

rls_dual_mkl: A PFBS-based Implementation for Multiple Kernel Learning

(Jeremiah) Zhe Liu

ZHL112@MAIL.HARVARD.EDU

Department of Biostatistics

Harvard School of Public Health

Boston, MA, 02115

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Multiple Kernel Learning Problem	2
1.2	Iterative PFBS Algorithm	2
1.3	Implementation Detail	3
1.3.1	Normalization	3
1.3.2	Choice of Stepsize	3
1.3.3	Choice of μ	4
1.3.4	Parallel	4
2	Software Structure and Usage	4
3	Example	4

1. Introduction

1.1. Multiple Kernel Learning Problem

Multiple kernel learning (MKL) (Bach et al. (2004)) is the process of finding an optimal kernel from a prescribed (convex) set \mathcal{K} of basis kernels, for learning a real-valued function by regularization. In this work, we consider a RKHS $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2 \cdots \oplus \mathcal{H}_M$ with reproducing kernel $\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K} = \{\sum_{i=1}^M c_i \mathbf{k}_i | (c_i \geq 0 \forall i) \wedge \sum_{i=1}^M c_i = 1\}$ such that $f = \sum_{i=1}^M f_i, f_i \in \mathcal{H}_i$. By Micchelli and Pontil (2005), the problem of multiple kernel learning corresponds to find f^* such that:

$$\arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{H}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Q\left(\sum_{j=1}^M f_j(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}\right) + \tau g\left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^M \|f_j\|_{\mathcal{H}}\right)^2\right) \right\}$$

Rosasco et al. (2009) generalized above problem by taking Q to be square loss, $g(\cdot) = \sqrt{\cdot}$ and also impose L1 regularization, leading to the elastic-net-regulated problem:

$$\arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{H}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^M f_j(x_i) - y_i\right)^2 + \mu \sum_{j=1}^M \|f_j\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + 2\tau \sum_{j=1}^M \|f_j\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right\} \quad (1)$$

1.2. Iterative PFBS Algorithm

By Theorem 1 of Rosasco et al. (2009), since the penalty function is lower semicontinuous, coercive, convex and one-homogenous, solution to problem 1 f^* is the unique fixed point of the the contractive mapping with step size σ :

$$\mathcal{T}_{\sigma}(f) = (\mathbf{I} - \pi_{\frac{\tau}{\sigma}K})(f - \frac{1}{2\sigma} \nabla_f [\frac{1}{n} \|f - y\|^2])$$

where $\pi_{\frac{\tau}{\sigma}K}(g)$ is a project operator which project g to $\mathcal{H}' = \{f \in \mathcal{H} | \|f_j\|_{\mathcal{H}_j} \leq \frac{1}{\tau/\sigma} \forall j\}$, or more rigorously:

$$\pi_{\frac{\tau}{\sigma}K}(g) = \frac{\tau}{\sigma} v, \quad \text{where } v = \arg \min_{v \in \mathcal{H}, \|v_j\| \leq 1} \left\| \frac{\tau}{\sigma} v - g \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2$$

Above mapping can also be written in terms of Kernel matrices by generalizing representer theorem and write $f_j^*(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{ji}^T k_j(x_i, x) = \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^T \mathbf{k}_j(x)$, where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j$ and $\mathbf{k}_j(x)$ are $n \times 1$ vectors. Further, if denote:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{Mn \times 1} &= (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_M)^T \\ \mathbf{k}(x)_{Mn \times 1} &= (\mathbf{k}_1(x)^T, \dots, \mathbf{k}_M(x)^T)^T \\ \mathbf{K}_{Mn \times Mn} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}_1 & \dots & \mathbf{K}_M \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{K}_1 & \dots & \mathbf{K}_M \end{bmatrix}, \text{ where } \mathbf{K}_i = \mathbf{k}_i(\cdot) \mathbf{k}_i(\cdot)^T \\ \mathbf{y}_{Mn \times 1} &= (y_{n \times 1}^T, \dots, y_{n \times 1}^T)^T \end{aligned}$$

The contraction mapping can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_\sigma(f) &= (\mathbf{I} - \pi_{\frac{\tau}{\sigma}K})\left(\left[\left(1 - \frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right)\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \frac{1}{\sigma n}(\mathbf{K}\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \mathbf{y})\right]^T \mathbf{k}\right) \quad \text{where} \\ \pi_{\frac{\tau}{\sigma}K}(g)_j &= \min\left\{1, \frac{\|g_j\|_{\mathcal{H}_j}}{\tau/\sigma}\right\} * \frac{g_j}{\|g_j\|_{\mathcal{H}_j}} = \min\left\{1, \frac{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^T \mathbf{K}_j \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j}}{\tau/\sigma}\right\} * \frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^T \mathbf{k}_j}{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^T \mathbf{K}_j \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j}} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Thus the projection $\mathbf{I} - \pi_{\frac{\tau}{\sigma}K}$ corresponds to the soft-thresholding operator for $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j$:

$$\mathbf{S}_{\frac{\tau}{\sigma}}(K, \boldsymbol{\alpha})_j = \frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^T}{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^T \mathbf{K}_j \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j}} \left(\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^T \mathbf{K}_j \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j} - \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \right)_+$$

Above discussions lead to below algorithm:

Algorithm 1: MKL Algorithm

```

set  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^0 = \mathbf{0}$ 
for  $p = 1$  to MAX_ITER do
     $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0^p = \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right)\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{p-1} - \frac{1}{\sigma n}(\mathbf{K}\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{p-1} - \mathbf{y})$ 
     $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^p = \mathbf{S}_{\frac{\tau}{\sigma}}(K, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0^p)$ 
end for
return  $f^{\text{MAX\_ITER}} = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\text{MAX\_ITER}})^T \mathbf{k}$ 
    
```

1.3. Implementation Detail

1.3.1. NORMALIZATION

1.3.2. CHOICE OF STEPSIZE

The convergence of the aforementioned procedure is guaranteed by Banach Fixed Point theorem, given proper choice of σ . Based on [Bach et al. \(2004\)](#), it can be shown that a suitable choice of σ is $\sigma = \frac{1}{4}(a * L_{\min} + b * L_{\max}) + \mu$, where (b, a) denotes the lower/upper bound on the eigenvalue of \mathbf{K} , and (L_{\min}, L_{\max}) denotes the lower/upper bound of $\nabla^2 Q(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{y})$.

In the context where Q is square loss (i.e. $\nabla_{\mathbf{f}}^2 Q(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{y}) = 2$), we have:

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{2}(a + b) + \mu$$

Approximate eigenvalue of \mathbf{K} using the PerronFrobenius upper bound, i.e. $\sigma_{\max} \leq \sum_j \mathbf{K}_{ij}$

Approximate eigenvalue of \mathbf{K} using its upper bound $\sigma = \|\mathbf{K}\| \leq M * \sum_{m=1}^M \|\mathbf{K}_m\|$, since:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{K}\| &= \underset{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{Mn}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \mathbf{K} \boldsymbol{\alpha} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^M \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i \right)^T \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \mathbf{K}_j \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j \right) \\
&\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^M \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i \right\| * \left\| \sum_{j=1}^M \mathbf{K}_j \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{j=1}^M \mathbf{K}_j \right\| * \left\| \sum_{i=1}^M \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i \right\|^2 = \|\mathbf{I}_{n \times Mn} \boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2 * \sum_{j=1}^M \|\mathbf{K}_j\| \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{I}_{n \times Mn}\|^2 \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}\|^2 * \sum_{j=1}^M \|\mathbf{K}_j\| \\
&= M * \sum_{m=1}^j \|\mathbf{K}_j\|
\end{aligned}$$

[Barzilai and Borwein \(1988\)](#)

$$\Delta \boldsymbol{\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}^p - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{p-1}$$

$$\Delta \mathbf{g} = u * (\boldsymbol{\alpha}^p - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{p-1}) + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{K} (\boldsymbol{\alpha}^p - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{p-1}) = (u \mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{K}) \Delta \boldsymbol{\alpha}$$

$$\frac{\langle \Delta \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \Delta \mathbf{g} \rangle}{\langle \Delta \mathbf{g}, \Delta \mathbf{g} \rangle} = \frac{\sum_{m=1}^M \Delta \boldsymbol{\alpha}_m^T \Delta \mathbf{g}_m}{\sum_{m=1}^M \Delta \mathbf{g}_m^T \Delta \mathbf{g}_m}$$

1.3.3. CHOICE OF μ

[\(Rosasco et al., 2009\)](#)

Contraction mapping

$$\|(1 - \frac{\mu}{\sigma}) \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{\sigma n} \mathbf{K}\|$$

1.3.4. PARALLEL

Notice that in (2), \mathcal{T}_σ updates $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ by group, it is thus possible to write \mathcal{T} at p^{th} step as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_\sigma^p &= [\mathcal{T}_{\sigma,1}^p, \mathcal{T}_{\sigma,2}^p, \dots, \mathcal{T}_{\sigma,M}^p] \quad \text{with} \\
\mathcal{T}_{\sigma,j}^p &= \mathbf{S}_{\frac{\tau}{\sigma}} \left(\mathbf{K}, \left(1 - \frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right) \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^{p-1} - \frac{1}{n} * \sum_{m=1}^M \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m^{p-1} \right) \quad \text{where } \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m^{p-1} = \frac{1}{\sigma} (\mathbf{K}_m \boldsymbol{\alpha}_m^{p-1} - y)
\end{aligned}$$

2. Software Structure and Usage

3. Example

References

- F Bach, G Lanckriet, and M Jordan. Multiple kernel learning, conic duality, and the smo algorithm. *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*, 69, 2004.
- J Barzilai and J Borwein. Two-point step size gradient methods. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 8(1):141148, 1988.
- C Micchelli and M Pontil. Learning the kernel function via regularization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 6:10991125, 2005.
- L Rosasco, S Mosci, M Santoro, A Verri, and S Villa. Iterative projection methods for structured sparsity regularization. Technical report, MIT, 2009.