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Motivation (1)

Feature design most difficult aspect in designing a learning system
- complex and difficult phase, e.g., structural feature representation:
- deep knowledge and intuitions are required
- design problems when the phenomenon is described by many features
Motivation (2)

- Kernel methods alleviate such problems
  - Structures represented in terms of substructures
  - High dimensional feature spaces
  - Implicit and abstract feature spaces

- Generate high number of features
  - Support Vector Machines “select” the relevant features
  - Automatic Feature engineering side-effect
Part I: Kernel Methods Theory
A simple classification problem: Text Categorization

- Politic $C_1$
- Economic $C_2$
- Sport $C_n$

Berlusconi acquires Inzaghi before elections
Text Classification Problem

Given:
- a set of target categories: \( C = \{C^1, \ldots, C^n\} \)
- the set \( T \) of documents,

define

\[
f : T \rightarrow 2^C
\]

VSM (Salton89’)
- Features are dimensions of a Vector Space.
- Documents and Categories are vectors of feature weights.

\( d \) is assigned to \( C^i \) if \( \vec{d} \cdot \vec{C}^i > th \)
More in detail

- In Text Categorization documents are word vectors

\[ \Phi(d_x) = \tilde{x} = (0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1) \]
  
  buy acquisition stocks sell market

\[ \Phi(d_z) = \tilde{z} = (0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 0) \]
  
  buy company stocks sell

- The dot product \( \tilde{x} \cdot \tilde{z} \) counts the number of features in common

- This provides a sort of similarity
Linear Classifier

- The equation of a hyperplane is
  \[ f(\vec{x}) = \vec{x} \cdot \vec{w} + b = 0, \quad \vec{x}, \vec{w} \in \mathbb{R}^n, b \in \mathbb{R} \]
- \( \vec{x} \) is the vector representing the classifying example
- \( \vec{w} \) is the gradient of the hyperplane
- The classification function is
  \[ h(x) = \text{sign}(f(x)) \]
The main idea of Kernel Functions

- Mapping vectors in a space where they are linearly separable $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \phi(\mathbf{x})$
A mapping example

- Given two masses $m_1$ and $m_2$, one is constrained
- Apply a force $f_a$ to the mass $m_1$
- Experiments
  - Features $m_1$, $m_2$ and $f_a$
- We want to learn a classifier that tells when a mass $m_1$ will get far away from $m_2$
- If we consider the Gravitational Newton Law

  $$f(m_1, m_2, r) = C \frac{m_1 m_2}{r^2}$$

- we need to find when $f(m_1, m_2, r) < f_a$
A mapping example (2)

\[ \tilde{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \rightarrow \phi(\tilde{x}) = (\phi_1(\tilde{x}), \ldots, \phi_n(\tilde{x})) \]

- The gravitational law is not linear so we need to change space

\[ (f_a, m_1, m_2, r) \rightarrow (k, x, y, z) = (\ln f_a, \ln m_1, \ln m_2, \ln r) \]

- As

\[ \ln f(m_1, m_2, r) = \ln C + \ln m_1 + \ln m_2 - 2 \ln r = c + x + y - 2z \]

- We need the hyperplane

\[ \ln f_a - \ln m_1 - \ln m_2 + 2 \ln r - \ln C = 0 \]

\[(\ln m_1, \ln m_2, -2\ln r) \cdot (x, y, z) - \ln f_a + \ln C = 0, \text{ we can decide without error if the mass will get far away or not} \]
A kernel-based Machine Perceptron training

\[ \tilde{w}_0 \leftarrow \tilde{0}; b_0 \leftarrow 0; k \leftarrow 0; R \leftarrow \max_{1 \leq i \leq l} \| \tilde{x}_i \| \]

do
    for i = 1 to \( \ell \)
        if \( y_i (\tilde{w}_k \cdot \tilde{x}_i + b_k) \leq 0 \) then
            \[ \tilde{w}_{k+1} = \tilde{w}_k + \eta y_i \tilde{x}_i \]
            \[ b_{k+1} = b_k + \eta y_i R^2 \]
            \[ k = k + 1 \]
        endif
    endfor
while an error is found
return k, (\( \tilde{w}_k \), \( b_k \))
Novikoff’s Theorem

Let $S$ be a non-trivial training-set and let

$$R = \max_{1 \leq i \leq l} \| x_i \|.$$ 

Let us suppose there is a vector $w^*, \| w^* \| = 1$ and

$$y_i(\langle w^*, x_i \rangle + b^*) \geq \gamma, \quad i = 1, \ldots, l,$$

with $\gamma > 0$. Then the maximum number of errors of the perceptron is:

$$t^* = \left( \frac{2R}{\gamma} \right)^2.$$
Dual Representation for Classification

- In each step of perceptron only training data is added with a certain weight
  \[ \vec{w} = \sum_{j=1..\ell} \alpha_j y_j \vec{x}_j \]

- So the classification function
  \[ \text{sgn}(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{x} + b) = \text{sgn} \left( \sum_{j=1..\ell} \alpha_j y_j \vec{x}_j \cdot \vec{x} + b \right) \]

- Note that data only appears in the scalar product
as well as the updating function

\[ \text{if } y_i( \sum_{j=1..\ell} \alpha_j y_j \bar{x}_j \cdot \bar{x}_i + b) \leq 0 \text{ then } \alpha_i = \alpha_i + \eta \]

The learning rate $\eta$ only affects the re-scaling of the hyperplane, it does not affect the algorithm, so we can fix $\eta = 1$. 
**Dual Perceptron algorithm and Kernel functions**

- We can rewrite the classification function as

\[ h(x) = \text{sgn}(\tilde{w}_\phi \cdot \phi(x) + b_\phi) = \text{sgn}(\sum_{j=1..\ell} \alpha_j y_j \phi(x_j) \cdot \phi(x) + b_\phi) = \]

\[ = \text{sgn}(\sum_{i=1..\ell} \alpha_j y_j k(x_j, x) + b_\phi) \]

- As well as the updating function

\[ \text{if } y_i \left( \sum_{j=1..\ell} \alpha_j y_j k(x_j, x) + b_\phi \right) \leq 0 \text{ allora } \alpha_i = \alpha_i + \eta \]
Support Vector Machines

- Hard-margin SVMs
- Soft-margin SVMs
Which hyperplane do we choose?
IDEA 1: Select the hyperplane with maximum margin
Support Vectors

Var_1

Var_2
Support Vector Machines

The margin is equal to \( \frac{2|k|}{||w||} \)
Support Vector Machines

The margin is equal to \( \frac{2|k|}{\|w\|} \)

We need to solve

\[
\max \frac{2|k|}{\|\vec{w}\|} \\
\vec{w} \cdot \vec{x} + b \geq +k, \text{ if } \vec{x} \text{ is positive} \\
\vec{w} \cdot \vec{x} + b \leq -k, \text{ if } \vec{x} \text{ is negative}
\]
Support Vector Machines

There is a scale for which $k = 1$.

The problem transforms in:

$$\max \frac{2}{\|\tilde{w}\|} \quad \begin{align*}
\tilde{w} \cdot \tilde{x} + b &\geq +1, \text{ if } \tilde{x} \text{ is positive} \\
\tilde{w} \cdot \tilde{x} + b &\leq -1, \text{ if } \tilde{x} \text{ is negative}
\end{align*}$$
Final Formulation

\[
\begin{align*}
\max & \quad \frac{2}{\| \vec{w} \|} \\
\vec{w} \cdot \vec{x}_i + b & \geq +1, \quad y_i = 1 \\
\vec{w} \cdot \vec{x}_i + b & \leq -1, \quad y_i = -1
\end{align*}
\]

\[\Rightarrow\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\max & \quad \frac{2}{\| \vec{w} \|} \\
y_i (\vec{w} \cdot \vec{x}_i + b) & \geq 1
\end{align*}
\]

\[\Rightarrow\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\min & \quad \frac{\| \vec{w} \|}{2} \\
y_i (\vec{w} \cdot \vec{x}_i + b) & \geq 1
\end{align*}
\]
Optimization Problem

- Optimal Hyperplane:
  - Minimize \( \tau(\vec{w}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\vec{w}\|^2 \)
  - Subject to \( y_i ((\vec{\tilde{w}} \cdot \vec{x}_i) + b) \geq 1, i = 1, \ldots, l \)

- The dual problem is simpler
Lagrangian Definition

**Def. 2.24** Let \( f(\vec{w}) \), \( h_i(\vec{w}) \) and \( g_i(\vec{w}) \) be the objective function, the equality constraints and the inequality constraints (i.e. \( \geq \)) of an optimization problem, and let \( L(\vec{w}, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{\beta}) \) be its Lagrangian, defined as follows:

\[
L(\vec{w}, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{\beta}) = f(\vec{w}) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i g_i(\vec{w}) + \sum_{i=1}^{l} \beta_i h_i(\vec{w})
\]
Dual Optimization Problem

The *Lagrangian dual problem* of the above primal problem is

\[
\text{maximize} \quad \theta(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) \\
\text{subject to} \quad \tilde{\alpha} \geq \tilde{0}
\]

where \( \theta(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) = \inf_{w \in W} L(w, \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) \)
Dual Transformation

- Given the Lagrangian associated with our problem

\[ L(\vec{w}, b, \vec{\alpha}) = \frac{1}{2} \vec{w} \cdot \vec{w} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i [y_i (\vec{w} \cdot \vec{x}_i + b) - 1] \]

- To solve the dual problem we need to evaluate:

\[ \theta(\vec{\alpha}, \vec{\beta}) = \inf_{\vec{w} \in W} L(\vec{w}, \vec{\alpha}, \vec{\beta}) \]

- Let us impose the derivatives to 0, with respect to \( \vec{w} \)

\[ \frac{\partial L(\vec{w}, b, \vec{\alpha})}{\partial \vec{w}} = \vec{w} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i \alpha_i \vec{x}_i = \vec{0} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \vec{w} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i \alpha_i \vec{x}_i \]
Dual Transformation (cont’d)

- and wrt $b$

$$\frac{\partial L(\vec{w}, b, \vec{\alpha})}{\partial b} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i \alpha_i = 0$$

- Then we substituted them in the objective function

$$L(\vec{w}, b, \vec{\alpha}) = \frac{1}{2} \vec{w} \cdot \vec{w} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i [y_i (\vec{w} \cdot \vec{x}_i + b) - 1] =$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} y_i y_j \alpha_i \alpha_j \vec{x}_i \cdot \vec{x}_j - \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} y_i y_j \alpha_i \alpha_j \vec{x}_i \cdot \vec{x}_j + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} y_i y_j \alpha_i \alpha_j \vec{x}_i \cdot \vec{x}_j$$
The Final Dual Optimization Problem

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{maximize} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} y_i y_j \alpha_i \alpha_j \vec{x}_i \cdot \vec{x}_j \\
\text{subject to} \quad & \alpha_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m \\
& \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i \alpha_i = 0
\end{align*}
\]
Khun-Tucker Theorem

- Necessary and sufficient conditions to optimality

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial L(\overrightarrow{w}^*, \overrightarrow{\alpha}^*, \overrightarrow{\beta}^*)}{\partial \overrightarrow{w}} &= \vec{0} \\
\frac{\partial L(\overrightarrow{w}^*, \overrightarrow{\alpha}^*, \overrightarrow{\beta}^*)}{\partial \overrightarrow{b}} &= \vec{0} \\
\alpha_i^* g_i(\overrightarrow{w}^*) &= 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m \\
g_i(\overrightarrow{w}^*) &\leq 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m \\
\alpha_i^* &\geq 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m
\end{align*}
\]
Properties coming from constraints

- Lagrange constraints: \( \sum_{i=1}^{l} a_i y_i = 0, \quad \vec{w} = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \alpha_i y_i \vec{x}_i \)

- Karush-Kuhn-Tucker constraints

\[ \alpha_i \cdot [y_i (\vec{x}_i \cdot \vec{w} + b) - 1] = 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, l \]

- Support Vectors have \( \alpha_i \) not null

- To evaluate \( b \), we can apply the following equation

\[ b^* = -\frac{\vec{w}^* \cdot \vec{x}^+ + \vec{w}^* \cdot \vec{x}^-}{2} \]
Soft Margin SVMs

Some errors are allowed but they should penalize the objective function.

\[ \bar{w} \cdot \bar{x} + b = 1 \]
\[ \bar{w} \cdot \bar{x} + b = -1 \]
\[ \bar{w} \cdot \bar{x} + b = 0 \]

\[ \xi_i \] slack variables are added
Soft Margin SVMs

The new constraints are

\[ y_i (\bar{w} \cdot \bar{x}_i + b) \geq 1 - \xi_i \]

\[ \forall \bar{x}_i \text{ where } \xi_i \geq 0 \]

The objective function penalizes the incorrect classified examples

\[ \min \frac{1}{2} \| \bar{w} \|^2 + C \sum_i \xi_i \]

\( C \) is the trade-off between margin and the error
Dual formulation

\[
\begin{align*}
&\min \quad \frac{1}{2}||\vec{w}|| + C \sum_{i=1}^{m} \xi_i^2 \\
y_i(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{x}_i + b) \geq 1 - \xi_i, \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, m \\
&\xi_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m
\end{align*}
\]

\[
L(\vec{w}, b, \vec{\xi}, \vec{\alpha}) = \frac{1}{2} \vec{w} \cdot \vec{w} + \frac{C}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \xi_i^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i [y_i(\vec{w} \cdot \vec{x}_i + b) - 1 + \xi_i],
\]

- By deriving wrt $\vec{w}, \vec{\xi}$ and $b$
Partial Derivatives

\[
\frac{\partial L(\vec{w}, b, \vec{\xi}, \vec{\alpha})}{\partial \vec{w}} = \vec{w} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i \alpha_i \vec{x}_i = \vec{0} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \vec{w} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i \alpha_i \vec{x}_i
\]

\[
\frac{\partial L(\vec{w}, b, \vec{\xi}, \vec{\alpha})}{\partial \vec{\xi}} = C\vec{\xi} - \vec{\alpha} = \vec{0}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial L(\vec{w}, b, \vec{\xi}, \vec{\alpha})}{\partial b} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i \alpha_i = 0
\]
Substitution in the objective function

\[
\begin{align*}
&= \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} y_i y_j \alpha_i \alpha_j \bar{x}_i \cdot \bar{x}_j + \frac{1}{2C} \bar{\alpha} \cdot \bar{\alpha} - \frac{1}{C'} \bar{\alpha} \cdot \bar{\alpha} = \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} y_i y_j \alpha_i \alpha_j \bar{x}_i \cdot \bar{x}_j - \frac{1}{2C} \bar{\alpha} \cdot \bar{\alpha} = \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} y_i y_j \alpha_i \alpha_j (\bar{x}_i \cdot \bar{x}_j + \frac{1}{C} \delta_{ij}),
\end{align*}
\]

\(- \delta_{ij} \) of Kronecker
Final dual optimization problem

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} y_i y_j \alpha_i \alpha_j (\vec{x}_i \cdot \vec{x}_j + \frac{1}{C} \delta_{ij}) \]

\[ \alpha_i \geq 0, \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, m \]

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i \alpha_i = 0 \]
Soft Margin Support Vector Machines

\[
\min \frac{1}{2} \| \tilde{w} \|^2 + C \sum \xi_i \quad \sum y_i (\tilde{w} \cdot \tilde{x}_i + b) \geq 1 - \xi_i \quad \forall \tilde{x}_i \\
\xi_i \geq 0
\]

- The algorithm tries to keep $\xi_i$ low and maximize the margin
- NB: The number of error is not directly minimized (NP-complete problem); the distances from the hyperplane are minimized
- If $C \to \infty$, the solution tends to the one of the hard-margin algorithm
- \textbf{Attention !!!:} if $C = 0$ we get $\| \tilde{w} \| = 0$, since $y_i b \geq 1 - \xi_i \quad \forall \tilde{x}_i$
- If $C$ increases the number of error decreases. When $C$ tends to infinite the number of errors must be 0, i.e. the hard-margin formulation
Robusteness of *Soft vs. Hard Margin SVMs*

\[ \xi \]

\[ \text{Var}_1 \]

\[ \text{Var}_2 \]

\[ \bar{w} \cdot \bar{x} + b = 0 \]

Soft Margin SVM

Hard Margin SVM
Kernels in Support Vector Machines

- In Soft Margin SVMs we maximize:

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} y_i y_j \alpha_i \alpha_j (\vec{x}_i \cdot \vec{x}_j + \frac{1}{C} \delta_{ij})
\]

- By using kernel functions we rewrite the problem as:

\[
\begin{cases}
\text{maximize} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{m} y_i y_j \alpha_i \alpha_j (k(o_i, o_j) + \frac{1}{C} \delta_{ij}) \\
\alpha_i \geq 0, \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, m \\
\sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i \alpha_i = 0
\end{cases}
\]
Kernel Function Definition

**Def. 2.26** A kernel is a function $k$, such that $\forall \vec{x}, \vec{z} \in X$

$$k(\vec{x}, \vec{z}) = \phi(\vec{x}) \cdot \phi(\vec{z})$$

where $\phi$ is a mapping from $X$ to an (inner product) feature space.

- Kernels are the product of mapping functions such as

$$\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \vec{\phi}(\vec{x}) = (\phi_1(\vec{x}), \phi_2(\vec{x}), ..., \phi_m(\vec{x})) \in \mathbb{R}^m$$
The Kernel Gram Matrix

With KM-based learning, the **sole** information used from the training data set is the Kernel Gram Matrix. If the kernel is valid, $K$ is symmetric definite-positive.

$$K_{training} = \begin{bmatrix}
k(x_1, x_1) & k(x_1, x_2) & \cdots & k(x_1, x_m) \\
k(x_2, x_1) & k(x_2, x_2) & \cdots & k(x_2, x_m) \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
k(x_m, x_1) & k(x_m, x_2) & \cdots & k(x_m, x_m)
\end{bmatrix}$$
Valid Kernels

Def. B.11 Eigen Values
Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m} \times \mathbb{R}^{n}$, an eigenvalue $\lambda$ and an eigenvector $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n} - \{\vec{0}\}$ are such that

$$A\vec{x} = \lambda \vec{x}$$

Def. B.12 Symmetric Matrix
A square matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \times \mathbb{R}^{n}$ is symmetric iff $A_{ij} = A_{ji}$ for $i \neq j$ and $i = 1, \ldots, m$ and $j = 1, \ldots, n$, i.e. iff $A = A'$.

Def. B.13 Positive (Semi-) definite Matrix
A square matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \times \mathbb{R}^{n}$ is said to be positive (semi-) definite if its eigenvalues are all positive (non-negative).
Valid Kernels cont’d

Proposition 2.27 (Mercer’s conditions)
Let $X$ be a finite input space with $K(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$ a symmetric function on $X$. Then $K(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$ is a kernel function if and only if the matrix

$$k(\bar{x}, \bar{z}) = \phi(\bar{x}) \cdot \phi(\bar{z})$$

is positive semi-definite (has non-negative eigenvalues).

- If the matrix is positive semi-definite then we can find a mapping $\phi$ implementing the kernel function
Mercer’s Theorem (finite space)

- Let us consider \( K = \left( K(\bar{x}_i, \bar{x}_j) \right)_{i,j=1}^n \)

- \( K \) symmetric \( \Rightarrow \exists \ V: K = V\Lambda V' \) for Takagi factorization of a complex-symmetric matrix, where:
  - \( \Lambda \) is the diagonal matrix of the eigenvalues \( \lambda_t \) of \( K \)
  - \( \vec{v}_t = \left( v_{ti} \right)_{i=1}^n \) are the eigenvectors, i.e. the columns of \( V \)
  - Let us assume lambda values non-negative

\[ \phi: \bar{x}_i \rightarrow \left( \sqrt{\lambda_t} v_{ti} \right)_{t=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n, \ i = 1, \ldots, n \]
Mercer’s Theorem
(sufficient conditions)

- Therefore

\[ \Phi(\tilde{x}_i) \cdot \Phi(\tilde{x}_j) = \sum_{t=1}^{n} \lambda_t v_{ti} v_{tj} = (V\Lambda V')_{ij} = K_{ij} = K(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{x}_j) \]

- which implies that K is a kernel function
Mercer’s Theorem  
(necessary conditions)

- Suppose we have negative eigenvalues \( \lambda_s \) and eigenvectors \( \vec{v}_s \) the following point

\[
\vec{z} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_{si} \Phi(\vec{x}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_{si} \left( \sqrt{\lambda_t} v_{ti} \right) = \sqrt{\Lambda} V' \vec{v}_s
\]

has the following norm:

\[
\|\vec{z}\|^2 = \vec{z} \cdot \vec{z} = \sqrt{\Lambda} V' \vec{v}_s \sqrt{\Lambda} V' \vec{v}_s = \vec{v}_s' V \sqrt{\Lambda} \sqrt{\Lambda} V' \vec{v}_s = \\
\vec{v}_s' K \vec{v}_s = \vec{v}_s' \lambda_s \vec{v}_s = \lambda_s \|\vec{v}_s\|^2 < 0
\]

this contradicts the geometry of the space.
Is it a valid kernel?

- It may not be a kernel so we can use $M' \cdot M$

**Proposition B.14** Let $A$ be a symmetric matrix. Then $A$ is positive (semi-)definite iff for any vector $\vec{x} \neq 0$

$$\vec{x}'A\vec{x} > 0 \quad (\geq 0).$$

From the previous proposition it follows that: If we find a decomposition $A$ in $M' M$, then $A$ is semi-definite positive matrix as

$$\vec{x}'A\vec{x} = \vec{x}' M' M \vec{x} = (M \vec{x})'(M \vec{x}) = M \vec{x} \cdot M \vec{x} = ||M \vec{x}||^2 \geq 0.$$
Valid Kernel operations

- \( k(x,z) = k_1(x,z) + k_2(x,z) \)
- \( k(x,z) = k_1(x,z) \times k_2(x,z) \)
- \( k(x,z) = \alpha k_1(x,z) \)
- \( k(x,z) = f(x)f(z) \)
- \( k(x,z) = k_1(\phi(x), \phi(z)) \)
- \( k(x,z) = x'Bz \)
Basic Kernels for unstructured data

- Linear Kernel
- Polynomial Kernel
- Lexical kernel
- String Kernel
Linear Kernel

- In Text Categorization documents are word vectors

\[ \Phi(d_x) = \vec{x} = (0,\ldots,1,\ldots,0,\ldots,1,\ldots,0,\ldots,1,\ldots,0,\ldots,1) \]

buy acquisition stocks sell market

\[ \Phi(d_z) = \vec{z} = (0,\ldots,1,\ldots,0,\ldots,1,\ldots,0,\ldots,1,\ldots,0,\ldots,1,\ldots,0) \]

buy company stocks sell

- The dot product \( \vec{x} \cdot \vec{z} \) counts the number of features in common

- This provides a sort of similarity
Feature Conjunction (polynomial Kernel)

- The initial vectors are mapped in a higher space
  \[ \Phi(<x_1, x_2>) \mapsto (x_1^2, x_2^2, \sqrt{2}x_1x_2, \sqrt{2}x_1, \sqrt{2}x_2, 1) \]

- More expressive, as \((x_1x_2)\) encodes \textbf{Stock+Market vs. Downtown+Market} features

- We can smartly compute the scalar product as
  \[
  \Phi(\tilde{x}) \cdot \Phi(\tilde{z}) = (x_1^2, x_2^2, \sqrt{2}x_1x_2, \sqrt{2}x_1, \sqrt{2}x_2, 1) \cdot (z_1^2, z_2^2, \sqrt{2}z_1z_2, \sqrt{2}z_1, \sqrt{2}z_2, 1) = \\
  = x_1^2z_1^2 + x_2^2z_2^2 + 2x_1x_2z_1z_2 + 2x_1z_1 + 2x_2z_2 + 1 = \\
  = (x_1z_1 + x_2z_2 + 1)^2 = (\tilde{x} \cdot \tilde{z} + 1)^2 = K_{\text{Poly}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z})
  \]
Document Similarity

Doc 1

industry

telephone

market

Doc 2

company

product
Lexical Semantic Kernel [CoNLL 2005]

- The document similarity is the SK function:

\[
SK(d_1, d_2) = \sum_{w_1 \in d_1, w_2 \in d_2} s(w_1, w_2)
\]

- where \( s \) is any similarity function between words, e.g. WordNet [Basili et al., 2005] similarity or LSA [Cristianini et al., 2002]

- Good results when training data is small
Using character sequences

\( \phi("bank") = \bar{x} = (0,..,1,..,0,..,1,..,0,\ldots,1,..,0,..,1,..,0,..,1,..,0) \)

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{bank} & \text{ank} & \text{bnk} & \text{bk} & \text{b} \\
\end{array}
\]

\( \phi("rank") = \bar{z} = (1,..,0,..,0,..,1,..,0,\ldots,0,..,1,..,0,..,1,..,0,..,1) \)

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{rank} & \text{ank} & \text{rnk} & \text{rk} & \text{r} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[ \bar{x} \cdot \bar{z} \text{ counts the number of common substrings} \]

\[ \bar{x} \cdot \bar{z} = \phi("bank") \cdot \phi("rank") = k("bank","rank") \]
String Kernel

- Given two strings, the number of matches between their substrings is evaluated.
- E.g. Bank and Rank
  - B, a, n, k, Ba, Ban, Bank, Bk, an, ank, nk,..
  - R, a, n, k, Ra, Ran, Rank, Rk, an, ank, nk,..
- String kernel over sentences and texts
- Huge space but there are efficient algorithms
Formal Definition

\[ s = s_1, \ldots, s_{|s|} \]

\[ \vec{I} = (i_1, \ldots, i_{|u|}) \quad u = s[\vec{I}] \]

\[ \phi_u(s) = \sum_{\vec{I}: u = s[\vec{I}]} \lambda^{l(\vec{I})}, \text{ where } l(\vec{I}) = i_{|u|} - i_1 + 1 \]

\[ K(s, t) = \sum_{u \in \Sigma^*} \phi_u(s) \cdot \phi_u(t) = \sum_{u \in \Sigma^*} \sum_{\vec{I}: u = s[\vec{I}]} \lambda^{l(\vec{I})} \sum_{\vec{J}: u = t[\vec{J}]} \lambda^{l(\vec{J})} = \]

\[ = \sum_{u \in \Sigma^*} \sum_{\vec{I}: u = s[\vec{I}]} \sum_{\vec{J}: u = t[\vec{J}]} \lambda^{l(\vec{I})+l(\vec{J})}, \text{ where } \Sigma^* = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \Sigma^n \]
Kernel between Bank and Rank

B, a, n, k, Ba, Ban, Bank, an, ank, nk, Bn, Bnk, Bk and ak are the substrings of \textit{Bank}.

R, a, n, k, Ra, Ran, Rank, an, ank, nk, Rn, Rnk, Rk and ak are the substrings of \textit{Rank}. 
An example of string kernel computation

- $\phi_a(Bank) = \phi_a(Rank) = \lambda^{(i_1-i_1+1)} = \lambda^{(2-2+1)} = \lambda$

- $\phi_n(Bank) = \phi_n(Rank) = \lambda^{(i_1-i_1+1)} = \lambda^{(3-3+1)} = \lambda$

- $\phi_k(Bank) = \phi_k(Rank) = \lambda^{(i_1-i_1+1)} = \lambda^{(4-4+1)} = \lambda$

- $\phi_{an}(Bank) = \phi_{an}(Rank) = \lambda^{(i_2-i_1+1)} = \lambda^{(3-2+1)} = \lambda^2$

- $\phi_{ank}(Bank) = \phi_{ank}(Rank) = \lambda^{(i_3-i_1+1)} = \lambda^{(4-2+1)} = \lambda^3$

- $\phi_{nk}(Bank) = \phi_{nk}(Rank) = \lambda^{(i_2-i_1+1)} = \lambda^{(4-3+1)} = \lambda^2$

- $\phi_{ak}(Bank) = \phi_{ak}(Rank) = \lambda^{(i_2-i_1+1)} = \lambda^{(4-2+1)} = \lambda^3$

$K(Bank, Rank) = (\lambda, \lambda, \lambda, \lambda^2, \lambda^3, \lambda^2, \lambda^3) \cdot (\lambda, \lambda, \lambda, \lambda^2, \lambda^3, \lambda^2, \lambda^3)$

$= 3\lambda^2 + 2\lambda^4 + 2\lambda^6$
Efficient Evaluation

- Dynamic Programming technique
- Evaluate the spectrum string kernels
- Substrings of size $p$
- Sum the contribution of the different spectra
Efficient Evaluation

Given two sequences $s_1a$ and $s_2b$, we define:

$$D_p(|s_1|, |s_2|) = \sum_{i=1}^{s_1} \sum_{r=1}^{s_2} \lambda^{s_1-i + s_2-r} \times SK_{p-1}(s_1[1:i], s_2[1:r]),$$

$s_1[1:i]$ and $s_2[1:r]$ are their subsequences from 1 to $i$ and 1 to $r$.

$$SK_p(s_1a, s_2b) = \begin{cases} \lambda^2 \times D_p(|s_1|, |s_2|) & \text{if } a = b; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$D_p$ satisfies the recursive relation:

$$D_p(k, l) = \begin{cases} \lambda D_p(k, l - 1) + \\ + \lambda D_p(k - 1, l) - \lambda^2 D_p(k - 1, l - 1) \end{cases}$$
An example: SK(“Gatta”, ”Cata”)

- First, evaluate the SK with size $p=1$, i.e. “a”, “a”, “t”, “t”, “a”, “a”
- Store this in the table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$SK_{p=1}$</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\lambda^2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\lambda^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\lambda^2$</td>
<td>$\lambda^2$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\lambda^2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\lambda^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluating DP2

- Evaluate the weight of the string of size $p$ in case a character will be matched.
- This is done by multiplying the double summation by the number of substrings of size $p-1$.

\[
D_p(|s_1|, |s_2|) = \sum_{i=1}^{|s_1|} \sum_{r=1}^{|s_2|} \lambda^{|s_1|-i+|s_2|-r} \times SK_{p-1}(s_1[1:i], s_2[1:r])
\]
Evaluating the Predictive DP on strings of size 2 (second row)

- Let's consider substrings of size 2 and suppose that:
  - we have matched the first “a”
  - we will match the next character that we will add to the two strings

- We compute the weights of matches above at different string positions with some not-yet known character “?”

- If the match occurs immediately after “a” the weight will be $\lambda^{1+1} \times \lambda^{1+1} = \lambda^4$ and we store just $\lambda^2$ in the DP entry in [“a”, ”a”]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DP$_2$</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\lambda^2$</td>
<td>$\lambda^3$</td>
<td>$\lambda^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\lambda^3$</td>
<td>$\lambda^4 + \lambda^2$</td>
<td>$\lambda^5 + \lambda^3 + \lambda^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluating the DP wrt different positions (second row)

- If the match for “gatta” occurs after “t” the weight will be $\lambda^{1+2} \times \lambda^2 = \lambda^5$ since the substring for it will be with “a☐?”
- We write such prediction in the entry [“a”,”t”]
- Same rationale for a match after the second “t”: we have the substring “a☐☐?” (matching with “a?” from “catta”) for a weight of $\lambda^{3+1} \times \lambda^2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DP₂</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\lambda^2$</td>
<td>$\lambda^3$</td>
<td>$\lambda^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\lambda^3$</td>
<td>$\lambda^4 + \lambda^2$</td>
<td>$\lambda^5 + \lambda^3 + \lambda^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluating the DP wrt different positions (third row)

- If the match occurs after “t” of “cata”, the weight will be $\lambda^{2+1}$ ($x \lambda^2 = \lambda^5$) since it will be with the string “a☐?”, with a weight of $\lambda^3$

- If the match occurs after “t” of both “gatta” and “cata”, there are two ways to compose substring of size two: “a☐?” with weight $\lambda^4$ or “t?” with weight $\lambda^2 \Rightarrow$ the total is $\lambda^2 + \lambda^4$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DP$_2$</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\lambda^2$</td>
<td>$\lambda^3$</td>
<td>$\lambda^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\lambda^3$</td>
<td>$\lambda^4 + \lambda^2$</td>
<td>$\lambda^5 + \lambda^3 + \lambda^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final case is a match after the last “t” of both “cat” and “gatta”

There are three possible substrings of “gatta”:
- “a☐☐?”,”t☐?”,”t?” for “gatta” with weight $\lambda^3$, $\lambda^2$ or $\lambda$, respectively.

There are two possible substrings of “cata”
- “a☐?”,”t?” with weight $\lambda^2$ and $\lambda$
- Their match gives weights: $\lambda^5$, $\lambda^3$, $\lambda^2 \Rightarrow$ by summing: $\lambda^5 + \lambda^3 + \lambda^2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>g</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\lambda^2$</td>
<td>$\lambda^3$</td>
<td>$\lambda^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\lambda^3$</td>
<td>$\lambda^4 + \lambda^2$</td>
<td>$\lambda^5 + \lambda^3 + \lambda^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluating SK of size 2 using DP2

\[
SK_p(s_1a, s_2b) = \begin{cases} 
\lambda^2 \times D_p(|s_1|, |s_2|) & \text{if } a = b; \\
0 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

- The number (weight) of substrings of size 2 between “gat” and “cat” is \(\lambda^4 = \lambda^2\) ([“a”,”a”] entry of DP) \(\times \lambda^2\) (cost of one character), where \(a = \text{“t”}\) and \(b = \text{“t”}\).

- Between “gatta” and “cata” is \(\lambda^7 + \lambda^5 + \lambda^4\), i.e the matches of “a☐☐a”, “t☐a”, “ta” with “a☐a” and “ta”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DP2</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\lambda^2)</td>
<td>(\lambda^3)</td>
<td>(\lambda^4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\lambda^3)</td>
<td>(\lambda^4 + \lambda^2)</td>
<td>(\lambda^5 + \lambda^3 + \lambda^2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SK_{p=2}</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\lambda^4)</td>
<td>(\lambda^5)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\lambda^7 + \lambda^5 + \lambda^4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tree kernels

- Subtree, Subset Tree, Partial Tree kernels
- Efficient computation
Example of a parse tree

“John delivers a talk in Rome”
The Syntactic Tree Kernel (STK)
[Collins and Duffy, 2002]

NP  D  N
VP  V
  delivers
    a  talk
    NP  D  N
      V  NP
The overall fragment set
The overall fragment set

Children are not divided
Explicit kernel space

\[ \phi(T_x) = \tilde{x} = (0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0) \]

\[ \phi(T_z) = \tilde{z} = (1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 0) \]

\[ \tilde{x} \cdot \tilde{z} \text{ counts the number of common substructures} \]
Efficient evaluation of the scalar product

\[ \bar{x} \cdot \bar{z} = \phi(T_x) \cdot \phi(T_z) = K(T_x, T_z) = \]

\[ = \sum_{n_x \in T_x} \sum_{n_z \in T_z} \Delta(n_x, n_z) \]
Efficient evaluation of the scalar product

\[ \bar{x} \cdot \bar{z} = \phi(T_x) \cdot \phi(T_z) = K(T_x, T_z) = \]

\[ = \sum_{n_x \in T_x} \sum_{n_z \in T_z} \Delta(n_x, n_z) \]

- [Collins and Duffy, ACL 2002] evaluate \( \Delta \) in \( O(n^2) \):

\[ \Delta(n_x, n_z) = 0, \text{ if the productions are different else} \]

\[ \Delta(n_x, n_z) = 1, \text{ if pre-terminals else} \]

\[ \Delta(n_x, n_z) = \prod_{j=1}^{nc(n_x)} (1 + \Delta(ch(n_x, j), ch(n_z, j))) \]
Other Adjustments

- Decay factor

\[ \Delta(n_x, n_z) = \lambda, \quad \text{if pre-terminals} \]
\[ \Delta(n_x, n_z) = \lambda \prod_{j=1}^{nc(n_x)} (1 + \Delta(ch(n_x, j), ch(n_z, j))) \]

- Normalization

\[ K'(T_x, T_z) = \frac{K(T_x, T_z)}{\sqrt{K(T_x, T_x) \times K(T_z, T_z)}} \]
SubTree (ST) Kernel [Vishwanathan and Smola, 2002]
Given the equation for the SST kernel

$$\Delta(n_x, n_z) = 0, \text{ if the productions are different else}$$

$$\Delta(n_x, n_z) = 1, \text{ if pre-terminals else}$$

$$\Delta(n_x, n_z) = \prod_{j=1}^{nc(n_x)} (1 + \Delta(ch(n_x, j), ch(n_z, j)))$$
Evaluation

Given the equation for the SST kernel

\[ \Delta(n_x, n_z) = \begin{cases} 
0, & \text{if the productions are different} \\
1, & \text{if pre-terminal} \\
\prod_{j=1}^{nc(n_x)} \Delta(ch(n_x, j), ch(n_z, j)), & \text{else}
\end{cases} \]
Fast Evaluation of STK [Moschitti, EACL 2006]

\[ K(T_x, T_z) = \sum_{\langle n_x, n_z \rangle \in NP} \Delta(n_x, n_z) \]

\[ NP = \left\{ \langle n_x, n_z \rangle \in T_x \times T_z : \Delta(n_x, n_z) \neq 0 \right\} = \]

\[ = \left\{ \langle n_x, n_z \rangle \in T_x \times T_z : P(n_x) = P(n_z) \right\}, \]

where \( P(n_x) \) and \( P(n_z) \) are the production rules used at nodes \( n_x \) and \( n_z \)
function Evaluate_Pair_Set(Tree $T_1$, $T_2$) returns NODE_PAIR_SET;
LIST $L_1$, $L_2$;
NODE_PAIR_SET $N_p$;
begin

$L_1 = T_1$.ordered_list;
$L_2 = T_2$.ordered_list; /*	extit{the lists were sorted at loading time}*/
n_1 = extract($L_1$); /*	extit{get the head element and}*/
$n_2 = extract(L_2);$ /*	extit{remove it from the list}*/
while ($n_1$ and $n_2$ are not NULL)
   if (production_of($n_1$) > production_of($n_2$))
      then $n_2 = extract(L_2)$;
   else if (production_of($n_1$) < production_of($n_2$))
      then $n_1 = extract(L_1)$;
   else
      while (production_of($n_1$) == production_of($n_2$))
         while (production_of($n_1$) == production_of($n_2$))
            add($(n_1$, $n_2$), $N_p$);
            $n_2$=get_next_elem($L_2$); /*	extit{get the head element}
         and move the pointer to the next element*/
   end
$n_1 = extract(L_1)$;
reset($L_2$); /*	extit{set the pointer at the first element}*/
end
return $N_p$;
end
Observations

- We order the production rules used in $T_x$ and $T_z$, at loading time.
- At learning time we may evaluate NP in $|T_x| + |T_z|$ running time.
- If $T_x$ and $T_z$ are generated by only one production rule $\Rightarrow O(|T_x| \times |T_z|)$...
Observations

- We order the production rules used in $T_x$ and $T_z$, at loading time.
- At learning time we may evaluate NP in $|T_x| + |T_z|$ running time.
- If $T_x$ and $T_z$ are generated by only one production rule $\Rightarrow O(|T_x| \times |T_z|)$...Very Unlikely!!!!
Labeled Ordered Tree Kernel

- SST satisfies the constraint “remove 0 or all children at a time”.
- If we relax such constraint we get more general substructures [Kashima and Koyanagi, 2002]
Weighting Problems

- Both matched pairs give the same contribution.
- Gap based weighting is needed.
- A novel efficient evaluation has to be defined.
Partial Trees, [Moschitti, ECML 2006]

- SST + String Kernel with weighted gaps on Nodes’ children
Partial Tree Kernel

- if the node labels of $n_1$ and $n_2$ are different then
  $\Delta(n_1, n_2) = 0$;
- else
  $\Delta(n_1, n_2) = 1 + \sum_{\vec{J}_1, \vec{J}_2, l(\vec{J}_1) = l(\vec{J}_2)}^{l(\vec{J}_1)} \prod_{i=1}^{l(\vec{J}_1)} \Delta(c_{n_1}[\vec{J}_{1i}], c_{n_2}[\vec{J}_{2i}])$

- By adding two decay factors we obtain:

$$\mu \left( \lambda^2 + \sum_{\vec{J}_1, \vec{J}_2, l(\vec{J}_1) = l(\vec{J}_2)}^{l(\vec{J}_1)} \lambda^{d(\vec{J}_1) + d(\vec{J}_2)} \prod_{i=1}^{l(\vec{J}_1)} \Delta(c_{n_1}[\vec{J}_{1i}], c_{n_2}[\vec{J}_{2i}]) \right)$$
Efficient Evaluation (1)

- In [Taylor and Cristianini, 2004 book], sequence kernels with weighted gaps are factorized with respect to different subsequence sizes.
- We treat children as sequences and apply the same theory

\[ \Delta(n_1, n_2) = \mu \left( \lambda^2 + \sum_{p=1}^{lm} \Delta_p(c_{n_1}, c_{n_2}) \right), \]

Given the two child sequences \( s_1a = c_{n_1} \) and \( s_2b = c_{n_2} \) (\( a \) and \( b \) are the last children), \( \Delta_p(s_1a, s_2b) = \)

\[ \Delta(a, b) \times \sum_{i=1}^{\mid s_1 \mid} \sum_{r=1}^{\mid s_2 \mid} \lambda^{\mid s_1 \mid-i+\mid s_2 \mid-r} \times \Delta_{p-1}(s_1[1:i], s_2[1:r]) \]
Efficient Evaluation (2)

\[ \Delta_p(s_1 a, s_2 b) = \begin{cases} 
\Delta(a, b) D_p(|s_1|, |s_2|) & \text{if } a = b; \\
0 & \text{otherwise.} 
\end{cases} \]

Note that \( D_p \) satisfies the recursive relation:

\[ D_p(k, l) = \Delta_{p-1}(s_1[1 : k], s_2[1 : l]) + \lambda D_p(k, l - 1) + \lambda D_p(k - 1, l) + \lambda^2 D_p(k - 1, l - 1). \]

- The complexity of finding the subsequences is \( O(p|s_1||s_2|) \)
- Therefore the overall complexity is \( O(p\rho^2|N_{T_1}||N_{T_2}|) \)

where \( \rho \) is the maximum branching factor (\( \rho = \rho \))
Running Time of Tree Kernel Functions

![Graph showing running time of tree kernel functions. The x-axis represents the number of tree nodes, ranging from 5 to 55. The y-axis represents the running time in microseconds, ranging from 0 to 120. The graph includes four different functions: FTK-SST (filled circle), QTK-SST (filled triangle), and FTK-PT (open square).]
SVM-light-TK Software

- Encodes ST, SST and combination kernels in SVM-light [Joachims, 1999]
- Available at http://dit.unitn.it/~moschitt/
- Tree forests, vector sets
- The new SVM-Light-TK toolkit will be released asap
Data Format

“What does Html stand for?”

1 |BT| (SBARQ (WHNP (WP What))(SQ (AUX does)(NP (NNP S.O.S.))(VP (VB stand)(PP (IN for))))(. ?))

|BT| (BOW (What *)(does *)(S.O.S. *)(stand *)(for *)(? *))

|BT| (BOP (WP *)(AUX *)(NNP *)(VB *)(IN *)(. *))

|BT| (PAS (ARG0 (R-A1 (What *))(ARG1 (A1 (S.O.S. NNP)))(ARG2 (rel stand))))


Basic Commands

- Training and classification
  - `./svm_learn -t 5 -C T train.dat model`
  - `./svm_classify test.dat model`

- Learning with a vector sequence
  - `./svm_learn -t 5 -C V train.dat model`

- Learning with the sum of vector and kernel sequences
  - `./svm_learn -t 5 -C + train.dat model`
Part II: Kernel Methods for Practical Applications
Kernel Engineering approaches

- Basic Combinations
- Canonical Mappings, e.g. object transformations
- Merging of Kernels
Kernel Combinations an example

\( K_p^3 \) polynomial kernel of flat features

\( K_{Tree} \) Tree kernel

Kernel Combinations:

\[
K_{Tree+P} = \gamma \times K_{Tree} + K_p^3, \quad K_{Tree\times P} = K_{Tree} \times K_p^3
\]

\[
K_{Tree+P} = \gamma \times \frac{K_{Tree}}{K_{Tree}} + \frac{K_p^3}{K_p^3}, \quad K_{Tree\times P} = \frac{K_{Tree} \times K_p^3}{K_{Tree} \times K_p^3}
\]
Object Transformation [Moschitti et al, CLJ 2008]

\[ K(O_1, O_2) = \phi(O_1) \cdot \phi(O_2) = \phi_E(\phi_M(O_1)) \cdot \phi_E(\phi_M(O_2)) \]
\[ = \phi_E(S_1) \cdot \phi_E(S_2) = K_E(S_1, S_2) \]

- **Canonical Mapping,** \( \phi_M() \)
  - object transformation,
  - e. g. a syntactic parse tree into a verb subcategorization frame tree.

- **Feature Extraction,** \( \phi_E() \)
  - maps the canonical structure in all its fragments
  - different fragment spaces, e. g. ST, SST and PT.
Predicate Argument Classification

- In an event:
  - target words describe relation among different entities
  - the participants are often seen as predicate's arguments.

- Example:
  Paul gives a talk in Rome
Predicate Argument Classification

- In an event:
  - target words describe relation among different entities
  - the participants are often seen as predicate's arguments.

- Example:
  
  \[
  \begin{array}{cccc}
  \text{Arg}_0 & \text{Paul} & \text{predicate} & \text{Arg}_1 \text{ a talk} & \text{Arg}_M \text{ in Rome}
  \end{array}
  \]
Given a sentence, a predicate $p$:

1. Derive the sentence parse tree
2. For each node pair $<N_p,N_x>$
   a. Extract a feature representation set $F$
   b. If $N_x$ exactly covers the Arg-$i$, $F$ is one of its positive examples
   c. $F$ is a negative example otherwise
Vector Representation for the linear kernel

Phrase Type
Predicate Word
Head Word
Parse Tree
Position Right
Voice Active

Phrase Tree

S

VP

NP

PP

V

N

Paul

delivers

D

N

IN

N

IN

N

Arg. 1

a talk in Rome
Kernel Engineering: Tree Tailoring
PAT Kernel [Moschitti, ACL 2004]

- Given the sentence:

\[ \text{[ Arg0 Paul] [ predicate delivers] [ Arg1 a talk] [ ArgM in formal Style]} \]

- These are Semantic Structures
In other words we consider…

The diagram represents the sentence structure:

- **S**: Sentence
- **N**: Name
- **V**: Verb
- **NP**: Noun Phrase
- **PP**: Prepositional Phrase
- **IN**: Preposition

**Sentence:**
Paul delivers a talk in a formal style.

**Arg. 1:**
- **D**: Determiner
- **N**: Noun
- **IN**: Preposition
- **NP**: Noun Phrase
Sub-Categorization Kernel (SCF) [Moschitti, ACL 2004]

Paul delivers a talk in a formal style.
Experiments on Gold Standard Trees

- PropBank and PennTree bank
  - about 53,700 sentences
  - Sections from 2 to 21 train., 23 test., 1 and 22 dev.
  - Arguments from Arg0 to Arg5, ArgA and ArgM for a total of 122,774 and 7,359

- FrameNet and Collins’ automatic trees
  - 24,558 sentences from the 40 frames of Senseval 3
  - 18 roles (same names are mapped together)
  - Only verbs
  - 70% for training and 30% for testing
Argument Classification with Poly Kernel

Accuracy

FrameNet
PropBank

$\text{d}$

Values:
- Accuracy ranges from 0.82 to 0.91.
- The graph shows the accuracy of FrameNet and PropBank as a function of $\text{d}$.
- The accuracy for FrameNet increases with $\text{d}$, peaking around $\text{d}=3$, then decreases slightly.
- The accuracy for PropBank remains relatively constant except for a slight decrease around $\text{d}=4$.
# PropBank Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Args</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>PAT</th>
<th>PAT+P</th>
<th>PAT×P</th>
<th>SCF+P</th>
<th>SCF×P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arg0</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arg1</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arg2</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arg3</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arg4</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArgM</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Accuracy</td>
<td><strong>90.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>91.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>92.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>93.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Argument Classification on PAT using different Tree Fragment Extractor

![Graph showing accuracy vs. % training data for different tree fragment extractors (ST, SST, Linear, PT).]
FrameNet Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>PAF</th>
<th>PAF+P</th>
<th>PAF×P</th>
<th>SCF+P</th>
<th>SCF×P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agent</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cause</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depictive</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrument</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Acc.</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ProbBank arguments vs. Semantic Roles
Kernel Engineering: Node marking
Marking Boundary nodes

A) PAF+
   VP
      
       V
       
       NP
       
       D
       N

delivers a talk delivers talk

PAF-
   VP
      
       V
       
       NP
       
       N

B) MPAF+
   VP
      
       V
       
       NP-B
       
       D
       N

delivers a talk delivers talk

MPAF-
   VP
      
       V
       
       NP
       
       N-B
Node Marking Effect

C) \[ \text{VP} \quad \text{common PAF features} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{N}
\end{array} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
delivers \\
\text{V} \\
\text{NP} \\
delivers \\
talk
\end{array} \]

D) \[ \text{common MPAF features} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
delivers
\end{array} \]
Different tailoring and marking
Experiments

- PropBank and PennTree bank
  - about 53,700 sentences
  - Charniak trees from CoNLL 2005
- Boundary detection:
  - Section 2 training
  - Section 24 testing
  - PAF and MPAF
# Number of examples/nodes of Section 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nodes</th>
<th>Section 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Section 24</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pos</td>
<td>neg</td>
<td>tot</td>
<td>pos</td>
<td>neg</td>
<td>tot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>11,847</td>
<td>71,126</td>
<td>82,973</td>
<td>7,525</td>
<td>50,123</td>
<td>57,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-terminal</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>114,052</td>
<td>114,946</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>80,366</td>
<td>81,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>12,741</td>
<td>185,178</td>
<td>197,919</td>
<td>8,234</td>
<td>130,489</td>
<td>138,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Predicate Argument Feature (PAF) vs. Marked PAF (MPAF) [Moschitti et al, ACL-ws-2005]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tagging strategy</th>
<th>CPU$_{time}$</th>
<th>F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAF</td>
<td>5,179.18</td>
<td>75.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPAF</td>
<td>3,131.56</td>
<td>82.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Merging of Kernels [ECIR 2007]: Question/Answer Classification

- Syntactic/Semantic Tree Kernel
- Kernel Combinations
- Experiments
Merging of Kernels [Bloehdorn & Moschitti, ECIR 2007 & CIKM 2007]

Definition 4 (Tree Fragment Similarity Kernel). For two tree fragments \( f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F} \), we define the Tree Fragment Similarity Kernel as:

\[
\kappa_{\mathcal{F}}(f_1, f_2) = \text{comp}(f_1, f_2) \prod_{t=1}^{nt(f_1)} \kappa_S(f_1(t), f_2(t))
\]

\[
\kappa_T(T_1, T_2) = \sum_{n_1 \in N_{T_1}} \sum_{n_2 \in N_{T_2}} \Delta(n_1, n_2)
\]

where \( \Delta(n_1, n_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{\left|\mathcal{F}\right|} \sum_{j=1}^{\left|\mathcal{F}\right|} I_i(n_1) I_j(n_2) \kappa_{\mathcal{F}}(f_i, f_j) \).
Merging of Kernels

\[
\kappa_T(T_1, T_2) = \sum_{n_1 \in N_{T_1}} \sum_{n_2 \in N_{T_2}} \Delta(n_1, n_2)
\]

where \(\Delta(n_1, n_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{\|\mathcal{F}\|} \sum_{j=1}^{\|\mathcal{F}\|} I_i(n_1)I_j(n_2)\kappa_{\mathcal{F}}(f_i, f_j)\).
Delta Evaluation is very simple

0. if $n_1$ and $n_2$ are pre-terminals and $\text{label}(n_1) = \text{label}(n_2)$ then $\Delta(n_1, n_2) = \lambda \kappa_S(ch_{n_1}^1, ch_{n_2}^1)$,

1. if the productions at $n_1$ and $n_2$ are different then $\Delta(n_1, n_2) = 0$;

2. $\Delta(n_1, n_2) = \lambda$,

3. $\Delta(n_1, n_2) = \lambda \prod_{j=1}^{nc(n_1)} (1 + \Delta(ch_{n_1}^j, ch_{n_2}^j))$. 
Question Classification

- **Definition**: What does HTML stand for?
- **Description**: What's the final line in the Edgar Allan Poe poem "The Raven"?
- **Entity**: What foods can cause an allergic reaction in people?
- **Human**: Who won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1992?
- **Location**: Where is the Statue of Liberty?
- **Manner**: How did Bob Marley die?
- **Numeric**: When was Martin Luther King Jr. born?
- **Organization**: What company makes Bentley cars?
Question Classifier based on Tree Kernels

- Question dataset (http://l2r.cs.uiuc.edu/~cogcomp/Data/QA/QC/) [Lin and Roth, 2005]
  - Distributed on 6 categories: Abbreviations, Descriptions, Entity, Human, Location, and Numeric.
- Fixed split 5500 training and 500 test questions
- Cross-validation (10-folds)
- Using the whole question parse trees
  - Constituent parsing
  - Example
    “What is an offer of direct stock purchase plan?”
What is an offer of direct stock purchase plan?
**Kernels**

- BOW, POS are obtained with a simple tree, e.g.
  
  ![Diagram](image)

  - PT (parse tree)
  - PAS (predicate argument structure)
# Question classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Accuracy (UIUC)</th>
<th>Accuracy (c.v.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>84.8±1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOW</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>84.7±1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>43.0±2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>32.4±2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT+BOW</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>86.1±1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT+BOW+POS</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>84.7±1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS+BOW</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>82.1±1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS+BOW+POS</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>81.0±1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similarity based on WordNet

Inverted Path Length:

\[ sim_{IPL}(c_1, c_2) = \frac{1}{(1 + d(c_1, c_2))^\alpha} \]

Wu & Palmer:

\[ sim_{WUP}(c_1, c_2) = \frac{2 \text{dep}(lso(c_1, c_2))}{d(c_1, lso(c_1, c_2)) + d(c_2, lso(c_1, c_2)) + 2 \text{dep}(lso(c_1, c_2))} \]

Resnik:

\[ sim_{RES}(c_1, c_2) = -\log P(lso(c_1, c_2)) \]

Lin:

\[ sim_{LIN}(c_1, c_2) = \frac{2 \log P(lso(c_1, c_2))}{\log P(c_1) + \log P(c_2)} \]
## Question Classification with S/STK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>λ parameter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear (bow)</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>string matching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full</td>
<td>0.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-ic</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>path-1</td>
<td>0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>path-2</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lin</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wup</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple Kernel Combinations
TASK: Question/Answer Classification [Moschitti, CIKM 2008]

- The classifier detects if a pair (question and answer) is correct or not
- A representation for the pair is needed
- The classifier can be used to re-rank the output of a basic QA system
Dataset 2: TREC data

- 138 TREC 2001 test questions labeled as “description”
- 2,256 sentences, extracted from the best ranked paragraphs (using a basic QA system based on Lucene search engine on TREC dataset)
- 216 of which labeled as correct by one annotator
Dataset 2: TREC data

- 138 TREC 2001 test questions labeled as "description"

A question is linked to many answers: all its derived pairs cannot be shared by training and test sets

- 216 of which labeled as correct by one annotator
Bags of words (BOW) and POS-tags (POS)

- To save time, apply STK to these trees:

```
  BOX
  |___ What
  |____ is
  |      |___ an
  |________ offer
  |__________ of
  |__________ *
  |__________ *
  |__________ *
  |__________ *
```

```
  BOX
  |___ WHNP
  |____ VBZ
  |____ DT
  |____ NN
  |____ IN
  |________ *
  |________ *
  |________ *
  |________ *
  |________ *
```
Word and POS Sequences

- What is an offer of…? (word sequence, WSK)
  - What_is_offer
  - What_is

- WHNP VBZ DT NN IN…(POS sequence, POSSK)
  - WHNP_VBZ_NN
  - WHNP_NN_IN
Syntactic Parse Trees (PT)
Predicate Argument Structure for Partial Tree Kernel (PAS$_{PTK}$)

- [ARG1 Antigens] were [AM–TMP originally] [rel defined] [ARG2 as non-self molecules].
- [ARG0 Researchers] [rel describe] [ARG1 antigens][ARG2 as foreign molecules] [ARGM–LOC in the body]
Kernels and Combinations

- Exploiting the property: \( k(x,z) = k_1(x,z) + k_2(x,z) \)
- BOW, POS, WSK, POSSK, PT, \( \text{PAS}_{\text{PTK}} \)
  \( \Rightarrow \) BOW+POS, BOW+PT, PT+POS, …
Results on TREC Data
(5 folds cross validation)

Kernel Type

F1-measure

- BOW
- POS
- POS_SK
- WSK
- PT
- PAS_SSTK
- PAS_PTK
- BOW+POS
- BOW+PT
- POS_SK+PT
- WSK+PT
- POS_SK+PT+PAS_SSTK
- POS_SK+PT+PAS_PTK
Results on TREC Data
(5 folds cross validation)

![Graph showing F1-measure for different kernel types.
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Results on TREC Data
(5 folds cross validation)
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F1-measure
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Results on TREC Data
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Results on TREC Data
(5 folds cross validation)
Results on TREC Data
(5 folds cross validation)

Kernel Type

F1-measure

- BOW
- POS
- POS_SK
- WSK
- PT
- PAS_SSTK
- PAS_PTK
- BOW+POS
- BOW+PT
- POS_SK+PT
- WSK+PT
- POS_SK+PT+PAS_SSTK
- POS_SK+PT+PAS_PTK
Results on TREC Data
(5 folds cross validation)

BOW ≈ 24
POSSK+STK+PAS_PTK≈ 39
⇒ 62 % of improvement
Kernels for Re-ranking
Local classifier generates the most likely set of hypotheses.

These are used to build annotation pairs, $\langle h^i, h^j \rangle$.
- positive instances if $h^i$ more correct than $h^j$,

A binary classifier decides if $h^i$ is more accurate than $h^j$.

Each candidate annotation $h^i$ is described by a structural representation
Re-ranking framework

Local Model → Hypotheses: H1, H2, H3, ..., Hn → Pairs: ⟨H1, H2⟩, ⟨H1, H3⟩, ..., ⟨Hn, H1⟩, ⟨Hn, H2⟩ → Re-ranker → Hypotheses: H4, H3, ..., H1, Hn → H4
Syntactic Parsing Re-ranking

- Pairs of parse trees (Collins and Duffy, 2002)
Re-ranking concept labeling
[Dinarelli et al, 2009]

- I have a problem with my monitor

\[ h^i: \text{I } \text{NULL} \text{ have } \text{NULL} \text{ a } \text{NULL} \text{ problem } \text{PROBLEM-}\text{B} \text{ with } \text{NULL} \text{ my } \text{NULL} \text{ monitor } \text{HW-B} \]

\[ h^i: \text{I } \text{NULL} \text{ have } \text{NULL} \text{ a } \text{NULL} \text{ problem } \text{HW-B} \]

\[ \text{with } \text{NULL} \text{ my } \text{NULL} \text{ monitor} \]
Flat tree representation (cross-language structure)

- ROOT
  - NULL
  - PROBLEM-B: Ho
  - PROBLEM-I: problema
  - HW-B: col
  - HW-I: monitor
Enriched Multilevel Tree

- FST CER from 23.2 to 16.01
Re-ranking for Named-Entity Recognition [Vien et al, 2010]

- CRF F1 from 84.86 to 88.16
Re-ranking Predicate Argument Structures
[Moschitti et al, CoNLL 2006]

- SVMs F1 from 75.89 to 77.25
Conclusions

- Kernel methods and SVMs are useful tools to design language applications
- Kernel design still requires some level of expertise
- Engineering approaches to tree kernels
  - Basic Combinations
  - Canonical Mappings, e.g.
    - Node Marking
  - Merging of kernels in more complex kernels
- Easy modeling produces state-of-the-art accuracy in many tasks, RTE, SRL, QC, NER, RE
- SVM-Light-TK efficient tool to use them
Future (on going work)

- Once we have found the right kernel, are we satisfied?
- What about knowing the most relevant features?
- Can we speed up learning/classification at real-application scenario level?
- The answer is reverse kernel engineering:
  - Mine the most relevant fragments according to SVMs gradient
  - Use the linear space
- Software for reverse kernel engineering available in the next months
Thank you
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