

Chance constrained conic-segmentation support vector machine with uncertain data

Shen Peng¹, Gianpiero Canessa¹

¹Optimization and Systems Theory, Department of Mathematics, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, SE-100 44 Stockholm, Sweden
{shenp, canessa}@kth.se,

Abstract

Support vector machines (SVM) is one of the well known supervised classes of learning algorithms. And the conic-segmentation SVM (CS-SVM) is a natural multiclass analogue of the standard binary SVM. As CS-SVM models are dealing with the situation where the exact values of the data points are known. This paper studies CS-SVM when the data points are uncertain or mislabelled. With some properties known for the distributions, chance-constrained CS-SVM is used to ensure the small probability of misclassification for the uncertain data. The geometric interpretation is presented to show how CS-SVM works. Finally, we present experimental results to investigate the chance constrained CS-SVM's performance.

1 Introduction

In classification problems, a classifier is a function that mimics the relationship between the data vectors and their class labels. Support vector machine (SVM) is a popular classifier, which was proposed by Vapnik (1998, 1999) as a maximum-margin classifier. The success of the SVM has encouraged further research into extensions to the more general multiclass cases, which as been an active topic of research interest [Mu and Nandi, 2009; Angulo *et al.*, 2006; Tian *et al.*, 2012]. Shilton *et al.* [2012] proposed the CS-SVM by introducing the concept of target space into the problem formulation and showed that some other multiclassification model are special cases of this framework.

The standard CS-SVM is dealing with the situation where the exact values of the data points are known. When the data points are uncertain or mislabelled, different models have been proposed to formulate the SVM with uncertainties [Xanthopoulos *et al.*, 2012; Xanthopoulos *et al.*, 2014; Fan *et al.*, 2014]. Stochastic programming is a natural approach to dealing with the uncertain situation. Models with chance constraints is then used to ensure the small probability of misclassification for the uncertain data [Shivaswamy *et al.*, 2006; Ben-Tal *et al.*, 2011; Wang *et al.*, 2018].

To handle the uncertainty and mislabeling in the data set, we propose a stochastic approach to CS-SVM by introducing chance constraints into the problem formulation. Based

on the samples, the chance constrained CS-SVM model is derived as a mixed integer programming problem. We illustrated the sample based reformulation for the chance constrained CS-SVM geometrically. And a preliminary experiment is proposed to compare the performances between chance constrained CS-SVM and standard SC-SVM.

The paper is arranged as follows. We present the background and modelling of chance constrained CS-SVM in section 2. In section 3, we derive the sample based reformulation of chance constrained CS-SVM and illustrate it geometrically. In section 4, we give some experimental results to demonstrate the performance of CS-SVM with chance constraints. Section 6 concludes this paper and shows the position of this work.

2 Chance constrained conic-segment SVM

In this section, we consider a conic-segment SVM (CS-SVM) with chance constraints for multiclass classification problem.

The multiclass (n -class) classification problem can be defined as follows: given a dataset $\Theta = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) | i \in \mathbb{Z}_N\}$ (the training set), where $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is the i th input vector and $y_i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ is its corresponding class, find a decision function $h : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_n$ (the trained classifier) that captures the pairwise relationships of the N training pairs. Here, \mathbb{X} is the input space, $\mathbb{Z}_N = \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_n = \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Inspired by [Shilton *et al.*, 2012], we consider the following classifiers:

$$h(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})), \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{m=1}^d x_m \mathbf{w}_m + \mathbf{b} = W\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)^\top$, $W = (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_T \times d}$, $\mathbf{g} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_T}$ is a training machine, $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^{d_T} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_n$ is a classing function, \mathbb{R}^{d_T} is the target space, the weight vectors $\mathbf{w}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{d_T}$, $m = 1, \dots, d$ and bias vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_T}$ are selected during training.

To retain the useful properties of the SVM formulation, the CS-SVM defines the classing function σ based on generalized inequalities. Each class $s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ is associated with a proper conic class region $H_s \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_T}$ with center $\mathbf{u}_{n,s}$, such that the set of all class regions forms an almost-everywhere non-intersecting target-space covering. Then, the classing function σ is defined as

$$\sigma(\mathbf{a}) = s, \text{ if } \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{u}_{n,s} \in \text{int}(H_s).$$

This approach provides a very flexible framework for multiclass classification. Following [Shilton *et al.*, 2012], for $s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, the class region H_s can be defined in a recursive division form. In this scheme, the class centers $\mathbf{u}_{n,s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ are defined as vertices of a regular $(n-1)$ -simplex in $d_T = n-1$ dimensional target space. The class regions are defined by the class centers using the max-projection principle:

$$H_s = \{\mathbf{a} : \mathbf{u}_{n,s}^\top \mathbf{a} \geq \mathbf{u}_{n,t}^\top \mathbf{a}, \forall t \neq s\},$$

where the class centres are defined recursively by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_{n,1} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_T}, \\ \mathbf{u}_{n,s+1} &= \frac{1}{n-1} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{n(n-2)}\mathbf{u}_{n-1,s} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_T}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \end{aligned}$$

with $\mathbf{u}_{2,1} = [-1], \mathbf{u}_{2,2} = [1], d_T = n-1$.

When uncertainties or mislabelled data exist in the data set, the model needs to be modified to contain the uncertainty information. Meanwhile, as all the data points \mathbf{x}_i with $y_i = s, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, belong to the same class, we can denote the sample set $\Theta_s = \{\mathbf{x}_i | y_i = s, i \in \mathbb{Z}_N\}$ for $s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. And, for each $s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, the data set Θ_s can be viewed as the samples set generated following the distribution of random feature vector $\boldsymbol{\xi}_s$. In other words, for $s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, $\boldsymbol{\xi}_s$ is a random vector defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with support set $\Xi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Therefore, the following chance constraint can be introduced to ensure the small probability of misclassification for the uncertain data:

$$\mathbb{P}_{F_s} \{\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_s) - \mathbf{u}_{n,s} \in \text{int}(H_s)\} \geq 1 - \alpha_s, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \quad (2)$$

where, for $s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, F_s is the distribution of $\boldsymbol{\xi}_s$, $\alpha_s \in (0, 1)$ is a confidence parameter and close to zero.

According to the definition of the subset $H_s, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, we can naturally assume that for any \mathbf{g} , the set $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_s : \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_s) \in \text{bd}(H_s)\}$ is \mathbb{P} -measure zero, i.e., $\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_s) \notin \text{bd}(H_s)$ w.p.1. Therefore, the chance constraint (2) can be reformulated as

$$\mathbb{P}_{F_s} \{\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_s) - \mathbf{u}_{n,s} \in H_s\} \geq 1 - \alpha_s, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n.$$

Then, the chance constrained conic-segmentation SVM can be modeled as

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{b}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^d \|\mathbf{w}_m\|^2 \quad (3)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbb{P}_{F_s} \{\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_s) - \mathbf{u}_{n,s} \in H_s\} \geq 1 - \alpha_s, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n.$$

This model ensures an upper bound on the misclassification probability.

As a special case, for the binary classification, we have $n = 2$ and $d_T = 1$. Then, the class region can be expressed as

$$H_1 = \{a : a \leq 0\}, H_2 = \{a : a \geq 0\},$$

with centers $\mathbf{u}_{2,1} = [-1], \mathbf{u}_{2,2} = [1]$. Hence, the problem (3) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{b}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbb{P}_{F_1} \{\boldsymbol{\xi}_1^\top \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{b} \leq -1\} \geq 1 - \alpha_1, \\ & \mathbb{P}_{F_2} \{\boldsymbol{\xi}_2^\top \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{b} \geq 1\} \geq 1 - \alpha_2, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_d)^\top$.

3 Reformulation of chance constrained CS-SVM

3.1 Sample based reformulation

In this section, we consider the multiclass classification based on SVM, i.e., $d_T = n-1 \geq 2$. By applying the structure of class region $H_s, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, the problem (3) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{b}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^d \|\mathbf{w}_m\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbb{P}_{F_s} \{(\mathbf{u}_{n,s} - \mathbf{u}_{n,t})^\top (\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_s) - \mathbf{u}_{n,s}) \geq 0, \\ & t \neq s, t \in \mathbb{Z}_n\} \geq 1 - \alpha_s, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_s) = \sum_{m=1}^d \boldsymbol{\xi}_{s,m} \mathbf{w}_m + \mathbf{b}$.

Given the training set $\Theta = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) | i \in \mathbb{Z}_N\}$, the data set $\Theta_s = \{\mathbf{x}_i | y_i = s, i \in \mathbb{Z}_N\}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, can be viewed as the samples of $\boldsymbol{\xi}_s, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. Denote N_s the size of data set Θ_s . Therefore, by applying sample average approximation (SAA), the model (5) can be solved approximated by the following model:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{b}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^d \|\mathbf{w}_m\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}_i \in \Theta_s, \\ i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}}} \mathbf{1}_{C_s}(\mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{x}_i) \geq 1 - \alpha_s, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $C_s = \{(\mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{x}_i) | (\mathbf{u}_{n,s} - \mathbf{u}_{n,t})^\top (\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \mathbf{u}_{n,s}) \geq 0, t \neq s, t \in \mathbb{Z}_n, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n \text{ and } \mathbf{1}_{C_s}(\mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{x}_i) = 1, \text{ if } (W, \boldsymbol{\xi}_s) \in C_s, \text{ otherwise, } \mathbf{1}_{C_s}(\mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{x}_i) = 0.$

Denote θ^* and S the optimal value and the optimal solution set of problem (5), respectively and θ_N and S_N the optimal value and the optimal solution set of problem (6), respectively. Then, from the Theorem 1 in [Chen *et al.*, 2020], we have $\theta_N \rightarrow \theta^*$ and $\mathbb{D}(S_N, S) \rightarrow 0$ w.p.1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Here, $\mathbb{D}(A, B) = \sup_{x \in A} \inf_{y \in B} \|x - y\|$, for two sets $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d_T \cdot d}$.

Moreover, problem (6) can be reformulated as a mixed integer programming problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{b}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^d \|\mathbf{w}_m\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (\mathbf{u}_{n,s} - \mathbf{u}_{n,t})^\top (\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \mathbf{u}_{n,s}) + M_s z_i^s \geq 0, \\ & t \neq s, t \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \mathbf{x}_i \in \Theta_s, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \\ & \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}} z_i^s \leq \alpha_s N_s, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \\ & z_i^s \in \{0, 1\}, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where M is a sufficiently large positive number, such that $(\mathbf{u}_{n,s} - \mathbf{u}_{n,t})^\top (\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \mathbf{u}_{n,s}) + M \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x}_i \in \Theta_s, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$.

Given the training set Θ , the classic conic-segment SVM

can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{b}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^d \|\mathbf{w}_m\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (\mathbf{u}_{n,s} - \mathbf{u}_{n,t})^\top (\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) - \mathbf{u}_{n,s}) \geq 0, \\ & t \neq s, t \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \mathbf{x}_i \in \Theta_s, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

From [Shilton *et al.*, 2012], the CS-SVM with soft margin can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{b}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^d \|\mathbf{w}_m\|^2 + \frac{C}{N} \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s} \\ s \in \mathbb{Z}_n}} \mathbf{u}_{n,s}^\top \zeta_{i,s} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (\mathbf{u}_{n,s} - \mathbf{u}_{n,t})^\top (\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) + \zeta_{i,s} - \mathbf{u}_{n,s}) \geq 0, \mathbf{x}_i \in \Theta_s, \\ & (\mathbf{u}_{n,s} - \mathbf{u}_{n,t})^\top \zeta_{i,s} \geq 0, t \neq s, t \in \mathbb{Z}_n, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, \\ & s \in \mathbb{Z}_n. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Here, the second term in the objective function provides a measure of the training error on the training set, as enabled by the inclusion of the slack variables $\zeta_{i,s}, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. The constant $C \in \mathbb{R}_+$ controls the trade-off between margin maximization and training error minimization. Readers are referred to [Shilton *et al.*, 2012] for more details.

Comparing the models (8), (9) and model (7), we can observe that under strict separation conditions, model (8) and model (9) are equivalent. And the solution of model (8) is also feasible for model (7). In addition, by setting $\alpha_s = 0, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, model (9) reduces to model (7). However, when there are uncertainty among the samples, model (7) won't be affected as much as model (8) and model (9), since only partial samples play a role during training in model (7).

Under non-strict separation conditions, model (8) becomes infeasible. An optimal solution, denoted by $(\bar{w}_m, \bar{\mathbf{b}})$, can be obtained by solving model (7), while some points, which lead the non-separation, are ignored according to the proportion α_s of total samples. Model (9) can provide a solution with slack variables $\zeta_{i,s}, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. By observing the constraints in model (7) and model (9), it is not hard to get that there always exist some $\bar{\zeta}_{i,s}, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, such that $(\bar{w}_m, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\zeta}_{i,s})$ is feasible for model (9). However, model (9) focus more on the points, which cause the non-separation, compared with model (7), which just ignores these points. It will lead the classifier provided by model (9) performs worse when these points are mislabelled. While, the model (7) is solved by ignoring these mislabelled data. Therefore, the classifier obtained by solving model (7) can perform more robust against the mislabelled data.

3.2 Kernel based reformulation

As the training machine \mathbf{g} is a linear vector-valued function on \mathbf{x} , the classifier in (1) is modelled for linearly separable case. For nonlinear classification, we can apply a feature map such that the nonlinearly separable case can be dealt with linear classifier.

Denote $\phi: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_K}$ the feature map and \mathbb{R}^{d_K} the feature space. The points in input space \mathbb{X} are mapped to feature

space \mathbb{R}^{d_K} by the pre-defined nonlinear feature map ϕ , and $\phi_m: \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the m -th component of map ϕ . And in the feature space \mathbb{R}^{d_K} , the linear classifier can be applied. Therefore, we can denote $\xi = \phi(\mathbf{x})$ and re-define the training machine as $\mathbf{g}: \mathbb{R}^{d_K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_T}$ and

$$\mathbf{g}(\xi) = \sum_{m=1}^{d_K} \xi_m \mathbf{w}_m + \mathbf{b} = W\xi + \mathbf{b},$$

where $W = (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{d_K}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_T \times d_K}$. Correspondingly, the classifier can be expressed as $h(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma(\mathbf{g}(\phi(\mathbf{x})))$.

Notice that the problem (7) is a mixed-integer programming problem with binary variables $z_i^s, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, when z_i^s takes a specific value \bar{z}_i^s satisfying $\bar{z}_i^s \in \{0, 1\}, \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}} \bar{z}_i^s \leq \alpha_s N_s$, we get the following following residual quadratic programming:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{b}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{d_K} \|\mathbf{w}_m\|^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (\mathbf{u}_{n,s} - \mathbf{u}_{n,t})^\top (\mathbf{g}(\phi(\mathbf{x}_i)) - \mathbf{u}_{n,s}) + M_s \bar{z}_i^s \geq 0, \\ & t \neq s, t \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \mathbf{x}_i \in \Theta_s, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Let $L, l(\bar{z}_i^s)$ denote the optimal values of problem (7) and problem (10), respectively. Denote $Z = \{\bar{z}_i^s, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n | \bar{z}_i^s \in \{0, 1\}, \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}} \bar{z}_i^s \leq \alpha_s N_s, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$, $\mathbf{v}_{s,t}^n = \mathbf{u}_{n,s} - \mathbf{u}_{n,t}, t \neq s, s, t \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, and matrix $A_s^\top = (\mathbf{v}_{s,t}^n)_{t \neq s, t \in \mathbb{Z}_n}$. Then, we have $L = \min_{\bar{z}_i^s \in Z} l(\bar{z}_i^s)$. With the strong duality of problem (10), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} l(\bar{z}_i^s) = \max_{\lambda_{si} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \quad & -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{s,i} \sum_{r,j} K_{ij} \lambda_{si}^\top A_s A_r^\top \lambda_{rj} \\ & + \sum_{s,i} \lambda_{si}^\top (A_s \mathbf{u}_{n,s} - M_s \bar{z}_i^s \mathbf{e}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{s,i} A_s^\top \lambda_{si} = 0, \\ & \lambda_{si} \geq 0, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

and $W = \sum_{s,i} A_s^\top \lambda_{si} \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)^\top$. Here, $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ is a vector with all components equal to 1, $K_{ij} = K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$ and K is the Mercer kernel associated with the feature map ϕ . The trained machine may be written as

$$\mathbf{g}(\phi(\mathbf{x})) = \sum_{s,i} A_s^\top \lambda_{si} K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) + \mathbf{b}$$

Problem (7) can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} L = \min_{\bar{z}_i^s} \max_{\lambda_{si} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \quad & \bar{Q}(\lambda_{si}) - \sum_{s,i} \lambda_{si}^\top \mathbf{e} M_s \bar{z}_i^s \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{s,i} A_s^\top \lambda_{si} = 0, \\ & \lambda_{si} \geq 0, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \\ & \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}} \bar{z}_i^s \leq \alpha_s N_s, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \\ & \bar{z}_i^s \in \{0, 1\}, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where

$$\bar{Q}(\lambda_{si}) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{s,i} \sum_{r,j} K_{ij} \lambda_{si}^\top A_s A_r^\top \lambda_{rj} + \sum_{s,i} \lambda_{si}^\top A_s \mathbf{u}_{n,s}.$$

For $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, as $\bar{z}_i^s \in \{0, 1\}$, $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}} \bar{z}_i^s \leq \alpha_s N_s$, we can replace the constraints $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}} \bar{z}_i^s \leq \alpha_s N_s$ with $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}} \bar{z}_i^s \leq \lceil \alpha_s N_s \rceil$, where $\lceil x \rceil$ means the largest integer not greater than x . Since the objective function of problem (12) is a linear function on z_i^s , $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, the optimal solution won't change if the constraint $\bar{z}_i^s \in \{0, 1\}$ is relaxed as $\bar{z}_i^s \in [0, 1]$.

In addition, as the second order derivative of $\bar{Q}(\lambda_{si}, z_i^s)$ with respect to λ_{si} , $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ is a positive semi-definite matrix, the objective function of problem (12) is convex on λ_{si} , $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. Therefore, by minimax theorem, problem (12) can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} L = \max_{\lambda_{si} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \min_{z_i^s} \bar{Q}(\lambda_{si}) - \sum_{s,i} \lambda_{si}^\top e M_s z_i^s \\ \text{s.t. } \sum_{s,i} A_s^\top \lambda_{si} = 0, \\ \lambda_{si} \geq 0, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \\ \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}} \bar{z}_i^s \leq \lceil \alpha_s N_s \rceil, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \\ \bar{z}_i^s \in [0, 1], i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

With strong duality of linear programming, the inner minimization problem of (13) can be reformulated as a maximization problem. The problem (13) can be equivalently reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\lambda_{si}, \tau_s, \rho_{si}} \bar{Q}(\lambda_{si}) - \sum_s \lceil \alpha_s N_s \rceil \tau_s - \sum_{s,i} \rho_{si} \\ \text{s.t. } \sum_{s,i} A_s^\top \lambda_{si} = 0, \\ \tau_s + \rho_{si} \geq M_s e^\top \lambda_{si}, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \\ \lambda_{si} \geq 0, \tau_s \geq 0, \rho_{si} \geq 0, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_s}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

which a convex constrained quadratic programming problem.

For the binary classification, which is a special case of classification, we have $n = 2$ and $d_T = 1$, and the chance constrained CS-SVM reduces to problem (4). Then, the kernel based formulation for binary classification can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\lambda_{si}, \tau_s, \rho_{si}} -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_1} \cup \mathbb{Z}_{N_2}} y_i y_j K_{ij} \lambda_i \lambda_j + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_1} \cup \mathbb{Z}_{N_2}} \lambda_i \\ - \lceil \alpha_1 N_1 \rceil \tau_1 - \lceil \alpha_2 N_2 \rceil \tau_2 - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_1} \cup \mathbb{Z}_{N_2}} \rho_i \\ \text{s.t. } \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_1} \cup \mathbb{Z}_{N_2}} y_i \lambda_i = 0, \\ \tau_1 + \rho_i \geq M_1 \lambda_i, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_1}, \\ \tau_2 + \rho_i \geq M_2 \lambda_i, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_2}, \\ \lambda_i \geq 0, \rho_i \geq 0, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_1} \cup \mathbb{Z}_{N_2}, \\ \tau_1 \geq 0, \tau_2 \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $y_i = -1$, if $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_1}$, $y_i = 1$, if $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_2}$.

3.3 Geometric interpretation

To interpret how the sample based reformulation of chance constrained SVM works geometrically, the binary classification is taken as an example. The geometric interpretation of sample based reformulation is shown in Figure 1. The black dashed line is the true classifier, which is a hyperplane. The blue points belong to class H_1 , and the red points belong to class H_2 . In addition, we assume that there exists uncertainty in the data set, which leads to misclassification and some outliers. The mislabelled points and outliers are remarked as the circled points.




Figure 1: Geometric interpretation of chance constrained CS-SVM

To guarantee the feasibility of the corresponding optimization problem, the mislabelled or the uncertainty points, which are far away from the boundary, will be ignored, such as the three circled blue points in the center of red points and the three circled red points in the center of blue points in Figure 1. Therefore, the effect of these mislabelled points will be reduced. Since the objective is to maximize the margin of separation, some of the data points, which are close to the boundary between two regions, will not be taken into consideration either, for example, the circled points close to the black dashed line in Figure 1. This will reduce the influence of the uncertainty or the misclassification in the data set as possible as we can. When the mislabelled data or the uncertainty is close to the boundary, as this kind of data will be ignored during training, the mislabelled data or the uncertainty won't effect our classifier much, either. And the total proportion of ignored data is smaller or equal to α_s , $s \in \mathbb{Z}_n$.

4 Preliminary experiment

In this section, we compare the performances of chance constrained CS-SVM and CS-SVM with soft margin by a preliminary experiment.

First, we consider a 2-dimensional binary classification. And the classification results of sample based reformulation of chance constrained model and CS-SVM are shown in Figure 2. In Figure 2, the dashed line is the true classifier. The black line denotes the classifier obtained by solving chance

constrained CS-SVM. The green line represents the classifier provided by standard CS-SVM with soft margin.




Figure 2: Result of chance constrained CS-SVM

From Figure 2, it is not hard to observe that the classifier obtained by solving chance constrained CS-SVM is very close to the true classifier, while there exists distance between the classifier provided by standard CS-SVM with soft margin and the true classifier. And the classification accuracy of chance constrained CS-SVM is higher. Some blue points are misclassified by the classifier provided by standard CS-SVM with soft margin. From these observations in the small size classification problem, it is not hard to get that chance constrained CS-SVM can perform better when misclassification and uncertainty exist in data set.

5 Conclusion and Position

In this paper, we have proposed a chance constrained CS-SVM, which can be seen as an extension of standard CS-SVM in uncertain situations. This can ensure the small probability of misclassification for the uncertain data. And geometric illustration has been presented to show how the chance constrained CS-SVM works. Preliminary experimental results demonstrate the feasibility of our proposed model.

So far, our work only considers linear separable case and the experiment results are about binary classification. In the next step, we will apply scenario reduction technique to further improve the performance of chance constrained CS-SVM model. And kernel tricks will be added in our model to handle nonlinear separable case. Moreover, more experiments about multiclassification problems will be completed.

References

[Angulo *et al.*, 2006] Cecilio Angulo, Francisco J Ruiz, Luis González, and Juan Antonio Ortega. Multi-classification by using tri-class svm. *Neural Processing Letters*, 23(1):89–101, 2006.

[Ben-Tal *et al.*, 2011] Aharon Ben-Tal, Sahely Bhadra, Chiranjib Bhattacharyya, and J Saketha Nath. Chance constrained uncertain classification via robust optimization. *Mathematical programming*, 127(1):145–173, 2011.

[Chen *et al.*, 2020] Zhiping Chen, Shen Peng, and Abdel Lisser. A sparse chance constrained portfolio selection model with multiple constraints. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 77:825–852, 2020.

[Fan *et al.*, 2014] Neng Fan, Elham Sadeghi, and Panos M. Pardalos. Robust support vector machines with polyhedral uncertainty of the input data. In Panos M. Pardalos, Mauricio G.C. Resende, Chrysafis Vogiatzis, and Jose L. Walteros, editors, *Learning and Intelligent Optimization*, pages 291–305, Cham, 2014. Springer International Publishing.

[Mu and Nandi, 2009] Tingting Mu and Asoke K Nandi. Multiclass classification based on extended support vector data description. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)*, 39(5):1206–1216, 2009.

[Shilton *et al.*, 2012] Alistair Shilton, Daniel TH Lai, and Marimuthu Palaniswami. The conic-segmentation support vector machine—a target space method for multiclass classification. In *The 2012 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2012.

[Shivaswamy *et al.*, 2006] Pannagadatta K Shivaswamy, Chiranjib Bhattacharyya, Alexander J Smola, Kristin P Bennett, and Emilio Parrado-Hernández. Second order cone programming approaches for handling missing and uncertain data. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7(7), 2006.

[Tian *et al.*, 2012] Yingjie Tian, Yong Shi, and Xiaohui Liu. Recent advances on support vector machines research. *Technological and economic development of Economy*, 18(1):5–33, 2012.

[Wang *et al.*, 2018] Ximing Wang, Neng Fan, and Panos M Pardalos. Robust chance-constrained support vector machines with second-order moment information. *Annals of Operations Research*, 263(1):45–68, 2018.

[Xanthopoulos *et al.*, 2012] Petros Xanthopoulos, Panos M Pardalos, and Theodore B Trafalis. *Robust data mining*. Springer Science & Business Media, Berlin, 2012.

[Xanthopoulos *et al.*, 2014] Petros Xanthopoulos, Mario R Guarracino, and Panos M Pardalos. Robust generalized eigenvalue classifier with ellipsoidal uncertainty. *Annals of Operations Research*, 216(1):327–342, 2014.