

1 Machine Learning
 Algorithm learns class of tasks, measured by loss function, from experience.
supervised learning learn $h : \Delta^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*, h = t$; example: $(x, y) \in \Delta^* \times \Sigma^*, t(x) = y$.
unsupervised learning learn $h : \Delta^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*, \ker(h) = \ker(t)$; example: $x \in \Delta^*$.
reinforcement learning learn strategy based on feedback from environment.

2 Supervised Learning

- model function $t : M \rightarrow R$
 - $\text{supp}(t) = \{m \in M \mid t(m) \neq 0\}$
 - $\bar{m} \in \text{supp}(t) \Leftrightarrow t(\bar{m}) = 1$
Hypothesis of A: potential result of A
Hypothesis space \mathcal{H}_A of A: set of all hypotheses
h fits D if $h(x_i) = y_i$ for all $(x_i, y_i) \in D$
Version space $\mathcal{V}_A(D)$ of A: all hypotheses that fit D
Inductive bias of A: set of assumptions that A uses to predict outputs of unseen data

2.1 Conjunctive Clause

$\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k), \theta_i \in M_i \cup \{\star, \perp\}$
 - $\theta_\perp = (\perp, \dots, \perp)$ most specific
 - $\theta_\star = (\star, \dots, \star)$ most general
 - $\text{supp}(h_{\theta_\perp}) = \emptyset, \text{supp}(h_{\theta_\star}) = M$
 $h_{\theta_\perp} = h_{(\theta_1, \dots, \perp, \dots, \theta_k) = \dots}$
 induced hypothesis $h_\theta(m_1, \dots, m_k) = 1$ if $\forall i: \theta_i \in \{m_i, \star\}$ else 0

$h \preceq h'$ if $\text{supp}(h) \subseteq \text{supp}(h')$. h is more specific (less general) than h'

Find-S Algorithm finds most specific conjunctive clause that fits D

1. Start with $\theta_\perp = (\perp, \dots, \perp)$
 2. iterate over POSITIVE examples
 3. min-generalize θ to fit example
 4. $\perp \rightarrow a, a \rightarrow \star$
- maximal general hypothesis:
 1. start at $\theta_\star = (\star, \dots, \star)$
 2. exclude every negative example
 3. $(\star, \dots) \rightarrow \{(b, \dots), (c, \dots)\} \dots$
- If $V_A(D) \neq \emptyset$, Find-S finds $h \in V_A(D)$

disjunctive normal form $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m\}$

'finite set of conjunctive clauses'
 induced hypothesis $h_\Theta(\bar{m}) = 1$ if $\exists \theta \in \Theta : h_\theta(\bar{m}) = 1$ else 0
 - $\text{supp}(\Theta) = \bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \text{supp}(h_\theta)$
 - can represent all boolean functions

Boundary sets of version space
 maximally general hypotheses $V_A^\top(D) = \{h \in V_A(D) \mid \nexists h' \in V_A(D) : h \prec h'\}$
 maximally specific hypotheses $V_A^\perp(D) = \{h \in V_A(D) \mid \nexists h' \in V_A(D) : h' \preceq h\}$
 - $h \in V_A^\top$ maximal, weil: $\forall x \in M \setminus \text{supp}(h) : \text{supp}(h) \cup \{x\} \notin \text{supp}(V_A(D))$
 Theorem: $V_A(D) = \{h \in H_A \mid \exists h_\top \in V_A^\top(D), \exists h_\perp \in V_A^\perp(D) : h_\perp \preceq h \preceq h_\top\}$
 $\rightarrow V_A(D)$ det. by $V_A^\top(D)$ and $V_A^\perp(D)$
 - only 1 lower bound (in $V_A^\perp(D)$), potentially multiple upper bounds (in $V_A^\top(D)$)

Candidate Elimination Algorithm
 Output: DNF for $V_A^\top(D)$ and $V_A^\perp(D)$

1. $S_\perp = \{\theta_\perp\}, S_\top = \{\theta_\star\}$
2. for $1 \leq i \leq n : y_i = 1$ (pos. xmples)
 1. keep only fitting h from S_\top
 2. $\forall \theta \in S_\perp : h_\theta(x_i) = 0$
 - remove θ , add all min generalizations θ' of θ that fit x_i to S_\perp
 3. keep only most specific h in S_\perp
3. for $1 \leq i \leq n : y_i = 0$ (neg. xmples)
 1. keep only fitting h from S_\perp
 2. $\forall \theta \in S_\top : h_\theta(x_i) = 1$
 - remove θ , add all min specializations θ' of θ that fit x_i to S_\top , for which a more specific $\theta_\perp \in S_\perp$ exists!
 3. keep only most general h in S_\top

- $V_A^\top = \{h_\theta \mid \theta \in S_\top\}, V_A^\perp = \{h_\theta \mid \theta \in S_\perp\}$
 - Concept identified if: $S_\perp = S_\top$ and $|S_\top| = 1$. $V_A(D) = \emptyset$ if $S_\perp = \emptyset \vee S_\top = \emptyset$

2.2 Decision Trees

Splitting $\Pi = \{M - 1, \dots, M_p\}$ is finite partition of (sub)feature Space \mathcal{M}'
 - induces splitting of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ into $I_{D'}(M_1), \dots, I_{D'}(M_p)$ (sets of indices)
 - monothetic splits: based on 1 feature
 - simple split: monothetic, into all realizations $M = \{\bar{m} \in M \mid m_1 = a(c, b, \dots)\}$
 - binary split: monothetic, into 2 sets $M = \{\bar{m} \in M \mid m_1 \in A\} \cup \{\bar{m} \in M \mid m_1 \notin A\}$

- induced hypothesis $h_T(\bar{m}) = T(v)$, where v is unique leaf s.t. $\bar{m} \in M_v$
 - simple decision trees can represent all hypotheses

Decision Tree Quality Measures

- Number of leaves
- Height (max number of constraints to check)
- External path length (sum of all path lengths from root to leaf)

- Weighted external path length (sum of all path lengths from root to leaf, weighted by number of examples classified in that leaf)

Theorem: Given D and bound b, its NP hard to decide existence of decision tree T s.t. h_T fits D and T has ext. p.l. $\leq b$
 - Majority Class $\text{Maj}_D(M')$ maj. $r \in R$

- Number of Misclassifications: $\text{Err}_D(M', r)$ in feature subspace M' with majority class r
- $\text{Err}_D(T)$: sum up all $\text{Err}_D(M_v, T(v))$
- Pure Node** v if $\text{Err}_D(M_v, T(v)) = 0$
- class distribution $p_D^{M'}(r)$: $p(r)$ in M'
- **Impurity Function** $\iota : [0, 1]^R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ if
 - $\iota(p)$ is minimal $\forall p : p(r) = 1$
 - ι symmetric in classes
 - ι is maximal for uniform distr.

gets probability distribution as input
 1. $\bar{\iota}(p) = 1 - \max_{r \in R} p(r)$
 2. Entropy $H(p) = -\sum_{r \in R} p(r) \log_2 p(r)$
 3. Gini Impurity $G(p) = 1 - \sum_{r \in R} p(r)^2$
 - Impurity of M' is $\iota_D(M') = \iota(p_D^{M'})$
Impurity Reduction of splitting
 $\Pi = \{M'_1, \dots, M'_p\}$ of M' is:

$\iota_D(\Pi) = \iota_D(M') - \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{|I_D(M'_i)|}{|I_D(M')|} \iota_D(M'_i)$
Tree Construction for $M' \subseteq M$

1. if no elements in M' : new leave v : $T(v) = \text{Maj}_D(M)$
2. if $\iota(M') \leq \epsilon$: new leaf v : $T(v) = \text{Maj}_D(M')$
3. else: select split Π of M' with maximal impurity reduction

- strict imp. fct.: concave at every point
 $\iota_D(\Pi) \geq 0 \forall \Pi$ and strict imp. fct. ι
ID3 simple D.T., monothetic simple splits, impurity function: entropy.
 inductive bias: local optimization (greedy)

CART D.T., binary splits, impurity function: Gini impurity
 - true loss of $h \in H_A$: misclassifications:
 $l^*(h) = \sum_{\bar{m} \in M} (1 - \delta_{h(\bar{m}), t(\bar{m})})$
 - h **overfits** D if $\exists h' \in H_A : l(h, D) < l(h', D)$ and $l^*(h) > l^*(h')$

when: training data: noisy, small, biased
 - Training Data: optimize loss here
 - Validation: optimize hyperparameters
 - Test Data: final estimation (true loss)
 - h **overfits** (D, D_V) if $\exists h' \in H_A : l(h, D) < l(h', D) \wedge l(h', D_V) < l(h, D_V)$

true loss of h estimated by $l(h, D_V)$
 Countermeasures to overfitting:

- increase data quality/quantity
- early stopping (no more splits) thrhld large \rightarrow omits useful splits thrhld small \rightarrow Large Tree
- regularization (penalize model complexity in training process)

Pruning: turn inner node v into leave with label $\text{Maj}(M_v)$

D.T. pruning Algorithm

1. given fully trained D.T.
2. prune every inner node as long as pruning doesn't increase validation loss: $l(h'_T, D_V) \leq l(h_T, D_V)$

2.3 Linear Regression

$t : M \rightarrow R, M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k, R \subseteq \mathbb{R}$
 - find $w = (w_0, \dots, w_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ s.t.:
 $h_w(x_1, \dots, x_k) = w_0 x_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k w_i x_i$ approximates $t \Leftrightarrow w$ minimizes $l(h_w, D)$
 - note: $x_0 = 1$ always! (w_0 is bias)

Analytical Solution

1. Partial derivatives: $\frac{\partial l(h_w, D)}{\partial w_i}$
2. Set to 0, put in values from D
3. Solve LGS with Gauss for w_i

SGD (Iterative Solution)

1. initialize w randomly
2. choose random $1 \leq i \leq n, T++$
3. $\delta = y_i - h_w(x_i)$ (residual)
4. $\Delta w = \delta \cdot x_i$ (derivatives)
5. $w = w + \eta \cdot \Delta w$ (parameters)
6. If \neg converged $\rightarrow 2$, else return w

- Pros: simple, robust to noisy data, representation independent

- Cons: stability, convergence problems, sensitive to learning rate η

BGD (accumulate derivatives $\forall i$)

1. initialize w randomly
2. For each $1 \leq i \leq n, T++$:
 - 2.1. $\delta = y_i - h_w(x_i)$
 - 2.2. $\Delta w = \Delta w + \delta \cdot x_i$
3. $w = w + \eta \cdot \Delta w$
4. If \neg converged $\rightarrow 2$, else return w

- sequence of examples (batch) are processed together, before updating w

IGD

1. initialize w randomly
2. For each $1 \leq i \leq n, T++$:
 - 2.1. $\delta = y_i - h_w(x_i)$
 - 2.2. $\Delta w = \delta \cdot x_i$
 - 2.3. $w = w + \eta \cdot \Delta w$
3. If \neg converged $\rightarrow 2$, else return w

| Property | SGD stochastic | IGD iterative | BGD batch | MBGD mini-batch |
|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Batch size | 1 | 1 | n | varies |
| Batch selection | random | sequential | sequential | sequential |
| Parallelization | difficult | difficult | trivial | trivial |
| Space requirement | low | low | high | varies |
| Stuck local minimum | no | no | yes | varies |
| Convergence speed | slow | slow | fast | varies |

Polynomial Regression

Approach: 1. prepare nonlinear combinations of features as features (curse of dimensionality: max k features $5k \leq n$)
 2. then perform linear regression on **expanded** feature space with SGD, BGD, IGD or analytical approach.
 3. Project solution back to input (feature) space
 - keep original features
 - for m_i^3 also include m_i^2
 - increase complexity \rightarrow increase risk of overfitting

Regularization

'penalize model complexity in training process', optimize for $l'(w, D)$:

$l'(w, D) = l(h_w, D) + \frac{\lambda}{k} \cdot r(w)$
 - Lasso Regression: $r(w) = \sum_{i=1}^k |w_i|$
 - Ridge Regression: $r(w) = \sum_{i=1}^k w_i^2$
 - λ big \rightarrow more regularization \rightarrow less complex model
 - k : num of features (excluding bias w_0)

Develop (S,B,I)GD for **specific loss function** $l(x)$:

1. get 1st derivative $l'(x)$ of loss:
- for 1 Data example: $n = 1$, leave out \sum
2. find $-\delta = h_w(x_i) - y_i$ in 1st derivative
3. replace line 4 (derivatives) with: $\Delta w = l'(x)$ but substitute δ (! - !!)

Logistic Regression (Classification)

'find optimal hyperplane w ' by optimization, to get h_w , to get classifier:
 $h_w^c(z) = 1$ if $h_w(z) \geq \frac{1}{2}$, 0 otherwise
 - 'discriminative' classifier
 - only reasonable for binary $R = \{0, 1\}$ ($|R| > 2$ induces order bias)
 - Training: optimizes w for $l(h_w, D)$
 - Prediction: performed by h_w^c (different)
 - Discriminating Hyperplane 1 Dimension less than w (Plane \rightarrow Line \rightarrow Point)
 $>$ logistic function: $h_w^\sigma(z) = \sigma(h_w(z))$
 $>$ logistic classifier: $h_w^{\sigma,c}(z) = 1$ if $h_w^\sigma(z) \geq \frac{1}{2}$, 0 otherwise
 - 'generative' classifier
 $h_w^\sigma(z)$ gives prop, that z is class 1

> MLE Maximum Likelihood Estimator given H_A for D is: $\hat{h} = \arg \max_{h \in H_A} P[D; h]$

2.4 Support Vector Machines

'learn optimal discriminating Hyperplane with maximal margin directly'

- Normal Representation $w = (w_0, \dots, w_k)$ is normal to discriminating Hyperplane $H(w)$
- H_1 closest x_i with $y_i = 1$
- H_0 closest x_i with $y_i = 0$
- Hyperplanes H_1, H_0 parallel to $H(w)$

Margin $\text{distance}(H_1, H_0) = \frac{2}{\|w\|}$

- Hinge Loss: only falsly classified data causes loss

Hard Margin SVM: no misclassifications/boundary violations

- $\hat{w} = \arg \min_w \frac{1}{2} \vec{w} \vec{w}^T, l_h(h_w, D) = 0$

Soft Margin SVM: λ trades margin size against boundary violations

λ small: larger margin, more violations

λ big: smaller margin, less violations

- $\hat{w} = \arg \min_w \frac{1}{2} \vec{w} \vec{w}^T + \lambda l_h(h_w, D)$

Kernel Trick: Kernels permits nonlinear seperation in input space \mathbb{R}^k (through linear seperation in \mathbb{R}^{k+d})

- with suitable Kernel: no actual computations in \mathbb{R}^{k+d}

-> no additional effort for non linear classification (linear classifier for free)

Linear Seperability

loss functions (and derivatives)

- $l(h, D) = \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - \delta_{y_i, h(x_i)})$
- $\delta_{ij} = 1$ if $i = j, 0$ otherwise.
- $l(h, D) = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (h(x_i) - y_i)^2$ (Mean Squared Error)
 $\frac{\partial l(h, D)}{\partial w_p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (h(x_i) - y_i) x_p = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_0 + w_1 x_{i1} + \dots + w_p x_{ip} - y_i) x_p$
- $l'(w, D) = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (h(x_i) - y_i)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i^2$ (Ridge Regression)
 $\frac{\partial l'(w, D)}{\partial w_p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (h(x_i) - y_i) x_p + 2\lambda w_p, w_p \in \{0, w_1, \dots, w_k\}$ WARUM NICHT: $\dots + \frac{2\lambda}{k} w_p$?!?!?!?!?!?
- $\ell_\sigma(h, D) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i \cdot \log(h(x_i)) + (1 - y_i) \cdot \log(1 - h(x_i)))$ (Logistic Loss)
 $\frac{\partial \ell_\sigma(h_w^\sigma, D)}{\partial w_p} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - h_w^\sigma(x_i)) \cdot x_{ip}$
- $l_h(h, D) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \max(0, 1 - (2y_i - 1)h(x_i))$ (Hinge Loss)

Ableitungsregeln

- Produktregel: $(f \cdot g)(x)' = f'(x) \cdot g(x) + f(x) \cdot g'(x)$
- Quotientenregel: $\left(\frac{f}{g}\right)'(x) = \frac{f'(x)g(x) - f(x)g'(x)}{g^2(x)}$
- Kettenregel: $(f \circ g)'(x) = (f' \circ g)(x) \cdot g'(x) = f'(g(x)) \cdot g'(x)$
 $(f \circ g \circ h)'(x) = f'(g(h(x))) \cdot g'(h(x)) \cdot h'(x)$
- $\left(\frac{1}{g}\right)'(x) = -\frac{g'(x)}{g^2(x)}$
- $\left(\frac{1}{x^n}\right)' = -nx^{-n-1}$
- $\log'_a(x) = \frac{1}{x \ln(a)}$
- $\ln_e(x)' = \frac{1}{x}$
- $|x|' = \frac{x}{|x|} = \text{sgn}(x)$ for $x \neq 0$