

## Sample Problems 5

To be discussed on 21.06.2024

### Sample Problem 5.1: Rademacher Complexity

Let  $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$  and denote by  $\mathcal{D}$  the uniform distribution on  $\mathcal{X}$ . Define the linear function class

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f(x) = \langle v, x \rangle : \|v\|_2 \leq \rho\}$$

Prove that

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{D}, m) \leq \frac{\rho\sqrt{m}}{m+1}$$

### Sample Problem 5.2: Hard SVM vs. Soft SVM

Prove or disprove the following statement: There exists a choice of parameter  $\lambda > 0$  such that the solution of Soft SVM with parameter  $\lambda$  is identical to the solution of Hard SVM for *every set of separable training data*.

### Sample Problem 5.3: Generalisation in one-class SVM

One-class SVM is a method used for anomaly detection. Here the training set  $S = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m\} \subset \mathcal{X}$  consists of only non-anomalous samples, and the one-class SVM learns a classifier that labels a small region, containing  $S$ , by  $+1$  and everything else by  $-1$ . One-class SVMs are usually defined using kernels, but in this problem, we consider linear one-class SVM.

Assume  $\mathcal{X} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p \mid \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq \rho\}$ . Given the positive examples  $S = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m\}$ , linear one-class SVM returns a classifier  $\hat{h} = \text{sign}(\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x})$  whose parameters are solutions of the optimisation

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^p, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^m, \nu \in \mathbb{R}}{\text{minimise}} \quad \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda \cdot m} \sum_{i=1}^m (\xi_i - \nu) \\ & \text{subject to } \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_i \geq \nu - \xi_i, \quad \xi_i \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned} \quad (*)$$

The following sub-problems show that the above optimisation is a Tikhonov regularised loss minimisation (RLM) problem with a convex Lipschitz loss. This view of one-class SVM as Tikhonov RLM allows one to derive generalisation error bounds for this method.

1. One can rewrite the optimisation (\*) as an unconstrained optimisation by eliminating  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m$  to obtain

$$\underset{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^p, \nu \in \mathbb{R}}{\text{minimise}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \ell_{x_i}(\mathbf{w}, \nu) + \lambda \|\mathbf{w}\|^2$$

where  $\ell_{\mathbf{x}_i}(\mathbf{w}, \nu)$  is a function of  $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{w}, \nu$ . Give the expression of  $\ell_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{w}, \nu)$ .

2. Define  $\theta = (\mathbf{w}, \nu) \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1}$ . Rewrite  $\ell_{\mathbf{x}}(\theta)$  in terms of the vector  $\theta$  and show that  $\ell_{\mathbf{x}}(\theta)$  is convex with respect to  $\theta$ .
3. Show that  $\ell_{\mathbf{x}}(\theta)$  is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant bounded by  $\rho' \leq 1 + \sqrt{1 + \rho^2}$  (in fact, you can find a better Lipschitz constant).