

867002105\_HW5

Charles Dotson

October 3, 2022

## Contents

1 Let the Lagrangian function of the primal SVM be

$$L(w, \lambda) = f(w) - \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i g_i(w) = f(w) - \lambda^T g(w)$$

with the multipliers  $\lambda \succeq 0$  and inequality constraints  $g(w) \succeq 0$ . Prove the weak duality property:

$$\max_{\lambda \succeq 0} \min_w L(w, \lambda) \leq \min_w \max_{\lambda \succeq 0} L(w, \lambda)$$

	3
2 Question 2	3
3 Question 3	4
4 Question 4	4
5 Question 5	4

# 1 Let the Lagrangian function of the primal SVM be

$$L(w, \lambda) = f(w) - \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i g_i(w) = f(w) - \lambda^T g(w)$$

with the multipliers  $\lambda \succeq 0$  and inequality constraints  $g(w) \succeq 0$ .  
Prove the weak duality property:

$$\max_{\lambda \succeq 0} \min_w L(w, \lambda) \leq \min_w \max_{\lambda \succeq 0} L(w, \lambda)$$

We are given the following primal problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & L(w, \lambda) = f(w) - \lambda^T g(w) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \lambda \succeq 0 \end{aligned}$$

We set  $\lambda'$  to be the optimal solution to the dual. Plugging this into the same function where all else is equal. We can clearly see that the subtractive term could become positive at certain  $W$ . This would then yield the result  $L(w, \lambda') \leq \max_{\lambda \succeq 0} L(w, \lambda)$

We now add in the primal constraint.  $\min_w L(w, \lambda') \leq \min_w \max_{\lambda \succeq 0} L(w, \lambda)$ . To prove this one simply needs to see that we are maximizing the objective without the primal constraint and this will yield  $\min_w L(w)$  as it is not a function of  $\lambda$  while  $\lambda'$  is the optimal solution already as well as minimizing a convex function. We can clearly see that the first relationship holds. These inequalities show that  $\max_{\lambda \succeq 0} \min_w L(w, \lambda) \leq \min_w \max_{\lambda \succeq 0} L(w, \lambda)$

## 2 Question 2

We start by using the hyperplane  $y = x$  in point slope form. Finding the  $w^\perp$  to satisfy  $w^T x = 0$  will give us  $w = [-1, 1]^T$ . We now set up our maximum margin linear classifier  $\hat{h}(x; w)$ . This classifier will also be used to have the new values used for the geometric margin calculations ( $y^{(i)}$ ). Also, through linear algebra, one can see that the perpendicular distance aka the margin, is  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ .

$$h(x; w) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } -x_1^{(i)} + x_2^{(i)} > 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } -x_1^{(i)} + x_2^{(i)} \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

We can now see that, based on our new classifier, that  $y^{(1)}, y^{(2)} = 1, -1$  respectively. The change creates a correct margin calculation as well as properly classifying the training examples. Shown below:

$$\frac{y^{(1)}(w_2)}{\|w\|} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} = \frac{y^{(2)}(w_1)}{\|w\|}$$

$$\frac{y^{(1)}}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} = \frac{-y^{(2)}}{\sqrt{2}}$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$$

This shows we have correctly formulated the classifier for our training example.

### 3 Question 3

$$\begin{aligned} L(h) &= (E)[\mathbb{1}[h(x) \neq (x)]] \\ &= P\left(\frac{2\pi}{3} < \theta < \frac{5\pi}{4}\right) + P\left(\frac{5\pi}{4} < \theta < \frac{7\pi}{4}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) \frac{1}{2\pi} + \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right) \frac{1}{2\pi} \\ &= \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{4} = \frac{3}{8} \end{aligned}$$

### 4 Question 4

$$\begin{aligned} L(x : \{x^{(i)}, y^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^m) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m (y^{(i)} - \langle w, x^{(i)} \rangle)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^m (y^{(i)})^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^m y^{(i)} \langle w, x^{(i)} \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^m \langle w, x^{(i)} \rangle^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^m (y^{(i)})^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m y^{(i)} \alpha_j K_{ij} + \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_j K_{ij} \right)^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

### 5 Question 5