

Optimal weighted random forests

Xinyu Chen

*School of Management
University of Science and Technology of China
Hefei, 230026, Anhui, China*

SA21204192@MAIL.USTC.EDU.CN

Dalei Yu

*School of Mathematics and Statistics
Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, 710049, Shaan'xi
China*

YUDALEI@126.COM

Xinyu Zhang

*Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, 100190, China
School of Management
University of Science and Technology of China
Hefei, 230026, Anhui, China*

XINYU@AMSS.AC.CN

Editor: editor1 and editor2

Abstract

The random forest (RF) algorithm has become a very popular prediction method for its great flexibility and promising accuracy. In RF, it is conventional to put equal weights on all the base learners (trees) to aggregate their predictions. However, the predictive performances of different trees within the forest can be very different due to the randomization of the embedded bootstrap sampling and feature selection. In this paper, we focus on RF for regression and propose two optimal weighting algorithms, namely the 1 Step Optimal Weighted RF (1step-WRF_{opt}) and 2 Steps Optimal Weighted RF (2steps-WRF_{opt}), that combine the base learners through the weights determined by weight choice criteria. Under some regularity conditions, we show that these algorithms are asymptotically optimal in the sense that the resulting squared loss and risk are asymptotically identical to those of the infeasible but best possible model averaging estimator. Numerical studies conducted on real-world data sets indicate that these algorithms outperform the equal-weight forest and two other weighted RFs proposed in existing literature in most cases.

Keywords: bootstrap, model averaging, optimality, regression, weighted random forest

1. Introduction

Random forest (RF) (Breiman, 2001) is one of the most successful machine learning algorithms that scale with the volume of information while maintaining sufficient statistical efficiency (Biau and Scornet, 2016). Due to its great flexibility and promising accuracy, RF has been widely used in diverse areas of data analysis, including policy-making (Yoon and Jaehyun, 2021; Lin et al., 2021), business analysis (Pallathadka et al., 2021 in press; Ghosh et al., 2022), chemoinformatics (Svetnik et al., 2003), real-time human pose recognition

(Shotton et al., 2011), and so on. RF ensembles multiple decision trees grown on bootstrap samples and yields highly accurate predictions. In the conventional implementation of RF, it is customary and convenient to allocate equal weight to each decision tree. Theoretically, the predictive performance varies from tree to tree due to the application of randomly selected sub-spaces of data and features. In other words, trees exhibit greater diversity owing to the injected randomness. An immediate question then arises: Is it always optimal to consider equal weights? In fact, there is sufficient evidence indicating that an averaging strategy with appropriately selected unequal weights may achieve better performance than simple averaging (i.e., equal weighting) if individual learners exhibit non-identical strength (Zhou, 2012; Peng and Yang, 2022).

To solve the problem mentioned above, some efforts have been made in the literature regarding weighted RFs. Specifically, Trees Weighting Random Forest (TWRF) introduced by Li et al. (2010) adopts the accuracy in the out-of-bag data as an index that measures the classification power of the tree and sets it as the weight. Winham et al. (2013) develop Weighted Random Forests (wRF), where the weights are determined based on tree-level prediction error. Based on wRF, Xuan et al. (2018) put forward Refined Weighted Random Forests (RWRf) using all training data, including in-bag data and out-of-bag data. A novel weights formula is also developed in RWRf but cannot be manipulated into a regression pattern. Pham and Olafsson (2019) replace the regular average with a Cesàro average with theoretical analysis. However, these studies have predominantly focused on classification and less attention has been paid to the regression pattern (i.e., estimating the conditional expectation), although some mechanisms for classification can be transformed into corresponding regression patterns. In addition, none of the aforementioned studies have investigated the theoretical underpinnings regarding the optimality properties of their methods.

Recently, Qiu et al. (2020) propose a novel framework that averages the outputs of multiple machine learning algorithms by the weights determined from Mallows-type criteria. The authors further demonstrate that their framework can be applied to tree-type algorithms, employing regression tree, bagging regression tree and RF as base learners, respectively. Motivated by their work, we extend this approach by developing an asymptotically optimal weighting strategy for RF. Specifically, we treat the individual trees within the RF as base learners and employ Mallows-type criteria to obtain their respective weights. Besides, to reduce computational burden, we further propose an accelerated algorithm that only requires two quadratic optimization tasks. Asymptotic optimality is established for both the original and accelerated weighted RF estimators. Extensive analyses on real-world data sets demonstrate that the proposed methods show promising performance over existing RFs.

The remaining part of the paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 formulates the problem. Section 3 establishes our weighted RF algorithms and provides theoretical analysis. Section 4 shows their promising performance on 12 real-world data sets from UCI Machine Learning Repository. Section 5 concludes.

2. Model and Problem Formulation

Let $\{x_{ij}\}$ be a set of p predictors (or explanatory variables) and y_i be a univariate response variable for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, p$. Consider a data sample of $\{y_i, \mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$, where

$\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ip})^\top$. The data generating process is as follows

$$y_i = \mu_i + e_i,$$

where e_i is the random error with $\mathbb{E}(e_i|\mathbf{x}_i) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(e_i^2|\mathbf{x}_i) = \sigma_i^2$, and $\mu_i = \mathbb{E}(y_i|\mathbf{x}_i)$. So heteroscedasticity is allowed here.

Given a predictor vector \mathbf{x}_i , the corresponding prediction for y_i by a tree (or base learner, BL) in the construction of RF can be written as follows

$$\hat{y}_i = \mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}}^\top(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}, \Theta)\mathbf{y},$$

where $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^\top$ is the vector of the response variable and $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)^\top$ is the matrix of predictors. The variables \mathcal{B} and Θ are not considered explicitly but play implicit roles in injecting randomness. First, each tree is fit to an independent bootstrap sample from the original data. The randomization involved in bootstrap sampling makes up \mathcal{B} . Second, The randomization used to split variables and to cut points at each node furnishes the component of Θ . The nature and dimension of \mathcal{B} and Θ depend on tree construction.

Let us assume that we have drawn M_n bootstrap data sets of size n and grown M_n trees on their bootstrapped data, where M_n can grow with n or remains fixed. Take the m^{th} tree for example. Dropping an instance (y_0, \mathbf{x}_0) down this base learner and end up with a specific tree leaf l with n_l observations $\mathcal{D}_l = \{(y_{i_1}, \mathbf{x}_{i_1}), \dots, (y_{i_{n_l}}, \mathbf{x}_{i_{n_l}})\}$. Assume that the number of occurrences of instance (y_i, \mathbf{x}_i) in this tree is h_i for all i because of the bootstrap sampling procedure. Then $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}, \Theta)$ for this tree is a sparse vector, with elements of h_i/n_l and zero otherwise, corresponding to the counterparts in \mathcal{D}_l between (y_0, \mathbf{x}_0) and $\{y_i, \mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Specifically, the i^{th} element of $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}, \Theta)$ is h_i/n_l , if $(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i) \in \mathcal{D}_l$, and zero otherwise. Elements of $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}, \Theta)$ are weights put on elements of \mathbf{y} to make a prediction for y_0 .

By randomly selecting sub-spaces of data and features, trees in RFs are given more randomness than trees without these randomization techniques. Specifically, bootstrapped data are used to generate trees rather than the original training data. In addition, instead of using all of the predictors before splitting at each node, we draw q ($q < p$) variables from a total of p variables. We have $h_i \equiv 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}, \Theta)$ will contain fewer zero elements, if without the bootstrap procedure.

The prediction for y_i by the m^{th} tree (or the m^{th} base learner) within the forest obeys the following relationship

$$\hat{y}_i^{(m)} = \mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}^\top(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}_{(m)}, \Theta_{(m)})\mathbf{y},$$

where $\hat{y}_i^{(m)}$ is the prediction for y_i by the m^{th} tree, and $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}_{(m)}, \Theta_{(m)})$ is the vector $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}, \Theta)$ related to the m^{th} tree. The final output of the forest is integrated by

$$\hat{y}_i(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} w_{(m)} \hat{y}_i^{(m)},$$

where $w_{(m)}$ is the weight put on the m^{th} tree.

Our goal is to determine appropriate weights to improve prediction accuracy of RF, given a predictor vector \mathbf{x} . Clearly, the conventional RF has $w_{(m)} \equiv 1/M_n$ for $m = 1, \dots, M_n$.

3. Mallows-type Weighted RFs

Let $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}$ be an $n \times n$ matrix, of which the i^{th} row is $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}^\top(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}(m), \Theta(m))$. Let $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} w(m) \mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}$, and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} w(m) \hat{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}$ with $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)} = (\hat{y}_1^{(m)}, \dots, \hat{y}_n^{(m)})^\top$. Define the following averaged squared error function

$$L_n(\mathbf{w}) \equiv \|\hat{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{w}) - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2, \quad (1)$$

which measures the sum of squared biases between the true $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{X})$ and its model averaging estimate $\hat{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{w})$. Let $\ell(m)$ be the number of leaves in the m^{th} tree, $n_{(m),l}$ be the number of observations in the l^{th} leaf of the m^{th} tree, and $R_n(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbb{E}\{L_n(\mathbf{w})|\mathbf{X}\}$. We will suggest criteria to obtain weights based on $R_n(\mathbf{w})$.

3.1 Mallows-type Weight Choice Criteria

Considering the choice of weights, we use the solution obtained by minimizing the following Mallows-type criterion (2) with the restriction of $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H} \equiv \{\mathbf{w} \in [0, 1]^{M_n} : \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} w(m) = 1\}$

$$C_n(\mathbf{w}) = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{y}\|^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^2 P_{ii}(\mathbf{w}), \quad (2)$$

where $P_{ii}(\mathbf{w})$ is the i^{th} diagonal term in $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w})$, and $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, \dots, e_n)^\top$ is the true error term vector.

This criterion is originally proposed by Zhao et al. (2016) for considering linear models. In the context of linear models, $\mathbb{E}\{C_n(\mathbf{w})\}$ equals the expected predictive squared error up to a constant. Zhao et al. (2016) further show that the criterion is asymptotically optimal in the context considered therein. However, e_i 's are unobservable terms in practice. So they further consider the following feasible criterion, replacing the true error terms with averaged residuals

$$C'_n(\mathbf{w}) = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{y}\|^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{e}_i(\mathbf{w})^2 P_{ii}(\mathbf{w}), \quad (3)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{w}) = [\hat{e}_1(\mathbf{w}), \dots, \hat{e}_n(\mathbf{w})]^\top = \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} w(m) \hat{\mathbf{e}}^{(m)} = \{\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w})\}\mathbf{y},$$

$\hat{\mathbf{e}}^{(m)}$ is the residual vector for the m^{th} candidate model, and \mathbf{I} is the identity matrix. This feasible criterion also accommodates heteroscedasticity. Besides, it relies on all candidate models to estimate the true error vector, which avoids placing too much confidence on a single model. Similar criterion has also been considered in Qiu et al. (2020).

We apply criterion (3) to determine \mathbf{w} in $\hat{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{w})$. Criterion (3) comprises of two terms. The first term measures the fitting error of the weighted RF in the training data, by computing the residual sum of squares. The second term penalizes the complexity of the trees in the forest. For each $m \in \{1, \dots, M_n\}$, $P_{\text{BL}(m)ii}$ denotes the i^{th} diagonal term in $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}$. As explained in Section 2, $P_{\text{BL}(m)ii}$ is the proportion of the i^{th} observation to the total number

of samples in the leaf that includes the i^{th} observation. Thus, for each $m \in \{1, \dots, M_n\}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the larger the value of $P_{\text{BL}(m)ii}$, the smaller the gap between y_i and $\hat{y}_i^{(m)}$. In the extreme case where a tree is so deep that the leaf node containing the i^{th} observation is pure, $P_{\text{BL}(m)ii}$ equals 1, and $\hat{y}_i^{(m)}$ equals y_i . Essentially, this tree has low prediction error within the training sample, but may exhibit poor generalization performance when applied to new data. To mitigate the contribution of overfitted trees in the ensembled output, this algorithm assigns a lower weight to these trees, thereby decreasing the second term.

From another perspective, assuming homoscedasticity, the weighted residual terms $\hat{\epsilon}_i(\mathbf{w})^2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ share the same value, and can be moved outside the summation. Then, the summation part $\sum_{i=1}^n P_{ii}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} w_{(m)} \sum_{i=1}^n P_{\text{BL}(m)ii} = \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} w_{(m)} \ell_{(m)}$ represents the weighted number of leaf nodes of all trees. The regularized objective for minimizing in Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost) algorithm, proposed by Chen and Guestrin (2016), also contains a penalty term that penalizes the number of leaves in the tree. In light of this, both the weighted RF with weights obtained by minimizing criterion (3) and XGBoost employ the number of tree leaves in a tree to measure its complexity. Intuitively, criterion (3) tends to assign higher weights to trees that exhibit lower prediction errors on the training sample and show better generalization performance outside the training sample.

It is clear that criterion (3) is a cubic function of \mathbf{w} , whose optimization is substantially more time-consuming than that of quadratic programming. To expedite the process, we further suggest an accelerated algorithm that estimates \mathbf{e} using a vector that is independent of \mathbf{w} . The accelerated algorithm consists of two steps, where the first step involves calculating the estimated error terms, and the second step involves substituting the vector obtained in the first step for the true error terms in criterion (2). In specific, consider the following intermediate criterion,

$$C_n^0(\mathbf{w}) = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{y}\|^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\sigma}^2 P_{ii}(\mathbf{w}), \quad (4)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w}_0)\mathbf{y}\|^2/n$, and \mathbf{w}_0 is a vector with all elements equal $1/M_n$. Solve this quadratic programming task over $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}$ and get a solution \mathbf{w}^* . Then, calculate the residual vector by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{e}} = (\tilde{\epsilon}_1, \dots, \tilde{\epsilon}_n)^\top = \{\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w}^*)\}\mathbf{y}.$$

Next, consider the following criterion

$$C_n''(\mathbf{w}) = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{y}\|^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\epsilon}_i^2 P_{ii}(\mathbf{w}). \quad (5)$$

Both (4) and (5) are quadratic functions of \mathbf{w} , while criterion (3) is a cubic function. Many contemporary software packages, such as quadprog in R or MATLAB, can effectively handle quadratic programming problems. In fact, from the real data analysis conducted in Section 4, it is observed that the time required to solve two quadratic programming problems is notably lower compared to that required to solve a more intricate nonlinear programming problem of higher order. Please see Table 4 for more details.

We refer to the RF with tree-level weights derived from optimizing criterion (3) as 1 Step Optimal Weighted RF (1step-WRF_{opt}), and the RF with weights of trees obtained by

optimizing criterion (5) as 2 Steps Optimal Weighted RF (2steps-WRF_{opt}). Their details are provided in Algorithms 1 and 2, respectively.

Before providing the theoretical support of the proposed algorithms, we introduce a tree-type algorithm that aims to construct a tree whose structure is independent of the output values of the learning sample. Such configuration has also been imposed in the theoretical analysis of Geurts et al. (2006) and Biau (2012). Moreover, this theoretical framework is referred to as “honesty” in the field of causal inference (Athey and Imbens, 2016) and is essential for further theoretical analysis. We term this tree as Split-Unsupervised Tree (SUT) in contrast to Classification and Regression Tree (CART) whose split criterion relies on response information. Under this setup, the vector $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}, \Theta)$ reduces to $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}, \mathcal{B}, \Theta)$. The details of the SUT and CART algorithms are provided in Appendix A.

Algorithm 1: 1step-WRF_{opt}

Input: (1) The training data set $\mathcal{D} = \{y_i, \mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ (2) The number of trees in random forest M_n

Output: Weight vector $\widehat{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathcal{H}$

```

1 for  $m = 1$  to  $M_n$  do
2   Draw a bootstrap data set  $\mathcal{D}_{(m)}$  of size  $n$  from the training data set  $\mathcal{D}$ ;
3   Grow a random-forest tree  $\hat{f}_{(m)}$  to the bootstrapped data  $\mathcal{D}_{(m)}$ , by recursively
   repeating the following steps for each terminal node of the tree, until the
   minimum node size  $n_{\min}$  is reached ; //  $n_{\min}, q$  are hyper parameters
4     i. Select  $q$  variables at random from the  $p$  variables;
5     ii. Pick the best variable/ split-point among the  $q$ ;
6     iii. Split the node into two daughter nodes.
7   for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
8     Drop  $\mathbf{x}_i$  down the tree  $m$  and get  $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}_{(m)}, \Theta_{(m)})$  if CART
     trees or  $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}, \mathcal{B}_{(m)}, \Theta_{(m)})$  if SUT trees;
9   end
10   $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)} \leftarrow \{\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}_{(m)}, \Theta_{(m)}), \dots, \mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}_{(m)}, \Theta_{(m)})\}^\top$  if
   CART trees
11  or  $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)} \leftarrow \{\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{X}, \mathcal{B}_{(m)}, \Theta_{(m)}), \dots, \mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{X}, \mathcal{B}_{(m)}, \Theta_{(m)})\}^\top$  if
   SUT trees;
12 end
13 Solve the convex optimization problem:
   
$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}} = (\widehat{w}_{(1)}, \dots, \widehat{w}_{(M_n)})^\top \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} C'_n(\mathbf{w}) \text{ with } \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} w_{(m)} \mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}.$$


```

Algorithm 2: 2steps-WRF_{opt}

Input: (1) The training data set $\mathcal{D} = \{y_i, \mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ (2) The number of trees in random forest M_n

Output: Weight vector $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathcal{H}$

```

1 for  $m = 1$  to  $M_n$  do
2   Draw a bootstrap data set  $\mathcal{D}_{(m)}$  of size  $n$  from the training data set  $\mathcal{D}$ ;
3   Grow a random-forest tree  $\hat{f}_{(m)}$  to the bootstrapped data  $\mathcal{D}_{(m)}$ , by recursively
   repeating the following steps for each terminal node of the tree, until the
   minimum node size  $n_{\min}$  is reached ;           //  $n_{\min}, q$  are hyper parameters
4     i. Select  $q$  variables at random from the  $p$  variables;
5     ii. Pick the best variable/ split-point among the  $q$ ;
6     iii. Split the node into two daughter nodes.
7   for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
8     Drop  $\mathbf{x}_i$  down the tree  $m$  and get  $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}_{(m)}, \Theta_{(m)})$  if CART
     trees or  $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}, \mathcal{B}_{(m)}, \Theta_{(m)})$  if SUT trees;
9   end
10   $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)} \leftarrow \{\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}_{(m)}, \Theta_{(m)}), \dots, \mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \mathcal{B}_{(m)}, \Theta_{(m)})\}^\top$  if
   CART trees
11  or  $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)} \leftarrow \{\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{X}, \mathcal{B}_{(m)}, \Theta_{(m)}), \dots, \mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{X}, \mathcal{B}_{(m)}, \Theta_{(m)})\}^\top$  if
   SUT trees;
12 end
13 Solve the quadratic programming problem:
    $\mathbf{w}^* = (w_{(1)}^*, \dots, w_{(M_n)}^*)^\top \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} C_n^0(\mathbf{w})$  with  $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} w_{(m)} \mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}$ ;
14  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}} \leftarrow \{\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w}^*)\} \mathbf{y}$  with  $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w}^*) = \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} w_{(m)}^* \mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}$ ;
15 Solve the quadratic programming problem:
    $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} = (\tilde{w}_{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{w}_{(M_n)})^\top \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} C_n''(\mathbf{w})$  with  $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} w_{(m)} \mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}$ .

```

3.2 Asymptotic Optimality

In this section, we will establish the asymptotic optimality of the 1step-WRF_{opt} estimator and 2steps-WRF_{opt} estimator with SUT trees. Denote the selected weight vectors from $C_n'(\mathbf{w})$ and $C_n''(\mathbf{w})$ by

$$\hat{\mathbf{w}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} C_n'(\mathbf{w}) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{w}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} C_n''(\mathbf{w}),$$

respectively. Let $\xi_n = \inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} R_n(\mathbf{w})$. The following theorems establish the asymptotic optimality of the 1step-WRF_{opt} estimator and 2steps-WRF_{opt} estimator, respectively. We will list and discuss technical conditions required for proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 in Appendix C.1.

Theorem 1 (Asymptotic Optimality for 1step-WRF_{opt}) *Assume Conditions 1 - 3 in Appendix C.1 hold. Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{L_n(\widehat{\mathbf{w}})}{\inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} L_n(\mathbf{w})} \xrightarrow{p} 1. \quad (6)$$

If, in addition, $\{L_n(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}) - \xi_n\} \xi_n^{-1}$ is bounded above by a positive constant, almost surely, then

$$\frac{R_n(\widehat{\mathbf{w}})}{\inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} R_n(\mathbf{w})} \rightarrow 1. \quad (7)$$

Theorem 2 (Asymptotic Optimality for 2steps-WRF_{opt}) *Assume Conditions 1 - 4 in Appendix C.1 hold. Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{L_n(\widetilde{\mathbf{w}})}{\inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} L_n(\mathbf{w})} \xrightarrow{p} 1. \quad (8)$$

If, in addition, $\{L_n(\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}) - \xi_n\} \xi_n^{-1}$ is bounded above by a positive constant, almost surely, then

$$\frac{R_n(\widetilde{\mathbf{w}})}{\inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} R_n(\mathbf{w})} \rightarrow 1. \quad (9)$$

Results obtained in (6) and (8) regard the asymptotic optimality in the sense of achieving the lowest possible squared loss, while (7) and (9) yield asymptotic optimality in the sense of achieving the lowest possible squared risk. Proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 are presented in Appendix C.3 and C.4.

4. Real Data Analysis

To assess the prediction performance of different weighted RFs in practical situations, we used 12 data sets from the UCI data repository for machine learning. Appendix B features a demonstration of two competitors, namely wRF and CRF. The details of the 12 data sets are listed in Table 1.

For the sake of brevity, in the following, we will refer to each data set by its abbreviation. We randomly partitioned each data set into training data, testing data and validation data, in the ratio of 0.5 : 0.3 : 0.2. The training data was used to construct trees and to calculate weights, and the test data was used to evaluate the predictive performance of different algorithms. The validation data was employed to select tuning parameters, such as the exponent in the expression for calculating weights in the wRF, and probability sequence in the SUT algorithm.

In this section, the number of trees M_n was set to 100. Before each split, the dimension of random feature sub-space q was set to $\lceil p/3 \rceil$, which is the default value in the regression mode of the R package randomForest. We set the minimum leaf size n_{\min} to \sqrt{n} in CART

Data set	Abbreviation	Attributes	Samples
Boston Housing	BH	13	506
Servo	Servo	4	167
Auto-mpg	AM	8	398
Concrete Compressive Strength	CCS	9	1030
Airfoil Self-Noise	ASN	5	1503
Combined Cycle Power Plant	CCPP	4	9568
Concrete Slump Test	CST	7	103
Energy Efficiency	EE	8	768
Parkinsons Telemonitoring	PT	20	5875
QSAR aquatic toxicity	QSAR	8	546
Synchronous Machine	SM	4	557
Yacht Hydrodynamics	YH	6	308

Table 1: Summary of 12 Data Sets

trees and 5 in SUT trees, in order to control the depth of trees. We also tried other values of M_n and n_{\min} , and the patterns of the performance remain unchanged in general.

For each strategy, the number of replication was set to $D = 1000$ and the forecasting performance was accessed by the following two criteria:

$$\text{MSFE} = \frac{1}{D \times n_{\text{test}}} \sum_{d=1}^D \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{test}}} (y_i - \hat{y}_{i,d})^2 \text{ and } \text{MAFE} = \frac{1}{D \times n_{\text{test}}} \sum_{d=1}^D \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{test}}} |y_i - \hat{y}_{i,d}|,$$

where n_{test} is the size of testing data, and $\hat{y}_{i,d}$ is the forecast for y_i in the d^{th} repetition. MSFE and MAFE are abbreviations of ‘‘Mean Squared Forecast Error’’ and ‘‘Mean Absolute Forecast Error’’, respectively. Next, we will exhibit the results of different weighting techniques on RFs with CART trees and RFs with SUT trees, respectively.

4.1 RFs with CART Trees

Tables 2 and 3 exhibit the risks of RFs with CART trees calculated by MSFE and MAFE, respectively. Each row in the tables presents the risks of different strategies, sorted in ascending order, with the corresponding values displayed in parentheses.

Regarding MSFE, the 1step-WRF_{opt} or 2steps-WRF_{opt} estimator manifests the best performance in 10 out of 12 data sets, whereas it exhibits the best performance in 9 out of 12 data sets in terms of MAFE. It is observed that the wRF becomes the best method in some data sets. Of all cases considered, the CRF is found to never be the best method. It is also noticeable that the 2steps-WRF_{opt} is superior to the 1step-WRF_{opt} in most cases, albeit with minor differences.

Table 4 compares the time consumption of the 2steps-WRF_{opt} and 1step-WRF_{opt} algorithms for a single run, averaged over D repetitions, with the ratio of the latter to the former in the fourth column. Apparently, the 2steps-WRF_{opt} can accelerate optimization by tens or hundreds of times when compared to the 1step-WRF_{opt}, given that solving quadratic optimization is considerably faster than solving higher-order nonlinear optimization task.

Data set	RF	2steps-WRF _{opt}	1step-WRF _{opt}	wRF	CRF
BH	15.484 ⁽⁵⁾	13.958 ⁽¹⁾	14.038 ⁽²⁾	14.517 ⁽³⁾	14.664 ⁽⁴⁾
Servo	1.610 ⁽⁵⁾	0.825 ⁽¹⁾	0.836 ⁽²⁾	0.860 ⁽³⁾	1.169 ⁽⁴⁾
AM	9.709 ⁽⁵⁾	9.272 ⁽³⁾	9.407 ⁽⁴⁾	9.077 ⁽¹⁾	9.078 ⁽²⁾
CCS	60.460 ⁽⁵⁾	50.004 ⁽¹⁾	50.048 ⁽²⁾	52.868 ⁽³⁾	54.065 ⁽⁴⁾
ASN	20.022 ⁽⁵⁾	14.572 ⁽¹⁾	14.575 ⁽²⁾	15.611 ⁽³⁾	17.054 ⁽⁴⁾
CCPP	18.016 ⁽⁵⁾	16.065 ⁽²⁾	16.062 ⁽¹⁾	16.237 ⁽³⁾	16.556 ⁽⁴⁾
CST	26.421 ⁽⁵⁾	19.877 ⁽¹⁾	20.074 ⁽²⁾	21.500 ⁽³⁾	22.534 ⁽⁴⁾
EE	4.332 ⁽⁵⁾	3.643 ⁽²⁾	3.642 ⁽¹⁾	3.964 ⁽³⁾	4.087 ⁽⁴⁾
PT	14.641 ⁽⁵⁾	8.653 ⁽²⁾	8.649 ⁽¹⁾	9.099 ⁽³⁾	10.819 ⁽⁴⁾
QSAR	1.436 ⁽⁵⁾	1.423 ⁽³⁾	1.434 ⁽⁴⁾	1.417 ⁽¹⁾	1.420 ⁽²⁾
SM($\times 10^{-4}$)	6.981 ⁽⁵⁾	3.403 ⁽¹⁾	3.404 ⁽²⁾	4.342 ⁽³⁾	5.214 ⁽⁴⁾
YH	35.442 ⁽⁵⁾	3.727 ⁽¹⁾	3.735 ⁽²⁾	5.603 ⁽³⁾	13.422 ⁽⁴⁾

Table 2: Test Error Comparisons by MSFE for Different Forests with CART Trees

Data set	RF	2steps-WRF _{opt}	1step-WRF _{opt}	wRF	CRF
BH	2.608 ⁽⁵⁾	2.536 ⁽¹⁾	2.549 ⁽³⁾	2.539 ⁽²⁾	2.562 ⁽⁴⁾
Servo	0.900 ⁽⁵⁾	0.550 ⁽²⁾	0.550 ⁽³⁾	0.535 ⁽¹⁾	0.754 ⁽⁴⁾
AM	2.199 ⁽⁵⁾	2.164 ⁽³⁾	2.182 ⁽⁴⁾	2.141 ⁽¹⁾	2.144 ⁽²⁾
CCS	6.092 ⁽⁵⁾	5.500 ⁽¹⁾	5.503 ⁽²⁾	5.668 ⁽³⁾	5.751 ⁽⁴⁾
ASN	3.607 ⁽⁵⁾	3.013 ⁽¹⁾	3.013 ⁽²⁾	3.121 ⁽³⁾	3.295 ⁽⁴⁾
CCPP	3.243 ⁽⁵⁾	3.058 ⁽²⁾	3.058 ⁽¹⁾	3.075 ⁽³⁾	3.108 ⁽⁴⁾
CST	4.023 ⁽⁵⁾	3.425 ⁽¹⁾	3.445 ⁽²⁾	3.568 ⁽³⁾	3.676 ⁽⁴⁾
EE	1.563 ⁽⁵⁾	1.349 ⁽²⁾	1.349 ⁽¹⁾	1.423 ⁽³⁾	1.487 ⁽⁴⁾
PT	2.933 ⁽⁵⁾	2.201 ⁽²⁾	2.201 ⁽¹⁾	2.241 ⁽³⁾	2.493 ⁽⁴⁾
QSAR	0.892 ⁽⁴⁾	0.888 ⁽³⁾	0.892 ⁽⁵⁾	0.885 ⁽¹⁾	0.887 ⁽²⁾
SM($\times 10^{-2}$)	2.044 ⁽⁵⁾	1.374 ⁽¹⁾	1.375 ⁽²⁾	1.551 ⁽³⁾	1.746 ⁽⁴⁾
YH	3.877 ⁽⁵⁾	1.182 ⁽¹⁾	1.182 ⁽²⁾	1.358 ⁽³⁾	2.329 ⁽⁴⁾

Table 3: Test Error Comparisons by MAFE for Different Forests with CART Trees

Data set	2steps-WRF _{opt}	1step-WRF _{opt}	Ratio
BH	0.065	3.898	60.371
Servo	0.072	1.347	18.778
AM	0.060	2.894	48.368
CCS	0.081	6.822	83.982
ASN	0.094	6.468	68.840
CCPP	0.566	2.785	4.916
CST	0.075	2.061	27.630
EE	0.072	3.498	48.304
PT	0.291	40.445	138.967
QSAR	0.069	3.148	45.431
SM	0.060	1.409	23.327
YH	0.065	2.631	40.546

Table 4: Time Consumption Comparisons (Unit: seconds)

To further highlight their abilities in predictive accuracy, we assessed relative risks based on the 2steps-WRF_{opt}. More specifically, we divided the risks of the RF, 1step-WRF_{opt}, wRF and CRF by the benchmark 2steps-WRF_{opt}. In the following, we assert that a relative risk is not essential if it falls in the interval of (0.95, 1.05), while it is essential if it is lower than 0.95 or higher than 1.05. The relative MSFE and MAFE of each method on 12 data sets are reported in Figures 1 and 2, respectively. The results are depicted by blue, black, green, purple and red lines, respectively, for the RF, 2steps-WRF_{opt}, 1step-WRF_{opt}, wRF, and CRF.

Some findings are worth mentioning in Figure 1. First, the improvement of the WRF_{opt} (including the 1step-WRF_{opt} and 2steps-WRF_{opt}) over the conventional RF is essential in 10 out of 12 data sets. What stands out in the figure is that the relative MSFEs of others with respect to the benchmark are conspicuously large in the YH data set. This spells the great success of our WRF_{opt} methods in practice. More importantly, the WRF_{opt} outperforms competitors essentially in 7 out of 12 data sets, while none of the competitors dominate the benchmark essentially in all cases, underscoring the robustness of the WRF_{opt}.

Figure 2 remains the similar qualitative results, albeit with less notable power of the WRF_{opt} than Figure 1. Specifically, the WRF_{opt} shows essential improvement over the conventional RF in 9 out of 12 data sets, and dominates all competitors essentially in 3 out of 12 data sets. These proportions are relatively lower than those in Figure 1. But none of the competitors surpass the benchmark essentially in all cases, which is consistent with Figure 1.

Note that the wRF algorithm requires tuning a parameter outside of the training set, whereas the WRF_{opt} and CRF do not. For the fairness of the comparison, all three weighted RFs should use identical tree models built in the same training data set. As a result, the WRF_{opt} and CRF will use more training samples if not compared with the wRF, which may contribute to their superior predictive capability. Combining all the findings together, we can conclude that the proposed WRF_{opt} yields more accurate predictions compared to the conventional RF and other existing weighted RFs in most cases.




Figure 1: Relative MSFE for Different Forests with CART Trees

4.2 RFs with SUT Trees

Similar to the previous scenario, Tables 5 and 6 display the risks of RFs with SUT trees computed by the MSFE and MAFE. The 1step-WRF_{opt} or 2steps-WRF_{opt} estimator consistently outperforms the conventional RFs and the two competitors in terms of MSFE, while performing best in 11 out of 12 data sets in terms of MAFE. Additionally, the gaps between the 1step-WRF_{opt} and 2steps-WRF_{opt} are relatively small, akin to random forests with CART trees.

The relative MSFE and MAFE are depicted in Figures 3 and 4, respectively. With SUT trees rather than CART trees, the WRF_{opt} performs better at upgrading equal-weight forests. Concerning the MSFE and MAFE, the number of supporting data sets jumps to 11 and 10 out of 12 data sets, respectively. Additionally, the proportion of outperforming rivals climbs to 10 out of 12 data sets for MSFE and 7 out of 12 data sets for MAFE. Notably, the improvement in the EE, SM, and YH data sets are particularly substantial.

Due to the lack of response data for guiding splits, the WRF_{opt} with SUT trees has worse predictive power than the WRF_{opt} with CART trees. However, it is worthwhile noting that the improvement for forests with equal weights has an essential increase in both the quantity of improvement ratio and the number of supporting data sets. This shows the practical success of our WRF_{opt} approaches with weaker base learners.




Figure 2: Relative MAFE for Different Forests with CART Trees

Data set	RF	2steps-WRF _{opt}	1step-WRF _{opt}	wRF	CRF
BH	38.213 ⁽⁵⁾	24.516 ⁽¹⁾	24.522 ⁽²⁾	28.797 ⁽³⁾	29.974 ⁽⁴⁾
Servo	1.604 ⁽⁵⁾	0.964 ⁽¹⁾	0.968 ⁽²⁾	0.998 ⁽³⁾	1.232 ⁽⁴⁾
AM	13.952 ⁽⁵⁾	9.632 ⁽¹⁾	9.642 ⁽²⁾	11.508 ⁽³⁾	12.148 ⁽⁴⁾
CCS	149.276 ⁽⁵⁾	119.471 ⁽¹⁾	119.505 ⁽²⁾	136.243 ⁽⁴⁾	132.435 ⁽³⁾
ASN	36.391 ⁽⁵⁾	33.465 ⁽¹⁾	33.472 ⁽²⁾	35.675 ⁽⁴⁾	35.419 ⁽³⁾
CCPP	50.329 ⁽⁵⁾	36.619 ⁽²⁾	36.613 ⁽¹⁾	39.145 ⁽⁴⁾	38.600 ⁽³⁾
CST	42.899 ⁽⁵⁾	25.933 ⁽²⁾	25.928 ⁽¹⁾	32.806 ⁽³⁾	36.783 ⁽⁴⁾
EE	17.768 ⁽⁵⁾	5.140 ⁽²⁾	5.140 ⁽¹⁾	6.193 ⁽³⁾	8.026 ⁽⁴⁾
PT	98.864 ⁽⁵⁾	89.299 ⁽¹⁾	89.325 ⁽²⁾	97.924 ⁽⁴⁾	95.321 ⁽³⁾
QSAR	1.737 ⁽⁵⁾	1.657 ⁽¹⁾	1.661 ⁽²⁾	1.680 ⁽⁴⁾	1.668 ⁽³⁾
SM($\times 10^{-4}$)	20.963 ⁽⁵⁾	0.212 ⁽¹⁾	0.212 ⁽²⁾	0.251 ⁽³⁾	4.460 ⁽⁴⁾
YH	33.241 ⁽⁵⁾	2.433 ⁽²⁾	2.431 ⁽¹⁾	3.171 ⁽³⁾	8.152 ⁽⁴⁾

Table 5: Test Error Comparisons by MSFE for Different Forests with SUT Trees

Data set	RF	2steps-WRF _{opt}	1step-WRF _{opt}	wRF	CRF
BH	3.759 ⁽⁵⁾	3.128 ⁽¹⁾	3.131 ⁽²⁾	3.314 ⁽³⁾	3.349 ⁽⁴⁾
Servo	0.847 ⁽⁵⁾	0.578 ⁽¹⁾	0.578 ⁽²⁾	0.606 ⁽³⁾	0.701 ⁽⁴⁾
AM	2.671 ⁽⁵⁾	2.221 ⁽¹⁾	2.222 ⁽²⁾	2.392 ⁽³⁾	2.459 ⁽⁴⁾
CCS	9.914 ⁽⁵⁾	8.764 ⁽¹⁾	8.764 ⁽²⁾	9.421 ⁽⁴⁾	9.273 ⁽³⁾
ASN	4.903 ⁽⁵⁾	4.689 ⁽²⁾	4.685 ⁽¹⁾	4.813 ⁽⁴⁾	4.765 ⁽³⁾
CCPP	5.805 ⁽⁵⁾	4.860 ⁽²⁾	4.858 ⁽¹⁾	5.019 ⁽⁴⁾	4.999 ⁽³⁾
CST	5.209 ⁽⁵⁾	3.927 ⁽²⁾	3.926 ⁽¹⁾	4.455 ⁽³⁾	4.773 ⁽⁴⁾
EE	3.356 ⁽⁵⁾	1.611 ⁽²⁾	1.609 ⁽¹⁾	1.799 ⁽³⁾	2.094 ⁽⁴⁾
PT	7.995 ⁽⁵⁾	7.553 ⁽²⁾	7.544 ⁽¹⁾	7.948 ⁽⁴⁾	7.815 ⁽³⁾
QSAR	1.001 ⁽⁵⁾	0.979 ⁽³⁾	0.980 ⁽⁴⁾	0.977 ⁽²⁾	0.972 ⁽¹⁾
SM($\times 10^{-2}$)	3.674 ⁽⁵⁾	0.290 ⁽¹⁾	0.291 ⁽²⁾	0.304 ⁽³⁾	1.628 ⁽⁴⁾
YH	3.508 ⁽⁵⁾	0.856 ⁽¹⁾	0.857 ⁽²⁾	0.902 ⁽³⁾	1.483 ⁽⁴⁾

Table 6: Test Error Comparisons by MAFE for Different Forests with SUT Trees




Figure 3: Relative MSFE for Different Forests with SUT Trees




Figure 4: Relative MAFE for Different Forests with SUT Trees

5. Conclusion

This paper investigates the weighted RFs for regression. We propose an optimal forest algorithm and its accelerated variant. The proposed methods are asymptotically optimal for the case where structures of trees are independent to the output values in learning samples. Empirical results demonstrate that the proposed methods achieve lower risk compared to RFs with equal weights and other existing unequally weighted forests. While this paper has focused on regression, it would be greatly desirable to study the optimal forests for classification. Another important extension would be to release the independence of tree architectures from the output values in training data.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the support of the NNSFC through grants 12071414 and 11661079.

Appendix A. Tree-Building Algorithms

We will elucidate the differences between the two splitting criteria in this appendix. When constructing RFs using CART trees, we consider Algorithm 3, and when building them with SUT trees, we adopt Algorithm 4. The structures of SUT trees are developed in an unsupervised manner, eliminating the reliance on response values during split, whereas CART trees use the information of \mathbf{y} to obtain the best splitting variables and cut points. They are the same in other procedures, such as growing on the bootstrapped data.

When selecting the probability sequence \mathcal{P} in Algorithm 4, we built conventional RFs with CART trees in the validation data to compute variables importance. The variable importance is the total decrease in node impurities from splitting on the variable, averaged over all trees. For regression, the node impurity is measured by residual sum of squares. After that, the probability sequence \mathcal{P} was determined by the normalized variables importance.

Algorithm 3: CART

Split_a_node(S)

Input: The local learning subset S corresponding to the node we want to split

Output: A split $[a < c]$ or nothing

-If **Stop_split**(S) is TRUE then return nothing.

-Otherwise select q attributes $A_q = \{a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_q}\}$ randomly among all non constant (in S) candidate attributes;

-Return the best split s_* , where $s_* = \mathbf{Find_the_best_split}(S, A_q)$.

Find_the_best_split(S, A_q)

Input: The subset S and the selected attribute list A_q

Output: The best split

- Seek the splitting variable a_j and cut point c that solve

$$\min_{j \in \{j_1, \dots, j_q\}, c} \left\{ \min_{c_1} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \{\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{x}_j \leq c\}} (y_i - c_1)^2 + \min_{c_2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_i \in \{\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{x}_j \geq c\}} (y_i - c_2)^2 \right\};$$

- Return the split $[a_j < c]$.

Stop_split(S)

Input: A subset S

Output: A boolean

- If $|S| < n_{\min}$, then return TRUE;

- If all attributes are constant in S , then return TRUE;

- If the output is constant in S , then return TRUE;

- Otherwise, return FALSE.

Algorithm 4: SUT

Split_a_node(S)**Input:** The local learning subset S corresponding to the node we want to split**Output:** A split $[a < c]$ or nothing-If **Stop_split**(S) is TRUE then return nothing.-Otherwise select q attributes $\{a_1, \dots, a_q\}$ by probability sequence \mathcal{P} among all non constant (in S) candidate attributes ; // Hyper parameter: probability sequence $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_p\}$, where $P_j \in [0, 1], \forall j = 1, \dots, p$ and $\sum_{j=1}^p P_j = 1$ -Draw q splits $\{s_1, \dots, s_K\}$, where $s_i = \mathbf{Pick_a_split}(S, a_i), \forall i = 1, \dots, q$;-Return a split s_* such that **Score**(s_*, S) = $\max_{i=1, \dots, q} \mathbf{Score}(s_i, S)$.**Pick_a_split**(S, a)**Input:** A subset S and an attribute a **Output:** A split- Let a_{\max}^S and a_{\min}^S be the maximal and minimal value of a in S ;- Calculate the cut-point $c \leftarrow (a_{\min}^S, a_{\max}^S)/2$;- Return the split $[a < c]$.**Stop_split**(S)**Input:** A subset S **Output:** A boolean- If $|S| < n_{\min}$, then return TRUE.- If all attributes are constant in S , then return TRUE.- If the output is constant in S , then return TRUE.

- Otherwise, return FALSE.

Score(s, S)**Input:** A split s and a subset S **Output:** The score of this split method-Let $\mathbf{X}_P, \mathbf{X}_L, \mathbf{X}_R$ be the attribute matrix of this local parent node, left daughter, right daughter, respectively;-Let n_P, n_L, n_R be the number of samples contained in the local parent node, left daughter, right daughter, respectively;-Obtain $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_P, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_L, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_R$ by centering and scaling of each column of the matrices
$$\mathbf{X}_P, \mathbf{X}_L, \mathbf{X}_R, \text{ respectively;}$$

$$\text{-score} \leftarrow \frac{\|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_P\| - \frac{n_L}{n_P} \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_L\| - \frac{n_R}{n_P} \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_R\|}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_P\|};$$

-Return score.

Appendix B. Detailed Demonstration of Competitors

In this appendix, we present an exposition of two weighted RF models that have been previously introduced in Section 1. Furthermore, we describe a methodology for transforming classification patterns into regression patterns to address predictive regression tasks.

B.1 Weighted RF (wRF)

Much of the current literature on binary classification pay particular attention to out-of-bag data. Namely, Li et al. (2010) use the accuracy in the out-of-bag data as an index of the classification ability of a given tree. This metric is subsequently considered to assign weights to the individual trees. Winham et al. (2013) provide a family of weights choice based on the prediction error in the out-of-bag data of each tree. The reason why using out-of-bag individuals instead of another shared data set is that it gives internal estimates that are helpful in understanding the predictive performance and how to improve it without testing data set aside (Breiman, 2001).

Specifically, Winham et al. (2013) define the tree-level prediction error, measuring the predictive ability for tree m as follows

$$tPE_m = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n OOB_{im}} \sum_{i=1}^n |v_{im} - y_i| \cdot OOB_{im}, \quad (10)$$

where v_{im} is the vote for subject i in tree m and OOB_{im} is the indicator for the out-of-bag status of subject i in tree m . By drawing on the concept of tPE , they have been able to show that weights inversely related to tPE are appropriate. Such as

$$w_{(m)} = 1 - tPE_m, \quad (11)$$

$$w_{(m)} = \exp\left(\frac{1}{tPE_m}\right), \quad (12)$$

and

$$w_{(m)} = \left(\frac{1}{tPE_m}\right)^\lambda \text{ for some } \lambda. \quad (13)$$

In their proposed wRF algorithm, they normalized weights of the form

$$w_{(m)} = \frac{w_{(m)}}{\sum_{m=1}^{M_n} w_{(m)}}.$$

The classification model can be easily turned into a regression model by simply changing (10) to the following definition

$$tPE_m^* = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n OOB_{im}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \hat{f}_m(\mathbf{x}_i) - y_i \right| \cdot OOB_{im}. \quad (14)$$

The details of the wRF in regression pattern is in Algorithm 5, which selects (13) for example. For simplicity, we only present the best result of the wRF family as a representative in Section 4.

Algorithm 5: wRF

Input: (1) The training data set $\mathcal{D} = \{y_i, \mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ (2) The number of trees in RF M_n (3) Parameter λ

Output: Weight vector $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathcal{H}$

- 1 **for** $m = 1$ to M_n **do**
- 2 Draw a bootstrap data set $\mathcal{D}_{(m)}$ of size n from the training data set \mathcal{D} ;
- 3 Grow a random-forest tree $\hat{f}_{(m)}$ to the bootstrapped data $\mathcal{D}_{(m)}$, by recursively repeating the following steps for each terminal node of the tree, until the minimum node size n_{\min} is reached ; // n_{\min}, q are hyper parameters
 - 4 i. Select q variables at random from the p variables;
 - 5 ii. Pick the best variable/ split-point among the q ;
 - 6 iii. Split the node into two daughter nodes.
- 7 $tPE_m^* \leftarrow \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{OOB}_{im}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \hat{f}_{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_i) - y_i \right| \cdot \text{OOB}_{im}$;
- 8 $\hat{w}_{(m)} \leftarrow \left(\frac{1}{tPE_m^*} \right)^\lambda$;
- 9 **end**
- 10 $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \leftarrow (\hat{w}_{(1)}, \dots, \hat{w}_{(M_n)})^\top$;
- 11 $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \leftarrow \frac{\hat{\mathbf{w}}}{\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}\|_1}$.

B.2 Cesáro RF (CRF)

Another non-equally weighted RF mentioned earlier is the CRF proposed by Pham and Olafsson (2019), which replace the regular average with the Cesáro average. Their method is based on a renowned theory that if a sequence converges to a number c , then the Cesáro sequence also converges to c . To implement the CRF, a strategy for sequencing M_n trees from best to worst must be established. This can be done by ranking trees based on their out-of-bag error rates or accuracy on a separate training set. Next, a weight sequence $\{w_{(m)}\}_{m=1}^{M_n}$ is obtained by arranging weights in descending order, where $w_{(m)} = \sum_{k=m}^{M_n} k^{-1}$, with normalizer being $\sum_{m=1}^{M_n} \sum_{k=m}^{M_n} k^{-1}$.

This classification model can be easily converted into a regression model as well through a simple modification in the sequencing methods. We can draw tPE^* defined by the wRF algorithm and subsequently rank trees using out-of-bag data. The details of the CRF in regression pattern are in Algorithm 6.

Appendix C. Proofs of Theorems 1 and 2

In this appendix, we provide the technical conditions for establishing the asymptotic optimality and adopt them to prove Theorems 1 and 2.

Algorithm 6: CRF

Input: (1) The training data set $\mathcal{D} = \{y_i, \mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ (2) The number of trees in RF M_n **Output:** Weight vector $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathcal{H}$

```

1 for  $m = 1$  to  $M_n$  do
2   Draw a bootstrap data set  $\mathcal{D}_{(m)}$  of size  $n$  from the training data set  $\mathcal{D}$ ;
3   Grow a random-forest tree  $\hat{f}_{(m)}$  to the bootstrapped data  $\mathcal{D}_{(m)}$ , by recursively
   repeating the following steps for each terminal node of the tree, until the
   minimum node size  $n_{\min}$  is reached ;           //  $n_{\min}, q$  are hyper parameters
4     i. Select  $q$  variables at random from the  $p$  variables;
5     ii. Pick the best variable/ split-point among the  $q$ ;
6     iii. Split the node into two daughter nodes.
7    $t\text{PE}_m^* \leftarrow \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{OOB}_{im}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \hat{f}_{(m)}(\mathbf{x}_i) - y_i \right| \cdot \text{OOB}_{im}$ ;
8 end
9 Sequence  $\{t\text{PE}_1^*, \dots, t\text{PE}_{M_n}^*\}$  from smallest to largest;
10 for  $m = 1$  to  $M_n$  do
11    $r_m \leftarrow$  the order of tree  $m$  in sorted sequence;
12    $\hat{w}_{(m)} \leftarrow \sum_{k=r_m}^{M_n} \frac{1}{k}$ ;
13 end
14  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \leftarrow (\hat{w}_{(1)}, \dots, \hat{w}_{(M_n)})^\top$ ;
15  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \leftarrow \frac{\hat{\mathbf{w}}}{\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}\|_1}$ .

```

C.1 Regularity Conditions**Condition 1** $\xi_n^{-1} M_n^2 = o(1)$ almost surely.**Condition 2** There exists a positive constant v such that $\mathbb{E}(e_i^4 | \mathbf{X}_i) \leq v < \infty$ almost surely for $i = 1, \dots, n$.**Condition 3** $\left\{ \min_{1 \leq m \leq M_n} \min_{1 \leq l \leq \ell_{(m)}} n_{(m),l} \right\}^{-1} n^{1/2} = O(1)$ almost surely.**Condition 4** $\xi_n^{-1} M_n n^{1/2} = o(1)$ almost surely.

Conditions 1 and 4 restrict the increasing rates of the number of trees M_n and the minimum averaging risk ξ_n . Similar conditions have been considered and discussed by Zhang et al. (2019), Zhang (2021), Zou et al. (2022), and others. Intuitively, these two conditions mean that all trees are misspecified, ruling out the situation where any trees within the RF yield perfect predictions and dominate others. Condition 2 establishes the boundedness of the conditional moments, which is a mild condition and can be found in much literature. Condition 3 is a high-level assumption that restricts the structure of the

RF and its constituent trees. Specifically, Condition 3 requires that the minimum number of samples in all leaves and all trees should not be of smaller order than $n^{1/2}$, which means that the number of tree leaves has smaller order than $n^{1/2}$. In other words, trees should not be fully developed. Consider the bias-variance decomposition equation

$$\text{Err} = \text{Bias}^2 + \text{Var} + \epsilon,$$

where Bias is the error produced by the fitted model when it is not capable of representing the true function, Var is the error resulting from the sampled data, and ϵ is the error. Shallow trees have low variances since they are robust to changes in a subset of the sample data. In the meantime, they have high biases because trees are underfitted. In contrast, fully grown trees have low biases and high variances. Therefore, it is advisable to build moderately developed trees in a RF, which are neither too shallow nor too deep. Thus, Condition 3 is reasonable and easy to be satisfied in practice.

C.2 Preliminary Results

The following preliminary results will be used in the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2. Inspired by Qiu et al. (2020), let $\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m),i}^\top$ be the i^{th} row of $\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)}$ for the m^{th} RT estimator, and $\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m),i,j}$ is the j^{th} component of $\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m),i,\cdot}$. From the discussion in Section 2, we know that the components of $\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m),i}$ are $\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_i) / n_{(m),l_i}$, and $\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m),i,j} = 1$, where $n_{(m),l_i}$ is the number of observations in the leaf l_i containing (y_i, \mathbf{X}_i) , and $\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}_i)$ is an indicator function determined by the relationship between \mathbf{X}_i and \mathbf{X} . We reorder y_i 's and \mathbf{X}_i 's such that the l^{th} leaf contain observations

$$\left\{ y_{n_{(m),1}+\dots+n_{(m),l-1}+1}, X_{n_{(m),1}+\dots+n_{(m),l-1}+1}, \dots, y_{n_{(m),1}+\dots+n_{(m),l}}, X_{n_{(m),1}+\dots+n_{(m),l}} \right\}.$$

Let $\mathbf{\Pi}_{(m),l}$ be an $n_{(m),l} \times n_{(m),l}$ matrix with all elements being ones and $\mathcal{L}_{(m),l}$ be an $n_{(m),l}$ -dimensional vector with all elements being ones. Qiu et al. (2020) showed that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)} &= \text{diag} \left(\mathbf{\Pi}_{(m),1} n_{(m),1}^{-1}, \dots, \mathbf{\Pi}_{(m),\ell} n_{(m),\ell}^{-1} \right) \\ &= \text{diag} \left(\mathcal{L}_{(m),1} \mathcal{L}_{(m),1}^\top n_{(m),1}^{-1}, \dots, \mathcal{L}_{(m),\ell} \mathcal{L}_{(m),\ell}^\top n_{(m),\ell}^{-1} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Additionally, they have proved that $\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)}$ for $m = 1, \dots, M_n$ satisfies the properties in Lemma 1. For convenience, they assume \mathbf{X} be non-stochastic instead of stochastic in all proofs. Nevertheless, the same conclusions can still be drawn under the assumption of stochastic \mathbf{X} . This can be achieved by substituting expectations with conditional expectations in the equations, and applying the Law of Iterated (or Total) Expectation, Pull-out rule and Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem in the process of obtaining orders of probabilities. An example of proof in the case of stochastic \mathbf{X} is demonstrated in Appendix C.5.

Lemma 1 (Qiu et al., 2020) *For each $m \in \{1, \dots, M_n\}$, $\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)}$ has the following properties.*

1. *There exists a positive constant c_0 such that for all $m, s \in \{1, \dots, M_n\}$,*

$$\text{trace} \left(\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)} \mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)}^\top \right) \geq c_0 > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{trace} \left(\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)} \mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(s)}^\top \right) \geq 0$$

almost surely.

2. There exists a positive constant c_1 such that for all $m \in \{1, \dots, M_n\}$,

$$\zeta_{\max} \left(\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)} \mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)}^\top \right) \leq c_1,$$

almost surely, where $\zeta_{\max}(\mathbf{B})$ denotes the largest singular value of a matrix \mathbf{B} .

3. There exists a positive constant c_2 such that for all $m, j \in \{1, \dots, M_n\}$,

$$\text{trace} \left(\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)}^2 \right) \leq c_2 \text{trace} \left(\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)}^\top \mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)} \right),$$

and

$$\text{trace} \left(\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(j)}^\top \mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)} \mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(j)}^\top \mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)} \right) \leq c_2 \text{trace} \left(\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)}^\top \mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)} \right)$$

almost surely.

4. We have $\max_{1 \leq m \leq M_n} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \iota_{ii}^{(m)\text{RT}} = O(n^{-1/2})$ almost surely, where $\iota_{ii}^{(m)\text{RT}}$ is the i^{th} diagonal element of $\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)}$.
5. For each $m \in \{1, \dots, M_n\}$, let $\mathbf{A}_{(m)}$ be a random matrix with elements $A_{(m)ij} \in \{0, 1\}$, $A_{(m)ii} = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(A_{(m)ij}) = (n-1)^{-1}$ for $i \neq j$. Then, results 1-4 above still hold if substitute $\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)}$ with $\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)} \mathbf{A}_{(m)}$.

Next, we introduce two other lemmas for proving Theorems 1 and 2.

Lemma 2 (Gao et al., 2019) *Let*

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \{L_n(\mathbf{w}) + a_n(\mathbf{w}) + b_n\},$$

where $a_n(\mathbf{w})$ is a term related to \mathbf{w} and b_n is a term unrelated to \mathbf{w} . If

$$\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} |a_n(\mathbf{w})| / R_n(\mathbf{w}) = o_p(1), \quad \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} |R_n(\mathbf{w}) - L_n(\mathbf{w})| / R_n(\mathbf{w}) = o_p(1),$$

and there exists a constant c and a positive integer n^* so that when $n \geq n^*$, $\inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} R_n(\mathbf{w}) \geq c > 0$ almost surely, then $L_n(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) / \inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} L_n(\mathbf{w}) \rightarrow 1$ in probability.

Lemma 3 (Saniuk and Rhodes, 1987) *For any $n \times n$ matrices \mathbf{G}_1 and \mathbf{G}_2 with both $\mathbf{G}_1, \mathbf{G}_2 \geq 0$,*

$$\text{trace}(\mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{G}_2) \leq \|\mathbf{G}_1\|_2 \text{trace}(\mathbf{G}_2),$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the spectral norm or largest singular value.

C.3 Proof of Theorem 1

It remains to verify that Conditions 1 to 3 can guarantee Conditions C.4 - C.9 in Qiu et al. (2020). Just note that the base learners in a RF employ two extra techniques than the regression trees. They are built on data sampled randomly with replacement and split nodes on a random subset of features, which are also employed in the bootstrap aggregating algorithm and the conventional RF algorithm, respectively. To get $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}$ from $\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)}$ for $m \in \{1, \dots, M_n\}$, it is sufficient to integrate these two randomization techniques into the formulation of $\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)}$.

Let \mathbf{P}_{RT} be an $n \times n$ matrix, of which the i^{th} row is $\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}}^\top(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \Theta^{\text{RT}})$. The random vector Θ^{RT} characterizes the randomness in the regression tree, such as how to split nodes. Denote $\tilde{\Theta}^{\text{RT}}$ when the best split is found over a randomly selected subset of q predictor variables instead of all p predictors by $\tilde{\Theta}$. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ be an $n \times n$ matrix, of which the i^{th} row is $\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}}^\top(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \tilde{\Theta})$. For each $m \in \{1, \dots, M_n\}$, let $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{(m)}$ denote the $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ related to the m^{th} tree, which remains a diagonal block matrix after data reordering, and has the same results stated in Lemma 1 as $\mathbf{P}_{\text{RT}(m)}$.

Inspired by Qiu et al. (2020), we exploit selection matrices to represent the bootstrapping procedure. Let \mathbf{A} be a random matrix with $A_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$, $A_{ii} = 0$, such that $\mathbb{E}(A_{ij}) = (n-1)^{-1}$ for $i \neq j$. Consequently, we have

$$\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)} = \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{(m)} \mathbf{A}_{(m)}, \quad (16)$$

where $\mathbf{A}_{(m)}$ is the selection matrix \mathbf{A} relating the m^{th} bootstrapping procedure. Note that for each $m \in \{1, \dots, M_n\}$, we have

$$\left\{ \max_{1 \leq m \leq M_n} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} l_{ii}^{(m)\text{BL}} \right\} \left\{ \max_{1 \leq m \leq M_n} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} l_{ii}^{(m)\text{RT}} \right\}^{-1} = O(1),$$

almost surely, where $l_{ii}^{(m)\text{BL}}$ is the i^{th} diagonal element of $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}$. Then, $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}$ inherits properties 1-4 as described in Lemma 1, with the aid of result 5 from the same lemma. Further, Conditions 1 and 2 in this paper are analogous to Conditions C.7 and C.8 in Qiu et al. (2020), respectively.

Based on the above results, Conditions 1 - 3 can deduce technical Conditions C.4 - C.9 showed by Qiu et al. (2020), which implies that the asymptotic optimality in the sense of achieving the lowest possible squared error can be established.

By (6) in Section 3, and (A34) in Proof of Theorem 2 by Qiu et al. (2020), we further have

$$L_n(\hat{\mathbf{w}}) \xi_n^{-1} = 1 + o_p(1). \quad (17)$$

This is because

$$\begin{aligned} L_n(\hat{\mathbf{w}}) \xi_n^{-1} &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{X}} \{L_n(\hat{\mathbf{w}}) L_n^{-1}(\mathbf{w})\} \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{X}} \{L_n(\mathbf{w}) R_n^{-1}(\mathbf{w})\} \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{X}} \{L_n(\hat{\mathbf{w}}) L_n^{-1}(\mathbf{w})\} \times \left[1 + \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{X}} \{|L_n(\mathbf{w}) - R_n(\mathbf{w})| R_n^{-1}(\mathbf{w})\} \right] \\ &= 1 + o_p(1), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 L_n(\widehat{\mathbf{w}})\xi_n^{-1} &\geq \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \{L_n(\widehat{\mathbf{w}})L_n^{-1}(\mathbf{w})\} \inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \{L_n(\mathbf{w})R_n^{-1}(\mathbf{w})\} \\
 &= \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \{L_n(\widehat{\mathbf{w}})L_n^{-1}(\mathbf{w})\} \times \left(1 + \inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} [\{L_n(\mathbf{w}) - R_n(\mathbf{w})\} R_n^{-1}(\mathbf{w})]\right) \\
 &\geq \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \{L_n(\widehat{\mathbf{w}})L_n^{-1}(\mathbf{w})\} \times \left[1 - \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \{|L_n(\mathbf{w}) - R_n(\mathbf{w})| R_n^{-1}(\mathbf{w})\}\right] \\
 &= 1 + o_p(1),
 \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

which is identical with the part in Appendix A.4 by Zhang et al. (2020). Consequently, from the uniform integrability of $\{L_n(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}) - \xi_n\} \xi_n^{-1}$, it is apparent that $\mathbb{E} [\{L_n(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}) - \xi_n\} \xi_n^{-1}] \rightarrow 0$, by which we obtain (7).

C.4 Proof of Theorem 2

Based on Lemma 2, we now present the proof of Theorem 2. It is seen that

$$C_n''(\mathbf{w}) = C_n(\mathbf{w}) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{e}_i^2 - e_i^2) P_{ii}(\mathbf{w}).$$

Hence, from Lemma 2 above and (24) in Qiu et al. (2020), in order to prove (8), we need only to verify that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \left\{ \left| \sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{e}_i^2 - e_i^2) P_{ii}(\mathbf{w}) \right| / R_n(\mathbf{w}) \right\} = o_p(1). \tag{20}$$

Let $\iota_{ii}^{(m)}$ be the i^{th} diagonal element of $\mathbf{P}_{\text{BL}(m)}$, $\mathbf{Q}_{(m)} = \text{diag}(\iota_{11}^{(m)}, \dots, \iota_{nn}^{(m)})$, $\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} w_{(m)} \mathbf{Q}_{(m)}$, and $\mathbf{K}_n = \text{diag}(\tilde{e}_1^2 - e_1^2, \dots, \tilde{e}_n^2 - e_n^2)$. Then, we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \left\{ \left| \sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{e}_i^2 - e_i^2) P_{ii}(\mathbf{w}) \right| / R_n(\mathbf{w}) \right\} = \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{|\text{trace}\{\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{K}_n\}|}{R_n(\mathbf{w})}.$$

We observe that for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \Pr \left(\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \left| \frac{\text{trace} \{ \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{w}) \mathbf{K}_n \}}{R_n(\mathbf{w})} \right| > \delta \right) \\
 & \leq \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} \Pr \left(\left| \frac{\text{trace} (\mathbf{Q}_{(m)} \mathbf{K}_n)}{R_n(\mathbf{w})} \right| > \delta \right) \\
 & \leq \delta^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left| \frac{\text{trace} (\mathbf{Q}_{(m)} \mathbf{K}_n)}{R_n(\mathbf{w})} \right| \right\} \\
 & \leq \delta^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} \mathbb{E} \{ |\text{trace} (\mathbf{Q}_{(m)} \mathbf{K}_n)| \xi_n^{-1} \} \\
 & \leq \delta^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} \mathbb{E} \{ \text{trace} (\mathbf{Q}_{(m)}) \|\mathbf{K}_n\|_2 \xi_n^{-1} \} \\
 & = \delta^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^{M_n} \mathbb{E} (\ell_{(m)} \|\mathbf{K}_n\|_2 \xi_n^{-1}) \\
 & \leq c_1 \delta^{-1} M_n \mathbb{E} (n^{1/2} \|\mathbf{K}_n\|_2 \xi_n^{-1}) \\
 & \leq c_1 \delta^{-1} M_n \mathbb{E}^{1/2} (n^{1/2} \xi_n^{-1})^2 \mathbb{E}^{1/2} \|\mathbf{K}_n\|_2^2 \\
 & \leq c_2 \delta^{-1} \mathbb{E}^{1/2} (M_n n^{1/2} \xi_n^{-1})^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

where c_1 and c_2 are positive constants, the second inequality follows from the Chebyshev's Inequality, the fourth inequality is obtained by Lemma 3, the fifth inequality comes from Condition 3, and the last second inequality is from the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality. Thus, (8) is proved by Condition 4 and the Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem. Similar to the proof techniques of Theorem 1, we have $L_n(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) \xi_n^{-1} = 1 + o_p(1)$. This completes the proof of (9).

C.5 Verifying Results of Qiu et al. (2020) for Stochastic \mathbf{X}

For the sake of convenience, Qiu et al. (2020) assume in all proofs that \mathbf{X} is non-stochastic rather than stochastic. However, theorems and corollaries in Qiu et al. (2020) still hold when \mathbf{X} is assumed to be stochastic. We take

$$\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \left| \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{w}) \boldsymbol{\mu} \right| / R_n(\mathbf{w}) = o_p(1)$$

for example, which is labeled as (A6) in Appendix A.2 of Qiu et al. (2020).

Proof of (A6) in Qiu et al. (2020) when \mathbf{X} is Stochastic. Let $\Phi = \left(\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \mathbf{A}_{(m)}^\top \mathbf{A}_{(s)} \boldsymbol{\mu} \right)_{M_n \times M_n}$, i.e., the ms^{th} component of Φ is $\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \mathbf{A}_{(m)}^\top \mathbf{A}_{(s)} \boldsymbol{\mu}$, $\mathbf{G}_{n \times M_n} = (\mathbf{A}_{(1)} \boldsymbol{\mu}, \dots, \mathbf{A}_{(M_n)} \boldsymbol{\mu})$, $\Psi = \left\{ \sigma^2 \text{trace} \left(\mathbf{P}_{(m)} \mathbf{P}_{(s)}^\top \right) \right\}_{M_n \times M_n}$, and

$$\Psi_0 = \sigma^2 \text{diag} \left\{ \text{trace} \left(\mathbf{P}_{(1)} \mathbf{P}_{(1)}^\top \right), \dots, \text{trace} \left(\mathbf{P}_{(M_n)} \mathbf{P}_{(M_n)}^\top \right) \right\}.$$

So $\Phi = \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{G}$. For any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\mathbf{w}^\top \Psi_0 \mathbf{w} \leq \mathbf{w}^\top \Psi \mathbf{w}, \quad (21)$$

because for any $m, s \in \{1, \dots, M_n\}$, $\mathbf{w}_{(m)} \geq 0$, $\mathbf{w}_{(s)} \geq 0$ and $\text{trace}(\mathbf{P}_{(m)} \mathbf{P}_{(s)}^\top) \geq 0$ by Condition C.4. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} R_n(\mathbf{w}) &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \|\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w})\boldsymbol{\mu} - \boldsymbol{\mu} + \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{e}\|^2 \mid \mathbf{X} \right\} \\ &= \|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{w})\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2 + \sigma^2 \text{trace} \left\{ \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{w})^\top \right\} \\ &= \mathbf{w}^\top (\Phi + \Psi) \mathbf{w} \\ &\geq \mathbf{w}^\top (\Phi + \Psi_0) \mathbf{w}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where the last step is from (21). We also have

$$\Phi + \Psi_0 > 0, \quad (23)$$

because $\Phi = \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{G}$ and $\Psi_0 > 0$ by Condition C.4 in Qiu et al. (2020).

Let $\boldsymbol{\rho} = (\mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{A}_{(1)} \boldsymbol{\mu}, \dots, \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{A}_{(M_n)} \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top$. It is straightforward to show that

$$\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\rho} \mid \mathbf{X}) = 0, \quad (24)$$

and

$$\text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\rho} \mid \mathbf{X}) = \mathbb{E} \left(\boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \mid \mathbf{X} \right) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left(\mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{A}_{(m)} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \mathbf{A}_{(s)} \mathbf{e} \right)_{M_n \times M_n} \mid \mathbf{X} \right\} = \sigma^2 \Phi. \quad (25)$$

It is seen that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{\{\mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{w})\boldsymbol{\mu}\}^2}{R_n^2(\mathbf{w})} &= \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{\left(\sum_{m=1}^{M_n} \mathbf{w}_{(m)} \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{A}_{(m)} \boldsymbol{\mu} \right)^2}{R_n^2(\mathbf{w})} \\ &= \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{(\mathbf{w}^\top \boldsymbol{\rho})^2}{R_n^2(\mathbf{w})} \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{(\mathbf{w}^\top \boldsymbol{\rho})^2}{\mathbf{w}^\top (\Phi + \Psi_0) \mathbf{w}} \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{R_n(\mathbf{w})} \\ &\leq \xi_n^{-1} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top (\Phi + \Psi_0)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\rho}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where the third step is from (22) and the last step is from (23) and Lemma 1 in Qiu et al. (2020). By Markov Inequality, we have that for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr \left\{ \xi_n^{-1} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top (\boldsymbol{\Phi} + \boldsymbol{\Psi}_0)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\rho} > \delta \right\} \\
& \leq \delta^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \xi_n^{-1} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top (\boldsymbol{\Phi} + \boldsymbol{\Psi}_0)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\rho} \right\} \\
& = \delta^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\xi_n^{-1} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top (\boldsymbol{\Phi} + \boldsymbol{\Psi}_0)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\rho} \mid \mathbf{X} \right] \right\} \\
& = \delta^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\xi_n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top (\boldsymbol{\Phi} + \boldsymbol{\Psi}_0)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\rho} \mid \mathbf{X} \right\} \right] \\
& = \delta^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\xi_n^{-1} \sigma^2 \text{trace} \left\{ (\boldsymbol{\Phi} + \boldsymbol{\Psi}_0)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Phi} \right\} \right] \\
& \leq \delta^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\xi_n^{-1} \sigma^2 \text{trace} \left\{ (\boldsymbol{\Phi} + \boldsymbol{\Psi}_0)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Phi} + \boldsymbol{\Psi}_0^{1/2} (\boldsymbol{\Phi} + \boldsymbol{\Psi}_0)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Psi}_0^{1/2} \right\} \right] \\
& = \delta^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\xi_n^{-1} \sigma^2 M_n \right), \tag{27}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second step follows from the Law of Iterated (or Total) Expectation, the third step is obtained by the Pull-out rule, the fourth step is guaranteed by (24) and (25). Combining (26), (27) and Condition 1, we obtain (A6) in Qiu et al. (2020) by the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem. \blacksquare

This demonstration bears a striking resemblance to Proof of (A6) in Appendix A.2 of Qiu et al. (2020). The only modification lies in the substitution of expectations with conditional expectations in (24) and (25), and the utilization of the Law of Iterated Expectation, Pull-out rule, and Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem in (27). Equations (A7) - (A9) and (A34) - (A35) for proving Theorems 1 and 2 in Qiu et al. (2020) can also be extrapolated using the same techniques.

References

- Susan Athey and Guido Imbens. Recursive partitioning for heterogeneous causal effects. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(27):7353–7360, 2016.
- G erard Biau. Analysis of a random forests model. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1):1063–1095, 2012.
- G erard Biau and Erwan Scornet. A random forest guided tour. *Test*, 25:197–227, 2016.
- Leo Breiman. Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45(1):5–32, 2001.
- Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 785–794, 2016.
- Yan Gao, Xinyu Zhang, Shouyang Wang, Terence Tai-leung Chong, and Guohua Zou. Frequentist model averaging for threshold models. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 71(2):275–306, 2019.
- Pierre Geurts, Damien Ernst, and Louis Wehenkel. Extremely randomized trees. *Machine Learning*, 63(1):3–42, 2006.

- Pushpendu Ghosh, Ariel Neufeld, and Jajati Keshari Sahoo. Forecasting directional movements of stock prices for intraday trading using LSTM and random forests. *Finance Research Letters*, 46(Part A):102280, 2022.
- Hongbo Li, Wei Wang, Hongwei Ding, and Jin Dong. Trees weighting random forest method for classifying high-dimensional noisy data. In *2010 IEEE 7th International Conference on E-Business Engineering*, pages 160–163, 2010.
- Jinyao Lin, Siyan Lu, Xiaoyu He, and Fang Wang. Analyzing the impact of three-dimensional building structure on CO₂ emissions based on random forest regression. *Energy*, 236(1):121502, 2021.
- Harikumar Pallathadka, Edwin Hernan Ramirez-Asis, Telmo Pablo Loli-Poma, Karthikeyan Kaliyaperumal, Randy Joy Magno Ventayen, and Mohd Naved. Applications of artificial intelligence in business management, e-commerce and finance. *Materials Today: Proceedings*, 2021 in press.
- Jingfu Peng and Yuhong Yang. On improvability of model selection by model averaging. *Journal of Econometrics*, 229(2):246–262, 2022.
- Hieu Pham and Sigurður Ólafsson. On Cesáro averages for weighted trees in the random forest. *Journal of Classification*, 37(1):1–14, 2019.
- Yue Qiu, Tian Xie, Jun Yu, and Xinyu Zhang. Mallows-type averaging machine learning techniques. Working paper, 2020.
- J Saniuk and I Rhodes. A matrix inequality associated with bounds on solutions of algebraic riccati and lyapunov equations. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 32(8):739–740, 1987.
- Jamie Shotton, Andrew Fitzgibbon, Mat Cook, Toby Sharp, Mark Finocchio, Richard Moore, Alex Kipman, and Andrew Blake. Real-time human pose recognition in parts from single depth images. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1297–1304, 2011.
- Vladimir Svetnik, Andy Liaw, Christopher Tong, J Christopher Culberson, Robert P Sheridan, and Bradley P Feuston. Random forest: a classification and regression tool for compound classification and QSAR modeling. *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences*, 43(6):1947–1958, 2003.
- Stacey J Winham, Robert R Freimuth, and Joanna M Biernacka. A weighted random forests approach to improve predictive performance. *Statistical Analysis and Data Mining: The ASA Data Science Journal*, 6(6):496–505, 2013.
- Shiyang Xuan, Guanjun Liu, and Zhenchuan Li. Refined weighted random forest and its application to credit card fraud detection. In *Computational Data and Social Networks*, pages 343–355, 2018.
- Yoon and Jaehyun. Forecasting of real gdp growth using machine learning models: Gradient boosting and random forest approach. *Computational Economics*, 57(1):247–265, 2021.

- Xinyu Zhang. A new study on asymptotic optimality of least squares model averaging. *Econometric Theory*, 37(2):388–407, 2021.
- Xinyu Zhang, Guohua Zou, Hua Liang, and Raymond J Carroll. Parsimonious model averaging with a diverging number of parameters. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2019.
- Xinyu Zhang, Guohua Zou, Hua Liang, and Raymond J Carroll. Parsimonious model averaging with a diverging number of parameters. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115(530):972–984, 2020.
- Shangwei Zhao, Xinyu Zhang, and Yichen Gao. Model averaging with averaging covariance matrix. *Economics Letters*, 145:214–217, 2016.
- Zhihua Zhou. *Ensemble Methods: Foundations and Algorithms*, chapter 4, pages 68–71. CRC Press, 2012.
- Jiahui Zou, Wendun Wang, Xinyu Zhang, and Guohua Zou. Optimal model averaging for divergent-dimensional Poisson regressions. *Econometric Reviews*, 41(7):775–805, 2022.