


Support Vector Machines

Machine Learning Group
Department of Computer Sciences
University of Texas at Austin



Perceptron Revisited: Linear Separators


- Binary classification can be viewed as the task of separating classes in feature space:



$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \text{sign}(\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x} + b)$$


Linear Separators

- Which of the linear separators is optimal?




Classification Margin

- Distance from example \mathbf{x}_i to the separator is $r = \frac{\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i + b}{\|\mathbf{w}\|}$
- Examples closest to the hyperplane are *support vectors*.
- Margin* ρ of the separator is the distance between support vectors.



Maximum Margin Classification

- Maximizing the margin is good according to intuition and PAC theory.
- Implies that only support vectors matter; other training examples are ignorable.



Linear SVM Mathematically

- Let training set $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1..n}$, $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbf{R}^d$, $y_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ be separated by a hyperplane with margin ρ . Then for each training example (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i + b &\leq -\rho/2 & \text{if } y_i = -1 \\ \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i + b &\geq \rho/2 & \text{if } y_i = 1 \end{aligned} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad y_i(\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i + b) \geq \rho/2$$

- For every support vector \mathbf{x}_s the above inequality is an equality. After rescaling \mathbf{w} and b by $\rho/2$ in the equality, we obtain that distance between each \mathbf{x}_s and the hyperplane is $r = \frac{y_s(\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_s + b)}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} = \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{w}\|}$
- Then the margin can be expressed through (rescaled) \mathbf{w} and b as:

$$\rho = 2r = \frac{2}{\|\mathbf{w}\|}$$

Linear SVMs Mathematically (cont.)

- Then we can formulate the *quadratic optimization problem*:

Find \mathbf{w} and b such that

$$\rho = \frac{2}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \text{ is maximized}$$

and for all $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i), i=1..n$: $y_i(\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i + b) \geq 1$

Which can be reformulated as:

Find \mathbf{w} and b such that

$$\Phi(\mathbf{w}) = \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w} \text{ is minimized}$$

and for all $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i), i=1..n$: $y_i (\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i + b) \geq 1$

Solving the Optimization Problem

Find \mathbf{w} and b such that

$\Phi(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}$ is minimized

and for all (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) , $i=1..n$: $y_i (\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i + b) \geq 1$

- Need to optimize a *quadratic* function subject to *linear* constraints.
- Quadratic optimization problems are a well-known class of mathematical programming problems for which several (non-trivial) algorithms exist.
- The solution involves constructing a *dual problem* where a *Lagrange multiplier* α_i is associated with every inequality constraint in the primal (original) problem:

Find $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n$ such that

$Q(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum \sum \alpha_i \alpha_j y_i y_j \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_j$ is maximized and

(1) $\sum \alpha_i y_i = 0$

(2) $\alpha_i \geq 0$ for all α_i

The Optimization Problem Solution

- Given a solution $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n$ to the dual problem, solution to the primal is:

$$\mathbf{w} = \sum \alpha_i y_i \mathbf{x}_i \quad b = y_k - \sum \alpha_i y_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_k \quad \text{for any } \alpha_k > 0$$


- Each non-zero α_i indicates that corresponding \mathbf{x}_i is a support vector.
- Then the classifying function is (note that we don't need \mathbf{w} explicitly):

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum \alpha_i y_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x} + b$$

- Notice that it relies on an *inner product* between the test point \mathbf{x} and the support vectors \mathbf{x}_i – we will return to this later.
- Also keep in mind that solving the optimization problem involved computing the inner products $\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_j$ between all training points.

Soft Margin Classification

- What if the training set is not linearly separable?
- *Slack variables* ξ_i can be added to allow misclassification of difficult or noisy examples, resulting margin called *soft*.



Soft Margin Classification Mathematically

- The old formulation:

Find \mathbf{w} and b such that

$\Phi(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w}$ is minimized

and for all $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i), i=1..n$: $y_i (\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i + b) \geq 1$

- Modified formulation incorporates slack variables:

Find \mathbf{w} and b such that

$\Phi(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{w} + C \sum \xi_i$ is minimized

and for all $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i), i=1..n$: $y_i (\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i + b) \geq 1 - \xi_i$, $\xi_i \geq 0$

- Parameter C can be viewed as a way to control overfitting: it “trades off” the relative importance of maximizing the margin and fitting the training data.

Soft Margin Classification – Solution

- Dual problem is identical to separable case (would *not* be identical if the 2-norm penalty for slack variables $C\sum \xi_i^2$ was used in primal objective, we would need additional Lagrange multipliers for slack variables):

Find $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_N$ such that

$Q(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum \sum \alpha_i \alpha_j y_i y_j \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_j$ is maximized and

(1) $\sum \alpha_i y_i = 0$

(2) $0 \leq \alpha_i \leq C$ for all α_i

- Again, \mathbf{x}_i with non-zero α_i will be support vectors.
- Solution to the dual problem is:

$$\mathbf{w} = \sum \alpha_i y_i \mathbf{x}_i$$

$$b = y_k (1 - \xi_k) - \sum \alpha_i y_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_k \quad \text{for any } k \text{ s.t. } \alpha_k > 0$$

Again, we don't need to compute \mathbf{w} explicitly for classification:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum \alpha_i y_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x} + b$$

Theoretical Justification for Maximum Margins

- Vapnik has proved the following:

The class of optimal linear separators has VC dimension h bounded from above as

$$h \leq \min \left\{ \left\lceil \frac{D^2}{\rho^2} \right\rceil, m_0 \right\} + 1$$

where ρ is the margin, D is the diameter of the smallest sphere that can enclose all of the training examples, and m_0 is the dimensionality.

- Intuitively, this implies that regardless of dimensionality m_0 we can minimize the VC dimension by maximizing the margin ρ .
- Thus, complexity of the classifier is kept small regardless of dimensionality.

Linear SVMs: Overview

- The classifier is a *separating hyperplane*.
- Most “important” training points are support vectors; they define the hyperplane.
- Quadratic optimization algorithms can identify which training points \mathbf{x}_i are support vectors with non-zero Lagrangian multipliers α_i .
- Both in the dual formulation of the problem and in the solution training points appear only inside inner products:

Find $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_N$ such that

$\mathbf{Q}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum \sum \alpha_i \alpha_j y_i y_j \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_j$ is maximized and


(1) $\sum \alpha_i y_i = 0$

(2) $0 \leq \alpha_i \leq C$ for all α_i


$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum \alpha_i y_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x} + b$$

Non-linear SVMs


- Datasets that are linearly separable with some noise work out great:



- But what are we going to do if the dataset is just too hard?




- How about... mapping data to a higher-dimensional space:



Non-linear SVMs: Feature spaces

- General idea: the original feature space can always be mapped to some higher-dimensional feature space where the training set is separable:



The “Kernel Trick”

- The linear classifier relies on inner product between vectors $K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_j$
- If every datapoint is mapped into high-dimensional space via some transformation $\Phi: \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \phi(\mathbf{x})$, the inner product becomes:

$$K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_j)$$

- A *kernel function* is a function that is equivalent to an inner product in some feature space.
- Example:

2-dimensional vectors $\mathbf{x} = [x_1 \ x_2]$; let $K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = (1 + \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_j)^2$,

Need to show that $K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_j)$:

$$\begin{aligned} K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) &= (1 + \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_j)^2 = 1 + x_{i1}^2 x_{j1}^2 + 2 x_{i1} x_{j1} x_{i2} x_{j2} + x_{i2}^2 x_{j2}^2 + 2 x_{i1} x_{j1} + 2 x_{i2} x_{j2} = \\ &= [1 \ x_{i1}^2 \ \sqrt{2} x_{i1} x_{i2} \ x_{i2}^2 \ \sqrt{2} x_{i1} \ \sqrt{2} x_{i2}]^T [1 \ x_{j1}^2 \ \sqrt{2} x_{j1} x_{j2} \ x_{j2}^2 \ \sqrt{2} x_{j1} \ \sqrt{2} x_{j2}] = \\ &= \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_j), \quad \text{where } \phi(\mathbf{x}) = [1 \ x_1^2 \ \sqrt{2} x_1 x_2 \ x_2^2 \ \sqrt{2} x_1 \ \sqrt{2} x_2] \end{aligned}$$

- Thus, a kernel function *implicitly* maps data to a high-dimensional space (without the need to compute each $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ explicitly).

What Functions are Kernels?

- For some functions $K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$ checking that $K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_j)$ can be cumbersome.
- Mercer's theorem:

Every semi-positive definite symmetric function is a kernel

- Semi-positive definite symmetric functions correspond to a semi-positive definite symmetric Gram matrix:

$K =$

$K(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1)$	$K(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$	$K(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_3)$...	$K(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_n)$
$K(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1)$	$K(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_2)$	$K(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3)$		$K(\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_n)$
...
$K(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_1)$	$K(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_2)$	$K(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_3)$...	$K(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n)$

Examples of Kernel Functions

- Linear: $K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_j$
 - Mapping $\Phi: \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \phi(\mathbf{x})$, where $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ is \mathbf{x} itself
- Polynomial of power p : $K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = (1 + \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_j)^p$
 - Mapping $\Phi: \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \phi(\mathbf{x})$, where $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ has $\binom{d+p}{p}$ dimensions
- Gaussian (radial-basis function): $K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = e^{-\frac{\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|^2}{2\sigma^2}}$
 - Mapping $\Phi: \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \phi(\mathbf{x})$, where $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ is *infinite-dimensional*: every point is mapped to *a function* (a Gaussian); combination of functions for support vectors is the separator.
- Higher-dimensional space still has *intrinsic* dimensionality d (the mapping is not *onto*), but linear separators in it correspond to *non-linear* separators in original space.

Non-linear SVMs Mathematically

- Dual problem formulation:

Find $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n$ such that

$Q(\alpha) = \sum \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum \sum \alpha_i \alpha_j y_i y_j K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$ is maximized and

(1) $\sum \alpha_i y_i = 0$

(2) $\alpha_i \geq 0$ for all α_i

- The solution is:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum \alpha_i y_i K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) + b$$

- Optimization techniques for finding α_i 's remain the same!

SVM applications

- SVMs were originally proposed by Boser, Guyon and Vapnik in 1992 and gained increasing popularity in late 1990s.
- SVMs are currently among the best performers for a number of classification tasks ranging from text to genomic data.
- SVMs can be applied to complex data types beyond feature vectors (e.g. graphs, sequences, relational data) by designing kernel functions for such data.
- SVM techniques have been extended to a number of tasks such as regression [Vapnik *et al.* '97], principal component analysis [Schölkopf *et al.* '99], etc.
- Most popular optimization algorithms for SVMs use *decomposition* to hill-climb over a subset of α_i 's at a time, e.g. SMO [Platt '99] and [Joachims '99]
- Tuning SVMs remains a black art: selecting a specific kernel and parameters is usually done in a try-and-see manner.