## Polynomial Classifier, Branch-and-Bound

Exercise 30 The training set of a classifier consists of four two-dimensional samples per class:

$$
\begin{align*}
& S_{1}=\left\{\binom{1}{1},\binom{1}{2},\binom{2}{1},\binom{3}{1}\right\}  \tag{1}\\
& S_{2}=\left\{\binom{2}{4},\binom{2}{3},\binom{3}{2},\binom{4}{2}\right\} \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

The decision boundary shall be parameterized by a function that is quadratic in the components of the input features. It shall evaluate to a value of 0 for samples from $S_{1}$, and a value of 1 for samples from $S_{2}$.

$$
\hat{\delta}\left(\mathbf{c}_{k}\right)=\sum_{i, j=1 ; i \leq j}^{2} a_{i j} c_{k, i} c_{k, j}= \begin{cases}0, & \text { if } \mathbf{c}_{k} \in S_{1}  \tag{3}\\ 1, & \text { if } \mathbf{c}_{k} \in S_{2}\end{cases}
$$

Here, $\mathbf{c}_{k}$ denotes the $k$-th sample, and $c_{k, i}$ the $i$-th component of $\mathbf{c}_{k}$.
(a) Compute the coefficient vector a for the decision boundary.
(b) Classify the two features $\mathbf{c}_{9}, \mathbf{c}_{10}$ below. Note that if the result is not precisely 0 or 1 , we decide for the class which is closest to the classifier result.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{c}_{9}=\binom{2}{6}, \quad \mathbf{c}_{10}=\binom{6}{2} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Exercise 31 Programming Task: The Branch-and-Bound method can be used to choose a subset of features.
(a) Describe the idea behind the method and how it could be applied in a depth-firstsearch (DFS) and a breadth-first-search (BFS) of the tree of possible solutions. What property is required of the rating function that allows us to prune subtrees?
(b) Use an exhaustive search as well as a DFS and BFS Branch-and-Bound approach to select seven out of ten features, given the following rating function:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G_{i}^{9}=10+i, \quad \text { for } i \quad=1,2,3, \ldots, 10 \\
& G_{i, j}^{8}=10-\frac{1}{2}(i+j), \quad \text { for } \quad i, j=1,2,3, \ldots, 10 \\
& G_{i, j, k}^{7}=10-\frac{1}{2}(i+j+k), \text { for } i, j, k=1,2,3, \ldots, 10
\end{aligned}
$$

(c) Compare all three methods in terms of the number of rating function evaluations. Why could this be an appropriate measure of efficiency in typical use cases?

