c = \tau$ **or** $l_i = N$
- 15: $e \leftarrow \text{SEARCH}_{H_k}(V_i)$
- 16: **if** $e \neq \perp$ **then**
- 17: $(k, S, V_i) \leftarrow \text{UPGRADE-VERSION-SPACE}(k, S, \{e\})$
- 18: $V_i \leftarrow \text{PRUNE-VERSION-SPACE}(V_i, \tilde{L}, \delta_i)$
- 19: $L_i \leftarrow \tilde{L}$
- 20: **else**
- 21: Update verified dataset $\tilde{L} \leftarrow L_i$.
- 22: Store temporary solution $\tilde{h} = \arg \min_{h' \in V_i} \text{err}(h', \tilde{L})$.
- 23: **end if**
- 24: **end loop**

Appendix E. SAMPLE-AND-LABEL performs standard disagreement-based selective sampling using oracle LABEL; labels of examples in the disagreement region are queried, otherwise inferred. PRUNE-VERSION-SPACE prunes the version space given the labeled examples collected, based on standard generalization error bounds. ERROR-CHECK checks if the best hypothesis in the version space has large error; SEARCH is used to find a systematic mistake for the version space; if either event happens, AA-LARCH calls UPGRADE-VERSION-SPACE to increase k , the level of our working hypothesis class.

Theorem 4. Assume $\text{err}(h^*) = \nu$. Let $\theta_{k'}(\cdot)$ denote the disagreement coefficient of V_i at the first iteration i after which $k \geq k'$. Fix any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Let $n_\epsilon = \tilde{O}(\max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(2\nu + 2\epsilon)d_{k^*}(1 + \nu^2/\epsilon^2))$ and define $C_\epsilon = 2(n_\epsilon + k^*\tau)$. Run Algorithm 2 with a nested sequence of hypotheses $\{H_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$, oracles LABEL and SEARCH, confidence parameter δ , cost ratio $\tau \geq 1$, and upper bound $N = \tilde{O}(d_{k^*}/\epsilon^2)$. If the cost spent is at least C_ϵ , then with probability $1 - \delta$, the current hypothesis \tilde{h} has error at most $\nu + \epsilon$.

The proof is in Appendix E. A comparison to Theorem 3 shows that AA-LARCH is adaptive: for any cost complexity C , the excess error rate ϵ is roughly at most twice that achieved by A-LARCH.

6 Discussion

The SEARCH oracle captures a powerful form of interaction that is useful for machine learning. Our theoretical analyses of LARCH and variants demonstrate that SEARCH can substantially improve LABEL-based active learners, while being plausibly cheaper to implement than oracles like CCQ.

Are there examples where CCQ is substantially more powerful than SEARCH? This is a key question, because a good active learning system should use minimally powerful oracles. Another key question is: Can the benefits of SEARCH be provided in a computationally efficient general purpose manner?

References

- Josh Attenberg and Foster J. Provost. Why label when you can search? alternatives to active learning for applying human resources to build classification models under extreme class imbalance. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Washington, DC, USA, July 25-28, 2010*, pages 423–432, 2010.
- Maria-Florina Balcan and Steve Hanneke. Robust interactive learning. In *COLT*, 2012.
- Maria-Florina Balcan, Alina Beygelzimer, and John Langford. Agnostic active learning. In *ICML*, 2006.
- Maria-Florina Balcan, Steve Hanneke, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan. The true sample complexity of active learning. *Machine learning*, 80(2-3):111–139, 2010.
- Alina Beygelzimer, Daniel Hsu, John Langford, and Tong Zhang. Agnostic active learning without constraints. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 23*, 2010.
- Alina Beygelzimer, Daniel Hsu, Nikos Karampatziakis, John Langford, and Tong Zhang. Efficient active learning. In *ICML Workshop on Online Trading of Exploration and Exploitation*, 2011.
- David A. Cohn, Les E. Atlas, and Richard E. Ladner. Improving generalization with active learning. *Machine Learning*, 15(2):201–221, 1994.
- Sanjoy Dasgupta. Coarse sample complexity bounds for active learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 18*, 2005.
- Sanjoy Dasgupta, Daniel Hsu, and Claire Monteleoni. A general agnostic active learning algorithm. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20*, 2007.
- Luc Devroye, László Györfi, and Gábor Lugosi. *A Probabilistic Theory of Pattern Recognition*. Springer Verlag, 1996.
- Steve Hanneke. A bound on the label complexity of agnostic active learning. In *ICML*, pages 249–278, 2007.
- Steve Hanneke. Rates of convergence in active learning. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(1):333–361, 2011.
- Steve Hanneke. Theory of disagreement-based active learning. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 7(2-3):131–309, 2014. ISSN 1935-8237. doi: 10.1561/2200000037.
- Tzu-Kuo Huang, Alekh Agarwal, Daniel Hsu, John Langford, and Robert E. Schapire. Efficient and parsimonious agnostic active learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28*, 2015.
- Matti Kääriäinen. Active learning in the non-realizable case. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory, 17th International Conference, ALT 2006, Barcelona, Spain, October 7-10, 2006, Proceedings*, pages 63–77, 2006.
- Patrice Y. Simard, David Maxwell Chickering, Aparna Lakshmiratan, Denis Xavier Charles, Léon Bottou, Carlos Garcia Jurado Suarez, David Grangier, Saleema Amershi, Johan Verwey, and Jina Suh. ICE: enabling non-experts to build models interactively for large-scale lopsided problems. *CoRR*, abs/1409.4814, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.4814>.
- Vladimir N. Vapnik. *Estimation of Dependences Based on Empirical Data*. Springer-Verlag, 1982.
- Vladimir N. Vapnik and Alexey Ya. Chervonenkis. On the uniform convergence of relative frequencies of events to their probabilities. *Theory of Probability and Its Applications*, 16(2):264–280, 1971.

A Basic Facts and Notations Used in Proofs

A.1 Concentration Inequalities

Lemma 2 (Bernstein's Inequality). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent zero-mean random variables. Suppose that $|X_i| \leq M$ almost surely. Then for all positive t ,*

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i > t \right] \leq \exp \left(-\frac{t^2/2}{\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] + Mt/3} \right).$$

Lemma 3. *Let Z_1, \dots, Z_n be independent Bernoulli random variables with mean p . Let $\bar{Z} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i$. Then with probability $1 - \delta$,*

$$\bar{Z} \leq p + \sqrt{\frac{2p \ln(1/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{2 \ln(1/\delta)}{3n}.$$

Proof. Let $X_i = Z_i - p$ for all i , note that $|X_i| \leq 1$. The lemma follows from Bernstein's Inequality and algebra. \square

Lemma 4 (Freedman's Inequality). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be a martingale difference sequence, and $|X_i| \leq M$ almost surely. Let V be the sum of the conditional variances, i.e.*

$$V = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i^2 | X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}]$$

Then, for every $t, v > 0$,

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i > t \text{ and } V \leq v \right] \leq \exp \left(-\frac{t^2/2}{v + Mt/3} \right).$$

Lemma 5. *Let Z_1, \dots, Z_n be a sequence of Bernoulli random variables, where $\mathbb{E}[Z_i | Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1}] = p_i$. Then, for every $\delta > 0$, with probability $1 - \delta$:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \leq 2v_n + \sqrt{4v_n \ln \frac{\log 4n}{\delta}} + \frac{2}{3} \ln \frac{\log 4n}{\delta}.$$

where $v_n = \max(\sum_{i=1}^n p_i, 1)$.

Proof. Let $X_i = Z_i - p_i$ for all i , note that $\{X_i\}$ is a martingale difference sequence and $|X_i| \leq 1$. From Freedman's Inequality and algebra, for any v ,

$$\Pr \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i > v + \sqrt{\frac{2v \ln \frac{\log 4n}{\delta}}{n}} + \frac{2 \ln \frac{\log 4n}{\delta}}{3n} \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \leq v \right] \leq \frac{\delta}{\log n + 2}.$$

The proof follows by taking union bound over $v = 2^i, i = 0, 1, \dots, \lceil \log n \rceil$. \square

Define

$$\phi(d, m, \delta) := \frac{1}{m} \left(d \log em^2 + \log \frac{2}{\delta} \right). \quad (1)$$

Theorem 5 (Vapnik and Chervonenkis, 1971). *Let \mathcal{F} be a family of functions $f: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ on a domain \mathcal{Z} with VC dimension at most d , and let P be a distribution on \mathcal{Z} . Let P_n denote the empirical measure from an iid sample of size n from P . For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$,*

$$-\min \left\{ \varepsilon + \sqrt{Pf\varepsilon}, \sqrt{P_n f \varepsilon} \right\} \leq Pf - P_n f \leq \min \left\{ \varepsilon + \sqrt{P_n f \varepsilon}, \sqrt{Pf\varepsilon} \right\}$$

where $\varepsilon := \phi(d, n, \delta)$.

A.2 Notations

For convenience, we define

$$\sigma(d, m, \delta) := \phi(d, m, \delta/3), \quad (2)$$

as we will often split the overall allowed failure probability δ across two or three separate events.

Because we apply the deviation inequalities to the hypothesis classes from $\{H_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$, we also define:

$$\sigma_k(m, \delta) := \sigma(d_k, m, \delta), \quad (3)$$

where d_k is the VC dimension of H_k . We have the following simple fact.

Fact 1.

$$\sigma\left(d, m, \frac{\delta}{2 \log m (\log m + 1)}\right) \geq \epsilon \implies m \leq \frac{64}{\epsilon} \left(d \log \frac{512}{\epsilon} + \log \frac{24}{\delta} \right).$$

For integers $i \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$, define

$$\delta_i := \frac{\delta}{i(i+1)}, \quad \delta_{i,k} := \frac{\delta_i}{(k+1)(k+2)}$$

Note that $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \delta_i = \delta$ and $\sum_{k=0}^\infty \delta_{i,k} = \delta_i$.

Finally, for any distribution \tilde{D} over $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ and any hypothesis $h: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, we use $\text{err}(h, \tilde{D}) := \Pr_{(x,y) \sim \tilde{D}}[h(x) \neq y]$ to denote the probability with respect to \tilde{D} that h makes a classification error.

B Active Learning Algorithm CAL

In this section, we describe and analyze a variant of the LABEL-only active learning algorithm of Cohn et al. [1994], which we refer to as CAL. Note that Hanneke [2011] provides a label complexity analysis of CAL in terms of the disagreement coefficient under the assumption that the LABEL oracle is consistent with some hypothesis in the hypothesis class used by CAL. We cannot use that analysis because we call CAL as a subroutine in LARCH with sets of hypotheses V that do not necessarily contain the optimal hypothesis h^* .

B.1 Description of CAL

CAL takes as input a set of hypotheses V , the LABEL oracle (which always returns $h^*(x)$ when queried with a point x), and learning parameters $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$.

The pseudocode for CAL is given in Algorithm 3 below, where we use the notation

$$U_{\leq i} := \bigcup_{j=1}^i U_j$$

for any sequence of sets $(U_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$.

B.2 Proof of Lemma 1

We now give the proof of Lemma 1.

Let $V_0 := V$ and $V_i := V(T_{\leq i})$ for each $i \geq 1$. Clearly $V_0 \supseteq V_1 \supseteq \dots$, and hence $\text{Dis}(V_0) \supseteq \text{Dis}(V_1) \supseteq \dots$ as well.

Let E_i be the event in which the following hold:

1. If CAL executes iteration i , then every $h \in V_i$ satisfies

$$\Pr_{x \sim D_X}[h(x) \neq h^*(x) \wedge x \in \text{Dis}(V_i)] \leq \phi(d, 2^i, \delta_i/2).$$

Algorithm 3 CAL

input: Hypothesis set V with VC dimension $\leq d$; oracle LABEL; learning parameters $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$
output: Labeled examples T

```

1: for  $i = 1, 2, \dots$  do
2:    $T_i \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3:   for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, 2^i$  do
4:      $x_{i,j} \leftarrow$  independent draw from  $D_{\mathcal{X}}$  (the corresponding label is hidden)
5:     if  $x_{i,j} \in \text{Dis}(V(T_{\leq i-1}))$  then
6:        $T_i \leftarrow T_i \cup \{(x_{i,j}, \text{LABEL}(x_{i,j}))\}$ 
7:     end if
8:   end for
9:   if  $\phi(d, 2^i, \delta_i/2) \leq \epsilon$  or  $V(T_{\leq i}) = \emptyset$  then
10:    return  $T_{\leq i}$ 
11:   end if
12: end for

```

2. If CAL executes iteration i , then the number of LABEL queries in iteration i is at most

$$2^i \mu_i + O\left(\sqrt{2^i \mu_i \log(2/\delta_i)} + \log(2/\delta_i)\right),$$

where

$$\mu_i := \theta_{V_{i-1}}(\epsilon) \cdot 2\phi(d, 2^{i-1}, \delta_{i-1}/2).$$

We claim that $E_0 \cap E_1 \cap \dots \cap E_i$ holds with probability at least $1 - \sum_{i'=1}^i \delta_{i'} \geq 1 - \delta$. The proof is by induction. The base case is trivial, as E_0 holds deterministically. For the inductive case, we just have to show that $\Pr(E_i \mid E_0 \cap E_1 \cap \dots \cap E_{i-1}) \geq 1 - \delta_i$.

Condition on the event $E_0 \cap E_1 \cap \dots \cap E_{i-1}$. Suppose CAL executes iteration i . For all $x \notin \text{Dis}(V_{i-1})$, let $V_{i-1}(x)$ denote the label assigned by every $h \in V_{i-1}$ to x . Define

$$\hat{S}_i := \left\{(x_{i,j}, \hat{y}_{i,j}) : j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^i\}, x_{i,j} \notin \text{Dis}(V_{i-1}), \hat{y}_{i,j} = V_{i-1}(x_{i,j})\right\}.$$

Observe that $\hat{S}_i \cup T_i$ is an iid sample of size 2^i from a distribution (which we call D_{i-1}) over labeled examples (x, y) , where $x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}$ and y is given by

$$y := \begin{cases} V_{i-1}(x) & \text{if } x \notin \text{Dis}(V_{i-1}), \\ h^*(x) & \text{if } x \in \text{Dis}(V_{i-1}). \end{cases}$$

In fact, for any $h \in V_{i-1}$, we have

$$\text{err}_{D_{i-1}}(h) = \Pr_{(x,y) \sim D_{i-1}} [h(x) \neq y] = \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [h(x) \neq h^*(x) \wedge x \in \text{Dis}(V_{i-1})]. \quad (4)$$

The VC inequality (Theorem 5) implies that, with probability at least $1 - \delta_i/2$,

$$\forall h \in V. \left(\text{err}(h, \hat{S}_i \cup T_i) = 0 \implies \text{err}_{D_{i-1}}(h) \leq \phi(d, 2^i, \delta_i/2) \right). \quad (5)$$

Consider any $h \in V_i$. We have $\text{err}(h, T_i) = 0$ by definition of V_i . We also have $\text{err}(h, \hat{S}_i) = 0$ since $h \in V_i \subseteq V_{i-1}$. So in the event that (5) holds, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [h(x) \neq h^*(x) \wedge x \in \text{Dis}(V_i)] &\leq \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [h(x) \neq h^*(x) \wedge x \in \text{Dis}(V_{i-1})] \\ &= \text{err}_{D_{i-1}}(h) \\ &\leq \phi(d, 2^i, \delta_i/2), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows because $\text{Dis}(V_i) \subseteq \text{Dis}(V_{i-1})$, and the equality follows from (4).

Now we prove the LABEL query bound.

Claim 1. *On event E_{i-1} for every $h, h' \in V_{i-1}$,*

$$\Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [h(x) \neq h'(x)] \leq 2\phi(d, 2^{i-1}, \delta_{i-1}/2)$$

Proof. On event E_{i-1} , every $h \in V_{i-1}$ satisfies

$$\Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [h(x) \neq h^*(x), x \in \text{Dis}(V_{i-1})] \leq \phi(d, 2^{i-1}, \delta_{i-1}/2).$$

Therefore, for any $h, h' \in V_{i-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [h(x) \neq h'(x)] &= \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [h(x) \neq h'(x), x \in \text{Dis}(V_{i-1})] \\ &\leq \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [h(x) \neq h^*(x), x \in \text{Dis}(V_{i-1})] \\ &\quad + \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [h'(x) \neq h^*(x), x \in \text{Dis}(V_{i-1})] \\ &\leq 2\phi(d, 2^{i-1}, \delta_{i-1}/2). \end{aligned}$$

□

Since CAL does not halt before iteration i , we have $2\phi(d, 2^{i-1}, \delta_{i-1}/2) \geq \epsilon$, and hence the above claim and the definition of the disagreement coefficient imply

$$\Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_{i-1})] \leq \theta_{V_{i-1}}(\epsilon) \cdot 2\phi(d, 2^{i-1}, \delta_{i-1}/2) = \mu_i.$$

Therefore, μ_i is an upper bound on the probability that LABEL is queried on $x_{i,j}$, for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, 2^i$. By Lemma 3, the number of queries to LABEL is at most

$$2^i \mu_i + O\left(\sqrt{2^i \mu_i \log(2/\delta_i)} + \log(2/\delta_i)\right).$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta_i/2$. We conclude by a union bound that $\Pr(E_i | E_0 \cap E_1 \cap \dots \cap E_{i-1}) \geq 1 - \delta_i$ as required.

We now show that in the event $E_0 \cap E_1 \cap \dots$, which holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the required consequences from Lemma 1 are satisfied. The definition of ϕ from (1) and the halting condition in CAL imply that the number of iterations I executed by CAL satisfies

$$\sigma(d, 2^{I-1}, \delta_{I-1}/2) \geq \epsilon.$$

Thus by Fact 1,

$$2^I \leq O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(d \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right),$$

which immediately gives the required bound on the number of unlabeled points drawn from $D_{\mathcal{X}}$. Moreover, I can be bounded as

$$I = O\left(\log(d/\epsilon) + \log \log(1/\delta)\right).$$

Therefore, in the event $E_0 \cap E_1 \cap \dots \cap E_I$, CAL returns a set of labeled examples $T := T_{\leq I}$ in which every $h \in V(T)$ satisfies

$$\Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [h(x) \neq h^*(x) \wedge x \in \text{Dis}(V(T))] \leq \epsilon,$$

and the number of LABEL queries is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^I \left(2^i \mu_i + O \left(\sqrt{2^i \mu_i \log(2/\delta_i)} + \log(2/\delta_i) \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^I O \left(2^i \cdot \left(\theta_{V_{i-1}}(\epsilon) \frac{d \log 2^i + \log(2/\delta_i)}{2^i} \right) + \log(2/\delta_i) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^I O \left(\theta_{V_{i-1}}(\epsilon) \cdot (d \cdot i + \log(1/\delta)) \right) \\
&= O \left(\theta_V(\epsilon) \cdot \left(d \cdot (\log(d/\epsilon) + \log \log(1/\delta))^2 + (\log(d/\epsilon) + \log \log(1/\delta)) \cdot \log(1/\delta) \right) \right) \\
&= \tilde{O} \left(\theta_V(\epsilon) \cdot d \cdot \log^2(1/\epsilon) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \square

C An Improved Algorithm for the Realizable Case

In this section, we present an improved algorithm for using SEARCH and LABEL in the realizable section. We call this algorithm SEABEL (Algorithm 4).

C.1 Description of Seabel

SEABEL proceeds in iterations like LARCH, but takes more advantage of SEARCH. Each iteration is split into two stages: the verification stage, and the sampling stage.

In the verification stage (Steps 4–13), SEABEL makes repeated calls to SEARCH to advance to as high of a complexity class as possible, until \perp is returned. When \perp is returned, it guarantees that whenever the latest version space completely agrees on an unlabeled point, then it is also in agreement with h^* , even if it does not contain h^* .

In the sampling stage (Steps 14–19), SEABEL performs selective sampling, querying and inferring labels based on disagreement over the new version space $V_i^{k_i}$. The preceding verification stage ensures that whenever a label is inferred, it is guaranteed to be in agreement with h^* .

The algorithm calls Algorithm 6 in Appendix E, where we slightly abuse the notation in SAMPLE-AND-LABEL that if the counter parameter is missing then it simply does not get updated.

C.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Observe that T_{i+1} is an iid sample of size 2^{i+1} from a distribution (which we call D_i) over labeled examples (x, y) , where $x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}$, and

$$y := \begin{cases} V_i^{k_i}(x) & \text{if } x \notin \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i}), \\ h^*(x) & \text{if } x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i}), \end{cases}$$

for every x in the support of $D_{\mathcal{X}}$. (T_1 is an iid sample from $D_0 := D$; also note $k_0 = 0$ and $S_0 = \emptyset$.)

Lemma 6. *Algorithm 4 maintains the following invariants:*

1. *The loop in the verification stage of iteration i terminates for all $i \geq 1$.*
2. *$k_i \leq k^*$ for all $i \geq 0$.*
3. *$h^*(x) = V_i^{k_i}(x)$ for all $x \notin \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})$ for all $i \geq 1$.*

Algorithm 4 SEABEL

4. h^* is consistent with $S_i \cup T_{i+1}$ for all $i \geq 0$.

Proof. It is easy to see that S only contains examples provided by SEARCH, and hence the labels are consistent with h^* .

Now we prove that the invariants hold by induction on i , starting with $i = 0$. For the base case, only the last invariant needs checking, and it is true because the labels in T_1 are obtained from LABEL.

For the inductive step, fix any $i \geq 1$, and assume that $k_{i-1} \leq k^*$, and that h^* is consistent with T_i . Now consider the verification stage in iteration i . We first prove that the loop in the verification stage will terminate and establish some properties upon termination. Observe that k and S are initially k_{i-1} and S_{i-1} , respectively. Throughout the loop, the examples added to S are obtained from SEARCH, and hence are consistent with h^* . Thus, $h^* \in H_{k^*}(S \cup T_i)$, implying $H_{k^*}(S \cup T_i) \neq \emptyset$. If $k = k^*$, then $\text{SEARCH}_{H_{k^*}}(H_{k^*}(S \cup T_i))$ would return \perp and Algorithm 4 would exit the loop. If $\text{SEARCH}_{H_k}(H_k(S \cup T_i)) \neq \perp$, then $k < k^*$, and k cannot be increased beyond k^* since $H_{k^*}(S \cup T_i) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, the loop must terminate with $k \leq k^*$, implying $k_i \leq k^*$. This establishes invariants 1 and 2. Moreover, because the loop terminates with $\text{SEARCH}_{H_k}(H_k(S \cup T_i))$ returning \perp (and here, $k = k_i$ and $H_k(S \cup T_i) = V_i^{k_i}$), there is no counterexample $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that h^* disagrees with every $h \in V_i^{k_i}$. This implies that $h^*(x) = V_i^{k_i}(x)$ for all $x \notin \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})$, i.e., invariant 3.

Now consider any (x, y) added to T_{i+1} in the sampling stage. If $x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})$, the label is obtained from LABEL , and hence is consistent with h^* ; if $x \notin \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})$, the label is $V_i^{k_i}(x)$, which is the same as $h^*(x)$ as previously argued. So h^* is consistent with all examples in T_{i+1} , and hence also all examples in $S_i \cup T_{i+1}$, proving invariant 4. This completes the induction. \square

Let E_i be the event in which the following hold:

1. For every $k \geq 0$, every $h \in H_k$ satisfies

$$\text{err}(h, D_{i-1}) \leq \text{err}(h, T_i) + \sqrt{\text{err}(h, T_i)\sigma_k(2^i, \delta_{i,k})} + \sigma_k(2^i, \delta_{i,k}).$$

2. The number of LABEL queries in iteration i (to form T_{i+1}) is at most

$$2^{i+1} \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] + O \left(\sqrt{2^{i+1} \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] \log(1/\delta_i)} + \log(1/\delta_i) \right),$$

Using Theorem 5 and Lemma 3, along with the union bound, $\Pr(E_i) \geq 1 - \delta_i$. Define $E := \cap_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$; a union bound implies that $\Pr(E) \geq 1 - \delta$.

We now prove Theorem 2, starting with the error rate guarantee. Condition on the event E . Since $k_i \leq k^*$ (Lemma 6), the definition of σ_k from (3), the halting condition in Algorithm 4, and Fact 1 imply that the algorithm must halt after at most I iterations, where

$$2^I \leq O \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(d_{k^*} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \log \frac{k^*}{\delta} \right) \right). \quad (6)$$

So let I denote the iteration in which Algorithm 4 halts. By definition of E_I , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{err}(\hat{h}, D_{i-1}) &\leq \text{err}(\hat{h}, T_i) + \sqrt{\text{err}(\hat{h}, T_i)\sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i})} + \sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i}) \\ &= \sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i}) \leq \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the termination condition. By Lemma 6, $h^*(x) = V_{i-1}^{k_{i-1}}(x)$ for all $x \notin \text{Dis}(V_{i-1}^{k_{i-1}})$. Therefore, $D(\cdot | x) = D_{i-1}(\cdot | x)$ for every x in the support of $D_{\mathcal{X}}$, and

$$\text{err}(\hat{h}, D) = \text{err}(\hat{h}, D_{i-1}) \leq \epsilon.$$

Now we bound the unlabeled, LABEL, and SEARCH complexities, all conditioned on event E . First, as argued above, the algorithm halts after at most I iterations, where 2^I is bounded as in (6). The number of unlabeled examples drawn from $D_{\mathcal{X}}$ across all iterations is within a factor of two of the number of examples drawn in the final sampling stage, which is $O(2^I)$. Thus (6) also gives the bound on the number of unlabeled examples drawn.

Next, we consider the SEARCH complexity. For each iteration i , each call to SEARCH either returns a counterexample that forces k to increment (but never past k^* , as implied by Lemma 6), or returns \perp which causes an exit from the verification stage loop. Therefore, the total number of SEARCH calls is at most

$$k^* + I = k^* + O \left(\log \frac{d_{k^*}}{\epsilon} + \log \log \frac{k^*}{\delta} \right).$$

Finally, we consider the LABEL complexity. For $i \leq I$, we first show that the version space $V_i^{k_i}$ is always contained in a ball of small radius (with respect to the disagreement pseudometric). Specifically, for every h, h' in $V_i^{k_i}$, $\text{err}(h, T_i) = 0$ and $\text{err}(h, T_i) = 0$. By definition of E_i , this implies that

$$\text{err}(h, D_{i-1}) \leq \sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{err}(h', D_{i-1}) \leq \sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i}).$$

Therefore, by the triangle inequality and the fact $k_i \leq k^*$,

$$\Pr_{x \sim D} [h(x) \neq h'(x)] \leq 2\sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i}) \leq 2\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}).$$

Also, the upper bound $2^I \leq \tilde{O}(d_{k^*}/\epsilon)$ from (6) implies the lower bound $\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}) \geq \epsilon/2$ for $i \leq I$. Thus, the probability mass of the disagreement region can be bounded as

$$\Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] \leq \theta_{k_i}(\epsilon) \cdot 2\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}).$$

By definition of E_i , the number of queries to LABEL at iteration i is at most

$$2^{i+1} \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] + O \left(\sqrt{2^{i+1} \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] \log(1/\delta_{i,k})} + \log(1/\delta_i) \right),$$

which is at most

$$O \left(2^i \cdot \theta_{k_i}(\epsilon) \cdot \sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}) \right).$$

We conclude that the total number of LABEL queries by Algorithm 4 is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 + \sum_{i=1}^I O \left(2^i \cdot \theta_{k_i}(\epsilon) \cdot \sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}) \right) \\ &= 2 + \sum_{i=1}^I O \left(2^i \cdot \max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(\epsilon) \cdot \sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}) \right) \\ &= O \left(\max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(\epsilon) \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^I 2^i \cdot \frac{d \ln(2^i) + \ln(\frac{(i^2+i)(k^*)^2}{\delta})}{2^i} \right) \right) \\ &= O \left(\max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(\epsilon) \cdot \left(d_{k^*} I^2 + I \log \frac{k^*}{\delta} \right) \right) \\ &= O \left(\max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(\epsilon) \cdot \left(d_{k^*} \left(\log \frac{d_{k^*}}{\epsilon} + \log \log \frac{k^*}{\delta} \right)^2 + \left(\log \frac{d_{k^*}}{\epsilon} + \log \log \frac{k^*}{\delta} \right) \log \frac{k^*}{\delta} \right) \right) \\ &= \tilde{O} \left(\max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(\epsilon) \cdot \left(d_{k^*} \cdot \log^2 \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \log k^* \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \square

D A-Larch: An Adaptive Agnostic Algorithm

In this section, we present a generalization of SEABEL that works in the agnostic setting. We call this algorithm A-LARCH (Algorithm 5).

D.1 Description of A-Larch

A-LARCH proceeds in iterations like SEABEL. Each iteration is split into three stages: the error estimation stage, the verification stage, and the sampling stage.

In the error estimation stage, A-LARCH uses a structural risk minimization approach (Step 4) to compute γ_{i-1} , a (tight) upper bound on $\Pr[h^*(x) \neq y, x \in \text{Dis}(V_{i-1})]$. (See item 1 of Lemma 7 for justification.)

The verification stage (Steps 5–18) and sampling stage (Steps 20–23) in A-LARCH are similar to the corresponding stages in SEABEL.

Same as SEABEL, the algorithm calls Algorithm 6, 8 and 9 in Appendix E (SAMPLE-AND-LABEL, PRUNE-VERSION-SPACE and UPGRADE-VERSION-SPACE, respectively), where we slightly abuse the notation in SAMPLE-AND-LABEL that if the counter parameter is missing then it simply does not get updated.

Algorithm 5 A-LARCH

D.2 Proof of Theorem 3

Let

$$\begin{aligned} M(\nu, k^*, \epsilon, \delta) &:= \min \left\{ 2^n : n \in \mathbb{N}, 6\sqrt{\nu \sigma_{k^*}(2^n, \delta_{n, k^*})} + 21\sigma_{k^*}(2^n, \delta_{n, k^*}) \leq \epsilon \right\} \\ &= O\left(\frac{(d_{k^*} \log(1/\epsilon) + \log(k^*/\delta))(\nu + \epsilon)}{\epsilon^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

where the second line is from Fact 1.

Theorem 6 (Restatement of Theorem 3). *Assume $\text{err}(h^*) = \nu$. If Algorithm 5 is run with inputs hypothesis classes $\{H_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$, oracles SEARCH and LABEL, learning parameter δ , unlabeled examples budget $m = M(\nu, k^*, \epsilon, \delta)$ and the disagreement coefficient of $H_k(S)$ is at most $\theta_k(\cdot)$, then, with probability $1 - \delta$:*

(1) The returned hypothesis \hat{h} satisfies

$$\text{err}(\hat{h}) \leq \nu + \epsilon .$$

(2) The total number of queries to oracle SEARCH is at most

$$k^* + \log m \leq k^* + O\left(\log \frac{d_{k^*}}{\epsilon} + \log \log \frac{k^*}{\delta}\right).$$

(3) The total number of queries to oracle LABEL is at most

$$\tilde{O} \left(\max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k (2\nu + 2\epsilon) \cdot d_{k^*} \left(\log \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\nu^2}{\epsilon^2} \right) \right).$$

The proof relies on an auxillary lemma. First, we need to introduce the following notation.

Observe that T_{i+1} is an iid sample of size 2^{i+1} from a distribution (which we call D_i) over labeled examples (x, y) , where $x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}$ and the conditional distribution is

$$D_i(y | x) := \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}\{y = V_i^{k_i}(x)\} & \text{if } x \notin \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i}), \\ D(y | x) & \text{if } x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i}). \end{cases}$$

T_1 is a sample of size 2 from $D_0 := D$.

Let E_i be the event in which the following hold:

1. For every $k \geq 0$, every $h \in H_k$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \text{err}(h, D_{i-1}) &\leq \text{err}(h, T_i) + \sqrt{\text{err}(h, T_i) \sigma_k(2^i, \delta_{i,k}) + \sigma_k(2^i, \delta_{i,k})}, \\ \text{err}(h, T_i) &\leq \text{err}(h, D_{i-1}) + \sqrt{\text{err}(h, D_{i-1}) \sigma_k(2^i, \delta_{i,k}) + \sigma_k(2^i, \delta_{i,k})}. \end{aligned}$$

2. The number of LABEL queries at iteration i is at most

$$2^{i+1} \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] + O \left(\sqrt{2^{i+1} \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] \log(1/\delta_i)} + \log(1/\delta_i) \right).$$

Using Theorem 5 and Lemma 3, along with the union bound, $\Pr(E_i) \geq 1 - \delta_i$. Define $E := \cap_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$, by union bound, $\Pr(E) \geq 1 - \delta$. Recall that k_i is the value of k at the end of iteration i .

Lemma 7. *On event E , Algorithm 5 maintains the following invariants:*

1. *For all $i \geq 1$, γ_{i-1} is such that*

$$\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) \leq \gamma_{i-1} \leq \text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) \sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + 3\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}).$$

2. *The loop in the verification stage of iteration i terminates for all $i \geq 1$.*

3. *$k_i \leq k^*$ for all $i \geq 0$.*

4. *$h^*(x) = V_i^{k_i}(x)$ for all $x \notin \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})$ for all $i \geq 1$.*

5. *For all $i \geq 0$, for every hypothesis h , $\text{err}(h, D_i) - \text{err}(h^*, D_i) \geq \text{err}(h, D) - \text{err}(h^*, D)$. Therefore, h^* is the optimal hypothesis among $\cup_k H_k$ with respect to D_i .*

Proof. Throughout, we assume the event E holds.

It is easy to see that S only contains examples provided by SEARCH, and hence the labels are consistent with h^* .

Now we prove that the invariants hold by induction on i , starting with $i = 0$. For the base case, invariant 3 holds since $k_0 = 0 \leq k^*$, and invariant 5 holds since $D_0 = D$ and h^* is the optimal hypothesis in $\cup_k H_k$.

Now consider the inductive step. We first prove that invariant 1 holds.

(1) By definition of E_i , for all $k' \geq k_{i-1}$, we have for all $h \in H_{k'}$,

$$\text{err}(h, D_{i-1}) \leq \text{err}(h, T_i) + \sqrt{\text{err}(h, T_i)\sigma_{k'}(2^i, \delta_{i,k'})} + \sigma_{k'}(2^i, \delta_{i,k'}) .$$

Thus,

$$\min_{h \in H_{k'}} \text{err}(h, D_{i-1}) \leq \min_{h \in H_{k'}} \text{err}(h, T_i) + \sqrt{\text{err}(h, T_i)\sigma_{k'}(2^i, \delta_{i,k'})} + \sigma_{k'}(2^i, \delta_{i,k'}) .$$

Taking minimum over $k' \geq k_{i-1}$ on both sides, notice that h^* is the optimal hypothesis with respect to D_{i-1} and recall the definition of γ_{i-1} , we get

$$\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) \leq \gamma_{i-1} .$$

(2) By definition of γ_{i-1} , we have

$$\gamma_{i-1} = \min_{k' \geq k_{i-1}, h \in H_{k'}} \left\{ \text{err}(h, T_i) + \sqrt{\text{err}(h, T_i)\sigma_{k'}(2^i, \delta_{i,k'})} + \sigma_{k'}(2^i, \delta_{i,k'}) \right\}$$

Taking $k' = k^*$, $h = h^*$, we get

$$\gamma_{i-1} \leq \text{err}(h^*, T_i) + \sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, T_i)\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + \sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})$$

In conjunction with the fact that by definition of E_i ,

$$\text{err}(h^*, T_i) \leq \text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) + \sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1})\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + \sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})$$

We get

$$\gamma_{i-1} \leq \text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1})\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + 3\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}) .$$

Thus, invariant 1 is established for iteration i .

Now consider the verification stage in iteration i . We first prove that the loop in the verification stage will terminate and establish some properties upon termination. Observe that k and S are initially k_{i-1} and S_{i-1} , respectively. Throughout the loop, the examples added to S are obtained from SEARCH, and hence are consistent with h^* . In addition, we have the following claim regarding k^* .

Claim 2. *If invariants 1–5 holds for iteration $i - 1$, then for iteration i , the following holds:*

$$(a) \min_{h \in H_{k^*}(S)} \text{err}(h, T_i) \leq \gamma_{i-1} + \sqrt{\gamma_{i-1}\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + \sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})$$

(b)

$$h^* \in V_i^{k^*} = \{h \in H_{k^*}(S) : \text{err}(h, T_i) \leq \min_{h' \in H_{k^*}(S)} \text{err}(h', T_i) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h', T_i)\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + 3\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})\} .$$

Proof. Recall that h^* is the optimal hypothesis under distribution D_{i-1} . We have already shown above that $\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) \leq \gamma_{i-1}$. By the definition of E_i ,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{h \in H_{k^*}(S)} \text{err}(h, T_i) &\leq \text{err}(h^*, T_i) \\ &\leq \text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) + \sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1})\sigma(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + \sigma(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}) \\ &\leq \gamma_{i-1} + \sqrt{\gamma_{i-1}\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + \sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is from that $\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) \leq \gamma_{i-1}$. This proves item (a).

On the other hand, for all h' in $H_{k^*}(S)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{err}(h^*, T_i) &\leq \text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) + \sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1})\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + \sigma(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}) \\ &\leq \text{err}(h', D_{i-1}) + \sqrt{\text{err}(h', D_{i-1})\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + \sigma(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}) \\ &\leq \text{err}(h', T_i) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h', T_i)\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + 3\sigma(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}). \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is from the definition of E_i , the second inequality is from Invariant 5 of iteration $i-1$, the third inequality is from the definition of E_i .

Thus, $\text{err}(h^*, T_i) \leq \min_{h' \in H_{k^*}(S)} \text{err}(h', T_i) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h', T_i)\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + 3\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})$, proving item (b). \square

Claim 2 implies that k cannot increase beyond k^* . To see this, observe that Claim 2(a) implies the condition in Step 8 is not satisfied for $k = k^*$. In addition, Claim 2(b) implies that $h^* \in V_i^{k^*} \neq \emptyset$, which in turn means that $\text{SEARCH}_{H_{k^*}}(V_i^{k^*}) = \perp$. Hence, the loop in the verification stage would terminate if k ever reaches k^* . Because iteration i starts with $k \leq k^*$ (as invariant 3 holds in iteration $i-1$), invariants 2 and 3 must also hold for iteration i .

Finally, we can establish invariants 4 and 5 for iteration i . Because the loop terminates with $\text{SEARCH}_{H_k}(V_i^{k_i})$ returning \perp , there is no counterexample $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that h^* disagrees with every $h \in V_i^{k_i}$. This implies that $h^*(x) = V_i^{k_i}(x)$ for all $x \notin \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})$ (i.e., invariant 4). Hence, for any hypothesis h ,

$$\text{err}(h, D_i) = \Pr[h(x) \neq h^*(x), x \notin \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] + \Pr[h(x) \neq y, x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})].$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{err}(h, D_i) - \text{err}(h^*, D_i) \\ &= \Pr[h(x) \neq h^*(x), x \notin \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] + \Pr[h(x) \neq y, x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] \\ &\quad - \Pr[h^*(x) \neq y, x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] \\ &\geq \Pr[h(x) \neq y, x \notin \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] - \Pr[h^*(x) \neq y, x \notin \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] \\ &\quad + \Pr[h(x) \neq y, x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] - \Pr[h^*(x) \neq y, x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] \\ &= \text{err}(h, D) - \text{err}(h^*, D), \end{aligned}$$

which proves invariant 5 for iteration i . \square

Proof of Theorem 6. Suppose event E happens.

We first show a claim regarding the error of hypotheses in current version spaces.

Claim 3. *On event E , for all $i \geq 1$, for all $h \in V_i^{k_i}$,*

$$\text{err}(h, D) \leq \text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) + 6\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1})\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + 21\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}).$$

Proof. First, for every h in $V_i^{k_i}$,

$$\text{err}(h, T_i) \leq \min_{h' \in H_{k_i}(S)} \text{err}(h', T_i) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h', T_i)\sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i})} + 3\sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i}),$$

and since the condition in step 8 is not satisfied for $k = k_i$, we know that

$$\min_{h' \in H_{k_i}(S)} \text{err}(h', T_i) \leq \gamma_{i-1} + \sqrt{\gamma_{i-1}\sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i})} + \sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i}).$$

Thus,

$$\text{err}(h, T_i) \leq \gamma_{i-1} + 3\sqrt{\gamma_{i-1}\sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i})} + 6\sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i}). \quad (7)$$

By definition of event E_i , we also have

$$\text{err}(h, D_{i-1}) \leq \text{err}(h, T_i) + \sqrt{\text{err}(h, T_i)\sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i})} + \sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i}).$$

Hence,

$$\text{err}(h, D_{i-1}) \leq \gamma_{i-1} + 4\sqrt{\gamma_{i-1}\sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i})} + 10\sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i}).$$

Furthermore, by item 1 of Lemma 7,

$$\gamma_{i-1} \leq \text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1})\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + 3\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}).$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{err}(h, D_{i-1}) &\leq \text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) + 6\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1})\sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i})} + 21\sigma_{k_i}(2^i, \delta_{i,k_i}) \\ &\leq \text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) + 6\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1})\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + 21\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is from item 3 of Lemma 7.

We first prove the error rate guarantee. Suppose iteration $i = I = \log_2 M(\nu, k^*, \epsilon, \delta)$ has been reached. Observe that from Claim 3, for $\hat{h} \in V_I^{k_I}$,

$$\text{err}(\hat{h}, D_{I-1}) - \text{err}(h^*, D_{I-1}) \leq 6\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, D_{I-1})\sigma_{k^*}(2^I, \delta_{I,k^*})} + 21\sigma_{k^*}(2^I, \delta_{I,k^*}) \leq \epsilon$$

where the second inequality is from that $m = 2^I = M(\nu, k^*, \epsilon, \delta)$. Thus, by item 5 of Lemma 7,

$$\text{err}(\hat{h}, D) - \text{err}(h^*, D) \leq \text{err}(\hat{h}, D_{I-1}) - \text{err}(h^*, D_{I-1}) \leq \epsilon.$$

Next, we prove the bound on the number of SEARCH queries. From Lemma 7, Algorithm 5 maintains the invariant that $k \leq k^*$. For each iteration i , each call to SEARCH either returns an example forcing k to increment, or returns \perp which causes an exit from the verification stage loop. Therefore, the total number of SEARCH calls is at most

$$k^* + I \leq k^* + O\left(\log \frac{d_{k^*}}{\epsilon^2} + \log \log \frac{k^*}{\delta}\right).$$

Finally, we prove the bound on the number of LABEL queries. This is done in a few steps.

1. We first show that the version space $V_i^{k_i}$ is always contained in a ball of small radius (with respect to the disagreement pseudometric $\Pr_{x \sim D_X}[h(x) \neq h'(x)]$). Specifically, for $1 \leq i \leq I$, for any $h, h' \in V_i^{k_i}$, from Claim 3, in conjunction with triangle inequality, and that $\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) \leq \text{err}(h, D) = \nu$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr_{x \sim D_X}[h(x) \neq h'(x)] \\ &\leq 2\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1}) + 12\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, D_{i-1})\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + 42\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}) \\ &\leq 2\nu + 12\sqrt{\nu\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + 42\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $V_i^{k_i}$ is contained in $B_{H_{k_i}(S)}(h, 2\nu + 12\sqrt{\nu\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + 42\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i,k^*}))$ for some h in $H_{k_i}(S)$.

2. Next we bound the label complexity per iteration. Note that by the choice of $m = 2^I = M(\nu, k^*, \epsilon, \delta)$, $6\sqrt{\nu\sigma_{k^*}(2^{I-1}, \delta_{I-1, k^*})} + 21\sigma_{k^*}(2^{I-1}, \delta_{I-1, k^*}) \geq \epsilon$, therefore for all $1 \leq i \leq I$, $6\sqrt{\nu\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i, k^*})} + 21\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i, k^*}) \geq \epsilon/2$. Thus, the size of the disagreement region can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] &\leq \theta_k(2\nu + \epsilon) \cdot \left(2\nu + 12\sqrt{\nu\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i, k^*})} + 42\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i, k^*}) \right) \\ &\leq \theta_k(2\nu + \epsilon) \cdot \left(8\nu + 48\sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i, k^*}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

By definition of E_i , the number of queries to LABEL at iteration i is at most

$$2^{i+1} \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] + O \left(\sqrt{2^{i+1} \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_i^{k_i})] \log(1/\delta_{i, k^*})} + \log(1/\delta_{i, k^*}) \right).$$

Combining this with (8) gives

$$\# \text{ LABEL queries in iteration } i = O \left(2^i \cdot \theta_{k_i}(2\nu + \epsilon) \cdot (\nu + \sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i, k^*})) \right). \quad (9)$$

3. From the setting of $m = 2^I = \tilde{O}(d_{k^*}(\nu + \epsilon)/\epsilon^2)$, we get that

$$I = O \left(\log \frac{d_{k^*}}{\epsilon} + \log \log \frac{k^*}{\delta} \right).$$

Now, using (9), we get that the total number of LABEL queries by Algorithm 5 is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &2 + \sum_{i=1}^I O \left(2^i \cdot \theta_{k_i}(2\nu + \epsilon) \cdot (\nu + \sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i, k^*})) \right) \\ &= 2 + \sum_{i=1}^I O \left(2^i \cdot \max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(2\nu + \epsilon) \cdot (\nu + \sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i, k^*})) \right) \\ &= O \left(\max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(2\nu + \epsilon) \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^I 2^i (\nu + \sigma_{k^*}(2^i, \delta_{i, k^*})) \right) \right) \\ &= O \left(\max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(2\nu + \epsilon) \cdot \left(\nu 2^I + \sum_{i=1}^I 2^i \frac{d \ln(2^i) + \ln(\frac{(i^2+i)(k^*)^2}{\delta})}{2^i} \right) \right) \\ &= O \left(\max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(2\nu + \epsilon) \cdot \left(\nu 2^I + d_{k^*} I^2 + I \log \frac{k^*}{\delta} \right) \right) \\ &= O \left(\max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(2\nu + \epsilon) \cdot \left(\frac{\nu^2 + \epsilon\nu}{\epsilon^2} \left(d_{k^*} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \log \frac{k^*}{\delta} \right) + d_{k^*} \left(\log \frac{d_{k^*}}{\epsilon} + \log \log \frac{k^*}{\delta} \right)^2 \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \left(\log \frac{d_{k^*}}{\epsilon} + \log \log \frac{k^*}{\delta} \right) \log \frac{k^*}{\delta} \right) \right) \\ &= \tilde{O} \left(\max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(2\nu + \epsilon) \cdot \left(d_{k^*} \left(\log \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right)^2 + \log \frac{k^*}{\delta} \right) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\nu^2}{\epsilon^2} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

E Performance Guarantees of AA-Larch

E.1 Detailed Description of Subroutines

Subroutine SAMPLE-AND-LABEL performs standard disagreement-based selective sampling. Specifically, it draws an unlabeled example x from the $D_{\mathcal{X}}$. If x is in the agreement region of version space V , its label is inferred as $V(x)$; otherwise, we query the LABEL oracle to get its label. The counter c is incremented when LABEL is called.

Algorithm 6 SAMPLE-AND-LABEL

input: Version space $V \subset H$, oracle LABEL, labeled dataset L , counter c .
output: New labeled dataset L' , new counter c' .

```

1:  $x \leftarrow$  independent draw from  $D_{\mathcal{X}}$  (the corresponding label is hidden).
2: if  $x \in \text{Dis}(V)$  then
3:    $L' \leftarrow L \cup \{(x, \text{LABEL}(x))\}$ 
4:    $c' \leftarrow c + 1$ 
5: else
6:    $L' \leftarrow L \cup \{(x, V(x))\}$ 
7:    $c' \leftarrow c$ 
8: end if
```

Subroutine ERROR-CHECK checks if the version space has high error, based on item 2 of Lemma 9 – that is, if $k = k^*$, then ERROR-CHECK should never fail. Furthermore, if version space V_i fails ERROR-CHECK, then V_i should have small radius – see Lemma 8 for details.

Algorithm 7 ERROR-CHECK

input: Version space $V \subset H_k$, labeled dataset L of size l , confidence δ .
output: Boolean variable b indicating if V has high error.

```

1: Let  $\delta_k := \delta / ((k+1)(k+2))$  for all  $k \geq 0$ .
2:  $\gamma \leftarrow \min_{k' \geq k, h \in H_{k'}} \{\text{err}(h, L) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h, L)\sigma_{k'}(l, \delta_{k'})} + 3\sigma_{k'}(l, \delta_{k'})\}$ 
3: if  $\min_{h \in V} \text{err}(h, L) > \gamma + 2\sqrt{\gamma\sigma_k(l, \delta_k)} + 3\sigma_k(l, \delta_k)$  then
4:    $b \leftarrow \text{true}$ 
5: else
6:    $b \leftarrow \text{false}$ 
7: end if
```

Subroutine PRUNE-VERSION-SPACE performs update on our version space based on standard generalization error bounds. The version space never eliminates the optimal hypothesis in $H_k(S)$ when working with H_k . Claim 4 shows that, if at step i , $k = k^*$, then $h^* \in V_i$ from then on.

Algorithm 8 PRUNE-VERSION-SPACE

input: Version space $V \subset H_k$, labeled dataset L of size l , confidence δ .
output: Pruned version space V' .

1: Update version space:

$$V' \leftarrow \left\{ h \in V : \text{err}(h, L) \leq \min_{h' \in V} \text{err}(h', L) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h', L)\sigma_k(l, \delta_k)} + 3\sigma_k(l, \delta_k) \right\},$$

where $\delta_k := \frac{\delta}{(k+1)(k+2)}$.

Subroutine UPGRADE-VERSION-SPACE is called when (1) a systematic mistake of the version space V_i has been found by SEARCH; or (2) ERROR-CHECK detects that the error of V_i is high. In either case, k can be increased to the minimum level such that the updated $H_k(S)$ is nonempty. This still maintains the invariant that $k \leq k^*$.

Algorithm 9 UPGRADE-VERSION-SPACE

input: Current level of hypothesis class k , seed set S , seed to be added s .

output: New level of hypothesis class k , new seed set S , updated version space V .

- 1: $S \leftarrow S \cup s$
 - 2: $k \leftarrow \min \{k' > k : H_{k'}(S) \neq \emptyset\}$
 - 3: $V \leftarrow H_k(S)$
-

E.2 Proof of Theorem 4

This section uses the following definition of σ :

$$\sigma_k(m, \delta) = \phi(d_k, m, \delta/3) = \frac{1}{m} (d \log em^2 + \log \frac{6}{\delta}).$$

We restate Theorem 4 here for convenience.

Theorem 7. *There exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that the following holds. Assume $\text{err}(h^*) = \nu$. Let $\theta_{k'}(\cdot)$ denote the disagreement coefficient of V_i at the first step i after which $k \geq k'$. Fix any $\epsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$. Let $n_\epsilon = c_1 \max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(2\nu + 2\epsilon)(d_{k^*} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\delta})(1 + \nu^2/\epsilon^2)$ and define $C_\epsilon = 2(n_\epsilon + k^* \tau)$. Run Algorithm 2 with a nested sequence of hypotheses $\{H_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$, oracles LABEL and SEARCH, confidence parameter δ , cost ratio $\tau \geq 1$, and upper bound $N = c_2(d_{k^*} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\delta})/\epsilon^2$. If the cost spent is at least C_ϵ , then with probability $1 - \delta$, the current hypothesis \tilde{h} has error at most $\nu + \epsilon$.*

Remark. The purpose of having a bound on unlabeled examples, N , is rather technical—to deter the algorithm from getting into an infinite loop due to its blind self-confidence. Suppose that AA-LARCH starts with H_0 that has a single element h . Then, without such an N -based condition, it will incorrectly infer the labels of all the unlabeled examples drawn and end up with an infinite loop between lines 4 and 14. The condition on N is very mild—any N satisfying $N = \text{poly}(d_{k^*}, 1/\epsilon)$ and $N = \Omega(d_{k^*}/\epsilon^2)$ is sufficient.

Proof of Theorem 7. For integer $j \geq 0$, define step j as the execution period in AA-LARCH when the value of i is j .

Let $l_i = |L_i|$. Denote by L_i^D the dataset containing unlabeled examples in L_i labeled entirely by LABEL, i.e., $L_i^D = \{(x, \text{LABEL}(x)) : (x, y) \in L_i\}$. Note that L_i^D is an iid sample from D .

We call dataset L_i has *favorable bias*, if the following holds for any hypothesis h :

$$\text{err}(h, L_i^D) - \text{err}(h^*, L_i^D) \leq \text{err}(h, L_i) - \text{err}(h^*, L_i). \quad (10)$$

Let E_i be the event that the following conditions hold:

1. For every $k \geq 0$, every $h \in H_k$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \text{err}(h, D) &\leq \text{err}(h, L_i^D) + \sqrt{\text{err}(h, L_i^D)\sigma_k(l_i, \delta_{i,k}) + \sigma_k(l_i, \delta_{i,k})}, \\ \text{err}(h, L_i^D) &\leq \text{err}(h, D) + \sqrt{\text{err}(h, D)\sigma_k(l_i, \delta_{i,k}) + \sigma_k(l_i, \delta_{i,k})}. \end{aligned}$$

For every $h, h' \in H_k$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{err}(h, L_i^D) - \text{err}(h', L_i^D)) - (\text{err}(h, D) - \text{err}(h', D)) \\ \leq \sqrt{d_{L_i^D}(h, h') \cdot \sigma_k(l_i, \delta_{i,k})} + \sigma_k(l_i, \delta_{i,k}). \end{aligned}$$

where $d_{L_i^D}(h, h') = \frac{1}{l_i} \sum_{(x,y) \in L_i^D} [h(x) \neq h'(x)]$, fraction of L_i^D where h and h' disagree.

2. For every $1 \leq i' < i$, the number of LABEL queries from step i' to step i is at most

$$\sum_{j=i'}^i \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_{j-1})] + O \left(\sqrt{\sum_{j=i'}^i \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_{j-1})] \log(1/\delta_i) + \log(1/\delta_i)} \right),$$

where V_j denotes its final value in Algorithm 2.

Using Theorem 5 and Lemma 5, along with the union bound, $\Pr(E_i) \geq 1 - \delta_i$. Define $E := \cap_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$, by union bound, $\Pr(E) \geq 1 - \delta$. We henceforth condition on E holding.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} M(\nu, k^*, \epsilon, \delta, N) &:= \min \left\{ m \in \mathbb{N} : 8\sqrt{\nu\sigma_{k^*}(m, \delta_{m+k^*N, k^*})} + 35\sigma_{k^*}(m, \delta_{m+k^*N, k^*}) \leq \epsilon \right\} \\ &\leq O \left(\frac{(d_{k^*} \log(1/\epsilon) + \log(Nk^*/\delta))(\nu + \epsilon)}{\epsilon^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

We say that an iteration of the loop is *verified* if Step 20 is triggered; all other iterations are *unverified*. Let Γ be the set of i 's where x_i gets added to the final set L , and Δ be the set of i 's where x_i gets discarded. It is easy to see that if i is in Γ (resp. Δ), then the i is in a verified (resp. unverified) iteration.

Define $i^* := \min \{i \in \Gamma : l_i \geq M(\nu, k^*, \epsilon, \delta, N)\}$. Denote by k_i the final value of k after i unlabeled examples are processed.

We need to prove two claims:

1. For $i \geq i^*$, $\text{err}(\tilde{h}_i) \leq \nu + \epsilon$, where \tilde{h}_i is the hypothesis \tilde{h} stored at the end of step i .
2. The total cost spent by Algorithm 2 up to step i^* is at most C_ϵ .

To prove the first claim, fix any $i \geq i^*$. The stored hypothesis \tilde{h}_i is updated only when $i \in \Gamma$, so it suffices to consider only $i \in \Gamma$. From Lemma 10, $i \leq l_i + k^*N$. We also have $l_i \geq M(\nu, k^*, \epsilon, \delta, N)$. Since $\tilde{h}_i \in V_i$, Lemma 8 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{err}(\tilde{h}_i) &\leq \nu + 8\sqrt{\nu\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i, k^*})} + 35\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i, k^*}) \\ &\leq \nu + 8\sqrt{\nu\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{l_i+k^*N, k^*})} + 35\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{l_i+k^*N, k^*}) \\ &\leq \nu + \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

For the second claim, we first show that for i in Γ , the version space is contained in a ball of small radius (with respect to the disagreement pseudometric), thus bounding the size of its disagreement region. Lemma 8 shows that for $i \in \Gamma$, every hypothesis $h \in V_i$ has error at most $\nu + 8\sqrt{\nu\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i, k^*})} + 35\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i, k^*})$.

Thus, by the triangle inequality and Lemma 10,

$$\begin{aligned} V_i &\subseteq B_{H_{k_i}}(h, 2\nu + 16\sqrt{\nu\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i, k^*})} + 70\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i, k^*})) \\ &\subseteq B_{H_{k_i}}(h, 2\nu + 16\sqrt{\nu\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{l_i+k^*N, k^*})} + 70\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{l_i+k^*N, k^*})). \end{aligned}$$

for some h in $H_{k_i}(S)$. This shows that for $i \in \Gamma$, $i \leq i^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_i)] \\ &\leq \theta_{k_i}(2\nu + 2\epsilon) \cdot \left(2\nu + 16\sqrt{\nu\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{l_i+k^*N, k^*})} + 70\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{l_i+k^*N, k^*}) \right) \\ &\leq \max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(2\nu + 2\epsilon) \cdot \left(2\nu + 16\sqrt{\nu\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{l_i+k^*N, k^*})} + 70\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{l_i+k^*N, k^*}) \right), \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where the first inequality is from the definition of $\theta_{k_i}(\cdot)$ and $8\sqrt{\nu\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{l_i+k^*N, k^*})} + 35\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{l_i+k^*N, k^*}) \geq \epsilon$ for $i \leq i^*$, the second inequality is from $k_i \leq k^*$.

For $i \geq 1$, let Z_i be the indicator of whether LABEL is queried with x_i in Step 12, i.e.,

$$Z_i = \mathbb{1}\{x_i \in \text{Dis}(V_{i-1})\}.$$

For $0 \leq k \leq k_{i^*}$, define

$$\begin{aligned} i_k^0 &:= \min\{i \leq i^* : k_i \geq k\}, \text{ the first step when the hypothesis class reaches } \geq k, \\ i_k &:= \max\{i \leq i^* : k_i \leq k\}, \text{ the last step when the hypothesis class is still } \leq k \text{ by the end of that step,} \\ i'_k &:= \max\left\{i_k^0 \leq i \leq i_k : k_i \leq k, i \in \Gamma\right\}, \text{ the last verified step for hypothesis class } \leq k \text{ (if exists).} \end{aligned}$$

We call class k *skipped* if there is no step i such that $k_i = k$. If level k is skipped, then $i_k = i_{k-1} = i_k^0 - 1$, and i'_k is undefined.

Let

$$W_k := \sum_{i=i_k^0+1}^{i'_k} Z_i$$

be the number of verified queried examples when working with hypothesis class H_k . Note that W_k/τ is the number of verified iterations when working with H_k . If level k is skipped, then $W_k := 0$.

Let

$$Y_k := \sum_{i=i'_k+1}^{i_k+1} Z_i$$

be the number of unverified queried examples when working with hypothesis class H_k . Note that $Y_k \leq \tau$, and there is at most one unverified iteration when working with H_k . If level k is skipped, then $Y_k := 0$.

Therefore, the total cost when working with H_k is at most

$$\frac{W_k}{\tau} \cdot 2\tau + Y_k + \tau \leq 2\tau + 2W_k$$

Furthermore, Claim 4 implies that there is no unverified iteration when working with H_{k^*} . Hence the total cost when working with H_{k^*} has a tighter upper bound, that is, $2W_{k^*}$.

As a shorthand, let $m = M(\nu, k^*, \epsilon, \delta, N)$. We now bound the total cost incurred up to time i^* as

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^{k^*-1} (2\tau + 2W_k) + 2W_{k^*} &= 2\tau k^* + 2 \sum_{k=0}^{k^*} W_k \\
&= 2\tau k^* + 2 \sum_{k=0}^{k^*} \sum_{i=i_k^0+1}^{i'_k} Z_i \\
&= 2\tau k^* + O\left(2 \sum_{i \in \Gamma: i \leq i^*} \Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_{i-1})]\right) + O\left(k^* \ln \frac{1}{\delta_{i^*}}\right) \\
&\leq 2 \left(\tau k^* + O\left(\sum_{l=1}^{m-1} \max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(2\nu + 2\epsilon)(\nu + \sigma_{k^*}(l, \delta_{l+k^*N, k^*}))\right) \right) \\
&\leq 2 \left(\tau k^* + O\left(\max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(2\nu + 2\epsilon) \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} (\nu + \sigma_{k^*}(l, \delta_{l+k^*N, k^*}))\right) \right) \\
&\leq 2 \left(\tau k^* + \tilde{O}\left(\max_{k \leq k^*} \theta_k(2\nu + 2\epsilon) d_{k^*} \left(1 + \frac{\nu^2}{\epsilon^2}\right)\right) \right) \\
&\leq 2(\tau k^* + n_{\epsilon}) = C_{\epsilon},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is by algebra, the second equality is from the definition of W_k , and the third equality is from the definition of E . The first inequality is from Lemma 8, using Equation (11) to bound $\Pr_{x \sim D_{\mathcal{X}}} [x \in \text{Dis}(V_{i-1})]$ and noting that $\{l_i : i \in \Gamma, i \leq i^*\} = [m]$. \square

Now we provide the proof of our two key lemmas(Lemmas 8 and 10).

Consider the last call of PRUNE-VERSION-SPACE in step i . Define γ_i as the value of γ in line 2 of ERROR-CHECK:

$$\gamma_i = \min_{k' \geq k_i, h \in H_{k'}} \left\{ \text{err}(h, L_i) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h, L_i)\sigma_{k'}(l, \delta_{i, k'})} + 3\sigma_{k'}(l, \delta_{i, k'}) \right\} \quad (12)$$

Meanwhile, from line 1 of PRUNE-VERSION-SPACE, we have for all $h \in V_i$,

$$\text{err}(h, L_i) \leq \min_{h' \in V_i} \text{err}(h', L_i) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h', L_i)\sigma_{k_i}(l_i, \delta_{i, k_i})} + 3\sigma_{k_i}(l_i, \delta_{i, k_i})$$

where V_i denotes its final value.

Lemma 8. *Assume that the following conditions hold:*

1. *The dataset L_i has favorable bias, i.e. it satisfies Equation (10).*
2. *The version space V_i is such that $\text{ERROR-CHECK}(V_i, L_i, \delta_i)$ returns false, i.e. it has a low empirical error on L_i :*

$$\min_{h' \in V_i} \text{err}(h', L_i) \leq \gamma_i + 2\sqrt{\gamma_i \sigma_{k_i}(l_i, \delta_{i, k_i})} + 3\sigma_{k_i}(l_i, \delta_{i, k_i}). \quad (13)$$

Then, every $h \in V_i$ is such that

$$\text{err}(h) \leq \nu + 8\sqrt{\nu \sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i, k^*})} + 35\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i, k^*}). \quad (14)$$

where V_i and L_i denote their final values, respectively. Specifically, Equation (14) holds for any $h \in V_i$ such that $i \in \Gamma$ or $i + 1 \in \Gamma$.

Proof. Lemma 10 shows that $k_i \leq k^*$, which we will use below.

Start with Equation (13):

$$\min_{h' \in V_i} \text{err}(h', L_i) \leq \gamma_i + 2\sqrt{\gamma_i \sigma_{k_i}(l_i, \delta_{i, k_i})} + 3\sigma_{k_i}(l_i, \delta_{i, k_i}).$$

Since $k_i \leq k^*$, $\sigma_{k_i}(l_i, \delta_{i, k_i}) \leq \sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i, k^*})$.

From the definition of γ_i (Equation (12)), taking $k = k^* \geq k_i$, $h = h^* \in H_{k^*}$,

$$\gamma_i \leq \text{err}(h^*, L_i) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, L_i)\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i, k^*})} + 3\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i, k^*}).$$

Plugging the latter into the former and using σ as a shorthand for $\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i, k^*})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{h' \in V_i} \text{err}(h', L_i) &\leq \text{err}(h^*, L_i) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, L_i)\sigma} + 3\sigma + 2\sqrt{(\text{err}(h^*, L_i) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, L_i)\sigma} + 3\sigma)\sigma} + 3\sigma \\ &\leq \text{err}(h^*, L_i) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, L_i)\sigma} + 6\sigma + 2(\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, L_i)\sigma} + \sqrt{3}\sigma) \\ &\leq \text{err}(h^*, L_i) + 4\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, L_i)\sigma} + 10\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Fix any $h \in V_i$. By construction,

$$\text{err}(h, L_i) \leq \min_{h' \in V_i} \text{err}(h', L_i) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h', L_i)\sigma_{k_i}(l_i, \delta_{i, k_i})} + 3\sigma_{k_i}(l_i, \delta_{i, k_i}).$$

Plugging the former into the latter (recalling that $\sigma_{k_i}(l_i, \delta_{i, k_i}) \leq \sigma$) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{err}(h, L_i) - \text{err}(h^*, L_i) &\leq 4\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, L_i)\sigma} + 10\sigma + 2(\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, L_i)\sigma} + \sqrt{10}\sigma) + 3\sigma \\ &\leq 6\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, L_i)\sigma} + 20\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Combined with Equation (10), we have,

$$\text{err}(h, L_i^D) - \text{err}(h^*, L_i^D) \leq 6\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, L_i)\sigma} + 20\sigma.$$

Since $\text{err}(h^*, L_i) \leq \text{err}(h^*, L_i^D)$,

$$\text{err}(h, L_i^D) - \text{err}(h^*, L_i^D) \leq 6\sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, L_i^D)\sigma} + 20\sigma.$$

From the definition of E_i ,

$$\text{err}(h^*, L_i^D) \leq \nu + \sqrt{\nu\sigma} + \sigma.$$

$$\text{err}(h) \leq \text{err}(h, L_i^D) + \sqrt{\text{err}(h, L_i^D)\sigma} + \sigma.$$

Plugging in and simplifying algebraically gives

$$\text{err}(h) \leq \nu + 8\sqrt{\nu\sigma} + 35\sigma.$$

Now, if $i \in \Gamma$, the dataset L_i has favorable bias from lemma 11; if $i \notin \Gamma$ and $i+1 \in \Gamma$, the final value of L_i equals some L_j for some $j \in \Gamma$, therefore also has favorable bias.

Meanwhile, if $i \in \Gamma$, Algorithm 2 fails $\text{ERROR-CHECK}(V_i, L_i, \delta_i)$ for $k = k_i$. If $i \notin \Gamma$ and $i+1 \in \Gamma$, then $i+1$ is the start of some verified iteration, i.e. $i+1 = i_k^0$ for some k . Hence the final value of V_i also fails $\text{ERROR-CHECK}(V_i, L_i, \delta_i)$ for $k = k_i$. In both cases, Equation (13) holds.

Therefore, if $i \in \Gamma$ or $i+1 \in \Gamma$, then Equation (14) holds for every h in V_i . \square

Lemma 9. For step i , suppose L_i has favorable bias, i.e. Equation (10) holds. Then for any k and any $h \in H_k$,

$$\text{err}(h^*, L_i) - \text{err}(h, L_i) \leq 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h, L_i)\sigma_{\bar{k}}(l_i, \delta_{i,\bar{k}})} + 3\sigma_{\bar{k}}(l_i, \delta_{i,\bar{k}}),$$

where $\bar{k} = \max(k^*, k)$. Specifically:

1. for any $h \in H_{k^*}$,

$$\text{err}(h^*, L_i) - \text{err}(h, L_i) \leq 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h, L_i)\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + 3\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i,k^*}), \quad (15)$$

2. The empirical error of h^* on L_i can be bounded as follows:

$$\text{err}(h^*, L_i) \leq \gamma_i + 2\sqrt{\gamma_i\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + 3\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i,k^*}) \quad (16)$$

Proof. Fix any k and $h \in H_k$. Since $\bar{k} \geq k$, $\sigma_k(l_i, \delta_{i,k}) \leq \sigma_{\bar{k}}(l_i, \delta_{i,\bar{k}})$. Similarly, $\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i,k^*}) \leq \sigma_{\bar{k}}(l_i, \delta_{i,\bar{k}})$. Using the shorthand $\sigma := \sigma_{\bar{k}}(l_i, \delta_{i,\bar{k}})$ and noting that $h, h^* \in H_{\bar{k}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{err}(h^*, L_i) - \text{err}(h, L_i) &\leq \text{err}(h^*, L_i^D) - \text{err}(h, L_i^D) \\ &\leq \sqrt{d_{L_i^D}(h^*, h) \cdot \sigma} + \sigma \\ &\leq \sqrt{(\text{err}(h^*, L_i) + \text{err}(h, L_i)) \cdot \sigma} + \sigma. \\ &\leq \sqrt{\text{err}(h^*, L_i)\sigma} + \sqrt{\text{err}(h, L_i)\sigma} + \sigma. \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is from Equation (10), the second inequality is from the definition of E_i and the optimality of h^* , and the third inequality is from the triangle inequality. Letting $A = \text{err}(h^*, L_i)$, $B = \text{err}(h, L_i)$, and $C = B + \sqrt{B\sigma} + \sigma$, we can rewrite the above inequality as $A \leq C + \sqrt{A\sigma}$. Solving the resulting quadratic equation in terms of A , we have $A \leq C + \sigma + \sqrt{C\sigma}$, or

$$\begin{aligned} A &\leq B + \sqrt{B\sigma} + 2\sigma + \sqrt{\sigma(B + \sqrt{B\sigma} + \sigma)} \\ &\leq B + \sqrt{B\sigma} + 2\sigma + \sqrt{\sigma}(\sqrt{B} + \sqrt{\sigma}) \\ &\leq B + 2\sqrt{B\sigma} + 3\sigma, \end{aligned}$$

or

$$\text{err}(h^*, L_i) \leq \text{err}(h, L_i) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h, L_i)\sigma} + 3\sigma.$$

Specifically:

1. Taking $k = k^*$, we get that Equation (15) holds for any $h \in H_{k^*}$, establishing item 1.
2. Define

$$(\hat{k}_i, \hat{h}_i) := \arg \min_{k' \geq k^*, h \in H_{k'}} \left\{ \text{err}(h, L_i) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(h, L_i)\sigma_{k'}(l_i, \delta_{i,k'})} + 3\sigma_{k'}(l_i, \delta_{i,k'}) \right\}.$$

In this notation, $\gamma_i = \text{err}(\hat{h}_i, L_i) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(\hat{h}_i, L_i)\sigma_{\hat{k}_i}(l_i, \delta_{i,\hat{k}_i})} + 3\sigma_{\hat{k}_i}(l_i, \delta_{i,\hat{k}_i})$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_i + 2\sqrt{\gamma_i\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i,k^*})} + 3\sigma_{k^*}(l_i, \delta_{i,k^*}) &\geq \text{err}(\hat{h}_i, L_i) + 2\sqrt{\text{err}(\hat{h}_i, L_i)\sigma_{\bar{k}}(l_i, \delta_{i,\bar{k}})} + 3\sigma_{\bar{k}}(l_i, \delta_{i,\bar{k}}) \\ &\geq \text{err}(h^*, L_i), \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{k} = \max(k^*, \hat{k}_i)$ and the last inequality comes from applying Lemma 9 for $h' = \hat{h}_i \in H_{\hat{k}_i}$ and \bar{k} . This establishes Equation (16), proving item 2. \square

Lemma 10. *At any step of AA-LARCH, $k \leq k^*$. Consequently, for every i , $i \leq l_i + k^*N$.*

Proof. We prove the lemma in two steps.

1. Notice that there are two places where k is incremented in AA-LARCH, line 6 and line 17. If $k < k^*$, neither line would increment it beyond k^* as $h^* \in H_{k^*}$ and h^* is consistent with S . If $k = k^*$, Claim 4 below shows that k will stay at k^* . This proves the first part of the claim.
2. An iteration becomes unverified only if k gets incremented, and Algorithm 2 maintains the invariant that $k_i \leq k^*$. Thus, the number of unverified iterations is at most k^* . In addition, each newly sampled set is of size at most N . So the number of unverified examples is at most k^*N .

Hence, i —the total number of examples processed up to step i —equals the sum of the number of verified examples l_i , plus the number of unverified examples, which is at most k^*N . This proves the second part of the claim. \square

We show a technical claim used in the proof of Lemma 10 which guarantees that, on event E , when k has reached k^* , it will remain k^* from then on. Recall that k_i is defined as the final value of k at the end of step i ; $i_k^0 = \min\{i : k_i \geq k\}$ is the step at the end of which the working hypothesis space reaches level $\geq k$.

Claim 4. *If $i_{k^*}^0$ is finite, then the following hold for all $i \geq i_{k^*}^0$:*

(C1) L_i has favorable bias.

(C2) Step i terminates with $k_i = k^*$.

(C3) $h^* \in V_i$.

Above, L_i and V_i denote their final values in AA-LARCH.

Proof. By induction on i .

Base Case. Let $i = i_{k^*}^0$. Consider the execution of AA-LARCH at the start of step $i_{k^*}^0$ (line 11). Since by definition of i_k , the final value of k at step $i_{k^*}^0 - 1$ is $< k^*$, at step $i_{k^*}^0$, line 5 or line 16 is triggered. Hence the dataset $L_{i_{k^*}^0}$ equals some verified labeled dataset L stored by AA-LARCH, i.e. L_j for some $j \in \Gamma$. Thus, applying Lemma 11, Claim C1 holds.

We focus on the moment in step $i = i_{k^*}^0$ when k increases to k^* in UPGRADE-VERSION-SPACE(line 6 or 17). Now consider the temporary $V_{i_{k^*}^0}$ computed in the next line (PRUNE-VERSION-SPACE). Item 2 of Lemma 9 implies that the version space $V_{i_{k^*}^0}$ is such that $\text{ERROR-CHECK}(V_{i_{k^*}^0}, L_{i_{k^*}^0}, \delta_{i_{k^*}^0})$ returns false. Therefore the final value of k in step $i_{k^*}^0$ is exactly k^* . Claim C2 follows.

Claim C2 implies the temporary $V_{i_{k^*}^0}$ is final. Item 1 of Lemma 9 implies that $h^* \in V_{i_{k^*}^0}$, establishing Claim C3.

Inductive Case. Now consider $i \geq i_{k^*}^0 + 1$. The inductive hypothesis says that Claims C1–3 hold for step $i - 1$.

Claim C1 follows from Claim C3 in step $i - 1$. Indeed, the newly added x_i either comes from the agreement region of V_{i-1} , in which case label y_i agrees with $h^*(x_i)$, or is from the disagreement region of V_{i-1} , in which case the inferred label y_i is queried from LABEL. Following the same reasoning as the proof of Lemma 11, Claim C1 is true.

Claims C2 and C3 follows the same reasoning as the proof for the base case. \square

Lemma 11. *If i is in Γ , then L_i has favorable bias. That is, for any hypothesis h ,*

$$\text{err}(h, L_i^D) - \text{err}(h^*, L_i^D) \leq \text{err}(h, L_i) - \text{err}(h^*, L_i).$$

Proof. We can split L_i^D into two subsets, the subset where L_i^D agrees with L_i and the subset $Q_i^D = \{(x, y) \in L_i^D : h^*(x) \neq y\}$ where L_i^D disagrees with L_i . On the former subset, L_i^D is identical to L_i , thus we just need to show that

$$\text{err}(h, Q_i^D) - \text{err}(h^*, Q_i^D) \leq \text{err}(h, Q_i) - \text{err}(h^*, Q_i),$$

where $Q_i = \{(x, y) : (x, -y) \in Q_i^D\}$. Since $\text{err}(h^*, Q_i^D) = 1$ and $\text{err}(h^*, Q_i) = 0$, this reduces to showing that $\text{err}(h, Q_i^D) \leq 1 + \text{err}(h, Q_i)$, which is easily seen to hold for any h as $\text{err}(h, Q_i^D) \leq 1$ and $\text{err}(h, Q_i) \geq 0$. \square