

Linear Classifiers

$f(x) = \theta \cdot x - \theta_0 = \frac{1}{2}(\theta_1 x_1 + \theta_2 x_2 + \dots + \theta_n x_n) + \theta_0 = \frac{1}{2}(\theta^T x + \theta_0)$

Decision boundary: $H = \{x | f(x) \geq 0\} = \{x | \theta^T x + \theta_0 \geq 0\}$

normal to θ : For any $x \in H$, $\theta^T x + \theta_0 > 0$, or $\theta^T x + \theta_0 = 0$

$\theta^T (\theta^T x + \theta_0) = \theta^T \theta^T x + \theta^T \theta_0 = \theta^T \theta^T x + \theta_0^2 = \theta^T \theta^T x + \theta_0^2 = 0$

Can augment x with $x_0 = 1$ and θ_0 to have $\theta^T x + \theta_0 = 1$, $\theta^T x + \theta_0 = 0$

Perceptron algorithm

Input: $(x_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \{-1, 1\}$

Convergence Theorem: If linearly separable, delta for any choice of planes, the perceptron algorithm picks some misclassified (x_i, y_i) to move more than δ from its plane. $\theta = \theta + \eta y_i x_i$ (update θ)

return θ (induced): $f(x) = \max\{0, \theta^T x\} = \min\{0, -\theta^T x\}$

Since $\theta = \sum_i y_i x_i$, $\theta \cdot x = \sum_i y_i x_i \cdot x = \sum_i y_i$ so just need product space.

View as stochastic gradient descent where $J = \sum_i y_i(f(x_i)) + \lambda \|\theta\|^2$ otherwise on margin, solution depends on starting point

Support Vector Machines

Optimize linear classification by choosing class fier margin $y_i \cdot \theta$

Find a separating θ , $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and scale θ by k so $y_i \cdot \theta = k$

$\max_{\theta, b} \min_{i=1}^n \|y_i(\theta^T x_i + b)\|$ (quadratic program)

Support vectors are points satisfying constraints with equality (marginless)

$\theta = \sum_i y_i x_i$ ($\theta^T x_i$ for s_i), $b = \sum_i y_i x_i^T \cdot b_i = \sum_i y_i x_i^T \cdot \theta^T x_i$

Such were products, so we can work in any inner product space

Hard Margin SVM

$\min_{\theta, b} \|\theta\|^2$ s.t. $y_i(\theta^T x_i + b) \geq 1$ (data linearly separable)

Soft Margin SVM

Relax inequalities $y_i(\theta^T x_i + b) \geq 1$ by introducing slack variables $\xi_i \geq 0$, enforcing smaller constraint $y_i(\theta^T x_i + b) - \xi_i \geq 1$, adding ξ_i to cost function

$\min_{\theta, b, \xi} \|\theta\|^2 + C \sum_i \xi_i$ s.t. $y_i(\theta^T x_i + b) - \xi_i \geq 1$, $\xi_i = (1 - y_i(\theta^T x_i + b))$

Regularization: small $C \rightarrow$ small margin, large $C \rightarrow$ small misclassification

Feature Selection

Linear classifier: $f(x) = \theta^T x + b_0$, quadratic: $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}(\theta^T x)^2 + b_0$

Quadratic is simply linear classifier w/ feature $Q(x)$, $f(Q(x)) = \theta^T Q(x) + b_0$

want to balance feature complexity and degrees of fit

Kernels

we can work in inner product space, so use $K(x_i, x_j) = x_i^T x_j$ or $d(x_i, d(x_j))$

Solve optimization problem given $K(x_i, x_j)$ to determine θ for $\theta = \sum_i y_i \xi_i K(x_i, \cdot)$ and then compute classifier for x via $\theta^T x = \sum_i y_i \xi_i K(x_i, x)$

Degree- m polynomial kernel: given by $K(x, t) = (1 + x^T t)^m$

Radial basis function kernel: $\sin(\pi x^T t)$ (use squared kernel $K(x, t) = \exp(-\|x-t\|^2)$)

Scaling parameter σ affects smoothness (small σ \rightarrow large margin, few points influence)

Kernels add modularity to classification training, same as some optimization procedure can be used (risk kernel matrix $K = K(x_i, x_j)$)

Degree- m polynomial kernel on \mathbb{R}^d is inner product with (ind_m) features

Convex Optimization and SVMs

Convex problems and those in which it is possible to draw lines, and stay within

Consider the convex optimization problem $\min_{\theta, b} \|\theta\|^2 + C \sum_i \max(0, 1 - y_i(\theta^T x_i + b))$

Rewriting constraints as penalties: $\min_{\theta, b} \|\theta\|^2 + C \sum_i \max(0, 1 - y_i(\theta^T x_i + b))^2$

Replace constraints with something simpler:

Introduce Lagrange multipliers dual variables λ_i , $\lambda_i \geq 0$ and define

Lagrangian: $L(\theta, b, \lambda) = \frac{1}{2} \|\theta\|^2 + C \sum_i \lambda_i (1 - y_i(\theta^T x_i + b))$

Re-cost of violating constraint: $\pi_i(\lambda) \leq 0$

λ defines a saddle point game; one player tries changes θ to minimize L and other player tries changes λ to maximize L . If $\lambda_i > 0$, then $\lambda_i \|\theta\| \leq C$

Primal problem: $\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} L(\theta, b^*)$ (unconstrained, recall $\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \|\theta\|^2$)

dual problem: $\lambda^* = \arg \max_{\lambda} L(\theta^*, b^*)$ (inner product first)

In a zero-sum game, always better to play second: $\min_{\theta} \max_{\lambda} L(\theta, \lambda) = \max_{\lambda} \min_{\theta} L(\theta, \lambda)$

If there is a saddle point, $\lambda^* = \lambda^*$ for all θ and $\theta^* = \theta^*$ for all λ

Then $\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} L(\theta, \lambda^*) = \min_{\theta} \max_{\lambda} L(\theta, \lambda)$ (strong duality)

Complementary Slackness

If $\theta^* = \theta^*$ and we have primal solution θ^* and dual solution λ^* , then for the i^{th} constraint $\lambda_i^* \geq 0$, $\lambda_i^* (1 - y_i(\theta^* + b^*)) \leq 0$

For a result, every term in sum $\sum_i \lambda_i^* (1 - y_i(\theta^* + b^*)) \leq 0$ since $\lambda_i^* \geq 0$, $y_i \leq 1$

Karush-Kuhn-Tucker optimality conditions

Suppose $f(x)$ is convex and differentiable over X and λ optimal FPs

① Primal feasibility: $f(x) \leq f(x^*)$ (Dual feasibility: $\lambda \geq 0$)

② Complementary slackness: $\lambda_i^* f'(x_i) = 0$ (Stationarity: $\nabla f(x^*) + \lambda^* \nabla g(x^*) = 0$)

Hard Margin SVM

With $\lambda_i^* \geq 0$, $y_i(\theta^* + b^*) \geq 1 - \sum_i \lambda_i^* (1 - y_i(\theta^* + b^*))$

$\theta^*(x_i) = \theta^* + \sum_i \lambda_i^* y_i x_i$ $\Rightarrow \theta^* = \theta^* + \sum_i \lambda_i^* y_i x_i$, given $\theta^* = \frac{1}{2}(\theta^T \theta + b^*)$

If 3 feasible, G , strong duality allows us to express θ^* as $\theta^* = \sum_i \lambda_i^* y_i x_i$ and we know $\|\theta^*\|^2 \geq 0 \Rightarrow y_i(\theta^* + b^*) \geq 1 - \sum_i \lambda_i^* (1 - y_i(\theta^* + b^*))$

Express solution at each i : $\lambda_i^* = \min\{\lambda_i^*, \frac{C}{1 - y_i(\theta^* + b^*)}\}$ where $\lambda_i^* \leq C$ and $\lambda_i^* (1 - y_i(\theta^* + b^*)) = 0$

Since $\lambda_i^* \geq 0$, $\lambda_i^* (1 - y_i(\theta^* + b^*)) = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda_i^* = 0$

Soft Margin SVM

Write $\min_{\theta, b} \|\theta\|^2 + C \sum_i \max(0, 1 - y_i(\theta^T x_i + b))$ as $\|\theta\|^2 + C \sum_i \max(0, 1 - y_i(\theta^T x_i + b))$

based on $\|\theta\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \theta^T \theta$ and $\max(0, 1 - y_i(\theta^T x_i + b)) = \frac{1}{2} (1 - y_i(\theta^T x_i + b))^2$

Total = $\theta^T \theta + C \sum_i (1 - y_i(\theta^T x_i + b))^2$

Dual problem: given by $\lambda^* = \arg \max_{\lambda} \sum_i \lambda_i (1 - y_i(\theta^T x_i + b)) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \lambda_i \lambda_j y_i y_j x_i^T x_j$

consequences of complementary slackness: $\lambda_i^* (1 - y_i(\theta^* + b^*)) = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda_i^* = 0$ implies $\lambda_i^* = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda_i^* \leq C$ so $\lambda_i^* = 0$ implies $\lambda_i^* = 0$ (strong duality)

Primal and dual penalties: given margins $\gamma_i = y_i(\theta^* + b^*) - 1$ decreasing C forces λ_i^* to be small (soft margin)

Decision Theory

The Prediction Dilemma: given a training set $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, choose function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ for later using $f(x)$ as good predictor of Y by loss function $l(y, f(x))$ where $l(y, f(x))$ is cost of pred f when y is actual

① Assume that (x_i, y_i) chosen iid according to probability distribution $P(X, Y)$

② A good prediction means small expected loss: choose f with small risk $R(f) = \mathbb{E}[l(Y, f(X))]$

Risk is misclassification probability: $R(f) = \mathbb{E}[I(f(x) \neq y)]$

Two classic example: $R(f) = \mathbb{E}[I(f(x) \neq y)] = \mathbb{E}[I(f(x) \neq y) I(f(x) \neq f^*(x))]$

Bayes Decision Rule: $f^*(x) = \arg \min_{f} \mathbb{E}[l(Y, f(x))] = \arg \min_{f} \mathbb{E}[l(Y, f(x)) P(Y | x)]$

Risk is minimized w/ f^* , w/c minimum Bayes Risk: $R^* = \mathbb{E}[l(Y, f^*(x))] = \mathbb{E}[l(Y, f^*(x)) P(Y | x)]$

Bayes Risk: $R^* = \mathbb{E}[l(Y, f^*(x))] = \mathbb{E}[l(Y, f^*(x)) P(Y | x)] + \mathbb{E}[l(Y, f^*(x)) P(Y \neq f^*(x))]$

can be quantified in terms of a certain classifier from $P(X, Y)$

Risk is the expected squared error: $R(f) = \mathbb{E}[l(Y, f(x))] = \mathbb{E}[l(Y, f(x)) I(f(x) \neq f^*(x))]$

Minimize conditional expectation of loss: $\mathbb{E}[l(f(x), f^*(x))] = \mathbb{E}[l(f(x), f^*(x)) I(f(x) \neq f^*(x))]$

Bias-Variance Decomposition

$R(f) = \mathbb{E}[l(f(x), f^*(x))] = \mathbb{E}[l(f(x), f^*(x)) I(f(x) \neq f^*(x))] + \mathbb{E}[l(f(x), f^*(x)) I(f(x) = f^*(x))]$

$= \mathbb{E}[l(f(x), f^*(x)) I(f(x) \neq f^*(x))] + \mathbb{E}[l(f(x), f^*(x)) I(f(x) = f^*(x))]$

Minimize $\mathbb{E}[l(f(x), f^*(x)) I(f(x) \neq f^*(x))]$, $\mathbb{E}[l(f(x), f^*(x)) I(f(x) = f^*(x))]$

Using randomly chosen training data to choose f , we would like f to be small: $\mathbb{E}[l(f(x), f^*(x)) I(f(x) \neq f^*(x))]$

Three approaches to choosing classifiers:

① Estimate a generative model using $P(X, Y)$ and $P(Y | x)$, use Bayes Theorem: $P(Y | x) = P(Y) P(x | Y) / P(x)$ and define plug-in estimator for discriminative model

② Estimate a discriminative model by $P(Y | x)$ and use $P(Y | x)$ as $P(Y | x)$ plug-in estimator

Only require knowing around $P(Y | x) = f(x)$

③ Choose a classification directly (perceptron, SVM...) based on optimization criterion

Generative and Discriminative Models

Recall $P(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[P(\theta | X, Y)] = \mathbb{E}[P(\theta | X) P(Y | \theta)] = \mathbb{E}[P(\theta | X) P(Y | X, \theta)] = \mathbb{E}[P(\theta | X)] P(Y | X)$

$\exists \theta_0$ otherwise: $\mathbb{E}[P(\theta | X, Y)] = \mathbb{E}[P(Y | X, \theta) P(\theta | X)] = \mathbb{E}[P(Y | X, \theta)] = \mathbb{E}[P(Y | X)]$

For Gaussian class conditional $P(Y | x) = \mathcal{N}(y | \mu_y, \Sigma_y)$, $P(X | \theta) = \mathcal{N}(x | \mu_\theta, \Sigma_\theta)$

posterior probability is logitistic: $P(Y | x, \theta) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\theta^T x + \theta_0)}$

Suppose the class conditional distributions are Gaussian: $P(Y | x) = \mathcal{N}(y | \mu_y, \Sigma_y)$

$P(Y | x) = \mathcal{N}(y | \mu_y, \Sigma_y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d |\Sigma_y|}} \exp(-\frac{1}{2} (x - \mu_y)^T \Sigma_y^{-1} (x - \mu_y))$

Consider the one-dimensional case: $x \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_x, \Sigma_x)$, $\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_\theta, \Sigma_\theta)$

apply Bayes Rule: $P(\theta | x) = \frac{P(x | \theta) P(\theta)}{P(x)}$

isimplify and substitute: $P(x | \theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d |\Sigma_x|}} \exp(-\frac{1}{2} (x - \mu_x)^T \Sigma_x^{-1} (x - \mu_x))$

$\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_\theta, \Sigma_\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d |\Sigma_\theta|}} \exp(-\frac{1}{2} (\theta - \mu_\theta)^T \Sigma_\theta^{-1} (\theta - \mu_\theta))$

exp($\theta^T x + \theta_0$) = $\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d |\Sigma_\theta|}} \exp(-\frac{1}{2} (\theta - \mu_\theta)^T \Sigma_\theta^{-1} (\theta - \mu_\theta))$

Integral dimensions, $\theta \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_\theta, \Sigma_\theta)$, $\theta = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1 \\ \theta_2 \\ \vdots \\ \theta_d \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_\theta, \Sigma_\theta)$

The discriminant function minimizes $\mathbb{E}[l(Y, f(x))]$ (overlap)

Linear Discriminant Analysis: $\theta^T x + \theta_0$ as multivariate Gaussian: $P(Y | x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d |\Sigma_y|}} \exp(-\frac{1}{2} (x - \mu_y)^T \Sigma_y^{-1} (x - \mu_y))$

$\log \frac{P(Y | x)}{P(Y' | x)} = -\frac{1}{2} (x - \mu_y)^T \Sigma_y^{-1} (x - \mu_y) + \frac{1}{2} (x - \mu_{y'})^T \Sigma_{y'}^{-1} (x - \mu_{y'})$

Using MLE estimates $\hat{\mu}_y = \text{mean}(x)$, $\hat{\mu}_{y'} = \text{mean}(x')$, $\hat{\Sigma}_y = \text{cov}(x)$, $\hat{\Sigma}_{y'} = \text{cov}(x')$

Predict class that maximizes $\hat{\theta}^T x + \theta_0 = \hat{\mu}_y^T \Sigma_y^{-1} x + \theta_0 + \hat{\mu}_{y'}^T \Sigma_{y'}^{-1} x'$

Parameter Estimation Methods

We are interested in estimating Bernoulli and Gaussian MV for classification

Bernoulli Random Variable (biased coin p)

Mean of Moments: choose a distribution with same expectation or average of data

Observing n tosses, define $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i x_i$ and choose $p = \hat{p}$

Maximum Likelihood: Count the number of 1's outcomes and write $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i x_i \rightarrow \hat{p} = \frac{1}{n}$

Count the number of 0's outcomes and write $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i (1 - x_i) \rightarrow \hat{p} = \frac{1}{n}$

Parzen Maximum Likelihood: Incorporate prior information such as p is close to some value

$\log(P(x)) + \log(p) = \log(\hat{p}) + \log(1 - \hat{p}) \rightarrow \log(p) = \log(\hat{p}) - \log(1 - \hat{p})$

$\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i x_i \rightarrow \hat{p} = \frac{1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_i x_i}{1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_i x_i} = 1 - \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_i x_i}{1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_i x_i} = \frac{n - \sum_i x_i}{n}$

Bayesian Estimation: Model θ as a random variable (prior distribution)

Conjugate prior: $\theta \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$ and posterior $\theta \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha + n, \beta + \sum_i x_i)$

Assumes that parameters suddenly change with fixed normal distribution

Posterior distribution is just a combination of prior and likelihood

Maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimate is just mode of the posterior

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x)$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Gaussian prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$

MAP (Maximum Likelihood if Uniform prior): $\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_{\theta} \log P(\theta | x) + \lambda \theta^T \theta$ </p

Nearest Neighbor Classification

Key idea: Store all training examples $(x_i, f(x_i))$

k-NN - Given query instance x_q , take a vote among its k nearest neighbors (if discrete target), take mean of k-NN f values (real valued)

Non-parametric, number of parameters grows with N

Training is fast, learn complex target functions easily, don't lose information but slow at query time, requires lots of storage, easily foiled by irrelevant attr.

Behavior at the limit: $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \text{Error} = \text{Error of opt/kNN}$ $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \text{Error} = \epsilon^*$

Curse of Dimensionality

Easy to mislead NN in high dimensions (points on hyper-grid, hypercube ...)

① Get more data (if D < N, make D > N)

② Reduce D to get better features (compress pixels, use bag-of-words model), compute histograms using Interleaved kernel $K_{\text{inter}}(x_i, x_j) = \sum_b \min(b_i, b_j)$

③ Use a better distance metric

Distance Metrics

Minkowski distance $D_{p,1}(x_i, x_j) = (\sum_{i=1}^D |x_i - y_i|^p)^{1/p} = \|x - y\|_p$

1-norm (Manhattan/cityblock distance) $D_{1,1}(x_i, y_i) = \sum_{i=1}^D |x_i - y_i|$

2-norm (Euclidean distance) $D_{2,2}(x_i, y_i) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^D (x_i - y_i)^2}$

0-norm (number of nonzero elements) $D_{0,0}(x_i, y_i) = \sum_{i=1}^D |x_i - y_i| = \sum_{i=1}^D \min(|x_i|, |y_i|)$

Hamming distance for binary strings, or edit/damerau distance

Mahalanobis distance $D_{M,2}(x_i, y_i) = \sqrt{(x_i - y_i)^T S^{-1} (x_i - y_i)}$

Decorrelate and recenterize features, Euclidean special case with $S = I$

Similarities

$\text{Inner}(x, y) = \langle x, y \rangle$, symmetric, output GR

$\text{Cosine}(x, y) = \frac{\langle x, y \rangle}{\|x\| \|y\|}$, symmetric, unit norm [0, 1], normalized inner product

$\text{Corr}(x, y) = \frac{\langle x - \bar{x}, y - \bar{y} \rangle}{\sqrt{\sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \sqrt{\sum_i (y_i - \bar{y})^2}}$, symmetric, output [-1, 1], invariant to shift in input

Criteria

Given an instance space X , a distance metric is function $D: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

such that for any $x, y, z \in X$:

$D(x, y) = 0$ (point and itself zero) $\Rightarrow D(x, y) \geq 0$ ($x \neq y$)

$D(x, y) = D(y, x)$ (symmetric) $\Rightarrow D(x, y) \leq D(x, z) + D(z, y)$

Problems

Easy to mislead NN in template matching, normalized cross-correlation

Euclidean distance for digit recognition sensitive to thickness, rotation

Strategies

Augment the dataset with transform copies of the digit

① Build invariance into the feature vector (orientation histograms)

② Build invariance into classification strategy (template dist, conv NN)

Oversampling \rightarrow set k by cross-validation, from prototypes, remove noisy data

Reducing Computational Cost

K-dtree

Binary tree data structure for organizing set of points in k-dim space

Internal node associated with axis-aligned hyper-plane, splitting subtrees

Dimensions with high variance chosen first

Position of splitting hyperplane taken as mean/median of projected points

Query for NN may require backtracking

Indexing local features: approximate NN search

Best-Bin First (BBF), variant of k-d trees, uses priority queue

to examine most promising branches first

Locality-sensitive Hashing (LSH): randomized hashing technique to map similar points to same bin with high probability

we want a high degree of collisions and hence each hash function

must satisfy $P[\text{ch}(x_i) = \text{ch}(x_j)] = \text{sim}(x_i, x_j) = 1 - \frac{\|x_i - x_j\|}{\pi}$

Decision Trees

Utilize labels y_i (unlike k-d trees) in performing classification

Internal nodes test value of features x_i and branch accordingly

Leaf nodes specify a class $h(x)$

Allow for great feature selection, interpretable results, decision regions look similar to kNN/linear classifiers

Learning/Tree Construction

Choosing best attribute: 2-step greedy (backward), does not account for "progress"

Split on entropy $H(x) = -\sum_i P(x_i) \log P(x_i)$

Information gain = entropy(parent) - average entropy(children)

Mutual information is a convex measure (\rightarrow vs. absolute error)

Non-Boolean features: Multiple discrete values - multiple split (cumulative info gain)

Non-Boolean features: Group into two disjoint subsets (one vs. all split-binary), group into two disjoint subsets

Real-valued features - consider threshold split at each stage

Unknown Attributes

If node n tests A, assign most common value of A among other examples

Assign most common value of A among other examples \rightarrow same target val

Assign prob p to each value v of A, assign from p to each descendant

Classification vs. Regression Trees

\rightarrow $\sum_i 2\beta_i$ vs. $\rightarrow y \in \mathbb{R}$, minimize sum of variances

$$\sum_{i \in \text{left}(x_i)} (y_i - \hat{y}_{\text{left}})^2 + \sum_{i \in \text{right}(x_i)} (y_i - \hat{y}_{\text{right}})^2$$

Overfitting

Don't want until absolute purity never happens - noise, data skewness, fewer datapoints \rightarrow depth, deep trees slow and huge)

Stop splitting earlier and make leaf node with (average/majority class)

Early termination based on max tree depth, min # points at node,

+ tree complexity penalty, validation error monitoring

Reduced-Error Pruning

Split data into training and validation set, do until harmful:

① Evaluate impact of pruning each possible node on validation

② Directly remove node that most improves validation accuracy

Random Forests

Ensemble Methods combine several "weak learner" models by averaging (combine each model), Bagging (random dataset given to model)

Bagging (specialize each model for subset of examples), Rand Forests (fix n_s, n_h)

Bagging still tends to correlated trees, limit to subset of p splits

Use each result as a vote towards overall classification

Busting

Define classifier using additive model $f(x) = \sum_i f_i(x) + \dots$

Example: Each data point starts with weight 1. Draw weak learner, then reweight misclassified points by $w_t = w_t + \exp(-y_t f_t)$

AdaBoost Algorithm: given m examples $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_m, y_m)$ where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, y_i \in \{-1, 1\}$, initialize $D_1(x_i) = 1/m$, $w_1 = 1$

① Train learner f_t with min error $E_t = \Pr_{x \sim D_1}[f_t(x) \neq y]$

② Compute the hypothesis weight $\alpha_t = \ln(1/E_t) - \ln(1 - E_t)$

③ For each example i weight $D_{t+1}(x_i) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{w_t}{1 - E_t} \exp(-y_i f_t(x_i))$

Output: $H(x) = \text{sign}(\sum_t \alpha_t f_t(x))$

Neural Networks

Input nodes, connected to hidden layers, then output via sigmoid
Each node outputs a linear combination of its inputs, sig activation
Two layer network equivalent to logistic matching, use more complicated learning scheme to extract better features
use one vs. all classification for multi-class

Learning

Randomly perturbing weights similar to reinforcement learning, but can be very inefficient, changing just one is not effective
Backpropagation uses error derivatives with respect to the hidden activations

Numerical and analytic gradient slow to calculate, backprop similar to cached analytic gradient
Using squared error, cannot enforce sum to one constraint
use softmax: $y_i = \frac{\sum_j e^{z_j}}{\sum_j e^{z_j}}, z_j = w_j^T x + b_j$

Combine ideas of logistic regression/template matching/kNN, decision forests/ensembles of weak learners, stochastic gradient descent, and feature learning

Apply regularization using L2, L1, both, maxnorm constraint

Convolutional Neural Networks

Alternating convolutional and pooling layers
Condition: Apply element wise convolution using filters to produce many layered output

Note: locally connected (but not fully connected), and share weights across each depth slice

Pooling: Filter responses at each location to extract features
Max (take max response), Average, L2 (std), L2 over features

For each point $x_{i,j}$, find closest center m and move towards x a little, repeat

Wants well N clusters spherical/well separated, of similar volumes and have similar number of points

Vector Quantization involves finding closest clusters (listen by training) and creating vectors to closest neighbor

Module Models

$p(x) = \sum_{i=1}^k p_i(x)P(X_i)$ (negative log-likelihood of data clustering brought up $\propto \chi^2$ cluster, $\propto N(M_i, \sigma_i^2)$)

EM Algorithm

Initialize parameters θ (moving into), repeat:
E: compute expected values of unobserved variables assuming θ
M: compute new parameters to maximize prob of data

For (iterations),

Initialization: choose means at random

E: For all examples x_i :
 $P(M_i) = \frac{P(x_i|M_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^k P(x_i|M_j)}$ $= \frac{P(M_i)P(x_i|M_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^k P(M_j)P(x_i|M_j)}$

M: For all components M_i :
 $P(M_i) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N P(M_i|x_i)$, $M_i = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \text{vec}(x_i)(P(M_i|x_i))^T}{\sum_{i=1}^N P(M_i|x_i)}$

Non-Parametric Density Estimation

Histogram method uses fixed bin widths

Kernel Density Estimation

$P(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta(x - x_i)$ function of finite number of data points

Normalized: $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} P(x) dx = 1$. Smoother: $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \delta(x - x_i) dx = 0$

Epanechnikov kernel: $K_E(x) = \begin{cases} 0.75(1 - x^2) & |x| \leq 1 \\ 0 & |x| > 1 \end{cases}$

Uniform kernel: $K_U(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & |x| \leq 1 \\ 0 & |x| > 1 \end{cases}$

Normal kernel: $K_N(x) = C \exp(-\frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2)$

Mode-seeking

"Association Rules", "Frequent Itemsets", "Bayesian Analysis"

Association Rules

Rule $X \rightarrow Y$: "Body \rightarrow Head (support, confidence)"

Support: $\text{supp}(X) = \text{frequency}$ i.e. $P(X)$

Confidence: $\text{conf}(X \rightarrow Y) = \frac{\text{supp}(X \cup Y)}{\text{supp}(X)}$ i.e. $P(Y|X)$

Lift ($X \rightarrow Y$) = $\text{supp}(X \cup Y) / \text{supp}(X) * \text{supp}(Y)$

Principle Component Analysis

Given a set of feature vectors x_i , we can represent as pattern matrix

Ex: Measurement vectors, digital images, text documents, user rating data

Problems \rightarrow too large/complex, missing/noisy entries, lack of structure

Extract Latent Structure of matrix using factorization $A \approx P \cdot R$

Can capture dimensionality reduction, compressing and keeping only directions of highest variance

PCA: ① Subtract mean from every point

② Sometimes scale each dimension by its variance

③ Compute covariance matrix $S = X^T X$

④ Compute k largest eigenvectors of $S = V D V^T$

Singular Value Decomposition

① Subtract mean from each data point

② Decompose $X = U S V^T$, $X^T X = V D V^T = U D U^T = U S S^T U^T = U D U^T$

③ Use S matrix provides coefficients: $x_i = U_{i,1} \sqrt{\lambda_1} v_1 + U_{i,2} \sqrt{\lambda_2} v_2 + \dots$