

SVD:

- $\bar{X} = U\Sigma V^{\top}, \quad U^{\top}U = I, \quad V^{\top}V = I, \quad \Sigma = \text{Diag}$
- Optimal $W = U_d \equiv$ matrix of first *d* columns of *U*
- Solution W also minimizes 'reconstruction error' ... \succ

$$\sum_i \|x_i - WW^T x_i\|^2 = \sum_i \|x_i - Wy_i\|^2$$

> In some methods recentering to zero is not done, i.e., \overline{X} replaced by X.

Unsupervised learning

"Unsupervised learning": methods do not exploit labeled data

> Example of digits: perform a 2-D projection

Images of same digit tend to cluster \succ (more or less)

Such 2-D representations are popular for visualization

Can also try to find natural clusters in data, e.g., in materials

> Basic clusterning technique: K-means



LLE - digits : 0 -- 4

ONPP - digits : 0 --- 4

0.2

-5.4341

-5.4341 x 10⁻³

-0.1 -0.15 -0.2 -0.2

0.1

0.05

-0.15 -0.2 -0.1

-0.25 -5.4341 -5.4341 -5.4341





Supervised learning

> We now have data that is 'labeled'

Examples: Health Sciences ('malignant'- 'non malignant') ; Materials ('photovoltaic', 'hard', 'conductor', ...) ; Digit Recognition ('0', '1',, '9')



Supervised learning

> We now have data that is 'labeled'

Examples: Health Sciences ('malignant'- 'non malignant') ; Materials ('photovoltaic', 'hard', 'conductor', ...) ; Digit Recognition ('0', '1', ..., '9')



Supervised learning: classification

► Best illustration: written digits recognition example

19-10

Given: set of labeled samples (training set), and an (unlabeled) test image x. *Problem:* label of x = ?



Roughly speaking: we seek dimension reduction so that recognition is 'more effective' in low-dim. space

19-12

superv



Simple linear classifiers

- Let $X = [x_1, \cdots, x_n]$ be the data matrix.
- > and $L = [l_1, \cdots, l_n] ==$ labels. $l_i = \pm 1$
- ▶ 1st Solution: Find a vector u such that $u^T x_i$ close to l_i , $\forall i$
- ► Common solution: SVD to reduce dimension of data [e.g. 2-D] then do comparison in this space. e.g.

A: $u^T x_i \geq 0$, B: $u^T x_i < 0$

 $egin{aligned} S_B &= \sum\limits_{k=1}^c n_k (\mu^{(k)} - \mu) (\mu^{(k)} - \mu)^T, \ S_W &= \sum\limits_{k=1}^c \sum\limits_{x_i \ \in X_k} (x_i - \mu^{(k)}) (x_i - \mu^{(k)})^T \end{aligned}$



• $\mu = \text{mean}(X)$

where:

CLUSTER CENTROIDS

GLOBAL CENTROID

X₃

• $\mu^{(k)}$ = mean (X_k)

• $X_k = k$ -th class

• $n_k = |X_k|$

- fisher

– fisher

[For clarity: principal axis *u* drawn below where it should be]

Fisher's Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA)

Principle: Use label information to build a good projector, i.e., one that can 'discriminate' well between classes

Define "between scatter": a measure of how well separated two distinct classes are.

> Define "within scatter": a measure of how well clustered items of the same class are.

Objective: make "between scatter" measure large and "within scatter" small.

Idea: Find projector that maximizes the ratio of the "between scatter" measure over "within scatter" measure

Consider 2nd moments for a vector *a*:

19-18

$$egin{aligned} a^T S_B a \ &= \ \sum_{i=1}^c n_k \ |a^T (\mu^{(k)} - \mu)|^2, \ a^T S_W a \ &= \ \sum_{k=1}^c \sum_{x_i \ \in \ X_k} |a^T (x_i - \mu^{(k)})|^2 \end{aligned}$$

> $a^T S_B a \equiv$ weighted variance of projected μ_i 's

> $a^T S_W a \equiv$ w. sum of variances of projected classes X_j 's

► LDA projects the data so as to maximize the ratio of these two numbers:

> Optimal a = eigenvector associated with top eigenvalue of: 19-20

19-19

 $a^T S_B a$

 $a^T S_W a$

max

- fisher

LDA – Extension to arbitrary dimensions	In Brief: Support Vector Machines (SVM)
Criterion: maximize the ratio of two traces: $\frac{\text{Tr } [U^T S_B U]}{\text{Tr } [U^T S_W U]}$	Similar in spirit to LDA. Formally, SVM finds a hyperplane that best separates two training sets belonging to two classes.
• Constraint: $U^T U = I$ (orthogonal projector).	> If the hyperplane is: $w^T x + b = 0$
> Reduced dimension data: $Y = U^T X$.	
<i>Common viewpoint:</i> hard to maximize, therefore	▶ Then the classifier is $f(x) = sign(w^T x + b)$: assigns $y = +1$ to one class and $y = -1$ to other
> alternative: Solve instead the $\max_{U^T S_W U=I} \text{Tr}[U^T S_B U]$	Normalize parameters w, b by looking for hyperplanes of the form $w^T x + b \ge 1$ to include one set and $w^T x + b \le -1$ to include the other.
Solution: largest eigenvectors of $S_B u_i = \lambda_i S_W u_i$.	▶ With $y_i = +1$ for one class and $y_i = -1$ for the other, we can write the constraints as $y_i(w^T x_i + b) \ge 1$.
19-21 – fisher	19-22
➤ The margin is the maximum distance between two such planes: goal find w, b to maximize margin.	 Need to solve the constrained quadratic programming problem: <i>Modification 1:</i> Soft margin. Consider hinge loss: max{0, 1 − y_i[w^Tx_i+b]} Zero if constraint satisfied for pair x_i, y_i. Otherwise proportional to dis-
Maximize margin subject to the constraint $y_i(w^Tx_i + b) \ge 1$.	tance from corresponding hyperplane. Hence we can minimize $\lambda \ w\ ^2 + rac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \max\{0, 1-y_i[w^Tx_i+b]\}$
As it turns out the margin is equal to: $\gamma = \frac{2}{\ w\ _2}$ <i>Z</i> ₁ Prove it.	Z Suppose $y_i = +1$ and let $d_i = 1 - y_i[w^T x_i + b]$. Show that the distance between x_i and hyperplane $w^T x_i + b = +1$ is $d_i / w $.
19-23 – fisher	<i>Modification 2</i> : Use in combination with a Kernel to improve separability

A few words on Deep Neural Networks (DNNs)

- Ideas of neural networks goes back to the 1960s were popularized in early 1990s – then laid dormant until recently.
- > Two reasons for the come-back:
- DNN are remarkably effective in some applications
- big progress made in hardware [\rightarrow affordable 'training cost']

Training a neural network can be viewed as a problem of approximating a function ϕ which is defined via sets of parameters:



Problem: find sets of parameters such that $\phi(x) \approx y$

