

## On the Uniqueness of the SVM Solution

### Hard-Margin SVM

Recall that the hard-margin SVM problem is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize}_{w,b} \quad \|w\|_2^2 \\ & \text{subject to} \quad y_i(w^T x_i + b) \geq 1 \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

We prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $(x_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \{-1, +1\}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  be our training data, and suppose there are  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $y_i(w^T x_i + b) > 0$  for all  $i$  (i.e., linear separability). Furthermore, suppose there exist  $i, j$  with  $y_i = +1$  and  $y_j = -1$ . Then there is a unique minimizer  $(w^*, b^*)$  to the hard-margin SVM problem.*

First we establish the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** *Consider the optimization problem*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize}_{w \in \mathbb{R}^m, v \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad f(w) + g(v) \\ & \text{subject to} \quad (w, v) \in S, \end{aligned}$$

where  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$  is convex,  $f$  is strictly convex, and  $g$  is convex. If  $(w_1, v_1)$  and  $(w_2, v_2)$  are both minimizers then  $w_1 = w_2$ .

*Proof.* Suppose, for contradiction, that  $(w_1, v_1)$  and  $(w_2, v_2)$  are minimizers with  $w_1 \neq w_2$ . Since  $S$  is convex, the average  $((w_1 + w_2)/2, (v_1 + v_2)/2)$  is also feasible. By strict convexity we have

$$f((w_1 + w_2)/2) < f(w_1)/2 + f(w_2)/2,$$

and by convexity we have

$$g((v_1 + v_2)/2) \leq g(v_1)/2 + g(v_2)/2.$$

Thus

$$f((w_1 + w_2)/2) + g((v_1 + v_2)/2) < \frac{f(w_1) + g(v_1)}{2} + \frac{f(w_2) + g(v_2)}{2} = f(w_1) + g(v_1),$$

with the last equality following since the two minimizers have equal objective values. This contradicts our assumption that  $(w_1, v_1)$  is a minimizer, and completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* First we establish existence. Let  $w_L, b_L$  satisfy  $y_i(w_L^T x_i + b_L) \geq \epsilon$  for all  $i$  and some  $\epsilon > 0$  (such  $w_L, b_L$  must exist by linear separability). Then we have

$$y_i \left( \frac{w_L^T}{\epsilon} x_i + \frac{b_L}{\epsilon} \right) \geq 1.$$

This shows  $(w_L/\epsilon, b_L/\epsilon)$  is in the feasible set. Thus any minimizer  $(w_*, b_*)$ , if it exists, must have  $\|w_*\|_2 \leq \|w_L\|_2/\epsilon$ . Furthermore, if  $\|w_*\| \leq \|w_L\|_2/\epsilon$  then note that

$$-y_i b \leq y_i w_*^T x_i - 1 \leq |y_i w_*^T x_i| + 1$$

implies that

$$b \leq 1 + \|w_*\|_2 \|x_i\|_2 \leq 1 + \|w_L\|_2 \|x_i\|_2/\epsilon$$

when  $y_i = -1$  and

$$-b \leq 1 + \|w_*\|_2 \|x_i\|_2 \leq 1 + \|w_L\|_2 \|x_i\|_2/\epsilon$$

when  $y_i = +1$ . By assumption, both values of  $y_i$  appear in our data set. Thus we obtain

$$|b| \leq 1 + \|w_L\|_2 \max_i \|x_i\|_2/\epsilon.$$

This shows that we are optimizing a continuous function over a non-empty compact region, and thus must have a minimizer.

Next we prove uniqueness. Suppose  $(w_1, b_1)$  and  $(w_2, b_2)$  are both minimizers. By the lemma we have  $w_1 = w_2$  using  $f(w) = \|w\|_2^2$  and  $g(b) = 0$ . To prove  $b_1 = b_2$  we use the following fact: at any minimizer  $(w_*, b_*)$  there must be  $i, j$  with  $y_i = +1$ ,  $y_j = -1$ ,  $w_*^T x_i + b_* = 1$  and  $w_*^T x_j + b_* = -1$ . Geometrically, this says that there must be points from both classes lying on the margin boundaries. Note that this implies  $b_1 = b_2$  since increasing  $b_*$  makes  $w_*^T x_j + b_* > -1$  and decreasing  $b_*$  makes  $w_*^T x_i + b_* < 1$ . Thus what remains is to establish this geometric fact. To prove it, suppose all data points  $i$  with  $y_i = +1$  have  $w_*^T x_i + b > 1$  and let  $m = \min_{y_i=+1} w_*^T x_i + b - 1$ . Letting  $\hat{w} = w_*/(1 + m/2)$  and  $\hat{b} = (b_* - m/2)/(1 + m/2)$  we obtain a new feasible point with a strictly lower objective:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{w}^T x_i + \hat{b} &= \frac{w_*^T x_i + b_* - m/2}{1 + m/2} \geq \frac{1 + m/2}{1 + m/2} = 1 & (\text{if } y_i = +1), \\ \hat{w}^T x_i + \hat{b} &= \frac{w_*^T x_i + b_* - m/2}{1 + m/2} \leq \frac{-1 - m/2}{1 + m/2} = -1 & (\text{if } y_i = -1). \end{aligned}$$

The same argument will apply if we swap the roles of  $+1$  and  $-1$ , thus proving the geometric fact, and completing our proof.  $\square$

## Soft-Margin SVM

The soft-margin SVM problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize}_{w,b,\xi} \quad \|w\|_2^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \\ &\text{subject to} \quad y_i(w^T x_i + b) \geq 1 - \xi_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n \\ &\quad \xi_i \geq 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $C > 0$  is a given constant, and  $(x_i, y_i)$  are as in the hard-margin SVM, but not necessarily linearly separable. Applying the lemma with  $f(w) = \|w\|_2^2$  and  $g(\xi, b) = C \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i$  we see that the minimizer  $w_*$  is uniquely determined. Unfortunately,  $b_*$  is not always uniquely determined. To see how this can happen, suppose

$$|\{i \mid y_i = +1 \text{ and } y_i(w_*^T x_i + b_*) \leq 1\}| = |\{i \mid y_i = -1 \text{ and } y_i(w_*^T x_i + b_*) < 1\}|.$$

Then we can slightly decrease  $b_*$  while keeping  $\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i$  constant. This is analogous to the lack of uniqueness that can occur when proving the conditional median minimizes the absolute difference loss. For more, see [1], [2].

## References

- [1] C. Burges and D. Crisp. Uniqueness of the SVM Solution. NIPS. Vol. 99. 1999.
- [2] R. Rifkin, P. Massimiliano, and A. Verri. A note on support vector machine degeneracy. International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1999.