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### 8.1 Support Vector Machine (SVM)

### 8.1.1 KKT Conditions

Assume $x^{*} ; \lambda^{*}, \mu^{*}$ are the optimal solutions of (P) and (D) (which we mentioned in lectures before) respectively, we have:

1. $\left.\nabla_{x} L(x ; \lambda, \mu)\right|_{x^{*} ; \lambda^{*}, \mu^{*}}=0$
2. $g_{i}\left(x^{*}\right) \leq 0, h_{i}\left(x^{*}\right)=0, \forall i \in[n]$
3. $\lambda_{i}^{*} \geq 0, \forall i \in[n]$
4. $\lambda_{i}^{*} * g_{i}\left(x^{*}\right)=0, \forall i \in[n]$

These four conditioins are called KKT conditions, and KKT conditions are necessary and sufficient conditions.

### 8.1.2 Support Vector

Recall the Max Margin Classifier:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(P) \quad \min _{w, b} \frac{1}{2}\|w\|_{2}^{2} \\
& \text { s.t. } \\
& y_{i}\left(w^{T} x_{i}+b\right) \geq 1, \forall i \in[n],
\end{aligned}
$$

and its dual form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(D) \quad \min _{\lambda} & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i} \sum_{j} \lambda_{i} \lambda_{j} y_{i} y_{j} x_{i}^{\top} x_{j}-\sum_{i} \lambda_{i} \\
\text { s.t. } & \lambda_{i} \geq 0, \forall i \in[n] \\
& \sum_{i} \lambda_{i} y_{i}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

We apply the KKT condition 1 and 4 on it and now we have:

1. $w^{*}=\sum_{i} \lambda_{i}^{*} y_{i} x_{i}$
2. $\lambda_{i}\left[y_{i}\left(w^{\top} x_{i}+b\right)-1\right]=0, \forall i \in[n]$
$\lambda_{i}^{*}>0$ only if $y_{i}\left(w^{T} x_{i}+b\right)-1=0$, thus:

$$
w^{*}=\sum_{i \in I} \lambda_{i}^{*} y_{i} x_{i}
$$

where I is the points nearest to the hyperplane, also known as Support Vector.

### 8.1.3 Situations without solid constraints

In situations where there's always points can't match the constraints, we get another form of question:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min _{w, b, \epsilon} & \frac{1}{2}\|w\|_{2}^{2}+c * \sum_{i=1}^{n} \epsilon_{i} \\
\text { s.t. } & y_{i}\left(w^{T} x_{i}+b\right) \geq 1-\epsilon_{i}, \forall i \in[n] \\
& \epsilon_{i} \geq 0, \forall i \in[n]
\end{aligned}
$$

and its dual form(see proof in Appendix A):

$$
\begin{aligned}
(D) \quad \min _{\lambda} & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i} \sum_{j} \lambda_{i} \lambda_{j} y_{i} y_{j} x_{i}^{\top} x_{j}-\sum_{i} \lambda_{i} \\
\text { s.t. } & c \geq \lambda_{i} \geq 0, \forall i \in[n] \\
& \sum_{i} \lambda_{i} y_{i}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

$(\mathrm{P})$ can be rewritten as the following form:
$(P) \quad \min _{w, b} \quad \frac{1}{2}\|w\|_{2}^{2}+c * \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[1-y_{i}\left(w^{T} x_{i}+b\right)\right]_{+}$
where []$_{+}$denotes:

$$
[u]_{+}= \begin{cases}u & \text { if } u \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Here the former term can be viewed as the regularization term, and the latter term can be viewed as hinge loss, which means $[1-y f(x)]_{+}$, where $y$ denotes the label and $f(x)$ denotes the predict result.

### 8.1.4 Expand the dim of data

Suppose we have four 2-d data points with their labels as follows:

$$
((1,1), 1) \quad((1,-1),-1) \quad((-1,1),-1) \quad((-1,-1), 1)
$$

This is actually the famous XOR example, and apparently these four data points are not linear separable.
However, by expanding the dim of data, we transform each 2-d data point $x=\left(x^{1}, x^{2}\right)$ into $\phi(x)=$ $\left(\left(x^{1}\right)^{2},\left(x^{2}\right)^{2}, x^{1} x^{2}, x^{1}, x^{2}\right)$, and these four 5 -d data points are actually linear separable, which means the original data can be separated by a quadratic curve.

### 8.2 Bootstrap-Aggregation (Bagging)

Bootstrap-Aggregation is an integration technique to train a classifier.
Suppose that we have a dataset consisting of $n$ samples, one choice is to train a classifier directly on the dataset. But the classifier may be weak.

Following Bootstrap-Aggregation, we can draw n samples from the original dataset with replacement, and combine them into a new dataset. After $m$ times of the same operation, we can get $m$ new datasets containing n samples each, on which we train m weak classifiers respectively. Finally we integrate the m weak classifiers to get a more powerful classifier.

It is worth mentioning that Bootstrap-Aggregation is not Boosting. Instead, Boosting was proposed one year later than Bootstrap-Aggregation and surpassed it in a large margin.

## Appendix A

We refer $\lambda_{i} \geq 0$ and $\mu_{i} \geq 0$ as the Lagrange multiplier associated with $1-\epsilon_{i}-y_{i}\left(w^{T} x_{i}+b\right)$ and $-\epsilon_{i}$, and we define the Lagrangian $L$ (assume $w$ 's dimension is $m$ ): $\mathbf{R}^{m} \times \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^{n} \times \mathbf{R}^{n} \times \mathbf{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& L(w, b, \epsilon, \lambda, \mu) \\
& =\frac{1}{2}\|w\|^{2}+C \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} \epsilon_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i}\left(1-\epsilon_{i}-y_{i}\left(w^{T} x_{i}+b\right)\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_{i}\left(-\epsilon_{i}\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{2}\|w\|^{2}-w^{T} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} y_{i} x_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(C-\lambda_{i}-\mu_{i}\right) \epsilon_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i}-b \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} y_{i},
\end{aligned}
$$

then we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
g(\lambda, \mu) & =\inf _{w, b, \epsilon} L(w, b, \epsilon, \lambda, \mu) \\
& =\left\{\begin{array}{l}
-\frac{1}{2}\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} y_{i} x_{i}\right\|^{2}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i}, \quad \lambda_{i}+\mu_{i}=C \wedge \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} y_{i}=0 \\
-\infty, \quad \text { else }
\end{array} .\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, the corresponding Lagrange dual problem is:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\max _{\lambda} & -\frac{1}{2}\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} y_{i} x_{i}\right\|^{2}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} \\
\text { s.t. } & \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i} y_{i}=0, \\
& 0 \leq \lambda_{i} \leq C, i=0,1, . ., n .
\end{array}
$$
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