

AdaBoost and robust one-bit compressed sensing

Geoffrey Chinot, Felix Kuchelmeister, Matthias Löffler and Sara van de Geer

Seminar for Statistics, Department of Mathematics, ETH Zürich, Switzerland,
Emails: geoffrey.chinot@stat.math.ethz.ch; felix.kuchelmeister@stat.math.ethz.ch;
matthias.loeffler@stat.math.ethz.ch; sara.vandeger@stat.math.ethz.ch

Abstract: This paper studies binary classification in robust one-bit compressed sensing with adversarial errors. It is assumed that the model is overparameterized and that the parameter of interest is effectively sparse. AdaBoost is considered, and, through its relation to the max- ℓ_1 -margin-classifier, risk bounds are derived. In particular, this provides an explanation why interpolating adversarial noise can be harmless for classification problems. Simulations illustrate the presented theory.

MSC2020 subject classifications: primary 62H30, secondary 94A12.

Keywords and phrases: AdaBoost, Overparameterization, classification, one-bit compressed sensing, sparsity.

1. Introduction

Classification is a fundamental statistical problem in data science, with applications ranging from genomics to character recognition. AdaBoost, proposed by Freund and Schapire [FS97] and further developed in [SS99], is a popular and successful algorithm from the machine learning literature to tackle such classification problems. It is based on building an additive model with coefficients $\hat{\beta}_T$ composed of simple classifiers such as regression trees and then using the binary classification rule $\text{sgn}(\langle \hat{\beta}_T, \cdot \rangle)$. At each iteration another simple classifier is added to the model, minimizing a weighted loss-function. Alternatively, AdaBoost can be viewed as a variant of mirror-gradient-descent for the exponential loss [Bre98, FHT00]. Empirically, it often achieves the best generalization performance when it is overparameterized and runs long after the training error equals zero [DC96].

However, a theoretical understanding of the generalization properties of AdaBoost, that explains this behaviour, is still missing. Early theoretical results on the generalization error of AdaBoost and other classification algorithms were based on margin-theory [BFLS98, KP02] and entropy bounds. In high-dimensional situations where the dimension of the features and number of base classifiers is larger than the number of observations n , these become meaningless. Another approach to explain the success of AdaBoost and other boosting algorithms is based on regularization through early stopping [Jia04, ZY05, Büh06]. However, by their nature these bounds can not explain generalization performance when the number of iterations grows large and the empirical training

error equals zero. In the population setting [Bre04] showed that the generalization risk of AdaBoost converges to the Bayes risk, but this does also not indicate any performance guarantees for finite data.

A more thorough understanding has developed through the lens of optimisation. Already in [FS97] it was shown that each iteration of AdaBoost decreases the training error. Moreover, in [Bre98, FHT00], a close connection to the exponential loss was pointed out and studied. Building on these results, [ROM01, ZY05, RZH04] discovered that overparameterized AdaBoost, when run long enough with vanishing learning rate ϵ , has ℓ_1 -margin converging to the max- ℓ_1 -margin. In particular, this means that given training data $(Y_i, X_i)_{i=1}^n$, where the Y_i are binary and the X_i are p -dimensional feature vectors, and where $\hat{\beta}_T$ denotes the output of AdaBoost with the canonical basis as simple classifiers, learning rate ϵ and run-time T , we have

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{Y_i \langle X_i, \hat{\beta}_T \rangle}{\|\hat{\beta}_T\|_1} \xrightarrow[\epsilon \rightarrow 0]{T \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\beta \neq 0} \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{Y_i \langle X_i, \beta \rangle}{\|\beta\|_1} =: \gamma, \quad (1)$$

provided that γ is positive. The above holds universally for boosting algorithms that are derived from exponential type loss functions and various possible adaptive step-sizes. For these, general non-asymptotic bounds have been developed in [MRS13, Tel13].

Any vector $\hat{\beta}$ that maximizes the right hand side in (1) is proportional to an output of

$$\hat{\beta} \in \arg \min \left\{ \|\beta\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} Y_i \langle X_i, \beta \rangle \geq 1 \right\}. \quad (2)$$

From the representation (2), it can be seen that, if $\hat{\beta}$ is well-defined, then $\hat{\beta}$ interpolates the data in the sense that $\langle X_i, \hat{\beta} \rangle$ and Y_i have matching signs for all i . Similarly, neural networks and random forests are typically massively overparameterized and trained until they interpolate the data. Empirically, it has been shown that this can lead to smaller test errors compared to algorithms with a smaller number of parameters [WOBM17, BHMM19]. Statistical learning theory based on empirical risk minimization techniques and entropy bounds can not explain these empirical findings and a mathematical understanding of this phenomenon has only began to form in recent years. The prevalent explanation so far is that, similar as in (1), these algorithms approximate max-margin solutions [Tel13, SHN⁺18, JT19]. As in (2), an algorithm that maximises a margin is equivalent to a minimum-norm-interpolator. It is then argued that this leads to implicit regularization and hence a good fit.

The study of minimum-norm interpolating algorithms has mainly been investigated in three settings so far. The first line of research has focused on a random matrix regime where the number of data points and parameters are proportional. Here precise asymptotic results can be obtained, see for instance [MRSY20, DKT20] for max- ℓ_2 -margin interpolation, [LS20] for max- ℓ_1 -margin interpolation and consequently AdaBoost, [MM19] for 2-layer-neural networks

in regression and [HMRT19] for minimum- ℓ_2 -norm linear regression. However, these results do not exploit possible low-dimensional structure such as sparsity and they also require a large enough, constant, noise-level, leading to inconsistent estimators.

Another line of work has focused on non-asymptotic results in an Euclidean setting with features that have a covariance matrix with decaying eigenvalues, see [MNS⁺20] for classification with support-vector machines (SVM) and [BLLT20, CL20] for linear regression. These results rely crucially on Euclidean geometry, which gives explicit formulas for the estimators under consideration, and also do not lead to improved convergence rates in the presence of low-dimensional intrinsic structure.

A third line of work originates in the compressed sensing literature. Here low-dimensional intrinsic structure and often small noise levels, including adversarial noise, are studied. Small noise might be a realistic assumption for many classification data sets from the machine learning literature. On data sets such as CIFAR-10 [FKMN21] or MNIST [WZZ⁺13] state of the art algorithms achieve test errors smaller than 0.5%, implying that the proportion of flipped labels in the full data set is also small. On the theoretical side, pioneering work by Wojtaszczyk [Woj10] has shown that minimum- ℓ_1 -norm interpolation, introduced by [CDS98] as *basis pursuit*, is robust to small, adversarial errors in sparse linear regression. This has recently been extended to other minimum-norm-solutions in linear regression [CLvdG20] and phase-retrieval [KKM20].

Sparsity enables to model the possibility that only few variables are sufficient to predict well and allows for easier model interpretation. In binary classification, a sparse model with adversarial errors can be described by having access to data $(Y_i, X_i)_{i=1}^n$, where the features X_i are i.i.d. standard Gaussian vectors in \mathbb{R}^p and where for $s > 0$ and an effectively s -sparse $\beta^* \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$, i.e. a vector β^* such that $\|\beta^*\|_2 = 1$ and $\|\beta^*\|_1 \leq \sqrt{s}$, and a set $\mathcal{O} \subset [n]$

$$Y_i = \begin{cases} \operatorname{sgn}(\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle) & i \notin \mathcal{O} \\ -\operatorname{sgn}(\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle) & i \in \mathcal{O}. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

The set \mathcal{O} contains the indices of the data that is labeled incorrectly. We do not impose any modelling assumptions on \mathcal{O} , \mathcal{O} may be random, deterministic or adversarially depend on all features X_i , but we impose that the proportion of flipped labels is small such that $|\mathcal{O}| = o(n)$. In the applied mathematics literature, this model is called *robust one-bit compressed sensing* and in learning theory *agnostic learning of (sparse) half-spaces*.

As far as we know, there are no theoretical results for estimators that necessarily interpolate in the model (3) when $\mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset$. In the noiseless case where $\mathcal{O} = \emptyset$, [PV12] have proposed and investigated an interpolating estimator, similarly defined as (2) with the minimum replaced by an average and an additional matching sign constraint. In particular, they showed that this estimator is able to consistently estimate the direction of β^* .

Subsequent work where the model (3) and variants of it were considered, has focused on regularized estimators in order to adapt to noise or to generalize the

required assumptions. First results for the model (3) were obtained by [PV13], where a convex program was proposed and investigated. If β^* is exactly s -sparse, i.e. it has at most s non-zero entries, the attainable convergence rates can be improved and faster performance guarantees were obtained by [JLBB13, ZYJ14, ABHZ16]. Further work investigated non-Gaussian measurements [ALPV14], active learning [ABHZ16, Zha18, ZSA20] and random shifts of $\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle$, called *dithering*, [KSW16, DM18].

In this paper, we consider the performance of AdaBoost in the overparameterized and small, adversarial, noise regime and assume additionally that β^* is effectively sparse. We leverage the relation in (1) between AdaBoost and the max- ℓ_1 -margin estimator (2) to analyze AdaBoost (as described below in Algorithm 1). In particular, we show that when the feature vectors X_i are i.i.d. Gaussian and $p^{1-\delta} > n$ for some $1 > \delta > 0$, then with high probability AdaBoost estimates the direction of β^* measured in Euclidean distance at rate

$$\left(\frac{(s + |\mathcal{O}|) \log(p) \log(n)^2}{n} \right)^{1/3}, \quad (4)$$

if at least $T = O(\log(p)^{4/3} n^{2/3} (s + |\mathcal{O}|)^{1/3})$ iterations of AdaBoost are performed.

This result is, as far as we know, the first non-asymptotic recovery result for overparameterized and data interpolating AdaBoost in a sparse and noisy setting. When the number of mislabeled data points is smaller than the effective sparsity s , AdaBoost behaves as if there was no noise and as long as $|\mathcal{O}| \log(p) \log(n)^2 = o(n)$, AdaBoost has error rate converging to zero.

Moreover, our main result also explains why interpolating data can perform well in the presence of adversarial noise, providing an explanation to the question raised in [ZBH⁺17].

Numerical experiments complement our theoretical results and indicate that in noisy situations the exponent of $1/3$ in the rate (4) might be optimal.

Compared to [LS20] we consider a completely different regime. In their setting sparsity can not be assumed and the noise level can neither be adversarial nor small. Hence, in [LS20] consistent estimation of the direction of β^* is impossible and the resulting generalization error is close to $1/2$ when p is large compared to n .

Notation

The Euclidean norm is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_2$ and induced by the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, $\|\cdot\|_1$ denotes the ℓ_1 -norm and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ the ℓ_∞ -norm for both vectors and matrices. B_1^p and B_2^p denote the unit ℓ_1 -ball and ℓ_2 -ball in \mathbb{R}^p , respectively. In addition, we write \mathcal{S}^{p-1} for the p -dimensional unit sphere. By c_1, c_2, \dots we denote generic, strictly positive constants. These may change from line to line. By $[p]$ we denote the enumeration $\{1, \dots, p\}$, by $\{e_j\}_{j \in [p]}$ the set of canonical basis vectors in \mathbb{R}^p and by X_i the i -th column of the matrix $X = [X_1, \dots, X_n]$ of feature vectors.

2. Main results

2.1. Model

We consider a binary classification model, which allows for adversarial flips. In particular, we assume that we have access to data $(Y_i, X_i)_{i=1}^n$. The X_i are assumed to be i.i.d. standard Gaussian vectors in \mathbb{R}^p and the Y_i are generated via

$$Y_i = \begin{cases} \operatorname{sgn}(\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle) & i \notin \mathcal{O} \\ -\operatorname{sgn}(\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle) & i \in \mathcal{O}. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

The set $\mathcal{O} \subset [n]$ is the set of the indices of the mislabeled data. We assume that the fraction of flipped labels is asymptotically vanishing, $|\mathcal{O}| = o(n)$, but that \mathcal{O} may be picked by an adversary and depend on the data. In particular, this includes parametric noise models such as logistic regression or additive Gaussian noise inside the sign-function above, as long as the variance of the noise decays to zero as n goes to infinity. Finally, we assume that $\beta^* \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$ is effectively s -sparse, that is $\|\beta^*\|_1 \leq \sqrt{s}$.

2.2. Recovery guarantees for AdaBoost

AdaBoost, proposed by Freund and Schapire [FS97], is an algorithm where an additive model for an unnormalized version of β^* is built by iteratively adding weak classifiers to the model. To facilitate our analysis, we assume that the features X_i are i.i.d. Gaussian and that the weak classifiers can be identified with the standard basis vectors in \mathbb{R}^p . We consider AdaBoost as described in Algorithm 1. The main difference to the original proposal by [FS97] consists of the choice of the step-size α_t , which is obtained by minimizing a quadratic upper bound for the loss-function at each step [Tel13].

Algorithm 1: AdaBoost for binary classification

Input: Binary data Y_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, features X_{ji} , $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, run-time T , learning rate ϵ

Output: Vector $\tilde{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$

1 Initialize $\tilde{\beta}_{0,i} = 0$ and rescale features $X = X/\|X\|_\infty$

2 For $t = 1, \dots, T$ repeat

- Update weights $w_{t,i} = \frac{\exp(-Y_i \langle X_i, \tilde{\beta}_{t-1} \rangle)}{\sum_{j=1}^n \exp(-Y_j \langle X_j, \tilde{\beta}_{t-1} \rangle)}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$
- Select coordinate: $v_t = \arg \max_{v \in \{e_j\}_{j=1}^p} |\sum_{i=1}^n w_{t,i} Y_i \langle X_i, v \rangle|$
- Compute adaptive stepsize $\alpha_t = \sum_{i=1}^n w_{t,i} Y_i \langle X_i, v_t \rangle$
- Update $\tilde{\beta}_t = \tilde{\beta}_{t-1} + \epsilon \alpha_t v_t$

3 Return $\tilde{\beta}_T$

Alternative to the interpretation by Freund and Schapire [FS97], AdaBoost can be viewed as a form of mirror gradient descent on the exponential loss-function [Bre98, FHT00]. It is thus natural to expect that it converges to the infimum of the loss-function and eventually interpolates the labels if possible. In fact, a stronger statement holds: As described in (1), AdaBoost with infinitesimally small learning rate and a growing number of iterations T converges to a ℓ_1 -margin solution [ROM01, ZY05, Tel13]. This holds even non-asymptotically [Tel13] for many variants of AdaBoost and includes both the exponential and logistic loss-function as well as various choices of adaptive stepsizes α_t , for instance logarithmic as originally proposed by [FS97], line search [SS99, ZY05] or quadratic as in Algorithm 1.

To present non-asymptotic results and to ensure that our theory can potentially be applied to other variants of AdaBoost, we introduce the following definition of an $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation of the margin: For $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$, we say that $\tilde{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ provides an $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation of the ℓ_1 -margin if

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{Y_i \langle X_i, \tilde{\beta} \rangle}{\|\tilde{\beta}\|_1} \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\gamma, \quad (6)$$

where we recall $\gamma := \max_{\beta \neq 0} \min_i Y_i \langle X_i, \beta \rangle / \|\beta\|_1$.

The following theorem shows that as long as $\tilde{\beta}$ provides an $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation of the ℓ_1 -margin and the margin is also neither too small nor too large, then $\tilde{\beta}$ is able to estimate the direction of β^* with convergence rates depending on the ℓ_1 -margin.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that $\log(p) \leq c_1 n$, that $\tilde{\beta}$ provides an $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation of the ℓ_1 -margin and that with probability at least $1 - t$ we have $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$ for some γ_0 , satisfying*

$$c_2 \left(\frac{\log(p)}{n} \right)^{1/2} \geq \frac{(1 - \varepsilon)^2 \gamma_0^2}{\log \left(\frac{(1 - \varepsilon)^2 \gamma_0^2 n}{\log(p)} \right)} \geq c_3 \frac{\log(p)}{n} \quad (7)$$

and

$$|\mathcal{O}| \leq c_4 \frac{\log(p) \log(n)^{2/3}}{\gamma_0^2 (1 - \varepsilon)^2}.$$

Then, with probability¹ at least $1 - p^{-c_5} - c_6/n - t$ we have that

$$\left\| \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{\|\tilde{\beta}\|_2} - \beta^* \right\|_2^2 \leq c_7 \left(\frac{\log(p) \log(n)^{2/3}}{(1 - \varepsilon)^2 \gamma_0^2 n} \right)^2. \quad (8)$$

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is involved. We renormalize $\tilde{\beta}$ such that $Y_i \langle X_i, \tilde{\beta} \rangle \geq 1$ for all i . Then, we use Maurey's empirical method [CGLP13] and show that

¹We present a simplified expression for the probability at the cost of a weaker statement. An explicit formula involving γ_0 can be obtained from the proof of Theorem 2.1.

any β that fulfills the constraint $Y_i \langle X_i, \beta \rangle \geq 1$ for all i must have ℓ_1/ℓ_2 -norm-ratio bounded in terms of the margin and $\log(p) \log(n)/n$. Finally, we apply the currently best available sparse hyperplane tessellation bound by [BL15], using the fact that for at most $|\mathcal{O}|$ data points the signs of $\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle$ and $\langle X_i, \tilde{\beta} \rangle$ differ. The $\log(n)^{2/3}$ -factor on the right-hand side in (8) is likely suboptimal and an artefact of our proof when using Maurey's empirical method.

The following lemma shows that AdaBoost, as described in Algorithm 1, provides an $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation of the ℓ_1 -margin, when it is run long enough. The proof is a simple adaptation of results by [Tel13] to our setting.

Lemma 2.1. *Consider the AdaBoost Algorithm 1. Suppose that $\gamma > 0$, $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon/3$ and $T > 2 \log(n) \|X\|_\infty^2 / (3\varepsilon^2 \gamma^2)$. Then, the output of Algorithm 1 provides an $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation of the ℓ_1 -margin.*

Hence, both for algorithmic as well as recovery guarantees, it is necessary to obtain a lower bound on the ℓ_1 -margin γ .

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that for a constant $0 < \delta < 1$ and another sufficiently large constant $c_1 > 0$ we have that $c_1 n \log(n) \leq p^{1-\delta}$ and $\log(p) \leq c_2 n$. Then, with probability at least $1 - c_3 n$*

$$\gamma \geq c_4 \left(\frac{\log(p)}{n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{s + |\mathcal{O}|}} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (9)$$

Crucial for the proof of Theorem 2.2 is the fact that, defining,

$$\hat{\beta} \in \arg \min \{ \|\beta\|_1 \text{ subject to } Y_i \langle X_i, \beta \rangle \geq 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n \}, \quad (10)$$

we have the relation $\gamma = 1/\|\hat{\beta}\|_1$ (see Lemma 5.1). Hence, to obtain a lower bound for γ it suffices to obtain an upper bound for $\|\hat{\beta}\|_1$, which we accomplish by explicitly constructing a β that fulfills the constraints in (10).

Combining Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 and Lemma 2.1 with a bound for the maximum of Gaussian random variables, we obtain a non-asymptotic recovery result for AdaBoost (as described in Algorithm 1).

Corollary 2.1. *Grant the assumptions of Theorem 2.2 and assume that $(s + |\mathcal{O}|) \log(p) \log(n)^2 \leq c_1 (1 - \varepsilon)^3 n$. Suppose that the AdaBoost Algorithm 1 is run for*

$$T \geq c_2 \log(p)^{4/3} n^{2/3} (s + |\mathcal{O}|)^{1/3} \varepsilon^{-2}$$

iterations with learning rate $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon/3$. Then, with probability at least $1 - n^{-c_3}$ we have that

$$\left\| \frac{\tilde{\beta}_T}{\|\tilde{\beta}_T\|_2} - \beta^* \right\|_2^2 \leq c_4 \left(\frac{(s + |\mathcal{O}|) \log(p) \log(n)^2}{(1 - \varepsilon)^3 n} \right)^{2/3}. \quad (11)$$

²As before, we present a simplified expression for the confidence probability.

Moreover, noting that Theorem 2.1 remains valid for $\varepsilon = 0$, Theorem 2.2 implies the same convergence rates as in (11) for the minimum- ℓ_1 -norm interpolator $\hat{\beta}$ defined in (10).

When $\mathcal{O} = \emptyset$ the performance guarantee in (11) is better than existing bounds for regularized algorithms [PV13, ZYJ14] and match, up to logarithmic factors, the best available bounds that can be obtained by combining the tessellation result by [BL15] with Plan and Vershynin's [PV12] linear programming estimator. Moreover, in the presence of adversarial errors, the convergence rate obtained in (11) improves over the rate for the regularized estimator by [PV13] if $(|\mathcal{O}| \log(p) \log(n)^2/n)^4 = o(s \log(p)/n)$ and otherwise their algorithm achieves faster convergence rates. If β^* is exactly s -sparse, i.e. at most s entries of β^* are non-zero, then the rate in (11) is suboptimal in the dependence on $s \log(p)/n$ and $|\mathcal{O}|/n$ and faster rates were obtained for a (non-interpolating) regularized estimator in [ABHZ16].

The recovery guarantee for $\tilde{\beta}_T$ in Corollary 2.1 immediately implies a generalization error bound, using Grothendieck's identity (e.g. Lemma 3.6.6. in [Ver18]) and equivalence, up to constants, of the Euclidean and geodesic distance on the sphere.

Corollary 2.2. *Under the conditions of Corollary 2.1 we have with probability at least $1 - n^{-c_1}$ that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\operatorname{sgn}(\langle X_{n+1}, \beta^* \rangle) \neq \operatorname{sgn}(\langle X_{n+1}, \tilde{\beta}_T \rangle) \mid \tilde{\beta}_T \right) &= \frac{\arccos \left(\left\langle \beta^*, \frac{\tilde{\beta}_T}{\|\tilde{\beta}_T\|_2} \right\rangle \right)}{\pi} \\ &\leq c_2 \left(\frac{(s + |\mathcal{O}|) \log(p) \log(n)^2}{(1 - \varepsilon)^3 n} \right)^{1/3}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we show that in the noiseless case, up to logarithmic factors, our lower bound for γ is, in general, sharp.

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose $p \geq c_1 n$ and $\mathcal{O} = \emptyset$. Then, for any $\beta^* \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$ which fulfills $\|\beta^*\|_\infty \|\beta^*\|_1 \leq c_2$, we have with probability at least $1 - 2 \log(p)^{-1}$*

$$\gamma \leq c_3 \left(\frac{\log(p)^3}{n} \frac{1}{\|\beta^*\|_1} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (12)$$

The proof of Proposition 2.1 follows by using the dual formulation of the margin and explicitly constructing a worst case weighting of the data, using upper bounds for the k -min of Gaussian random variables due to [GLSW06].

2.3. Simulations

In this subsection, we provide simulations to illustrate our theoretical results, in particular the growth of the margin (Theorem 2.2 and Proposition 2.1) and the Euclidean distance of AdaBoost to β^* (Corollary 2.1).

We generated β^* with a s -sparse Rademacher prior, i.e. we chose s entries of β^* at random, set them to $\pm 1/\sqrt{s}$ with equal probability and set the remaining entries of β^* to zero. The set \mathcal{O} was chosen adversarially such that it contains the indices of the $|\mathcal{O}|$ largest entries of $(|\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle|)_{i=1}^n$. We took $s = 5$. As for the choice of p , Theorem 2.2 requires that $c_1 n \log(n) \leq p^{1-\delta}$. Ignoring the $\log(n)$ factor to speed up computations (as it may be an artefact of our proof), we chose $p = 2n^{1.1}$. AdaBoost was executed as described in Algorithm 1, using $T = \lfloor 2 \log(p)^{4/3} n^{2/3} (s + |\mathcal{O}|)^{1/3} \epsilon^{-2} \rfloor$ iterations, following the assumption in Corollary 2.1. We performed the simulations over twenty iterations and report here the averaged values.

We compare our simulations with the theoretically predicted monomials. We multiplied these monomials with a constant factor, which was chosen to obtain the best fit to the empirical curves corresponding to the max-margin, to account for the constant factors in our results.




Fig 1: On the left we plot for $|\mathcal{O}| = 40$ against the number of samples n , and compare with the rate $(\log(p)/n)^{1/3}$. On the right, we show for $n = 500$ how the distances change as the percentage of randomly flipped labels $|\mathcal{O}|/n$ decreases, comparing with the rate $|\mathcal{O}|^{1/3}$. Here $\hat{\beta}$ is the max-margin estimator (2) and $\tilde{\beta}_T$ is an instance of AdaBoost as defined in Algorithm 1, with learning rate $\epsilon = 0.2$.




Fig 2: On the left we consider noiseless data with $|\mathcal{O}| = 0$ and compare with the faster rate $(\log(p)/n)^{1/2}$. Here $\hat{\beta}$ and $\tilde{\beta}_T$ are as in Figure 1. On the right, we plot for noiseless data the margin γ , as defined in (1), the ℓ_1 -margin of $\tilde{\beta}_T$, which we denote by $\tilde{\gamma}_T$, and the theoretical prediction $(\log(p)/n)^{1/3}$.

The two plots in Figure 1 show the noisy case. In particular, the left plot shows that the dependence on $\log(p)/n$ agrees with the theoretical rate predicted in Corollary 2.1. Likewise, the top-right plot shows an agreement with the rate $|\mathcal{O}|^{1/3}$ that was obtained in Corollary 2.1.

In the left plot of Figure 2, we observe in the noiseless case for fixed s a faster convergence rate of $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_2$, thus suggesting that the bound in Corollary 2.1 is not sharp for exactly sparse vectors and when $\mathcal{O} = \emptyset$. By contrast, in the bottom-right plot our simulations show for fixed s and $|\mathcal{O}| = 0$ an excellent match for the margin γ with the lower bound $c_1(\log(p)/n)^{1/3}$ predicted by Theorem 2.2.

3. Conclusion

In this paper we have shown that AdaBoost, as described in Algorithm 1, achieves consistent recovery in the presence of small, adversarial errors, despite being overparameterized and interpolating the observations. In addition, the derived convergence rates in Corollary 2.1 are comparable to convergence rates of state-of-the-art regularized estimators [PV13]. This is a first step for the understanding of overparameterized and interpolating AdaBoost and other interpolating algorithms and shows why such algorithms can generalize well in high-dimensional and noisy situations, despite interpolating the data.

However, in the presence of well-behaved noise, as in logistic regression, our bounds are suboptimal and require that the fraction of mislabeled data points decays to zero. By contrast, regularized estimators [PV13] are able to achieve faster convergence rates in such settings and do not require that the fraction of mislabeled data is asymptotically vanishing.

Many open questions do remain. First, it would be interesting to generalize Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 to other feature distributions than the isotropic Gaussian measure, for instance heavy-tailed features as in [DM18], sub-Gaussian features [ALPV14] or correlated Gaussian features [PV13]. The main difficulty to overcome is an extension of Lemma 6.1 to these cases. Moreover, while the convergence rate in Corollary 2.1 is among the best available results if β^* is allowed to be genuinely effectively sparse, it is not clear whether the exponent in (11) is optimal, and further research about information theoretic lower bounds is needed. When β^* is exactly sparse, the convergence rate in (11) is sub-optimal and better results in terms of the fraction of mislabeled data points and the sparsity have been obtained in [ABHZ16]. In particular, for noiseless data and exact sparse β^* our simulations suggest that AdaBoost attains a faster rate with exponent $1/2$ instead of $1/3$ whereas in the noisy case the exponent $1/3$ seems to be optimal. It is an interesting further research question how to show that AdaBoost attains faster convergence rates for noiseless data.

4. Proof of Theorem 2.1

We first present the two main propositions that will be used to establish Theorem 2.1. Their proofs are given in Sections 4.3 and in [BL15], respectively.

4.1. Key propositions

The following proposition allows to control the ratio $\|\beta\|_1/\|\beta\|_2$ for any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$, fulfilling $\min_{i=1,\dots,n} Y_i \langle X_i, \beta \rangle \geq 1$.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that r_n satisfies*

$$c_1 \left(\frac{n}{\log(p)} \right)^{1/2} \leq r_n^2 \log \left(\frac{n}{r_n^2 \log(p)} \right) \leq c_2 \frac{n}{\log(p)}.$$

In addition, suppose that $\beta \in r_n B_1^p$ and $Y_i \langle X_i, \beta \rangle \geq 1 \forall i = 1, \dots, n$. Set $v_n = r_n^2 \log(p)$. Then, with probability at least

$$1 - \exp(-c_3 v_n \log(n/v_n)) - 2 \exp\left(-c_3 (v_n \log(n/v_n))^2/n\right),$$

we have uniformly for β fulfilling the above

$$\frac{\|\beta\|_1}{\|\beta\|_2} \leq c_4 r_n^3 \frac{\log(p)}{n} \log \left(\frac{n}{r_n^2 \log(p)} \right).$$

The next proposition is a sparse hyperplane tessellation result from [BL15], which is obtained by applying their Theorem 1.5. with the set $(a_1 B_1^p \cap \mathcal{S}^{p-1}) \cup \{\beta^*\}$, noting that the η -covering number (in Euclidean distance) of $(a_1 B_1^p \cap \mathcal{S}^{p-1}) \cup \{\beta^*\}$ coincides up to an additive factor of at most one with the η -covering number of $a_1 B_1^p \cap \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$ and is thus by Lemma 3.4. in [PV12] bounded by $c_1 s \log(p)/\eta^2$.

Proposition 4.2 (Theorem 1.5. in [BL15]). *For $a > 0$ set*

$$\eta = \left(\frac{a^2 \log(p)}{n} \right)^{1/3}.$$

and assume $\eta \leq c_1$ for a small enough constant $c_1 > 0$. Then, with probability at least $1 - c_2/n$ we have

$$\inf_{\beta \in a B_1^p \cap \mathcal{S}^{p-1} \cap \{\|\beta - \beta^*\|_2 \geq \eta\}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(\text{sgn}(\langle X_i, \beta \rangle) \neq \text{sgn}(\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle)) \geq c_3 \eta.$$

4.2. Proof of Theorem 2.1

Proof. Recall that $\tilde{\beta}$ is an $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation of the ℓ_1 -margin, that is

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{Y_i \langle X_i, \tilde{\beta} \rangle}{\|\tilde{\beta}\|_1} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \gamma,$$

where with probability at least $1 - t$ we have $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$.

Define $\bar{\beta} = \tilde{\beta} / \left((1 - \varepsilon)\gamma_0 \|\tilde{\beta}\|_1 \right)$ and observe that $\|\bar{\beta}\|_1 = 1 / ((1 - \varepsilon)\gamma_0)$ and, by the above, with probability at least $1 - t$

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} Y_i \langle X_i, \bar{\beta} \rangle \geq 1.$$

Consequently, $\bar{\beta}$ satisfies the conditions of Proposition 4.1 with $r_n = ((1 - \varepsilon)\gamma_0)^{-1}$, noting in particular that by our assumptions in Theorem 2.1 the condition (7) is fulfilled. Hence, for $v_n = ((1 - \varepsilon)^2 \gamma_0^2)^{-1} \log(p)$ we have with probability at least $1 - \left(t + e^{-c_1 v_n \log(n/v_n)} + 2e^{-c_1 (v_n \log(n/v_n))^2/n} \right)$ that

$$\frac{\|\tilde{\beta}\|_1}{\|\tilde{\beta}\|_2} = \frac{\|\bar{\beta}\|_1}{\|\bar{\beta}\|_2} \leq c_2 \frac{\log(p) \log(n)}{(1 - \varepsilon)^3 \gamma_0^3 n}. \quad (13)$$

Since $\tilde{\beta}$ interpolates the data (because it has positive margin) and there are $|\mathcal{O}|$ mislabeled data points, we have by assumption on $|\mathcal{O}|$ that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1} \left(\text{sgn} \left(\langle X_i, \tilde{\beta} \rangle \right) \neq \text{sgn} \left(\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle \right) \right) = \frac{|\mathcal{O}|}{n} < \frac{c_3 \log(p) \log(n)^{2/3}}{(1 - \varepsilon)^2 \gamma_0^2 n}.$$

Hence, applying Proposition 4.2 with a given by the right-hand side in (13), arguing by contradiction, we obtain that with probability at least

$$1 - \left(t + e^{-c_1 v_n \log(n/v_n)} + 2e^{-c_1 (v_n \log(n/v_n))^2/n} + c_4/n \right) \geq 1 - t - p^{-c_5} - c_6/n$$

that

$$\left\| \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{\|\tilde{\beta}\|_2} - \beta^* \right\|_2^2 \leq c_7 \left(\frac{\log(p) \log(n)^{2/3}}{(1 - \varepsilon)^2 \gamma_0^2 n} \right)^2.$$

□

4.3. Proof of Proposition 4.1

Proof. Let $\beta \in r_n B_1^p$ be such that $Y_i \langle X_i, \beta \rangle \geq 1$ for every $i \in [n]$. We argue by contradiction. Hence, we assume that $\|\beta\|_1 \geq (r_n/\tau_n) \|\beta\|_2$ for some $\tau_n \geq 1$ to be defined later. Thus, we have $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{r_n, \tau_n}$, where $\mathcal{B}_{r_n, \tau_n} = \{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|\beta\|_1 \leq r_n, \|\beta\|_2 \leq \tau_n\} = r_n B_1^p \cap \tau_n B_2^p$.

For $\alpha \in [1/n, 1 - 1/n]$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the α -empirical quantile of x as

$$Q_\alpha(x) = \{u : |i \in [n] : x_i \leq u| \geq \alpha n, \quad |i \in [n] : x_i \geq u| \geq (1 - \alpha)n\}.$$

For arbitrary $z \in \mathbb{R}^p$ we have for all $i \in [n]$ that

$$1 \leq \langle X_i, \beta \rangle \leq |\langle X_i, z \rangle| + |\langle X_i, \beta - z \rangle|.$$

As a consequence, for $\alpha \in [1/n, 1 - 1/n]$ and by definition of Q_α there exists at least one index i^* such that

$$|\langle X_{i^*}, z \rangle| + |\langle X_{i^*}, \beta - z \rangle| \leq \sup Q_\alpha \left((|\langle X_i, z \rangle|)_{i=1}^n \right) + \sup Q_{1-\alpha} \left((|\langle X_i, \beta - z \rangle|)_{i=1}^n \right),$$

and it follows that

$$1 \leq \sup Q_\alpha (|\langle X_i, z \rangle|)_{i=1}^n + \sup Q_{1-\alpha} (|\langle X_i, \beta - z \rangle|)_{i=1}^n. \quad (14)$$

The rest of the proof consists of using Maurey's empirical method (see Chapter 5 in [CGLP13]) to show that (14) is absurd uniformly for $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{r_n, \tau_n}$ and thus $\|\beta\|_1 / \|\beta\|_2 \leq r_n / \tau_n$.

For $m = \lceil 1024\pi r_n^2 \log(60\tau_n) \rceil$, we define

$$\mathcal{Z}_m = \left\{ z := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m z_k, \quad z_k \in \{0\} \cup \{(\pm e_j r_n)_{j=1}^p\}, \quad \|z\|_2 \leq 2\tau_n \right\}. \quad (15)$$

Fix $z \in \mathcal{Z}_m$. We have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{|\langle X_i, z \rangle| \leq 1/2\} > \alpha \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sup Q_\alpha (|\langle X_i, z \rangle|)_{i=1}^n \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Define $p(z) = \mathbb{P}(|\langle X, z \rangle| \leq 1/2)$. By Bernstein's inequality, Theorem 3.1.7 in [GN16], we have with probability at least $1 - \exp(-np(z)/10)$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{|\langle X_i, z \rangle| \geq 1/2\} > \frac{p(z)}{2}.$$

Let $g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Since $\|z\|_2 \leq 2\tau_n$, it follows that

$$p(z) = \mathbb{P}\left(|g| \leq \frac{1}{2\|z\|_2}\right) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(|g| \leq \frac{1}{4\tau_n}\right) =: 2\alpha.$$

Taking an union bound over \mathcal{Z}_m , we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_m} \sup Q_\alpha (|\langle X_i, z \rangle|)_{i=1}^n \geq \frac{1}{2}\right) \leq \exp\left(m \log(2p+1) - \frac{\alpha n}{5}\right). \quad (16)$$

We now apply Proposition 4.3 to bound the remainder term $\sup Q_{1-\alpha} (|\langle X_i, \beta - z \rangle|)_{i=1}^n$. Indeed, since $\tau_n \geq 1$, we have that

$$\alpha = \int_{-1/(4\tau_n)}^{1/(4\tau_n)} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp(-x^2/2) dx \geq \frac{\exp(-1/(32\tau_n^2))}{\tau_n 4\sqrt{2\pi}} \geq \frac{1}{20\tau_n}$$

and the conditions in Proposition 4.3 hold if

$$1 \leq \tau_n \leq \frac{1}{40} \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log(p)}}.$$

Then, with probability at least $1 - 2\exp(-n/(1800\tau_n^2))$, for every $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{r_n, \tau_n}$ there exists $z \in \mathcal{Z}_m$ such that

$$\sup Q_{1-\alpha} (|\langle X_i, \beta - z \rangle|)_{i=1}^n \leq \frac{1}{4}. \quad (17)$$

Equations (14), (16) and (17) are a contradiction. Consequently, with probability at least

$$1 - \exp\left(m \log(2p+1) - \frac{\alpha n}{5}\right) - 2 \exp\left(-\frac{n}{1800\tau_n^2}\right),$$

we have that

$$\|\bar{\beta}\|_1 \leq (r_n/\tau_n)\|\bar{\beta}\|_2.$$

Picking

$$\tau_n = \frac{cn}{r_n^2 \log(2p+1) \log\left(\frac{30cn}{r_n^2 \log(2p+1)}\right)},$$

with $c = 1/(204800\pi)$ concludes the proof. \square

4.3.1. Proposition 4.3

Proposition 4.3. For $\tau_n \geq 1$ set $\alpha = \mathbb{P}(|g| \leq 1/(4\tau_n))/2$ where $g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and for $r_n > 0$ set $m = \lceil 1024\pi r_n^2 \log(60\tau_n) \rceil$. Assume that $4\sqrt{\log(p)/(n \log(60\tau_n))} \leq \alpha/3$. Then, with probability $1 - 2 \exp(-2\alpha^2 n/9)$, for every $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{r_n, \tau_n} = r_n B_1^p \cap \tau_n B_2^p$, there exists z in \mathcal{Z}_m , defined in (15), such that

$$\sup Q_{1-\alpha}(\langle X_i, \beta - z \rangle)_{i=1}^n \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Proof. Fix $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{r_n, \tau_n}$ and let Z be a random variable taking values in $\{0\} \cup \{\pm r_n e_j\}_{j=1}^p$ such that $\mathbb{P}(Z = r_n \operatorname{sgn}(\beta_j) e_j) = |\beta_j|/r_n$ and $\mathbb{P}(Z = 0) = 1 - \|\beta\|_1/r_n$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}Z = \sum_{j=1}^p \operatorname{sgn}(\beta_j) |\beta_j| e_j = \beta.$$

Let $Z_1, \dots, Z_m \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} Z$ and set $\bar{Z}_m = (1/m) \sum_{k=1}^m Z_k$. Using symmetrization, Theorem 3.1.21 in [GN16], we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\|\beta - \bar{Z}_m\|_1 = \mathbb{E}\left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m Z_k - \mathbb{E}Z_k \right\|_1 \leq \frac{2}{m} \mathbb{E}\left\| \sum_{k=1}^m \sigma_k Z_k \right\|_1,$$

where $(\sigma_k)_{k=1}^m$ are i.i.d Rademacher random variables independent from $(Z_k)_{k=1}^m$. Hence, additionally applying the Khintchine inequality, Lemma 4.1 in [LT13], we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\|\beta - \bar{Z}_m\|_1 \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2\pi}}{\sqrt{m}} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|Z\|_2^2} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2\pi}r_n}{\sqrt{m}}.$$

Consequently, there exists z of the form $z = \sum_{i=1}^m z_i/m$, $z_i \in \{0\} \cup \{\pm e_j r_n\}_{j=1}^p$, such that

$$\beta - z \in (2\sqrt{2\pi}r_n/\sqrt{m})B_1^p.$$

Moreover, this z fulfills $\|z\|_2 \leq \|\beta\|_2 + 2\sqrt{2\pi}r_n/\sqrt{m} \leq 2\tau_n$ if $m \geq 8\pi(r_n/\tau_n)^2$ and hence $z \in \mathcal{Z}_m$. The rest of the proof consists of showing that

$$\sup_{\beta \in (2\sqrt{2\pi}r_n/\sqrt{m})B_1^p} \sup Q_{1-\alpha} ((|\langle X_i, \beta \rangle|)_{i=1}^n) \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Let $\beta \in (2\sqrt{2\pi}r_n/\sqrt{m})B_1^p$. Observe that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{|\langle X_i, \beta \rangle| \leq 1/4\} > 1 - \alpha \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sup Q_{1-\alpha} ((|\langle X_i, \beta \rangle|)_{i=1}^n) \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

By Proposition 6.1, we have, for g denoting an univariate standard Gaussian random variable, with probability at least $1 - 2\exp(-2nt^2)$ uniformly in β

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{|\langle X_i, \beta \rangle| \leq 1/4\} > \mathbb{P}\left(|g| \leq \frac{\sqrt{m}}{16\sqrt{2\pi}r_n}\right) - 128\sqrt{\pi} \frac{r_n}{\sqrt{m}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}} - t.$$

Since $\tau_n \geq 1$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \mathbb{P}\left(|g| \leq \frac{1}{4\tau_n}\right) / 2 = \int_{-1/(4\tau_n)}^{1/(4\tau_n)} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp(-x^2/2) dx \geq \frac{\exp(-1/(32\tau_n^2))}{\tau_n 4\sqrt{2\pi}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{20\tau_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, and since $m = \lceil 1024\pi r_n^2 \log(60\tau_n) \rceil$ and applying a standard upper tail bound for Gaussian random variables we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|g| \leq \frac{\sqrt{m}}{16\sqrt{2\pi}r_n}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(|g| \leq \sqrt{2\log(60\tau_n)}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{1}{20\tau_n}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{\alpha}{3}.$$

Choosing $t = \alpha/3$ and since $4\sqrt{\log(p)/(n \log(60\tau_n))} \leq \alpha/3$, we obtain uniformly for $\beta \in (2\sqrt{2\pi}r_n/\sqrt{m})B_1^p$ with probability at least $1 - 2\exp(-2n\alpha^2/9)$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{|\langle X_i, \beta \rangle| \leq 1/4\} \geq 1 - \alpha,$$

that is, for every $\beta \in (2\sqrt{2\pi}r_n/\sqrt{m})B_1^p$

$$Q_{1-\alpha} ((|\langle X_i, \beta \rangle|)_{i=1}^n) \leq \frac{1}{4},$$

concluding the proof. \square

5. Proof of Theorem 2.2

We start this section with the following lemma. A proof is given in [LS20].

Lemma 5.1 (Proposition A.2 in [LS20]). *Suppose that $\gamma := \max_{\beta \neq 0} \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \langle Y_i X_i, \beta \rangle / \|\beta\|_1 > 0$. Then, we have that*

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{\|\hat{\beta}\|_1},$$

where

$$\hat{\beta} \in \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \{\|\beta\|_1 \text{ subject to } Y_i \langle X_i, \beta \rangle \geq 1\}. \quad (18)$$

Hence, in order to lower bound γ it suffices to upper bound $\|\hat{\beta}\|_1$, which is accomplished in the following proposition.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose that for some constant $0 < \delta < 1$ and another sufficiently large positive constant c_1 we have*

$$c_1 n \log(n) \leq p^{1-\delta}. \quad (19)$$

Then, we have that

$$\|\hat{\beta}\|_1 \leq c_4 \left(\frac{n (\|\beta^*\|_1 + |\mathcal{O}|^{1/2})}{\delta^{3/2} \log(p)} \right)^{1/3} \quad (20)$$

with probability at least

$$1 - \exp\left(-c_2 \log(p)^{2/3} n^{1/3} (\sqrt{\delta} \|\beta^*\|_1 + |\mathcal{O}|^{1/2})^{4/3}\right) - (p+1) \exp(-n/2) - \frac{1}{n}.$$

Proof. We prove Proposition 5.1 by explicitly constructing a β that fulfills the constraints in (18). For $\varepsilon > 0$, we define a lifting function $f_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$f_\varepsilon(x) := \begin{cases} x - \varepsilon & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq \varepsilon \\ x + \varepsilon & \text{if } -\varepsilon \leq x < 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $i \in [n]$, we denote

$$Z_i = \begin{cases} f_\varepsilon(\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle), & i \notin \mathcal{O} \\ 2\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle - f_\varepsilon(\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle) & i \in \mathcal{O} \end{cases}$$

and $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)^T$. Finally, we define

$$\hat{\nu} \in \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \|\beta\|_1 \text{ subject to } \langle X_i, \beta \rangle = Z_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (21)$$

A solution to (21) exists almost surely when $p > n$, as the X_i are linearly independent with probability one.

By definition of $\hat{\nu}$, if $i \in \mathcal{O}$, we have the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \langle X_i, \beta^* - \hat{\nu} \rangle &= -\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle + f_\varepsilon(\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle) \\ &= \begin{cases} -\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle & \text{if } |\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle| \geq \varepsilon \\ -\varepsilon & \text{if } 0 \leq \langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle \leq \varepsilon \\ \varepsilon & \text{if } -\varepsilon \leq \langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle < 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

A similar decomposition with each equation above multiplied with -1 holds if $i \notin \mathcal{O}$. Hence, we have that $\text{sgn}(\langle X_i, \beta^* - \hat{\nu} \rangle) = Y_i$ and $|\langle X_i, \beta^* - \hat{\nu} \rangle| \geq \varepsilon$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. It follows that

$$\|\hat{\beta}\|_1 \leq \frac{\|\beta^* - \hat{\nu}\|_1}{\varepsilon} \leq \frac{\|\beta^*\|_1}{\varepsilon} + \frac{\|\hat{\nu}\|_1}{\varepsilon}.$$

We now apply Lemma 6.1 to obtain that $\|\hat{\nu}\|_1 \leq 4\|Z\|_2/\sqrt{\delta \log(p)}$ with probability at least $1 - (p+1)\exp(-n/2)$. It is left to bound $\|Z\|_2$. By the triangle inequality, we have that

$$\|Z\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}} |\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle|^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n f_\varepsilon(\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle)^2}. \quad (22)$$

We start by bounding the first term on the right-hand side in (22). Bounding $|\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle|$ by the maximum over i , we obtain with probability at least $1 - n^{-1}$ that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}} \langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle^2 \leq |\mathcal{O}| \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle^2 \leq 4|\mathcal{O}| \log(n) \leq 4|\mathcal{O}| \log(p).$$

We next bound the second term on the right hand side in (22).

Indeed, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_\varepsilon(\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle)^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (|\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle| - \varepsilon)^2 \mathbf{1}(|\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle| \leq \varepsilon) \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(|\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle| \leq \varepsilon) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The right hand side in (23) is a sum of independent and identically distributed indicator functions with expectation $\mathbb{P}(|\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle| \leq \varepsilon)$. Since $\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle$ is univariate standard Gaussian and denoting by $\phi(\cdot)$ the p.d.f. of a standard Gaussian random variable, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle| \leq \varepsilon) = \int_{-\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \phi(x) dx \leq \varepsilon \sqrt{2/\pi} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Hence, by Hoeffding's inequality, Theorem 3.1.2 in [GN16], we have with probability at least $1 - \exp(-2n\varepsilon^2)$ that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_\varepsilon(\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle)^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(|\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle| \leq \varepsilon) \leq 2\varepsilon^3.$$

Hence, summarizing, we have with probability at least $1 - (p+1)e^{-n/2} - e^{-2n\varepsilon^2} - n^{-1}$ that

$$\|\hat{\beta}\|_1 \leq \frac{\|\beta^*\|_1}{\varepsilon} + \frac{16\sqrt{|\mathcal{O}|}}{\varepsilon\sqrt{\delta}} + \frac{7\sqrt{n\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{\delta \log(p)}}.$$

Optimizing in ε leads to the choice

$$\varepsilon = \left(\frac{\log(p)}{n} \frac{(\sqrt{\delta} \|\beta^*\|_1 + 16\sqrt{|\mathcal{O}|})^2}{49} \right)^{1/3}.$$

□

6. Rest of the proofs

6.1. Proof of Proposition 2.1

Proof. By the dual formulation of the margin (see Appendix A), we have that

$$\gamma = \inf_{w: w_i \geq 0 \forall i \in [n], \|w\|_1 = 1} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i Y_i X_i \right\|_{\infty}. \quad (24)$$

Hence, for proving an upper bound it suffices to find an appropriate weighting w . For τ_n a sequence to be defined and τ_n^{-1} taking integer values, we define

$$w_i = \begin{cases} \tau_n & i \text{ is among indices of } \tau_n^{-1} \text{ smallest entries of } (|\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle|)_{i=1}^n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We use this choice of w to upper bound γ . We denote the projector onto the space spanned by β^* by P , $P := \beta^* (\beta^*)^T$, and define its orthogonal complement $P^\perp := I_p - P$. We have that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i Y_i X_i \right\|_{\infty} \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i Y_i P X_i \right\|_{\infty} + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i Y_i P^\perp X_i \right\|_{\infty}. \quad (25)$$

We treat the two terms separately. For the first term, we have by Theorem 5 and Theorem 7 in [GLSW06] that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i Y_i P X_i \right\|_{\infty} &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i |\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle| \beta^* \right\|_{\infty} = \|\beta^*\|_{\infty} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i |\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle| \\ &\leq \|\beta^*\|_{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\tau_n^{-1}} \frac{4\sqrt{\pi} \tau_n k \log(k+1)}{n} \\ &\leq \frac{2\sqrt{\pi} \|\beta^*\|_{\infty} (\tau_n^{-1} + 1) \log(p)}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Markov's inequality with probability $1 - \log(p)^{-1}$

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i Y_i P X_i \right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{\pi} \|\beta^*\|_{\infty} (\tau_n^{-1} + 1) \log(p)^2}{n}.$$

We next bound the second term on the right hand side in (25). Observe that $Y_i = \text{sgn}(\langle X_i, \beta^* \rangle) = \text{sgn}(\langle PX_i, \beta^* \rangle)$ and hence Y_i is independent of $P^\perp X_i$. Likewise, w is a function of $(PX_i)_i$ and not $(P^\perp X_i)_i$ and hence w and $P^\perp X_i$ are independent for each i . We conclude that

$$\left(\sum_i w_i Y_i P^\perp X_i \right)_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \|w\|_2^2 \langle e_j, P^\perp e_j \rangle)$$

and hence, by a union bound with probability at least $1 - p^{-1}$

$$\left\| \sum_i w_i Y_i P X_i \right\|_\infty \leq 2 \|w\|_2 \sqrt{\log(p)} = 2 \sqrt{\tau_n \log(p)}.$$

Hence, with probability at least $1 - 2 \log(p)^{-1}$

$$\left\| \sum_i w_i Y_i X_i \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{4\sqrt{\pi} \|\beta^*\|_\infty \log(p)^2}{n\tau_n} + 2 \sqrt{\tau_n \log(p)}.$$

The final result is obtained by choosing

$$\tau_n^{-1} = \left\lceil \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{1/3}} \frac{n^{2/3}}{\|\beta^*\|_\infty^{2/3} \log(p)} \right\rceil.$$

□

6.2. Proof of Lemma 2.1

Proof. The proof follows closely the arguments in [Tel13]. First, note that rescaling $X = X/\|X\|_\infty$ does not change the approximating properties of $\tilde{\beta}_T$ for the ℓ_1 -margin. Indeed, if $\tilde{\beta}_T$ fulfills

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{Y_i \langle \frac{X_i}{\|X\|_\infty}, \tilde{\beta}_T \rangle}{\|\tilde{\beta}_T\|_1} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \max_{\beta \neq 0} \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{Y_i \langle \frac{X_i}{\|X\|_\infty}, \beta \rangle}{\|\beta\|_1} =: \gamma_R = \gamma / \|X\|_\infty,$$

then, by linearity, $\tilde{\beta}_T$ also fulfills

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{Y_i \langle X_i, \tilde{\beta}_T \rangle}{\|\tilde{\beta}_T\|_1} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \max_{\beta \neq 0} \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{Y_i \langle X_i, \beta \rangle}{\|\beta\|_1} = \gamma.$$

Henceforth, we work with the rescaled data $X/\|X\|_\infty$, which, in slight abuse of notation, we also denote by X . Note, that by definition $\|X\|_\infty \leq 1$. Define the exponential loss,

$$\ell(\beta) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(-Y_i \langle X_i, \beta \rangle).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla\ell(\beta) &= -\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i X_i \exp(-Y_i\langle X_i, \beta\rangle) \quad \text{and} \\ \nabla^2\ell(\beta) &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^T \exp(-Y_i\langle X_i, \beta\rangle).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have that

$$-\langle\nabla\ell(\tilde{\beta}_t), v_t\rangle = \alpha_t\ell(\tilde{\beta}_t).$$

Moreover, note that $|\alpha_t| \leq \sum w_{t,i}|\langle X_i, v_t\rangle| \leq 1$. By second order Taylor expansion, we obtain that

$$\ell(\tilde{\beta}_{t+1}) \leq \ell(\tilde{\beta}_t) + \epsilon\alpha_t\langle\nabla\ell(\tilde{\beta}_t), v_t\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\sup_{r\in[0,1]}\langle\nabla^2\ell(\tilde{\beta}_t + r\epsilon\alpha_tv_t)v_t, v_t\rangle.$$

We next bound the Hessian above. Indeed, we have for any r that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\nabla^2\ell(\tilde{\beta}_t + r\epsilon\alpha_tv_t)v_t, v_t\rangle &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \langle X_i, v_t\rangle^2 \epsilon^2 \alpha_t^2 \exp(-Y_i\langle X_i, \tilde{\beta}_t + r\epsilon\alpha_tv_t\rangle) \\ &\leq \epsilon^2 \alpha_t^2 \exp(r|\alpha_t|\epsilon)\ell(\tilde{\beta}_t) \leq \epsilon^2 \alpha_t^2 e^\epsilon \ell(\tilde{\beta}_t).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can further bound

$$\begin{aligned}\ell(\tilde{\beta}_{t+1}) &\leq \ell(\tilde{\beta}_t) + \epsilon\alpha_t\langle\nabla\ell(\tilde{\beta}_t), v_t\rangle + \frac{\epsilon^2\alpha_t^2 e^\epsilon}{2}\ell(\tilde{\beta}_t) \\ &\leq \ell(\tilde{\beta}_t) \left(1 - \epsilon\alpha_t^2 + \frac{3\epsilon^2\alpha_t^2}{2}\right) \leq \ell(\tilde{\beta}_t) \exp\left(-\epsilon\left(\alpha_t^2 - \frac{3\epsilon\alpha_t^2}{2}\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

and hence we obtain

$$\ell(\tilde{\beta}_T) \leq \exp\left(-\epsilon\sum_{t=1}^T\left(\alpha_t^2 - \frac{3\epsilon\alpha_t^2}{2}\right)\right).$$

Moreover, we have that

$$\|\tilde{\beta}_T\|_1 = \left\|\sum_{t=1}^T \epsilon\alpha_tv_t\right\|_1 \leq \epsilon\sum_{t=1}^T |\alpha_t|.$$

In addition, we note that by the dual formulation of the margin (see Appendix A) and definition of v_t and α_t we have that

$$|\alpha_t| = \left\|\sum w_{t,i}Y_iX_i\right\|_\infty \geq \inf_{w: w_i\geq 0 \forall i, \|w\|_1=1} \left\|\sum w_iY_iX_i\right\|_\infty = \gamma_R.$$

Hence, by Markov's inequality and since $3\epsilon/2 < 1$, we obtain for any positive x

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i \langle X_i, \tilde{\beta}_T \rangle \leq \|\tilde{\beta}_T\|_1 x\}} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\|\tilde{\beta}_T\|_1 x - Y_i \langle X_i, \tilde{\beta}_T \rangle) \\ &= n \ell(\tilde{\beta}_T) \exp(\|\tilde{\beta}_T\|_1 x) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\log(n) - \epsilon \sum_{t=1}^T |\alpha_t| \left(|\alpha_t| - x - \frac{3\epsilon|\alpha_t|}{2}\right)\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\log(n) - \epsilon \sum_{t=1}^T |\alpha_t| \left(\gamma_R - x - \frac{3\epsilon\gamma_R}{2}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, choosing $x = (1 - \epsilon)\gamma_R$ and using that $\epsilon \leq \epsilon/3$ and that $T > \frac{2\log(n)}{3\epsilon^2\gamma_R^2} = \frac{2\log(n)\|X\|_\infty^2}{3\epsilon^2\gamma^2}$ by choice of T , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i \langle X_i, \tilde{\beta}_T \rangle \leq \|\tilde{\beta}_T\|_1 x\}} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\|\tilde{\beta}_T\|_1 x - Y_i \langle X_i, \tilde{\beta}_T \rangle) \\ &\leq \exp(\log(n) - 3T\epsilon^2\gamma_R^2/2) < e^0 = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i \langle X_i, \tilde{\beta}_T \rangle \leq \|\tilde{\beta}_T\|_1 (1-\epsilon)\gamma_R\}}$ can only take values in $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ this implies that $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i \langle X_i, \tilde{\beta}_T \rangle \leq \|\tilde{\beta}_T\|_1 (1-\epsilon)\gamma_R\}} = 0$ and hence the result follows. \square

6.3. Proposition 6.1

Proposition 6.1. *Let $a_1, a_2, t > 0$ and $g \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. With probability at least $1 - 2\exp(-2nt^2)$, we have uniformly for $\beta \in a_1 B_1^p \cap a_2 B_2^p$ that*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{|\langle X_i, \beta \rangle| \leq 1/4\}} > \mathbb{P}\left(|g| \leq \frac{1}{8a_2}\right) - 32\sqrt{2}a_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}} - t.$$

Proof. Let us introduce

$$\Phi(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t \leq 1 \\ t - 1 & \text{if } 1 \leq t \leq 2 \\ 1 & \text{if } t \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

The function Φ is 1-Lipschitz and satisfies $\mathbf{1}\{t \geq 2\} \leq \Phi(t) \leq \mathbf{1}\{t \geq 1\}$. Let $\beta \in a_1 B_1^p \cap a_2 B_2^p$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{|\langle X_i, \beta \rangle| \geq 1/4\}} &\leq \mathbb{E}\Phi(|8\langle X_1, \beta \rangle|) \\ &+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sup_{\beta \in a_1 B_1^p \cap a_2 B_2^p} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \Phi(|8\langle X_i, \beta \rangle|) - \mathbb{E}\Phi(|8\langle X_i, \beta \rangle|) \right|}_{(\star)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the bounded difference inequality, Theorem 3.3.14 in [GN16], we obtain with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-2nt^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\star) &< \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\beta \in a_1 B_1^p \cap a_2 B_2^p} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n (\Phi(|8\langle X_i, \beta \rangle|) - \mathbb{E} \Phi(|8\langle X_i, \beta \rangle|)) \right| + t \\
&\leq \frac{2}{n} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\beta \in a_1 B_1^p \cap a_2 B_2^p} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i \Phi(|8\langle X_i, \beta \rangle|) \right| + t \\
&\leq \frac{32}{n} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\beta \in a_1 B_1^p \cap a_2 B_2^p} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i \langle X_i, \beta \rangle \right| + t \\
&\leq \frac{32a_1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i X_i \right\|_{\infty} + t \leq 32\sqrt{2}a_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}} + t,
\end{aligned}$$

where $(\sigma_i)_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d Rademacher random variables independent from $(X_i)_{i=1}^n$. We used in the two first lines the symmetrization and contraction principles, Theorem 3.1.21 and Theorem 3.2.1. in [GN16], respectively. It remains to upper bound the term involving the expectation. We have that

$$\mathbb{E} \Phi(|8\langle X_1, \beta \rangle|) \leq \mathbb{P}(|\langle X_1, \beta \rangle| \geq 1/8) \leq 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(|g| \leq \frac{1}{8a_2}\right).$$

□

6.4. Lemma 6.1

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose that for some constant $\delta < 1$*

$$n \log \left(36 \sqrt{\frac{n}{\delta \log(p)}} \right) \leq p^{1-\delta}. \quad (26)$$

For some $Z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ consider

$$\hat{\nu} \in \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \|\beta\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \langle X_i, \beta \rangle = Z_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Then, with probability at least $1 - (p+1) \exp(-n/2)$, we have that

$$\|\hat{\nu}\|_1 \leq 4 \frac{\|Z\|_2}{\sqrt{\delta \log(p)}}.$$

Proof. The proof of Lemma 6.1 is a small refinement of Lemma 5.1 in [CLvdG20] and is omitted for the sake of conciseness. □

Acknowledgements

GC and ML are funded in part by ETH Foundations of Data Science (ETH-FDS). Moreover, ML would like to thank C.S. Lorenz and M.D. Wong for helpful comments and FK would like to thank D. Fan for help with the Euler Cluster.

References

- [ABHZ16] P. Awasthi, M. Balcan, N. Haghtalab, and H. Zhang. Learning and 1-bit Compressed Sensing under Asymmetric Noise. In *29th Annual Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 152–192, 2016.
- [ALPV14] A. Ai, A. Lapanowski, Y. Plan, and R. Vershynin. One-bit compressed sensing with non-Gaussian measurements. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 441:222–239, 2014.
- [BFLS98] P. Bartlett, Y. Freund, W.S. Lee, and R.E. Schapire. Boosting the margin: a new explanation for the effectiveness of voting methods. *Ann. Statist.*, 26(5):1651–1686, 1998.
- [BHMM19] M. Belkin, D. Hsu, S. Ma, and S. Mandal. Reconciling modern machine-learning practice and the classical bias–variance trade-off. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 116(32):15849–15854, 2019.
- [BL15] D. Bilyk and M.T. Lacey. Random tessellations, restricted isometric embeddings, and one bit sensing. *arxiv preprint*, 2015.
- [BLLT20] P.L. Bartlett, P.M. Long, G. Lugosi, and A. Tsigler. Benign overfitting in linear regression. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 117(48):30063–30070, 2020.
- [Bre98] L. Breiman. Arcing classifiers. *Ann. Statist.*, 26(3):801–849, 1998.
- [Bre04] L. Breiman. Population theory for boosting ensembles. *Ann. Statist.*, 32(1):1–11, 2004.
- [Büh06] P. Bühlmann. Boosting for high-dimensional linear models. *Ann. Statist.*, 34(2):559–583, 2006.
- [BV04] S.P. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University press, 2004.
- [CDS98] S.S. Chen, D.L. Donoho, and M.A. Saunders. Atomic Decomposition by Basis Pursuit. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 20:33–61, 1998.
- [CGLP13] D. Chafaï, O. Guédon, G. Lecué, and A. Pajor. *Interactions between compressed sensing random matrices and high dimensional geometry*. Société Mathématique de France, 2013.
- [CL20] G. Chinot and M. Lerasle. Benign overfitting in the large deviation regime. *arxiv preprint*, 2020.
- [CLvdG20] G. Chinot, M. Löffler, and S. van de Geer. On the robustness of minimum norm interpolators. *arxiv preprint*, 2020.
- [DC96] H. Drucker and C. Cores. Boosting decision trees. In *Advances in neural information processing systems (NIPS)*, pages 479–485, 1996.
- [DKT20] Z. Deng, A. Kammoun, and C. Thrampoulidis. A Model of Double Descent for High-dimensional Binary Linear Classification. *Inf. Inference*, to appear, 2020.
- [DM18] S. Dirksen and S. Mendelson. Non-Gaussian hyperplane tessellations and robust one-bit compressed sensing. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, to appear, 2018.
- [FHT00] J. Friedman, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani. Additive logistic regression: a statistical view of boosting. *Ann. Statist.*, 28(2):337–407,

- 2000.
- [FKMN21] P. Foret, A. Kleiner, H. Mobahi, and B. Neyshabur. Sharpness-aware minimization for efficiently improving generalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
 - [FS97] Y. Freund and R.E. Schapire. A Decision-Theoretic Generalization of On-Line Learning and an Application to Boosting. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 55(1):119–139, 1997.
 - [GLSW06] Y. Gordon, A. Litvak, C. Schütt, and E. Werner. On the minimum of several random variables. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 134(12), 2006.
 - [GN16] E. Giné and R. Nickl. *Mathematical Foundations of Infinite-Dimensional Statistical Methods*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
 - [HMRT19] T. Hastie, A. Montanari, S. Rosset, and R.J. Tibshirani. Surprises in high-dimensional ridgeless least squares interpolation. *arXiv preprint*, 2019.
 - [Jia04] W. Jiang. Process consistency for AdaBoost. *Ann. Statist.*, 32(1):13–29, 2004.
 - [JLBB13] L. Jacques, J.N. Laska, P.T. Boufounos, and R.G. Baraniuk. Robust 1-Bit Compressive Sensing via Binary Stable Embeddings of Sparse Vectors. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 59(4):2082–2102, 2013.
 - [JT19] Z. Ji and M. Telgarsky. The implicit bias of gradient descent on nonseparable data. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 1772–1798, 2019.
 - [KKM20] F. Krahmer, C. Kümmerle, and O. Melnyik. On the Robustness of Noise-Blind Low-Rank Recovery from Rank-One Measurements. *arxiv preprint*, 2020.
 - [KP02] V. Koltchinskii and D. Panchenko. Empirical Margin Distributions and bounding the generalization error of combined classifiers. *Ann. Statist.*, 30(1):1–50, 2002.
 - [KSW16] K. Knudson, R. Saab, and R. Ward. One-Bit Compressive Sensing With Norm Estimation. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 62(5):2748–2758, 2016.
 - [LS20] T. Liang and P. Sur. A Precise High-Dimensional Asymptotic Theory for Boosting and Minimum- ℓ_1 -Norm Interpolated Classifiers. *arxiv preprint*, 2020.
 - [LT13] M. Ledoux and M. Talagrand. *Probability in Banach Spaces: isoperimetry and processes*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
 - [MM19] S. Mei and A. Montanari. The generalization error of random features regression: Precise asymptotics and double descent curve. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, to appear, 2019.
 - [MNS⁺20] V. Muthukumar, A. Narang, V. Subramanian, M. Belkin, D. Hsu, and A. Sahai. Classification vs regression in overparameterized regimes: Does the loss function matter? *arxiv preprint*, 2020.
 - [MRS13] I. Mukherjee, C. Rudin, and R.E. Schapire. The Rate of Convergence of AdaBoost. *J. Mach. Learn. Res*, 14:2315–2347, 2013.

- [MRSY20] A. Montanari, F. Ruan, Y. Sohn, and J. Yan. The generalization error of max-margin linear classifiers: High-dimensional asymptotics in the overparametrized regime. *arxiv preprint*, 2020.
- [PV12] Y. Plan and R. Vershynin. One-bit compressed sensing by linear programming. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 66(8):1275–1297, 2012.
- [PV13] Y. Plan and R. Vershynin. Robust 1-bit compressed sensing and sparse logistic regression: A convex programming approach. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 59(1):482–494, 2013.
- [ROM01] G. Rätsch, T. Onoda, and K.R. Müller. Soft margins for AdaBoost. *Mach. Learn.*, 42:287–320, 2001.
- [RZH04] S. Rosset, J. Zhu, and T. Hastie. Boosting as a regularized path to a maximum margin classifier. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 5:941–973, 2004.
- [SHN⁺18] D. Soudry, E. Hoffer, M.S. Nacson, S. Gunasekar, and N. Srebro. The implicit bias of gradient descent on separable data. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 1:2822–2878, 2018.
- [SS99] R.E. Schapire and Y. Singer. Improved Boosting Algorithms Using Confidence-rated Predictions. *Mach. Learn.*, 37:297–336, 1999.
- [Tel13] M. Telgarsky. Margins, shrinkage, and boosting. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 307–315, 2013.
- [Ver18] R. Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press, 2018.
- [WOBM17] A.J. Wyner, M. Olson, J. Bleich, and D. Mease. Explaining the success of AdaBoost and random forests as interpolating classifiers. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 18(48):1–33, 2017.
- [Woj10] P. Wojtaszczyk. Stability and Instance Optimality for Gaussian Measurements in Compressed Sensing. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 10:1–13, 2010.
- [WZZ⁺13] L. Wan, M. Zeiler, S. Zhang, Y. Lecun, and R. Fergus. Regularization of Neural Networks using DropConnect. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 1058–1066, 2013.
- [ZBH⁺17] C. Zhang, S. Bengio, M. Hardt, B Recht, and O. Vinyals. Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2017.
- [Zha18] C. Zhang. Efficient active learning of sparse halfspaces. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pages 1–26, 2018.
- [ZSA20] C. Zhang, J. Shen, and P. Awasthi. Efficient active learning of sparse halfspaces with arbitrary bounded noise. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33 (NeurIPS 2020)*, pages 7184–7197, 2020.
- [ZY05] T. Zhang and B. Yu. Boosting with early stopping: Convergence and consistency. *Ann. Statist.*, 33(4):1538–1579, 2005.
- [ZYJ14] L. Zhang, J. Yi, and R. Jin. Efficient Algorithms for Robust One-bit Compressive Sensing. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 820–828, 2014.

Appendix A: Dual formulation of the margin

We use Lagrangian duality to derive the dual version of the margin. Recall that

$$\gamma = \max_{\beta \neq 0} \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{Y_i \langle X_i, \beta \rangle}{\|\beta\|_1} = \frac{1}{\|\hat{\beta}\|},$$

where we used Lemma 5.1, recalling that

$$\hat{\beta} \in \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \|\beta\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad Y_i \langle X_i, \beta \rangle \geq 1. \quad (27)$$

For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n$, define the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\mathcal{L}(\beta, \lambda) = \|\beta\|_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (1 - Y_i \langle \beta, X_i \rangle).$$

The dual problem of (27) is defined as

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \mathcal{L}(\beta, \lambda). \quad (28)$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \mathcal{L}(\beta, \lambda) &= \inf_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ \|\beta\|_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (1 - Y_i \langle \beta, X_i \rangle) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i - \sup_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ \langle \beta, \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i Y_i X_i \rangle - \|\beta\|_1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For any function $f : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, the conjugate f^* is defined as

$$f^*(y) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^p} \{ \langle x, y \rangle - f(x) \}. \quad (29)$$

In particular (see [BV04], Example 3.26), when $f(\beta) = \|\beta\|_1$, we have that

$$f^*(y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } y \in B_\infty \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

where B_∞ is the unit ball with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. From (29) and (30), the dual problem (28) can be rewritten as

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \quad \text{subject to} \quad \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \lambda_i X_i \right\|_\infty \leq 1.$$

Since the X_i are linearly independent with probability one and $p > n$, the Moore-Penrose inverse of $X = [X_1, \dots, X_n]$ exists and hence there exists some β in \mathbb{R}^p such that $Y_i \langle X_i, \beta \rangle = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Hence, Slater's condition is satisfied and consequently there is no duality gap. It follows that

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{\|\hat{\beta}\|_1} = \inf_{w: w_i \geq 0 \forall i \in [n], \|w\|_1 = 1} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i Y_i X_i \right\|_\infty.$$