COMP 551 - Applied Machine Learning Lecture 10 — Support vector machines

William L. Hamilton

(with slides and content from Joelle Pineau)

MiniProject 1

- Average ~90%
- Common errors:
  - Incorrect gradient descent implementation (15 points).
  - Incorrect closed-form implementation (15 points).
  - Typos and clarity issues (2-5 points).

High-level views of classification

- Probabilistic
  - Goal: Estimate P(y | x), i.e. the conditional probability of the target variable given the feature data.
- Decision boundaries
  - Goal: Partition the feature space into different regions, and classify points based on the region where the lie.

Outline

- Perceptrons
  - Definition
  - Perceptron learning rule
  - Convergence
- Margin & max margin classifiers
- Linear Support Vector Machines
  - Formulation as optimization problem
  - Generalized Lagrangian and dual
- Non-linear Support Vector Machines (next class)

A simple linear classifier

- Given a binary classification task: $\{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\}_{i=1:n}$, $y_i=\{-1,+1\}$.
- The **perceptron** (Rosenblatt, 1957) is a classifier of the form:

$$h_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{x}) = \text{sign}(\mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{x}) = \{+1 \text{ if } \mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{x} \geq 0;\ -1 \text{ otherwise}\}$$

  - The decision boundary is $\mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{x}=0$.
  - An example $<\mathbf{x}_i, y_i>$ is classified correctly if and only if: $y_i(\mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{x}_i)>0$.



Perceptron learning rule (Rosenblatt, 1957)

- Consider the following procedure:

Initialize w_j, $j=0:m$ randomly,

While any training examples remain incorrectly classified

Loop through all misclassified examples x_i

Perform the update: $\mathbf{w} \leftarrow \mathbf{w} + \alpha\, y_i\, \mathbf{x}_i$

where α is the learning rate (or step size).

- **Intuition**: For misclassified positive examples, increase $w^T x$, and reduce it for negative examples.

Gradient-descent learning

- The perceptron learning rule can be interpreted as a **gradient descent procedure**, with optimization criterion:

$$\text{Err}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{i=1:n} \{ 0 \text{ if } y_i \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i \geq 0; \; -y_i \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x} \text{ otherwise } \}$$

Gradient-descent learning

- The perceptron learning rule can be interpreted as a **gradient descent procedure**, with optimization criterion:

$$\text{Err}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{i=1:n} \{ 0 \text{ if } y_i \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i \geq 0; \ -y_i \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x} \text{ otherwise } \}$$

- For correctly classified examples, the error is zero.
- For incorrectly classified examples, the error tells by how much $\mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{x}$ is on the wrong side of the decision boundary.
- The error is zero when all examples are classified correctly.

Linear separability

The data is **linearly separable** if and only if there exists a $\mathbf{w}$ such that:

- For all examples, $y_i \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i > 0$
- Or equivalently, the loss is zero for some set of parameters ($\mathbf{w}$).



Linearly separable



Not linearly separable

Perceptron convergence theorem

- The basic theorem:
  - If the perceptron learning rule is applied to a linearly separable dataset, a solution will be found after some finite number of updates.

Perceptron convergence theorem

- The basic theorem:
  - If the perceptron learning rule is applied to a linearly separable dataset, a solution will be found after some finite number of updates.

- Additional comments:
  - The number of updates depends on the dataset, on the learning rate, and on the initial weights.
  - If the data is not linearly separable, there will be oscillation (which can be detected automatically).
  - Decreasing the learning rate to 0 can cause the oscillation to settle on some particular solution.

Perceptron learning example



Perceptron learning example



Weight as a combination of input vectors

- Recall perceptron learning rule:

$$\mathbf{w} \leftarrow \mathbf{w} + \alpha\, y_i\, \mathbf{x}_i$$

- If initial weights are zero, then at any step, the weights are a linear combination of feature vectors of the examples:

$$\mathbf{w} = \sum_{i=1:n} \alpha_i\, y_i\, \mathbf{x}_i$$

where α_i is the sum of step sizes used for all updates applied example i.

Weight as a combination of input vectors

- Recall perceptron learning rule:

$$\mathbf{w} \leftarrow \mathbf{w} + \alpha\, y_i\, \mathbf{x}_i$$

- If initial weights are zero, then at any step, the weights are a linear combination of feature vectors of the examples:

$$\mathbf{w} = \sum_{i=1:n} \alpha_i\, y_i\, \mathbf{x}_i$$

where α_i is the sum of step sizes used for all updates applied example i.

- By the end of training, some examples may have never participated in an update, so will have $\alpha_i = 0$.
- This is called the dual representation of the classifier.

Perceptron learning example

- Examples used (bold) and not (faint). What do you notice?



Perceptron learning example

- Solutions are often non-unique. The solution depends on the set of instances and the order of sampling in updates.



A few comments on the Perceptron

- Perceptrons can be learned to fit linearly separable data, using a gradient-descent rule.
  - The logistic function offers a "smooth" version of the perceptron.



A few comments on the Perceptron

- Perceptrons can be learned to fit linearly separable data, using a gradient-descent rule.
  - The logistic function offers a "smooth" version of the perceptron.



- Two issues:
  - Solutions are non-unique.

A few comments on the Perceptron

- Perceptrons can be learned to fit linearly separable data, using a gradient-descent rule.
  - The logistic function offers a "smooth" version of the perceptron.



- Two issues:
  - Solutions are non-unique.
  - What about non-linearly separable data? *(Topic for next class.)*
    - Perhaps data can be linearly separated in a different feature space?
    - Perhaps we can relax the criterion of separating all the data?

The non-uniqueness issue

- Consider a linearly separable binary classification dataset.
- There is an infinite number of hyper-planes that separate the classes:

- Which plane is best?



The non-uniqueness issue

- Consider a linearly separable binary classification dataset.
- There is an infinite number of hyper-planes that separate the classes:

- Which plane is best?



- Related question: For a given plane, for which points should we be most confident in the classification?

Linear Support Vector Machine (SVM)

- A **linear** SVM is a perceptron for which we chose $\mathbf{w}$ such that the margin is maximized.
- For a given separating hyper-plane, the margin is twice the (Euclidean) distance from hyper-plane to nearest training example.
  - I.e. the width of the "strip" around the decision boundary that contains no training examples.



Distance to the decision boundary

- Suppose we have a decision boundary that separates the data.



Distance to the decision boundary

- Suppose we have a decision boundary that separates the data.



- Let γ_i be the distance from instance x_i to the decision boundary.
- Define vector w to be the normal to the decision boundary.

Distance to the decision boundary

- How can we write γ_i in terms of $\mathbf{x}_i, y_i, \mathbf{w}$?
- Let $\mathbf{x}_i^0$ be the point on the decision boundary nearest $\mathbf{x}_i$
- The vector from $\mathbf{x}_i^0$ to $\mathbf{x}_i$ is $\gamma_i \mathbf{w} / ||\mathbf{w}||$.
  - γ_i is a scalar (distance from $\mathbf{x}_i$ to $\mathbf{x}_i^0$)
  - $\mathbf{w}/||\mathbf{w}||$ is the unit normal.
- So we can define $\mathbf{x}_i^0 = \mathbf{x}_i - \gamma_i \mathbf{w} / ||\mathbf{w}||$.



Distance to the decision boundary

- How can we write γ_i in terms of $\mathbf{x}_i, y_i, \mathbf{w}$?
- Let $\mathbf{x}_i^0$ be the point on the decision boundary nearest $\mathbf{x}_i$
- The vector from $\mathbf{x}_i^0$ to $\mathbf{x}_i$ is $\gamma_i \mathbf{w} / ||\mathbf{w}||$.
  - γ_i is a scalar (distance from $\mathbf{x}_i$ to $\mathbf{x}_i^0$)
  - $\mathbf{w}/||\mathbf{w}||$ is the unit normal.
- So we can define $\mathbf{x}_i^0 = \mathbf{x}_i - \gamma_i \mathbf{w} / ||\mathbf{w}||$.
- As $\mathbf{x}_i^0$ is <u>on</u> the decision boundary, we have

$$\mathbf{w}^T(\mathbf{x}_i - \gamma_i \mathbf{w} / ||\mathbf{w}||) = 0$$



- Solving for γ_i yields, for a positive example: $\gamma_i = \mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{x}_i / ||\mathbf{w}||$

  or for examples of both classes: $\gamma_i = y_i\mathbf{w}^T\mathbf{x}_i / ||\mathbf{w}||$

Optimization

- First suggestion:

Maximize $\mathbf{M}$

with respect to $\mathbf{w}$

subject to $y_i \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i / ||\mathbf{w}|| \geq \mathbf{M}, \forall i$

Optimization

- First suggestion:

  Maximize M

  with respect to $\mathbf{w}$

  subject to $y_i \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i / ||\mathbf{w}|| \geq \mathrm{M}, \forall i$

- This is not very convenient for optimization:
  - w appears nonlinearly in the constraints.
  - Problem is underconstrained. If $(\mathbf{w}, \mathrm{M})$ is optimal, so is $(\beta\mathbf{w}, \mathrm{M})$, for any $\beta > 0$.
    Add a constraint: $||\mathbf{w}||\mathrm{M} = 1$

Optimization

- First suggestion:

  Maximize M

  with respect to $\mathbf{w}$

  subject to $y_i \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i / ||\mathbf{w}|| \geq \mathrm{M}, \forall i$

- This is not very convenient for optimization:
  - w appears nonlinearly in the constraints.
  - Problem is underconstrained. If $(\mathbf{w}, \mathrm{M})$ is optimal, so is $(\beta\mathbf{w}, \mathrm{M})$, for any $\beta > 0$.
    Add a constraint: $||\mathbf{w}||\mathrm{M} = 1$

- Instead try:

  Minimize $||\mathrm{w}||$

  with respect to $\mathbf{w}$

  subject to $y_i \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i \geq 1$

Final formulation

- Let's minimize $\frac{1}{2}||\mathbf{w}||^2$ instead of $||\mathbf{w}||$

  (Taking the square is a monotone transform, as $||w||$ is positive, so it doesn't change the optimal solution. The ½ is for mathematical convenience.)

- This gets us to: Min $\frac{1}{2}||\mathbf{w}||^2$

  w.r.t. $\mathbf{w}$

  s.t. $y_i \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i \geq 1$

Final formulation

- Let's minimize $\frac{1}{2}||\mathbf{w}||^2$ instead of $||\mathbf{w}||$

  (Taking the square is a monotone transform, as $||w||$ is positive, so it doesn't change the optimal solution. The ½ is for mathematical convenience.)

- This gets us to: Min $\frac{1}{2}||\mathbf{w}||^2$

  w.r.t. $\mathbf{w}$

  s.t. $y_i \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i \geq 1$

- This can be solved! How?
  - It is a quadratic programming (QP) problem – a standard type of optimization problem for which many efficient packages are available. Better yet, it's a convex (positive semidefinite) QP.

Constrained optimization

$$\min_x \; x^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x \geq b$$

$\min_x \; x^2$



$x^* = 0$

$\min_x \; x^2$ s.t. $x \geq -1$



$x^* = 0$

$\min_x \; x^2$ s.t. $x \geq 1$



$x^* = 1$

Picture from: http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~aarti/Class/10701_Spring14/

Example



We have a unique solution, but no support vectors yet.
Recall the dual solution for the Perceptron: Extend for the margin case.

Example



We have a unique solution, but no support vectors yet.
Recall the dual solution for the Perceptron: Extend for the margin case.

Lagrange multipliers

- Consider the following optimization problem, called primal:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}} \quad f(\mathbf{w})$$
$$\text{s.t.} \quad g_i(\mathbf{w}) \leq 0, \; i=1...k$$

- We define the generalized Lagrangian:

$$L(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = f(\mathbf{w}) + \sum_{i=1:k} \alpha_i \, g_i(\mathbf{w})$$

where α_i, $i=1...k$ are the *Lagrange multipliers.*



Figure : Find *x* and *y* to maximize *f*(*x*, *y*)
subject to a constraint (shown in red) *g*(*x*, *y*) = *c*.
From: *https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lagrange_multiplier*

Lagrangian optimization

- Consider $P(\mathbf{w}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}:\alpha i \geq 0} L(\mathbf{w},\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}:\alpha i \geq 0} f(\mathbf{w}) + \sum_{i=1:k} \alpha_i g_i(\mathbf{w})$
  - (P stands for "primal")
- Recall: $L(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) =$ Observe that the following is true:

$$P(\mathbf{w}) = \begin{cases} f(\mathbf{w}), & \text{if all constraints are satisfied,} \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise } \} \end{cases}$$

Lagrangian optimization

- Consider $P(\mathbf{w}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}:\alpha i \geq 0} L(\mathbf{w},\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}:\alpha i \geq 0} f(\mathbf{w}) + \sum_{i=1:k} \alpha_i g_i(\mathbf{w})$
  - (P stands for "primal")
- Recall: $L(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) =$ Observe that the following is true:

$$P(\mathbf{w}) = \begin{cases} f(\mathbf{w}), & \text{if all constraints are satisfied,} \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise } \} \end{cases}$$

- Hence, instead of computing $\min_{\mathbf{w}} f(\mathbf{w})$ subject to the original constraints, we can compute:

$$p^* = \min_{\mathbf{w}} P(\mathbf{w}) = \min_{\mathbf{w}} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}:\alpha i \geq 0} L(\mathbf{w},\boldsymbol{\alpha})$$ *Primal*

- Alternately, invert max and min to get:

$$d^* = \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}:\alpha i \geq 0} \min_{\mathbf{w}} L(\mathbf{w},\boldsymbol{\alpha})$$ *Dual*

Maximum Margin Perceptron

- We wanted to solve:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Min} && \tfrac{1}{2}\,||\mathbf{w}||^2 \\ &\text{w.r.t.} && \mathbf{w} \\ &\text{s.t.} && y_i \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i \geq 1 \end{aligned}$$

- The Lagrangian is:

$$L(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \tfrac{1}{2}\,||\mathbf{w}||^2 + \sum_i \alpha_i \left(1 - y_i \left(\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i\right)\right)$$

- The primal problem is: $\min_{\mathbf{w}} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}:\alpha i \geq 0} L(\mathbf{w},\boldsymbol{\alpha})$
- The dual problem is: $\max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}:\alpha i \geq 0} \min_{w} L(\mathbf{w},\boldsymbol{\alpha})$

Dual optimization problem

- Consider both solutions:

$$p^* = \min_{\mathbf{w}} \max_{\alpha:\alpha i \geq 0} L(\mathbf{w},\alpha) \qquad \textit{Primal}$$
$$d^* = \max_{\alpha:\alpha i \geq 0} \min_{\mathbf{w}} L(\mathbf{w},\alpha) \qquad \textit{Dual}$$

- If f and g_i are convex and the g_i can all be satisfied simultaneously for some $\mathbf{w}$, then we have equality: $d^* = p^* = L(\mathbf{w}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*)$.
  - $\mathbf{w}^*$ is the optimal weight vector (= primal solution)
  - $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*$ is the optimal set of support vectors (= dual solution)
  - For SVMs, we have a quadratic objective and linear constraints so both f and g_i are convex.
  - For linearly separable data, all g_i can be satisfied simultaneously.
  - Note: $\mathbf{w}^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*$ solve the primal and dual if and only if they satisfy the Karush-Kunh-Tucker conditions (*see suggested readings*).

Solving the dual

- Taking derivatives of $L(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ wrt $\mathbf{w}$, setting to 0, and solving for $\mathbf{w}$:

$$L(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \tfrac{1}{2} ||\mathbf{w}||^2 + \sum_i \alpha_i (1 - y_i (\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i))$$

$$\delta L / \delta \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w} - \sum_i \alpha_i y_i \mathbf{x}_i = 0$$

$$\mathbf{w}^* = \sum_i \alpha_i y_i \mathbf{x}_i$$

- Just like for the perceptron with zero initial weights, the optimal solution $\mathbf{w}^*$ is a linear combination of the $\mathbf{x}_i$.
- Plugging this back into L we get the dual: $\max_\alpha \sum_i \alpha_i - \tfrac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} y_i y_j \alpha_i \alpha_j (\mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{x})$ with constraints $\alpha_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_i \alpha_i y_i = 0$. (Quadratic programming problem).
- Complexity of solving quadratic program? Polynomial time, $O(|v|^3)$ (where $|v|$=# variables in optimization; here $|v|=n$). Fast approximations exist.

The support vectors

- Suppose we find the optimal α 's (e.g. using a QP package.)
- Constraint i is active when $\alpha_i > 0$. This corresponds for the points for which $(1\text{-}y_i \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i)=0$.
- These are the points lying on the edge of the margin. We call them support vectors. They define the decision boundary.

- The output of the classifier for query point $\mathbf{x}$ is computed as:

$$h_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{x}) = \text{sign}(\sum_{i=1:n} \alpha_i y_i (\mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}))$$

  - I.e., it is determined by computing the dot product of the query point with the support vectors.

Example



Support vectors are in bold

What you should know

From today:

- The perceptron algorithm.
- The margin definition for linear SVMs.
- The use of Lagrange multipliers to transform optimization problems.
- The primal and dual optimization problems for SVMs.

After the next class:

- Non-linearly separable case.
- Feature space version of SVMs.
- The kernel trick and examples of common kernels.