May 20-23, 2008

PAKDD2008

Semi-Supervised Local Fisher Discriminant Analysis for Dimensionality Reduction



Masashi Sugiyama (Tokyo Tech.) Tsuyoshi Ide (IBM) Shinichi Nakajima (Nikon) Jun Sese (Ochanomizu Univ.)

Dimensionality Reduction

Curse of dimensionality: High-dimensional data is hard to deal with



We want to reduce dimensionality while keeping intrinsic information

Linear Dimensionality Reduction ³

We focus on linear dimensionality reduction:

- High-dimensional samples: $\{m{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ $m{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$
- Embedding matrix: $oldsymbol{T}$
- Embedded samples: $\{m{z}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ $m{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^r$



Organization

- 1. Linear dimensionality reduction
- 2. Unsupervised methods:
 - Principal component analysis (PCA)
 - Locality preserving projection (LPP)
- 3. Supervised methods:
 - Fisher discriminant analysis (FDA)
 - Local Fisher discriminant analysis (LFDA)
- 4. Semi-supervised method:
 - Semi-supervised LFDA (SELF)
- 5. Conclusions



Principal Component Analysis (PCA⁵)

- Unsupervised learning:
 - Unlabeled samples

$$oldsymbol{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n \quad oldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

- Basic idea of PCA:
 - Find the embedding subspace that gives the best approximation to the original samples
 - Equivalent to finding the embedding subspace with the largest variance





Principal Component Analysis (PCA⁶)

 $oldsymbol{\mu} = rac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n oldsymbol{x}_i$

Total scatter matrix:

$$oldsymbol{S}^{(t)} = \sum_{i=1}^n (oldsymbol{x}_i - oldsymbol{\mu}) (oldsymbol{x}_i - oldsymbol{\mu})^ op$$

PCA criterion: maximize scatter after
embedding
$$\max_{T} \left[\operatorname{tr}(T^{\top}S^{(t)}T(T^{\top}T)^{-1}) \right]$$

normalizatio

Solution: major eigenvectors of $S^{(t)}$

$$\boldsymbol{T}_{PCA} = (\boldsymbol{\varphi}_1 | \boldsymbol{\varphi}_2 | \cdots | \boldsymbol{\varphi}_r)$$
$$\boldsymbol{S}^{(t)} \boldsymbol{\varphi} = \lambda \boldsymbol{\varphi} \qquad \lambda_1 \ge \lambda_2 \ge \cdots \ge \lambda_d$$



Global structure is well preserved.
 But, local structure such as clusters is not necessarily preserved.

Organization

- 1. Linear dimensionality reduction
- 2. Unsupervised methods:
 - Principal component analysis (PCA)
 - Locality preserving projection (LPP)
- 3. Supervised methods:
 - Fisher discriminant analysis (FDA)
 - Local Fisher discriminant analysis (LFDA)
- 4. Semi-supervised method:
 - Semi-supervised LFDA (SELF)
- 5. Conclusions



Locality Preserving Projection (LPP)

He & Niyogi (NIPS2003)

Basic idea: Embed similar samples close





Affinity Matrix

10

Nearby samples have large affinity
 Far-apart samples have small affinity



Local Scaling Heuristic

Zelnik-Manor & Perona (NIPS2005)

11

Local scaling based affinity matrix:

$$oldsymbol{A}_{i,j} = \exp\left(-rac{\|oldsymbol{x}_i-oldsymbol{x}_j\|^2}{\gamma_i\gamma_j}
ight)$$

 $\mathbf{P}\gamma_i$: scaling around the sample x_i

$$\gamma_i = \|oldsymbol{x}_i - oldsymbol{x}_i^{(k)}\|$$

 $oldsymbol{x}_i^{(k)}$: k-th nearest neighbor sample of $oldsymbol{x}_i$

• A heuristic choice is k=7.

NOTE: We may cross-validate k in supervised cases if necessary

Locality Preserving Projection (LPP)

Locality matrix:

 $oldsymbol{A}_{i,j}$:Affinity matrix

$$\boldsymbol{S}^{(l)} = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{A}_{i,j} (\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{x}_j) (\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{x}_j)^{\top}$$

LPP criterion: put samples with large affinity close $\int \int (m T q(l)m(mT m) - m T q(l)m(mT m)) dt$

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{T}} \left[\operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{T}^{\top} \boldsymbol{S}^{(l)} \boldsymbol{T}(\boldsymbol{T}^{\top} \boldsymbol{T})^{-1}) \right]$$
Normalization

Solution: minor eigenvectors of $S^{(l)}$

$$\boldsymbol{T}_{LPP} = (\boldsymbol{\varphi}_d | \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{d-1} | \cdots | \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{d-r+1})$$

$$oldsymbol{S}^{(l)}oldsymbol{arphi} = \lambda oldsymbol{arphi} \qquad \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_d$$





Cluster structure tends to be preserved.
 Class-separability is not taken into account due to unsupervised nature.

Organization

- 1. Linear dimensionality reduction
- 2. Unsupervised methods:
 - Principal component analysis (PCA)
 - Locality preserving projection (LPP)
- 3. Supervised methods:
 - Fisher discriminant analysis (FDA)
 - Local Fisher discriminant analysis (LFDA)
- 4. Semi-supervised method:
 - Semi-supervised LFDA (SELF)
- 5. Conclusions



Supervised Dimensionality Reduction

Supervised learning:

• Labeled samples

$$\{(\boldsymbol{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n \qquad y_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, c\}$$

Put samples in the same class close

Put samples in different classes apart





Fisher Discriminant Analysis (FDA)7

FDA criterion:

- Increase between-class scatter
- Reduce within-class scatter

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{T}} \left[\operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{T}^{\top} \boldsymbol{S}^{(b)} \boldsymbol{T}(\boldsymbol{T}^{\top} \boldsymbol{S}^{(w)} \boldsymbol{T})^{-1}) \right]$$

Solution: major eigenvectors of between/within-class scatter matrices

$$oldsymbol{T}_{FDA} = (oldsymbol{arphi}_1 | oldsymbol{arphi}_2 | \cdots | oldsymbol{arphi}_r)$$
 $oldsymbol{S}^{(b)} oldsymbol{arphi} = \lambda oldsymbol{S}^{(w)} oldsymbol{arphi}$
 $oldsymbol{\lambda}_1 \ge \lambda_2 \ge \cdots \ge \lambda_d$

Examples of FDA



- Samples in different classes are separated from each other.
- But, FDA does not work well in the presence of within-class multi-modality.

Since $rank(S^{(b)}) = c - 1$, at most c - 1 features can be extracted.

Organization

- 1. Linear dimensionality reduction
- 2. Unsupervised methods:
 - Principal component analysis (PCA)
 - Locality preserving projection (LPP)
- 3. Supervised methods:
 - Fisher discriminant analysis (FDA)
 - Local Fisher discriminant analysis (LFDA)
- 4. Semi-supervised method:
 - Semi-supervised LFDA (SELF)
- 5. Conclusions



Medical diagnosis:

Hormone imbalance (too high/low) vs. normal

Digit recognition:

Even (0,2,4,6,8) vs. odd (1,3,5,7,9)

Multi-class classification:

one class vs. the others (i.e, one-versus-rest)

Local FDA (LFDA)

Sugiyama (JMLR2007)

Basic idea:

- Put nearby samples in the same class close
- Don't care far-apart samples in the same class
- Put samples in different classes apart



LPP and FDA are combined!

Pairwise Expression of Scatter Matrices

$$\boldsymbol{S}^{(w)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{W}_{i,j}^{(w)} (\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{x}_j) (\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{x}_j)^{\top}$$
$$\boldsymbol{W}_{i,j}^{(w)} = \begin{cases} 1/n_{y_i} & (y_i = y_j) \\ 0 & (y_i \neq y_j) \end{cases}$$

$$\boldsymbol{S}^{(b)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{W}_{i,j}^{(b)} (\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{x}_j) (\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{x}_j)^{\top}$$

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{T}} \left[\operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{T}^{\top} \boldsymbol{S}^{(b)} \boldsymbol{T}(\boldsymbol{T}^{\top} \boldsymbol{S}^{(w)} \boldsymbol{T})^{-1}) \right] \qquad \boldsymbol{W}_{i,j}^{(b)} = \begin{cases} 1/n - 1/n_{y_i} & (y_i = y_j) \\ 1/n & (y_i \neq y_j) \end{cases}$$

Put samples in the same class close

Put samples in different classes apart

Local FDA (LFDA)

23

Local within-class scatter matrix: $A_{i,j}$:Affinity matrix

$$S^{(lw)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} W_{i,j}^{(lw)} (x_i - x_j) (x_i - x_j)^{\top}$$
$$W_{i,j}^{(lw)} = \begin{cases} A_{i,j}/n_{y_i} & (y_i = y_j) \\ 0 & (y_i \neq y_j) \end{cases}$$

Local between-class scatter matrix:

$$S^{(lb)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} W_{i,j}^{(lb)} (x_i - x_j) (x_i - x_j)^{\top}$$
$$W_{i,j}^{(lb)} = \begin{cases} A_{i,j} (1/n - 1/n_{y_i}) & (y_i = y_j) \\ 1/n & (y_i \neq y_j) \end{cases}$$

When $A_{i,j} = 1$, $S^{(lw)} = S^{(l)}$ and $S^{(lb)} = S^{(b)}$.

Local FDA (LFDA)

LFDA criterion:

- Increase local between-class scatter
- Reduce local within-class scatter

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{T}} \left[\operatorname{tr}(\boldsymbol{T}^{\top} \boldsymbol{S}^{(lb)} \boldsymbol{T}(\boldsymbol{T}^{\top} \boldsymbol{S}^{(lw)} \boldsymbol{T})^{-1}) \right]$$

Solution: major eigenvectors of local between/within-class scatter matrices

$$oldsymbol{S}^{(lb)}oldsymbol{arphi}=\lambdaoldsymbol{S}^{(lw)}oldsymbol{arphi}$$

$$oldsymbol{T}_{LFDA} = (\sqrt{\lambda_1} arphi_1 | \sqrt{\lambda_2} arphi_2 | \cdots | \sqrt{\lambda_r} arphi_r) \ \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda$$

Examples of LFDA



Between-class separability is preserved.
 Within-class cluster structure is also preserved.
 Since rank(S^(lb)) > c in general, no upper limit on the number of features to extract

25

Examples of LFDA (cont.)

Analysis of thyroid disease data (5-dim):

- T3-resin uptake test.
- Total Serum thyroxin as measured by the isotopic displacement method.

etc.

- Label: healthy or disease
- Two types of thyroid diseases:
 - Hyper-functioning: thyroid works too strongly
 - Hypo-functioning: thyroid works too weakly



- Healthy/sick are nicely separated.
- Hyper-/hypofunctioning are mixed.
- Healthy/sick and hyper-/hypofunctioning are both nicely separated.
- LFDA feature has high (negative) correlation to thyroid's functioning level.

Classification Error by 1-NN ²⁸

| | LFDA | LDI | NCA | MCML | LPP | PCA |
|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| banana | 13.7(0.8) | 13.6(0.8) | 14.3(2.0) | 39.4(6.7) | 13.6(0.8) | 13.6(0.8) |
| b-cancer | 34.7(4.3) | 36.4(4.9) | 34.9(5.0) | 34.0(5.8) | 33.5(5.4) | 34.5(5.0) |
| diabetes | 32.0(2.5) | 30.8(1.9) | | 31.2(2.1) | 31.5(2.5) | 31.2(3.0) |
| f-solar | 39.2(5.0) | 39.3(4.8) | | | 39.2(4.9) | 39.1(5.1) |
| german | 29.9(2.8) | 30.7(2.4) | 29.8(2.6) | 31.3(2.4) | 30.7(2.4) | 30.2(2.4) |
| heart | 21.9(3.7) | 23.9(3.1) | 23.0(4.3) | 23.3(3.8) | 23.3(3.8) | 24.3(3.5) |
| image | 3.2(0.8) | 3.0(0.6) | | 4.7(0.8) | 3.6(0.7) | 3.4(0.5) |
| ringnorm | 21.1(1.3) | 17.5(1.0) | 21.8(1.3) | 22.0(1.2) | 20.6(1.1) | 21.6(1.4) |
| splice | 16.9(0.9) | 17.9(0.8) | | 17.3(0.9) | 23.2(1.2) | 22.6(1.3) |
| thyroid | 4.6(2.6) | 8.0(2.9) | 4.5(2.2) | 18.5(3.8) | 4.2(2.9) | 4.9(2.6) |
| titanic | 33.1(11.9) | 33.1(11.9) | 33.0(11.9) | 33.1(11.9) | 33.0(11.9) | 33.0(12.0) |
| twonorm | 3.5(0.4) | 4.1(0.6) | 3.7(0.6) | 3.5(0.4) | 3.7(0.7) | 3.6(0.6) |
| waveform | 12.5(1.0) | 20.7(2.5) | 12.6(0.8) | 17.9(1.5) | 12.4(1.0) | 12.7(1.2) |
| Comp. Time | 1.00 | 1.11 | 97.23 | 70.61 | 1.04 | 0.91 |

- Mean and Std. of misclassification rate. Dim is chosen by cross-validation.
- Blue: Data with within-class multimodality, Red: Significantly better by 5% t-test
- LDI: Local disciminant information (Hastie & Tibshirani, IEEE-PAMI1996)
- NCA: Neighborhood component analysis (Goldberger et al. NIPS2004)
- MCML: Maximally collapsing metric learning (Globerson & Roweis, NIPS2005)

Organization

- 1. Linear dimensionality reduction
- 2. Unsupervised methods:
 - Principal component analysis (PCA)
 - Locality preserving projection (LPP)
- 3. Supervised methods:
 - Fisher discriminant analysis (FDA)
 - Local Fisher discriminant analysis (LFDA)
- 4. Semi-supervised method:
 - Semi-supervised LFDA (SELF)
- 5. Conclusions



Semi-supervised Dimensionality Reduction

Semi-supervised learning:

- Small number of labeled samples: $\{(\boldsymbol{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n'}$
- Large number of unlabeled samples: $\{m{x}_i\}_{i=n'+1}^n$
- Supervised dimensionality reduction method tends to overfit labeled samples.
- We want to utilize unlabeled samples.

LFDA and PCA in Semi-supervised Setting



LFDA tends to overfit.

PCA does not use label information
 LFDA and PCA tend to be complementary.

Semi-supervised LFDA (SELF) ³²

- Basic idea: Combine LFDA and PCA
- Key fact: Both involve similar eigenproblems.
 - LFDA: $S^{(lb)} arphi = \lambda S^{(lw)} arphi$ • PCA: $S^{(t)} arphi = \lambda arphi$

SELF criteiron: weighted sum of LFDA & PCA

$$oldsymbol{S}^{(rlb)}oldsymbol{arphi}=\lambdaoldsymbol{S}^{(rlw)}oldsymbol{arphi}$$

• Regularized local between-class scatter matrix:

$$\boldsymbol{S}^{(rlb)} = (1-\beta)\boldsymbol{S}^{(lb)} + \beta\boldsymbol{S}^{(t)} \quad 0 \le \beta \le 1$$

• Regularized local within-class scatter matrix:

$$\boldsymbol{S}^{(rlw)} = (1-\beta)\boldsymbol{S}^{(lw)} + \beta\boldsymbol{I}$$



Classification Error

| | LFDA | $\begin{array}{c} {\rm SELF} \\ (\beta=0.5) \end{array}$ | PCA | SELF (CV) |
|------|-----------|--|-----------|--------------|
| SSL1 | 14.9(1.8) | 6.0(1.3) | 6.2(1.1) | 6.0(1.4) |
| SSL2 | 15.7(0.9) | 9.6(1.1) | 11.2(0.8) | 10.3(2.4) |
| SSL3 | 21.1(3.9) | 14.3(1.8) | 15.5(1.0) | 14.1(1.4) |
| SSL4 | 33.4(3.5) | 36.6(2.4) | 48.7(2.4) | 33.4(3.7) |
| SSL5 | 27.5(2.3) | 27.2(2.3) | 31.0(1.9) | 27.3(2.9) |
| SSL6 | 38.1(1.5) | 35.4(2.4) | 27.3(2.7) | 27.0(2.7) |
| SSL7 | 29.4(2.4) | 29.1(2.4) | 29.3(1.6) | 27.7(1.4) |

 Data taken from semi-supervised learning book (Chapelle et al., 2006)
 Red: significantly better by 5% ttest

LFDA and PCA are complementary.

SELF($\beta = 0.5$ **) combines LFDA & PCA effectively.**

Optimizing β by cross-validation further improves the performance.

Non-linear Extension of SELF ³⁵ by Kernelization

Standard kernel trick allows us to obtain a non-linear version of SELF.



Conclusions

- Semi-supervised LFDA (SELF) : Combination of LFDA and PCA
 - Between-class separability enhanced.
 - Within-class local structure preserved.
 - Global data structure preserved.
 - Closed-form solution exists.
 - Computationally fast and stable.
 - Non-linear extension of SELF by kernelization