

Divide and Conquer Local Average Regression

Xiangyu Chang¹, Shaobo Lin^{2*} and Yao Wang³

¹*Center of Data Science and Information Quality, School of Management, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, China*

²*Department of Statistics, College of Mathematics and Information Science, Wenzhou University, Wenzhou, China*

³*Department of Statistics, School of Mathematics and Statistics, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, China*

This Version: March 3, 2022

Abstract

The divide and conquer strategy, which breaks a massive data set into a series of manageable data blocks, and then combines the independent results of data blocks to obtain a final decision, has been recognized as a state-of-the-art method to overcome challenges of massive data analysis. In this paper, we merge the divide and conquer strategy with local average regression methods to infer the regressive relationship of input-output pairs from a massive data set. After theoretically analyzing the pros and cons, we find that although the divide and conquer local average regression can reach the optimal learning rate, the restriction to the number of data blocks is a bit strong, which makes it only feasible for small number of data blocks. We then propose two variants to lessen (or remove) this restriction. Our results show that these variants can achieve the optimal learning rate with much milder restriction (or without such restriction). Extensive experimental studies are carried out to verify our theoretical assertions.

KEY WORDS: Divide and Conquer Strategy, Local Average Regression, Nadaraya-Watson Estimate, k Nearest Neighbor Estimate

^{**}Correspondence Author: sblin1983@gmail.com

1 Introduction

Rapid expansion of capacity in the automatic data generation and acquisition has made a profound impact on statistics and machine learning, as it brings data in unprecedented size and complexity. These data are generally called as the “massive data” or “big data” (Wu et al., 2014). Massive data bring new opportunities of discovering subtle population patterns and heterogeneities which are believed to embody rich values and impossible to be found in relatively small data sets. It, however, simultaneously leads to a series of challenges such as the storage bottleneck, efficient computation, etc. (Zhou et al., 2014).

To attack the aforementioned challenges, a divide and conquer strategy was suggested and widely used in statistics and machine learning communities (Li et al., 2013; Mcdonald et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2013, 2015; Dwork and Smith, 2009; Battey et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2015). This approach firstly distributes a massive data set into m data blocks, then runs a specified learning algorithm on each data block independently to get a *local estimate* $\hat{f}_j, j = 1, \dots, m$ and at last transmits m local estimates into one machine to synthesize a *global estimate* \bar{f} , which is expected to model the structure of original massive dataset. A practical and exclusive synthesizing method is the *average mixture* (AVM) (Li et al., 2013; Mcdonald et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2013, 2015; Dwork and Smith, 2009; Battey et al., 2015), i.e., $\bar{f} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{f}_j$.

In practice, the above divide and conquer strategy has many applicable scenarios. We show the following three situations as motivated examples. The first one is using limited primary memory to handle a massive data set. In this situation, the divide and conquer strategy is employed as a two-stage procedure. In the first stage, it reads the whole data set sequentially block by block, each having a manageable sample size for

the limited primary memory, and derives a local estimate based on each block. In the second stage, it averages local estimates to build up a global estimate (Li et al., 2013). The second motivated example is using distributed data management systems to tackle massive data. In this situation, distributed data management systems (e.g., Hadoop) are designed by the divide and conquer strategy. They can load the whole data set into the systems and tackle computational tasks separably and automatically. Guha et al. (2012) has developed an integrated programming environment of R and Hadoop (called RHIPE) for expedient and efficient statistical computing. The third motivated example is the massive data privacy. In this situation, it divides a massive data set into several small pieces and combining the estimates derived from these pieces for keeping the data privacy (Dwork and Smith, 2009).

For nonparametric regression, the aforementioned divide and conquer strategy has been shown to be efficient and feasible for global modeling methods such as the kernel ridge regression (Zhang et al., 2015) and conditional maximum entropy model (McDonald et al., 2009). Compared with the global modeling methods, local average regression (LAR) (Györfi et al., 2002; Fan, 2000; Tsybakov, 2008), such as the Nadaraya-Watson kernel (NWK) and k nearest neighbor (KNN) estimates, benefits in computation and therefore, is also widely used in image processing (Takeda et al., 2007), power prediction (Kramer et al., 2010), recommendation system (Biau et al., 2010) and financial engineering (Kato, 2012). LAR is by definition a learning scheme that averages outputs whose corresponding inputs satisfy certain localization assumptions. To tackle massive data regression problems, we combine the divide and conquer approach with LAR to produce a new learning scheme, average mixture local average regression (AVM-LAR), just as Zhang et al. (2015) did for kernel ridge regression.

Our first purpose is to analyze the performance of AVM-LAR. After providing the

optimal learning rate of LAR, we show that AVM-LAR can also achieve this rate, provided the number of data blocks, m , is relatively small. We also prove that the restriction concerning m cannot be essentially improved. In a word, we provide both the optimal learning rate and the essential restriction concerning m to guarantee the optimal rate of AVM-LAR. It should be highlighted that this essential restriction is a bit strong and makes AVM-LAR feasible only for small m . Therefore, compared with LAR, AVM-LAR does not bring the essential improvement, since we must pay much attention to determine an appropriate m .

Our second purpose is to pursue other divide and conquer strategies to equip LAR efficiently. In particular, we provide two concrete variants of AVM-LAR in this paper. The first variant is motivated by the distinction between KNN and NWK. In our experiments, we note that the range of m to guarantee the optimal learning rate of AVM-KNN is much larger than AVM-NWK. Recalling that the localization parameter of KNN depends on data, while it doesn't hold for NWK, we propose a variant of AVM-LAR such that localization parameters of each data block depend on data. We establish the optimal learning rate of this variant with mild restriction to m and verify its feasibility by numerical simulations. The second variant is based on the definitions of AVM and LAR. It follows from the definition of LAR that the predicted value of a new input depends on samples near the input. If there are not such samples in a specified data block, then this data block doesn't affect the prediction of LAR. However, AVM averages local estimates directly, neglecting the concrete value of a specified local estimate, which may lead to an inaccurate prediction. Based on this observation, we propose another variant of AVM-LAR by distinguishing whether a specified data block affects the prediction. We provide the optimal learning rate of this variant without any restriction to m and also present the experimental verifications.

To complete the above missions, the rest of paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present optimal learning rates of LAR and AVM-LAR and analyze the pros and cons of AVM-LAR. In Section 3, we propose two new modified AVM-LARs to improve the performance of AVM-LAR. A set of simulation studies to support the correctness of our assertions are given in Section 4. In Section 5, we detailedly justify all the theorems. In Section 6, we present the conclusion and some useful remarks.

2 Divide and Conquer Local Average Regression

In this section, after introducing some basic concepts of LAR, we present a baseline of our analysis, where an optimal minimax learning rate of LAR is derived. Then, we deduce the learning rate of AVM-LAR and analyze its pros and cons.

2.1 Local Average Regression

Let $D = \{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ be the data set where $X_i \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a covariant and $Y_i \in [-M, M]$ is the real-valued response. We always assume \mathcal{X} is a compact set. Suppose that samples are drawn independently and identically according to an unknown joint distribution ρ over $\mathcal{X} \times [-M, M]$. Then the main aim of nonparametric regression is to construct a function $\hat{f} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [-M, M]$ that can describe future responses based on new inputs. The quality of the estimate \hat{f} is measured in terms of the *mean-squared prediction error* $\mathbf{E}\{\hat{f}(X) - Y\}^2$, which is minimized by the so-called *regression function* $f_\rho(x) = \mathbf{E}\{Y|X = x\}$.

LAR, as one of the most widely used nonparametric regression approaches, con-

constructs an estimate formed as

$$f_{D,h}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}(x) Y_i, \quad (2.1)$$

where the localization weight W_{h,X_i} satisfies $W_{h,X_i}(x) > 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}(x) = 1$. Here, $h > 0$ is the so-called localization parameter. Generally speaking, $W_{h,X_i}(x)$ is “small” if X_i is “far” from x . Two widely used examples of LAR are Nadaraya-Watson kernel (NWK) and k nearest neighbor (KNN) estimates.

Example 1. (*NWK estimate*) Let $K : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a kernel function (Györfi et al., 2002), and $h > 0$ be its bandwidth. The NWK estimate is defined by

$$\hat{f}_h(x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N K\left(\frac{x-X_i}{h}\right) Y_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N K\left(\frac{x-X_i}{h}\right)}, \quad (2.2)$$

and therefore,

$$W_{h,X_i}(x) = \frac{K\left(\frac{x-X_i}{h}\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^N K\left(\frac{x-X_i}{h}\right)}.$$

It is worth noting that we use the convention $\frac{0}{0} = 0$ in the following. Two popular kernel functions are the naive kernel, $K(x) = I_{\{\|x\| \leq 1\}}$ and Gaussian kernel $K(x) = \exp(-\|x\|^2)$, where $I_{\{\|x\| \leq 1\}}$ is an indicator function with the feasible domain $\|x\| \leq 1$ and $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm.

Example 2. (*KNN estimate*) For $x \in \mathcal{X}$, let $\{(X_{(i)}(x), Y_{(i)}(x))\}_{i=1}^N$ be a permutation of $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ such that

$$\|x - X_{(1)}(x)\| \leq \dots \leq \|x - X_{(N)}(x)\|.$$

Then the KNN estimate is defined by

$$\hat{f}_k(x) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k Y_{(i)}(x). \quad (2.3)$$

According to (2.1), we have

$$W_{h,X_i}(x) = \begin{cases} 1/k, & \text{if } X_i \in \{X_{(1)}, \dots, X_{(k)}\}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here we denote the weight of KNN as W_{h,X_i} instead of W_{k,X_i} in order to unify the notation and h in KNN depends on the distribution of points and k .

2.2 Optimal Learning Rate of LAR

The weakly universal consistency and optimal learning rates of some specified LARs have been justified by Stone (1977, 1980, 1982) and summarized in the book Györfi et al. (2002). In particular, Györfi et al. (2002, Theorem 4.1) presented a sufficient condition to guarantee the weakly universal consistency of LAR. Györfi et al. (2002, Theorem 5.2, Theorem 6.2) deduced optimal learning rates of NWK and KNN. The aim of this subsection is to present some sufficient conditions to guarantee optimal learning rates of general LAR.

For $r, c_0 > 0$, let $\mathcal{F}^{c_0,r} = \{f|f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}, |f(x) - f(x')| \leq c_0 \|x - x'\|^r, \forall x, x' \in \mathcal{X}\}$. We suppose in this paper that $f_\rho \in \mathcal{F}^{c_0,r}$. This is a commonly accepted prior assumption of regression function which is employed in (Tsybakov, 2008; Györfi et al., 2002; Zhang et al., 2015). The following Theorem 1 is our first main result.

Theorem 1. *Let $f_{D,h}$ be defined by (2.1). Assume that:*

(A) there exists a positive number c_1 such that

$$\mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}^2(X) \right\} \leq \frac{c_1}{Nh^d};$$

(B) there exists a positive number c_2 such that

$$\mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}(X) I_{\{\|X-X_i\|>h\}} \right\} \leq \frac{c_2}{\sqrt{Nh^d}}.$$

If $h \sim N^{-1/(2r+d)}$, then there exist constants C_0 and C_1 depending only on d, r, c_0, c_1 and c_2 such that

$$C_0 N^{-2r/(2r+d)} \leq \sup_{f_\rho \in \mathcal{F}^{c_0, r}} \mathbf{E} \{ \|f_{D,h} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \} \leq C_1 N^{-2r/(2r+d)}. \quad (2.4)$$

Theorem 1 presents sufficient conditions of the localization weights to ensure the optimal learning rate of LAR. There are totally four constraints of the weights $W_{h,X_i}(\cdot)$. The first one is the averaging constraint $\sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}(x) = 1$, for all $X_i, x \in \mathcal{X}$. It essentially reflects the word “average” in LAR. The second one is the non-negative constraint. We regard it as a mild constraint as it holds for all the widely used LAR such as NWK and KNN. The third constraint is condition (A), which devotes to controlling the scope of the weights. It aims at avoiding the extreme case that there is a very large weight near 1 and others are almost 0. The last constraint is condition (B), which implies the localization property of LAR.

We should highlight that Theorem 1 is significantly important for our analysis. On the one hand, it is obvious that the AVM-LAR estimate (see Section 2.3) is also a new LAR estimate. Thus, Theorem 1 provides a theoretical tool to derive optimal learning rates of AVM-LAR. On the other hand, Theorem 1 also provides a sanity-check that

an efficient AVM-LAR estimate should possess the similar learning rate as (2.4).

2.3 AVM-LAR

The AVM-LAR estimate, which is a marriage of the classical AVM strategy (McDonald et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2013, 2015) and LAR, can be formulated in the following Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 AVM-LAR

Initialization: Let $D = \{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ be N samples, m be the number of data blocks, h be the bandwidth parameter.

Output: The global estimate \bar{f}_h .

Division: Randomly divide D into m data blocks D_1, D_2, \dots, D_m such that $D = \bigcup_{j=1}^m D_j$, $D_i \cap D_j = \emptyset, i \neq j$ and $|D_1| = \dots = |D_m| = n = N/m$.

Local processing: For $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, implement LAR for the data block D_j to get the j th *local estimate*

$$f_{j,h}(x) = \sum_{(X_i, Y_i) \in D_j} W_{X_i, h}(x) Y_i.$$

Synthesization: Transmit m *local estimates* $f_{j,h}$ to a machine, getting a *global estimate* defined by

$$\bar{f}_h = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m f_{j,h}. \quad (2.5)$$

In Theorem 2, we show that this simple generalization of LAR achieves the optimal learning rate with a rigorous condition concerning m . We also show that this condition is essential.

Theorem 2. Let \bar{f}_h be defined by (2.5) and h_{D_j} be the mesh norm of the data block D_j defined by $h_{D_j} := \max_{X \in \mathcal{X}} \min_{X_i \in D_j} \|X - X_i\|$. Suppose that

(C) for all D_1, \dots, D_m , there exists a positive number c_3 such that

$$\mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{(X_i, Y_i) \in D_j} W_{h, X_i}^2(X) \right\} \leq \frac{c_3}{nh^d};$$

(D) for all D_1, \dots, D_m , there holds almost surely

$$W_{X_i, h} I_{\{\|x - X_i\| > h\}} = 0.$$

If $h \sim N^{-1/(2r+d)}$, and the event $\{h_{D_j} \leq h \text{ for all } D_j\}$ holds, then there exists a constant C_2 depending only on d, r, M, c_0, c_3 and c_4 such that

$$C_0 N^{-2r/(2r+d)} \leq \sup_{f_\rho \in \mathcal{F}^{c_0, r}} \mathbf{E}\{\|\bar{f}_h - f_\rho\|_\rho^2\} \leq C_2 N^{-2r/(2r+d)}. \quad (2.6)$$

Otherwise, if the event $\{h_{D_j} \leq h \text{ for all } D_j\}$ dose not hold, then for arbitrary $h \geq \frac{1}{2}(n+2)^{-1/d}$, there exists a distribution ρ such that

$$\sup_{f_\rho \in \mathcal{F}^{c_0, r}} \mathbf{E}\{\|\bar{f}_h - f_\rho\|_\rho^2\} \geq \frac{M^2\{(2h)^{-d} - 2\}}{3n}. \quad (2.7)$$

The assertions in Theorem 2 can be divided into two parts. The first one is the positive assertion, which means that if some conditions of the weights and an extra constraint of the data blocks are imposed, then the AVM-LAR estimate (2.5) possesses the same learning rate as that in (2.4) by taking the same localization parameter h (ignoring constants). This means that the proposed divide and conquer operation in Algorithm 1 doesn't affect the learning rate under this circumstance. In fact, we can relax the restriction (D) for the bound (2.6) to the following condition (D*).

(D*) For all D_1, \dots, D_m , there exists a positive number c_4 such that

$$\mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{(X_i, Y_i) \in D_j} W_{h, X_i}(X) I_{\{\|X - X_i\| > h\}} \right\} \leq \frac{c_4}{\sqrt{N} h^d}.$$

To guarantee the optimal minimax learning rate of AVM-LAR, condition (C) is the same as condition (A) by noting that there are only n samples in each D_j . Moreover, condition (D*) is a bit stronger than condition (B) as there are totally n samples in D_j but the localization bound of it is $c_4/(\sqrt{N} h^d)$. However, we should point out that such a restriction is also mild, since in almost all widely used LAR, the localization bound either is 0 (see NWK with naive kernel, and KNN) or decreases exponentially (such as NWK with Gaussian kernel). All the above methods satisfy conditions (C) and (D*).

The negative assertion, however, shows that if the event $\{\text{there is a } D_j \text{ such that } h_{D_j} > h\}$ holds, then for any $h \geq \frac{1}{2}(n+2)^{-1/d}$, the learning rate of AVM-LAR isn't faster than $\frac{1}{nh^d}$. It follows from Theorem 1 that the best localization parameter to guarantee the optimal learning rate satisfies $h \sim N^{-1/(2r+d)}$. The condition $h \geq \frac{1}{2}(n+2)^{-1/d}$ implies that if the best parameter is selected, then m should satisfy $m \leq \mathcal{O}(N^{2r/(2r+d)})$. Under this condition, from (2.7), we have

$$\sup_{f_\rho \in \mathcal{F}^{c_0, r}} \mathbf{E}\{\|\bar{f}_h - f_\rho\|_\rho^2\} \geq \frac{C}{nh^d}.$$

This means, if we select $h \sim N^{-1/(2r+d)}$ and $m \leq \mathcal{O}(N^{2r/(2r+d)})$, then the learning rate of AVM-LAR is essentially slower than that in (2.4). If we select a smaller h , then the above inequality also yields the similar conclusion. If we select a larger h , however, the approximation error (see the proof of Theorem 1) is $\mathcal{O}(h^{2r})$ which can be larger than the learning rate in (2.4). In a word, if the event $\{h_{D_j} \leq h \text{ for all } D_j\}$ does not hold, then the AVM operation essentially degrades the optimal learning rate of LAR.

At last, we should discuss the probability of the event $\{h_{D_j} \leq h \text{ for all } D_j\}$. As $\mathbf{P}\{h_{D_j} \leq h \text{ for all } D_j\} = 1 - m\mathbf{P}\{h_{D_1} > h\}$, and it can be found in (Györfi et al., 2002, P.93-94) that $\mathbf{P}\{h_{D_1} > h\} \leq \frac{c}{nh^d}$, we have $\mathbf{P}\{h_{D_j} \leq h \text{ for all } D_j\} \geq 1 - \frac{m}{nh^d}$. When $h \sim (mn)^{-1/(2r+d)}$, we have

$$\mathbf{P}\{h_{D_j} \leq h \text{ for all } D_j\} \geq 1 - c' \frac{m^{(2r+2d)/(2r+d)}}{n^{2r/(2r+d)}}.$$

The above quantity is small when m is large, which means that the event $\{h_{D_j} \leq h \text{ for all } D_j\}$ has a significant chance to be broken down. By using the method in (Györfi et al., 2002, Problem 2.4), we can show that the above estimate for the confidence is essential in the sense that for the uniform distribution, the equality holds for some constant c' .

3 Modified AVM-LAR

As shown in Theorem 2, if $h_{D_j} \leq h$ does not hold for some D_j , then AVM-LAR cannot reach the optimal learning rate. In this section, we propose two variants of AVM-LAR such that they can achieve the optimal learning rate under mild conditions.

3.1 AVM-LAR with data-dependent parameters

The event $\{h_{D_j} \leq h \text{ for all } D_j\}$ essentially implies that for arbitrary x , there is at least one sample in the ball $B_h(x) := \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x - x'\| \leq h\}$. This condition holds for KNN as the parameter h in KNN changes with respect to samples. However, for NWK and other local average methods (e.g., partition estimation (Györfi et al., 2002)), such a condition usually fails. Motivated by KNN, it is natural to select a sample-dependent

localization h to ensure the event $\{h_{D_j} \leq h \text{ for all } D_j\}$. Therefore, we propose a variant of AVM-LAR with data-dependent parameters in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 AVM-LAR with data-dependent parameters

Initialization: Let $D = \{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ be N samples, m be the number of data blocks.

Output: The global estimate $\tilde{f}_{\tilde{h}}$.

Division: Randomly divide D into m data blocks D_1, D_2, \dots, D_m such that $D = \bigcup_{j=1}^m D_j$, $D_i \cap D_j = \emptyset, i \neq j$ and $|D_1| = \dots = |D_m| = n = N/m$. Compute the mesh norms h_{D_1}, \dots, h_{D_m} , and select $\tilde{h} \geq h_{D_j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, m$.

Local processing: For any $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, implement LAR with bandwidth parameter \tilde{h} for the data block D_j to get the j th *local estimate*

$$f_{j,\tilde{h}}(x) = \sum_{(X_i, Y_i) \in D_j} W_{X_i, \tilde{h}}(x) Y_i.$$

Synthesization: Transmit m *local estimates* $f_{j,\tilde{h}}$ to a machine, getting a *global estimate* defined by

$$\tilde{f}_{\tilde{h}} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m f_{j,\tilde{h}}. \quad (3.1)$$

Comparing with AVM-LAR in Algorithm 1, the only difference of Algorithm 2 is the division step, where we select the bandwidth parameter to be greater than all $h_{D_j}, j = 1, \dots, m$. The following Theorem 3 states the theoretical merit of AVM-LAR with data-dependent parameters.

Theorem 3. Let $r < d/2$, $\tilde{f}_{\tilde{h}}$ be defined by (3.1). Assume (C) and (D*) hold. Suppose

$$\tilde{h} = \max\{m^{-1/(2r+d)} \max_j \{h_{D_j}^{d/(2r+d)}\}, \max_j \{h_{D_j}\}\},$$

and $m \leq \left(\frac{c_0^{2(2r+d)} + 8d(c_3 + 2c_4^2)M^2}{4r(c_0^2 + 2)} \right)^{d/(2r)} N^{2r/(2r+d)}$, then there exists a constant C_3 depending only on c_0, c_3, c_4, r, d and M such that

$$C_0 N^{-2r/(2r+d)} \leq \sup_{f_\rho \in \mathcal{F}^{c_0, r}} \mathbf{E}\{\|\tilde{f}_{\tilde{h}} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2\} \leq C_3 N^{-2r/(2r+d)}. \quad (3.2)$$

Theorem 3 shows that if the localization parameter is selected elaborately, then AVM-LAR can achieve the optimal learning rate under mild conditions concerning m . It should be noted that there is an additional restriction to the smoothness degree, $r < d/2$. We highlight that this condition cannot be removed. In fact, without this condition, (3.2) may not hold for some marginal distribution ρ_X . For example, let $d = 1$, it can be deduced from (Györfi et al., 2002, Problem 6.1) that there exists a ρ_X such that (3.2) doesn't hold. However, if we don't aim at deriving a distribution free result, we can fix this condition by using the technique in (Györfi et al., 2002, Problem 6.7). Actually, for $d \leq 2r$, assume the marginal distribution ρ_X satisfies that there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, a nonnegative function g such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ satisfying $\rho_X(B_\varepsilon(x)) > g(x)\varepsilon^d$, and $\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{g^{2/d}(x)} d\rho_X < \infty$, then (3.2) holds for arbitrary r and d . It is obvious that the uniform distribution satisfies the above conditions.

Instead of imposing a restriction to h_{D_j} , Theorem 3 states that after using the data-dependent parameter \tilde{h} , AVM-LAR doesn't degrade the learning rate for a large range of m . We should illustrate that the derived bound of m cannot be improved further. Indeed, it can be found in our proof that the bias of AVM-LAR can be bounded by $C\mathbf{E}\{\tilde{h}^{2r}\}$. Under the conditions of Theorem 3, if $m \sim N^{(2r+\varepsilon)/(2r+d)}$, then for arbitrary D_j , there holds $\mathbf{E}\{h_{D_j}\} \leq Cn^{-1/d} = C(N/m)^{-1/d} \leq CN^{(d-\varepsilon)/(2r+d)}$. Thus, it is easy to check that $\mathbf{E}\{\tilde{h}^{2r}\} \leq CN^{(-2r+\varepsilon)/(2r+d)}$, which implies a learning rate slower than $N^{-2r/(2r+d)}$.

3.2 Qualified AVM-LAR

Algorithm 2 provided an intuitive way to improve the performance of AVM-LAR. However, Algorithm 2 increases the computational complexity of AVM-LAR, because we have to compute the mesh norm $h_{D_j}, j = 1, \dots, m$. A natural question is whether

we can avoid this procedure while maintaining the learning performance. The following Algorithm 3 provides a possible way to tackle this question.

Algorithm 3 Qualified AVM-LAR

Initialization: Let $D = \{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ be N samples, m be the number of data blocks, h be the bandwidth parameter.

Output: The global estimate \hat{f}_h .

Division: Randomly divide D into m data blocks, i.e. $D = \cup_{j=1}^m D_j$ with $D_j \cap D_k = \emptyset$ for $k \neq j$ and $|D_1| = \dots = |D_m| = n$.

Qualification: For a test input x , if there exists an $X_0^j \in D_j$ such that $|x - X_0^j| \leq h$, then we qualify D_j as an active data block for the *local estimate*. Rewrite all the active data blocks as T_1, \dots, T_{m_0} .

Local processing : For arbitrary data block T_j , $j = 1, \dots, m_0$, define

$$f_{j,h}(x) = \sum_{(X_i, Y_i) \in T_j} W_{X_i, h}(x) Y_i.$$

Synthesization: Transmit m_0 *local estimates* $f_{j,h}$ to a machine, getting a *global estimate* defined by

$$\hat{f}_h = \frac{1}{m_0} \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} f_{j,h}. \quad (3.3)$$

Comparing with Algorithms 1 and 2, the only difference of Algorithm 3 is the qualification step which essentially doesn't need extra computation. In fact, the qualification and local processing steps can be implemented simultaneously. It should be further mentioned that the qualification step actually eliminates the data blocks which have a chance to break down the event $\{h_{D_j} \leq h \text{ for all } D_j\}$. Although, this strategy may loss a part of information, we show that the qualified AVM-LAR can achieve the optimal learning rate without any restriction to m .

Theorem 4. Let \hat{f}_h be defined by (3.3). Assume (C) holds and

(E) for all D_1, \dots, D_m , there exists a positive number c_5 such that

$$\mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n |W_{h, X_i}(X)| I_{\{\|X - X_i\| > h\}} \right\} \leq \frac{c_5}{m \sqrt{nh^d}}.$$

If $h \sim N^{-1/(2r+d)}$, then there exists a constant C_4 depending only on c_0, c_1, c_3, c_5, r, d and M such that

$$C_0 N^{-2r/(2r+d)} \leq \sup_{f_\rho \in \mathcal{F}^{c_0, r}} \mathbf{E}\{\|\hat{f}_h - f_\rho\|_\rho^2\} \leq C_4 N^{-2r/(2r+d)}. \quad (3.4)$$

In Theorem 3, we declare that AVM-LAR with data-dependent parameter doesn't slow down the learning rate of LAR. However, the bound of m in Theorem 3 depends on the smoothness of the regression function, which is usually unknown in the real world applications. This makes m be a potential parameter in AVM-LAR with data-dependent parameter, as we do not know which m definitely works. However, Theorem 4 states that we can avoid this problem by introducing a qualification step. The theoretical price of such an improvement is only to use condition (E) to take place condition (D*). As shown above, all the widely used LARs such as the partition estimate, NWK with naive kernel, NWK with Gaussian kernel and KNN satisfy condition (E) (with a logarithmic term for NWK with Gaussian kernel).

4 Experiments

In this section, we report experimental studies on synthetic data sets to demonstrate the performances of AVM-LAR and its variants. We employ three criteria for the comparison purpose. The first criterion is the *global error* (GE) which is the mean square error of testing set when N samples are used as a training set. We use GE as a baseline that does not change with respect to m . The second criterion is the *local error* (LE) which is the mean square error of testing set when we use only one data block (n samples) as a training set. The third criterion is the *average error* (AE) which is the mean square error of AVM-LAR (including Algorithms 1, 2 and 3).

4.1 Simulation 1

We use a fixed total number of samples $N = 10,000$, but assume that the number of data blocks m (the data block size $n = N/m$) and dimensionality d are varied. The simulation results are based on the average values of 20 trails.

We generate data from the following regression models $y = g_j(x) + \varepsilon$, $j = 1, 2$, where ε is the Gaussian noise $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.1)$,

$$g_1(x) = \begin{cases} (1 - 2x)_+^3(1 + 6x), & 0 < x \leq 0.5 \\ 0 & x > 0.5 \end{cases}, \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$g_2(x) = \begin{cases} (1 - \|x\|_+^5)(1 + 5\|x\|) + \frac{1}{5}\|x\|^2, & 0 < \|x\| \leq 1, x \in \mathbb{R}^5 \\ \frac{1}{5}\|x\|^2 & \|x\| > 1 \end{cases}. \quad (4.2)$$

Wendland (2004) revealed that g_1 and g_2 are the so-called Wendland functions with the property $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{F}^{c_0, 1}$ and $g_1, g_2 \notin \mathcal{F}^{c_0, 2}$ for some absolute constant c_0 . The simulated N samples are drawn i.i.d. according to the uniform distribution on the (hyper-)cube $[0, 1]^d$. We also generate 1000 test samples (X'_i, Y'_i) with X'_i drawn i.i.d. according to the uniform distribution and $Y'_i = g_j(X'_i)$, $j = 1, 2$.

On the basis of above setting, we illustrate two simulation results. The first one is to compare the learning performance between Algorithm 1 and LAR. Both NWK and KNN are considered. The second one is to show how Algorithms 2 and 3 overcome Algorithm 1's weakness. Because Algorithms 1, 2 and 3 are the same for KNN, KNN is not considered in this part. The detailed implementation of NWK and KNN is specified as follows.

- NWK: In Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 3, for each $m \in \{5, 10, \dots, 350\}$, the band-

width parameter satisfies $h \sim N^{-\frac{1}{2r+d}}$ according to Theorem 2 and Theorem 4. In Algorithm 2, we set $\tilde{h} \sim \max\{m^{-1/(2r+d)} \max_j\{h_{D_j}^{d/(2r+d)}\}, \max_j\{h_{D_j}\}\}$ according to Theorem 3.

- KNN: According to Theorem 2, the parameter k is set to $k \sim \frac{N^{\frac{2r}{2r+d}}}{m}$. However, as $k \geq 1$, the range of m should satisfy $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, N^{\frac{2r}{2r+d}}\}$.

To present proper constants for the localization parameters (e.g., $h = cN^{-\frac{1}{2r+d}}$), we use the 5-fold cross-validation method in simulations. Based on these strategies, we obtain the simulation results in the following Figures 1, 2 and 3.

As shown in Figure 1, AEs are smaller than LEs, which means AVM-NWK outperforms NWK with only one data block. Furthermore, AEs of NWK are comparable with GEs when m is not too big and there exists an upper bound of the number of data blocks, m' , larger than which the curve of AE increases dramatically. Moreover, m' decreases when d increases.

Let us explain these above phenomena. If only one data block is utilized, then it follows from Theorem 1 that $\min_{j=1, \dots, m} \mathbf{E}\{\|f_{j,h} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2\} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{2r}{2r+d}})$, which is far larger than $\mathcal{O}(N^{-\frac{2r}{2r+d}})$ for AVM-NWK due to Theorem 2. Thus, AEs are smaller than LEs. Moreover, Theorem 2 implies that AEs are comparable with GE as long as the event $\{h_{D_j} \leq h \text{ for all } D_j, j = 1, \dots, m\}$ holds. To verify this assertion, we record the number of data blocks breaking down the condition $h_{D_j} \leq h$ for different m in the second row of Figure 1. It can be observed that the dramatically increasing time of the number of inactive data blocks and AEs are almost same. This result is extremely consistent with the negative part of Theorem 2. Because large d and m lead to a higher probability to break down the event $\{h_{D_j} \leq h \text{ for all } D_j, j = 1, \dots, m\}$. Thus m' decreases when d increases.




Figure 1: The first row shows AEs, LEs and GEs of NWK for different m . The second row shows the number of inactive machines which satisfy $h_{D_j} > h$. The vertical axis of the second row of Figure 1 is the number of inactive data blocks which break down the condition $h_{D_j} \leq h$.

Compared with AVM-NWK, AVM-KNN shows significant different results in Figure 2. In fact, there isn't a similar m' to guarantee comparable AEs and GE for AVM-KNN. The reason is KNN selects a data-dependent bandwidth h which makes the event $\{h_{D_j} \leq h \text{ for all } D_j, j = 1, \dots, m\}$ always holds. This result is extremely consistent with the positive part of Theorem 2. However, we find that AVM-KNN has a design deficiency. To be detailed, the range of m must be in $\{1, 2, \dots, N^{\frac{2r}{2r+d}}\}$ due to $k \geq 1$.

In Figure 3, AEs of Algorithms 1, 2 and 3 which are denoted by AE-A1, AE-A2 and




Figure 2: AEs, LEs and GEs of KNN for different m .

AE-A3. We can find that AE-A1, AE-A2 and AE-A3 have similar values which are comparable with GE when $m \leq m'$. The reason is that the small number of data blocks can guarantee the event $\{h_{D_j} \leq h \text{ for all } D_j, j = 1, \dots, m\}$. Under this circumstance, Theorems 2, 3 and 4 yield that all these estimates can reach optimal learning rates. As m increasing, the event $\{h_{D_j} > h \text{ for some } j\}$ inevitably happens, then Algorithm 1 fails according to the negative part of Theorem 2. At the same time, AE-A1 begins to increase dramatically. As Algorithms 2 and 3 are designed to avoid the weakness of Algorithm 1, the curves of AE-A2 and AE-A3 are always below that of AE-A1 when $m > m'$. Another interesting fact is that AE-A3 is smaller than AE-A2, although both of them all can achieve the same learning rate in theory.




Figure 3: AE-A1, AE-A2, AE-A3 and GE of the simulation. The curves of AE-A2 and AE-A3 are always below AE-A1's to illustrate the improved capability of modified AVM-LARs.

4.2 Simulation 2

We make use of the same simulation study which is conducted by Zhang et al. (2015) for comparing the learning performance of AVM-NWK (including Algorithms 1, 2 and 3) and the divide and conquer kernel ridge regression (DKRR for short).

We generate data from the regression model $y = g_3(x) + \epsilon$, where $g_3(x) = \min(x, 1 - x)$, the noise variable ϵ is normally distributed with mean 0 and variance $\sigma^2 = 1/5$, and $X_i, i = 1, \dots, N$ are simulated from a uniform distribution in $[0, 1]$ independently. In Zhang et al. (2015)'s simulation, DKRR used the kernel function $K(x, x') = 1 + \min\{x, x'\}$, and regularization parameter $\lambda = N^{-2/3}$ due to $g_3 \in \mathcal{F}^{c_0, 1}$ for some absolute constant c_0 . We also use $N = 10,000$ training samples, and 1,000 test samples. The parameter setting of Algorithms 1, 2 and 3 is the same as that in Simulation 1.




Figure 4: AEs of Algorithm 1, 2, 3 and DKRR.

In Figure 4, we plot AEs of Algorithms 1, 2, 3 and DKRR for $m \in \{2^3, 2^4, \dots, 2^{11}\}$. Figure 4 shows AEs of Algorithm 1, 2, 3 and DKRR are comparable when $m < 256$. As long as $m > 256$, AEs of Algorithm 1, 2 and DKRR increase dramatically. However, AEs of Algorithm 3 are stable. The reason is that, to keep the optimal learning rates, DKRR needs $m = \mathcal{O}(N^{1/3})$ (Zhang et al., 2015), and Algorithm 2 needs $m = \mathcal{O}(N^{2/3})$, while Algorithm 3 holds for all m .

4.3 3D Road Network Data

Building accurate 3D road networks is one of centrally important problems for *Advanced Driver Assistant Systems* (ADAS). Benefited from an accurate 3D road network, eco-routing, as an application of ADAS, can yield fuel cost savings 8-12% when compared with standard routing (Tavares et al., 2009). For this reason, obtaining an accurate 3D road networks plays an important role for ADAS (Kaul et al., 2013).

North Jutland (NJ), the northern part of Justland, Denmark, covers a region of

185km \times 130km. NJ contains a spatial road network with a total length of $1.17 \times 10^7 m$, whose 3D ployline representation is containing 414,363 points. Elevation values where extracted from a publicly available massive Laser Scan Point Clod for Denmark are added in the data set. Thus, the data set includes 4 attribute: *OSMID* which is the OpenStreetMap ID for each road segment or edge in the graph; *longitude and latitude* with Google format; *elevation* in meters. In practice, the acquired data set may include missing values. In this subsection, we try to use AVM-LAR based on Algorithms 1, 2 and 3 for rebuilding the missing elevation information on the points of 3D road networks via aerial laser scan data.

To this end, we randomly select 1000 samples as a test set (record time seed for the reproducible research). Using the other samples, we run AVM-NWK based on Algorithm 1, 2 and 3 to predict the missed elevation information in the test set. Here, the bandwidth $h = 0.13N^{-1/4}$ and $N = 413,363$. AE-A1, AE-A2, AE-A3 and GE for different $m \in \{2, 2^2, \dots, 2^{10}\}$ are recorded in Figure 5.




Figure 5: AE-A1, AE-A2, AE-A3 and GE of the 3D road network data.

We can find in Figure 5 that AEs of Algorithm 1 are larger than GE, which implies the weakness of AVM-NWK based on the negative part of Theorem 2. AE-A3 has almost same values with the GE for all m , however, AE-A2 possesses similar property only when $m \leq 32$. Then, for the 3D road network data set, Algorithm 3 is applicable to fix the missed elevation information for the data set.

5 Proofs

5.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Let $f_{\rho,h}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}(x) f_{\rho}(X_i)$. Then, it is obvious that $f_{\rho,h}(x) = \mathbf{E}^*\{f_{D,h}(x)\}$, where $\mathbf{E}^*\{\cdot\} = \mathbf{E}\{\cdot|X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$. Therefore, we can deduce

$$\mathbf{E}^*\{(f_{D,h}(x) - f_{\rho}(x))\} = \mathbf{E}^*\{(f_{D,h}(x) - f_{\rho,h}(x))^2\} + (f_{\rho,h}(x) - f_{\rho}(x))^2.$$

That is,

$$\mathbf{E}\{\|f_{D,h} - f_{\rho}\|_{\rho}^2\} = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{E}\{\mathbf{E}^*\{(f_{D,h}(X) - f_{\rho,h}(X))^2\}\} d\rho_X + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{E}\{(f_{\rho,h}(X) - f_{\rho}(X))^2\} d\rho_X.$$

The first and second terms are referred to the *sample error* and *approximation error*, respectively. To bound the sample error, noting $\mathbf{E}^*\{Y_i\} = f_{\rho}(X_i)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}^*\{(f_{D,h}(x) - f_{\rho,h}(x))^2\} &= \mathbf{E}^*\left\{\left(\sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}(x)(Y_i - f_{\rho}(X_i))\right)^2\right\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}^*\left\{\sum_{i=1}^N (W_{h,X_i}(x)(Y_i - f_{\rho}(X_i)))^2\right\} \leq 4M^2 \sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}^2(x). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we can use (A) to bound the sample error as

$$\mathbf{E}\{(f_{D,h}(X) - f_{\rho,h}(X))^2\} \leq 4M^2 \mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}^2(X) \right\} \leq \frac{4c_1 M^2}{Nh^d}.$$

Now, we turn to bound the approximation error. Let $B_h(x)$ be the l^2 ball with center x and radius h , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\{(f_{\rho,h}(X) - f_{\rho}(X))^2\} &= \mathbf{E} \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}(X) f_{\rho}(X_i) - f_{\rho}(X) \right)^2 \right\} \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}(X) (f_{\rho}(X_i) - f_{\rho}(X)) \right)^2 \right\} \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}(X) (f_{\rho}(X_i) - f_{\rho}(X)) \right)^2 I_{\{B_h(X) \cap D = \emptyset\}} \right\} \\ &+ \mathbf{E} \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}(X) (f_{\rho}(X_i) - f_{\rho}(X)) \right)^2 I_{\{B_h(X) \cap D \neq \emptyset\}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (Györfi et al., 2002, P.66) and $\sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}(X) = 1$ that

$$\mathbf{E} \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}(X) (f_{\rho}(X_i) - f_{\rho}(X)) \right)^2 I_{\{B_h(X) \cap D = \emptyset\}} \right\} \leq \frac{16M^2}{Nh^d}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E} \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^N W_{h,X_i}(X) (f_\rho(X_i) - f_\rho(X)) \right)^2 I_{\{B_h(X) \cap D \neq \emptyset\}} \right\} \\
& \leq \mathbf{E} \left\{ \left(\sum_{\|X_i - X\| \leq h} W_{h,X_i}(X) |f_\rho(X_i) - f_\rho(X)| \right)^2 I_{\{B_h(X) \cap D \neq \emptyset\}} \right\} \\
& + \mathbf{E} \left\{ \left(\sum_{\|X_i - X\| > h} W_{h,X_i}(X) |f_\rho(X_i) - f_\rho(X)| \right)^2 \right\} \\
& \leq c_0^2 h^{2r} + \frac{4c_2^2 M^2}{Nh^d},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is deduced by $f_\rho \in \mathcal{F}^{c_0, r}$, condition (B) and Jensen's inequality. Under this circumstance, we get

$$\mathbf{E}\{\|f_{D,h} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2\} \leq c_0^2 h^{2r} + \frac{4(c_1 + c_2^2 + 4)M^2}{Nh^d}.$$

If we set $h = \left(\frac{4(c_1 + c_2^2 + 4)M^2}{c_0^2 N} \right)^{-1/(2r+d)}$, then

$$\mathbf{E}\{\|f_{D,h} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2\} \leq c_0^{2d/(2r+d)} (4(c_1 + c_2^2 + 4)M^2)^{2r/(2r+d)} N^{-2r/(2r+d)}.$$

This together with (Györfi et al., 2002, Theorem 3.2) finishes the proof of Theorem 1.

□

5.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Since $\mathbf{E} \{ \|\bar{f}_h - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \} = \mathbf{E} \{ \|\bar{f}_h - \mathbf{E}\{\bar{f}_h\} + \mathbf{E}\{\bar{f}_h\} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \}$ and $\mathbf{E}\{\bar{f}_h\} = \mathbf{E}\{f_{j,h}\}$, $j = 1, \dots, m$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} \{ \|\bar{f}_h - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \} &= \frac{1}{m^2} \mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m (\|f_{j,h} - \mathbf{E}\{f_{j,h}\}\|_\rho^2 + \|\mathbf{E}\{f_{j,h}\} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2 \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k \neq j}^m \langle f_{j,h} - \mathbf{E}\{f_{j,h}\}, f_{k,h} - \mathbf{E}\{f_{k,h}\} \rangle_\rho \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{E} \{ \|f_{1,h} - \mathbf{E}\{f_{1,h}\}\|_\rho^2 \} + \|\mathbf{E}\{f_{1,h}\} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2}{m} \mathbf{E} \{ \|f_{1,h} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \} + 2 \|\mathbf{E}\{f_{1,h}\} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

As $h \geq h_{D_j}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m$, we obtain that $B_h(x) \cap D_j \neq \emptyset$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$. Then, using the same method as that in the proof of Theorem 1, (C) and (D*) yield that

$$\mathbf{E} \{ \|f_{1,h} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \} \leq c_0^2 h^{2r} + \frac{4(c_3 + c_4^2)M^2}{nh^d}.$$

Due to the Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\mathbf{E} \{ \|\bar{f}_h - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \} \leq \frac{2c_0^2 h^{2r}}{m} + \frac{8(c_3 + c_4^2)M^2}{mnh^d} + 2\mathbf{E} \{ \|\mathbf{E}^*\{f_{1,h}\} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \}.$$

Noting $B_h(X) \cap D_j \neq \emptyset$ almost surely, the same method as that in the proof of Theorem 1 together with (D) yields that

$$\mathbf{E} \{ \|\mathbf{E}^*\{f_{1,h}\} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \} \leq c_0^2 h^{2r} + \frac{8c_4^2 M^2}{mnh^d}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbf{E} \{ \|\bar{f}_h - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \} \leq \frac{16(c_3 + c_4^2)M^2}{mnh^d} + 3c_0^2 h^{2r}.$$

This finishes the proof of (2.6) by taking $h = \left(\frac{16(c_3+c_4^2)M^2}{3c_0^2nm} \right)^{-1/(2r+d)}$ into account.

Now, we turn to prove (2.7). According to (5.1), we have

$$\mathbf{E} \{ \|\bar{f}_h - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \} \geq \|\mathbf{E}\{f_{1,h}\} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left(\mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n W_{X_i,h}(X) f_\rho(X_i) - f_\rho(X) \right\} \right)^2 d\rho_X.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $h < h_{D_1}$. It then follows from the definition of the mesh norm that there exists $X \in \mathcal{X}$ which is not in $B_h(X_i)$, $X_i \in D_1$. Define the separation radius of a set of points $S = \{\zeta_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{X}$ via

$$q_S := \frac{1}{2} \min_{j \neq k} \|\zeta_j - \zeta_k\|.$$

The mesh ratio $\tau_S := \frac{h_S}{q_S} \geq 1$ provides a measure of how uniformly points in S are distributed on \mathcal{X} . If $\tau_S \leq 2$, we then call S as the quasi-uniform point set. Let $\Xi_l = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_l\}$ be $l = \lfloor (2h)^{-d} \rfloor$ quasi-uniform points (Wendland, 2004) in \mathcal{X} . That is $\tau_{\Xi_l} = \frac{h_{\Xi_l}}{q_{\Xi_l}} \leq 2$. Since $h_{\Xi_l} \geq l^{-1/d}$, we have $q_{\Xi_l} \geq \frac{1}{2l^{1/d}} \geq h$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \{ \|\bar{f}_h - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \} &= \|\mathbf{E}\{f_{1,h}\} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^l \int_{B_{q_{\Xi_l}}(\xi_k)} \left(\mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n W_{X_i,h}(X) f_\rho(X_i) - f_\rho(X) \right\} \right)^2 d\rho_X. \end{aligned}$$

If $f_\rho(x) = M$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \{ \|\bar{f}_h - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \} &\geq M^2 \sum_{k=1}^l \int_{B_{q_{\Xi_l}}(\xi_k)} \left(\mathbf{E} \left\{ I_{\{D_1 \cap B_{q_{\Xi_l}}(\xi_k) = \emptyset\}} \right\} \right)^2 d\rho_X \\ &\geq M^2 \sum_{k=1}^l \rho_X(B_{q_{\Xi_l}}(\xi_k)) \mathbf{P}\{D_1 \cap B_{q_{\Xi_l}}(\xi_k) = \emptyset\} \\ &= M^2 \sum_{k=1}^l \rho_X(B_{q_{\Xi_l}}(\xi_k)) (1 - \rho_X(B_{q_{\Xi_l}}(\xi_k)))^n. \end{aligned}$$

Since $h \geq \frac{1}{2}(n+2)^{-1/d}$, we can let ρ_X be the marginal distribution satisfying

$$\rho_X(B_{q_{\Xi_l}}(\xi_k)) = 1/n, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, l-1.$$

Then

$$\mathbf{E} \left\{ \|\bar{f}_h - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \right\} \geq M^2 \sum_{k=1}^{l-1} \frac{1}{n} (1 - 1/n)^n \geq \frac{M^2((2h)^{-d} - 2)}{3n}.$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 2. \square

5.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Without loss of generality, we assume $h_{D_1} = \max_j \{h_{D_j}\}$. It follows from (5.1) that

$$\mathbf{E} \left\{ \|\tilde{f}_{\tilde{h}} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \right\} \leq \frac{2}{m} \mathbf{E} \{ \|f_{1,\tilde{h}} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \} + 2 \|\mathbf{E} \{ f_{1,\tilde{h}} \} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2.$$

We first bound $\mathbf{E} \{ \|f_{1,\tilde{h}} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \}$. As $\tilde{h} \geq h_{D_1}$, the same method as that in the proof of Theorem 2 yields that

$$\mathbf{E} \{ \|f_{1,\tilde{h}} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \} \leq c_0^2 \mathbf{E} \{ \tilde{h}^{2r} \} + \mathbf{E} \left\{ \frac{4M^2(c_3 + c_4^2)}{n\tilde{h}^d} \right\}.$$

To bound $\|\mathbf{E} \{ f_{1,\tilde{h}} \} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2$, we use the same method as that in the proof of Theorem 2 again. As $\tilde{h} \geq m^{-1/(2r+d)} h_{D_1}^{d/(2r+d)}$, it is easy to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{E} \{ f_{1,\tilde{h}} \} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 &\leq \mathbf{E} \left\{ \|\mathbf{E}^* \{ f_{1,\tilde{h}} \} - f_\rho\|_\rho^2 \right\} \leq c_0^2 \mathbf{E} \{ \tilde{h}^{2r} \} + \mathbf{E} \left\{ \frac{8c_4^2 M^2}{mn\tilde{h}^d} \right\} \\ &\leq c_0^2 m^{-2r/(2r+d)} \mathbf{E} \{ h_{D_1}^{2rd/(2r+d)} \} + c_0^2 \mathbf{E} \{ h_{D_1}^{2r} \} \\ &\quad + 8c_4^2 M^2 (mn)^{-1} \mathbf{E} \{ m^{d/(2r+d)} h_{D_1}^{-d^2/(2r+d)} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}\{\|\tilde{f}_{\tilde{h}} - f_{\rho}\|_{\rho}^2\} &\leq c_0^2 m^{-2r/(2r+d)} \mathbf{E}\{h_{D_1}^{2rd/(2r+d)}\} + (c_0^2 + 2) \mathbf{E}\{h_{D_1}^{2r}\} \\ &\quad + 8(c_3 + 2c_4^2) M^2 (mn)^{-1} m^{d/(2r+d)} \mathbf{E}\{h_{D_1}^{-d^2/(2r+d)}\}.\end{aligned}$$

To bound $\mathbf{E}\{h_{D_1}^{2rd/(2r+d)}\}$, we note that for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$, there holds

$$\mathbf{P}\{h_{D_1} > \varepsilon\} = \mathbf{P}\{\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \min_{X_i \in D_1} \|x - X_i\| > \varepsilon\} \leq \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{E}\{(1 - \rho_X(B_{\varepsilon}(x)))^n\}.$$

Let t_1, \dots, t_l be the quasi-uniform points of \mathcal{X} . Then it follows from (Györfi et al., 2002, P.93) that $\mathbf{P}\{h_{D_1} > \varepsilon\} \leq \frac{1}{n\varepsilon^d}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}\{h_{D_1}^{2rd/(2r+d)}\} &= \int_0^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\{h_{D_1}^{2rd/(2r+d)} > \varepsilon\} d\varepsilon = \int_0^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\{h_{D_1} > \varepsilon^{(2r+d)/(2rd)}\} d\varepsilon \\ &\leq \int_0^{n^{-2r/(2r+d)}} 1 d\varepsilon + \int_{n^{-2r/(2r+d)}}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\{h_{D_1} > \varepsilon^{(2r+d)/(2rd)}\} d\varepsilon \\ &\leq n^{-2r/(2r+d)} + \frac{1}{n} \int_{n^{-2r/(2r+d)}}^{\infty} \varepsilon^{-(2r+d)/(2r)} d\varepsilon \leq \frac{2r+d}{d} n^{-2r/(2r+d)}.\end{aligned}$$

To bound $\mathbf{E}\{h_{D_1}^{2r}\}$, we can use the above method again and $r < d/2$ to derive $\mathbf{E}\{h_{D_1}^{2r}\} \leq 4rd^{-1}n^{-2r/d}$. To bound $\mathbf{E}\{h_{D_1}^{-d^2/(2r+d)}\}$, we use the fact $h_{D_1} \geq n^{-1/d}$ almost surely to obtain $\mathbf{E}\{h_{D_1}^{-d^2/(2r+d)}\} \leq n^{d/(2r+d)}$. Hence

$$\mathbf{E}\{\|\tilde{f}_{\tilde{h}} - f_{\rho}\|_{\rho}^2\} \leq \left(\frac{c_0^2(2r+d)}{d} + 8(c_3 + 2c_4^2)M^2 \right) N^{-2r/(2r+d)} + \frac{4r(c_0^2 + 2)}{d} n^{-2r/d}.$$

Since

$$m \leq \left(\frac{c_0^2(2r+d) + 8d(c_3 + 2c_4^2)M^2}{4r(c_0^2 + 2)} \right)^{d/(2r)} N^{2r/(2r+d)},$$

we have

$$\mathbf{E}\{\|\tilde{f}_h - f_\rho\|_\rho^2\} \leq 2 \left(\frac{c_0^2(2r+d)}{d} + 8(c_3 + 2c_4^2)M^2 \right) N^{-2r/(2r+d)}$$

which finishes the proof of (3.2). \square

5.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. From the definition, it follows that

$$\hat{f}_h(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{I_{\{B_h(x) \cap D_j \neq \emptyset\}}}{\sum_{j=1}^m I_{\{B_h(x) \cap D_j \neq \emptyset\}}} \sum_{(X_i^j, Y_i^j) \in D_j} W_{h, X_i^j}(x) Y_i^j.$$

We then use Theorem 1 to consider a new local estimate with

$$W_{h, X_i^j}^*(x) = \frac{I_{\{B_h(x) \cap D_j \neq \emptyset\}} W_{h, X_i^j}(x)}{\sum_{j=1}^m I_{\{B_h(x) \cap D_j \neq \emptyset\}}}.$$

We first prove (A) holds. To this end, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{(X_i^j, Y_i^j) \in D_j} (W_{h, X_i^j}^*(X))^2 \right\} &\leq \mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{(X_i^j, Y_i^j) \in D_j, X_i^j \in B_h(X)} (W_{h, X_i^j}^*(X))^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{(X_i^j, Y_i^j) \in D_j, X_i^j \notin B_h(X)} (W_{h, X_i^j}^*(X))^2 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we define $\sum_{\emptyset} = 0$. To bound the first term in the right part of the above inequality, it is easy to see that if $I_{\{X_i^j \in B_h(X)\}} = 1$, then $I_{\{B_h(X) \cap D_j \neq \emptyset\}} = 1$, vice versa.

Thus, it follows from (C) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{(X_i^j, Y_i^j) \in D_j, X_i^j \in B_h(X)} (W_{h, X_i^j}^*(X))^2 \right\} &= \frac{1}{m^2} \mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{(X_i^j, Y_i^j) \in D_j, X_i^j \in B_h(X)} (W_{h, X_i^j}(X))^2 \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{m} \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{(X_i^j, Y_i^j) \in D_j, X_i^j \in B_h(X)} (W_{h, X_i^j}(X))^2 \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{m} \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{(X_i^j, Y_i^j) \in D_j} (W_{h, X_i^j}(X))^2 \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{c_3}{Nh^d}
\end{aligned}$$

To bound the second term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{(X_i^j, Y_i^j) \in D_j, X_i^j \notin B_h(X)} (W_{h, X_i^j}^*(X))^2 \right\} \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{(X_i^j, Y_i^j) \in D_j, X_i^j \notin B_h(X)} \left(\frac{I_{\{B_h(X) \cap D_j \neq \emptyset\}} W_{h, X_i^j}(X)}{\sum_{j=1}^m I_{\{B_h(X) \cap D_j \neq \emptyset\}}} \right)^2 \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

At first, the same method as that in the proof of Theorem 1 yields that $\mathbf{E}\{B_h(X) \cap D = \emptyset\} \leq \frac{4}{Nh^d}$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{(X_i^j, Y_i^j) \in D_j, X_i^j \notin B_h(X)} \left(\frac{I_{\{B_h(X) \cap D_j \neq \emptyset\}} W_{h, X_i^j}(X)}{\sum_{j=1}^m I_{\{B_h(X) \cap D_j \neq \emptyset\}}} \right)^2 \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{4}{Nh^d} + m \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{(X_i^j, Y_i^j) \in D_j} \left(W_{h, X_i^j}(X) I_{\|X - X_i^j\| > h} \right) \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{4 + c_3 + c_5}{Nh^d}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we turn to prove (B) holds. This can be deduced directly by using the similar method as the last inequality and the condition (E). That is,

$$\mathbf{E} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{(X_i^j, Y_i^j) \in D_j} |W_{h, X_i^j}^*(X)| I_{\{\|X - X_i\| > h\}} \right\} \leq \frac{c_5}{\sqrt{N h^d}}.$$

Then Theorem 4 follows from Theorem 1. \square

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we combined the divide and conquer strategy with local average regression to provide a new method called average-mixture local average regression (AVM-LAR) to attack the massive data regression problems. We found that the estimate obtained by AVM-LAR can achieve the minimax learning rate under a strict restriction concerning m . We then proposed two variants of AVM-LAR to either lessen the restriction or remove it. Theoretical analysis and simulation studies confirmed our assertions.

We discuss here three interesting topics for future study. Firstly, LAR cannot handle the high-dimensional data due to the curse of dimensionality (Györfi et al., 2002; Fan, 2000). How to design variants of AVM-LAR to overcome this hurdle can be accommodated as a desirable research topic. Secondly, we have justified that applying the divide and conquer strategy on the LARs does not degenerate the order of learning rate under mild conditions. However, we did not show there is no loss in the constant factor. Discussing the constant factor of the optimal learning rate is an interesting project. Finally, equipping other nonparametric methods (e.g., Fan and Gijbels (1994); Györfi et al. (2002); Tsybakov (2008)) with the divide and conquer strategy can be

taken into consideration for massive data analysis. For example, Cheng and Shang (2015) have discussed that how to appropriately apply the divide and conquer strategy to the smoothing spline method.

References

- Battey, H., Fan, J., Liu, H., Lu, J., and Zhu, Z. (2015), “Distributed Estimation and Inference with Statistical Guarantees,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.05457*.
- Biau, G., Cadre, B., Rouviere, L., et al. (2010), “Statistical analysis of k-nearest neighbor collaborative recommendation,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 38, 1568–1592.
- Cheng, G. and Shang, Z. (2015), “Computational Limits of Divide-and-Conquer Method,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.09226*.
- Dwork, C. and Smith, A. (2009), “Differential privacy for statistics: What we know and what we want to learn,” *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality*, 1, 135–154.
- Fan, J. (2000), “Prospects of nonparametric modeling,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 95, 1296–1300.
- Fan, J. and Gijbels, I. (1994), “Censored regression: local linear approximations and their applications,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89, 560–570.
- Guha, S., Hafen, R., Rounds, J., Xia, J., Li, J., Xi, B., and Cleveland, W. S. (2012), “Large complex data: divide and recombine (d&r) with rhipe,” *Stat*, 1, 53–67.
- Györfi, L., Kohler, M., Krzyzak, A., and Walk, H. (2002), *A distribution-free theory of nonparametric regression*, Springer Science & Business Media.

- Kato, K. (2012), “Weighted Nadaraya–Watson estimation of conditional expected shortfall,” *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 10, 265–291.
- Kaul, M., Yang, B., and Jensen, C. S. (2013), “Building accurate 3d spatial networks to enable next generation intelligent transportation systems,” in *Mobile Data Management (MDM), 2013 IEEE 14th International Conference on*, IEEE, vol. 1, pp. 137–146.
- Kramer, O., Satzger, B., and Lässig, J. (2010), “Power prediction in smart grids with evolutionary local kernel regression,” in *Hybrid Artificial Intelligence Systems*, Springer, pp. 262–269.
- Li, R., Lin, D. K., and Li, B. (2013), “Statistical inference in massive data sets,” *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry*, 29, 399–409.
- Mcdonald, R., Mohri, M., Silberman, N., Walker, D., and Mann, G. S. (2009), “Efficient large-scale distributed training of conditional maximum entropy models,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 1231–1239.
- Stone, C. J. (1977), “Consistent nonparametric regression,” *The annals of statistics*, 595–620.
- (1980), “Optimal rates of convergence for nonparametric estimators,” *The annals of Statistics*, 1348–1360.
- (1982), “Optimal global rates of convergence for nonparametric regression,” *The annals of statistics*, 1040–1053.
- Takeda, H., Farsiu, S., and Milanfar, P. (2007), “Kernel regression for image processing and reconstruction,” *Image Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, 16, 349–366.

- Tavares, G., Zsigraiova, Z., Semiao, V., and Carvalho, M. d. G. (2009), “Optimisation of MSW collection routes for minimum fuel consumption using 3D GIS modelling,” *Waste Management*, 29, 1176–1185.
- Tsybakov, A. B. (2008), *Introduction to nonparametric estimation*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Wang, C., Chen, M.-H., Schifano, E., Wu, J., and Yan, J. (2015), “Statistical Methods and Computing for Big Data,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.07989*.
- Wendland, H. (2004), *Scattered data approximation*, vol. 17, Cambridge university press.
- Wu, X., Zhu, X., Wu, G.-Q., and Ding, W. (2014), “Data mining with big data,” *Knowledge and Data Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 26, 97–107.
- Zhang, Y., Duchi, J. C., and Wainwright, M. J. (2015), “Divide and conquer kernel ridge regression: A distributed algorithm with minimax optimal rates,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research, to appear*.
- Zhang, Y., Wainwright, M. J., and Duchi, J. C. (2013), “Communication-efficient algorithms for statistical optimization,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14, 3321–3363.
- Zhou, Z., Chawla, N., Jin, Y., and Williams, G. (2014), “Big Data Opportunities and Challenges: Discussions from Data Analytics Perspectives [Discussion Forum],” *Computational Intelligence Magazine, IEEE*, 9, 62–74.