20.6 Kernel Machines

Our discussion of neural networks left us with a dilemma. Single-layer networks have a simple and efficient learning algorithm, but have very limited expressive power—they can learn only linear decision boundaries in the input space. Multilayer networks, on the other hand, are much more expressive—they can represent general nonlinear functions—but are very hard to train because of the abundance of local minima and the high dimensionality of the weight space. In this section, we will explore a relatively new family of learning methods called support vector machines (SVMs) or, more generally, kernel machines. To some extent, kernel machines give us the best of both worlds. That is, these methods use an efficient training algorithm and can represent complex, nonlinear functions.

The full treatment of kernel machines is beyond the scope of the book, but we can illustrate the main idea through an example. Figure 20.27(a) shows a two-dimensional input space defined by attributes \( \mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2) \), with positive examples \( (y = +1) \) inside a circular region and negative examples \( (y = -1) \) outside. Clearly, there is no linear separator for this problem. Now, suppose we re-express the input data using some computed features—i.e., we map each input vector \( \mathbf{x} \) to a new vector of feature values, \( F(x) \). In particular, let us use the three features

\[
 f_1 = x_1^2, \quad f_2 = x_2^2, \quad f_3 = \sqrt{2}x_1x_2.
\]  

We will see shortly where these came from, but, for now, just look at what happens. Figure 20.27(b) shows the data in the new, three-dimensional space defined by the three features; the data are linearly separable in this space! This phenomenon is actually fairly general: if data are mapped into a space of sufficiently high dimension, then they will always be linearly separable. Here, we used only three dimensions,\(^{14}\) but if we have \( N \) data points then, except in special cases, they will always be separable in a space of \( N - 1 \) dimensions or more (Exercise 20.21).

So, is that it? Do we just produce loads of computed features and then find a linear separator in the corresponding high-dimensional space? Unfortunately, it’s not that easy. Remember that a linear separator in a space of \( d \) dimensions is defined by an equation with \( d \) parameters, so we are in serious danger of overfitting the data if \( d \approx N \), the number of data points. (This is like overfitting data with a high-degree polynomial, which we discussed in Chapter 18.) For this reason, kernel machines usually find the optimal linear separator—the one that has the largest margin between it and the positive examples on one side and the negative examples on the other. (See Figure 20.28.) It can be shown, using arguments from computational learning theory (Section 18.5), that this separator has desirable properties in terms of robust generalization to new examples.

Now, how do we find this separator? It turns out that this is a quadratic programming optimization problem. Suppose we have examples \( \mathbf{x}_i \) with classifications \( y_i = \pm 1 \) and we want to find an optimal separator in the input space; then the quadratic programming problem

\(^{14}\) The reader may notice that we could have used just \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \), but the 3D mapping illustrates the idea better.
Figure 20.27  (a) A two-dimensional training set with positive examples as black circles and negative examples as white circles. The true decision boundary, $x_1^2 + x_2^2 \leq 1$, is also shown.  (b) The same data after mapping into a three-dimensional input space $(x_1^2, x_2^2, \sqrt{2}x_1x_2)$. The circular decision boundary in (a) becomes a linear decision boundary in three dimensions.

Figure 20.28  A close-up, projected onto the first two dimensions, of the optimal separator shown in Figure 20.27(b). The separator is shown as a heavy line, with the closest points—the support vectors—marked with circles. The margin is the separation between the positive and negative examples.
is to find values of the parameters $\alpha_i$ that maximize the expression

$$
\sum_i \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \alpha_i \alpha_j y_i y_j (x_i \cdot x_j)
$$

subject to the constraints $\alpha_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_i \alpha_i y_i = 0$. Although the derivation of this expression is not crucial to the story, it does have two important properties. First, the expression has a single global maximum that can be found efficiently. Second, the data enter the expression only in the form of dot products of pairs of points. This second property is also true of the equation for the separator itself; once the optimal $\alpha_i$s have been calculated, it is

$$
h(x) = \text{sign} \left( \sum_i \alpha_i y_i (x \cdot x_i) \right).
$$

A final important property of the optimal separator defined by this equation is that the weights $\alpha_i$ associated with each data point are zero except for those points closest to the separator—the so-called support vectors. (They are called this because they “hold up” the separating plane.) Because there are usually many fewer support vectors than data points, the effective number of parameters defining the optimal separator is usually much less than $N$.

Now, we would not usually expect to find a linear separator in the input space $x$, but it is easy to see that we can find linear separators in the high-dimensional feature space $F(x)$ simply by replacing $x_i \cdot x_j$ in Equation (20.17) with $F(x_i) \cdot F(x_j)$. This by itself is not remarkable—replacing $x$ by $F(x)$ in any learning algorithm has the required effect—but the dot product has some special properties. It turns out that $F(x_i) \cdot F(x_j)$ can often be computed without first computing $F$ for each point. In our three-dimensional feature space defined by Equation (20.16), a little bit of algebra shows that

$$
F(x_i) \cdot F(x_j) = (x_i \cdot x_j)^2.
$$

The expression $(x_i \cdot x_j)^2$ is called a kernel function, usually written as $K(x_i, x_j)$. In the kernel machine context, this means a function that can be applied to pairs of input data to evaluate dot products in some corresponding feature space. So, we can restate the claim at the beginning of this paragraph as follows: we can find linear separators in the high-dimensional feature space $F(x)$ simply by replacing $x_i \cdot x_j$ in Equation (20.17) with a kernel function $K(x_i, x_j)$. Thus, we can learn in the high-dimensional space but we compute only kernel functions rather than the full list of features for each data point.

The next step, which should by now be obvious, is to see that there’s nothing special about the kernel $K(x_i, x_j) = (x_i \cdot x_j)^2$. It corresponds to a particular higher-dimensional feature space, but other kernel functions correspond to other feature spaces. A venerable result in mathematics, Mercer’s theorem (1909), tells us that any “reasonable” \(^\text{15}\) kernel function corresponds to some feature space. These feature spaces can be very large, even for innocuous-looking kernels. For example, the polynomial kernel, $K(x_i, x_j) = (1 + x_i \cdot x_j)^d$, corresponds to a feature space whose dimension is exponential in $d$. Using such kernels in Equation (20.17), then, optimal linear separators can be found efficiently in feature spaces with billions (or, in some cases, infinitely many) dimensions. The resulting linear separators,

\(^\text{15}\) Here, “reasonable” means that the matrix $K_{ij} = K(x_i, x_j)$ is positive definite; see Appendix A.
when mapped back to the original input space, can correspond to arbitrarily wiggly, nonlinear boundaries between the positive and negative examples.

We mentioned in the preceding section that kernel machines excel at handwritten digit recognition; they are rapidly being adopted for other applications—especially those with many input features. As part of this process, many new kernels have been designed that work with strings, trees, and other non-numerical data types. It has also been observed that the kernel method can be applied not only with learning algorithms that find optimal linear separators, but also with any other algorithm that can be reformulated to work only with dot products of pairs of data points, as in Equations 20.17 and 20.18. Once this is done, the dot product is replaced by a kernel function and we have a kernelized version of the algorithm. This can be done easily for \( k \)-nearest-neighbor and perceptron learning, among others.

### 20.7 Case Study: Handwritten Digit Recognition

Recognizing handwritten digits is an important problem with many applications, including automated sorting of mail by postal code, automated reading of checks and tax returns, and data entry for hand-held computers. It is an area where rapid progress has been made, in part because of better learning algorithms and in part because of the availability of better training sets. The United States National Institute of Science and Technology (NIST) has archived a database of 60,000 labeled digits, each \( 20 \times 20 = 400 \) pixels with 8-bit grayscale values. It has become one of the standard benchmark problems for comparing new learning algorithms. Some example digits are shown in Figure 20.29.
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Figure 20.29  Examples from the NIST database of handwritten digits. Top row: examples of digits 0–9 that are easy to identify. Bottom row: more difficult examples of the same digits.

Many different learning approaches have been tried. One of the first, and probably the simplest, is the 3-nearest-neighbor classifier, which also has the advantage of requiring no training time. As a memory-based algorithm, however, it must store all 60,000 images, and its runtime performance is slow. It achieved a test error rate of 2.4%.

A single-hidden-layer neural network was designed for this problem with 400 input units (one per pixel) and 10 output units (one per class). Using cross-validation, it was found that roughly 300 hidden units gave the best performance. With full interconnections between layers, there were a total of 123,300 weights. This network achieved a 1.6% error rate.