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What is a hyperplane?

\[ \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \ldots + \beta_p X_p = 0 \]

**Figure 9.1.** The hyperplane \( 1 + 2X_1 + 3X_2 = 0 \) is shown. The blue region is the set of points for which \( 1 + 2X_1 + 3X_2 > 0 \), and the purple region is the set of points for which \( 1 + 2X_1 + 3X_2 < 0 \).
Classification using a separating hyperplane

Data matrix: \(X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}\)

\[
x_1 = \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} \\ \vdots \\ x_{1p} \end{pmatrix}, \ldots, x_n = \begin{pmatrix} x_{n1} \\ \vdots \\ x_{np} \end{pmatrix}
\]

Separating hyperplane:

\[\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \ldots + \beta_p x_{ip} > 0 \quad \text{if } y_i = 1,\]

\[\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \ldots + \beta_p x_{ip} < 0 \quad \text{if } y_i = -1.\]

or equivalently

\[y_i (\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \ldots + \beta_p x_{ip}) > 0\]
FIGURE 9.2. Left: There are two classes of observations, shown in blue and in purple, each of which has measurements on two variables. Three separating hyperplanes, out of many possible, are shown in black. Right: A separating hyperplane is shown in black. The blue and purple grid indicates the decision rule made by a classifier based on this separating hyperplane: a test observation that falls in the blue portion of the grid will be assigned to the blue class, and a test observation that falls into the purple portion of the grid will be assigned to the purple class.
Maximal margin classifier

Margin: minimal distance between an observation to the hyperplane

**FIGURE 9.3.** There are two classes of observations, shown in blue and in purple. The maximal margin hyperplane is shown as a solid line. The margin is the distance from the solid line to either of the dashed lines. The two blue points and the purple point that lie on the dashed lines are the support vectors, and the distance from those points to the hyperplane is indicated by arrows. The purple and blue grid indicates the decision rule made by a classifier based on this separating hyperplane.
Construction of the maximal margin classifier

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{maximize} & \quad M \\
\beta_0, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_p, M & \\
\text{subject to} & \quad \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_j^2 = 1, \\
y_i (\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \ldots + \beta_p x_{ip}) & \geq M \quad \forall \ i = 1, \ldots, n.
\end{align*}
\]

**Constraint:**

- The perpendicular distance from the \(i\)th observation to the hyperplane is given by
  \[y_i (\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \ldots + \beta_p x_{ip}).\]
- These constraints ensure that each observation is on the correct side of the hyperplane and at least a distance \(M\) from the hyperplane. \(M\) is the margin of our hyperplane.
Maximal margin classifier is not robust

FIGURE 9.5. Left: Two classes of observations are shown in blue and in purple, along with the maximal margin hyperplane. Right: An additional blue observation has been added, leading to a dramatic shift in the maximal margin hyperplane shown as a solid line. The dashed line indicates the maximal margin hyperplane that was obtained in the absence of this additional point.
The non-separable case

**FIGURE 9.4.** There are two classes of observations, shown in blue and in purple. In this case, the two classes are not separable by a hyperplane, and so the maximal margin classifier cannot be used.
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Support vector classifier

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{maximize} & \quad M \\
\beta_0, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_p, \epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n, M
\end{align*}
\]

subject to \( \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_j^2 = 1, \)

\( y_i(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \ldots + \beta_p x_{ip}) \geq M(1 - \epsilon_i), \)

\( \epsilon_i \geq 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} \epsilon_i \leq C, \)

- Allow some observations to be on the incorrect side of the margin
- Introduce slack variables \( \epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n. \)
  - \( \epsilon_i > 0 \) then the \( i \)th observation is on the wrong side of the margin
  - \( \epsilon_i > 1 \) then the \( i \)th observation is on the wrong side of the hyperplane
- Tuning parameter \( C \) determines the number and severity of the violations to the margin.
  - For \( C > 0 \), no more than \( C \) observations can be on the wrong side of the hyperplane.
  - \( C \) is usually chosen by cross-validation.
A support vector classifier was fit to a small data set. The hyperplane is shown as a solid line and the margins are shown as dashed lines. Purple observations: Observations 3, 4, 5, and 6 are on the correct side of the margin, observation 2 is on the margin, and observation 1 is on the wrong side of the margin. Blue observations: Observations 7 and 10 are on the correct side of the margin, observation 9 is on the margin, and observation 8 is on the wrong side of the margin. No observations are on the wrong side of the hyperplane. Right: Same as left panel with two additional points, 11 and 12. These two observations are on the wrong side of the hyperplane and the wrong side of the margin.

- Only observations that either lie on the margin or that violate the margin will affect the hyperplane, and therefore the classifier. These observations are called support vectors.
FIGURE 9.7. A support vector classifier was fit using four different values of the tuning parameter $C$ in (9.12)–(9.15). The largest value of $C$ was used in the top left panel, and smaller values were used in the top right, bottom left, and bottom right panels. When $C$ is large, then there is a high tolerance for observations being on the wrong side of the margin, and so the margin will be large. As $C$ decreases, the tolerance for observations being on the wrong side of the margin decreases, and the margin narrows.
Nonlinear boundary

FIGURE 9.8. Left: The observations fall into two classes, with a non-linear boundary between them. Right: The support vector classifier seeks a linear boundary, and consequently performs very poorly.
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Classification with nonlinear decision boundaries

Incorporate quadratic features:

\[ X_1, X_1^2, X_2, X_2^2, \ldots, X_p, X_p^2. \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{maximize} & \quad M \\
\text{subject to} & \quad y_i \left( \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_{1j} x_{ij} + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_{2j} x_{ij}^2 \right) \geq M (1 - \epsilon_i) \\
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \epsilon_i & \leq C, \quad \epsilon_i \geq 0, \quad \sum_{j=1}^{p} \sum_{k=1}^{2} \beta_{jk}^2 = 1.
\end{align*}
\]

How to enlarge the space of features?
Using inner product

**Inner product:**

\[ \langle a, b \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{r} a_i b_i. \]

\[ \langle x_i, x_i' \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{p} x_{ij} x_{i'j}. \]

**Linear support vector machine:**

\[ f(x) = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \langle x, x_i \rangle, \quad (9.18) \]

where there are \( n \) parameters \( \alpha_i, i = 1, \ldots, n \), one per training observation.

To estimate the parameters \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \) and \( \beta_0 \), all we need are the \( \binom{n}{2} \) inner products \( \langle x_i, x_i' \rangle \) between all pairs of training observations. (The notation \( \binom{n}{2} \) means \( n(n-1)/2 \), and gives the number of pairs among a set of \( n \) items.)
Support vector machine

Evaluate \( f(x) \):

Notice that in (9.18), in order to evaluate the function \( f(x) \), we need to compute the inner product between the new point \( x \) and each of the training points \( x_i \). However, it turns out that \( \alpha_i \) is nonzero only for the support vectors in the solution—that is, if a training observation is not a support vector, then its \( \alpha_i \) equals zero. So if \( S \) is the collection of indices of these support points, we can rewrite any solution function of the form (9.18) as

\[
f(x) = \beta_0 + \sum_{i \in S} \alpha_i \langle x, x_i \rangle,
\]

which typically involves far fewer terms than in (9.18). \(^2\)

Summary: all we need are inner products.
From inner product to kernel

Kernel:

\[ K(x_i, x_i'), \]

The linear kernel giving support vector classifier:

\[ K(x_i, x_i') = \sum_{j=1}^{p} x_{ij} x_{i'j}, \]

Polynomial kernel of degree \( d \):

\[ K(x_i, x_i') = (1 + \sum_{j=1}^{p} x_{ij} x_{i'j})^d. \]

Radial kernel:

\[ K(x_i, x_i') = \exp(-\gamma \sum_{j=1}^{p} (x_{ij} - x_{i'j})^2). \]
Support vector machine

Classification function:

\[ f(x) = \beta_0 + \sum_{i \in S} \alpha_i K(x, x_i). \]

**FIGURE 9.9.** Left: An SVM with a polynomial kernel of degree 3 is applied to the non-linear data from Figure 9.8, resulting in a far more appropriate decision rule. Right: An SVM with a radial kernel is applied. In this example, either kernel is capable of capturing the decision boundary.
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SVMs with multiple classes

- **One-versus-one classification**
  - $K$ classes: run SVM $\binom{K}{2}$ times for all pairs
  - The final classification is performed by assigning the test observation to the class to which it was most frequently assigned in these $\binom{K}{2}$ pairwise classifications.

- **One-versus-all classification**
  The *one-versus-all* approach is an alternative procedure for applying SVMs in the case of $K > 2$ classes. We fit $K$ SVMs, each time comparing one of the $K$ classes to the remaining $K - 1$ classes. Let $\beta_0k, \beta_{1k}, \ldots, \beta_{pk}$ denote the parameters that result from fitting an SVM comparing the $k$th class (coded as $+1$) to the others (coded as $-1$). Let $x^*$ denote a test observation. We assign the observation to the class for which $\beta_0k + \beta_{1k}x^*_1 + \beta_{2k}x^*_2 + \ldots + \beta_{pk}x^*_p$ is largest, as this amounts to a high level of confidence that the test observation belongs to the $k$th class rather than to any of the other classes.

9.5 Relationship to Logistic Regression

When SVMs were first introduced in the mid-1990s, they made quite a splash in the statistical and machine learning communities. This was due in part to their good performance, good marketing, and also to the fact that the underlying approach seemed both novel and mysterious. The idea of finding a hyperplane that separates the data as well as possible, while allowing some violations to this separation, seemed distinctly different from classical approaches for classification, such as logistic regression and linear discriminant analysis. Moreover, the idea of using a kernel to expand the feature space in order to accommodate non-linear class boundaries appeared to be a unique and valuable characteristic.

However, since that time, deep connections between SVMs and other more classical statistical methods have emerged. It turns out that one can rewrite the criterion (9.12)–(9.15) for fitting the support vector classifier $f(X) = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \ldots + \beta_pX_p$ as

$$
\text{minimize } \beta_0, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_p \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \max \left[ 0, 1 - y_i f(x_i) \right] + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_j^2 \right], \quad (9.25)
$$
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