

# Short HW3 – SVM, Optimization, and PAC learning

Submitted individually by Sunday, 18.12, at 23:59.

You may answer in Hebrew or English and write on a computer or by hand (but be clear).

Please submit a PDF file named like your ID number, e.g., 123456789.pdf.

**Bonus** (maximal grade is 100): Writing on a computer (using LyX/LaTeX, Word + Equation tool, etc.) = 2 pts.

### 1. VC-dimension exercises:

1.1. In tutorial 05, we defined the hypothesis class of **axis aligned rectangles** (or cuboids) in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^2, \mathcal{H}_{\text{rect}} = \{h_\theta \mid \theta = (a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2) \in \mathbb{R}^4, \quad a_1 < a_2, \quad b_1 < b_2\}$$

$$\text{where a single hypothesis is defined by } h_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} +1, & (a_1 \leq x_1 \leq a_2) \wedge (b_1 \leq x_2 \leq b_2) \\ -1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We saw that  $\text{VCdim}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{rect}}) \geq 4$ .

Rigorously prove that  $\text{VCdim}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{rect}}) < 5$  (thus proving that  $\text{VCdim}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{rect}}) = 4$ ).

1.2. Prove that the VC-dimension is monotone:

For any two hypothesis classes, if  $\mathcal{H}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{H}_2$  then  $\text{VCdim}(\mathcal{H}_1) \leq \text{VCdim}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ .

1.3. Using only the above, what can be said on the VC-dimension of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{DT}}$ , the class of decision trees of at most depth 4 (recall slides 4-5 in Tutorial 03)?

Prove your answer (to claim that  $\mathcal{H}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{H}_2$ , you need to prove that  $h \in \mathcal{H}_1 \Rightarrow h \in \mathcal{H}_2$ ).

2. Let  $K_1(u, v) = \langle \phi_1(u), \phi_1(v) \rangle$ ,  $K_2(u, v) = \langle \phi_2(u), \phi_2(v) \rangle$  be two **kernels** with corresponding feature mappings  $\phi_1: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ ,  $\phi_2: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$  where  $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ . Notice that  $K$  is a **valid** (i.e., well-defined) kernel since it can be written as an inner product of a mapping of  $u$  and  $v$ .

**Prove** that  $K_3(u, v) = 4 \cdot K_1(u, v) + 9 \cdot K_2(u, v)$  is a valid kernel. That is, propose a feature mapping  $\phi_3: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_3}$  for some  $n_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that  $K_3(u, v) = 4 \cdot K_1(u, v) + 9 \cdot K_2(u, v) = \langle \phi_3(u), \phi_3(v) \rangle$ .

3. We will now prove that the following **Soft-SVM** problem is convex:

$$\underset{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d}{\text{argmin}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \max\{0, 1 - y_i \cdot \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_i\} + \lambda \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2$$

Let  $f, g: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be two convex functions defined over a convex set  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Lemma** (no need to prove): given a constant  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , the function  $\alpha f(\mathbf{z})$  is convex w.r.t  $\mathbf{z}$ .

**Lemma** (no need to prove): a sum of any number of convex functions is convex.

3.1. Prove (by definition) that  $q(\mathbf{z}) \triangleq \max\{f(\mathbf{z}), g(\mathbf{z})\}$  is convex w.r.t  $\mathbf{z}$ .

3.2. Using a rule from Tutorial 07, conclude that  $\max\{0, 1 - y_i \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_i\}$  is convex w.r.t  $\mathbf{w}$ .

3.3. Using the above (and properties from Tutorial 07), conclude that the Soft-SVM optimization problem is convex w.r.t  $\mathbf{w}$ .