Everything you’ve ever wanted to know about linear classifiers
Outline

- Formalization of statistical learning of classifiers
- Ways to train linear classifiers
  1. Linear regression
  2. Perceptron training algorithm
  3. Logistic regression
  4. Support vector machines
- Gradient descent and stochastic gradient descent
Formalization

• Let’s focus on statistical learning of a *parametric model* in a supervised scenario
Formalization

• Given: training data \( \{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, ..., n\} \)
• Find: predictor \( f \)
• Goal: make good predictions \( \hat{y} = f(x) \) on test data
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Formalization

• Given: training data \( \{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, \ldots, n\} \)
• Find: predictor \( f \)
• Goal: make good predictions \( \hat{y} = f(x) \) on test data

What kinds of functions?
Formalization
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• Goal: make good predictions \(\hat{y} = f(x)\) on test data
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Formalization

• Given: training data \{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, \ldots, n\}
• Find: predictor \( f \in \mathcal{H} \)
• Goal: make good predictions \( \hat{y} = f(x) \) on test data

Source: Y. Liang

Connection between training and test data?
Formalization

• Given: training data \{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, ..., n\} i.i.d. from distribution $D$
• Find: predictor $f \in \mathcal{H}$
• Goal: make good predictions $\hat{y} = f(x)$ on test data i.i.d. from distribution $D$
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Formalization

• Given: training data \{ (x_i, y_i), i = 1, ..., n \} i.i.d. from distribution \( D \)
• Find: predictor \( f \in \mathcal{H} \)
• Goal: make good predictions \( \hat{y} = f(x) \) on test data i.i.d. from distribution \( D \)

What kind of performance measure?

Source: Y. Liang
Formalization

- Given: training data \( \{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, \ldots, n\} \) i.i.d. from distribution \( D \)
- Find: predictor \( f \in \mathcal{H} \)
- S.t. the \textit{expected loss} is small:
  \[
  L(f) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim D}[l(f, x, y)]
  \]
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Formalization

• Given: training data \{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, ..., n\} i.i.d. from distribution \(D\)
• Find: predictor \(f \in \mathcal{H}\)
• S.t. the expected loss is small:
  \[ L(f) = \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim D}[l(f, x, y)] \]
• Example losses:

  0 – 1 loss: \(l(f, x, y) = \mathbb{I}[f(x) \neq y]\) and \(L(f) = \Pr[f(x) \neq y]\)

  \(l_2\) loss: \(l(f, x, y) = [f(x) - y]^2\) and \(L(f) = \mathbb{E}[f(x) - y]^2\)
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Formalization

• Given: training data \( \{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, \ldots, n\} \) i.i.d. from distribution \( D \)
• Find: predictor \( f \in \mathcal{H} \)
• S.t. the expected loss is small:

\[
L(f) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim D}[l(f, x, y)]
\]

Can’t optimize this directly

Source: Y. Liang
Formalization

• Given: training data \( \{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, \ldots, n\} \) i.i.d. from distribution \( D \)

• Find: predictor \( f \in \mathcal{H} \) that minimizes

\[
\hat{L}(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} l(f, x_i, y_i)
\]

Source: Y. Liang
Supervised learning in a nutshell

1. Collect *training data* and labels

2. **Specify model:** select *hypothesis class* and *loss function*

3. **Train model:** find the function in the hypothesis class that minimizes the *empirical loss* on the training data
Training linear classifiers

- Given: i.i.d. training data \( \{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, ..., n\}, \)
  \( y_i \in \{-1, 1\} \)

![Hotdog!](image1.png) ![Not hotdog!](image2.png)
Training linear classifiers

- Given: i.i.d. training data \{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, ..., n\},
  \[ y_i \in \{-1, 1\} \]
- Hypothesis class: \[ f_w(x) = \text{sgn}(w^T x) \]
- Classification with bias, i.e. \[ f_w(x) = \text{sgn}(w^T x + b) \],
  can be reduced to the case w/o bias by letting
  \[ w' = [w; b] \quad \text{and} \quad x' = [x; 1] \]

Source: Y. Liang
Training linear classifiers

- Given: i.i.d. training data \( \{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, ..., n\} \),
  \( y_i \in \{-1, 1\} \)
- Hypothesis class: \( f_w(x) = \text{sgn}(w^T x) \)
- Loss: minimizing the number of mistakes
  \[ \hat{L}(f_w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}[\text{sgn}(w^T x_i) \neq y_i] \]
- Difficult to optimize directly!

Source: Y. Liang
Linear regression ("straw man" model)

- Find \( f_w(x) = w^T x \) that minimizes \( l_2 \) loss or mean squared error

\[
\hat{L}(f_w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (w^T x_i - y_i)^2
\]

- Ignores the fact that \( y \in \{-1, 1\} \) but is easy to optimize

Source: Y. Liang
Linear regression: Optimization

- Let $X$ be a matrix whose $i$th row is $x_i^T$, $Y$ be the vector $(y_1, \ldots, y_n)^T$

$$\hat{L}(f_w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (w^T x_i - y_i)^2 = \|Xw - Y\|_2^2$$

Source: Y. Liang
Linear regression: Optimization

- Let $X$ be a matrix whose $i$th row is $x_i^T$, $Y$ be the vector $(y_1, \ldots, y_n)^T$

$$
\hat{L}(f_w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (w^T x_i - y_i)^2 = \|Xw - Y\|_2^2
$$

- This is a convex function of the weights
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Linear regression: Optimization

- Let $X$ be a matrix whose $i$th row is $x_i^T$, $Y$ be the vector $(y_1, \ldots, y_n)^T$

$$
\hat{L}(f_w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (w^T x_i - y_i)^2 = \|Xw - Y\|_2^2
$$

- Find the gradient w.r.t. $w$:

$$
\nabla_w \|Xw - Y\|_2^2
$$
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Linear regression: Optimization

• Let $X$ be a matrix whose $i$th row is $x_i^T$, $y$ be the vector $(y_1, \ldots, y_n)^T$

\[
\hat{L}(f_w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (w^T x_i - y_i)^2 = \|Xw - Y\|_2^2
\]

• Find the gradient w.r.t. $w$:

\[
\nabla_w \|Xw - Y\|_2^2 = \nabla_w [(Xw - Y)^T(Xw - Y)] \\
= \nabla_w [w^T X^T Xw - 2w^T X^T Y + Y^T Y] \\
= 2X^T Xw - 2X^T Y
\]

• Set gradient to zero to get the minimizer:

\[
X^T Xw = X^T Y \\
w = (X^T X)^{-1} X^T Y
\]

Source: Y. Liang
Linear regression: Optimization

- Linear algebra view
  - If $X$ is invertible, simply solve $Xw = Y$ and get $w = X^{-1}Y$
  - But typically $X$ is a “tall” matrix so you need to find the least squares solution to an over-constrained system

Normal equation: $w = (X^T X)^{-1} X^T y$

Source: Y. Liang
Maximum likelihood estimation

- **Interpretation of $l_2$ loss:** *negative log likelihood* assuming $y$ is normally distributed with mean $f_w(x) = w^T x + b$
Maximum likelihood estimation

- Given: i.i.d. training data \( \{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, \ldots, n\} \)
- Let \( \{P_\theta(y|x), \theta \in \Theta\} \) be a family of distributions parameterized by \( \theta \)
- Maximum (conditional) likelihood estimate:
  \[
  \theta_{ML} = \arg\max_\theta \prod_i P_\theta(y_i|x_i)
  \]
  \[
  = \arg\min_\theta - \sum_i \log P_\theta(y_i|x_i)
  \]
Maximum likelihood estimation

\[ \theta_{ML} = \arg\min_\theta - \sum_i \log P_\theta(y_i|x_i) \]

- Assume \( P_\theta(y|x) = \text{Normal}(y; f_\theta(x), \sigma^2) \)

\[
\log P_\theta(y|x) = \log \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \exp \left[ - \frac{(y - f_\theta(x))^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] \right]
= - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} (y - f_\theta(x))^2 - \log \sigma - \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi)
\]

\[ \theta_{ML} = \arg\min_\theta \sum_i (y_i - f_\theta(x_i))^2 \]
Problem with linear regression

- Interpretation of $l_2$ loss: *negative log likelihood* assuming $y$ is normally distributed with mean $f_w(x) = w^T x + b$

- Does this make sense for binary classification?
Problem with linear regression

- In practice, very sensitive to outliers

Figure 4.4 The left plot shows data from two classes, denoted by red crosses and blue circles, together with the decision boundary found by least squares (magenta curve) and also by the logistic regression model (green curve), which is discussed later in Section 4.3.2. The right-hand plot shows the corresponding results obtained when extra data points are added at the bottom left of the diagram, showing that least squares is highly sensitive to outliers, unlike logistic regression.

Figure from *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*, Bishop
Problem with linear regression

• In practice, very sensitive to outliers
Back to what we really want

- Given: i.i.d. training data \( \{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, \ldots, n\} \),
  \( y_i \in \{-1, 1\} \)
- Find \( f_w(x) = \text{sgn}(w^T x) \) that minimizes the number of mistakes
  \[
  \hat{L}(f_w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}[\text{sgn}(w^T x_i) \neq y_i]
  \]
Linear classifiers: Outline

• Formalization of statistical learning of classifiers
• Linear classification models
  1. Linear regression (least squares)
  2. Perceptron training algorithm
  3. Logistic regression
  4. Support vector machines
Recap so far

• We want to learn a linear classifier that minimizes the number of mistakes on the training data (but this is NP-hard)

• **Attempt 1:** relax objective by dropping the sign function, using $l_2$ loss – *linear regression*
  • Easy to optimize, not really appropriate for binary classification, sensitive to outliers

• **Attempt 2:** *perceptron update rule*
Perceptron training algorithm

• Initialize weights randomly
• Cycle through training examples in multiple passes (epochs)
• For each training example $(x_i, y_i)$:
• If current prediction $\text{sgn}(w^T x_i)$ does not match $y_i$ then update weights:

$$w \leftarrow w + \eta \, y_i x_i$$

where $\eta$ is a learning rate that should decay slowly* over time
Understanding the update rule

- **Perceptron update rule:** If \( y_i \neq \text{sgn}(w^T x_i) \) then update weights:
  \[
  w \leftarrow w + \eta \ y_i x_i
  \]

- The raw response of the classifier changes to:
  \[
  w^T x_i + \eta \ y_i \|x_i\|^2
  \]

- How does the response change if \( y_i = 1 \)?
  - The response \( w^T x_i \) is initially *negative* and will be *increased*

- How does the response change if \( y_i = -1 \)?
  - The response \( w^T x_i \) is initially *positive* and will be *decreased*
Recap so far

• We want to learn a linear classifier that minimizes the number of mistakes on the training data (but this is NP-hard)

• **Attempt 1**: *relax* objective by dropping the sign function, using $l_2$ loss – *linear regression*
  • Easy to optimize, not really appropriate for binary classification, sensitive to outliers

• **Attempt 2**: *perceptron update rule*
  • Converges for separable data, but hard to extend to optimizing more complicated models

• **Attempt 3**: relax objective by turning the sign function into a differentiable “soft threshold” – *logistic regression*
Sigmoid function

- Squash the linear response of the classifier to the interval $[0,1]$:

$$\sigma(w^T x) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-w^T x)}$$
Sigmoid function

• Output of sigmoid can be interpreted as posterior label probability or confidence returned by classifier:

\[ P_w(y = 1 | x) = \sigma(w^T x) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-w^T x)} \]
Sigmoid function

- Output of sigmoid can be interpreted as posterior label probability or confidence returned by classifier:

\[ P_w(y = 1|x) = \sigma(w^T x) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-w^T x)} \]

- What is \( P_w(y = -1|x) \)?

![Graph of Sigmoid function]

\[ \text{sig}(t) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-t}} \]
Sigmoid function

• Output of sigmoid can be interpreted as posterior label probability or confidence returned by classifier:

\[ P_w(y = 1|x) = \sigma(w^T x) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-w^T x)} \]

• What is \( P_w(y = -1|x) \)?

\[
P_w(y = -1|x) = 1 - \sigma(w^T x) = \frac{1 + \exp(-w^T x) - 1}{1 + \exp(-w^T x)} = \frac{\exp(-w^T x)}{1 + \exp(-w^T x)} = \frac{1}{\exp(w^T x) + 1} = \sigma(-w^T x)
\]

• Thus, sigmoid is symmetric: \( 1 - \sigma(t) = \sigma(-t) \)
Sigmoid function

• Output of sigmoid can be interpreted as posterior label probability or confidence returned by classifier:

\[ P_w(y = 1|x) = \sigma(w^T x) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-w^T x)} \]

• Sigmoid is symmetric: \( 1 - \sigma(t) = \sigma(-t) \)
Sigmoid function

- Output of sigmoid can be interpreted as posterior label probability or confidence returned by classifier:

\[
P_w(y = 1|x) = \sigma(w^T x) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-w^T x)}
\]

- What happens if we scale \( w \) by a constant?
Sigmoid function

• Output of sigmoid can be interpreted as posterior label probability or confidence returned by classifier:

\[ P_w(y = 1|x) = \sigma(w^T x) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-w^T x)} \]

• What happens if we scale \( w \) by a constant?
Sigmoid: Interpretation

- We can write out the connection between the *posteriors* $P(y|x)$ and the *class-conditional densities* $P(x|y)$:

\[
P(y = 1|x) = \frac{P(x|y = 1)P(y = 1)}{P(x)}
\]

\[
= \frac{P(x|y = 1)P(y = 1)}{P(x|y = 1)P(y = 1) + P(x|y = -1)P(y = -1)}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-a)} = \sigma(a), \quad a = \log \frac{P(y = 1|x)}{P(y = -1|x)}
\]
Sigmoid: Interpretation

- Adopting a linear + sigmoid model is equivalent to assuming linear log odds:

\[
\log \frac{P(y = 1|x)}{P(y = -1|x)} = w^T x + b
\]

- This happens when \( P(x|y = 1) \) and \( P(x|y = -1) \) are Gaussians with different means and the same covariance matrices (\( w \) is related to the difference between the means)
Logistic regression: Training

- Given: \( \{(x_i, y_i), i = 1, \ldots, n\}, y_i \in \{-1, 1\} \)
- Find \( w \) that minimizes

\[
\hat{L}(w) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log P_w(y_i|x_i)
\]

\[
= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:y_i=1}^{n} \log \sigma(w^T x_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:y_i=-1}^{n} \log[1 - \sigma(w^T x_i)]
\]

\[
= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:y_i=1}^{n} \log \sigma(w^T x_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i:y_i=-1}^{n} \log[\sigma(-w^T x_i)]
\]

\[
= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \sigma(y_i w^T x_i)
\]

No closed-form solution, need to use gradient descent
Gradient descent

- Goal: find $w$ to minimize loss $\hat{L}(w)$
- Start with some initial estimate of $w$
- At each step, find $\nabla \hat{L}(w)$, the gradient of the loss w.r.t. $w$, and take a small step in the opposite direction

$$w \leftarrow w - \eta \nabla \hat{L}(w)$$
Gradient descent

- Goal: find $w$ to minimize loss $\hat{L}(w)$
- Start with some initial estimate of $w$
- At each step, find $\nabla \hat{L}(w)$, the gradient of the loss w.r.t. $w$, and take a small step in the opposite direction
  \[ w \leftarrow w - \eta \nabla \hat{L}(w) \]
- Note: step size plays a crucial role
Gradient descent for logistic regression

\[ \hat{L}(w) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \sigma(y_i w^T x_i) \]

\[ \nabla \hat{L}(w) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla_w \log \sigma(y_i w^T x_i) \]

- Derivative of log:

\[ [\log(f(x))]' = \frac{f'(x)}{f(x)} \]
Gradient descent for logistic regression

\[ \hat{L}(w) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \sigma(y_i w^T x_i) \]

\[ \nabla \hat{L}(w) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla_w \log \sigma(y_i w^T x_i) \]

\[ = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla_w \sigma(y_i w^T x_i) \frac{1}{\sigma(y_i w^T x_i)} \]

- Derivative of sigmoid:

\[ \sigma'(a) = \sigma(a)(1 - \sigma(a)) = \sigma(a)\sigma(-a) \]
Gradient descent for logistic regression

\[ \hat{L}(w) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \sigma(y_i w^T x_i) \]

\[ \nabla \hat{L}(w) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla_w \log \sigma(y_i w^T x_i) \]

\[ = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla_w \sigma(y_i w^T x_i) \frac{\sigma(y_i w^T x_i)}{\sigma(y_i w^T x_i)} \]

\[ = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\sigma(y_i w^T x_i) \sigma(-y_i w^T x_i) y_i x_i}{\sigma(y_i w^T x_i)} \]

• We also used the chain rule: \[ [g(f(x))]' = g'(f(x))f'(x) \]
Gradient descent for logistic regression

\begin{align*}
\hat{L}(w) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \sigma(y_i w^T x_i) \\
\nabla \hat{L}(w) &= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla_w \log \sigma(y_i w^T x_i) \\
&= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\nabla_w \sigma(y_i w^T x_i)}{\sigma(y_i w^T x_i)} \\
&= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\sigma(y_i w^T x_i) \sigma(-y_i w^T x_i) y_i x_i}{\sigma(y_i w^T x_i)} \\
&= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma(-y_i w^T x_i) y_i x_i
\end{align*}
Gradient descent for logistic regression

\[ \nabla \hat{L}(w) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma(-y_i w^T x_i) y_i x_i \]

- Update for \( w \):
  \[ w \leftarrow w + \eta \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma(-y_i w^T x_i) y_i x_i \]

- For a single parameter update, need to cycle through the entire training set!
  - This is also called a batch update
Stochastic gradient descent (SGD)

- At each iteration, take a single data point \((x_i, y_i)\) and perform a parameter update using \(\nabla l(w, x_i, y_i)\), the gradient of the loss for that point:

\[
w \leftarrow w - \eta \nabla l(w, x_i, y_i)
\]

- This is called an *online* or *stochastic* update
SGD for logistic regression

- Full empirical loss:
  \[
  \hat{L}(w) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \sigma(y_i w^T x_i)
  \]

- Loss for a single sample:
  \[
  l(w, x_i, y_i) = -\log \sigma(y_i w^T x_i)
  \]

- Full gradient update:
  \[
  w \leftarrow w + \eta \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma(-y_i w^T x_i)y_i x_i
  \]

- SGD update:
  \[
  w \leftarrow w + \eta \sigma(-y_i w^T x_i)y_i x_i
  \]
SGD for logistic regression

• Let’s take a closer look at the SGD update:

\[ w \leftarrow w + \eta \sigma(-y_i w^T x_i) y_i x_i \]

• For an *incorrectly* classified point, \(-y_i w^T x_i\) is *positive*, and the update rule approaches the perceptron update rule:

\[ w \leftarrow w + \eta y_i x_i \]
SGD for logistic regression

• Let’s take a closer look at the SGD update:

\[ w \leftarrow w + \eta \sigma(-y_i w^T x_i)y_i x_i \]

• For a correctly classified point, \(-y_i w^T x_i\) is negative, so \(\sigma(-y_i w^T x_i)\) is small

• However, the update never reaches zero, and logistic regression actually does not converge for linearly separable data!

Scaling \(w\) by ever larger constants makes the classifier more confident and increases the likelihood of the data
Revisiting the perceptron training algorithm

- Define \textit{hinge loss}

\[ l(w, x_i, y_i) = \max(0, -y_i w^T x_i) \]
Revisiting the perceptron training algorithm

• Define \textit{hinge loss}

\[ l(w, x_i, y_i) = \max(0, -y_i w^T x_i) \]

• Let’s find the gradient update
  • Note: strictly speaking the hinge loss is not differentiable, so this is called a \textit{sub-gradient}
Revisiting the perceptron training algorithm

- Define *hinge loss*

\[
l(w, x_i, y_i) = \max(0, -y_i w^T x_i)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial a} \max(0, a) = \mathbb{I}[a > 0]
\]
Revisiting the perceptron training algorithm

• Define *hinge loss*

\[
l(w, x_i, y_i) = \max(0, -y_i w^T x_i)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\max(0, a) = \mathbb{I}[a > 0]
\]

\[
\nabla l(w, x_i, y_i) = -\mathbb{I}[y_i w^T x_i < 0] y_i x_i
\]

• Corresponding SGD update:

\[
w \leftarrow w + \eta \mathbb{I}[y_i w^T x_i < 0] y_i x_i
\]

• This is the same as the perceptron update we originally introduced!
Revisiting linear regression

• For completeness: what is the SGD update for linear regression?

\[ l(w, x_i, y_i) = (w^T x_i - y_i)^2 \]

\[ \nabla l(w, x_i, y_i) = 2(w^T x_i - y_i)x_i \]

• Update: \( w \leftarrow w - \eta (w^T x_i - y_i)x_i \)

• What will happen if \( x_i \) is correctly classified with high confidence?
Linear classifiers: Outline

- Formalization of statistical learning of classifiers
- Linear classification models
  1. Linear regression (least squares)
  2. Perceptron training algorithm
  3. Logistic regression
  4. Support vector machines
Support vector machines

• When the data is linearly separable, which of the many possible solutions should we prefer?

  • **Perceptron training algorithm:**
    no special criterion, solution depends on initialization
Support vector machines

• When the data is linearly separable, which of the many possible solutions should we prefer?

• **Perceptron training algorithm:** no special criterion, solution depends on initialization

• **SVM criterion:** maximize the *margin*, or distance between the hyperplane and the closest training example
Finding the maximum margin hyperplane

• Assume training data is linearly separable
• Define the margin of the training set as the distance between the hyperplane $w^T x = 0$ and the closest training point (support vector)
• Distance between point $x$ and hyperplane defined by $w$ is given by $\frac{|w^T x|}{\|w\|}$
• Assuming the data is linearly separable, we can fix the scale of $w$ so that $y_i w^T x_i = 1$ for support vectors and $y_i w^T x_i \geq 1$ for all other points
• Then the margin is $\frac{1}{\|w\|}$
Finding the maximum margin hyperplane

• We want to maximize margin $\frac{1}{||w||}$ while correctly classifying all training data: $y_i w^T x_i \geq 1$

• Equivalent problem:

\[
\min_w \frac{1}{2} ||w||^2 \quad \text{s. t.} \quad y_i w^T x_i \geq 1 \quad \forall i
\]

• This is a quadratic objective with linear constraints: convex optimization problem, global optimum can be found using well-studied methods
“Soft margin” formulation

• What about non-separable data?
• And even for separable data, we may prefer a larger margin with a few constraints violated

Source
“Soft margin” formulation

• What about non-separable data?
• And even for separable data, we may prefer a larger margin with a few constraints violated
“Soft margin” formulation

- Penalize margin violations using hinge loss:

\[
\min_w \frac{\lambda}{2} \|w\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \max[0, 1 - y_i w^T x_i]
\]

Incorrectly classified

Correctly classified
“Soft margin” formulation

- Penalize margin violations using hinge loss:

\[
\min_w \frac{\lambda}{2} \|w\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \max[0,1 - y_i w^T x_i]
\]

Recall hinge loss used by the perceptron update algorithm!
“Soft margin” formulation

- Penalize margin violations using *hinge loss*:

\[
\min_w \frac{\lambda}{2} \|w\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \max[0, 1 - y_i w^T x_i]
\]

Maximize margin – a.k.a. *regularization*

Minimize misclassification loss
SGD update for SVM

\[ l(w, x_i, y_i) = \frac{\lambda}{2n} \|w\|^2 + \max[0, 1 - y_i w^T x_i] \]

\[ \nabla l(w, x_i, y_i) = \frac{\lambda}{n} w - \mathbb{I}[y_i w^T x_i < 1] y_i x_i \]

Recall: \[ \frac{\partial}{\partial a} \max(0, a) = \mathbb{I}[a > 0] \]
SGD update for SVM

\[
l(w, x_i, y_i) = \frac{\lambda}{2n} ||w||^2 + \max[0, 1 - y_i w^T x_i]
\]

\[
\nabla l(w, x_i, y_i) = \frac{\lambda}{n} w - \mathbb{I}[y_i w^T x_i < 1] y_i x_i
\]

• SGD update:
  • If \( y_i w^T x_i < 1 \): \( w \leftarrow w + \eta \left( y_i x_i - \frac{\lambda}{n} w \right) \)
  • Otherwise: \( w \leftarrow w - \eta \frac{\lambda}{n} w \)

SVM vs. perceptron

- SVM loss: \( l(w, x_i, y_i) = \frac{\lambda}{2n} \|w\|^2 + \max[0, 1 - y_i w^T x_i] \)

- SVM update:
  - If \( y_i w^T x_i < 1 \): \( w \leftarrow \left(1 - \eta \frac{\lambda}{n}\right) w + \eta y_i x_i \)
  - Otherwise: \( w \leftarrow (1 - \eta \frac{\lambda}{n}) w \)

- Perceptron loss: \( l(w, x_i, y_i) = \max[0, -y_i w^T x_i] \)

- Perceptron update:
  - If \( y_i w^T x_i < 0 \): \( w \leftarrow w + \eta y_i x_i \)
  - Otherwise: do nothing

- What are the differences?