
On the ERM Principle in Meta-Learning

Yannay Alon

Technion

yannay.alon@campus.technion.ac.il

Steve Hanneke

Purdue University

steve.hanneke@gmail.com

Shay Moran

Technion & Google Research

smoran@technion.ac.il

Uri Shalit

Tel Aviv University & Technion

urishalit@tauex.tau.ac.il

Abstract

Classic supervised learning involves algorithms trained on n labeled examples to produce a hypothesis $h \in \mathcal{H}$ aimed at performing well on unseen examples. Meta-learning extends this by training across n tasks, with m examples per task, producing a hypothesis class \mathcal{H} within some meta-class \mathbb{H} . This setting applies to many modern problems such as in-context learning, hypernetworks, and learning-to-learn. A common method for evaluating the performance of supervised learning algorithms is through their learning curve, which depicts the expected error as a function of the number of training examples. In meta-learning, the learning curve becomes a two-dimensional “learning surface,” which evaluates the expected error on unseen domains for varying values of n (number of tasks) and m (number of training examples).

Our findings characterize the distribution-free learning surfaces of meta-Empirical Risk Minimizers when either m or n tend to infinity: we show that the number of tasks (n) must increase inversely with the desired error. In contrast, we show that the number of examples (m) exhibits very different behavior: it satisfies a dichotomy where every meta-class conforms to one of the following conditions: (i) either m must grow inversely with the error, or (ii) a *finite* number of examples per task suffices for the error to vanish as n goes to infinity. This finding illustrates and characterizes cases in which a small number of examples per task is sufficient for successful learning. We further refine this for positive values of ε and identify for each ε how many examples per task are needed to achieve an error of ε in the limit as the number of tasks n goes to infinity. We achieve this by developing a necessary and sufficient condition for meta-learnability using a bounded number of examples per domain.

1 Introduction

In classical learning problems, we are given examples sampled from some unknown distribution and wish to find a hypothesis that fits new examples from the same distribution. This general framework is the basis of many machine-learning systems used nowadays, from complex NLP (Chowdhary and Chowdhary [2020], Torfi et al. [2020], Khurana et al. [2023]) and multi-modal tasks (Baltrušaitis et al. [2018], Wang et al. [2023]) through protein folding (Jumper et al. [2021]) to decision support in healthcare (Johnson et al. [2016], Awaysheh et al. [2019]) and many more.

However, when we consider human learning, we see that humans have the incredible ability not just to learn from specific examples as in supervised learning, but also to learn from tasks, and generalize to new tasks (Bion [2023]). In recent years, machine learning has followed this path

with the idea of meta-learning (Hospedales et al. [2021], Ruder [2017], Howard and Ruder [2018]). Meta-learning involves not only learning from data within a specific domain but also leveraging data from related domains. This approach is particularly useful when it allows us to solve a group of problems more efficiently than solving each problem individually. For example, consider the problem of transcribing voice messages from different individuals. Each person’s voice, accent, and speaking style represent a distinct domain. While there may not be enough data to train a robust model for each individual separately, we can leverage the commonalities across these domains to improve overall efficiency and performance in transcribing all voice messages.

In meta-learning, we aim to find a hypothesis class (or more generally, an algorithm) based on previous tasks or domains, that can be efficiently adapted to new domains. This general framework captures many training strategies in deep learning including fine-tuning, in-context learning, few-shot learning, and more. For example, in the case of pre-training and fine-tuning, one starts by training a model over large and versatile datasets to achieve an initial model. This stage induces a hypothesis class represented by all models that can be fine-tuned from this pre-trained model. Next, when one tackles a specific domain, the pre-trained model is updated using some examples from the new domain which is equivalent to searching for a good hypothesis in the induced hypothesis class.

Following ideas from Baxter [2000], we assume that domains are sampled i.i.d from an (unknown) meta-distribution. We consider a meta-hypothesis family \mathbb{H} , which is a set of hypothesis classes. We use data from the training domains in order to produce a hypothesis class \mathcal{H} (not necessarily from \mathbb{H}) which in turn we use to find a good hypothesis for the test domain, based on examples from this domain. The number of examples from the new domain needed for learning a good hypothesis from the produced class \mathcal{H} is well studied under the distribution-free context in the PAC (Probably Approximately Correct) model. We thus focus on the first stage of meta-learning - how to learn a good hypothesis class based on examples from multiple training domains.

1.1 Meta-learnability

A common definition for meta-learnability (following Baxter [2000]), is that \mathbb{H} is meta-learnable if there exists a meta-algorithm \mathcal{A} such that for any desired error $\varepsilon > 0$, using large enough (yet finite) values for n , the number of domains, and m , the number of examples per domain, the meta-algorithm \mathcal{A} produces a hypothesis class $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}$ that can later be fitted a new domain drawn from the same meta-distribution, using a finite sample from this domain, achieving an error of at most ε in expectation.

In this paper, we focus on the case where the number of classes is finite (yet each class can be of infinite size). We show that without such a restriction, there are problems whose learnability cannot be determined. We further focus on meta-ERM algorithms. Given the fundamental role of the ERM principle within the PAC model, and building on previous works in meta-learning that focus on deriving bounds for ERMs, we find meta-ERMs to be a natural path to initiate this investigation.

1.2 Learning surface

To study the performance of meta-ERM algorithms, we generalize the notion of a learning curve to a learning surface. In classical learning, the learning curve describes the performance of an algorithm using the error rate as a function of the number of examples given. In meta-learning, we have a learning surface that measures the performance of the meta-algorithm using the error rate as a function of both the number of domains n and the number of examples per domain m . Several questions naturally arise for meta-learning: Does the number of domains have to tend to infinity for the error to vanish? Does the number of examples per domain have to tend to infinity?

In the PAC model, it is known that (except for trivial cases) the number of examples must grow indefinitely for the error to vanish. We show that similarly, the number of domains must tend to infinity (except for trivial meta-hypothesis families). Interestingly, previous results by Aliakbarpour et al. [2023] show that for the number of examples per domain, there are cases when a finite number is sufficient for the error to vanish, and prove a sufficient condition for when this happens. In this work, we improve upon this condition and give a necessary and sufficient condition characterizing which meta-hypothesis families can be learned using meta-ERMs with a bounded number of examples per domain. Furthermore, we give an exact quantitative characterization of the number of examples per domain required to achieve any error $\varepsilon \geq 0$ for any meta-hypothesis family by meta-ERMs.

2 Problem setup

2.1 Meta-learning and the PAC model

In the PAC model, a classification problem is defined by a distribution (or a domain) D over the set of labeled examples $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. For binary classification, the setting in interest in this paper, we set $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}$. The distribution D is unknown, the learning algorithm \mathcal{A} gets n i.i.d examples from the domain: $S \sim D^n$ known as the training set. The learning algorithm is a mapping from the training set to a classifier, $\mathcal{A}(S): \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$. The task of the algorithm is to minimize the error of mislabeling an example drawn from the same domain: $L_D(h) := \Pr_{(x,y) \sim D}(h(x) \neq y)$. We say that \mathcal{A} is an ERM algorithm if its output is a hypothesis consistent with its training set. That is, for $S = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ the output $h = \mathcal{A}(S)$ satisfies for all $i \in [n]$: $h(x_i) = y_i$. In the PAC model, we define a hypothesis class $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}^{\mathcal{X}}$, a set of classifiers. A domain D is realizable with respect to \mathcal{H} if it satisfies $\inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}} L_D(h) = 0$.

To generalize the PAC model for learning using multiple domains we follow the work of Baxter [2000]. In this framework, we assume a shared (unknown) meta-distribution over the possible domains Q , with the data our learning algorithm gets, sampled in two steps:

- Sample n i.i.d domains $D_1, \dots, D_n \sim Q^n$
- For each domain i , sample m i.i.d examples $S_i = \{(x_{i,1}, y_{i,1}), \dots, (x_{i,m}, y_{i,m})\} \sim D_i^m$

The final data is $S = \left\{ \{(x_{i,j}, y_{i,j})\}_{j=1}^m \right\}_{i=1}^n$. We denote this sampling process as $S \sim Q^{(n,m)}$.

The (meta-)algorithm \mathcal{A} gets the training set S and outputs an entire hypothesis class $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}^{\mathcal{X}}$ with the objective of minimizing the error $L_Q(\mathcal{H}) := \mathbb{E}_{D \sim Q} \inf_{h \in \mathcal{H}} L_D(h)$. Intuitively, we ask the algorithm to output a hypothesis class that contains a good hypothesis for future domains. Later, when we want to learn a hypothesis for a specific domain, we search for a hypothesis in this class that best fits the new domain. For the second stage to be feasible using a finite number of examples, we demand the output hypothesis class to have a finite VC dimension.

Like the hypothesis class \mathcal{H} in the PAC model, we define a meta-hypothesis family \mathbb{H} with each $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}$ being a hypothesis class. The realizability property now becomes $\inf_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}} L_Q(\mathcal{H}) = 0$. Similar to the development of the PAC model, we focus on the realizable settings, where the unknown meta-distribution Q is realizable, and leave the extension to the agnostic case for future work. We denote the set of all realizable meta-distributions as $\text{RE}(\mathbb{H}) = \{Q \mid \inf_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}} L_Q(\mathcal{H}) = 0\}$

As discussed, we require each class in our meta-hypothesis family to be a VC class:

Definition 2.1 (VC family). *A meta-hypothesis family \mathbb{H} is a VC family if there is $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\forall \mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}, \text{VC}(\mathcal{H}) \leq d$. The VC of the meta-hypothesis family is then $\text{VC}(\mathbb{H}) = \sup_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}} \text{VC}(\mathcal{H})$.*

In this paper we study finite VC families, meaning there are finitely many classes in \mathbb{H} . Note that a finite family can contain classes of infinite size. Relaxing the finite assumption produces non-trivial subtleties which are beyond the scope of this paper: As we will later see, we can have meta-hypothesis families whose learnability cannot be determined (using the standard set theory axioms) when removing this assumption, even when $\text{VC}(\mathbb{H}) = 1$.

The meta-ERM algorithm in the meta-learning setting is a learning algorithm that outputs a hypothesis class \mathcal{H} consistent with the training set: For each training domain $i \in [n]$ there is a hypothesis $h_i \in \mathcal{H}$ such that for each example in the domain $j \in [m]$ we have $h_i(x_{i,j}) = y_{i,j}$. As discussed in the introduction, we will focus on proper meta-ERM algorithms.

2.2 Learning surface

The learning surface of a specific algorithm over a specific meta-distribution is a function that assigns for each pair of (n, m) , the number of domains and the number of examples per domain respectively, the expected error of the algorithm over the distribution.

In the theory of PAC and beyond, the worst-case learning curve of an arbitrary ERM is an object of great interest. This object bounds the error an ERM might suffer from. We extend this notion to the meta-learning setting.

Definition 2.2 (ERM learning surface). *Let \mathbb{H} be a meta-hypothesis family. We define the ERM learning surface over \mathbb{H} to be the function $\varepsilon^{ERM}: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ defined by:*

$$\varepsilon^{ERM}(n, m) = \sup_{Q \in RE(\mathbb{H})} \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q^{(n, m)}} \sup_{\mathcal{H}: L_S(\mathcal{H})=0} L_Q(\mathcal{H})$$

Note the ε^{ERM} chooses the highest error among classes consistent with the data. Since any ERM must output a consistent class, this bounds from above the worst-case behavior of ERMs. To prove an upper bound for this learning surface, one must bound the error for all ERM algorithms uniformly for all realizable meta-distributions. For a lower bound it is enough to find a single ERM with high error for some realizable meta-distribution.

In the PAC model, the fundamental theorem (Vapnik and Chervonenkis [1974], Ehrenfeucht et al. [1989]) and the results from Hanneke [2016] show that there are three possible shapes for learning curves of ERMs using n labeled examples: $\Theta_{\mathbb{H}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$, $\Theta_{\mathbb{H}}\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)$ or $\Theta(1)$ depending on the finiteness of the star number Hanneke and Yang [2015] and of the VC-dimension, where $\Theta_{\mathbb{H}}$ hides constants that may depend only on \mathbb{H} .

2.3 Main results

We start with the task of upper bounding the ERM learning surface ε^{ERM} for finite VC families:

Theorem 1 (ERM learning surface upper bound). *Let \mathbb{H} be a finite VC meta-hypothesis family. Then,*

$$\varepsilon^{ERM}(n, m) = O_{\mathbb{H}}\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\log m}{m}\right)$$

Where $O_{\mathbb{H}}$ hides constants that may depend on \mathbb{H} only.

Proof idea. We bound the error of any ERM algorithm using two error causes. The first is where the sampled domains fail to approximate the meta-distribution, and the second is when the sampled examples fail to approximate the domains.

The first term is bounded as a function of the number of domains, and the second is bounded using the number of examples per domain. \square

The full proof is available in Appendix A.1

This bound suggests that as the number of domains and the number of examples per domain tend to infinity, the error vanishes and gives an upper bound on the required rate of each resource. We ask whether this bound can be met with a corresponding lower bound. To answer this question, we separate between the two resources (n and m) and define the projection of the learning surface for a single resource:

Definition 2.3 (Learning surface projection). *Let \mathbb{H} be a meta-hypothesis family and denote its corresponding ERM learning surface ε^{ERM} . The projections of ε^{ERM} on each resource are:*

$$\varepsilon_{dom}^{ERM}(n) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon^{ERM}(n, m) \qquad \varepsilon_{exp}^{ERM}(m) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon^{ERM}(n, m)$$

The learning surface is monotonic for each variable and bounded. Hence the limits are well-defined. From the result of Theorem 1, as each resource tends to infinity we have the upper bounds:

Corollary 1. *Let \mathbb{H} be a finite VC meta-hypothesis family. Then,*

$$\varepsilon_{dom}^{ERM}(n) = O_{\mathbb{H}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \qquad \varepsilon_{exp}^{ERM}(m) = O_{\mathbb{H}}\left(\frac{\log m}{m}\right).$$

Next, we define a simple notion of non-triviality for meta-hypothesis families.

Definition 2.4 (Informal definition of non-trivial meta-hypothesis family). *Let \mathbb{H} be a meta-hypothesis family. We say that \mathbb{H} is non-trivial if: there exists an example (x, y) which is realizable by more than a single class, and no class is dominated by another class.*

The formal definitions for the two conditions are given in Definition 4.1, Definition 4.2. Intuitively, a meta-hypothesis family that does not satisfy the first condition can always be learned perfectly using only a single example from a single domain. The second condition demands the meta-hypothesis family not contain any redundant classes that should never be produced.

The following parameter defines a sense of complexity for the meta-hypothesis family. For a more complete definition, see Section 4.2.

Definition 2.5 (ε dual Helly number). *Let \mathbb{H} be a meta-hypothesis family. For any class $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}$ and $\varepsilon \geq 0$ we define the ε dual Helly number of \mathcal{H} with respect to \mathbb{H} , denoted as $m_{\mathcal{H}|\mathbb{H}}(\varepsilon)$ to be the smallest integer m such that any set $S \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ which is realizable by \mathbb{H} but is ε -non-realizable by \mathcal{H} has a non-realizable subset $S' \subseteq S$ with $|S'| \leq m$.*

We further define the ε dual Helly number of \mathbb{H} as $m_{\mathbb{H}}(\varepsilon) = \sup_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}} m_{\mathcal{H}|\mathbb{H}}(\varepsilon)$.

In the special case where $\varepsilon = 0$, we recover the dual Helly number from Bousquet et al. [2020] which is inspired by Helly’s theorem, a fundamental result about convex sets. See Definition 4.3 for more discussion about related dimensions. Intuitively, this number represents the minimal amount of examples we need to ensure a realizable set hints the hypothesis class fits the data. Using less than $m_{\mathbb{H}}(\varepsilon)$, any set that seems realizable does not tell us anything on whether the entire domain is ε -realizable or not.

Using these definitions we can complement the upper bounds with the lower bounds:

Theorem 2 (Learning surface’s projections lower bound). *For any non-trivial finite VC meta-hypothesis family, \mathbb{H} :*

1. *Number of domains must go to infinity: $\varepsilon_{dom}^{ERM}(n) = \Omega_{\mathbb{H}}(\frac{1}{n})$.*
2. *Dichotomy for the number of examples per domain:*
 - *If $m_{\mathbb{H}}(0) = \infty$, the number of examples must go to infinity: $\varepsilon_{exp}^{ERM}(m) = \Omega_{\mathbb{H}}(\frac{1}{m})$.*
 - *Otherwise, for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$, we can achieve ε error using a finite number of examples. Specifically, to achieve zero error; for all $m \geq m_{\mathbb{H}}(0)$ we have $\varepsilon_{exp}^{ERM}(m) = 0$. More generally, $m \geq m_{\mathbb{H}}(\varepsilon) \iff \varepsilon_{exp}^{ERM}(m) \leq \varepsilon$.*

The proof for the number of domains is given in Section 4.1 and for the number of examples per domain in Section 4.2.

This result shows that in some non-trivial cases, a few examples per domain suffice for perfect meta-learning (as $n \rightarrow \infty$). For example, consider some high-dimensional space $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^\ell$. For any set of vectors $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^\ell$, denote by $\mathcal{H}_V = \{h_{w,b}(x) = \mathbb{1}(w^T x \geq b) \mid w \in V, b \in \mathbb{R}\}$ the class of all half-spaces whose normal is in V . Let $\mathbb{H} = \{\mathcal{H}_V \mid V \in \mathcal{V}\}$ for some set finite set \mathcal{V} with $|V| \leq d \ll \ell$ for all $V \in \mathcal{V}$. Then we have $\text{VC}(\mathbb{H}) \leq d + 1$ and $m_{\mathbb{H}}(0) \leq d + 2$ ¹. Therefore, we can meta-learn \mathbb{H} and achieve zero error with only $d + 2$ examples per domain. Note that this number of examples is far too small to learn a good hypothesis with error $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ for each domain even for a specific \mathcal{H}_V .

Combined with the result of Corollary 1 we have a tight bound for the number of domains. Furthermore, this lower bound applies to all proper algorithms, not only meta-ERMs. This shows that any meta-ERM achieves the optimal sample complexity for the number of domains.

For the number of examples per domain, this result characterizes exactly which meta-hypothesis classes can achieve zero error using a finite number of examples per domain. For such families, we know exactly how many examples per domain are needed to achieve ε error, for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$

One might have expected that we could have families with arbitrarily fast rates regarding the number of examples per domain. However, this result shows a gap between the possible rates. All families with unbounded dual Helly can only hope for a rate of $1/m$ and no faster (like e^{-m} or even $\frac{1}{m \log m}$). For these families, we remain with a gap between the upper and lower bound. As we will see, for some meta-hypothesis families the lower bound of $\frac{1}{m}$ is achievable while others require the upper bound of $\frac{\log m}{m}$, and rates in between are also possible.

The case of finite examples per domain has been studied by Aliakbarpour et al. [2023] where a sufficient condition for finite examples was proven. Our result refines the parameter defined there,

¹For the dual Helly of half-spaces, see proposition 2.8 in Braverman et al. [2019] and the remark afterward.

which allows for a sufficient and necessary condition for proper ERM. Furthermore, our result generalizes the condition for finite examples for all error $\varepsilon \geq 0$.

3 Related work

The idea of meta-learning has been researched under many names including learning-to-learn, bias learning, transfer learning, multitask learning, domain generalization, hyperparameter learning, and more. In some cases, the exact term used suggests specific assumptions or modeling of the problem. Since the work of Baxter [2000] where the meta-learning framework we build upon was suggested and several upper bounds were obtained. Many following works have improved upon the upper bounds using different methods such as PAC-Bayes Rezagadeh [2022] (and citations within), information-theoretic Chen et al. [2021] and distribution-dependent bounds Konobeev et al. [2021], Titsias et al. [2021]. Others used different notions of relatedness among the domains Ben-David and Schuller [2003], Tripuraneni et al. [2020], Jose and Simeone [2021], Mahmud [2009], or focused on specific structures, from linear classification Tripuraneni et al. [2021] up to deep networks Galanti et al. [2016].

The vast majority of previous work has been focused on finding upper bounds for the generalization performance of meta-learning. Some works complement these with lower bounds, either for special cases like linear representations Tripuraneni et al. [2021], Aliakbarpour et al. [2023] or under strong relatedness assumptions Lucas et al. [2020]. Other works show lower bounds for related problems like identifiability Yang et al. [2011].

The Empirical Risk Minimization (ERM) principle has been a long-time interest in the theory of machine learning. The works of Vapnik [1991], Blumer et al. [1989], Alon et al. [1997] and many more investigated the role of ERM algorithms in binary classification. The work of Shalev-Shwartz et al. [2010] has studied the limitations of ERMs in general learning settings. Other works have studied the ERM principle in different settings like multi-class classification Ben-David et al. [1992], Daniely et al. [2011] and differential privacy Wang et al. [2016]. In this work, we study the ERM for the setting of multi-learning. A line of works after Finn et al. [2017] suggested gradient-based ERMs for meta-learning (Nichol and Schulman [2018], Nichol et al. [2018] and more).

The most related work to ours is Aliakbarpour et al. [2023], where a similar meta-learning model was researched and some sufficient conditions for learnability with a finite number of examples per domain were proven. In our work, we strengthen this result and prove a sufficient and necessary condition. Moreover, we generalize this result for a positive error rate, allowing for a trade-off between the sample complexity and an acceptable error.

4 Analysis

4.1 Number of domains

For Theorem 2 we assumed two conditions of non-triviality which we elaborate on here:

Definition 4.1 (Weak non-separability). *Let \mathbb{H} be a meta-hypothesis family. We say that the meta-hypothesis family \mathbb{H} satisfies the weak non-separability assumption if there exists an example $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ such that $|\{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H} : \exists h \in \mathcal{H} \ h(x) = y\}| > 1$.*

If \mathbb{H} does not satisfy this assumption, then any example determines the only consistent hypothesis class. Consequently, a single example from a single domain is enough to achieve optimal error.

Definition 4.2 (No pairwise domination). *Let \mathbb{H} be a meta-hypothesis family. We say the meta-hypothesis family \mathbb{H} satisfies the no pairwise domination assumption if for any two different hypothesis classes $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}' \in \mathbb{H}$, there exists some meta-distribution Q which is realizable by \mathcal{H}' but not by \mathcal{H} , that is, $L_Q(\mathcal{H}) > 0$ and $L_Q(\mathcal{H}') = 0$.*

Suppose \mathbb{H} does not satisfy this assumption. In that case, there is a redundant hypothesis class $\mathcal{H}' \in \mathbb{H}$ and a dominant one $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}$ such that $L_Q(\mathcal{H}') = 0 \implies L_Q(\mathcal{H}) = 0$, so \mathcal{H}' can be removed.

A stronger version of the bound in Theorem 2 for the number of domains can now be stated:

Theorem 3 (Learning surface lower bound with respect to n). *Let \mathbb{H} be a meta-hypothesis family with $|\mathbb{H}| < \infty$. Assume \mathbb{H} satisfies Definitions 4.1 and 4.2. Then, there exists a constant $c > 0$ depending only on \mathbb{H} such that for any proper learning algorithm \mathcal{A} and any $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$:*

$$\sup_{Q \in RE(\mathbb{H})} \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q^{(n,m)}} L_Q(\mathcal{A}(S)) \geq \frac{c}{n}$$

Proof idea. Using Definition 4.1, we construct an easy domain on which multiple hypothesis classes are realizable. For each algorithm, we define the distribution it induces over \mathbb{H} when this domain is the only one sampled. For the mode of this distribution, using Definition 4.2, there is a hard domain with high error.

Finally, using a convex combination of the two distributions, we ensure that with a high enough probability, the training domains are all the same easy domain while the test domain is the hard one that achieves the desired error. \square

The full proof is given in Appendix A.2. We also give a more general result for infinite meta-hypothesis classes in Theorem 6. Note that this result holds for all proper algorithms, not only for ERM. As we have shown for the upper bound, any meta-ERM achieves this optimal rate of $\frac{1}{n}$ with respect to the number of domains.

4.2 Number of examples per domain

For the number of examples per domain, we identify the dual Helly number Bousquet et al. [2020] and some generalizations of it as an important characteristic in determining the behavior of the learning surface. Intuitively, the dual Helly number is a parameter of the hypothesis class that measures how large a sample needs to be to allow the detection of a non-realizable domain. More formally,

Definition 4.3 (Dual Helly number). *Let \mathcal{H} be a hypothesis class. The dual Helly number of \mathcal{H} is defined as the minimal size m such that every non-realizable set has a subset of size at most m that witnesses this non-realizability. Formally:*

$$DH(\mathcal{H}) := \min \{m : \forall S \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times Y \ L_S(\mathcal{H}) > 0 \ \exists S' \subseteq S \ |S'| \leq m \ L_{S'}(\mathcal{H}) > 0\}$$

In the case all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ do not satisfy the condition, we set $DH(\mathcal{H}) = \infty$.

The dual Helly number, and some variants of it, has been shown to have a strong connection with the learnability in the PAC model for proper algorithms Bousquet et al. [2020], with proper learning in a distributed settings Kane et al. [2019] where it was named coVC, and to allow meta-learning using a finite number of examples in the realizable scenario Aliakbarpour et al. [2023] where it was named the Non-Realizable Certificate (NRC) complexity. We generalize the notion of the dual Helly number for ε -non-realizable sets as follows:

Definition 4.4 (ε dual Helly number). *Let \mathcal{H} be a hypothesis class. For any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ we define the ε dual Helly number of \mathcal{H} as:*

$$m_{\mathcal{H}}(\varepsilon) := \min \{m : \forall S \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times Y \ L_S(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon \ \exists S' \subseteq S \ |S'| \leq m \ L_{S'}(\mathcal{H}) > 0\}$$

That is the minimal size m for which every ε non-realizable set is witnessed by a subset of size at most m . If no $m \in \mathbb{H}$ satisfies the condition, we define $m_{\mathcal{H}}(\varepsilon) = \infty$.

As we will see, this variant of the dual Helly number is strongly related to the learnability of a meta-hypothesis family for varying levels of acceptable error. Definition 2.5 is a variant of this definition where we only consider sets that are realizable by the meta-hypothesis family. This extra condition will allow us to prove a necessary and sufficient condition unlike the NRC in Aliakbarpour et al. [2023] that only gives a sufficient condition.

Finally, we define the optimal error function of a meta-hypothesis family. Intuitively, this can be considered as the inverse of the ε dual Helly. If the dual Helly translates a desired error to the required number of examples, the optimal error is the minimal error guaranteed by this number of examples.

Definition 4.5 (Optimal error function). *Let \mathbb{H} be a meta-hypothesis family. We define the optimal error function of \mathbb{H} as $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m) := \inf \{\varepsilon \in [0, 1] \mid m_{\mathbb{H}}(\varepsilon) \leq m\}$*

Using those definitions, we are ready to characterize the projection learning surface for m . The following results show that the optimal error function is precisely the optimal rate at which the meta-hypothesis can be learned using an arbitrary ERM algorithm.

Theorem 4 (Learning surface with respect to m and dual Helly number). *Let \mathbb{H} be a meta-hypothesis family with $|\mathbb{H}| < \infty$ and $VC(\mathbb{H}) < \infty$. Then,*

$$\varepsilon_{\text{exp}}^{\text{ERM}}(m) = \varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m)$$

Proof idea. We show two inequalities. For the upper bound, $\varepsilon_{\text{exp}}^{\text{ERM}}(m) \geq \varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m)$, we note that for an ERM to make a mistake he must fail to identify a hypothesis class with an error greater than $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m)$. This might happen when either the sampled domains fail to show the true error of the meta-distribution or the sampled examples fail to show the error of the domains.

Instead of the two-stage sampling method, we can equivalently sample $S \sim Q^{(n,m)}$ in three steps. First sample the domains $\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n$, then sample an ε -net of size $\approx \frac{d + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon^2}$ from each domain, and finally sample m examples from each ε -net (with no repetition).

Then, we bound the probability for each step that the sampled object fails to show an error in the previous step using conditioning.

For the lower bound, $\varepsilon_{\text{exp}}^{\text{ERM}}(m) \leq \varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m)$, we show that for all errors smaller than $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m)$, using the contradiction of the ε dual Helly number we can find a hard set of examples that is ε non-realizable but cannot be witnessed by any sampled set using only m examples per domain.

Therefore, regardless of the number of domains, this hard sample would seem to be realizable, and an arbitrary ERM could consistently choose the wrong hypothesis class. \square

The full proof is given in Appendix A.3.

Following this result, we see that the optimal error function $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}$ separates between two cases. When $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m_0) = 0$ for some m_0 , we do not need more than m_0 examples for the error to vanish. This happens exactly when the dual Helly number $m_{\mathbb{H}}(0)$ is finite. Otherwise, we have $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m) > 0$ for all m and we must have m tend to infinity for the error to go to zero.

The next result shows that the dual Helly number exactly characterizes the distinction between the need in an infinite number of examples per domain and the sufficiency of a finite one. Moreover, in the case of an infinite number of examples, one can only hope for a rate of $\frac{1}{m}$ and no faster.

Lemma 4.1 (optimal error function and dual Helly number). *Let \mathbb{H} be a finite VC meta-hypothesis.*

- *If $m_{\mathbb{H}}(0) < \infty$, then for all $m \geq m_{\mathbb{H}}(0)$ we have $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m) = 0$.*
- *Otherwise, if $m_{\mathbb{H}}(0) = \infty$, then for infinitely many $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m) \geq \frac{1}{m+1}$.*

The proof is given in Appendix A.3.

Combining Theorem 4 with Lemma 4.1 gives Theorem 2 for the number of examples per domain. For the case where $m_{\mathbb{H}}(0) = \infty$, we are left with a gap $\frac{1}{m} \leq \varepsilon_{\text{exp}}^{\text{ERM}}(m) \leq \frac{\log m}{m}$ (ignoring exact constants).

4.3 Impossibility in the infinite case

In this paper, we limited our attention to meta-hypothesis families with a finite number of classes. In this section, we will see that relaxing this restriction raises subtleties where the notion of learnability itself becomes unstable, even when all hypothesis classes have VC dimension 1.

This will be done by showing the continuum hypothesis can be encoded as a learnability problem of a meta-hypothesis family. Since the continuum hypothesis is independent of the Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory with the axiom of choice (ZFC), one cannot determine whether this meta-hypothesis family is learnable.

Given a finite subset $X \subseteq [0, 1]$, denote $\mathcal{H}_X = \{\mathbb{1}_{\{x\}} : x \in X\}$ the set of indicators over singletons in X . Define the meta-hypothesis family $\mathbb{H}^* = \{\mathcal{H}_X : X \subseteq [0, 1] \mid |X| < \infty\}$.

Theorem 5. *The learnability of \mathbb{H}^* is independent of the ZFC axioms.*

Proof idea. We show that the learnability of \mathbb{H}^* is an EMX problem, as defined in Ben-David et al. [2019]. In their work, they proved the EMX problem is independent of the ZFC axioms. \square

This theorem indicates some limit for results that can be established for the proper meta-learning framework in its general form. Notably, no simple combinatorial dimension can fully characterize which meta-hypothesis families are learnable in the proper settings and which are not. For a formal definition of such simple dimensions, see Ben-David et al. [2019]. The proof of our result is given in Appendix A.4.

5 Future work

There are several interesting directions for future research. To begin with, we assumed a fairly strong assumption on the structure of the meta-hypothesis family of being a finite family. Even though this assumption cannot be relaxed completely due to the independence result of Theorem 5, there are possible options for limiting the meta-hypothesis family. One approach would be assuming a finite dimension of the family, for example, a version of the Littlestone dimension or a VC dimension like the one suggested by Aliakbarpour et al. [2023]. Another approach would be assuming a parameterized family.

In the framework discussed here, we assumed the meta-algorithm to be proper, meaning the hypothesis class it produces must be from \mathbb{H} . Allowing the meta-algorithm to produce any hypothesis class would fail to capture the structure of the problem². However, we can limit the meta-algorithm using a restricted notion of improperness. For example, we might restrict the algorithm to produce hypothesis classes whose VC dimension is $O(\text{VC}(\mathbb{H}))$. This will ensure the sample complexity for the downstream tasks will not suffer too much.

The focus of this paper was the ERM principle in the setting of meta-learning. There are several questions left open: Are ERMs optimal in this setting? Is there a gap in the asymptotic behavior between the worst and the best ERM? For the number of domains, we have seen that ERMs are optimal among all proper meta-algorithms and all ERMs achieve the same asymptotic bound. For the number of examples per domain, these questions are still open.

In this work we only discuss the realizable case. Nevertheless, the agnostic case for the meta-learning setting is of great interest. Some bounds can be easily proven using standard techniques from the PAC model combined with the analysis we developed here.

The meta-learning model we studied in this paper was in the distribution-free context. However, other contexts with different motivations were developed over the years like the non-uniform setting Benedek and Itai [1994] or the universal learning model Bousquet et al. [2021] to name a few.

6 Acknowledgements

Shay Moran is a Robert J. Shillman Fellow; he acknowledges support by ISF grant 1225/20, by BSF grant 2018385, by Israel PBC-VATAT, by the Technion Center for Machine Learning and Intelligent Systems (MLIS), and by the European Union (ERC, GENERALIZATION, 101039692). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

References

M. Aliakbarpour, K. Bairaktari, G. Brown, A. Smith, N. Srebro, and J. Ullman. Metalearning with very few samples per task. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.13978*, 2023.

²In this case, the meta-hypothesis family \mathbb{H} is meta-learnable if and only if the union over \mathbb{H} is a VC class. An algorithm that outputs the union trivially meta-learn when the union is a VC class, and when the union is meta-learnable, applying the algorithm over a meta-distribution that outputs the same domain w.p. 1 will PAC-learn the union. However, this would result in poor sample complexity for the downstream tasks.

- N. Alon, S. Ben-David, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and D. Haussler. Scale-sensitive dimensions, uniform convergence, and learnability. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 44(4):615–631, 1997.
- A. Awaysheh, J. Wilcke, F. Elvinger, L. Rees, W. Fan, and K. L. Zimmerman. Review of medical decision support and machine-learning methods. *Veterinary pathology*, 56(4):512–525, 2019.
- T. Baltrušaitis, C. Ahuja, and L.-P. Morency. Multimodal machine learning: A survey and taxonomy. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 41(2):423–443, 2018.
- J. Baxter. A model of inductive bias learning. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 12:149–198, 2000.
- S. Ben-David and R. Schuller. Exploiting task relatedness for multiple task learning. In *Learning Theory and Kernel Machines: 16th Annual Conference on Learning Theory and 7th Kernel Workshop, COLT/Kernel 2003, Washington, DC, USA, August 24-27, 2003. Proceedings*, pages 567–580. Springer, 2003.
- S. Ben-David, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and P. M. Long. Characterizations of learnability for classes of $\{0, \dots, n\}$ -valued functions. In *Proceedings of the fifth annual workshop on Computational learning theory*, pages 333–340, 1992.
- S. Ben-David, P. Hrubeš, S. Moran, A. Shpilka, and A. Yehudayoff. Learnability can be undecidable. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(1):44–48, 2019.
- G. M. Benedek and A. Itai. Nonuniform learnability. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 48(2):311–323, 1994.
- W. Bion. *Learning from experience*. Taylor & Francis, 2023.
- A. Blumer, A. Ehrenfeucht, D. Haussler, and M. K. Warmuth. Learnability and the vapnik-chervonenkis dimension. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 36(4):929–965, 1989.
- O. Bousquet, S. Hanneke, S. Moran, and N. Zhivotovskiy. Proper learning, helly number, and an optimal svm bound. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 582–609. PMLR, 2020.
- O. Bousquet, S. Hanneke, S. Moran, R. Van Handel, and A. Yehudayoff. A theory of universal learning. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 532–541, 2021.
- M. Braverman, G. Kol, S. Moran, and R. R. Saxena. Convex set disjointness, distributed learning of halfspaces, and lp feasibility. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.03547*, 2019.
- Q. Chen, C. Shui, and M. Marchand. Generalization bounds for meta-learning: An information-theoretic analysis. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:25878–25890, 2021.
- K. Chowdhary and K. Chowdhary. Natural language processing. *Fundamentals of artificial intelligence*, pages 603–649, 2020.
- A. Daniely, S. Sabato, S. Ben-David, and S. Shalev-Shwartz. Multiclass learnability and the erm principle. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 207–232. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011.
- A. Ehrenfeucht, D. Haussler, M. Kearns, and L. Valiant. A general lower bound on the number of examples needed for learning. *Information and Computation*, 82(3):247–261, 1989.
- C. Finn, P. Abbeel, and S. Levine. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In D. Precup and Y. W. Teh, editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1126–1135. PMLR, 06–11 Aug 2017. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v70/finn17a.html>.
- T. Galanti, L. Wolf, and T. Hazan. A theoretical framework for deep transfer learning. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 5(2):159–209, 2016.
- S. Hanneke. Refined error bounds for several learning algorithms. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(135):1–55, 2016.

- S. Hanneke and L. Yang. Minimax analysis of active learning. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 16(1):3487–3602, 2015.
- T. Hospedales, A. Antoniou, P. Micaelli, and A. Storkey. Meta-learning in neural networks: A survey. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 44(9):5149–5169, 2021.
- J. Howard and S. Ruder. Universal language model fine-tuning for text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.06146*, 2018.
- A. E. Johnson, M. M. Ghassemi, S. Nemati, K. E. Niehaus, D. A. Clifton, and G. D. Clifford. Machine learning and decision support in critical care. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 104(2):444–466, 2016.
- S. T. Jose and O. Simeone. An information-theoretic analysis of the impact of task similarity on meta-learning. In *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 1534–1539. IEEE, 2021.
- J. Jumper, R. Evans, A. Pritzel, T. Green, M. Figurnov, O. Ronneberger, K. Tunyasuvunakool, R. Bates, A. Žídek, A. Potapenko, et al. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with alphafold. *nature*, 596(7873):583–589, 2021.
- D. Kane, R. Livni, S. Moran, and A. Yehudayoff. On communication complexity of classification problems. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1903–1943. PMLR, 2019.
- D. Khurana, A. Koli, K. Khatter, and S. Singh. Natural language processing: state of the art, current trends and challenges. *Multimedia tools and applications*, 82(3):3713–3744, 2023.
- M. Konobeev, I. Kuzborskij, and C. Szepesvári. A distribution-dependent analysis of meta learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5697–5706. PMLR, 2021.
- J. Lucas, M. Ren, I. Kamení, T. Pitassi, and R. Zemel. Theoretical bounds on estimation error for meta-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.07140*, 2020.
- M. H. Mahmud. On universal transfer learning. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(19):1826–1846, 2009.
- A. Nichol and J. Schulman. Reptile: a scalable metalearning algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02999*, 2(3):4, 2018.
- A. Nichol, J. Achiam, and J. Schulman. On first-order meta-learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02999*, 2018.
- A. Rezazadeh. A unified view on PAC-Bayes bounds for meta-learning. In K. Chaudhuri, S. Jegelka, L. Song, C. Szepesvari, G. Niu, and S. Sabato, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 18576–18595. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/rezazadeh22a.html>.
- S. Ruder. An overview of multi-task learning in deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.05098*, 2017.
- S. Shalev-Shwartz, O. Shamir, N. Srebro, and K. Sridharan. Learnability, stability and uniform convergence. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:2635–2670, 2010.
- M. K. Titsias, F. J. Ruiz, S. Nikoloutsopoulos, and A. Galashov. Information theoretic meta learning with gaussian processes. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1597–1606. PMLR, 2021.
- A. Torfi, R. A. Shirvani, Y. Keneshloo, N. Tavaf, and E. A. Fox. Natural language processing advancements by deep learning: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.01200*, 2020.
- N. Tripuraneni, M. Jordan, and C. Jin. On the theory of transfer learning: The importance of task diversity. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:7852–7862, 2020.
- N. Tripuraneni, C. Jin, and M. Jordan. Provable meta-learning of linear representations. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10434–10443. PMLR, 2021.

- V. Vapnik. Principles of risk minimization for learning theory. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 4, 1991.
- V. Vapnik and A. Chervonenkis. Theory of pattern recognition. 1974.
- X. Wang, G. Chen, G. Qian, P. Gao, X.-Y. Wei, Y. Wang, Y. Tian, and W. Gao. Large-scale multi-modal pre-trained models: A comprehensive survey. *Machine Intelligence Research*, 20(4):447–482, 2023.
- Y.-X. Wang, J. Lei, and S. E. Fienberg. Learning with differential privacy: Stability, learnability and the sufficiency and necessity of erm principle. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(183): 1–40, 2016.
- L. Yang, S. Hanneke, and J. Carbonell. Identifiability of priors from bounded sample sizes with applications to transfer learning. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 789–806. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011.

A Appendix

A.1 General upper bound

Proof of Theorem 1. We wish to bound uniformly for all $Q \in \text{RE}(\mathbb{H})$ the expected error of the worst ERM:

$$\mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q^{(n,m)}} \sup_{\mathcal{H}: L_S(\mathcal{H})} L_Q(\mathcal{H})$$

We denote $\mathbb{H}[S] = \{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H} \mid L_S(\mathcal{H}) = 0\}$ for simplicity.

Fix a sample $S \sim Q^{(n,m)}$ and denote its domains by $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}^n$. For any fixed $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} L_Q(\mathcal{H}) &= \mathbb{E}_{D \sim Q} L_D(\mathcal{H}) = \int_0^1 \Pr_{D \sim Q}(L_D(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon) d\varepsilon \\ &\leq \int_0^{\varepsilon_0} 1 d\varepsilon + \int_{\varepsilon_0}^1 \Pr_{D \sim Q}(L_D(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon_0) d\varepsilon \\ &= \varepsilon_0 + (1 - \varepsilon_0) \Pr_{D \sim Q}(L_D(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon_0) \leq \varepsilon_0 + \Pr_{D \sim Q}(L_D(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon_0) \end{aligned}$$

Denote $\lambda_Q(\mathcal{H}) = \Pr_{D \sim Q}(L_D(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon_0)$. We divide into two cases:

1. If $\forall i \in [n], L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \varepsilon_0$, then

$$\lambda_Q(\mathcal{H}) \leq \lambda_Q(\mathcal{H}) \cdot \mathbf{1}(\forall i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \varepsilon_0)$$

2. Otherwise, $\exists i \in [n]$ such that $L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon_0$. Since $\lambda_Q(\mathcal{H}) \leq 1$, we have

$$\lambda_Q(\mathcal{H}) \leq \mathbf{1}(\exists i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon_0)$$

In any case,

$$\lambda_Q(\mathcal{H}) \leq \lambda_Q(\mathcal{H}) \cdot \mathbf{1}(\forall i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \varepsilon_0) + \mathbf{1}(\exists i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon_0)$$

Taking the supremum over $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}[S]$ gives,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}[S]} \lambda_Q(\mathcal{H}) &\leq \sup \{\lambda_Q(\mathcal{H}) \mid \mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}, \forall i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \varepsilon_0\} \\ &\quad + \mathbf{1}(\exists \mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}[S], \exists i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon_0) \end{aligned}$$

We will now bound each term separately. For the first term, taking the expectation over $\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n$ using the formula for expectation of non-negative variable $\mathbb{E}[X] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Pr(X \geq x) dx$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n} \sup \{\lambda_Q(\mathcal{H}) \mid \mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}, \forall i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \varepsilon_0\} \\ &= \int_0^1 \Pr_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n}(\sup \{\lambda_Q(\mathcal{H}) \mid \mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}, \forall i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \varepsilon_0\} \geq \gamma) d\gamma \\ &= \int_0^1 \Pr_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n}(\exists \mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H} : \lambda_Q(\mathcal{H}) \geq \gamma \wedge \forall i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \varepsilon_0) d\gamma \end{aligned}$$

Applying a union bound with the trivial bound for probabilities

$$\leq \int_0^1 \min \left\{ 1, \sum_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}} \Pr_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n}(\lambda_Q(\mathcal{H}) \geq \gamma \wedge \forall i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \varepsilon_0) \right\} d\gamma$$

Using conditional probabilities $\Pr(A \wedge B) = \Pr(B \mid A) \Pr(A) \leq \Pr(B \mid A)$

$$\leq \int_0^1 \min \left\{ 1, \sum_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}} \Pr_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n}(\forall i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) \leq \varepsilon_0 \mid \lambda_Q(\mathcal{H}) \geq \gamma) \right\} d\gamma$$

Since the domains are drawn i.i.d:

$$= \int_0^1 \min \left\{ 1, \sum_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}} \Pr_{D \sim Q} (L_D(\mathcal{H}) \leq \varepsilon_0 \mid \lambda_Q(\mathcal{H}) \geq \gamma)^n \right\} d\gamma$$

Note that $\Pr_{D \sim Q} (L_D(\mathcal{H}) \leq \varepsilon_0) = 1 - \lambda_Q(\mathcal{H})$. Therefore, for any choice of $p \in (0, 1)$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \int_0^1 \min \left\{ 1, \sum_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}} (1 - \gamma)^n \right\} d\gamma \leq \int_0^p 1 d\gamma + \int_p^1 |\mathbb{H}| e^{-\gamma n} d\gamma \\ &\leq p + \frac{|\mathbb{H}|}{n} e^{-pn} \end{aligned}$$

Now we are left with the second term. Using a union bound:

$$\mathbb{1} (\exists \mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}[S], \exists i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon_0) \leq \sum_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}} \mathbb{1} (L_S(\mathcal{H}) = 0 \wedge \exists i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon_0)$$

taking the expectation over both $\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n$ and $S \sim \mathbf{D}^m$ we get:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n} \mathbb{E}_{S \sim \mathbf{D}^m} \mathbb{1} (\exists \mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}[S], \exists i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon_0) \\ &\leq \sum_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n} \mathbb{E}_{S \sim \mathbf{D}^m} \mathbb{1} (L_S(\mathcal{H}) = 0 \wedge \exists i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon_0) \\ &\leq \sum_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n} \Pr_{S \sim \mathbf{D}^m} (L_S(\mathcal{H}) = 0 \mid \exists i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon_0) \end{aligned}$$

For each $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}[S]$ and $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{D}^n$, denote by $i_{\mathcal{H}, \mathbf{D}}$ the smallest index for which $L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon_0$ if it exists, then

$$\leq \sum_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n} \Pr_{S \sim \mathbf{D}^m} (L_{S_{i_{\mathcal{H}, \mathbf{D}}}}(\mathcal{H}) = 0 \mid i_{\mathcal{H}, \mathbf{D}}, \mathbf{D})$$

Using standard ε -net bound, if $m \geq c \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0} \left(d \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0} + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)$ for some universal constant $c > 0$ then,

$$\Pr_{S \sim \mathbf{D}^m} (L_{S_{i_{\mathcal{H}, \mathbf{D}}}}(\mathcal{H}) = 0 \mid i_{\mathcal{H}, \mathbf{D}}, \mathbf{D}) \leq \delta$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n \\ S \sim \mathbf{D}^m}} \mathbb{1} (\exists \mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}[S], \exists i \in [n] : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon_0) \leq |\mathbb{H}| \cdot \delta$$

Combining the bounds we have,

$$\mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q^{(n, m)}} \sup_{\mathcal{H}: L_S(\mathcal{H})} L_Q(\mathcal{H}) \leq \varepsilon_0 + p + \frac{|\mathbb{H}|}{n} e^{-pn} + |\mathbb{H}| \cdot \delta$$

For all $p, \delta \in (0, 1)$ and $m \geq c \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0} \left(d \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0} + \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right)$.

Finally, set $p = \frac{\log |\mathbb{H}|}{n}$ and $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{|\mathbb{H}|}$. Then for all $m \geq 2c \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0} \left(d \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0} + \log |\mathbb{H}| \right)$ to get,

$$\mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q^{(n, m)}} \sup_{\mathcal{H}: L_S(\mathcal{H})} L_Q(\mathcal{H}) \leq 2\varepsilon_0 + 2 \frac{\log |\mathbb{H}|}{n}$$

Note that for $\varepsilon_0 = \frac{4c}{m} \left(d \log \frac{m}{d} + \log |\mathbb{H}| \right)$, the condition for m is satisfied. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q^{(n, m)}} \sup_{\mathcal{H}: L_S(\mathcal{H})} L_Q(\mathcal{H}) \leq 8c \frac{d \log \frac{m}{d} + \log |\mathbb{H}|}{m} + 2 \frac{\log |\mathbb{H}|}{n} = O_{\mathbb{H}} \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{\log m}{m} \right)$$

□

A.2 Number of domains

We will prove a more general version of Theorem 3 for infinite meta-hypothesis families and all algorithms, not only ERMs. We start by defining a property of the meta-hypothesis family inspired by game theory.

Definition A.1 (Value of meta-hypothesis family). *Let \mathbb{H} be a meta-hypothesis family. Denote by $\Delta(\mathbb{H})$ the set of all distributions over the classes. We define the value of \mathbb{H} as:*

$$v(\mathbb{H}) = \inf_{P \in \Delta(\mathbb{H})} \sup_{Q \in RE(\mathbb{H})} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H} \sim P} \mathbb{E}_{D \sim Q} L_D(\mathcal{H})$$

Intuitively, this can be thought of as a two-player zero-sum game between a naive algorithm and an adversary. The algorithm chooses a hypothesis class and the adversary chooses a domain, the utility of the adversary is the error of the chosen hypothesis class on the domain.

Note that a meta-hypothesis family with $v(\mathbb{H}) = 0$ is a trivial family in the sense that an algorithm could achieve arbitrary small without relying on any data. We will show this in the proof of the next result, Theorem 6.

Moreover, we define a simple assumption about the meta-hypothesis family that assumes the existence of a trivial task - a domain realizable by all classes:

Definition A.2 (Strong non-separability). *Let \mathbb{H} be a meta-hypothesis family. We say that \mathbb{H} satisfies the strong non-separability assumption if there exists a meta-distribution Q such that for all $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}$ we have $L_Q(\mathcal{H}) = 0$*

A simple case is when there is an example $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ that all classes can correctly classify.

The next theorem states that as long as there is a simple task, one realizable by all classes, and the family is non-trivial ($v(\mathbb{H}) > 0$) then the error of any proper algorithm is $\Omega_{\mathbb{H}}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$.

Theorem 6 (General learning surface lower bound with respect to n). *Let \mathbb{H} be a meta-hypothesis family. Assume \mathbb{H} satisfies Definition A.2.*

- *If $v(\mathbb{H}) > 0$, then there exists $c > 0$ depending only on \mathbb{H} such that for any proper learning algorithm \mathcal{A} and any $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$:*

$$\sup_{Q \in RE(\mathbb{H})} \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q^{(n,m)}} L_Q(\mathcal{A}(S)) \geq \frac{c}{n}$$

- *Otherwise, if $v(\mathbb{H}) = 0$, then for any rate $R: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, 1]$ there exists an algorithm \mathcal{A} with*

$$\sup_{Q \in RE(\mathbb{H})} \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q^{(n,m)}} L_Q(\mathcal{A}(S)) \leq R(n, m)$$

Proof. Assume $v(\mathbb{H}) > 0$. Let \mathcal{A} be a learning algorithm and let $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote by Q_0 the meta-distribution that satisfies Definition A.2.

Define the distribution over \mathbb{H} induced by the algorithm $P_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q_0^{(n,m)}} \mathcal{A}(S)$. By definition of the value of \mathbb{H} , there exists some $Q_{\mathcal{A}} \in RE(\mathbb{H})$ such that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H} \sim P_{\mathcal{A}}} L_{Q_{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \frac{v(\mathbb{H})}{2}$

Next, define the set of realizable meta-distributions: $\{Q_{\mathcal{A},p} := p \cdot Q_{\mathcal{A}} + (1-p) \cdot Q_0 \mid p \in (0, 1)\}$
For any $p \in (0, 1)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q_{\mathcal{A},p}^{(n,m)}} L_{Q_{\mathcal{A},p}}(\mathcal{A}(S)) &\geq p(1-p)^n \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q_0^{(n,m)}} L_{Q_{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{A}(S)) = p(1-p)^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H} \sim P_{\mathcal{A}}} L_{Q_{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{H}) \\ &\geq p(1-p)^n \frac{v(\mathbb{H})}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Specifically, for $p = \frac{1}{n+1}$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n+1}\right)^n \frac{v(\mathbb{H})}{2} = \frac{v(\mathbb{H})}{2n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n+1}\right)^{n+1} \\ &\geq \frac{v(\mathbb{H})}{8n} \end{aligned}$$

Denote $c = \frac{v(\mathbb{H})}{8}$ to complete this part.

Next, assume $v(\mathbb{H}) = 0$ and fix some $R: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, 1]$. For any n, m , by the definition of $v(\mathbb{H})$ there exists a distribution $P_{n,m} \in \Delta(\mathbb{H})$ such that

$$\sup_{Q \in \text{RE}(\mathbb{H})} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H} \sim P_{n,m}} L_Q(\mathcal{H}) \leq R(n, m)$$

Define the algorithm \mathcal{A} as follows: Given $S \in (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})^{(n,m)}$, sample $\mathcal{H} \sim P_{n,m}$ and output \mathcal{H} . Then, for any $Q \in \text{RE}(\mathbb{H})$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q^{(n,m)}} L_Q(\mathcal{A}(S)) = \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q^{(n,m)}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H} \sim P_{n,m}} L_Q(\mathcal{H}) \leq \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q^{(n,m)}} R(n, m) = R(n, m)$$

As needed. \square

The proof of Theorem 3 follows a very similar proof using the assumptions of non-triviality together with the finiteness of the meta-hypothesis family.

Proof of Theorem 3. This proof follows similar ideas as in Theorem 6. We start by constructing a subset of \mathbb{H} that satisfies Definition A.2 and has a positive value (as defined in Definition A.1). By Theorem 6, any algorithm over this subset cannot have an error less than $\frac{c}{n}$ for all n, m . We then show that any algorithm over the entire \mathbb{H} either outputs the subset with high enough probability or has a constant error.

First, by Definition 4.1, there exists $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ such that $|\mathbb{H}_0| \geq 2$ for

$$\mathbb{H}_0 = \{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H} : \exists h \in \mathcal{H} \quad h(x_0) = y_0\}$$

Define the meta-distribution $Q_0 = \delta_{\delta_{(x_0, y_0)}}$ - a meta-distribution with mass 1 on the domain which has mass 1 on (x_0, y_0) . Note that for any $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}_0$ we have $L_{Q_0}(\mathcal{H}) = 0$. Thus, \mathbb{H}_0 satisfy Definition A.2 with Q_0 .

We will now show that $v(\mathbb{H}_0) > 0$. Using Definition 4.2, for any $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}_0$ there is $\mathcal{H}' \in \mathbb{H}_0$ and a meta-distribution $Q_{\mathcal{H}}$ such that

$$L_{Q_{\mathcal{H}}}(\mathcal{H}) > 0 \quad L_{Q_{\mathcal{H}}}(\mathcal{H}') = 0$$

Denote $c_0 = \min_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}_0} L_{Q_{\mathcal{H}}}(\mathcal{H})$, and note that $c_0 > 0$. For any $P \in \Delta(\mathbb{H}_0)$, there exists $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}_0$ with $P(\mathcal{H}) \geq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{H}_0|} > 0$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}' \sim P} L_{Q_{\mathcal{H}}}(\mathcal{H}') \geq P(\mathcal{H}) \cdot L_{Q_{\mathcal{H}}}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \frac{c_0}{|\mathbb{H}_0|} > 0$$

This implies that $v(\mathbb{H}_0) > 0$.

Let \mathcal{A} be a learning algorithm. Similar to the proof of Theorem 6, define the induced distribution $P_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q_0^{(n,m)}} \mathcal{A}(S)$.

We differentiate between two cases:

Case 1 - $\Pr_{\mathcal{H} \sim P_{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}_0) < \frac{1}{2}$: Since for all $\mathbb{H} \notin \mathbb{H}_0$ we have $L_{Q_0}(\mathcal{H}) = 1$ we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q_0^{(n,m)}} L_{Q_0}(\mathcal{A}(S)) \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

So the error of the algorithm is bounded by a constant.

Case 2 - $\Pr_{\mathcal{H} \sim P_{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}_0) \geq \frac{1}{2}$: Define the conditional distribution induced by the algorithm $P_{\mathcal{A},0} = \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q_0^{(n,m)}} [\mathcal{A}(S) \mid \mathcal{A}(S) \in \mathbb{H}_0]$. Note that $P_{\mathcal{A},0} \in \Delta(\mathbb{H}_0)$. Therefore, there exists a meta-distribution $Q_{\mathcal{A},0} \in \text{RE}(\mathbb{H}_0)$ such that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H} \sim P_{\mathcal{A},0}} L_{Q_{\mathcal{A},0}}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \frac{v(\mathbb{H}_0)}{2}$.

Following the proof of Theorem 6, using the meta-distribution $Q_{\mathcal{A},p} = p \cdot Q_{\mathcal{A},0} + (1-p)Q_0$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q_{\mathcal{A},p}^{(n,m)}} L_{Q_{\mathcal{A},p}} \geq p(1-p)^n \frac{v(\mathbb{H}_0)}{4}$$

Setting $p = \frac{1}{n+1}$ to get

$$\mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q_{\mathcal{A},p}^{(n,m)}} L_{Q_{\mathcal{A},p}} \geq \frac{v(\mathbb{H}_0)}{8n}$$

For $c = \frac{v(\mathbb{H}_0)}{8}$ we complete the proof. \square

A.3 Number of examples per domain

Proof of Theorem 4. We prove the theorem with two inequalities. We start with the upper bound: $\varepsilon_{\text{exp}}^{\text{ERM}}(m) \leq \varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m)$

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and fix $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m)$. For any meta-distribution $Q \in \text{RE}(\mathbb{H})$ and any class $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}$ with $L_Q(\mathcal{H}) \geq \varepsilon$. We will show that any ERM would choose such a hypothesis class with probability zero (as $n \rightarrow \infty$).

For this, we suggest an alternative sampling method:

1. Sample $\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n$ as usual.
2. Sample a large set $S' \sim \mathbf{D}^T$ with $T = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \left(d + \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$. This set will have a non-realizable set with high probability.
3. Resample from the large set $S \sim S'^{(m)}$ which denotes sampling with no repetitions.

Note that the distribution of S is equivalent to our usual sampling method $S \sim Q^{(n,m)}$.

We will further denote several events. Each one will be a possible error source that corresponds to a different stage in the alternative sampling process:

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= |\{i : L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \beta\varepsilon\}| < (1 - \alpha)(1 - \beta)n\varepsilon \\ E_2 &= |\{i : L_{S'_i}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \beta\gamma\varepsilon\}| < (1 - \alpha)(1 - \beta)(1 - \eta)(1 - \delta)n\varepsilon \\ E_3 &= |\{i : L_{S_i}(\mathcal{H}) \geq 0\}| = 0 \end{aligned}$$

With $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \eta \in (0, 1)$ to be specified later.

Using conditioning, we have:

$$\Pr_{S \sim Q^{(n,m)}}(L_S(\mathcal{H}) = 0) \leq \Pr_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n}(E_1) + \Pr_{\substack{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n \\ S' \sim \mathbf{D}^T}}(E_2 \mid \neg E_1) + \Pr_{\substack{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n \\ S' \sim \mathbf{D}^T \\ S \sim S'^{(m)}}}(E_3 \mid \neg E_1 \neg E_2)$$

We bound each term individually.

For the first term, using Markov's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n}(L_D(\mathcal{H}) < \beta\varepsilon) &= \Pr_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n}(1 - L_D(\mathcal{H}) > 1 - \beta\varepsilon) \leq \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n} L_D(\mathcal{H})}{1 - \beta\varepsilon} \\ &\leq \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{1 - \beta\varepsilon} = 1 - \frac{(1 - \beta)\varepsilon}{1 - \beta\varepsilon} \leq 1 - (1 - \beta)\varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

And therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \beta\varepsilon) \geq (1 - \beta)n\varepsilon$$

Using (multiplicative) Chernoff bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n}(E_1) &\leq \Pr_{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \beta\varepsilon) \leq (1 - \alpha) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \beta\varepsilon) \right] \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(L_{D_i}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \beta\varepsilon) \right] \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 (1 - \beta)n\varepsilon \right) \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, using uniform convergence results (for agnostic learning), for $T = O\left(\frac{d + \log \frac{1}{\delta}}{(\beta(1 - \gamma)\varepsilon)^2}\right)$ we have:

$$\Pr_{S' \sim \mathbf{D}^T}(|L_{S'}(\mathcal{H}) - L_D(\mathcal{H})| \leq \beta(1 - \gamma)\varepsilon) \geq 1 - \delta$$

For any domain with $L_D(\mathcal{H}) \geq \beta\varepsilon$ this implies:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{S' \sim \mathbf{D}^T} (L_{S'}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \beta\gamma\varepsilon) &\geq \Pr_{S' \sim \mathbf{D}^T} (L_{S'}(\mathcal{H}) \geq L_D(\mathcal{H}) - \beta(1-\gamma)\varepsilon) \\ &\geq \Pr_{S' \sim \mathbf{D}^T} (|L_{S'}(\mathcal{H}) - L_D(\mathcal{H})| \leq \beta(1-\gamma)\varepsilon) \geq 1 - \delta \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n \\ S' \sim \mathbf{D}^T}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(L_{S'_i}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \beta\gamma\varepsilon) \mid \neg E_1 \right] \geq (1-\delta)(1-\alpha)(1-\beta)n\varepsilon$$

And using Chernoff bound once again we have:

$$\Pr_{\substack{\mathbf{D} \sim Q^n \\ S' \sim \mathbf{D}^T}} (E_1 \mid \neg E_2) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\eta^2(1-\alpha)(1-\beta)(1-\delta)n\varepsilon\right)$$

For the third term, for any $\beta, \gamma \in (0, 1)$ with $\beta\gamma\varepsilon > \varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m)$ we have $m' := m_{\mathbb{H}}(\beta\gamma\varepsilon) \leq m$. Thereby, for any $S' \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ with $L_{S'}(\mathbb{H}) = 0$ and $L_{S'}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \beta\gamma\varepsilon$ there exists some $S \subseteq S'$ with $|S'| \leq m'$ and $L_S(\mathcal{H}) > 0$. Sampling a subset of size m from S' uniformly will contain this non-realizable

subset with a probability of at least $\frac{\binom{T-m'}{m-m'}}{\binom{T}{m}} \geq \frac{1}{\binom{T}{m}}$. This implies

$$\Pr_{\substack{D \sim Q \\ S' \sim D^T \\ S \sim S'^{(m)}}} (L_S(\mathcal{H}) = 0 \mid L_{S'}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \beta\gamma\varepsilon) \leq 1 - \binom{T}{m}^{-1} \leq \exp\left(-\binom{T}{m}^{-1}\right)$$

Conditioning on the negation of the two previous events we get:

$$\Pr_{\substack{D \sim Q \\ S' \sim D^T \\ S \sim S'^{(m)}}} (E_3 \mid \neg E_1 \neg E_2) \leq \exp\left(-\binom{T}{m}^{-1} n\varepsilon\right)$$

Combining the three terms:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{S \sim Q^{(n,m)}} (L_S(\mathcal{H}) = 0) &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2(1-\beta)n\varepsilon\right) \\ &\quad + \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(1-\alpha)(1-\beta)(1-\delta)\eta^2n\varepsilon\right) \\ &\quad + \exp\left(-\binom{T}{m}^{-1} n\varepsilon\right) \end{aligned}$$

Note this bound is uniform for all $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}$ and $Q \in \text{RE}(\mathbb{H})$ with $L_Q(\mathcal{H}) \geq \varepsilon$. Using a union bound over \mathbb{H} :

$$\Pr_{S \sim Q^{(n,m)}} \left(\sup_{\mathcal{H}: L_S(\mathcal{H})=0} L_Q(\mathcal{H}) \geq \varepsilon \right) \leq \sum_{\mathcal{H}: L_S(\mathcal{H})=0} \Pr_{S \sim Q^{(n,m)}} (L_S(\mathcal{H}) = 0)$$

This tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Finally, since

$$\mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q^{(n,m)}} \sup_{\mathcal{H}: L_S(\mathcal{H})=0} L_Q(\mathcal{H}) \leq \varepsilon + \Pr_{S \sim Q^{(n,m)}} \left(\sup_{\mathcal{H}: L_S(\mathcal{H})=0} L_Q(\mathcal{H}) \geq \varepsilon \right)$$

we have $\varepsilon_{\text{exp}}^{\text{ERM}}(m) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m)$.

For the lower bound $\varepsilon_{\text{exp}}^{\text{ERM}}(m) \geq \varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m)$, fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and fix some $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m)$. (The case for $\varepsilon = 0$ is trivial).

By Definition 4.5, $m_{\mathbb{H}}(\varepsilon) > m$ and therefore, there exists $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}$ with $m_{\mathcal{H}|\mathbb{H}}(\varepsilon) > m$.

By the negation of the ε dual Helly number, there exists $S^* \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ with $L_{S^*}(\mathbb{H}) = 0$ and $L_{S^*}(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon$ yet for all $S \subseteq S^*$ with $|S| \leq m$ we have $L_S(\mathcal{H}) = 0$.

For the domain which samples from S^* uniformly, $D = U(S^*)$ and the meta-distribution that always outputs this domain, $Q = \delta_D$, any sampled sets $S \sim Q^{(n,m)}$ is realizable by \mathcal{H} with probability 1, yet $L_Q(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon$.

This implies that for all n :

$$\mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q^{(n,m)}} \sup_{\mathcal{H}: L_S(\mathcal{H})=0} L_Q(\mathcal{H}) > \varepsilon$$

And therefore, $\varepsilon_{\text{exp}}^{\text{ERM}}(m) \geq \varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m)$ \square

We will next prove a lower bound on the rate of $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}$ in the case where the dual Helly number is infinite:

Proof of Lemma 4.1. First, assume $m_{\mathbb{H}}(0) < \infty$. For all $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $m_{\mathbb{H}}(\varepsilon) \leq m_{\mathbb{H}}(0)$. Therefore, for all $m \geq m_{\mathbb{H}}(0)$ we have $\varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m) = 0$ by definition of the optimal error function.

Next, assume $m_{\mathbb{H}}(0) = \infty$. Then, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{H}$ with $m_{\mathcal{H}}(0) > k$. From the definition of $m_{\mathbb{H}}(0)$, there exists $S \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ with $L_S(\mathcal{H}) > 0$ yet $L_S(\mathbb{H}) = 0$ and for any subset $S' \subseteq S$ with $|S'| < k$ we have $L_{S'}(\mathcal{H}) = 0$

Note that for some $k' \geq k$, there exists $S^* \subseteq S$ with $|S^*| = k'$ with $L_{S^*}(\mathcal{H}) > 0$. Denote by k^* the minimal such size and note that $k^* \geq k$. Then, $L_{S^*}(\mathcal{H}) > 0 \implies L_{S^*}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \frac{1}{k^*}$ and by its minimality, all subsets $S' \subseteq S^*$ satisfy $L_{S'}(\mathcal{H}) = 0$. Next, define the meta-distribution $Q = \delta_{U(S^*)}$ which samples from S^* uniformly. For all $m < k^*$, any sampled set S of size m is a (multi-)subset of S^* and therefore $L_S(\mathcal{H}) = 0$ yet $L_Q(\mathcal{H}) = L_{S^*}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \frac{1}{k^*}$. Specifically, for $m = k^* - 1$, $L_Q(\mathcal{H}) \geq \frac{1}{m+1}$.

Next, denote this k^* as k_1^* , and repeat the argument with $k = k_1^* + 1$. This gives a new minimal $k^* > k_1^*$ with a corresponding classes \mathcal{H} and sets S^* with $L_{S^*}(\mathcal{H}) > 0$. Denote the new k^* as k_2^* and repeat to create a series $\{k_i^*\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Denote their corresponding hypothesis classes as \mathcal{H}_i and meta-distributions as Q_i .

Finally, define the ERM algorithm \mathcal{A} such that if $m = k_i^* - 1$ for some i , then it outputs \mathcal{H}_i . By definition of our series, for any such m ,

$$\varepsilon_{\mathbb{H}}(m) \geq \sup_{Q \in \text{RE}(\mathbb{H})} \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q^m} L_Q(\mathcal{A}(S)) \geq \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q_i^m} L_{Q_i}(\mathcal{A}(S)) \geq \frac{1}{m+1}$$

\square

A.4 Independence result

To show the meta-learnability of \mathbb{H}^* is independent from the ZFC axioms we will show that \mathbb{H}^* is learnable if and only if the cardinality of the continuum is \aleph_k for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ which is known to be independent of the ZFC axioms. For more discussion about this independence result see Ben-David et al. [2019] and citations within.

Proof of Theorem 5. We first show that if there exists a meta-algorithm \mathcal{A} that properly meta-learns \mathbb{H}^* , then the family $\mathcal{F}^* = \{f_X(x) = \mathbb{1}(x \in X) \mid X \subseteq [0, 1], |X| < \infty\}$ is $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$ -EMX learnable. According to Ben-David et al. [2019] this shows the cardinality of the continuum is \aleph_k for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let P be a distribution over $X \subseteq [0, 1]$ with $|X| < \infty$. For each $x \in X$, define the domain $D_x = \delta_x$ and the meta-distribution Q such that $\Pr_{D \sim Q}(D = D_x) = P(x)$.

Since \mathcal{A} properly meta-learn \mathbb{H}^* , there exists some n_0, m_0 such that $\mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q^{(n_0, m_0)}} L_Q(\mathcal{A}(S)) \leq \frac{1}{9}$.

Define the algorithm $G: \mathcal{X}^{n_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^*$ as follows: Given a sample S' of n_0 examples from X , assign $y = 1$ for all and duplicate each example m_0 times to get $S \in (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})^{(n, m)}$. Then, denote

$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{A}(S)$ and return the function $f_X \in \mathcal{F}^*$ for $X = \{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid \mathbb{1}_{\{x\}} \in \mathcal{H}\}$. Then, using Markov's inequality,

$$\Pr_{S' \sim P^{n_0}} \left(\mathbb{E}_P G(S') < \frac{2}{3} \right) = \Pr_{S \sim Q^{(n_0, m_0)}} \left(L_Q(\mathcal{A}(S)) > \frac{1}{3} \right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[L_Q(\mathcal{A}(S))]}{1/3} \leq \frac{1}{3}$$

Which, by definition, means that G is a $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$ -EMX learner for \mathcal{F}^*

To show the other direction, we need to show that given the cardinality of the continuum is \aleph_k for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an algorithm \mathcal{A} that meta-learn \mathbb{H}^* . Using the results from Ben-David et al. [2019], if the cardinality of the continuum is \aleph_k for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ then there exists a monotone compression scheme $n \rightarrow k + 1$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $n > k + 1$ for \mathcal{F}^* . Denote $p = k + 1$ for simplicity.

The compression scheme is defined using a reconstruction function $\eta: \mathcal{X}^p \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^*$ such that for every $f \in \mathcal{F}^*$ and $w_1, \dots, w_n \in \mathcal{X}$ with $f(w_i) = 1$ for all i , there exists i_1, \dots, i_p so that for $g = \eta((w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_p}))$ we have $g(w_i) = 1$ for all i .

We will define the algorithm \mathcal{A} that learns using $m = 1$ examples per domain as follows: Let $S \in (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})^{(n, 1)}$. For each $i \in [n]$, denote $S_i = \{(x_i, y_i)\}$. If $y_{i,j} = 1$, set $w_i = x_i$, otherwise set $w_i = 0$. Next, apply the reconstruction function $g = \eta((w_{i_1}, \dots, w_{i_p}))$ and return \mathcal{H}_W for $W = \{w \in \mathcal{X} \mid g(w) = 1\}$.

We are left to show that \mathcal{A} meta-learns \mathbb{H} . For every subset $B \subseteq [n]$ with $|B| = p$, let \mathcal{H}_B denote the hypothesis class corresponding to the function $\eta((w_i)_{i \in B})$. Notice that \mathcal{H}_B is independent of all domains $i \notin B$ and there are $n - p$ such domains. Note that $L_Q(\mathcal{A}(S)) \geq \varepsilon$ implies that at least one of \mathcal{H}_B satisfies $L_Q(\mathcal{H}_B) \geq \varepsilon$ yet $L_S(\mathcal{H}_B) = 0$.

For any fixed B ,

$$L_Q(\mathcal{H}_B) = \Pr_{\substack{D \sim Q \\ (x, y) \sim D}} (y = 1, \mathbb{1}_{\{x\}} \notin \mathcal{H}_B)$$

Conditioning on $L_Q(\mathcal{H}_B) \geq \varepsilon$,

$$\Pr_{S \sim Q^{(n, 1)}} (L_S(\mathcal{H}_B) = 0 \mid B) \leq \prod_{i \notin B} \Pr_{\substack{D \sim Q \\ (x, y) \sim D}} (y = 1, \mathbb{1}_{\{x\}} \notin \mathcal{H}_B) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)^{n-p}$$

Using a union bound over all $B \subseteq [n]$ with $|B| \leq p$ we have,

$$\Pr_{S \sim Q^{(n, 1)}} (L_Q(\mathcal{A}(S)) \geq \varepsilon) \leq \sum_B \Pr_{S \sim Q^{(n, 1)}} (L_S(\mathcal{H}_B) = 0, L_Q(\mathcal{H}_B) \geq \varepsilon \mid B) \leq \binom{n}{p} (1 - \varepsilon)^{n-p}$$

This tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and therefore the algorithm successfully meta-learns \mathbb{H}^* \square