### Support Vector Machines-Part 1

CS 760@UW-Madison



#### Goals for the lecture



#### you should understand the following concepts

- the margin
- the linear support vector machine
- the primal and dual formulations of SVM learning
- support vectors
- Optional: variants of SVM
- Optional: Lagrange Multiplier

## Motivation



#### Linear classification





#### Attempt



- Given training data  $\{(x_i, y_i): 1 \le i \le n\}$  i.i.d. from distribution *D*
- Hypothesis  $y = \operatorname{sign}(f_w(x)) = \operatorname{sign}(w^T x)$ 
  - y = +1 if  $w^T x > 0$ • y = -1 if  $w^T x < 0$
- Let's assume that we can optimize to find w

#### Multiple optimal solutions?





Same on empirical loss; Different on test/expected loss

#### What about $w_1$ ?





#### What about $w_3$ ?





#### Most confident: $w_2$





#### Intuition: margin





## Margin



#### Margin



We are going to prove the following math expression for margin using a geometric argument

- Lemma 1: x has distance  $\frac{|f_w(x)|}{||w||}$  to the hyperplane  $f_w(x) = w^T x = 0$
- Lemma 2: x has distance  $\frac{|f_{w,b}(x)|}{||w||}$  to the hyperplane  $f_{w,b}(x) = w^T x + b = 0$

Need two geometric facts:

- w is orthogonal to the hyperplane  $f_{w,b}(x) = w^T x + b = 0$
- Let v be a direction (i.e., unit vector). Then the length of the projection of x on v is  $v^T x$

#### Margin

• Lemma 1: x has distance  $\frac{|f_w(x)|}{||w||}$  to the hyperplane  $f_w(x) = w^T x = 0$ 

Proof:

- w is orthogonal to the hyperplane
- The unit direction is  $\frac{w}{||w||}$
- The projection of x is  $\left(\frac{w}{||w||}\right)^T x = \frac{f_w(x)}{||w||}$





#### Margin: with bias



• Claim 1: w is orthogonal to the hyperplane  $f_{w,b}(x) = w^T x + b = 0$ 

Proof:

- pick any  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  on the hyperplane
- $w^T x_1 + b = 0$
- $w^T x_2 + b = 0$
- So  $w^T(x_1 x_2) = 0$

#### Margin: with bias

- Claim 2: 0 has distance  $\frac{|b|}{||w||}$  to the hyperplane  $w^T x + b = 0$ Proof:
- pick any  $x_1$  the hyperplane
- Project  $x_1$  to the unit direction  $\frac{w}{||w||}$  to get the distance

• 
$$\left(\frac{w}{||w||}\right)^T x_1 = \frac{-b}{||w||}$$
 since  $w^T x_1 + b = 0$ 

#### Margin: with bias

• Lemma 2: x has distance  $\frac{|f_{w,b}(x)|}{||w||}$  to the hyperplane  $f_{w,b}(x) = w^T x + b = 0$ 

Proof:

- Let  $x = x_{\perp} + r \frac{w}{||w||}$ , then |r| is the distance
- Multiply both sides by  $w^T$  and add b
- Left hand side:  $w^T x + b = f_{w,b}(x)$
- Right hand side:  $w^T x_{\perp} + r \frac{w^T w}{||w||} + b = 0 + r||w||$

## Support Vector Machine (SVM)

3



#### SVM: objective



• Absolute margin over all training data points:

$$\gamma = \min_{i} \frac{|f_{w,b}(x_i)|}{||w||}$$

• Since only want correct  $f_{w,b}$ , and recall  $y_i \in \{+1, -1\}$ , we define the margin to be

$$\gamma = \min_{i} \frac{y_i f_{w,b}(x_i)}{||w||}$$

• If  $f_{w,b}$  incorrect on some  $x_i$ , the margin is negative

#### SVM: objective



• Maximize margin over all training data points:

$$\max_{w,b} \gamma = \max_{w,b} \min_{i} \frac{y_i f_{w,b}(x_i)}{||w||} = \max_{w,b} \min_{i} \frac{y_i (w^T x_i + b)}{||w||}$$

• A bit complicated ...

#### SVM: simplified objective



• Observation: when (w, b) scaled by a factor c, the margin unchanged

$$\frac{y_i(cw^T x_i + cb)}{||cw||} = \frac{y_i(w^T x_i + b)}{||w||}$$

• Let's consider a fixed scale such that

 $y_{i^*}(w^T x_{i^*} + b) = 1$ 

where  $x_{i^*}$  is the point closest to the hyperplane

#### SVM: simplified objective



Let's consider a fixed scale such that

#### $y_{i^*}(w^T x_{i^*} + b) = 1$

where  $x_{i^*}$  is the point closet to the hyperplane

Now we have for all data

#### $y_i(w^T x_i + b) \ge 1$

and at least for one i the equality holds

• Then the margin over all training points is  $\frac{1}{||w||}$ 

#### SVM: simplified objective



Optimization simplified to

 $\min_{w,b} \frac{1}{2} ||w||^2$  $y_i(w^T x_i + b) \ge 1, \forall i$ 

- How to find the optimum  $\widehat{w}^*$ ?
- Solved by Lagrange multiplier method





• Optimization (Quadratic Programming):

```
\min_{w,b} \frac{1}{2} ||w||^2y_i(w^T x_i + b) \ge 1, \forall i
```

• Generalized Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}(w, b, \alpha) = \frac{1}{2} ||w||^2 - \sum_{i} \alpha_i [y_i(w^T x_i + b) - 1]$$

where  $\alpha$  is the Lagrange multiplier



• KKT conditions:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial w} = 0, \Rightarrow w = \sum_{i} \alpha_{i} y_{i} x_{i} (1)$$
$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial b} = 0, \Rightarrow 0 = \sum_{i} \alpha_{i} y_{i} (2)$$

• Plug into *L*:

 $\mathcal{L}(w, b, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum_{i} \alpha_{i} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \alpha_{i} \alpha_{j} y_{i} y_{j} x_{i}^{T} x_{j} \quad (3)$ combined with  $0 = \sum_{i} \alpha_{i} y_{i}, \alpha_{i} \ge 0$ 

Reduces to dual problem:



Only depend on inner products

• Since 
$$w = \sum_{i} \alpha_{i} y_{i} x_{i}$$
, we have  $w^{T} x + b = \sum_{i} \alpha_{i} y_{i} x_{i}^{T} x + b$ 



#### Support Vectors

- final solution is a sparse linear combination of the training instances
- those instances with  $\alpha_i > 0$ are called *support vectors* 
  - they lie on the margin boundary
- solution NOT changed if delete the instances with  $\alpha_i = 0$



### Optional: Lagrange Multiplier



#### Lagrangian



• Consider optimization problem:  $\min_{w} f(w)$ 

 $h_i(w) = 0, \forall 1 \le i \le l$ 

• Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}(w, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = f(w) + \sum_{i} \beta_{i} h_{i}(w)$$

where  $\beta_i$ 's are called Lagrange multipliers

#### Lagrangian



- Consider optimization problem:  $\min_{w} f(w)$   $h_i(w) = 0, \forall 1 \le i \le l$
- Solved by setting derivatives of Lagrangian to 0

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial w_i} = 0; \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \beta_i} = 0$$

#### **Generalized Lagrangian**



• Consider optimization problem:

 $\min_{w} f(w)$   $g_{i}(w) \leq 0, \forall 1 \leq i \leq k$   $h_{j}(w) = 0, \forall 1 \leq j \leq l$ Concretized Learneries:

• Generalized Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}(w, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = f(w) + \sum_{i} \alpha_{i} g_{i}(w) + \sum_{j} \beta_{j} h_{j}(w)$$

where  $\alpha_i$ ,  $\beta_j$ 's are called Lagrange multipliers

#### **Generalized Lagrangian**



• Consider the quantity:

$$\theta_P(w) \coloneqq \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}: \alpha_i \ge 0} \mathcal{L}(w, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$$

• Why?

 $\theta_P(w) = \begin{cases} f(w), & \text{if } w \text{ satisfies all the constraints} \\ +\infty, & \text{if } w \text{ does not satisfy the constraints} \end{cases}$ 

• So minimizing f(w) is the same as minimizing  $\theta_P(w)$  $\min_{w} f(w) = \min_{w} \theta_P(w) = \min_{w} \max_{\alpha, \beta: \alpha_i \ge 0} \mathcal{L}(w, \alpha, \beta)$ 



• The primal problem

$$p^* \coloneqq \min_{w} f(w) = \min_{w} \max_{\alpha, \beta: \alpha_i \ge 0} \mathcal{L}(w, \alpha, \beta)$$

• The dual problem

$$d^* \coloneqq \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}: \alpha_i \geq 0} \min_{\boldsymbol{w}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$$

• Always true:

 $d^* \leq p^*$ 



• The primal problem

$$p^* \coloneqq \min_{w} f(w) = \min_{w} \max_{\alpha, \beta: \alpha_i \ge 0} \mathcal{L}(w, \alpha, \beta)$$

• The dual problem

$$d^* \coloneqq \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}: \alpha_i \geq 0} \min_{\boldsymbol{w}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$$

Interesting case: when do we have

 $d^* = p^*?$ 



Theorem: under proper conditions, there exists (w<sup>\*</sup>, α<sup>\*</sup>, β<sup>\*</sup>) such that

$$d^* = \mathcal{L}(w^*, oldsymbol{lpha}^*, oldsymbol{eta}^*) = p^*$$

Moreover,  $(w^*, \alpha^*, \beta^*)$  satisfy Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial w_i} = 0, \qquad \alpha_i g_i(w) = 0$$
$$g_i(w) \le 0, \quad h_j(w) = 0, \qquad \alpha_i \ge 0$$



Theorem: under proper conditions, there exists (w<sup>\*</sup>, α<sup>\*</sup>, β<sup>\*</sup>) such that

$$d^* = \mathcal{L}(w^*, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*, \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) = p^*$$

dual complementarity

Moreover,  $(w^*, \alpha^*, \beta^*)$  satisfy Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial w_i} = 0, \qquad \alpha_i g_i(w) = 0$$
$$g_i(w) \le 0, \quad h_j(w) = 0, \qquad \alpha_i \ge 0$$



Theorem: under proper conditions, there exists (w<sup>\*</sup>, α<sup>\*</sup>, β<sup>\*</sup>) such that





- What are the proper conditions?
- A set of conditions (Slater conditions):
  - $f, g_i$  convex,  $h_j$  affine, and exists w satisfying all  $g_i(w) < 0$
- There exist other sets of conditions
  - Check textbooks, e.g., Convex Optimization by Boyd and Vandenberghe

# Optional: Variants of SVM



#### Hard-margin SVM



• Optimization (Quadratic Programming):

```
\min_{w,b} \frac{1}{2} ||w||^2y_i(w^T x_i + b) \ge 1, \forall i
```

#### Soft-margin SVM [Cortes & Vapnik, Machine Learning 1995]



- if the training instances are not linearly separable, the previous formulation will fail
- we can adjust our approach by using *slack variables* (denoted by  $\zeta_i$ ) to tolerate errors

$$\min_{w,b,\zeta_i} \frac{1}{2} ||w||^2 + C \sum_i \zeta_i$$

$$y_i(w^T x_i + b) \ge 1 - \zeta_i, \zeta_i \ge 0, \forall i$$

• *C* determines the relative importance of maximizing margin vs. minimizing slack

#### The effect of *C* in soft-margin SVM





Figure from Ben-Hur & Weston, *Methods in Molecular Biology* 2010



- when we covered neural nets, we talked about minimizing squared loss and cross-entropy loss
- SVMs minimize *hinge loss*



#### **Support Vector Regression**



- the SVM idea can also be applied in regression tasks
- an ε-insensitive error function specifies that a training instance is well explained if the model's prediction is within ε of y<sub>i</sub>



#### **Support Vector Regression**



• Regression using *slack variables* (denoted by  $\zeta_i, \xi_i$ ) to tolerate errors

$$\min_{w,b,\zeta_i,\xi_i} \frac{1}{2} ||w||^2 + C \sum_i \zeta_i + \xi_i$$
$$(w^T x_i + b) - y_i \le \epsilon + \zeta_i,$$
$$y_i - (w^T x_i + b) \le \epsilon + \xi_i,$$
$$\zeta_i, \xi_i \ge 0.$$

slack variables allow predictions for some training instances to be off by more than  $\epsilon$ 

## THANK YOU



Some of the slides in these lectures have been adapted/borrowed from materials developed by Mark Craven, David Page, Jude Shavlik, Tom Mitchell, Nina Balcan, Elad Hazan, Tom Dietterich, and Pedro Domingos.