

# SVM

February 25, 2023

## 1 Multiclass Support Vector Machine exercise

Complete and hand in this completed worksheet (including its outputs and any supporting code outside of the worksheet) with your assignment submission. For more details see the [assignments page](#) on the course website.

In this exercise you will:

- implement a fully-vectorized **loss function** for the SVM
- implement the fully-vectorized expression for its **analytic gradient**
- **check your implementation** using numerical gradient
- use a validation set to **tune the learning rate and regularization** strength
- **optimize** the loss function with **SGD**
- **visualize** the final learned weights

```
[2]: # Run some setup code for this notebook.
import random
import numpy as np
from cs231n.data_utils import load_CIFAR10
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt

# This is a bit of magic to make matplotlib figures appear inline in the
# notebook rather than in a new window.
%matplotlib inline
plt.rcParams['figure.figsize'] = (10.0, 8.0) # set default size of plots
plt.rcParams['image.interpolation'] = 'nearest'
plt.rcParams['image.cmap'] = 'gray'

# Some more magic so that the notebook will reload external python modules;
# see http://stackoverflow.com/questions/1907993/
↪ autoreload-of-modules-in-ipython
%load_ext autoreload
%autoreload 2
```

## 1.1 CIFAR-10 Data Loading and Preprocessing

```
[3]: # Load the raw CIFAR-10 data.
cifar10_dir = 'cs231n/datasets/cifar-10-batches-py'

# Cleaning up variables to prevent loading data multiple times (which may cause
↳memory issue)
try:
    del X_train, y_train
    del X_test, y_test
    print('Clear previously loaded data.')
except:
    pass

X_train, y_train, X_test, y_test = load_CIFAR10(cifar10_dir)

# As a sanity check, we print out the size of the training and test data.
print('Training data shape: ', X_train.shape)
print('Training labels shape: ', y_train.shape)
print('Test data shape: ', X_test.shape)
print('Test labels shape: ', y_test.shape)
```

Training data shape: (50000, 32, 32, 3)

Training labels shape: (50000,)

Test data shape: (10000, 32, 32, 3)

Test labels shape: (10000,)

```
[4]: # Visualize some examples from the dataset.
# We show a few examples of training images from each class.
classes = ['plane', 'car', 'bird', 'cat', 'deer', 'dog', 'frog', 'horse', '
↳ship', 'truck']
num_classes = len(classes)
samples_per_class = 7
for y, cls in enumerate(classes):
    idxs = np.flatnonzero(y_train == y)
    idxs = np.random.choice(idxs, samples_per_class, replace=False)
    for i, idx in enumerate(idxs):
        plt_idx = i * num_classes + y + 1
        plt.subplot(samples_per_class, num_classes, plt_idx)
        plt.imshow(X_train[idx].astype('uint8'))
        plt.axis('off')
        if i == 0:
            plt.title(cls)
plt.show()
```



```
[5]: # Split the data into train, val, and test sets. In addition we will
# create a small development set as a subset of the training data;
# we can use this for development so our code runs faster.
num_training = 49000
num_validation = 1000
num_test = 1000
num_dev = 500

# Our validation set will be num_validation points from the original
# training set.
mask = range(num_training, num_training + num_validation)
X_val = X_train[mask]
y_val = y_train[mask]

# Our training set will be the first num_train points from the original
# training set.
mask = range(num_training)
X_train = X_train[mask]
y_train = y_train[mask]

# We will also make a development set, which is a small subset of
# the training set.
mask = np.random.choice(num_training, num_dev, replace=False)
X_dev = X_train[mask]
```

```

y_dev = y_train[mask]

# We use the first num_test points of the original test set as our
# test set.
mask = range(num_test)
X_test = X_test[mask]
y_test = y_test[mask]

print('Train data shape: ', X_train.shape)
print('Train labels shape: ', y_train.shape)
print('Validation data shape: ', X_val.shape)
print('Validation labels shape: ', y_val.shape)
print('Test data shape: ', X_test.shape)
print('Test labels shape: ', y_test.shape)

```

```

Train data shape: (49000, 32, 32, 3)
Train labels shape: (49000,)
Validation data shape: (1000, 32, 32, 3)
Validation labels shape: (1000,)
Test data shape: (1000, 32, 32, 3)
Test labels shape: (1000,)

```

```

[6]: # Preprocessing: reshape the image data into rows
X_train = np.reshape(X_train, (X_train.shape[0], -1))
X_val = np.reshape(X_val, (X_val.shape[0], -1))
X_test = np.reshape(X_test, (X_test.shape[0], -1))
X_dev = np.reshape(X_dev, (X_dev.shape[0], -1))

# As a sanity check, print out the shapes of the data
print('Training data shape: ', X_train.shape)
print('Validation data shape: ', X_val.shape)
print('Test data shape: ', X_test.shape)
print('dev data shape: ', X_dev.shape)

```

```

Training data shape: (49000, 3072)
Validation data shape: (1000, 3072)
Test data shape: (1000, 3072)
dev data shape: (500, 3072)

```

```

[7]: # Preprocessing: subtract the mean image
# first: compute the image mean based on the training data
mean_image = np.mean(X_train, axis=0)
print(mean_image[:10]) # print a few of the elements
plt.figure(figsize=(4,4))
plt.imshow(mean_image.reshape((32,32,3)).astype('uint8')) # visualize the mean_
→ image
plt.show()

```

```

# second: subtract the mean image from train and test data
X_train -= mean_image
X_val -= mean_image
X_test -= mean_image
X_dev -= mean_image

# third: append the bias dimension of ones (i.e. bias trick) so that our SVM
# only has to worry about optimizing a single weight matrix W.
X_train = np.hstack([X_train, np.ones((X_train.shape[0], 1))])
X_val = np.hstack([X_val, np.ones((X_val.shape[0], 1))])
X_test = np.hstack([X_test, np.ones((X_test.shape[0], 1))])
X_dev = np.hstack([X_dev, np.ones((X_dev.shape[0], 1))])


print(X_train.shape, X_val.shape, X_test.shape, X_dev.shape)

```

```

[130.64189796 135.98173469 132.47391837 130.05569388 135.34804082
 131.75402041 130.96055102 136.14328571 132.47636735 131.48467347]

```



```

(49000, 3073) (1000, 3073) (1000, 3073) (500, 3073)

```

## 1.2 SVM Classifier

Your code for this section will all be written inside `cs231n/classifiers/linear_svm.py`.

As you can see, we have prefilled the function `svm_loss_naive` which uses for loops to evaluate the multiclass SVM loss function.

```
[8]: # Evaluate the naive implementation of the loss we provided for you:
from cs231n.classifiers.linear_svm import svm_loss_naive
import time
```

```
# generate a random SVM weight matrix of small numbers
```

```
W = np.random.randn(3073, 10) * 0.0001
```

```
loss, grad = svm_loss_naive(W, X_dev, y_dev, 0.000005)
```

```
print('loss: %f' % (loss, ))
```

```
loss: 9.318401
```

The grad returned from the function above is right now all zero. Derive and implement the gradient for the SVM cost function and implement it inline inside the function `svm_loss_naive`. You will find it helpful to interleave your new code inside the existing function.

To check that you have correctly implemented the gradient correctly, you can numerically estimate the gradient of the loss function and compare the numeric estimate to the gradient that you computed. We have provided code that does this for you:

```
[9]: # Once you've implemented the gradient, recompute it with the code below
# and gradient check it with the function we provided for you
```

```
# Compute the loss and its gradient at W.
```

```
loss, grad = svm_loss_naive(W, X_dev, y_dev, 0.0)
```

```
# Numerically compute the gradient along several randomly chosen dimensions, and
# compare them with your analytically computed gradient. The numbers should
↪match
```

```
# almost exactly along all dimensions.
```

```
from cs231n.gradient_check import grad_check_sparse
```

```
f = lambda w: svm_loss_naive(w, X_dev, y_dev, 0.0)[0]
```

```
grad_numerical = grad_check_sparse(f, W, grad)
```

```
# do the gradient check once again with regularization turned on
```

```
# you didn't forget the regularization gradient did you?
```

```
loss, grad = svm_loss_naive(W, X_dev, y_dev, 5e1)
```

```
f = lambda w: svm_loss_naive(w, X_dev, y_dev, 5e1)[0]
```

```
grad_numerical = grad_check_sparse(f, W, grad)
```

```
numerical: 4.066394 analytic: 4.129151, relative error: 7.657412e-03
```

```
numerical: -5.600240 analytic: -5.600240, relative error: 7.350527e-11
```

```
numerical: 4.651978 analytic: 4.651978, relative error: 8.995426e-13
```

```
numerical: -22.334557 analytic: -22.334557, relative error: 1.318483e-11
```

```
numerical: -3.009755 analytic: -3.009755, relative error: 1.557965e-10
```

```
numerical: -11.344121 analytic: -11.344121, relative error: 4.304613e-13
```

```
numerical: 3.158882 analytic: 3.204693, relative error: 7.198895e-03
```

```
numerical: -18.502906 analytic: -18.382096, relative error: 3.275296e-03
```

```
numerical: -6.049070 analytic: -6.049070, relative error: 7.427929e-12
```

```

numerical: 30.572300 analytic: 30.572300, relative error: 7.611381e-12
numerical: -6.443605 analytic: -6.548512, relative error: 8.074646e-03
numerical: -3.362234 analytic: -3.294436, relative error: 1.018498e-02
numerical: -1.974795 analytic: -1.974795, relative error: 2.956606e-10
numerical: -42.768838 analytic: -42.768838, relative error: 2.457229e-12
numerical: 2.931244 analytic: 2.931244, relative error: 4.977740e-11
numerical: 1.526142 analytic: 1.601676, relative error: 2.414897e-02
numerical: -2.584603 analytic: -2.584603, relative error: 9.321052e-11
numerical: -12.417974 analytic: -12.417974, relative error: 2.307688e-11
numerical: -22.304136 analytic: -22.232664, relative error: 1.604777e-03
numerical: 25.988804 analytic: 25.988804, relative error: 1.067483e-11

```

### Inline Question 1

It is possible that once in a while a dimension in the gradcheck will not match exactly. What could such a discrepancy be caused by? Is it a reason for concern? What is a simple example in one dimension where a gradient check could fail? How would change the margin affect of the frequency of this happening? *Hint: the SVM loss function is not strictly speaking differentiable*

*Your Answer :*

To begin with, the loss function is not totally differentiable at 0. Since the numerical result is get from approximation, the approximation will fail in the position that the loss function is not differentiable.

Given that the error is caused by approximation, it is not a concern.

A simple example in 1-D: consider ReLU function,  $f(x) = \max(0, x)$ , if we approximate the gradient at  $x = -0.02$  and take the interval length  $h = 0.02$ , then the approximated gradient is

$$f'(x) = \frac{f(0.01) - f(-0.03)}{2 \times 0.02} = \frac{1}{4} \neq 0$$

but the true gradient is 0.

The way to reduce the effect is to reduce the interval length  $h$ .

```

[10]: # Next implement the function svm_loss_vectorized; for now only compute the
      ↪ loss;
      # we will implement the gradient in a moment.
      tic = time.time()
      loss_naive, grad_naive = svm_loss_naive(W, X_dev, y_dev, 0.000005)
      toc = time.time()
      print('Naive loss: %e computed in %fs' % (loss_naive, toc - tic))

      from cs231n.classifiers.linear_svm import svm_loss_vectorized
      tic = time.time()
      loss_vectorized, _ = svm_loss_vectorized(W, X_dev, y_dev, 0.000005)
      toc = time.time()
      print('Vectorized loss: %e computed in %fs' % (loss_vectorized, toc - tic))

      # The losses should match but your vectorized implementation should be much
      ↪ faster.

```

```
print('difference: %f' % (loss_naive - loss_vectorized))
```

Naive loss: 9.318401e+00 computed in 0.045376s  
Vectorized loss: 9.318401e+00 computed in 0.008753s  
difference: -0.000000

```
[11]: # Complete the implementation of svm_loss_vectorized, and compute the gradient
# of the loss function in a vectorized way.

# The naive implementation and the vectorized implementation should match, but
# the vectorized version should still be much faster.
tic = time.time()
_, grad_naive = svm_loss_naive(W, X_dev, y_dev, 0.000005)
toc = time.time()
print('Naive loss and gradient: computed in %fs' % (toc - tic))

tic = time.time()
_, grad_vectorized = svm_loss_vectorized(W, X_dev, y_dev, 0.000005)
toc = time.time()
print('Vectorized loss and gradient: computed in %fs' % (toc - tic))

# The loss is a single number, so it is easy to compare the values computed
# by the two implementations. The gradient on the other hand is a matrix, so
# we use the Frobenius norm to compare them.
difference = np.linalg.norm(grad_naive - grad_vectorized, ord='fro')
print('difference: %f' % difference)
```

Naive loss and gradient: computed in 0.075716s  
Vectorized loss and gradient: computed in 0.009150s  
difference: 0.000000

### 1.2.1 Stochastic Gradient Descent


We now have vectorized and efficient expressions for the loss, the gradient and our gradient matches the numerical gradient. We are therefore ready to do SGD to minimize the loss. Your code for this part will be written inside `cs231n/classifiers/linear_classifier.py`.

```
[12]: # In the file linear_classifier.py, implement SGD in the function
# LinearClassifier.train() and then run it with the code below.
from cs231n.classifiers import LinearSVM
svm = LinearSVM()
tic = time.time()
loss_hist = svm.train(X_train, y_train, learning_rate=1e-7, reg=2.5e4,
                      num_iters=1500, verbose=True)
toc = time.time()
print('That took %fs' % (toc - tic))
```



```
iteration 0 / 1500: loss 791.981194
iteration 100 / 1500: loss 289.379744
iteration 200 / 1500: loss 108.449161
iteration 300 / 1500: loss 42.430152
iteration 400 / 1500: loss 18.899496
iteration 500 / 1500: loss 10.146439
iteration 600 / 1500: loss 7.472539
iteration 700 / 1500: loss 5.959729
iteration 800 / 1500: loss 5.459304
iteration 900 / 1500: loss 5.492587
iteration 1000 / 1500: loss 5.032883
iteration 1100 / 1500: loss 5.570110
iteration 1200 / 1500: loss 5.641019
iteration 1300 / 1500: loss 5.025879
iteration 1400 / 1500: loss 5.251474
That took 7.209703s
```

```
[13]: # A useful debugging strategy is to plot the loss as a function of
      # iteration number:
      plt.plot(loss_hist)
      plt.xlabel('Iteration number')
      plt.ylabel('Loss value')
      plt.show()
```



```
[14]: # Write the LinearSVM.predict function and evaluate the performance on both the
# training and validation set
y_train_pred = svm.predict(X_train)
print('training accuracy: %f' % (np.mean(y_train == y_train_pred), ))
y_val_pred = svm.predict(X_val)
print('validation accuracy: %f' % (np.mean(y_val == y_val_pred), ))
```

training accuracy: 0.369653  
validation accuracy: 0.386000

```
[15]: # Use the validation set to tune hyperparameters (regularization strength and
# learning rate). You should experiment with different ranges for the learning
# rates and regularization strengths; if you are careful you should be able to
# get a classification accuracy of about 0.39 on the validation set.

# Note: you may see runtime/overflow warnings during hyper-parameter search.
# This may be caused by extreme values, and is not a bug.

# results is dictionary mapping tuples of the form
# (learning_rate, regularization_strength) to tuples of the form
# (training_accuracy, validation_accuracy). The accuracy is simply the fraction
# of data points that are correctly classified.
results = {}
best_val = -1 # The highest validation accuracy that we have seen so far.
best_svm = None # The LinearSVM object that achieved the highest validation
    ↪rate.

#####
# TODO: #
# Write code that chooses the best hyperparameters by tuning on the validation #
# set. For each combination of hyperparameters, train a linear SVM on the #
# training set, compute its accuracy on the training and validation sets, and #
# store these numbers in the results dictionary. In addition, store the best #
# validation accuracy in best_val and the LinearSVM object that achieves this #
# accuracy in best_svm. #
# #
# Hint: You should use a small value for num_iters as you develop your #
# validation code so that the SVMs don't take much time to train; once you are #
# confident that your validation code works, you should rerun the validation #
# code with a larger value for num_iters. #
#####

# Provided as a reference. You may or may not want to change these
    ↪hyperparameters
learning_rates = [1e-7, 5e-5]
regularization_strengths = [2.5e4, 5e4]
```

```

# *****START OF YOUR CODE (DO NOT DELETE/MODIFY THIS LINE)*****

for lr in learning_rates:
    for r in regularization_strengths:
        svm = LinearSVM()
        svm.train(X_train, y_train, learning_rate=lr, reg=r, num_iters=1500)
        y_train_pred = svm.predict(X_train)
        y_val_pred = svm.predict(X_val)
        train_accuracy = np.mean(y_train_pred == y_train)
        val_accuracy = np.mean(y_val_pred == y_val)
        results[(lr, r)] = (train_accuracy, val_accuracy)
        if val_accuracy > best_val:
            best_val = val_accuracy
            best_svm = svm

# *****END OF YOUR CODE (DO NOT DELETE/MODIFY THIS LINE)*****

# Print out results.
for lr, reg in sorted(results):
    train_accuracy, val_accuracy = results[(lr, reg)]
    print('lr %e reg %e train accuracy: %f val accuracy: %f' % (
        lr, reg, train_accuracy, val_accuracy))

print('best validation accuracy achieved during cross-validation: %f' %
      ↪best_val)

```

```

/Users/caleblee/Desktop/CS280/CS280-Spring23-Assignment1/Homework1_partB/cs231n/
classifiers/linear_svm.py:88: RuntimeWarning: overflow encountered in scalar
multiply
    loss += reg * np.sum(W * W)
/Users/caleblee/Library/Python/3.9/lib/python/site-
packages/numpy/core/fromnumeric.py:86: RuntimeWarning: overflow encountered in
reduce
    return ufunc.reduce(obj, axis, dtype, out, **passkwargs)
/Users/caleblee/Desktop/CS280/CS280-Spring23-Assignment1/Homework1_partB/cs231n/
classifiers/linear_svm.py:88: RuntimeWarning: overflow encountered in multiply
    loss += reg * np.sum(W * W)
/Users/caleblee/Desktop/CS280/CS280-Spring23-Assignment1/Homework1_partB/cs231n/
classifiers/linear_svm.py:106: RuntimeWarning: overflow encountered in multiply
    dW += reg * 2 * W
/Users/caleblee/Desktop/CS280/CS280-Spring23-Assignment1/Homework1_partB/cs231n/
classifiers/linear_svm.py:83: RuntimeWarning: invalid value encountered in
matmul
    loss = X @ W
/Users/caleblee/Desktop/CS280/CS280-Spring23-Assignment1/Homework1_partB/cs231n/
classifiers/linear_classifier.py:77: RuntimeWarning: invalid value encountered
in subtract
    self.W -= learning_rate * grad

```

```
lr 1.000000e-07 reg 2.500000e+04 train accuracy: 0.366571 val accuracy: 0.375000
lr 1.000000e-07 reg 5.000000e+04 train accuracy: 0.358327 val accuracy: 0.371000
lr 5.000000e-05 reg 2.500000e+04 train accuracy: 0.043796 val accuracy: 0.049000
lr 5.000000e-05 reg 5.000000e+04 train accuracy: 0.100265 val accuracy: 0.087000
best validation accuracy achieved during cross-validation: 0.375000
```


```
[16]: # Visualize the cross-validation results
import math
import pdb

# pdb.set_trace()

x_scatter = [math.log10(x[0]) for x in results]
y_scatter = [math.log10(x[1]) for x in results]

# plot training accuracy
marker_size = 100
colors = [results[x][0] for x in results]
plt.subplot(2, 1, 1)
plt.tight_layout(pad=3)
plt.scatter(x_scatter, y_scatter, marker_size, c=colors, cmap=plt.cm.coolwarm)
plt.colorbar()
plt.xlabel('log learning rate')
plt.ylabel('log regularization strength')
plt.title('CIFAR-10 training accuracy')

# plot validation accuracy
colors = [results[x][1] for x in results] # default size of markers is 20
plt.subplot(2, 1, 2)
plt.scatter(x_scatter, y_scatter, marker_size, c=colors, cmap=plt.cm.coolwarm)
plt.colorbar()
plt.xlabel('log learning rate')
plt.ylabel('log regularization strength')
plt.title('CIFAR-10 validation accuracy')
plt.show()
```




```
[17]: # Evaluate the best svm on test set
y_test_pred = best_svm.predict(X_test)
test_accuracy = np.mean(y_test == y_test_pred)
print('linear SVM on raw pixels final test set accuracy: %f' % test_accuracy)
```

linear SVM on raw pixels final test set accuracy: 0.369000

```
[18]: # Visualize the learned weights for each class.
# Depending on your choice of learning rate and regularization strength, these
# may
# or may not be nice to look at.
w = best_svm.W[:-1,:] # strip out the bias
w = w.reshape(32, 32, 3, 10)
w_min, w_max = np.min(w), np.max(w)
classes = ['plane', 'car', 'bird', 'cat', 'deer', 'dog', 'frog', 'horse', '
# ship', 'truck']
for i in range(10):
    plt.subplot(2, 5, i + 1)

    # Rescale the weights to be between 0 and 255
    wimg = 255.0 * (w[:, :, :, i].squeeze() - w_min) / (w_max - w_min)
    plt.imshow(wimg.astype('uint8'))
```

```
plt.axis('off')
plt.title(classes[i])
```



### Inline question 2

Describe what your visualized SVM weights look like, and offer a brief explanation for why they look the way that they do.

*Your Answer :*

Those pictures look like the “average” pictures of each class. This is because the angle between  $w_k$  and  $x_i$  affects the value of  $w_k^T x_i$ . Thus, the smaller the angle is, the more similar  $w_k$  is to  $x_i$  and the higher the probability that  $x_i$  is classified into class  $k$ .

[18] :