

Kernels, dual forms, etc.

## 1. Kernelized Perceptron:

- First, recall the exact sol<sup>n</sup> for Lin Reg:

$$\mathbf{w} = \left( \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}$$

$\mathbf{C}$ , cov. matrix of the data

$$= \mathbf{C}^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}$$

$$= \sum_n x_n y_n \cdot (\mathbf{C}^{-1})$$

- This is quite different from the perceptron solution: Starting from  $\vec{w} = \vec{0}$ ,  $b = 0$ , we add  $+ \eta \vec{x}_n y_n$  to  $\vec{w}$  each time an example  $(\vec{x}_n, y_n)$  is wrongly classified by  $\vec{w}$  (think eg of the Online version).  
So, assuming we do converge (as is guaranteed by the model in the case of linearly separable data), the solat<sup>n</sup>  $\vec{w}^*$  is built as a sum like:

$$\vec{w}^* = \left( \sum_n \alpha_n \vec{x}_n y_n \right) \eta$$

- $\alpha_n = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if it was always well classif.} \\ 1 & \text{if it was incorrectly classified only exactly once} \\ 2 & \dots \end{cases}$
- $\rightarrow \alpha_n$  is a counter ( $\geq 0$ ) of the number of times example  $n$  was misclassified

We drop  $\eta$  or include it in  $\alpha_n$ , so that

$$\text{we have } \vec{w} = \sum_n \alpha_n \vec{x}_n y_n$$



In this view,  $\vec{w}$  is a linear combination of the training examples  $\vec{x}_n$ , with weights  $\alpha_n y_n$  ( $\alpha_n > 0$ ,  $y_n = \pm 1$ ).

This may be called the dual form.

In the online perceptron, in a sense, we are updating the  $\alpha_n$ 's (they start from  $\alpha_n = 0, \forall n$ ).

(This is very  $\neq$  from  $w = \sum_n C^{-1} \vec{x}_n y_n$  in linear reg, where in effect,  $\alpha_n = C^{-1}, \forall n$ , (constant  $\alpha_n$ ).

• At prediction time, we get:

$$y^{\text{pred}}(\vec{x}^{\text{test}}) = \text{sign}(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{x}^{\text{test}}) \\ = \text{sign}\left(\sum_n \alpha_n y_n \vec{x}_n \cdot \vec{x}^{\text{test}}\right)$$

If we used feature maps,  $\phi: x_n \rightarrow \phi(x_n)$ , we would have:  $y^{\text{test}} = \text{sign}\left(\sum_n \alpha_n y_n \phi(\vec{x}_n) \cdot \phi(\vec{x}^{\text{test}})\right)$

• Remark:  $\vec{x}_n \cdot \vec{x}^{\text{test}}$  is a measure of the similarity between  $\vec{x}_n$  and  $\vec{x}^{\text{test}}$ . If they're very  $\neq$ , it's  $\approx 0$ , and  $\alpha_n$  does not matter for  $y^{\text{test}}$ . If they are very similar, it is large, and  $\alpha_n$  matters.

(Note: if data is standardized, then it cannot grow too large).

• Definition: We call Kernel method the fact of replacing  $\vec{x} \cdot \vec{x}'$  (or  $\phi(\vec{x}) \cdot \phi(\vec{x}')$ ) with an other function  $K(\vec{x}, \vec{x}')$ , which is called a kernel.



## Several remarks:

- 1) Kernels are more general than feature maps:
  - all feature maps are kernels:  
 $K(x, x') = \phi(x) \phi(x')$  is a kernel for any feature map  $\phi$ .
  - not all kernels can be re-written as feature maps (see eg the RBF kernel  $\rightarrow$  it's like a  $D=\infty$  feature map)
  - Not all funct<sup>o</sup> of 2 variables are valid kernels

We must respect the Mercer condition =

Mercer condition =  $K$  must be a semi-positive definite operator  
 $= \forall f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}), \forall g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}), \int_{x,y} f(x) K(x,y) g(y) dx dy \geq 0$

In a discrete setting, this would be like  $\forall f \in \mathbb{R}^d, \forall g \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  
we must have:  $f^T K g = \sum_i f_i K_{ij} g_j \geq 0$ .

- Remark how  $K$  builds a new geometry in the space of features: the similarity between two points, instead of being measured by  $\vec{x} \cdot \vec{x}'$  or  $1/\|x - x'\|_2^2$ , is measured by  $K(x, x')$ .