

Assignment 1—Group:

Chen Chen (480458339), Xiaodan Gan(440581983)
Xinyue Wang (440359463)

18th September 2018

Abstract

Abstract text goes here, justified and in italics. The abstract would normally be one paragraph long.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Related work	3
3	Methods	4
3.1	NMF and Gaussian noise	4
3.2	KLNMF and Poisson noise	6
3.3	Gaussian and Poisson are asymptotic equivalent	7
3.4	Multiple initial estimates avoids local minima	8
3.5	Preprocessing	9

1	Introduction	2
4	Experiments	9
4.1	Noise	9
5	Conclusion	9
A	Appendix	10

1 Introduction

Non-negative matrix factorization (NMF) is a matrix decomposition technique that approximates a data matrix with non-negative entries with the multiplication of two non-negative matrices.

$$V \approx WH,$$

where matrix W is a dictionary and matrix H is the new data matrix corresponding to the new dictionary W . As NMF only allows additive, non-subtractive combination of matrix factors, it is applicable to an extensive range of domain. Lee and Seung [1999] suggest that NMF is useful for image processing problems including facial recognition. Specifically, NMF generates two matrices W and H which are often referred as the basis images and weights. This is because the observed image V is approximated by a linear combination of W and H . This property also distinguishes NMF from other traditional image processing methods such as principal components analysis (PCA) and K-means clustering. Guillaumet and Vitrià [2002] demonstrate that NMF is more robust to corrupted images than PCA. Moreover, NMF is also applicable to text mining such as semantic analysis. More generally, NMF is useful to discover semantic features of an article by counting the frequency of each word than approximating the document from a subset of a large array of features [Lee and Seung, 1999].

In practice, face images could be easily corrupted during data collection by large magnitude noise. Corruption may result from lighting environment, facial expression or facial details. An NMF algorithm that is robust to large noise is desired for real-world application. Therefore, the objective of this project is to analyse

the robustness of NMF algorithms on corrupted dataset. We implement two NMF algorithms on real face image datasets, ORL dataset and Extended YaleB dataset. The face images are contaminated by artificial noises.

The rest of the report is organized as follows. We describe noisy design and two NMF algorithms including Euclidean Distance and Kullback-Leibler Divergence (KLD) in Section 2. Section 3 shows experiment setup and empirical results which demonstrate the robustness of the two NMF algorithms. The conclusions and future work are discussed in Section 5.

2 Related work

Researchers proposed many NMF algorithms. As the objective function of NMF is non-convex, for which the traditional gradient decent method is not applicable, [Lee and Seung \[2001\]](#) first proposes to algorithms which minimises Euclidean distance or Kullback-Leibler divergence (KLD) between the original matrix and its approximation. Although this algorithm is easy to implement and have reasonable convergent rate [[Lee and Seung, 2001](#)], it may fail on seriously corrupted dataset which violates its assumption of Gaussian noise or Poisson noise, respectively [[Guan et al., 2017](#)]. Moreover, [Yang et al. \[2011\]](#) indicate that KLD is sensitive to the initial value of matrix factors and requiries many iterations to retrieve from wrong initial values. To improve the robustness of NMF, many methods have been proposed. [Lam \[2008\]](#) proposes L_1 -norm based NMF to model noisy data by a Laplace distribution which is less sensitive to outliers. However, as L_1 -norm is not differentiable at zero, the optimization procedure is computationally expensive. [Kong et al. \[2011\]](#) proposed an NMF algorithm using L_{21} -norm loss function which is robust to outliers. The updating rules used in L_{21} -norm NMF, however, converge slowly because of a continual use of the power method [[Guan et al., 2017](#)].

Apart from different loss functions, several optimization methods were proposed to improve the performance of NMF. After [Lee and Seung \[2001\]](#) proposed multiplicative update rules MUR, [Lin \[2007\]](#) proposed a modified MUR which

guaranteed the convergence to a stationary point. This modified MUR, however, did not improve the convergence rate of traditional MUR [Guan et al., 2012]. Moreover, as MUR is not able to shrink all entries in matrix factors to zero, Berry et al. [2007] proposed a projected nonnegative least square (PNLS) method to overcome this problem. Although, in each nonnegative least square (NLS) subproblem, the least squares solution is directly projected to the negative quadratic, PNLS does not guarantee convergence [Guan et al., 2012]. In contrast to these gradient-based optimization methods, Kim and Park [2008] presented an active set method AS which divides variables into two sets, free set and active set and update free set in each iteration by solving unconstrained equation. Even though AS has good convergence rate, it assumes strictly convex in each NLS subproblem [Kim and Park, 2008].


3 Methods

Some carefully designed NMF are robust to various noises. These robust algorithms aim to significantly reduce the amount of noise while preserving the edges without blurring the image [Barbu, 2013]. Figure 3 shows three kinds of noises we designed, including Gaussian noise, Poisson noise, and Salt & Pepper noise.

3.1 NMF and Gaussian noise

Gaussian noise is a noise with a probability density function being normal with mean zero. Lee and Seung [2001] propose the first NMF with the objective function between image V and its NMF factorisation W and H being

$$\|V - WH\| = \sum_{ij} [V_{ij} - (WH)_{ij}]^2. \quad (1)$$



To minimise this object function of least square, [Lee and Seung \[2001\]](#) prove the convergence of the multiplication update rule

$$H_{jk} \leftarrow H_{jk} \frac{(W^T V)_{jk}}{(W^T W H)_{jk}} \text{ and } W_{ij} \leftarrow W_{ij} \frac{(V H)_{ij}}{(W H H^T)_{ij}}. \quad (2)$$

Here, $()_{ij}/()_{ij}$ denotes elementwise division of the two matrix. [Liu and Tao \[2016\]](#) shows this NMF algorithm minimises Gaussian.

3.2 KLNMF and Poisson noise

Poisson noise or shot noise is a type of electronic noise that occurs when the finite number of particles that carry energy, such as electrons in an electronic circuit or photons in an optical device, is small enough to give rise to detectable statistical fluctuations in a measurement. [Lee and Seung \[2001\]](#) suggest that KLNMF is a algorithm that minimising the Kullback-Leibler divergence

$$\begin{aligned} D(V||WH) &= \sum_{ij} \left(V_{ij} \log \frac{V_{ij}}{(WH)_{ij}} - V_{ij} + (WH)_{ij} \right) \\ &= \sum_{ij} \left(-V_{ij} \log (WH)_{ij} + (WH)_{ij} + C(V_{ij}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $C(V_{ij}) = V_{ij} \log V_{ij} - V_{ij}$. $C(V_{ij})$ is a function of the observed image matrix V only. [Lee and Seung \[2001\]](#) also suggest a multiplication update rule to find as the optimisation procedure of KLNMF

$$H_{jk} \leftarrow H_{jk} \frac{\sum_i W_{ij} V_{ik} / (WH)_{jk}}{\sum_{i'} W_{i'j}} \text{ and } W_{ij} \leftarrow W_{ij} \frac{\sum_k H_{jk} V_{ik} / (WH)_{jk}}{\sum_{k'} H_{ik'}}. \quad (4)$$

As this original image matrix V is observed, minimising this Kullback-Leibler divergence (3) is equivalent to minimising

$$\sum_{ij} \left(-V_{ij} \log (WH)_{ij} + (WH)_{ij} + C(V_{ij}) \right).$$

, for arbitrary bounded function $C(V_{ij})$. Taking exponential of the negative of this score function, the problem transforms to maximising the following likelihood function

$$L(WH|V) = \prod_{ij} \left((WH)_{ij}^{V_{ij}} e^{-(WH)_{ij}} + C(V_{ij}) \right).$$

Choosing constant $C(V_{ij})$ to be $-\log V_{ij}!$ gives

$$L(WH|V) = \prod_{ij} \left(\frac{(WH)_{ij}^{V_{ij}} e^{-(WH)_{ij}}}{V_{ij}!} \right).$$

Hence, the probability density function of each element of the original matrix V is Poisson

$$P(V_{ij}) = \frac{(WH)_{ij}^{V_{ij}} e^{-(WH)_{ij}}}{V_{ij}!}$$

is a sufficient condition to yield this likelihood. Hence KLNMF is most suitable for images with Poisson noise.

3.3 Gaussian and Poisson are asymptotic equivalent

We design an Gaussian noise and a Poisson noise with different magnitude. Poisson distribution with parameter λ (integer) is equivalent to the sum of λ Poisson distributions with parameter 1 [Walck, 1996, p. 45]. Hence for λ large, Central Limit Theorem implies that Poisson distribution with parameter λ is well approximated by $N(\lambda, \lambda)$. When applying Poisson noise to an image, we do not degree of freedom to choose any parameter. The variance is the magnitude of the pixels. To compare the robustness of KLNMF with NMF with different noise, we choose the variance of Gaussian noise to be the different from the magnitude of the pixel, that is, $N(0, \text{Var}) \neq N(0, V) \approx \text{Poi}(V) - V$. Figure 2 visualises the similarity of Poisson distribution and Normal distribution with parameter $V = 40$. To overcome this issue, the Gaussian noise we use should be larger or smaller variance in comparison with the mean of the images. We choose the variance of the noise to be 80.




Figure 2: Compare a Gaussian noise $N(0,40)$ with Poisson noise $Poi(40) - 40$. They two distributions are asymptotically equivalent and have similar density functions.

3.4 Multiple initial estimates avoids local minima

As discussed in the section of related work. The problem of nonnegative matrix factorization is not a convex problem. Hence the results update rules (2) and (4) coverage to may be local minima instead of global minima. To address this issue, we implement several initial estimates for each matrix factorization problem. We use the factorized matrices W and H corresponding to the least objective function (1) and (3), for NMF and KLNMF, algorithms respectively, as the final result of factorization. This

	rre	acc
Multiplication Euclidean Normal	0.15683265883959555	0.7286111111111111
Multiplication Euclidean Poisson	0.1591413186921236	0.7249999999999999
Multiplication KL Divergence Normal	0.15703871615765036	0.7283333333333333
Multiplication KL Divergence Poisson	0.1589874246949232	0.7424999999999999

3.5 Preprocessing

We apply global centring and local centring to preprocess the image data Vhat

Algorithm 1: Centring image data

```
1 n_samples = len(Vhat)
2 # global centering
3 Vhat = Vhat - Vhat.mean(axis=0)
4 # local centering
5 Vhat -= Vhat.mean(axis=1).reshape(n_samples, -1)
6 Vhat -= Vhat.min()
```

4 Experiments

4.1 Noise

5 Conclusion

Your conclusion goes at the end, followed by References, which must follow the Vancouver Style (see: www.icmje.org/index.html). References begin below with a header that is centered. Only the first word of an article title is capitalized in the References.

A Appendix

Algorithm 2: The Levenberg–Marquardt algorithm iteratively finds optimal macro-scale Robin boundary conditions.

```

1 %A=imread('C:\Users\chenc\OneDrive - UNSW\machine
   learning\assignment
   1\data\CroppedYaleB\yaleB01\yaleB01_P00A+000E+00.pgm');
2 red=3;
3 k=40;
4
5 imagefiles = dir('data/ORL/*/*.pgm');
6 imagefiles2=struct2cell(imagefiles);
7 imagefiles=imagefiles((~endsWith(imagefiles2(1,:), 'Ambient.pgm'))');
8 imagefiles2=struct2cell(imagefiles);
9 A=imread(strcat(imagefiles(1).folder, '\', imagefiles(1).name));
10 if size(A,1)==112
11     A=A(1:111,1:90);
12 end
13 A_list=zeros(size(A,1)/red, size(A,2)/red, red);
14 nfiles = length(imagefiles); % Number of files found
15 matrix_image=zeros(prod(size(A))/red^2, nfiles);
16 temp=struct2cell(imagefiles);
17 names=temp(1,:);
18 for ii=1:nfiles
19     currentfilename = imagefiles(ii).name;
20     currentfilename=strcat(imagefiles(ii).folder, '\', currentfilename);
21     currentimage = imread(currentfilename);
22     if abs(size(A,1)-112)<=1
23         currentimage=currentimage(1:111,1:90);
24     end
25
26     for i=1:red
27         A_list(:,:,i)=currentimage(i:red:end,i:red:end);
28     end
29     A2=uint8(mean(A_list,3));
30     matrix_image(:,ii) = A2(:);
31 end
32

```

```

33 [w h]=NeNMF(matrix_image,k);
34 idx = kmeans(h',k)
35 Y_pred=zeros(size(matrix_image,2),1)
36 names=str2mat(string(imagefiles2(2,:))')
37 names=str2num(names(:,end-1:end))
38 for ii=unique(idx)'
39     ind= (idx==ii);
40     Y_pred(ind)=mode(names(ind,:));
41 end
42 nmi(Y_pred,names)

```

References

- Daniel D Lee and H Sebastian Seung. Learning the parts of objects by non-negative matrix factorization. *Nature*, 401(6755):788, 1999.
- David Guillaumet and Jordi Vitrià. Non-negative matrix factorization for face recognition. In *Topics in artificial intelligence*, pages 336–344. Springer, 2002.
- Daniel D. Lee and H. Sebastian Seung. Algorithms for non-negative matrix factorization. In T. K. Leen, T. G. Dietterich, and V. Tresp, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 13*, pages 556–562. MIT Press, 2001. URL <http://papers.nips.cc/paper/1861-algorithms-for-non-negative-matrix-factorization.pdf>.
- Naiyang Guan, Tongliang Liu, Yangmuzi Zhang, Dacheng Tao, and Larry Steven Davis. Truncated cauchy non-negative matrix factorization for robust subspace learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2017.
- Zhirong Yang, He Zhang, Zhijian Yuan, and Erkki Oja. Kullback-leibler divergence for nonnegative matrix factorization. In *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*, pages 250–257. Springer, 2011.
- Edmund Y Lam. Non-negative matrix factorization for images with laplacian noise. In *Circuits and Systems, 2008. APCCAS 2008. IEEE Asia Pacific Conference on*, pages 798–801. IEEE, 2008.

- Deguang Kong, Chris Ding, and Heng Huang. Robust nonnegative matrix factorization using l21-norm. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM international conference on Information and knowledge management*, pages 673–682. ACM, 2011.
- Chih-Jen Lin. On the convergence of multiplicative update algorithms for non-negative matrix factorization. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 18(6): 1589–1596, 2007.
- Naiyang Guan, Dacheng Tao, Zhigang Luo, and Bo Yuan. Nnmf: An optimal gradient method for nonnegative matrix factorization. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 60(6):2882–2898, 2012.
- Michael W Berry, Murray Browne, Amy N Langville, V Paul Pauca, and Robert J Plemmons. Algorithms and applications for approximate nonnegative matrix factorization. *Computational statistics & data analysis*, 52(1):155–173, 2007.
- Hyunsoo Kim and Haesun Park. Nonnegative matrix factorization based on alternating nonnegativity constrained least squares and active set method. *SIAM journal on matrix analysis and applications*, 30(2):713–730, 2008.
- Tudor Barbu. Variational image denoising approach with diffusion porous media flow. In *Abstract and Applied Analysis*, volume 2013. Hindawi, 2013.
- Tongliang Liu and Dacheng Tao. On the performance of manhattan nonnegative matrix factorization. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 27(9):1851–1863, September 2016. doi:[10.1109/TNNLS.2015.2458986](https://doi.org/10.1109/TNNLS.2015.2458986).
- Christian Walck. *Hand-book on statistical distributions for experimentalists*. 1996. URL <http://www.fysik.su.se/~walck/suf9601.pdf>.