Exam Preparation and HW7

Introduction to Machine Learning 2020

Julian Mäder

Schedule

- Exam 2019, Question 1
- Exam 2019, Question 2
- HW7 Questions 13, 14 and 15

This questions is about weighted linear regression. You are given a dataset consisting of n labeled training points $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1), ..., (\mathbf{x}_n, y_n)\}$, where $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$.

In addition, you are given a set of non-negative weights $\{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n\}$, where $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1$. Each weight $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ reflects the importance of correctly estimating the label of a specific training point (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) .

A common approach towards this task is to find a solution $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ which minimizes the *weighted empirical risk* $\hat{R}(\mathbf{w})$, which is defined as follows:

$$\hat{R}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_i - y_i)^2$$
.

(i) Analytic Solution (MC)

Let us denote by $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ the matrix whose rows are $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n\}$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ a row vector whose entries are $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$, and let $\mathbf{\Lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a diagonal matrix such $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{ii} = \lambda_i$

What is the closed form solution for the minimizer $\hat{\mathbf{w}} := \arg \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \hat{R}(\mathbf{w})$? Comment: You may assume that the matrices $\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{X}^\top \Lambda \mathbf{X}$ are invertible.

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{\mathbf{w}} = (\mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{y} \\ & \square \quad \hat{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{\Lambda} (\mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{y} \\ & \square \quad \hat{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2} (\mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2} \mathbf{y} \\ & \square \quad \hat{\mathbf{w}} = (\mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2} \mathbf{y} \\ & \square \quad \hat{\mathbf{w}} = (\mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2} \mathbf{y} \\ & \square \quad \hat{\mathbf{w}} = (\mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2} \mathbf{y} \\ & \square \quad \hat{\mathbf{w}} = (\mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{1/2} \mathbf{y} \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & \dots & x_{1d} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \\ x_{n1} & \dots & x_{nd} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{\Lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \lambda_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{w} = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ \dots \\ \dots \\ w_d \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{y} = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ \dots \\ \dots \\ y_n \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\hat{R}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i (\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_i - y_i)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_i - y_i) \lambda_i (\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_i - y_i)$$
$$= (\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{\Lambda} (\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{X}^\top - \mathbf{y}^\top) \mathbf{\Lambda} (\mathbf{X}\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{y})$$

$$\hat{R}(\mathbf{w}) = (\mathbf{w}^{\top} \mathbf{X}^{\top} - \mathbf{y}^{\top}) \mathbf{\Lambda} (\mathbf{X} \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{y})$$
$$= \mathbf{w}^{\top} \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^{\top} \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{y}$$
$$\stackrel{*}{=} \mathbf{w}^{\top} \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{w} - 2 \mathbf{w}^{\top} \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{y}$$

*:
$$\mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{w}$$
 is a scalar
 $\Rightarrow \mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{w})^{\top} = \mathbf{w}^{\top} \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{y}$

$$\hat{R}(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}^{\top} \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{w} - 2 \mathbf{w}^{\top} \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{y}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{y}$$

$$\Rightarrow \nabla_w \hat{R}(\mathbf{w}) = 2\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{w} - 2\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{y} \stackrel{!}{=} 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{X} \hat{\mathbf{w}} = \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{y}$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{\mathbf{w}} = (\mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^{\top} \mathbf{\Lambda} \mathbf{y}$$

(ii) Probabilistic Interpretation (MC)

Consider the following probabilistic model. Assume that for all i,

$$y_i = \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_i + \epsilon_i,$$

where $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a fixed (unknown) vector, and $\{\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n\}$ are statistically independent Gaussian random variables such that

$$\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_i^2)$$

where, $\sigma_i > 0$ is the standard deviation. The Maximum Likelihood Estimate (MLE) for this model is defined as follows,

$$\mathbf{w}_{\mathrm{MLE}} := \arg \max_{\mathbf{w}} P(y_1, \dots, y_n | x_1, \dots, x_n, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \mathbf{w}).$$

Recall that in class you have shown that if all σ_i 's are the same then solving the above MLE problem is equivalent to minimizing the empirical risk $\arg \min_{\mathbf{w}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\mathbf{w}^{\top} \mathbf{x}_i - y_i)^2$.

It can be shown that minimizing the weighted empirical risk appearing in the previous problem is equivalent to finding the MLE solution for an appropriate choice of $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n$. What should the relation be between σ_i and λ_i for this equivalence to hold?

 $\begin{array}{c|c} \square & \lambda_i \propto \sigma_i^{-2} \\ \square & \lambda_i \propto \sigma_i^{-1} \\ \square & \lambda_i \propto \sigma_i^{-1/2} \\ \square & \lambda_i \propto \sigma_i \\ \square & \lambda_i \propto \sigma_i^{1/2} \\ \square & \lambda_i \propto \sigma_i^{2} \\ \square & \lambda_i \propto \log(1 + \sqrt{\sigma_i}) \end{array}$

First we reformulate the maximum likelihood estimate:

$$\mathbf{w}_{MLE} = \operatorname*{argmax}_{\mathbf{w}} P(y_1, ..., y_n | \mathbf{x}_1, ..., \mathbf{x}_n, \sigma_1, ..., \sigma_n, \mathbf{w})$$

$$\stackrel{i.i.d.}{=} \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{w}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} P(y_i | \mathbf{x}_i, \sigma_i, \mathbf{w}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{w}} \log \prod_{i=1}^{n} P(y_i | \mathbf{x}_i, \sigma_i, \mathbf{w})$$
$$= \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{w}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log P(y_i | \mathbf{x}_i, \sigma_i, \mathbf{w}) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w}} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log P(y_i | \mathbf{x}_i, \sigma_i, \mathbf{w})$$

Next we look at our assumptions about the data:

We assume that $y_i = \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_i + \epsilon_i$ with $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_i^2)$ $\Rightarrow P(y_i | \mathbf{x}_i, \sigma_i, \mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{N}(y_i, \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_i, \sigma_i^2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_i}} \exp(-\frac{(\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{x}_i - y_i)^2}{2\sigma_i^2})$

And from the last slide we know $\mathbf{w}_{MLE} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w}} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log P(y_i | \mathbf{x}_i, \sigma_i, \mathbf{w})$

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{w}_{MLE} &= \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{w}} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} log P(y_i | \mathbf{x}_i, \sigma_i, \mathbf{w}) \\ &= \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{w}} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} log(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_i} \exp(-\frac{(\mathbf{w}^{\top} \mathbf{x}_i - y_i)^2}{2\sigma_i^2})) \end{split}$$

$$= \underset{\mathbf{w}}{\operatorname{argmin}} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\log(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_i}}) - \frac{(\mathbf{w}^{\top}\mathbf{x}_i - y_i)^2}{2\sigma_i^2})$$

$$= \underset{\mathbf{w}}{\operatorname{argmin}} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2\sigma_{i}^{2}} (\mathbf{w}^{\top} \mathbf{x}_{i} - y_{i})^{2}$$

So let's compare the maximum likelihood estimate to the weighted empirical risk:

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{w}_{MLE} &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w}} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2\sigma_{i}^{2}} (\mathbf{w}^{\top} \mathbf{x}_{i} - y_{i})^{2} \\ \hat{R}(\mathbf{w}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} (\mathbf{w}^{\top} \mathbf{x}_{i} - y_{i})^{2} \\ \Rightarrow \lambda_{i} \propto \sigma_{i}^{-2} \end{split}$$

In order to improve generalization properties of our model, we introduce a regularization term to the training objective (same weights). This is especially beneficial when you have little data. The cost function becomes,

$$\hat{R}_{\eta}(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\mathbf{w}^{\top} \mathbf{x}_{i} - y_{i})^{2} + \eta C(\mathbf{w}).$$

Two common candidates seen in the course are L_1 (Lasso) and L_2 (Ridge) regularization. These correspond to $C_1(w) = ||\mathbf{w}||_1$, and $C_2(w) = ||\mathbf{w}||_2^2$ in the above formula (in place of C) respectively.

(iii) Analytic solution for L_1 (MC)

Please choose which of the following formulas corresponds to the closed form of the minimizer of the $\hat{R}_{\eta}(\mathbf{w})$ with $C(\mathbf{w}) = ||\mathbf{w}||_1$, $\Box \hat{\mathbf{w}} = (\mathbf{X}^{\top}\mathbf{X} + \eta\mathbf{I})^{-1}\mathbf{X}^{\top}\mathbf{y}$ $\Box \hat{\mathbf{w}} = (\eta\mathbf{I})^{1/2}(\mathbf{X}^{\top}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}^{\top}(\eta\mathbf{I})^{1/2}\mathbf{y}$ $\Box \hat{\mathbf{w}} = (\mathbf{X}^{\top}(\mathbf{I} + \eta\mathbf{I})\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}^{\top}\mathbf{y}$ \boxtimes In general, there is no closed form.

...because $||\mathbf{w}||_1$ is not differentiable!

$$\hat{R}_{\eta}(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i (\mathbf{w}^{\top} \mathbf{x}_i - y_i)^2 + \eta C(\mathbf{w})$$

with $C(\mathbf{w}) = \|\mathbf{w}\|_1$ (Lasso) or $C(\mathbf{w}) = \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2$ (Ridge)

(iv) Regularization limits (T/F)

Decide whether the following statements are true or false when $\eta \to \infty$: True False

$$\square$$
 When $C(\mathbf{w}) = ||\mathbf{w}||_1$, then the solution $||\hat{\mathbf{w}}||_2 \to 0$.

 \square When $C(\mathbf{w}) = ||\mathbf{w}||_1$, the regularization has no longer any effect on \hat{w} .

- $\square \qquad \forall \qquad \text{When } C(\mathbf{w}) = ||\mathbf{w}||_1 \text{ or } C(\mathbf{w}) = ||\mathbf{w}||_2^2 \text{ the solution } ||\hat{\mathbf{w}}||_2 \to \infty.$
- $\square \qquad \forall \qquad \text{When } C(\mathbf{w}) = ||\mathbf{w}||_2^2 \text{ the regularization has no longer any effect on } \hat{w}.$

(v) Different L_2 regularization (T/F)

Suppose we use the regularizer $C(\mathbf{w}) = ||\mathbf{w}||_2^2$ and optimize \hat{R}_{η_1} with a regularization constant η_1 to get the minimizer \hat{w}_1 , and \hat{R}_{η_2} with a regularization constant η_2 to get the minimizer \hat{w}_2 . We know that η_2 and η_1 are *arbitrary* and *positive*, and crucially,

 $\eta_2 > \eta_1.$

Decide which of the following statements are true or false for all possible datasets $\{x_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^n$: True False

- $\boxtimes \qquad \square \qquad ||\hat{\mathbf{w}}_2||_2 \le ||\hat{\mathbf{w}}_1||_2$
- \square \square The solution $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_2$ is sparser than $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_1$
- \square Solutions are the same, i.e. $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_1 = \hat{\mathbf{w}}_2$
- $\square \qquad \square \qquad \text{There always exist } \eta_1, \eta_2 \text{ s.t. } \eta_1 \neq \eta_2 \text{ and } \hat{\mathbf{w}}_1 = \hat{\mathbf{w}}_2.$

Recap Kernels

Perceptron:
$$\hat{\mathbf{w}} = \arg\min_{\mathbf{w}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \max\{0, -y_i \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i\}$$

Fundamental insight: Optimal hyperplane lies in the span of the data $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i y_i \mathbf{x}_i$

$$\Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow \hat{\alpha} = \arg\min_{\alpha_{1:n}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \max\{0, -\sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{j} y_{i} y_{j} \underbrace{\mathbf{x}_{i}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{j}}_{\underbrace{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_{i} | \boldsymbol{x}_{j}}\}$$

The "Kernel Trick"

- Express problem s.t. it only depends on inner products
 Replace inner products by kernels

 $\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_j \implies k(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$

Recap Kernels

Often $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$ can be computed much more efficiently than $\phi(\mathbf{x})^{\top} \phi(\mathbf{x}')$. Here is a simple example of a polynomial kernel of degree 2:

Feature transformation: $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2) \mapsto \phi(\mathbf{x}) := (x_1^2, x_2^2, \sqrt{2}x_1x_2)$

Not kernelized: $\mathbf{x}^{\top}\mathbf{x}' \mapsto \phi(\mathbf{x})^{\top}\phi(\mathbf{x}') = x_1^2 x_1'^2 + x_2^2 x_2'^2 + 2x_1 x_2 x_1' x_2'$ Kernelized: $\mathbf{x}^{\top}\mathbf{x}' \mapsto k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = (\mathbf{x}^{\top}\mathbf{x}')^2 = (x_1 x_1' + x_2 x_2')^2$

Examples of kernels on \mathbb{R}^d

• Linear kernel:

Gaussian (RBF

Polynomial kernel:

$$k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}'$$
$$k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = (\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}' + 1)^d$$

squared exp. kernel):
$$k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \exp(-||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'||_2^2/h^2)$$

Bondwidth"/
Laplacian kernel: $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \exp(-||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'||_1/h)$

(i) *Kernelization* (*T/F*)

Which of the following learning algorithms can be kernelized?

True False

- Image: Principal component analysis \rightarrow Lecture Slides: Dimensionality Reduction #, slides 6 12
- \square Logistic regression \rightarrow Lecture Slides: Kernels *I*, slides 34 37
- \square K-Means Clustering \rightarrow Lecture Slides: Dimensionality Reduction *I*, slides 6 13
- \square Nearest Neighbour Classification \rightarrow See Kernel Nearest-Neighbor Algorithm, Yu et al. 2002

(ii) Feature Maps (T/F)

From the lectures, we know that every kernel admits a feature representation in an inner product space such that the kernel can be represented as inner product (for example; if the inner product is in the Euclidean space, $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \phi(\mathbf{x})^{\top} \phi(\mathbf{y})$). Decide whether the following statements are true or false.

True False

- \square \square The feature map ϕ induced by a kernel k is always one-to-one.
- \square The identity map $\phi(x) = x$ defines the linear kernel.

 $\square \quad \text{The dimension of the Euclidean feature map } \phi \text{ induced by the cubic kernel } k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (1 + \mathbf{x}^{\top} \mathbf{y})^3 \text{ where } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ grows at least at a polynomial rate in } d.$

 \square The radial basis function kernel $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \exp(-||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}||_2^2)$ has an infinitedimensional feature map ϕ .

TrueFalse \Box \boxtimes The feature map ϕ induced by a kernel k is always one-to-one.

Consider the feature map $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2) \mapsto \phi(\mathbf{x}) := (x_1^2, x_2^2, \sqrt{2}x_1x_2),$

induced by the kernel $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = (\mathbf{x}^{\top} \mathbf{x}')^2$.

Therefore, the points $\mathbf{x}^1 = (1, 1)$ and $\mathbf{x}^2 = (-1, -1)$ are transformed to

 $\phi(\mathbf{x}^1) = (1, 1, \sqrt{2}) = \phi(\mathbf{x}^2).$

True False

 $\square \quad \text{The dimension of the Euclidean feature map } \phi \text{ induced by the cubic kernel } k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (1 + \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y})^3 \text{ where } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ grows at least at a polynomial rate in } d.$

The feature map induced by this kernel $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, ..., x_d) \mapsto \phi(\mathbf{x}) := (1, x_1, ..., x_d, x_1^2, ..., x_d^2, x_1^3, ..., x_d^3, x_1x_2, x_1x_3, ...)$ contains all monomials up to degree 3 in d variables.

The number of monomials up to degree n in d variables is given by: $\binom{d+n}{n} = \frac{(d+n)!}{n!d!}$

 $\Rightarrow \text{ In our case: } \binom{d+n}{n} = \frac{(d+3)!}{6d!} = \frac{(d+3)(d+2)(d+1)d!}{6d!} = \frac{(d+3)(d+2)(d+1)}{6}$

 \Rightarrow Growth rate: $\mathcal{O}(d^3)$

Kernel Definition

A kernel is a function $k: X \times X \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying 1) Symmetry: For any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in X$ it must hold that $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = k(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x})$

2) Positive semi-definiteness: For any *n*, any set $S = {\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n} \subseteq X$, the kernel (Gram) matrix $\mathbf{K} = \begin{pmatrix} k(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) & \dots & k(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_n) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ k(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_1) & \dots & k(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n) \end{pmatrix}$

must be positive semi-definite

Kernel Definition

- Kernel function $k: X \times X \to \mathbb{R}$
- Take any finite subset of data $S = {\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n} \subseteq X$
- Then the kernel (gram) matrix

 $\mathbf{K} = \begin{pmatrix} k(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_1) & \dots & k(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_n) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ k(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_1) & \dots & k(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_n) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi(\mathbf{x}_1)^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_1) & \dots & \phi(\mathbf{x}_1)^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_n) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \phi(\mathbf{x}_n)^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_1) & \dots & \phi(\mathbf{x}_n)^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_n) \end{pmatrix}$ is positive semidefinite

Because $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{\Phi}^{\top} \mathbf{\Phi}$ with $\mathbf{\Phi} = (\phi(\mathbf{x_1}), ..., \phi(\mathbf{x_n}))$

$$\Rightarrow \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{K} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{\Phi}^\top \mathbf{\Phi} \mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{\Phi} \mathbf{x})^\top (\mathbf{\Phi} \mathbf{x}) \ge 0$$

Kernel Rules

Suppose we have two kernels

 $k_1: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ $k_2: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$

defined on data space X

Then the following functions are valid kernels:

$$k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = k_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') + k_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$$
$$k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = k_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \ k_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$$
$$k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = c \ k_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \text{ for } c > 0$$
$$k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = f(k_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'))$$

where *f* is a polynomial with positive coefficients or the exponential function

(iii) Valid Kernels (T/F)

Let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $k_1(x, y)$ and $k_2(x, y)$ be any valid kernel functions on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. Consider the definitions of the function f(x, y) below. For which of these definitions is f always a valid kernel (True)?

Hint: $\cos(x+y) = \cos(x)\cos(y) - \sin(x)\sin(y)$

TrueFalse \Box $f(x,y) = ck_1(x,y)^2k_2(x,y)$ for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$ \boxtimes f(x,y) = cos(x-y) \Box $f(x,y) = \frac{1}{k_1(x,y)}$ assuming $k_1(x,y) > 0$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ \boxtimes $f(x,y) = \frac{1}{k_1(x,y)}$ assuming $k_1(x,y) > 0$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ \boxtimes $f(x,y) = (k_1(x,y) + k_2(x,y))^2$

True False $\Box \quad \boxtimes \quad f(x,y) = ck_1(x,y)^2k_2(x,y) \text{ for any } c \in \mathbb{R}$

Because c needs to be bigger than Zero!

True False $\square \quad f(x,y) = (k_1(x,y) + k_2(x,y))^2$

 $= k_1(x,y)k_1(x,y) + 2k_1(x,y)k_2(x,y) + k_2(x,y)k_2(x,y)$

Hint: $\cos(x + y) = \cos(x)\cos(y) - \sin(x)\sin(y)$

True False

 $\boxtimes \quad \Box \quad f(x,y) = \cos(x-y)$ = $\cos(x)\cos(-y) - \sin(x)\sin(-y) = \cos(x)\cos(y) + \sin(x)\sin(y)$ $\Rightarrow f(x,y)$ is symmetric and $\phi(x) = (\cos(x), \sin(x))$ is the induced feature map. $\Rightarrow f(x,y)$ is a valid kernel.

(iv) Separable space (T/F)

Consider a dataset consisting of the following four points in \mathbb{R}^2 : $\mathbf{x}^1 = [-1, -1]^\top$, $\mathbf{x}^2 = [-1, 1]^\top$, $\mathbf{x}^3 = [1, -1]^\top$, $\mathbf{x}^4 = [1, 1]^\top$. Class labels for each point are unknown, but assume that each point \mathbf{x}^i may belong to either of only two classes. You apply a feature transformation $\Phi(\cdot)$ to each point. For which of the feature transformations below is the resulting dataset { $\Phi(\mathbf{x}^1), \Phi(\mathbf{x}^2), \Phi(\mathbf{x}^3), \Phi(\mathbf{x}^4)$ } guaranteed to be linearly separable (with no point lying exactly on the decision boundary) for every possible class labelling (True)?

Hint: Note that subscript denotes the coordinate in this question, and superscript identifies the datapoint in the dataset.





$$\mathbf{x}^1 = [-1, -1]^\top, \mathbf{x}^2 = [-1, 1]^\top, \mathbf{x}^3 = [1, -1]^\top, \mathbf{x}^4 = [1, 1]^\top$$

True False $\Box \quad \boxtimes \quad \Phi(\mathbf{x}) = [\mathbf{x}_1^2, \mathbf{x}_2^2, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, 1]$

For all 4 points it holds that: $\mathbf{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}^i) = [1, 1, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, 1]$

 \Rightarrow Still not linearly separable!

$$\mathbf{x}^1 = [-1, -1]^\top, \mathbf{x}^2 = [-1, 1]^\top, \mathbf{x}^3 = [1, -1]^\top, \mathbf{x}^4 = [1, 1]^\top$$

True False $\Box \quad \Theta \quad \Phi(\mathbf{x}) = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1^2 + \mathbf{x}_2^2, 1]$

For all 4 points it holds that: $\Phi(\mathbf{x}^i) = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, 2, 1]$

 \Rightarrow Still not linearly separable!

$$\mathbf{x}^1 = [-1, -1]^\top, \mathbf{x}^2 = [-1, 1]^\top, \mathbf{x}^3 = [1, -1]^\top, \mathbf{x}^4 = [1, 1]^\top$$

True False $\square \Phi(\mathbf{x}) = [\mathbf{x}_1^2, \mathbf{x}_2^2, \mathbf{x}_1\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, 1]$

For all 4 points it holds that: $\Phi(\mathbf{x}^i) = [1, 1, \mathbf{x}_1 \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, 1]$

$$\Rightarrow \text{Look at: } \mathbf{\Phi}'(\mathbf{x}^i) = [\mathbf{x}_1 \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2] \Rightarrow \mathbf{\Phi}'(\mathbf{x}^1) = [-1, -1, -1], \mathbf{\Phi}'(\mathbf{x}^2) = [-1, -1, 1], \mathbf{\Phi}'(\mathbf{x}^3) = [-1, 1, -1], \mathbf{\Phi}'(\mathbf{x}^4) = [1, 1, 1]$$

 \Rightarrow Linearly separable!



(v) Decision Boundaries (Matching Question)

You have fitted the following four models to learn a classifier for a multi-class classification problem with three classes:

- A. SVM with kernel $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}^{\top} \mathbf{y}$
- B. SVM with kernel $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\gamma \mathbf{x}^{\top} \mathbf{y} + 1)^3$
- C. SVM with kernel $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \exp(-\gamma \|\mathbf{x} \mathbf{y}\|^2)$
- D. Nearest neighbour classifier (with five neighbours and uniform weighting)

All SVMs use a *one-vs-one* approach for the multi-class classification and are fitted using the same value for γ . The four figures below show the samples used for fitting all models and the decision boundaries generated by each classifier. Match each model above with its corresponding figures.

- A. SVM with kernel $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}^{\top} \mathbf{y}$
- B. SVM with kernel $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\gamma \mathbf{x}^{\top} \mathbf{y} + 1)^3$
- C. SVM with kernel $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \exp(-\gamma \|\mathbf{x} \mathbf{y}\|^2)$
- D. Nearest neighbour classifier (with five neighbours and uniform weighting)



D. Nearest neighbour classifier



C. SVM with kernel $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \exp(-\gamma \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2)$



B. SVM with kernel $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\gamma \mathbf{x}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{y} + 1)^3$



A. SVM with kernel $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}^{\top} \mathbf{y}$

(vi) Consider the following function over real-valued scalars x and y:

$$k(x,y) = (1 + cxy)^2,$$

where c is a positive constant. The basis function of this kernel represent the kernel as $k(x, y) = \phi(x)^{\top}\phi(y)$, where $\phi(x) \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Given that $\phi(x) = [1, \star, cx^2]$, derive the expression that falls under the star.

$$\begin{split} \phi(x)^{\top}\phi(y) &= [1, \star_x, cx^2]^{\top}[1, \star_y, cy^2] = 1 + \star_x \star_y + c^2 x^2 y^2 \\ k(x, y) &= (1 + cxy)^2 = 1 + 2cxy + c^2 x^2 y^2 \\ \phi(x)^{\top}\phi(y) \stackrel{!}{=} k(x, y) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \star_x \star_y = 2cxy \quad \Rightarrow \quad \star_x = \sqrt{2c}x, \star_y = \sqrt{2c}y \\ \Rightarrow \phi(x) &= [1, \sqrt{2c}x, cx^2] \end{split}$$

Coffee Break

It's time for a coffee break, let's have a cup of coffee.



We'll Come Back After 15 Minutes

HW7 Question 13-15: Important Tipps

Expectation of a (discrete) Random Variable

Let X be a random variable with a finite number of finite outcomes x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k occurring with probabilities p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_k , respectively. The **expectation** of X is defined as

$$\operatorname{E}[X] = \sum_{i=1}^k x_i\,p_i = x_1p_1 + x_2p_2 + \dots + x_kp_k.$$

HW7 Question 13-15: Important Tipps

Jensen's Inequality

If f is a convex function, we have

 $f(\mathbb{E}[X]) \le \mathbb{E}[f(X)]$

Note that if X is constant we get an equality. Suppose we have $f(x) = x^2$, which is a convex function. Then, using Jensen's Inequality, we have $(\mathbb{E}[X])^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[X^2]$, which you may recall from the definition of Var(X). Moreover, if f is a concave function (e.g. $f(x) = \log x$), we reverse the inequality sign.

In this question you will show that EM can be seen as an iterative algorithm which maximizes a lower bound on the log-likelihood. We will treat any general model P(X, Z) with observed variables X and latent variable Z. For the sake of simplicity, we will assume that Z is discrete and takes values in 1, 2, ..., m. If we observe X, the goal is to maximize the log-likelihood

$$l(\theta) = log P(\mathbf{x}; \theta) = log \Sigma_{z=1}^{m} P(\mathbf{x}, z; \theta)$$

with respect to the parameter vector θ . Q(Z) denotes any distribution over the latent variables.

- 13. For Q(z) > 0 when $P(\mathbf{x}, z) > 0$, find a lower bound for the likelihood, $l(\theta)$. Hint: Consider using the Jensen's inequality.
 - (a) $\mathbb{E}_Q[logP(X,Z)] \sum_{z=1}^m Q(z)logQ(z)$ (b) $\mathbb{E}_Q[logP(X,Z)] + \sum_{z=1}^m Q(z)logQ(z)$ (c) $\mathbb{E}_Q[logP(X,Z)]$ (d) $\mathbb{E}_Q[logP(X,Z)] + \sum_{z=1}^m Q(\mathbf{x})logQ(\mathbf{x})$

$$l(\theta) = \log \sum_{z} P(x, z; \theta) = \log \sum_{z} \frac{P(x, z; \theta)}{Q(z)} Q(z) \stackrel{*}{=} \log \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim Q}\left[\frac{P(x, z; \theta)}{Q(z)}\right]$$

$$\stackrel{**}{\geq} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim Q}[log \frac{P(x, z; \theta)}{Q(z)}] = \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim Q}[log P(x, z; \theta) - log Q(z)]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim Q}[log P(x, z; \theta)] - \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim Q}[log Q(z)]$$

$$\stackrel{*}{=} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim Q}[log P(x, z; \theta)] - \sum_{z} Q(z) log Q(z) \Rightarrow (a) \text{ is the correct answer!}$$

* Expectation ** Jensen's Inequality

.

For a fixed θ , pick the distribution $Q^*(Z)$ which maximizes the lower bound derived in the previous question. Show by yourself that bound is exact for this specific distribution. Hint: Do not forget to add Lagrange multipliers to make sure that Q^* is a valid distribution.

- (a) $P(Z|\mathbf{x};\theta)$
- (b) $P(Z;\theta)$
- (c) $P(\mathbf{X}|z;\theta)$
- (d) $P(\mathbf{X}, Z; \theta)$

We start with: $log \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim Q}\left[\frac{P(x,z;\theta)}{Q(z)}\right] \stackrel{**}{\geq} \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim Q}\left[log \frac{P(x,z;\theta)}{Q(z)}\right]$

We know, from Jensens Inequality, that the equality holds if $\frac{P(x,z;\theta)}{Q(z)}$ is constant.

 $\Rightarrow Q^*(z) = cP(x, z; \theta)$

For some constant c that does not depend on z.

* Expectation ** Jensen's Inequality

Additionally, we know that $Q^*(z)$ has to be a valid distribution: $\sum_z Q^*(z) = 1$

$$\Rightarrow Q^*(z) = cP(x, z; \theta) = \frac{cP(x, z; \theta)}{\sum\limits_z Q^*(z)} = \frac{cP(x, z; \theta)}{\sum\limits_z cP(x, z; \theta)} = \frac{P(x, z; \theta)}{\sum\limits_z P(x, z; \theta)} = \frac{P(x, z; \theta)}{P(x; \theta)} = P(Z|x; \theta)$$

 \Rightarrow (a) is the correct answer!

Mark the following statements True or False.

- (a) Optimizing the lower bound on likelihood with respect to Q(.) is exactly the E-step.
- (b) Optimizing the lower bound on likelihood with respect to Q(.) is exactly the M-step.
- (c) Optimizing the lower bound on likelihood with respect to θ for fixed Q(.) is exactly the E-step.
- (d) Optimizing the lower bound on likelihood with respect to θ for fixed Q(.) is exactly the M-step.
- (e) The lower bound on likelihood monotonically increases after each step of optimisation. \checkmark
- (f) The lower bound on likelihood monotonically decreases after each step of optimisation.

There is a more detailed explanation in the CS229 lecture notes (Part IX, The EM Algorithm) by Andrew Ng: (https://course.ccs.neu.edu/cs6220f16/sec3/assets/pdf/cs229-notes8.pdf)