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Claim 2 holds even if no separating hyperplane!
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Hinge Loss.
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**Claim 1:** \( w_{t+1} \cdot w \geq w_t \cdot w + \gamma. \)

Don’t make progress or tilt the wrong way.

How much bad tilting?
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Hinge Loss.

Most of data has good separator.

**Claim 1:** $w_{t+1} \cdot w \geq w_t \cdot w + \gamma$.

Don’t make progress or tilt the wrong way.

How much bad tilting?

Rotate points to have $\gamma$-margin.
   - Total rotation: $TD_\gamma$. 

Analysis: subtract bad tilting part.
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Claim 2(?): \( |w_{t+1}|^2 \leq |w_t|^2 + 1 \)??

Adding \( x_i \) to \( w_t \) even if in correct direction.

Obtuse triangle.

\[
|v|^2 \leq |w_t|^2 + 1 \\
\rightarrow |v| \leq |w_t| + \frac{1}{2|w_t|} \\
\text{(square right hand side.)}
\]

Red bit is at most \( \gamma/2 \).

Together: \( |w_{t+1}| \leq |w_t| + \frac{1}{2|w_t|} + \frac{\gamma}{2} \)

If \( |w_t| \geq \frac{2}{\gamma} \), then \( |w_{t+1}| \leq |w_t| + \frac{3}{4} \gamma \).
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Kernel Functions.

Map $x$ to $\phi(x)$.

Hyperplane separator for points under $\phi(\cdot)$. Problem: complexity of computing in higher dimension. Recall perceptron. Only compute dot products!

Test: $w_t \cdot x_i > \gamma$

$w_t = x_{i1} + x_{i2} + x_{i3} \cdots$ Support Vectors: $x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \ldots$ → Support Vector Machine.

Kernel trick: compute dot products in original space. Kernel function for mapping $\phi(\cdot)$:

$K(x, y) = \phi(x) \cdot \phi(y)$

$K(x, y) = (1 + x_1 y_1)(1 + x_2 y_2) \cdots (1 + x_n y_n)$

$\phi(x)$ - products of all subsets. Polynomial.

$K(x, y) = \exp(C|x - y|^2)$

Infinite dimensional space. Expansion of $e^z$.

Gaussian Kernel.
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Test: $w_t \cdot x_i \geq \gamma$

$w_t = x_{i_1} + x_{i_2} + x_{i_3} \cdots$

Support Vectors: $x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \ldots$
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Kernel trick: compute dot products in original space.

Kernel function for mapping $\phi(\cdot)$: $K(x, y) = \phi(x) \cdot \phi(y)$

$K(x, y) = (1 + x \cdot y)^d$ $\phi(x) = [1, \ldots, x_i, \ldots, x_i x_j \ldots]$. Polynomial.
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Support Vectors: \( x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \ldots \)

\( \rightarrow \) Support Vector Machine.
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$K(x, y) = (1 + x \cdot y)^d$ \hspace{1em} $\phi(x) = [1, \ldots, x_i, \ldots, x_i x_j \ldots]$. Polynomial.

$K(x, y) = (1 + x_1 y_1)(1 + x_2 y_2) \cdots (1 + x_n y_n)$
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Recall perceptron. Only compute dot products!

Test: $\mathbf{w}_t \cdot \mathbf{x}_i > \gamma$

$\mathbf{w}_t = x_{i_1} + x_{i_2} + x_{i_3} \cdots$

Support Vectors: $x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \ldots$
→ Support Vector Machine.

Kernel trick: compute dot products in original space.

Kernel function for mapping $\phi(\cdot)$: $K(x, y) = \phi(x) \cdot \phi(y)$

$K(x, y) = (1 + x \cdot y)^d \phi(x) = [1, \ldots, x_i, \ldots, x_i x_j \ldots]$. Polynomial.

$K(x, y) = (1 + x_1 y_1)(1 + x_2 y_2) \cdots (1 + x_n y_n)$

$\phi(x)$ - products of all subsets. Boolean Fourier basis.
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Problem: complexity of computing in higher dimension.

Recall perceptron. Only compute dot products!

Test: $w_t \cdot x_i > \gamma$

$$w_t = x_{i_1} + x_{i_2} + x_{i_3} \cdots$$

Support Vectors: $x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \ldots$

$\rightarrow$ Support Vector Machine.

Kernel trick: compute dot products in original space.

Kernel function for mapping $\phi(\cdot)$: $K(x, y) = \phi(x) \cdot \phi(y)$

$$K(x, y) = (1 + x \cdot y)^d \quad \phi(x) = [1, \ldots, x_i, \ldots, x_i x_j \ldots].$$

Polynomial.

$$K(x, y) = (1 + x_1 y_1) (1 + x_2 y_2) \cdots (1 + x_n y_n)$$

$\phi(x)$ - products of all subsets. Boolean Fourier basis.

$$K(x, y) = \exp(C |x - y|^2)$$
Kernel Functions.

Map \( x \) to \( \phi(x) \).

Hyperplane separator for points under \( \phi(\cdot) \).

Problem: complexity of computing in higher dimension.

Recall perceptron. Only compute dot products!

Test: \( w_t \cdot x_i > \gamma \)

\( w_t = x_i_1 + x_i_2 + x_i_3 \cdots \)

Support Vectors: \( x_i_1, x_i_2, \ldots \)

→ Support Vector Machine.

Kernel trick: compute dot products in original space.

Kernel function for mapping \( \phi(\cdot) \): \( K(x, y) = \phi(x) \cdot \phi(y) \)

\[ K(x, y) = (1 + x \cdot y)^d \quad \phi(x) = [1, \ldots, x_1, \ldots, x_i x_j \ldots]. \] Polynomial.

\[ K(x, y) = (1 + x_1 y_1)(1 + x_2 y_2) \cdots (1 + x_n y_n) \]

\( \phi(x) \)-products of all subsets. Boolean Fourier basis.

\[ K(x, y) = \exp(C|x - y|^2) \] Infinite dimensional space.

Expansion of \( e^z \).
Kernel Functions.

Map \( x \) to \( \phi(x) \).

Hyperplane separator for points under \( \phi(\cdot) \).

Problem: complexity of computing in higher dimension.

Recall perceptron. Only compute dot products!

Test: \( w_t \cdot x_i > \gamma \)

\( w_t = x_{i_1} + x_{i_2} + x_{i_3} \cdots \)

Support Vectors: \( x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \ldots \)

\( \rightarrow \) Support Vector Machine.

Kernel trick: compute dot products in original space.

Kernel function for mapping \( \phi(\cdot) \): \( K(x, y) = \phi(x) \cdot \phi(y) \)

\( K(x, y) = (1 + x \cdot y)^d \) \( \phi(x) = [1, \ldots, x_i, \ldots, x_i x_j \ldots] \). Polynomial.

\( K(x, y) = (1 + x_1 y_1)(1 + x_2 y_2) \cdots (1 + x_n y_n) \)

\( \phi(x) \) - products of all subsets. Boolean Fourier basis.

\( K(x, y) = \exp(C|x - y|^2) \) Infinite dimensional space.

Expansion of \( e^z \). Gaussian Kernel.
“http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3liCbRZPrZA”
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Maximizing \(\lambda\), only positive \(\lambda_i\) when \(f_i(x) = 0\)
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If (primal) \( x \) has value \( \nu \) \( f(x) = \nu \) and all \( f_i(x) \leq 0 \)

For all \( \lambda \geq 0 \) have \( L(x, \lambda) \leq \nu \)

Maximizing \( \lambda \), only positive \( \lambda_i \) when \( f_i(x) = 0 \)

which implies \( L(x, \lambda) \geq f(x) \)
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\]

If (primal) \(x\) has value \(v\) \(f(x) = v\) and all \(f_i(x) \leq 0\)

For all \(\lambda \geq 0\) have \(L(x, \lambda) \leq v\)
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