

CM146: PSET 3

(a) Kernel

$k(u, z)$ is a kernel. We can see that it is symmetric since $k(u, z) = k(z, u)$ as the intersection of the words remains the same. Now we show positive semi-definiteness.

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} k(u, u) & k(u, z) \\ k(z, u) & k(z, z) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\det(K - \lambda I) = (k(u, u) - \lambda)(k(z, z) - \lambda) - k(u, z)^2 = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \lambda^2 - \lambda(k(u, u) + k(z, z)) + k(u, u)k(z, z) - k(u, z)^2 = 0$$

Using quadratic formula to solve for λ .

$$\lambda = \frac{k(u, u) + k(z, z) \pm \sqrt{(k(u, u) + k(z, z))^2 - 4(k(u, u)k(z, z) - k(u, z)^2)}}{2}$$

$$= \frac{k(u, u) + k(z, z) \pm \sqrt{(k(u, u) - k(z, z))^2 + 4k(u, z)^2}}{2}$$

$$= \frac{k(u, u) + k(z, z) \pm \sqrt{(k(u, u) + k(z, z))^2 - 4(k(u, u)k(z, z) - k(u, z)^2)}}{2}$$

$$(\text{clearly, } k(u, u) + k(z, z) \pm \sqrt{(k(u, u) + k(z, z))^2 - 4(k(u, u)k(z, z) - k(u, z)^2)})$$

$$= \frac{k(u, u) + k(z, z) \pm \sqrt{(k(u, u) - k(z, z))^2 + 4k(u, z)^2}}{2}$$

is positive, so $\lambda > 0$ (as k is +ve and $\sqrt{\cdot} > 0 \forall u \in \mathbb{R}$)

Now considering $\lambda_2 = k(u, u) + k(z, z) - \sqrt{(k(u, u) + k(z, z))^2 - 4(k(u, u)k(z, z) - k(u, z)^2)}$

$$\text{We want } k(u, u) + k(z, z) \geq \sqrt{(k(u, u) + k(z, z))^2 - 4(k(u, u)k(z, z) - k(u, z)^2)}$$

$$(k(u, u) + k(z, z))^2 \geq (k(u, u) + k(z, z))^2 - 4(k(u, u)k(z, z) - k(u, z)^2)$$

$$0 \geq -4(k(u, u)k(z, z) - k(u, z)^2)$$

$$0 \geq -4(k(u, u)k(z, z) - k(u, z)^2)$$

$$k(u, u)k(z, z) \geq k(u, z)^2$$

But we know this since the intersection of a document with itself is necessarily greater than/equal to a different document i.e. $k(u, u) \geq k(u, z)$ and $k(z, z) \geq k(u, z)$.

Since K is symmetric and has only non-negative eigenvalues it is positive semi-definite.

$\therefore k(u, z)$ is a kernel.

(b) Since $k(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{z}$ is a kernel, we use scaling to with $f(\mathbf{n}) = \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{n}\|}$ to get that $\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{n}\|} \mathbf{n} \cdot \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{z}\|}$ is also a kernel.

Also since $k^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{z}) = 1$ is clearly a kernel, $1 + \frac{\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{n}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}$ is a kernel through the sum rule.

Multiplying this kernel by itself thrice and using the product rule, $\left(1 + \frac{\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{z}}{\|\mathbf{n}\| \|\mathbf{z}\|}\right)^3$ is a kernel.

(c) $k_\beta(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{z}) = (1 + \beta \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{z})^3$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= (1 + \beta(n_1 z_1 + n_2 z_2))^3 \quad \because \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \\
 &= (1 + \beta n_1 z_1 + \beta n_2 z_2)^3 \\
 &= (1 + \beta^2 n_1^2 z_1^2 + \beta^2 n_2^2 z_2^2 + 2\beta n_1 z_1 + 2\beta n_2 z_2 + 2\beta^2 n_1 z_1 n_2 z_2) \\
 &= 1 + \beta^2 n_1^2 z_1^2 + \beta^2 n_2^2 z_2^2 + 2\beta n_1 z_1 + 2\beta n_2 z_2 + 2\beta^2 n_1 z_1 n_2 z_2 + \\
 &\quad \beta^3 n_1^3 z_1^3 + \beta^3 n_1^2 z_1^2 z_2 + 2\beta^2 n_1^2 z_1^2 + 2\beta^2 n_1 n_2 z_1 z_2 + \\
 &\quad 2\beta^3 n_1^2 z_1^2 n_2 z_2 + \beta n_1 z_1 + \beta^3 n_1^2 z_1^2 n_2 z_2 + \beta^3 n_1^3 z_1^3 + \\
 &\quad 2\beta^3 n_1 z_1 n_2 z_2 + 2\beta^3 n_2^2 z_2^2 + 2\beta^3 n_1 n_2 z_1^2 z_2^2 \\
 &= (1 + 3\beta n_1 z_1 + 3\beta^2 n_1^2 z_1^2 + \beta^3 n_1^3 z_1^3 + 3\beta n_2 z_2 + 6\beta^2 n_1 z_1 n_2 z_2 \\
 &\quad + 3\beta^3 n_1^2 z_1^2 n_2 z_2 + 3\beta^2 n_2^2 z_2^2 + 2\beta^3 n_1 z_1 n_2^2 z_2^2 + \beta^3 n_2^3 z_2^3)
 \end{aligned}$$

So $\varphi_\beta(\mathbf{x}) =$

1
$\sqrt{3}\beta n_1$
$\sqrt{3}\beta n_2$
$\beta^3 n_1^3$
$\sqrt{3}\beta^3 n_1^2 n_2$
$\sqrt{6}\beta n_1 n_2$
$\sqrt{3}\beta^3 n_1^2 n_2$
$\sqrt{3}\beta n_1^2$
$\sqrt{3}\beta^3 n_1^2 n_2^2$
$\beta^3 n_2^3$

→ The difference between $k_\beta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ and $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ is that k_β has the scaling factor β that scales the vector. It ^{potentially} could be used to regularise the ~~kernel~~ β scales the vector.

2) SVM

(a) Want to minimize $\frac{1}{2} \|\theta\|^2$ with $y_n \theta^T u_n \geq 1$, i.e. $-\theta^T (a, e)^T \geq 1$
 $\Rightarrow 1 + a\theta_1 + e\theta_2 \leq 0$

$$L(\theta, \alpha) = \frac{1}{2} \|\theta\|^2 + \alpha (\theta^T (a, e)^T + 1)$$

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \theta} = \theta + \alpha (a, e)^T = 0 \Rightarrow \theta = -\alpha \begin{pmatrix} a \\ e \end{pmatrix}$$

Now minimizing over α :

$$\max_{\alpha} \frac{1}{2} \left\| -\alpha \begin{pmatrix} a \\ e \end{pmatrix} \right\|^2 + \alpha \left(-\alpha \begin{pmatrix} a \\ e \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} a \\ e \end{pmatrix} + 1 \right)$$

$$= \max_{\alpha} \frac{1}{2} (\alpha^2 a^2 + \alpha^2 e^2) - (\alpha^2 a^2 + \alpha^2 e^2) + \alpha$$

$$= \max_{\alpha} -\frac{\alpha^2}{2} (a^2 + e^2) + \alpha$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} = -\alpha (a^2 + e^2) + 1 = 0 \Rightarrow \alpha^* = \frac{1}{a^2 + e^2}$$

$$\theta^* = -\alpha^* \begin{pmatrix} a \\ e \end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{a^2 + e^2} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ e \end{pmatrix}$$

(b) Given $u_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $u_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $y_1 = 1$ and $y_2 = -1$ we must

satisfy $\theta_1 + \theta_2 \geq 0$, $\theta_1 \leq 0$ and

$\theta_1 + \theta_2 \geq 1$, $\theta_1 \leq 1$ for $y_n \theta^T u_n \geq 1$

Then $\theta_1 = -1$ and $\theta_2 = 2$ satisfy these constraints

$$\theta^* = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1^2 + 2^2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}}$$

(c) The constraints with the offset term are $\theta_1 + \theta_2 \geq 1 - b$ & $\theta_1 \leq 1 - b$
 These are satisfied by $\theta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$ and $b = -1$.

The margin $\gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ which is larger than the margin without the offset $\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \right)$

2) Twitter Analysis using SVMs

3.2) Hyperparameter Selection for a Linear Kernel SVM

- (b) Since we wish to find hyperparameters that generalise best to unseen data, specifically measured using training/test data, we want the dataset we are testing on to have similar distributions. A fold that doesn't have the same proportions could lead to overfitting and it would be an outlier. Moreover, a fold with mostly true/false samples teaches the model nothing.

(d)

C	accuracy	F1-score	AUROC	precision	sensitivity	specificity
10^{-3}	70.89%	82.97%	50%	70.89%	100%	0%
10^{-2}	71.07%	83.06%	50.31%	71.07%	100%	0.63%
10^{-1}	80.60%	87.55%	71.88%	83.57%	92.94%	50.81%
10^0	81.46%	87.49%	75.31%	85.62%	90.17%	60.45%
10^1	81.82%	87.66%	75.92%	85.95%	90.17%	61.67%
10^2	81.82%	87.66%	75.92%	85.95%	90.17%	61.67%
best C	10	10	10	10	0.001	10

On all performance metrics $C=10$ and $C=100$ give the same value, but which is actually the best for all metrics outside sensitivity. For sensitivity, smaller values like $C=10^{-3}$ and $C=10^{-2}$ perform better, but this is an outlier and susceptible to overfitting. We use $C=10$ as our best C.

3.3) Hyperparameter Selection for an RBF Kernel SVM

- (a) The γ parameter "defines how far the influence of a single training example reaches, lower values meaning far and higher values meaning close" (from sklearn docs). Basically as γ increases, the support vectors' radius of influence decreases. We can tune it to avoid overfitting and increase generalization.

- (b) In my grid, both C and γ range from 10^{-3} to 10^2 in powers of 10. We used these values for C for the linear kernel and they performed quite well. Moreover, this grid allows for a very large range of values for both parameters.

(c)

metric	score	C	γ
accuracy	74.34%	100	0.01
F1-score	87.63%	100	0.01
AUROC	75.45%	100	0.01
precision	85.83%	100	0.01
sensitivity	100%	0.001	0.001
specificity	60.47%	100	0.01

Just as in the linear kernel, sensitivity is an outlier with $C=0.001$ and $\gamma=0.001$ performing best for it. However, for every other performance metric, $C=100$ and $\gamma=0.01$ are the best hyperparameters in our grid.

3.4) Test Set Performance

- (a) We use $C=10$ for the linear kernel SVM as it performed the best on all metrics ~~except~~ except sensitivity (as did $C=100$). Similarly, as $C=100$ & $\gamma=0.01$ did the best for almost all metrics for the RBF kernel SVM, we use these hyperparameters to train it.

(c)

metric	linear	RBF	
accuracy	74.29%	75.71%	As we can see, the RBF kernel classifier performs slightly better than the linear kernel SVM on all metrics (except sensitivity). We would ideally deploy this model over the linear one.
F1-score	43.75%	45.16%	
AUROC	62.59%	63.61%	
precision	63.64%	70.00%	
sensitivity	33.33%	33.33%	
specificity	91.84%	93.88%	