Kernel-Based Learning & Multivariate Modeling

MIRI Master - DMKM Master

Lluís A. Belanche

belanche@cs.upc.edu

Soft Computing Research Group

Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya

2016-2017

Kernel-Based Learning & Multivariate Modeling

Contents by lecture

- Sept 14 Introduction to Kernel-Based Learning
- **Sept 21** The SVM for classification, regression and novelty detection (I)
- Sept 28 The SVM for classification, regression and novelty detection (II)
- Oct 05 Kernel design (I): theoretical issues
- Oct 19 Kernel design (II): practical issues
- Oct 26 Kernelizing ML & stats algorithms
- Nov 02 Advanced topics

Introduction

Desiderata for learning methods (note this is my particular view):

Robust Insensitive to outliers, errors and/or wrong model assumptions

Stable Against variations of the training data samples

Efficient In the computational sense (necessary to handle large datasets)

Effective Flexibility (complexity surplus) & explicit complexity control

Versatile Accept different data types and/or similarity measures

⇒ Generalize well to unseen data (as well as possible)

Introduction

Kernel-based methods consist of two ingredients:

- 1. The (right) **kernel function** to convert input data into a similarity matrix
- 2. The algorithm that uses the kernels and data to produce a model

Introduction

Examples of kernel functions:

- RBF
- Polynomial
- String
- Wavelet
- Fisher

Examples of learning algorithms:

- Support Vector Machine (SVM) and Relevance Vector Machine (RVM)
- kernel Fisher Discriminant Analysis (FDA)
- kernel PCA, kernel CCA
- kernel regression (logistic, ridge)
- kernel k-means

Introduction

Relationship between the two ingredients:

• The real art is to pick an appropriate kernel. Consider the RBF kernel:

$$k(u, v) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\|u - v\|^2}{\sigma^2}\right), \ \sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}$$

- All information of a problem (besides the target values) is tunneled through the kernel matrix $\mathbf{K} = (k_{ij})$, where $k_{ij} = k(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$
- ullet if σ^2 is very small, then $\mathbf{K} pprox \mathbf{I}$ (all data are dissimilar): over-fitting
- ullet if σ^2 is very large, then $\mathbf{K} pprox \mathbf{1}$ (all data are similar): under-fitting

Linear regression

Problem: We wish to find a function $f(x) = w^T x$ which best models a data set $S = \{(x_1, t_1), \dots, (x_N, t_N)\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$

- If $f(x) = w^T x + w_0$, just add one dimension $x \leftarrow (1, x)$; $w \leftarrow (w_0, w)$
- ullet Call $X_{N \times d}$ the matrix of the $oldsymbol{x}_n$ and $oldsymbol{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_N)^T$
- If S is generated as (x, f(x)), the x_n vectors are linearly independent and N = d, then there is a unique solution for Xw = t given by $w^* = X^{-1}t$. In any other case, the problem is ill-posed.

Ill-posed & well-posedness

A problem is **ill-posed** if the solution may not always exist, is not uniquely determined or is unstable (small variations in the initial conditions of the problem cause the solution to change quite a lot).

• Learning problems are in general ill-posed.



Jacques Hadamard (1865-1963)

• The solution is to use an **inductive principle**; one of (1865-1963) the most popular is the **regularization** principle.

Ridge regression

Under the standard assumptions $t = f(x) + \varepsilon$, $\varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$, ML leads to the minimization of the regularized (= penalized) empirical error:

$$E_{\lambda}(w) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} (t_n - w^T x_n)^2 + \lambda \sum_{i=0}^{d} w_i^2 = (t - Xw)^T (t - Xw) + \lambda w^T w$$

- 1. Note $E_{\lambda}(w) = ||t Xw||^2 + \lambda ||w||^2$
- 2. The parameter $\lambda > 0$ defines a trade-off between the fit to the data and the complexity of the model (length of w in this case)

Ridge regression

Setting $\nabla E_{\lambda}(w) = 0$, we obtain the (regularized) normal equations

$$-2X^T(t - Xw) + 2\lambda w = 0$$

with solution $\boldsymbol{w}^* = (X^TX + \lambda I_d)^{-1}X^T\boldsymbol{t}$

and therefore $f(x) = (w^*)^T x = \langle w^*, x \rangle = t^T X (X^T X + \lambda I_d)^{-1} x$.

Since X is $N \times d$, the matrix $X^T X$ is $d \times d$

- 1. The "model size" does not grow with data size (a parametric model)
- 2. $X^TX + \lambda I_d$ always has an inverse, for all $\lambda > 0$

Dual representation

It turns out that the regularized solution can be written as:

$$w^* = \sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_n x_n$$

In consequence,

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \alpha_n \langle \boldsymbol{x}_n, \boldsymbol{x} \rangle$$

- 1. The vector of parameters $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N)^T$ is $\alpha = (XX^T + \lambda I_N)^{-1}t$
- 2. The **Gram matrix** XX^T ("matrix of inner products") is $N \times N$

Primal and dual

So we have the **primal** and the **dual** forms for f(x):

$$f(x) = \langle w^*, x \rangle = \sum_{i=0}^d w_i^* x_i$$
 and $f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_n \langle x_n, x \rangle$

The dual form is (apparently) more convenient when d >> N:

- The primal requires the computation and inversion of $X^TX + \lambda I_d$, requiring $O(Nd^2+d^3)$ operations
- The dual requires the computation and inversion of $XX^T + \lambda I_N$, requiring $O(dN^2 + N^3)$ operations

Key aspects of kernel methods

- 1. Input data is embedded (mapped) into a vector space
- 2. Linear relations are sought among the elements of this vector space
- 3. The coordinates of the images (mapped data) are *not* needed: only their pairwise inner products
- 4. Often these inner products can be computed (efficiently and implicitly) in the input space (via a kernel function) \rightarrow the PROMISE

Feature maps (1)

How can we perform **non-linear** function regression?

First create a *feature map*, a function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^D$:

$$\phi(x) = (\phi_1(x), \phi_2(x), \cdots, \phi_D(x))^T$$

 $\phi(x)$ is called the *feature vector* and $\{\phi(x): x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ is the *feature space* (possibly part of a larger vector space \mathcal{H}), and typically D >> d.

(as a technicality, we could easily define $\phi_0(x) = 1$ as before, if need be)

Feature maps (2)

The non-linear regression function has now the primal representation:

$$f(x) = \langle w, \phi(x) \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{D} w_j \phi_j(x)$$

- ullet This feature space has the structure of \mathbb{R}^D (a vector space)
- In consequence, there is also the dual representation:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \alpha_n \langle \phi(\mathbf{x}_n), \phi(\mathbf{x}) \rangle$$

(how general is this result???)

Feature maps (3)

We will see that it suffices for \mathcal{H} to have the structure of a **Hilbert space**:

 A vector space endowed with an inner product whose associated norm defines a complete metric



David Hilbert (1862-1943)

- Distances, lenghts and angles are well-defined for the Hilbert elements of the space (1862-)
- \bullet Completeness means that all Cauchy sequences defined in ${\cal H}$ converge to an element of ${\cal H}$

Feature maps and kernels (1)

Given a feature map $\phi: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathcal{H}$, being \mathcal{H} a Hilbert space, we define its associated **kernel function** $k: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ as:

$$k(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}) = \langle \phi(\boldsymbol{u}), \phi(\boldsymbol{v}) \rangle, \qquad \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

One key point is that, for some feature maps, computing k(u, v) is independent of the dimension of \mathcal{H} (it only depends on d).

 \rightarrow the PROMISE!!!

Feature maps and kernels (2)

Our regression function has now the dual representation:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \alpha_n \langle \phi(\mathbf{x}_n), \phi(\mathbf{x}) \rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \alpha_n k(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x})$$

This dual representation:

- ... is a **non-linear model** (in the input space)
- ... is a **linear model** (in the feature space)

We now have a non-parametric model (complexity grows with data size)

Feature maps and kernels (3)

The new vector of parameters $\alpha=(\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_N)^T$ is now given by $\alpha=(\mathbf{K}+\lambda I_N)^{-1}t,$

where (as introduced earlier) $\mathbf{K} = (k_{ij})$, with $k_{ij} = k(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$.

So we can do ridge regression based only on K (and throw away X)

Kernel ridge regression

What if we take the (simplest) choice $\phi(x) = x$? In this case d = D and $k(u, v) = \langle u, v \rangle$. The regularized solution reads

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \alpha_n \langle \boldsymbol{x}_n, \boldsymbol{x} \rangle$$

where

$$\alpha = (XX^T + \lambda I_N)^{-1}t,$$

(so $\mathbf{K} = XX^T$ in this particularly simple case)

This means we have generalized (the dual of) standard ridge regression via a kernel function (we have **kernelized**)

Kernelizing ...

Many (classical and new) learning algorithms can be kernelized:

- 1. They require solving a problem where the data appear in the form of pairwise inner products (or pairwise Euclidean distances)
- 2. The solution is expressed as a linear combination of the kernel function centered at the data (ideally we only use *some* of the data: **sparsity**)
- 3. Examples include SVMs, ridge regression, perceptrons, FDA, PLS [supervised], as well as PCA, k-means, Parzen Windows [unsupervised]

General feature maps (4)

A feature map is of the general form $\phi: \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{H}$

The associated kernel function $k: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ is:

$$k(u, v) = \langle \phi(u), \phi(v) \rangle, \qquad u, v \in \mathcal{X}$$

 ${\mathcal X}$ can be any space, ${\mathcal H}$ is always a Hilbert space

In our starting development, $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$

Regularization-based learning algorithms

The key for this is the **regularization framework**; consider the regularized empirical error for mapped data:

$$E_{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{w}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} (t_n - \langle \boldsymbol{w}, \phi(\boldsymbol{x}_n) \rangle)^2 + \lambda ||\boldsymbol{w}||^2, \qquad \lambda > 0$$

which we now generalize to arbitrary **loss** functions $L: \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$E_{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{w}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} L(t_n, \langle \boldsymbol{w}, \phi(\boldsymbol{x}_n) \rangle) + \lambda ||\boldsymbol{w}||^2, \qquad \lambda > 0$$

Regularization-based learning algorithms

Theorem. If L is differentiable w.r.t. its second argument and w^* is a minimizer of $E_{\lambda}(w)$, then we can represent:

$$\boldsymbol{w^*} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \alpha_n \phi(\boldsymbol{x}_n)$$

and therefore

$$f(x) = \langle w^*, \phi(x) \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{D} w_j^* \phi_j(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \alpha_n k(x_n, x), \qquad \alpha = (\mathbf{K} + \lambda I_N)^{-1} t$$

This result is usually called the **Representer Theorem**.