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ABSTRACT
The use of Support Vector Machines (SVMs) to represent the performance space of analog circuits is explored. In abstract terms, an analog circuit maps a set of input design parameters to a set of performance figures. This function is usually evaluated through simulations and its range defines the feasible performance space of the circuit. In this paper, we directly model performance spaces as mathematical relations. We study approximation approaches based on two-class and one-class SVMs, the latter providing a better tradeoff between accuracy and complexity avoiding “curse of dimensionality” issues with 2-class SVMs. We propose two improvements of the basic one-class SVM performances: conformal mapping and active learning. Finally we develop an efficient algorithm to compute projections, so that top-down methodologies can be easily supported.

Categories and Subject Descriptors
B.7.2 [Integrated Circuits]: Design Aids-Verification

General Terms
Algorithms

1. INTRODUCTION
Analog design has been traditionally a difficult discipline of IC design. While in digital designs functionality depends on discrete sequences of discrete (binary) signals, continuous sequences (waveforms) of continuous values encode the information we need to manipulate and use in the analog case. For this reason, any second-order physical effect may have a significant impact on function and performance of an analog circuit. The effect of the choice of design parameters such as transistor size and layout on performance is usually computed by simulation. Since simulations require completely specified circuits to compute performances, the complexity of setting up simulations for system level exploitation is daunting even if we do not consider its computational cost and the size of the search space. For this reason, behavioral models are currently used at the first stages of designs to partition heuristically system constraints on individual blocks. However, this is carried out in a purely functional way, without any notion of the underlying feasible performance space and tradeoffs. Building an approximate representation of the performance space is of great interest for providing behavioral models with architectural constraints that can fully enable top-down design methodologies [1]. In the 70s and early 80s, a number of approaches [2] have been proposed to approximate the relation between circuit performance and parameters in explicit form. In particular, the design problem tackled was to identify the value of the design parameters that would yield a point in the performance space meeting a set of requirements expressed as inequalities. Assuming that the region of points satisfying the requirements is convex, the boundaries of the region were approximated by a set of hyperplanes (simplicial approximation [3]) or by quadratic functions. If the exploration of the feasible region was part of an optimization procedure, the simplicial or quadratic approximation was refined locally to obtain a smaller error and yield an optimization procedure that would eventually converge to an optimal point.

In this paper, we take a slightly different view of the problem by directly modeling performances themselves in place of parameter-performance relations. We improve upon the existing techniques by exploiting recent results on learning and approximation techniques. In particular, we want to directly represent the feasibility of achieving particular performances for a given topology of a circuit. This can be viewed as the problem of estimating the support of a set, and treated statistically as a quantile estimation problem.

2. BACKGROUND
System level analog design is a process largely dominated by heuristics. Given a set of specifications/requirements that describe the system to be realized, the selection of an optimal implementation architecture comes mainly out of experience. Usually, what is achieved is just a feasible point at the system level, while optimality is sought locally at the circuit level. The reason for this is the difficulty in the analog world of knowing if something is realizable without actually attempting to design the circuit. The number of effects to consider and their complex interrelations make this problem approachable only through the experience coming from past designs. System level optimization is extremely
hard because of the difficulties that hierarchical designs face in abstracting single block behaviors and establishing cost and feasibility without further knowledge of the implementation architecture and topology.

To cope with these problems, the Analog Platform concept has been proposed in [4] extending the one developed for the digital world. The term Analog Platform (AP) indicates an architectural resource to map analog functionalities during early system level exploration phases and constrain exploration to the feasible space of the considered implementation (or set of implementations). Therefore, an AP consists of a set of behavioral models and of matching performance models. Behavioral models are parameterized mathematical models of the analog functionality that introduce at the functional level a number of non-idealities attributable to the implementation and not intrinsic in the functionality itself, such as distortion, bandwidth limitations, and noise. Non-ideal effects, as well as the principal performance figures of the functionality (e.g. gain, power consumption and area) are embedded in the behavioral models in the form of parameters. Performance models constrain these parameters to satisfy a mathematical relation so that only feasible instances of the behavioral model (models with a complete set of parameter values) can be selected with respect of the considered architecture. In this paper we provide the details of the performance representation mechanism presented in [4], showing how they can be derived from sample data.

Other methods for building analog models from simulation data are mostly based on regression mechanisms. A given performance figure is fit on a set of regressors that are function of physical parameters of the circuit. An interesting model based on boosting methods has been recently proposed [5]. However, regression approaches are not suited to top-down methodologies where abstraction levels introduce opaqueness in the system hierarchy that hides the implementation details needed for regression. Furthermore, each performance figure is fitted independently from the others, so that errors in capturing relations among different feasible performances may cumulate. An approach to model the feasible space has been proposed in [6]. In this paper we present a novel approach to directly model performances that allows capturing high dimensional performance spaces with efficient representations and provides the necessary means to support the multiple levels of abstraction required in top-down flows. Furthermore, it does not require that designers generate explicit models for their circuits, nor it asks them to cast their problems into specific mathematical frameworks.

3. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Top-down flows incrementally process designs through a sequence of abstraction levels until final implementation is achieved. At each level of abstraction top-down methodologies only deal with parameters present at the current level to transform a given set of requirements into next-level constraints. For example, if we are exploring the use of an amplifier at a given point in a design, our main interest is in selecting the optimal amplifier instance with respect to a given set of performance figures, such as gain, power, noise, etc. Looking at the next (more detailed) level of abstraction, gain, power and noise can be placed in effect/cause relation with a given amplifier topology, bias point and device sizing, which should not be considered at the current level of abstraction. This implies that classic regression schemes for representing analog circuit performances are not the most suitable means of performance representation in top-down flows. Therefore, we propose modeling the performances themselves as mathematical relations on performance figures (effects), discarding the information on the relative parameters (causes) as not pertinent at the current level of abstraction. To approach the problem quantitatively, we introduce the following definitions:

1. Input space $I$ - Given a circuit $C$ and $m$ parameters controlling its instances, $I_C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is the set of $m$-tuples (parameter values) over which we want to characterize $C$.

2. Output space $O$ - Given a circuit $C$ and $n$ performance figures completely characterizing its behavioral model, $O_C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is the set of $n$-tuples (performance values) that are achievable by $C$.

3. Evaluation function $\phi$ - Given a circuit $C$, $I_C$ and $O_C$, $\phi : I_C \rightarrow O_C$ allows translating a parameter $m$-tuple set into a performance $n$-tuple set.

4. Performance relation $P$ - Given a circuit $C$, $I_C$, $O_C$ and $\phi_C$, we define the performance relation of $C$ given $I_C$ and $\phi_C$ to be $P_C$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ that hold only for points $\phi \in O_C$. With a little abuse in notation, we will denote both the performance relation characteristic function $\chi_P(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and the relation itself with $P_C(x)$.

Unfortunately, very little is known a priori about $\phi_C$: circuits are nonlinear systems so complex that it is difficult to derive any strong property concerning $O_C$ or $P_C$. However, it is usually the case that the control set $I_C$ of interest is a region of $\mathbb{R}^m$ where $\phi_C$ can be assumed to be continuous. If we also assume $I$ to be a connected set (or a union of connected sets), then $O$ will be a (union of) connected set as well, which is the only property we will exploit for building the approximation of $P_C$.

Even when the continuity assumption does not strictly hold in $I$, the set of performances that we are interested in modeling usually relates to circuits with well determined operating characteristics (performance invariant $\mu(x) = 1$). For example, when we look at an oscillator we are not concerned in modeling points where it does not oscillate and that would introduce an abrupt discontinuity in its performance figures. As long as the circuit remains in that operating mode, we can assume its performance to vary with
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the performance relation \( \mathcal{P} \). These approximating functions

are of the form

\[
\phi(x) = \text{sign}(\sum \alpha_i e^{-\gamma |x-x_i|^2} - \rho)
\]

where \( x_i \) are input samples, \( \alpha_i \) are weighting multipliers, \( \rho \) is a constant, \( \gamma \) is a parameter controlling the fit of the approx-

imation and the sum is over a proper set of samples (support vector set).

SVMs belong to the class of hyper-plane classifiers that separate data points according to which side of a hyper-

plane they fall. Non-linear mappings \( \psi(\cdot) \) of the input samples into a high dimensional feature space are exploited so to

increase data separability through hyperplanes. More specifically, SVMs exploit mapping to Hilbert spaces through kernel

functions, so that a kernel \( k(x, \cdot) \) is associated at each point \( x \). In this paper, because of the weak properties that we have on \( \mathcal{P} \), the Gaussian (Radial Basis Function - RBF) kernel is chosen,

\[
k(x, x') = e^{-\gamma \|x-x'\|^2}
\]

where \( \gamma \) is a parameter of the kernel and controls the “width” of the kernel function around \( x \). In paragraph 5.3 we show a

method to modify the kernel function to improve the approx-

imation accuracy. The optimal hyperplane is represented by a small fraction of the original training data and can be

computed very efficiently through the following optimization problem:

\[
\min \frac{1}{2} \|w\|^2 + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \xi_i - \nu p
\]

s.t. \( y_i(w \cdot x_i + b) \geq \rho - \xi_i, \quad \rho, \xi_i \geq 0 \)

where \( \mathbf{x}_i = \psi(x_i) \) are the training samples, \( y_i \) are the training

labels, \( m \) is the number of samples, \( w = \sum_{i=1}^{m} y_i \alpha_i \mathbf{x}_i \) defines the optimal hyperplane in terms of a linear combina-

tion of samples and \( nSV \) is the number of support vectors. The parameter \( \nu \) provides an intuitively appealing control on

some of properties of the SVM; most importantly \( \nu \) provides an upper bound on the fraction of false negatives (outliers).

In Section 5.1 we rely on a standard two-class SVM clas-

sifiers to build an approximation for \( \mathcal{P} \). A more direct ap-

proach, however, is to make use of the so-called “one-class SVM” [8]. Since the characteristic functions of the perform-

ance relations being considered are deterministic, the sup-

port regions show sharp boundaries. The SVM approach

also holds open the promise of obtaining representations of

the performance space at varying levels of abstraction, pro-

viding needed flexibility for the design process. In Section 6,

we investigate an approach for achieving such abstraction that makes use of the computational properties of the SVM

approach.

5. SVM APPROXIMATIONS OF \( \mathcal{P} \)

The accuracy of an approximation \( \hat{\mathcal{P}} \) is ideally assessed by two quantities: the rate of false negatives and the rate

of false positives. In our problem, false positives represent a more serious problem than false negatives. In fact, top-

down methodologies rely on predicted performances being achievable when partitioning constraints over all the blocks in

the system; therefore, a false positive would make the resulting design not feasible. On the other hand, false nega-

tives may prevent us to achieve a better point but the design would still be feasible. Although false positives are of great

interest, they are also problematic to measure—since we use simulation to generate samples, there is no constructive way

of generating points in \( \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{O} \).

In the attempt of gaining some initial insight into the rate of occurrence of false positives, we generated plots of some
characteristic 2-D and 3-D projections of $P_{LNA}(\cdot)$. Examples of such plots are reported in Figure 2, where we show the projection on a plane representing second-order harmonic distortion ($HD_2$) and third-order ($HD_3$) for four different estimators to be described in the following section. Estimators that place the estimated boundary around regions that contain few data points are oversmoothed, and provide visual evidence of the need to choose smaller values of regularization parameters.

We have also explored a more quantitative approach, based on the following intuition. Since $\mathcal{O}$ generally lies in a low-dimensional manifold in the ambient Euclidean space, if data are sampled throughout $\mathbb{R}^n$, the number of true positives ($n_p\mathcal{P}$) is expected to be small relative to the number of false positives ($n_{FP}$). Also, for reasonable values of the SVM parameters ($\gamma$ — controls the width of the kernel around the $i^{th}$ support vector, and $\nu$ — controls false positives), such that the performance space is approximated as a connected set, it is reasonable to expect that $n_{FP}$ may be nearly independent of the SVM parameters. This suggests that we can model the number of positives, $n_p(\gamma, \nu)$, from samples in $\mathbb{R}^n$ as follows:

$$n_p(\gamma, \nu) = n_TP + n_{FP}(\gamma, \nu).$$  

Thus, based on the rate of variation of $n_p(\gamma, \nu)$ with $\gamma$ and $\nu$, we can obtain a more quantitative basis for setting optimal values for $\gamma$ and $\nu$ and thereby controlling the problematic false positive rate.

5.1 Two-class SVM

One approach to finding an approximation of $\mathcal{O}$ is to attempt to use the powerful tools of two-class SVMs to form a discriminant boundary that separates $\mathcal{O}$ from its complement. This requires generating artificial “negative-class” data from the complement, and given that we are unable to generate data from the complement set algorithmically (the simulator only generates “positive-class” data), we must develop heuristics for generating such data. We have studied three different heuristics for specifying suitable density functions $p(x)$, $(x \in [-1, 1]^7)$ that can be used to generate “negative-class” data:

- $p_{WN}(x) = \text{constant};$
- $p_{data}(x) = \prod i \hat{p}_i(x_i)$, where $\hat{p}_i(x_i)$ is the empirical marginal density function of points in $\mathcal{O}$ on the $i^{th}$ dimension;
- $p_{comp}(x) = \prod i \hat{q}_i(x_i)$, where $\hat{q}_i(x_i) = \frac{\hat{p}_{max} - \hat{p}_i(x_i)}{\hat{p}_{max} \Delta x_i}$, $\Delta x_i$ = range of variable $x_i$, is a complementary density function of $\hat{p}_i(x_i)$ (in the sense that $\arg\max\{\hat{p}_i(x_i)\} \equiv \arg\min\{\hat{q}_i(x_i)\}$).

The first approach places negative points independently of the actual $\mathcal{O}$ so that the number of points near the bound-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of random samples</th>
<th>#SV</th>
<th>%Train</th>
<th>%Test</th>
<th>FP with 40k noise samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>98.76</td>
<td>95.56</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>97.08</td>
<td>92.07</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>3,056</td>
<td>93.70</td>
<td>90.11</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Performance of two-class ($\gamma = 20, \nu = 0.05, 5,000 +1$ samples). Large negative sets decrease the number of false positives, but for sets larger than 30,000 samples the false negative rates become significantly worse.

Figure 3: Test error rates (false negatives) and random positive rates achieved by a one-class SVM trained with 5,000 samples and $\nu = 0.05$ as a function of $\gamma$. False negative rates are computed presenting the SVM with 10,000 fresh samples, while random positives with 80,000 random samples.
that of two-class SVMs:

\[
\min_{w, \xi, \rho} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|w\|^2 + \frac{1}{\nu m} \sum_i \xi_i - \rho \right\} \quad (5)
\]

\[
s.t. \quad w \cdot x_i \geq \rho - \xi_i, \quad \xi_i \geq 0
\]

As with two-class SVMs, there are efficient algorithms to solve this quadratic programming problem that exploit structural properties of SVMs, e.g., [9] [10]. We based our implementation on libsvm [1], and we trained SVMs with up to 50,000 samples in very reasonable time (10’s of minutes).

Differently from the two class formulation (3), there is no explicit penalties for false positives in (5) — all y_i's are +1. As a consequence, larger values of \( \gamma \) in the RBF kernel are required to achieve tight approximations for the performance region. In our case, for moderate values of \( \gamma (\approx 8) \), the number of positives (eqn. 4) represents a major problem, as can be seen from Figure 3. Increasing \( \gamma \) reduces the number of positives. However, the performance in terms of generalization becomes worse than in the two-class case, as reported in Table 2 (false negatives are about 8% higher than comparable two-class SVMs). Finally, SVMs tend to degenerate into Parzen window estimators as larger and larger values for \( \gamma \) are used.

### 5.3 Improving accuracy

The accuracy of the estimator can be improved by enhancing the resolution in the support region boundaries. Since the underlying problem is deterministic, the transition across the boundary should be sharp. One way to achieve improved resolution is via conformal transformation. This approach was described in the context of the two-class SVM by [12] and [13], but the basic idea is also applicable to the one-class SVM. In particular, an initial estimate of the boundary is provided by prior training of an SVM. Since support vectors are located on the boundary of the hyperplane in feature space, they provide information about the region that is to undergo expansion. This expansion is achieved via a conformal transformation:

\[
\hat{k}(x, x') = c(x) \cdot k(x, x') \cdot c(x').
\]

(6)

Possible conformal transformations include:

\[
c_1(x) = \sum_i \alpha_i \cdot e^{-\|x-x_i\|^2}, \quad c_2(x) = \sum_i e^{-\zeta_i \|x-x_i\|^2}
\]

(7)

where \( \zeta_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_j \|x_{\eta(j)} - x_j\|^2 \), and where \( x_{\eta(j)} \) is the \( j^{th} \) nearest neighbor of \( x_i \). \( \alpha_i \) and \( x_i \) refer to an SVM previously trained on the same dataset. Our results with both conformal transformations show significant performance improvements (see Table 2), with \( c_1(x) \) performing slightly better than \( c_2(x) \). However, the results achievable with active learning schemes (sec. 5.4) and the complexity of projections over transformed kernels (sec. 6) make their use less attractive.

### 5.4 Active learning

Because one-class SVMs estimate the degree of novelty of a given vector, it is possible to exploit misclassified samples as seeds for further sample generation, thus forcing the sampling scheme to place more points where fewer are present [2]. Ideally, all the training samples should be correctly classified, but the need to regularize forces a fraction of the training samples to be misclassified (controlled via the parameter \( \nu \)). We can exploit such false negatives as follows.

For each such false negative \( o_i \), we can reinforce the information content of the data point (i.e. its novelty) by generating new samples \( \{o_{i}\} \), in the neighborhood of \( o_i \). One way to achieve this is by applying small random perturbations to the input vector \( i \). Even if the simulation function \( o_{m} \) is not bijective, we can store the mapping \( \{i \} \rightarrow \{o \} \) to get \( i \). The set \( \{i \} \) is then simulated to generate a new sample \( o' \). A new SVM is then trained on \( O \cup O' \) and the process is iterated. As a consequence, the accuracy of the approximation \( \hat{P} \) of \( P \) is increased.

We tested the approach by running five simulation/train iterations, starting from a data set consisting of 1,000 samples and selecting 5% more samples each time. We started with relatively small values of \( \gamma \) and relatively large values for \( \nu \) because these combinations of parameters produce very smooth support regions that allow to better isolate “novel” points. In successive iterations, \( \gamma \) was increased while \( \nu \) decreased using a sort of annealing schedule leading to the final SVM reported in Figure 4. For each selected sample a variable number of new simulation points was generated depending on the value of the decision function (the more negative, the more simulations). The resulting \( \hat{P}_{LNA,5} \) (trained on 3,065 samples, Figure 4) yields excellent performance, displaying features that were not present in SVMs trained with uniformly sampled datasets containing 5,000 samples.

### 6. PROJECTIONS ON \( P \)

Given the nature of top-down flows, the same circuit may be considered at different levels of abstraction in the design process. As a consequence, given an analog circuit \( C \) and its performance relation \( P_{C}(x), x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), it is often the case that at a high level of abstraction we are interested in a lower-dimensional relation \( P_{C}(x') \) with \( x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n'} \), \( n' < n \). \( x' \) is a projection of \( x \) that refers to a more abstract view of the circuit. For example, \( x = [\text{gain}, \text{bandwidth}, \text{noise, distortion}], x' = [\text{gain, bandwidth}] \). The formal definition of \( P'(x') \) is:

\[
P'(x') = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } \exists x'' \text{ s.t. } P([x'x'']) = 1 \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]
and so the support vector.

Then if on a randomized testing procedure. By augmenting the ba-

tion algorithm allows considering the same circuit at differ-
sions on implementation parameters. An efficient projec-
tion provides a clear separation of abstraction levels,
mance space of an analog circuit based on SVMs. The result-
7. CONCLUSIONS

When working with SVMs, the problem becomes that of
finding $x''$ that makes the decision function positive given
$x'$. An equivalent condition is that the maximum of $f(x) =
\sum \gamma_i k(x, x_i) - \rho$ is positive, which generates a non-
linear global optimization problem. However, the decision
function is a sum of Gaussian kernels that, in our case, have
large $\gamma$ parameters. Therefore, each point where such a
Gaussian is centered (i.e., each support vector) provides a
small neighborhood of a possible local optimum. Exploring
these points running a simple steepest ascent method from
the support vectors, we can keep track of local optima and
find the global optimum more rapidly. We have implemented
this approach to compute projections. Some heuristics have
also been adopted to limit the number of support vectors to
be checked for optimality. If we rewrite the decision function as:

$$f((x' x'')) = \sum \alpha_i e^{-\gamma \|x' - x_i\|^2} e^{-\gamma \|x'' - x_i''\|^2},$$

then if $\|x' - x_i\| = \|x'' - x_i''\|$ is “large” ($x'$ is fixed) $\alpha_i$ will be very small
and so the support vector $x_i$ will not be a good candidate
to get to the maximum. Furthermore, if the SVM had a global
optimum in the neighbor of $x_i'$ because of $x_i$, then the SVM
would classify $x$ based on a support vector whose compo-
ents $x_i'$ are “far” from $x'$. This would be an inconsistent
behavior for an SVM based on RBF modeling $\mathcal{O} = \phi(I)$
under the assumptions made in section 3. The condition
$\|x' - x_i\| > 0.1$ provides a good heuristic for discarding
support vectors. Given a candidate support vector $x_i$,
and the smoothness of the decision function, we found that
a simple steepest ascent local optimizer suffices for finding
the optimum in fewer than 15 iterations. The complexity of
the implemented algorithm is ($n$ is the dimensionality of $\mathcal{P}$
and $l$ the number of support vectors) $O(l^n)$ for the normal
case and $O(l^3n)$ for the conformal mapping case.
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Table 2: Summary of SVM performance. The false negative rate on the training set is very good due to the $\nu$-SVM formulation used, with the exception of the third row, which relies on $p_{data}(\cdot)$ to generate random samples (random samples blur the data pattern). All two-class SVMs were trained with 30,000 random negative samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%Train</th>
<th>%Test</th>
<th>$\mathcal{O}$</th>
<th>$\nu$</th>
<th>$\gamma$</th>
<th>#SV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-Class $p_n(\cdot)$</td>
<td>97.08</td>
<td>92.07</td>
<td>$\mathbb{R}^4$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Class $0.66 p_n(\cdot) 0.33 p_c(\cdot)$</td>
<td>95.66</td>
<td>93.06</td>
<td>$\mathbb{R}^4$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Class $0.66 p_n(\cdot) 0.33 p_d(\cdot)$</td>
<td>71.12</td>
<td>60.58</td>
<td>$\mathbb{R}^4$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Class $0.6 p_n(\cdot) 0.2 p_d(\cdot)0.2 p_c(\cdot)$</td>
<td>97.84</td>
<td>91.81</td>
<td>$\mathbb{R}^4$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Class</td>
<td>95.72</td>
<td>85.11</td>
<td>$\mathbb{R}^4$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Class prior $c_1(\cdot)$</td>
<td>95.20</td>
<td>79.67</td>
<td>$\mathbb{R}^7$</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Class prior $c_2(\cdot)$</td>
<td>95.97</td>
<td>84.39</td>
<td>$\mathbb{R}^7$</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. REFERENCES

dimensional distribution,” Tech. Rep. MSR-TR-99-87, Mi-
crosoft Research, 1999.