sheet09_prog

December 16, 2018

1 Support Vector Machines

In this exercise sheet, you will experiment with training various support vector machines on a subset of the MNIST dataset composed of digits 5 and 6. First, download the MNIST dataset from http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/, uncompress the downloaded files, and place them in a data/ subfolder. Install the optimization library CVXOPT (python-cvxopt package, or directly from the website www.cvxopt.org). This library will be used to optimize the dual SVM in part A.

1.1 Part A: Kernel SVM and Optimization in the Dual

We would like to learn a nonlinear SVM by optimizing its dual. An advantage of the dual SVM compared to the primal SVM is that it allows to use nonlinear kernels such as the Gaussian kernel, that we define as:

$$k(x, x') = \exp\left(-\frac{\|x - x'\|^2}{\sigma^2}\right)$$

The dual SVM consists of solving the following quadratic program:

$$\max_{\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \alpha_i \alpha_j y_i y_j k(x_i, x_j)$$

subject to:

$$0 \le \alpha_i \le C$$
 and $\sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i y_i = 0$.

Then, given the alphas, the prediction of the SVM can be obtained as:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i y_i k(x, x_i) + \theta > 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i y_i k(x, x_i) + \theta < 0 \end{cases}$$

where

$$\theta = \frac{1}{\#SV} \sum_{i \in SV} \left(y_i - \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j y_j k(x_i, x_j) \right)$$

and SV is the set of indices corresponding to the unbound support vectors.

1.1.1 Implementation (25 P)

We will solve the dual SVM applied to the MNIST dataset using the CVXOPT quadratic optimizer. For this, we have to build the data structures (vectors and matrices) to must be passed to the optimizer.

- *Implement* a function gaussianKernel that returns for a Gaussian kernel of scale σ , the Gram matrix of the two data sets given as argument.
- Implement a function getQPMatrices that builds the matrices P, q, G, h, A, b (of type cvxopt.matrix) that need to be passed as argument to the optimizer cvxopt.solvers.qp.
- *Run* the code below using the functions that you just implemented. (It should take less than 3 minutes.)

```
In [1]: import utils,numpy,cvxopt,cvxopt.solvers,scipy.spatial
        Xtrain,Ttrain,Xtest,Ttest = utils.getMNIST56()
        cvxopt.solvers.options['show_progress'] = False
 \begin{tabular}{ll} In & [2]: \#print("Xtrain, Ttrain, Xtest, Ttest", Xtrain.shape, Ttrain.shape, Xtest.shape, Ttest.shape) \end{tabular} 
        def gaussianKernel(X1, X2, sigma):
            return numpy.exp(-scipy.spatial.distance.cdist(X1, X2, 'euclidean')**2/sigma**2)
        def getQPMatrices(K, T, C):
            ones = numpy.ones(K.shape[0])
            zeros = ones*.0
            # maximizer: therefore negative minimizer --> max qx - xPx = min -qx + xPx
            Y = numpy.outer(T, T)
            P = Y*K
            q = -ones
            # constraint: 0 a_i C \longrightarrow Gx h
            G = numpy.concatenate([numpy.diag(ones), -numpy.diag(ones)])
            h = numpy.concatenate([C*ones, zeros])
            \# constraint: sum \ a_i*y_i = 0 \longrightarrow Ax = b
            A = T.reshape(1,-1)
            b = .0
             # numpy matrices needs to be converted before accepted by cvxopt
            return map(cvxopt.matrix, (P, q, G, h, A, b))
        for scale in [10,30,100]:
            for C in [1,10,100]:
                 # Prepare kernel matrices
                 Ktrain = gaussianKernel(Xtrain, Xtrain, scale)
                 Ktest = gaussianKernel(Xtest, Xtrain, scale)
                 # Prepare the matrices for the quadratic program
```

```
P,q,G,h,A,b = getQPMatrices(Ktrain, Ttrain, C)
                 # Train the model (i.e. compute the alphas)
                alpha = numpy.array(cvxopt.solvers.qp(P,q,G,h,A,b)['x']).flatten()
                 # Get predictions for the training and test set
                SV = (alpha>1e-6)
                uSV = SV*(alpha<C-1e-6)
                \label{eq:theta} \texttt{theta} = 1.0/\text{sum}(\text{uSV})*(\text{Ttrain}[\text{uSV}]-\text{numpy.dot}(\text{Ktrain}[\text{uSV},:],\text{alpha*Ttrain})).\text{sum}()
                Ytrain = numpy.sign(numpy.dot(Ktrain[:,SV],alpha[SV]*Ttrain[SV])+theta)
                Ytest = numpy.sign(numpy.dot(Ktest [:,SV],alpha[SV]*Ttrain[SV])+theta)
                 # Print accuracy and number of support vectors
                Atrain = (Ytrain == Ttrain).mean()
                Atest = (Ytest == Ttest).mean()
                print('Scale=%3d C=%3d SV: %4d Train: %.3f Test: %.3f'%(scale,C,sum(SV),Atra
            print('')
Scale= 10 C= 1 SV: 1000 Train: 1.000 Test: 0.937
Scale= 10 C= 10 SV: 1000 Train: 1.000 Test: 0.937
Scale= 10 C=100 SV: 1000 Train: 1.000 Test: 0.937
Scale= 30 C= 1 SV:
                       254 Train: 1.000 Test: 0.985
Scale= 30 C= 10 SV:
                       274 Train: 1.000 Test: 0.986
Scale= 30 C=100 SV:
                       256 Train: 1.000 Test: 0.986
Scale=100 C= 1 SV: 317 Train: 0.973 Test: 0.971
Scale=100 C= 10 SV: 159 Train: 0.990 Test: 0.975
Scale=100 C=100 SV: 136 Train: 1.000 Test: 0.975
```

1.1.2 Analysis (10 P)

• *Explain* which combinations of parameters σ and C lead to good generalization, underfitting or overfitting?

Looking at the results, the best generalisation seems to come from scale=30 and c=10 or c=100, where we got the highest test score (although it might be slightly overfitted). Scale=10 seems to lead to some overfitting, seing that the test scores are significantly lower than the training score. And Scale=100 seems to be a case of underfitting, where both test and training scores are smaller than 1 in general. Judging by the number of support vectors used, this seems to further confirm this idea.

• *Explain* which combinations of parameters *σ* and *C* produce the fastest classifiers (in terms of amount of computation needed at prediction time)?

Generally speaking, a lower amount of support vectors should lead to a faster computation, which means that sigma and c, should be rather large.

1.2 Part B: Linear SVMs and Gradient Descent in the Primal

The quadratic problem of the dual SVM does not scale well with the number of data points. For large number of data points, it is generally more appropriate to optimize the SVM in the primal. The primal optimization problem for linear SVMs can be written as

$$\min_{w,\theta} ||w||^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i \quad \text{where} \quad \forall_{i=1}^N : y_i(w \cdot x_i + \theta) \ge 1 - \xi_i \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_i \ge 0.$$

It is common to incorporate the constraints directly into the objective and then minimizing the unconstrained objective

$$J(w,\theta) = ||w||^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^{N} \max(0, 1 - y_i(w \cdot x_i + \theta))$$

using simple gradient descent.

1.2.1 Implementation (15 P)

- *Implement* the function J computing the objective $I(w, \theta)$
- *Implement* the function DJ computing the gradient of the objective $J(w, \theta)$ with respect to the parameters w and θ .
- *Run* the code below using the functions that you just implemented. (It should take less than 1 minute.)

```
In [4]: import utils,numpy
        C = 10.0
        lr = 0.001
        Xtrain, Ttrain, Xtest, Ttest = utils.getMNIST56()
        n,d = Xtrain.shape
        w = numpy.ones([d])
        theta = 1e-9
        def J(w, theta, C, Xtrain, Ttrain):
            comp = 1.0-Ttrain*(w.dot(Xtrain.T))+theta
            return numpy.linalg.norm(w)**2 + C*numpy.maximum(.0, comp).sum()
        def DJ(w,theta,C,Xtrain,Ttrain):
            comp = 1.0-Ttrain*(w.dot(Xtrain.T))+theta
            select = (numpy.maximum(0,comp)/comp)
            dw = 2*w+C*-numpy.dot(Ttrain*select, Xtrain)
            dtheta = C*(-Ttrain*select).sum()
            return dw, dtheta
```

```
for it in range(0,101):
            # Monitor the training and test error every 5 iterations
           if it%5==0:
               Ytrain = numpy.sign(numpy.dot(Xtrain,w)+theta)
               Ytest = numpy.sign(numpy.dot(Xtest ,w)+theta)
               ### TODO: REPLACE BY YOUR OWN CODE
                      = J(w,theta,C,Xtrain,Ttrain)
               Obj
               ###
               Etrain = (Ytrain==Ttrain).mean()
               Etest = (Ytest ==Ttest ).mean()
                              J: %9.3f Train: %.3f Test: %.3f'%(it,Obj,Etrain,Etest))
               print('It=%3d
            ### TODO: REPLACE BY YOUR OWN CODE
           dw,dtheta = DJ(w,theta,C,Xtrain,Ttrain)
           ###
           #print(dw.shape)
           w = w - lr*dw
           theta = theta - lr*dtheta
It= 0
        J: 552154.345 Train: 0.443 Test: 0.434
It= 5
        J: 32779.497 Train: 0.971 Test: 0.961
It= 10
        J: 21448.473 Train: 0.972 Test: 0.968
It= 15
        J: 14459.996 Train: 0.975 Test: 0.968
It=20
        J: 9907.475 Train: 0.980
                                   Test: 0.972
It= 25
        J:
            6781.030 Train: 0.986
                                   Test: 0.972
        J:
It=30
            4920.204 Train: 0.986
                                   Test: 0.971
It=35
            3523.371 Train: 0.992 Test: 0.970
        J:
It=40
        J:
            2779.522 Train: 0.996
                                   Test: 0.969
It= 45
            2445.678 Train: 0.998
                                   Test: 0.970
        J:
It=50
            2112.371 Train: 0.998
                                   Test: 0.970
        J:
It= 55
                     Train: 0.998
            1992.196
                                   Test: 0.970
Tt=60
        J: 1960.825 Train: 0.997
                                   Test: 0.970
It=65
        J:
            1770.648 Train: 1.000 Test: 0.970
It=70
        J: 1735.552 Train: 1.000 Test: 0.970
It=75
            1701.152 Train: 1.000
                                   Test: 0.970
        J:
It=80
            1667.434 Train: 1.000
                                   Test: 0.970
        J:
It= 85
        J:
            1634.384 Train: 1.000
                                   Test: 0.970
It= 90
            1601.988 Train: 1.000
                                   Test: 0.970
It= 95
            1570.236 Train: 1.000
                                   Test: 0.970
        J:
It=100
        J: 1539.112 Train: 1.000 Test: 0.970
```