

# Minsky and Papert's Proof

---

\*From 'Perceptrons: An Introduction to Computational Geometry' by Marvin Minsky and Seymour Papert,

Suppose at step  $t$ , the perceptron with weight  $w_t$  makes a mistake on data point  $(x, y)$ , then it updates to  $w_{t+1} = w_t + r(y - f(w_t(x)))x$ .

If  $y = 0$ , the argument is symmetric, so we omit it.

WLOG,  $y = 1$ , then  $f(w_t(x)) = 0$ ,  $f(w_t^*(x)) = 1$ , and  $w_{t+1} = w_t + rx$ .

By assumption, we have separation with margins:

$$w^* \cdot x \geq \gamma$$

$$\text{Thus, } w^* \cdot w_{t+1} - w^* \cdot w_t = w^* \cdot (rx) \geq r\gamma$$

Also

$$\|w_{t+1}\|_2^2 - \|w_t\|_2^2 = \|w_t + rx\|_2^2 - \|w_t\|_2^2 = 2r(w_t \cdot x) + r^2\|x\|_2^2$$

and since the perceptron made a mistake,  $w_t \cdot x \leq 0$ , and so

$$\|w_{t+1}\|_2^2 - \|w_t\|_2^2 \leq \|x\|_2^2 \leq r^2 R^2$$

Since we started with  $w_0 = 0$ , after making  $N$  mistakes,

$$\|w\|_2 \leq \sqrt{Nr^2 R^2}$$

but also

$$\|w\|_2 \geq w \cdot w^* \geq N r \gamma$$

Combining the two, we have  $N \leq (R/\gamma)^2$

## Addendum to initial proof by Taylor Metz

---

\*Draft by Taylor Metz, 2025-01-31\*

The proof above assumes linear separability for the data point  $(x,y)$ . However, for XOR patterns in the initial proof are considered not linear separable. Using the same weights and bias as the initial proof:

- $W_x = [-1, 0, +1]$
- $W_y = [-1, 0, +1]$
- $b_x = (0, 1)$
- $b_y = (0, 1)$

The data point  $(x,y)$  sum to the percentage allocation  $XY$  where the summation is  $2 \times 100\%$ .

Thus,  $\{((xy)-1) \times (-1/2)\}$  resolves the logic to achieve separability.

- For  $x = -1$ ,  $y = -1$ , the product  $xy$  is 1. Applying the transformation,  $(1 - 1) \times (-1/2)$  results in 0.
- For  $x = -1$ ,  $y = +1$ , the product  $xy$  is -1. Applying the transformation,  $(-1 - 1) \times (-1/2)$  results in +1.
- For  $x = +1$ ,  $y = -1$ , the product  $xy$  is -1. Applying the transformation,  $(-1 - 1) \times (-1/2)$  results in +1.
- For  $x = +1$ ,  $y = +1$ , the product  $xy$  is 1. Applying the transformation,  $(1 - 1) \times (-1/2)$  results in 0.