Basics on generative and discriminative classification

Machine Learning and Object Recognition 2016-2017

Jakob Verbeek

Course website:

http://thoth.inrialpes.fr/~verbeek/MLOR.16.17

Practical matters

- Online course information
  - **Updated schedule**, links to slides and papers
  - http://thoth.inrialpes.fr/~verbeek/MLOR.16.17.php
- Grading: Final grades are determined as follows
  - 50% written exam, 50% quizes on the presented papers
  - If you present a paper: the grade for the presentation can substitute the worst grade you had for any of the quizes.
- Paper presentations:
  - each student presents once
  - each paper is presented by two or three students
  - presentations last for 15~20 minutes, time yours in advance!

Classification in its simplest form

- Given training data labeled for two or more classes



Classification in its simplest form

- Given training data labeled for two or more classes
- Determine a surface that separates those classes



Classification in its simplest form

- Given training data labeled for two or more classes
- Determine a surface that separates those classes
- Use that surface to predict the class membership of new data



Classification examples in category-level recognition

- Image classification: for each of a set of labels, predict if it is relevant or not for a given image.
- For example: Person = yes, TV = yes, car = no, ...

Classification examples in category-level recognition

- Category localization: predict bounding box coordinates.
- Classify each possible bounding box as containing the category or not.
- Report most confidently classified box.



Classification examples in category-level recognition

- Semantic segmentation: classify pixels to categories (multi-class)
- Impose spatial smoothness by Markov random field models.

Classification

- Goal is to predict for a test data input the corresponding class label.
  - **Data input x**, e.g. image but could be anything, format may be vector or other
  - **Class label y**, can take one out of at least 2 discrete values, can be more

    - In binary classification we often refer to one class as “positive”, and the other as “negative”

- Classifier: function f(x) that assigns a class to x, or probabilities over the classes.

- Training data: pairs (x,y) of inputs x, and corresponding class label y.

- Learning a classifier: determine function f(x) from some family of functions based on the available training data.

- Classifier partitions the input space into regions where data is assigned to a given class
  - Specific form of these boundaries will depend on the family of classifiers used

Generative classification: principle

- Model the class conditional distribution over data x for each class y: $p(x|y)$
  - Data of the class can be sampled (generated) from this distribution
- Estimate the a-priori probability that a class will appear $p(y)$

- Infer the probability over classes using Bayes' rule of conditional probability

$$p(y|x) = \frac{p(y)\,p(x|y)}{p(x)}$$

- Marginal distribution on x is obtained by marginalizing the class label y

$$p(x) = \sum_y p(y)\,p(x|y)$$





Generative classification: practice

- In order to apply Bayes' rule, we need to estimate two distributions.

- A-priori class distribution
  - In some cases the class prior probabilities are known in advance.
  - If the frequencies in the training data set are representative for the true class probabilities, then estimate the prior by these frequencies.

- Class conditional data distributions
  - Select a class of density models
    - Parametric model, e.g. Gaussian, Bernoulli, …
    - Semi-parametric models: mixtures of Gaussian, Bernoulli, ...
    - Non-parametric models: histograms, nearest-neighbor method, …
    - Or more structured models taking problem knowledge into account.
  - Estimate the parameters of the model using the data in the training set associated with that class.

Estimation of the class conditional model

- Given a set of n samples from a certain class, and a family of distributions

$$X=\{x_1,\ldots,x_n\} \qquad P=\{p_\theta(x);\theta\in\Theta\}$$

- How do we quantify the fit of a certain model to the data, and how do we find the best model defined in this sense?

- Maximum a-posteriori (MAP) estimation: use Bayes' rule again as follows:
  - Assume a prior distribution over the parameters of the model $p(\theta)$
  - Then the posterior likelihood of the model given the data is

$$p(\theta|X)=p(X|\theta)\,p(\theta)/p(X)$$

  - Find the most likely model given the observed data

$$\hat{\theta}=\text{argmax}_\theta\, p(\theta|X)=\text{argmax}_\theta\{\ln p(\theta)+\ln p(X|\theta)\}$$

- Maximum likelihood parameter estimation: assume prior over parameters is uniform (for bounded parameter spaces), or “near uniform” so that its effect is negligible for the posterior on the parameters.
  - In this case the MAP estimator is given by $\hat{\theta}=\text{argmax}_\theta\, p(X|\theta)$
  - For i.id. samples:

$$\hat{\theta}=\text{argmax}_\theta\prod_{i=1}^{n} p(x_i|\theta)=\text{argmax}_\theta\sum_{i=1}^{n}\ln p(x_i|\theta)$$

Generative classification methods

- Generative probabilistic methods use Bayes' rule for prediction
  - Problem is reformulated as one of parameter/density estimation

$$p(y|x) = \frac{p(y)\,p(x|y)}{p(x)} \qquad p(x) = \sum_y p(y)\,p(x|y)$$

- Adding new classes to the model is easy:
  - Existing class conditional models stay as they are
  - Estimate p(x|new class) from training examples of new class
  - Re-estimate class prior probabilities





Example of generative classification

- Three-class example in 2D with parametric model
  - Single Gaussian model per class, uniform class prior
  - Exercise 1: how is this model related to the Gaussian mixture model we looked at before for clustering ?
  - Exercise 2: characterize surface of equal class probability when the covariance matrices are the same for all classes



$p(x|y)$



$$p(y|x) = \frac{p(y)\,p(x|y)}{p(x)}$$

Density estimation for class-conditional models

- Any type of data distribution may be used, preferably one that is modeling the data well, so that we can hope for accurate classification results.

- If we do not have a clear understanding of the data generating process, we can use a generic approach,

  - Gaussian distribution, or other reasonable parametric model
    - Estimation often in closed form or relatively simple process

  - Mixtures of parametric models
    - Estimation using EM algorithm, not more complicated than single parametric model

  - Non-parametric models can adapt to any data distribution given enough data for estimation. Examples: (multi-dimensional) histograms, and nearest neighbors.
    - Estimation often trivial, given a single smoothing parameter.

Histogram density estimation

- Suppose we have *N* data points use a histogram with *C* cells
- Consider maximum likelihood estimator

$$\hat{\theta} = \text{argmax}_\theta \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln p_\theta(x_i) = \text{argmax}_\theta \sum_{c=1}^{C} n_c \ln \theta_c$$

- Take into account constraint that density should integrate to one

$$\theta_C := 1 - \left(\sum_{k=1}^{C-1} \nu_k \theta_k \right) / \nu_C$$

- Exercise: derive maximum likelihood estimator

- Some observations:
  - Discontinuous density estimate
  - Cell size determines smoothness
  - Number of cells scales exponentially with the dimension of the data



Histogram density estimation

- Suppose we have *N* data points use a histogram with *C* cells
- Data log-likelihood

$$L(\theta)=\sum_{i=1}^{N}\ln p_\theta(x_i)=\sum_{c=1}^{C} n_c \ln \theta_c$$

- Take into account constraint that density should integrate to one

$$\theta_C := 1-\left(\sum_{k=1}^{C-1} v_k \theta_k\right)/v_C$$

- Compute derivative, and set to zero for i=1,..., C-1

$$\frac{\partial L(\theta)}{\partial \theta_i}=\frac{n_i}{\theta_i}-\frac{n_c}{\theta_c}\frac{v_i}{v_c}$$

$$\theta_i v_i=\frac{\theta_c v_c}{n_c} n_i$$

- Use fact that probability mass should integrate to one, and substitute

$$\sum_{i=1}^{C}\theta_i v_i=\frac{\theta_C v_C}{n_C}\sum_{i=1}^{C} n_i=\frac{\theta_C v_C}{n_C} N=1$$

$$\theta_i=\frac{n_i}{v_i N}$$

The Naive Bayes model

- Histogram estimation, and other methods, scale poorly with data dimension
  - Fine division of each dimension: many empty bins
  - Rough division of each dimension: poor density model
    - Even for one cut per dimension: 2^D cells, eg. a million cells in 20 dims.

- The number of parameters can be made linear in the data dimension by assuming independence between the dimensions

$$p(x) = \prod_{d=1}^{D} p(x(d))$$

- For example, for histogram model: we estimate a histogram per dimension
  - Still C^D cells, but only D x C parameters to estimate, instead of C^D

- Independence assumption can be unrealistic for high dimensional data
  - But classification performance may still be good using the derived p(y|x)
  - Partial independence, e.g. using graphical models, relaxes this problem.

- Principle can be applied to estimation with any type of density estimate

Example of a naïve Bayes model

- Hand-written digit classification
  - Input: binary 28x28 scanned digit images

  - Desired output: class label of image

- Generative model over 28 x 28 pixel images: 2^{784} possible images
  - Independent Bernoulli model for each class
  - Probability per pixel per class
  - Maximum likelihood estimator is average value per pixel/bit per class

$$p(x|y=c)=\prod_d p(x^d|y=c)$$

$$p(x^d=1|y=c)=\theta_{cd}$$

$$p(x^d=0|y=c)=1-\theta_{cd}$$



- Classify using Bayes' rule: $p(y|x)=\frac{p(y)\,p(x|y)}{p(x)}$

k-nearest-neighbor density estimation: principle

- **Instead of having fixed cells** as in histogram method,
  - **Center cell on the test sample** for which we evaluate the density.
  - Fix number of samples in the cell, find the corresponding **cell size.**

- Probability to find a point in a sphere ***A*** centered on $\boldsymbol{x_0}$ with volume ***v*** is

$$P(x \in A) = \int_A p(x)\,dx$$

- A smooth density is approximately constant in small region, and thus

$$P(x \in A) = \int_A p(x)\,dx \approx \int_A p(x_0)\,dx = p(x_0)\,v_A$$

- Alternatively: estimate ***P*** from the fraction of training data in ***A***: $P(x \in A) \approx \frac{k}{N}$
  - Total N data points, k in the sphere ***A***

- Combine the above to obtain estimate $p(x_0) \approx \frac{k}{N v_A}$
  - Same per-cell density estimate as in histogram estimator
- Note: density estimates not guaranteed to integrate to one!

k-nearest-neighbor density estimation: practice

- Procedure in practice:
  - Choose ***k***
  - For given ***x***, compute the volume ***v*** which contain ***k*** samples.
  - Estimate density with $p(x) \approx \frac{k}{Nv}$
- Volume of a sphere with radius ***r*** in ***d*** dimensions is $v(r,d) = \frac{2r^d \pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(d/2+1)}$
- What effect does ***k*** have?
  - Data sampled from mixture of Gaussians plotted in green
  - Larger ***k***, larger region, smoother estimate
  - Similar role as cell size for histogram estimation



K-nearest-neighbors for classification

- Use Bayes' rule with kNN density estimation for p(x|y)
  - Find sphere volume v to capture ***k*** data points for estimate $p(x)=\frac{k}{N v}$
  - Use the same sphere for each class for estimates $p(x|y=c)=\frac{k_c}{N_c v}$
  - Estimate class prior probabilities $p(y=c)=\frac{N_c}{N}$
  - Calculate class posterior distribution as fraction of k neighbors in class c



$$p(y=c|x)=\frac{p(y=c)\,p(x|y=c)}{p(x)}$$

$$=\frac{1}{p(x)}\frac{k_c}{Nv}$$

$$=\frac{k_c}{k}$$



Smoothing effects for large values of k: data set



Smoothing effects for large values of k, k=1



Smoothing effects for large values of k, k=5



Smoothing effects for large values of k, k=10



Smoothing effects for large values of k, k=100



Summary generative classification methods

- (Semi-) Parametric models, e.g. p(x|y) is Gaussian, or mixture of …
  - Pros: no need to store training data, just the class conditional models
  - Cons: may fit the data poorly, and might therefore lead to poor classification result

- Non-parametric models:
  - Pros:
    - flexibility, no assumptions distribution shape, learning is trivial
    - KNN can be used for anything that comes with a distance.
  - Cons of histograms:
    - Only practical in low dimensional data (<5 or so), application in high dimensional data leads to exponentially many and mostly empty cells
    - Naïve Bayes modeling in higher dimensional cases
  - Cons of k-nearest neighbors
    - Need to store all training data (memory cost)
    - Computing nearest neighbors (computational cost)

Discriminative classification methods

- Generative classification models
  - Model the density of inputs x from each class p(x|y)
  - Estimate class prior probability p(y)
  - Use Bayes' rule to infer distribution over class given input
- In discriminative classification methods we directly estimate class probability given input: p(y|x)
  - Choose class of decision functions in feature space
  - Estimate function that maximizes performance on the training set
  - Classify a new pattern on the basis of this decision rule.



Binary linear classifier

- Decision function is linear in the features:

$$f(x) = w^T x + b = b + \sum_{i=1}^{d} w_i x_i$$



- Classification based on the sign of f(x)

- Orientation is determined by **w**
- Offset from origin is determined by *b*

- Decision surface is (d-1) dimensional hyper-plane orthogonal to **w**, given by

$$f(x) = w^T x + b = 0$$

Common loss functions for classification

- Assign class label using $y = sign(f(x))$
- Measure how model quality on a test sample using loss function
  - Zero-One loss: $L(y_i, f(x_i)) = [y_i f(x_i) \leq 0]$
  - Hinge loss: $L(y_i, f(x_i)) = max(0, 1 - y_i f(x_i))$
  - Logistic loss: $L(y_i, f(x_i)) = \log_2(1 + e^{-y_i f(x_i)})$



Common loss functions for classification

- Assign class label using $y = sign(f(x))$
  - Zero-One loss: $L(y_i, f(x_i)) = [y_i f(x_i) \leq 0]$
  - Hinge loss: $L(y_i, f(x_i)) = max(0, 1 - y_i f(x_i))$
  - Logistic loss: $L(y_i, f(x_i)) = \log_2(1 + e^{-y_i f(x_i)})$
- The zero-one loss counts the number of misclassifications, which is the “ideal” empirical loss
  - Discontinuity at zero makes optimization intractable
- Hinge and logistic loss provide continuous and convex upperbounds, which allow for continuous optimization

Dealing with more than two classes

- First idea: construction from multiple binary classifiers
  - Learn binary “base” classifiers independently

- One vs rest approach:
  - 1 vs (2 & 3)
  - 2 vs (1 & 3)
  - 3 vs (1 & 2)

- Problem: Region claimed by several classes



Dealing with more than two classes

- First idea: construction from multiple binary classifiers
  - Learn binary “base” classifiers independently

- One vs one approach:
  - 1 vs 2
  - 1 vs 3
  - 2 vs 3

- Problem: conflicts in some regions



Dealing with more than two classes

- Instead: define a separate linear score function for each class

$$f_k(x) = w_k^T x + b_k$$

- Assign sample to the class of the function with maximum value

$$y = arg\,max_k f_k(x)$$

- Exercise 1: give the expression for points where two classes have equal score



- Exercise 2: show that the set of points assigned to a class is convex
  - If two points fall in the region, then also all points on connecting line

Logistic discriminant for two classes

- Map linear score function to class probabilities with sigmoid function

$$p(y=+1|x)=\sigma(w^T x+b)$$

  - For binary classification problem, we have by definition

$$p(y=-1|x)=1-p(y=+1|x)$$

  - Exercise: show that

$$p(y=-1|x)=\sigma(-(w^T x+b))$$

and thus

$$p(y|x)=\sigma(y(w^T x+b))$$

$$\sigma(z)=\frac{1}{1+\exp(-z)}$$



Logistic discriminant for two classes

- Map linear score function to class probabilities with sigmoid function
- The class boundary is obtained for p(y|x)=1/2, thus by setting linear function in exponent to zero





Multi-class logistic discriminant

- Map score function of each class to class probabilities with “soft-max” function
  - Absorb bias into w and x

$$f_k(x) = w_k^T x \qquad p(y=c|x) = \frac{\exp(f_c(x))}{\sum_{k=1}^{K} \exp(f_k(x))}$$

  - The class probability estimates are non-negative, and sum to one.
  - Relative probability of most likely class increases exponentially with the difference in the linear score functions

$$\frac{p(y=c|x)}{p(y=k|x)} = \frac{\exp(f_c(x))}{\exp(f_k(x))} = \exp(f_c(x) - f_k(x))$$

  - For any given pair of classes we find that they are equally likely on a hyperplane in the feature space



Maximum likelihood parameter estimation

- Maximize the log-likelihood of predicting the correct class label for training data
  - Predictions are made independently, so sum log-likelihood of all training data

$$L = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \log p(y_n | x_n)$$

- Derivative of log-likelihood as intuitive interpretation

Indicator function
1 if $y_n = k$, else 0

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial w_k} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left([y_n = k] - p(y = k | x_n) \right) x_n = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \alpha_n x_n$$

Expected value of each feature, weighting points by p(y|x), should equal empirical expectation.

- No closed-form solution, but log-likelihood is concave in parameters
  - no local optima, use general purpose convex optimization methods
  - For example: gradient started from w=0
    - ***w*** is linear combination of data points
    - Sign of coefficients depends on class labels

Maximum a-posteriori (MAP) parameter estimation

- Let us assume a zero-mean Gaussian prior distribution on w
  - We expect weight vectors with a small norm

- Find w that maximizes posterior likelihood

$$\hat{w} = \text{argmax}_w \sum_{n=1}^{N} \ln p(y_n | x_n, w) + \ln p(w)$$

- Can be rewritten as following “penalized” maximum likelihood estimator:

$$\hat{w} = \text{argmax}_w \sum_{n=1}^{N} \ln p(y_n | x_n, w) - \lambda ||w||_2^2$$

  - With lambda non-negative

- Penalty for “large” w, bounds the scale of w in case of separable data

- Exercise: show that for separable data the norm of the optimal w's would be infinite without using the penalty term.

Support Vector Machines

- Find linear function to separate positive and negative examples
- Which function best separates the samples ?
  - Function inducing the largest margin



$$y_i = +1 \quad : \quad w^T x_i + b > 0$$
$$y_i = -1 \quad : \quad w^T x_i + b < 0$$

Support vector machines

- Without loss of generality, let function value at the margin be +/- 1
- Now constrain w to that all points fall on correct side of the margin:

$$y_i\left(w^T x_i + b\right) \geq 1$$

- By construction we have that the “support vectors”, the ones that define the margin, have function values

$$w^T x_i + b = y_i$$

- Express the size of the margin

  in terms of w.



Support vector machines

- Let's consider a support vector x from the positive class $f(x) = w^T x + b = 1$
- Let z be its projection on the decision plane
  - Since w is normal vector to the decision plane, we have $z = x - \alpha w$
  - and since z is on the decision plane $f(z) = w^T(x - \alpha w) + b = 0$
- Solve for alpha

$$w^T(x - \alpha w) + b = 0$$
$$w^T x + b - \alpha w^T w = 0$$
$$\alpha w^T w = 1$$
$$\alpha = \frac{1}{\|w\|_2^2}$$

- Margin is twice distance from x to z

$$\|x - z\|_2 = \|x - (x - \alpha w)\|_2$$
$$\|\alpha w\|_2 = \alpha \|w\|_2$$
$$\frac{\|w\|_2}{\|w\|_2^2} = \frac{1}{\|w\|_2}$$



Support vector machines

- To find the maximum-margin separating hyperplane, we
  - Maximize the margin, while ensuring correct classification
  - Minimize the norm of w, s.t. $\forall_i: \; y_i(w^T x_i + b) \geq 1$
- Solve using quadratic program with linear inequality constraints over p+1 variables

$$argmin_{w,b} \frac{1}{2} w^T w$$

$$\text{subject to } y_i(w^T x_i + b) \geq 1$$



Support vector machines: inseperable classes

- For non-separable classes we incorporate hinge-loss

$$L(y_i, f(x_i)) = max(0, 1 - y_i f(x_i))$$

- Recall: convex and piece-wise linear upper bound on zero/one loss.
  - Zero if point on the correct side of the margin
  - Otherwise given by absolute difference from score at margin



Support vector machines: inseperable classes

- Minimize penalized loss function

$$min_{w,b} \quad \lambda \frac{1}{2} w^T w \; + \; \sum_i max\left(0, 1 - y_i\left(w^T x_i + b\right)\right)$$

  - Quadratic function, plus **piece-wise linear functions**.

- Transformation into a quadratic program
  - Define “slack variables” that measure the loss for each data point
  - Should be non-negative, and at least as large as the loss

$$min_{w,b,\{\xi_i\}} \quad \lambda \frac{1}{2} w^T w \; + \; \sum_i \xi_i$$

$$\text{subject to } \forall_i: \;\; \xi_i \geq 0 \text{ and } \xi_i \geq 1 - y_i\left(w^T x_i + b\right)$$

- Solution of the quadratic program has the property that w is a linear combination of the data points.

SVM solution properties

- Optimal w is a linear combination of data points $w = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \alpha_n y_n x_n$
- Alpha weights are zero for all points on the correct side of the margin
- Points on the margin, or on the wrong side, have non-zero weight
  - Called support vectors
- Classification function thus has form $f(x) = w^T x + b = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \alpha_n y_n \boxed{x_n^T x} + b$
  - relies only on inner products between the test point ***x*** and data points with non-zero alpha's
- Solving the optimization problem also requires access to the data only in terms of inner products between pairs of training points

Relation SVM and logistic regression

- A classification error occurs when sign of the function does not match the sign of the class label: the zero-one loss $z = y_i f(x_i) \leq 0$
- Consider error minimized when training classifier:
  - Hinge loss: $\xi_i = max(0, 1 - y_i f(x_i)) = max(0, 1 - z)$
  - Logistic loss: $-\log p(y_i|x_i) = -\log \sigma(y_i f(x_i)) = \log(1 + \exp(-z))$



- L2 penalty for SVM motivated by margin between the classes
- For Logistic discriminant we find it via MAP estimation with a Gaussian prior
- Both lead to efficient optimization
  - Hinge-loss is piece-wise linear: quadratic programming
  - Logistic loss is smooth : smooth convex optimization methods

Summary of discriminative linear classification

- Two most widely used linear classifiers in practice:
  - Logistic discriminant (supports more than 2 classes directly)
  - Support vector machines (multi-class extensions possible)

- For both, in the case of binary classification
  - Criterion that is minimized is a convex bound on zero-one loss
  - weight vector **w** is a linear combination of the data points $w = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \alpha_n x_n$

- This means that we only need the inner-products between data points to calculate the linear functions

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= w^T x + b \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{N} \alpha_n x_n^T x + b \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{N} \alpha_n k(x_n, x) + b \end{aligned}$$

  - The “kernel” function k(,) computes the inner products

Nonlinear Classification

- 1 dimensional data that is linearly separable



- But what if the data is not linearly seperable?



- We can map it to a higher-dimensional space:



Slide credit: Andrew Moore

Kernels for non-linear classification

- General idea: map the original input space to some higher-dimensional feature space where the training set is separable

- Exercise: find features that could separate the 2d data linearly



Slide credit: Andrew Moore

Nonlinear classification with kernels

- *The kernel trick*: instead of explicitly computing the feature transformation $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{x})$, define a kernel function K such that

$$K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{x}_i) \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{x}_j)$$

- Conversely, if a kernel satisfies Mercer's condition then it computes an inner product in some feature space, possibly with large or infinite number of dimensions

  - *Mercer's Condition: The square N x N matrix with kernel evaluations for any arbitrary N data points should always be a positive definite matrix.*

- This gives a **nonlinear decision boundary** in the original space:

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= b + w^T \varphi(x) \\ &= b + \sum_i \alpha_i \varphi(x_i)^T \varphi(x) \\ &= b + \sum_i \alpha_i k(x_i, x) \end{aligned}$$

Kernels for non-linear classification

- What is the kernel function that corresponds to this feature mapping ?

$$\varphi(x)=\begin{pmatrix} x_1^2 \\ x_2^2 \\ \sqrt{2}\,x_1 x_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$k(x,y)=\varphi(x)^T\varphi(y)=?$$
$$=x_1^2y_1^2+x_2^2y_2^2+2x_1x_2y_1y_2$$
$$=(x_1y_1+x_2y_2)^2$$
$$=(x^Ty)^2$$



Kernels for non-linear classification

- Suppose we also want to keep the original features to be able to still implement linear functions

$$\varphi(x)=\begin{pmatrix}1\\ \sqrt{2}x_1\\ \sqrt{2}x_2\\ x_1^2\\ x_2^2\\ \sqrt{2}x_1x_2\end{pmatrix}$$

$$k(x,y)=\varphi(x)^T\varphi(y)=?$$

$$=1+2x^Ty+(x^Ty)^2$$

$$=(x^Ty+1)^2$$



$\Phi:\ \mathbf{x}\rightarrow\varphi(\mathbf{x})$



Kernels for non-linear classification

- What happens if we use the same kernel for higher dimensional data
  - Which feature vector $\varphi(x)$ corresponds to it ?

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

  - First term, encodes an additional 1 in each feature vector
  - Second term, encodes scaling of the original features by sqrt(2)
  - Let's consider the third term $(x^T y)^2=(x_1 y_1+\ldots+x_D y_D)^2$

$$=\sum_{d=1}^{D}(x_d y_d)^2+2\sum_{d=1}^{D}\sum_{i=d+1}^{D}(x_d y_d)(x_i y_i)$$

$$=\sum_{d=1}^{D}x_d^2 y_d^2+2\sum_{d=1}^{D}\sum_{i=d+1}^{D}(x_d x_i)(y_d y_i)$$

  - In total we have 1 + 2D + D(D-1)/2 features !
  - But the kernel is computed as efficiently as dot-product in original space

$$\varphi(x)=(1,\underbrace{\sqrt{2}x_1,\sqrt{2}x_{2,}\ldots,\sqrt{2}x_D}_{\text{Original features}},\underbrace{x_1^2,x_2^2,\ldots,x_D^2}_{\text{Squares}},\underbrace{\sqrt{2}x_1x_2,\ldots,\sqrt{2}x_1x_D,\ldots,\sqrt{2}x_{D-1}x_D}_{\text{Products of two distinct elements}})^T$$

Common kernels for bag-of-word histograms

- Hellinger kernel:

$$k(h_1, h_2) = \sum_d \sqrt{h_1(i)} \times \sqrt{h_2(i)}$$

- Histogram intersection kernel:

$$k(h_1, h_2) = \sum_d min(h_1(d), h_2(d))$$

  - Exercise: find the feature transformation, when h(d) is a bounded integer

- Generalized Gaussian kernel:

$$k(h_1, h_2) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{A} d(h_1, h_2)\right)$$

  - *d* can be Euclidean distance, χ^2 distance, Earth Mover's Distance, etc.

See also:
J. Zhang, M. Marszalek, S. Lazebnik, and C. Schmid,
Local features and kernels for classification of texture and object categories: a comprehensive study. Int. Journal of Computer Vision, 2007

Logistic discriminant with kernels

- Let us assume a given kernel, and weight vectors $\boldsymbol{w}_c = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{ic} \varphi(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$
  - Express the score functions using the kernel

$$f_c(\boldsymbol{x}_j) = b_c + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{ic} \langle \varphi(\boldsymbol{x}_i), \varphi(\boldsymbol{x}_j) \rangle = b_c + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_{ic} k(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j) = b_c + \boldsymbol{\alpha}_c^T \boldsymbol{k}_j$$

    - Where $\boldsymbol{k}_j = \left(k(\boldsymbol{x}_j, \boldsymbol{x}_1), \ldots, k(\boldsymbol{x}_j, \boldsymbol{x}_n) \right)^T$

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}_c = \left(\alpha_{1c}, \ldots, \alpha_{nc} \right)^T$$

  - Express the L2 penalty on the weight vectors using the kernel

$$\langle \boldsymbol{w}_c, \boldsymbol{w}_c \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{ic} \alpha_{jc} k(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j) = \boldsymbol{\alpha}_c^T \boldsymbol{K} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_c$$

  - Where $[\boldsymbol{K}]_{ij} = k(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j)$

- MAP estimation of the alpha's and b's amounts to maximize

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln p(y_i | \boldsymbol{x}_i) - \lambda \frac{1}{2} \sum_{c=1}^{C} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_c^T \boldsymbol{K} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_c$$

Logistic discriminant with kernels

- Recall that $p(y_i|\boldsymbol{x}_i)=\frac{\exp\left(f_{y_i}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right)}{\sum_c \exp f_c(\boldsymbol{x}_i)}$ and $f_c(\boldsymbol{x}_i)=b_c+\boldsymbol{\alpha}_c^T\boldsymbol{k}_i$

- Therefore we want to maximize

$$E(\{\alpha_c\},\{b_c\})=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(f_{y_i}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)-\ln\sum_c \exp f_{y_i}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right)-\lambda\frac{1}{2}\sum_c \boldsymbol{\alpha}_c^T\boldsymbol{K}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_c$$

- Consider the partial derivative of this function with respect to the b's, and the gradient with respect to the alpha vectors

$$\frac{\partial E}{\partial b_c}=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left([y_i=c]-p(c|\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right)$$

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_c}E=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left([y_i=c]-p(c|\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right)\boldsymbol{k}_i-\lambda\boldsymbol{K}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_c$$

  - Essentially the same gradients as in the linear case, feature vector is replaced with a column of the kernel matrix

Support vector machines with kernels

- Minimize quadratic program

$$min_{\boldsymbol{w},b,\{\xi_i\}} \quad \lambda \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{w}^T \boldsymbol{w} \; + \; \sum_i \xi_i$$

$$\text{subject to } \forall_i: \; \xi_i \geq 0 \text{ and } \xi_i \geq 1 - y_i f(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$$

- Let us again define the classification function in terms of kernel evaluations

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}_i) = b + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \boldsymbol{k}_i$$

- Then we obtain a quadratic program in b, alpha, and the slack variables

$$min_{\boldsymbol{\alpha},b,\{\xi_i\}} \quad \lambda \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \boldsymbol{K} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \; + \; \sum_i \xi_i$$

$$\text{subject to } \forall_i: \; \xi_i \geq 0 \text{ and } \xi_i \geq 1 - y_i \left(b + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \boldsymbol{k}_i \right)$$

Summary linear classification & kernels

- Linear classifiers learned by minimizing convex cost functions
  - Logistic discriminant: smooth objective, minimized using gradient-based methods
  - Support vector machines: piecewise linear objective, quadratic programming
  - Both require only computing inner product between data points

- Non-linear classification can be done with linear classifiers over new features that are non-linear functions of the original features
  - Kernel functions efficiently compute inner products in (very) high-dimensional spaces, can even be infinite dimensional in some cases.

- Using kernel functions non-linear classification has drawbacks
  - Requires storing the support vectors, may cost lots of memory in practice
  - Computing kernel between new data point and support vectors may be computationally expensive (at least more expensive than linear classifier)

- The “kernel trick” also applies for other linear data analysis techniques
  - Principle component analysis, k-means clustering, regression, ...

Reading material

- A good book that covers all machine learning aspects of the course is
  - Pattern recognition & machine learning
    Chris Bishop, Springer, 2006
- For clustering with k-means & mixture of Gaussians read
  - Section 2.3.9
  - Chapter 9, except 9.3.4
  - Optionally, Section 1.6 on information theory
- For classification read
  - Section 2.5, except 2.5.1
  - Section 4.1.1 & 4.1.2
  - Section 4.2.1 & 4.2.2
  - Section 4.3.2 & 4.3.4
  - Section 6.2
  - Section 7.1 start + 7.1.1 & 7.1.2
- (Much) more on kernels: course “Advanced Learning Models” in MSIAM program