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## Exercises

1. The following Boolean functions take two Boolean features $x_{1}$ and $x_{2}$ as input. The features can take on the values -1 and +1 , where -1 represents False and +1 represents True. The output $y$ of the functions can also take on the values -1 and +1 , with the same interpretation. For each of the functions below, either give weights for a perceptron such that the perceptron represents the function or argue that no such weights exist.
Hint: Draw pictures like on slides 9 and 10 from mlslides8.pdf. (You do not have to submit these.)
(a) $y=\neg \operatorname{AND}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)$
(b) $y= \begin{cases}+1 & \text { if } x_{1}=x_{2} \\ -1 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}$
(c) $y= \begin{cases}+1 & \text { if } x_{1}=1 \text { and } x_{2}=-1 \\ -1 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}$

## Answers:



A perceptron can represent this function using for example the weights $w_{0}=1, w_{1}=-1, w_{2}=-1$. Other answers are possible as well. In particular, all of these weights multiplied by the same positive constant would give the same classifications. Multiplication by a negative constant is not correct, however, because it inverts the classifications made by the perceptron.
(b)


No weights exist such that a perceptron represents this function, because the pairs of inputs and corresponding outputs are not linearly separable. (See also slide 10 of mlslides8.pdf.)
(c)


A perceptron can represent this function using for example the weights $w_{0}=-1, w_{1}=1, w_{2}=-1$. Again, other answers are possible as well.

## Grading:

- 1 point for each correct answer.
- Giving weights that represent a correct decision boundary, but result in exactly the opposite of the desired classifications, still gives 0.5 points. For example, in (a) the answer $w_{0}=-1, w_{1}=1$, $w_{2}=1$ would still give 0.5 points.

2. (a) For both of the following functions, argue whether gradient descent is an appropriate method to find the minimum.

(b) Suppose we run gradient descent for each of the functions, regardless of whether it is appropriate. What would be $\Delta x_{n}$ for each of the
functions when the learning rate is $\eta=0.1$ ? (Work out the derivative.)

## Answers:

(a) N.B. A function that is not convex does not need to have local minima. It only works the other way around: If a function is convex, then it is guaranteed not to have any local minima (apart from the global one). $\frac{1}{4} x^{4}+10 x^{3}-500 x^{2}+1$ : Gradient descent is not appropriate to find the minimum of this function, because it has a local minimum (at $x=20$ ).
$x^{4}+100:$ Gradient descent is appropriate, because $x^{4}+100$ only has one global minimum (at $x=0$ ) and no other local minima. An informal argument that points this out is sufficient to get full points. For example, one might argue rather informally that $x^{4}$ increases faster and faster as $|x|$, the absolute value of $x$, increases, and hence it must be convex, which implies that it has no other local minima than the global minimum in the picture.
You could also have used the fact that $x^{4}$ is convex, which I told you during the lecture, and argued that if $x^{4}$ is convex, so must be $x^{4}+100$, which is just $x^{4}$ moved up a little.
As a third option, some of you knew that if the second derivative of a function with domain $\mathbb{R}$ is non-negative everywhere on $\mathbb{R}$, then this implies that the function is convex. This is easily verified, since

$$
\frac{d^{2}}{d x^{2}}\left(x^{4}+100\right)=\frac{d}{d x} 4 x^{3}=12 x^{2}
$$

which is non-negative for any $x$.
(b) I write $x$ instead of $x_{n}$ to simplify the notation.

$$
\frac{1}{4} x^{4}+10 x^{3}-500 x^{2}+1:
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta x & =-\eta \frac{d}{d x}\left(\frac{1}{4} x^{4}+10 x^{3}-500 x^{2}+1\right) \\
& =-\frac{1}{10}\left(x^{3}+30 x^{2}-1000 x\right) \\
& =-\frac{1}{10} x^{3}-3 x^{2}+100 x
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
x^{4}+100:
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta x & =-\eta \frac{d}{d x}\left(x^{4}+100\right) \\
& =-\frac{4}{10} x^{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Grading:

- 1 point for each of the two cases of part (a)
- 1 point for each of the two cases of part (b)

3. Suppose we have training data $D=\binom{y_{1}}{\mathbf{x}_{1}}, \ldots,\binom{y_{n}}{\mathbf{x}_{n}}$ and we want to use gradient descent to find weights $\mathbf{w}$ that minimize the error on $D$ for a linear unit $h_{\mathbf{w}}$. However, instead of the Sum of Squared Errors (SSE), we use a strange new error measure called the Sum of Quadratic Errors (SQE). It is defined as

$$
\operatorname{SQE}(\mathbf{w}, D)=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(y_{i}-h_{\mathbf{w}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{i}\right)\right)^{4}
$$

What would be the gradient that our algorithm would use in this case? Give a derivation like in Equation 4.6 of Mitchell.
Hints: See slides 28 and 29 of mlslides8.pdf, and Equation 4.6 in Mitchell. Note that Equation 4.6 applies the chain rule, so you may have to look that up somewhere.

Answer: The $i$ th component of the gradient is given by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial w_{i}} \operatorname{SQE}(\mathbf{w}, D) & =\frac{\partial}{\partial w_{i}} \sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(y_{j}-h_{\mathbf{w}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{j}\right)\right)^{4} \\
& =\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_{i}}\left(y_{j}-h_{\mathbf{w}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{j}\right)\right)^{4}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now by the chain rule:

$$
=\sum_{j=1}^{n} 4\left(y_{j}-h_{\mathbf{w}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{j}\right)\right)^{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_{i}}\left(y_{j}-h_{\mathbf{w}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{j}\right)\right)
$$

Letting $x_{j k}$ denote the $k$ th component of vector $\mathbf{x}_{j}$, we get:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =4 \sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(y_{j}-h_{\mathbf{w}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{j}\right)\right)^{3} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_{i}}\left(y_{j}-\sum_{k=0}^{d} w_{k} x_{j k}\right) \\
& =4 \sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(y_{j}-h_{\mathbf{w}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{j}\right)\right)^{3}\left(-\sum_{k=0}^{d} \frac{\partial}{\partial w_{i}} w_{k} x_{j k}\right) \\
& =4 \sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(y_{j}-h_{\mathbf{w}}\left(\mathbf{x}_{j}\right)\right)^{3} \cdot\left(-x_{j i}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Here the last equality follows because

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial w_{i}} w_{k} x_{j k}= \begin{cases}x_{j k} & \text { if } k=i \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

N.B. I should have called SQE differently, because 'quadratic' means the same as 'squared' and I meant to say 'to-the-fourth'. So for example "Sum of Strange Errors" would have been better.

## Grading:

- 2 points for a correct answer.


## Grading Policy

- Grades are between 1 and 10 .
- You always start with 1 point.
- Partial points may be awarded for partially correct answers.

