## An equivalent formulation of matrix kernels (II)

Miaoyan Wang, Aug 3, 2020

## 1 Corrections to your section 1

Let  $K(\cdot, \cdot)$  denote a usual kernel defined over vector pairs in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We use the shorthand  $K(i, j) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K(X_i, X'_i)$  to denote the kernel value evaluated on the vector pair  $(X_i, X'_i)$ .

(Note: my projection matrix P is the transpose of your P.)

**Proposition 1** (Rank-1 weights in Kernel). Define a kernel over matrix pairs,  $\mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{X}') \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \boldsymbol{P}^T \Phi(\boldsymbol{X}) \boldsymbol{P}, \ \boldsymbol{P}^T \Phi(\boldsymbol{X}') \boldsymbol{P} \rangle$  for some rank-1 projection matrix  $\boldsymbol{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 1}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{K}$  has an equivalent representation,

$$\mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{X}') = 2C \sum_{i,j} w_{ij} K(i,j), \tag{1}$$

where  $\boldsymbol{W} = \boldsymbol{P}\boldsymbol{P}^T = [\![w_{ij}]\!]$  is a rank-1 weight matrix, and C>0 is a normalizing constant.

*Proof.* By definition,

$$\mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{X}') = \langle \boldsymbol{P}^T \Phi(\boldsymbol{X}) \boldsymbol{P}, \ \boldsymbol{P}^T \Phi(\boldsymbol{X}') \boldsymbol{P} \rangle$$

$$= \langle \underbrace{\boldsymbol{P} \boldsymbol{P}^T}_{=:\boldsymbol{W}}, \ \Phi^T(\boldsymbol{X}) \underbrace{\boldsymbol{P} \boldsymbol{P}^T}_{=:\boldsymbol{W}} \Phi(\boldsymbol{X}') \rangle$$
(2)

Both W and  $\Phi^T(X)W\Phi(X')$  are d-by-d matrices. The (i,j)-th entry of  $\Phi^T(X)W\Phi(X')$  is

$$[\Phi^{T}(\boldsymbol{X})\boldsymbol{W}\Phi(\boldsymbol{X}')]_{ij} = \sum_{s,s'} [\Phi^{T}(\boldsymbol{X})]_{is} [\boldsymbol{W}]_{ss'} [\Phi(\boldsymbol{X}')]_{s'j}$$

$$= \sum_{s,s'} w_{ss'} \langle (\phi(\boldsymbol{X}_{s:}), \phi(\boldsymbol{X}_{i:})), (\phi(\boldsymbol{X}'_{s':}), \phi(\boldsymbol{X}'_{j:})) \rangle$$

$$= \sum_{s,s'} w_{ss'} (K(s,s') + K(i,j))$$

$$= CK(i,j) + \sum_{s,s'} w_{ss'} K(s,s'),$$
(3)

where we have denoted the constant  $C = \sum_{s,s'} w_{ss'} > 0$ . Plugging (3) into (2) gives

$$\mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{X}') = \sum_{i,j} w_{ij} [\Phi^{T}(\boldsymbol{X}) \boldsymbol{W} \Phi(\boldsymbol{X}')]_{ij}$$

$$= C \sum_{i,j} w_{ij} K(i,j) + \left( \sum_{i,j} w_{ij} \right) \left( \sum_{s,s'} w_{ss'} K(s,s') \right)$$

$$= 2C \sum_{i,j} w_{ij} K(i,j).$$

**Proposition 2** (Compatibility with row-wise-only mapping). Based on your Section 2, the row-wise-only mapping induces the following kernel,

$$\langle \Phi(\boldsymbol{X})\boldsymbol{P}, \ \Phi(\boldsymbol{X}')\boldsymbol{P} \rangle = \sum_{i,j} w_{ij} K(i,j), \text{ where } \boldsymbol{W} = [\![w_{ij}]\!] = \boldsymbol{P}^T \boldsymbol{P} \text{ is a low-rank p.s.d. matrix.}$$

This kernel is proportional to that in (1).

## 2 Commentary to your section 3

**Proposition 3** (Isomorphic Mappings; From Mapping to Kernel). The following two mappings are isomorphic, in the sense that they induce the same kernel  $\mathcal{K}$  over matrix pairs.

• Mapping 1

$$\Phi_1: \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2} \to \mathcal{H}_r^{d_1} \times \mathcal{H}_c^{d_2}$$

$$\boldsymbol{X} \mapsto (\Phi_r(\boldsymbol{X}), \Phi_c(\boldsymbol{X})) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\phi_r(\boldsymbol{X}_{1:}), \dots, \phi_r(\boldsymbol{X}_{d_1:}), \phi_c(\boldsymbol{X}_{:1}), \dots, \phi_c(\boldsymbol{X}_{:d_2}))$$

• Mapping 2

$$\Phi_2: \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2} \to (\mathcal{H}_r \times \mathcal{H}_c)^{d_1 \times d_2}$$

$$\boldsymbol{X} \mapsto [\Phi_2(\boldsymbol{X})_{ij}], \quad \text{where } \Phi_2(\boldsymbol{X})_{ij} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\phi_c(\boldsymbol{X}_{i:}), \ \phi_r(\boldsymbol{X}_{:j}))$$

*Proof.* Using the similar argument in Proposition 1, we show that the kernel induced by (mapping 2 + low-rank coefficients) is

$$\mathcal{K} \colon \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2} \to \mathbb{R}$$

$$\mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{X}') \mapsto \sum_{i,j \in [d_1]} w_{ij}^{\text{row}} K_r(i,j) + \sum_{i,j \in [d_2]} w_{ij}^{\text{col}} K_c(i,j), \tag{4}$$

where  $\boldsymbol{W}^{\text{row}} = [\![w_{ij}^{\text{row}}]\!] = \frac{1}{c_1} \boldsymbol{P}_r \boldsymbol{P}_r^T$ ,  $\boldsymbol{W}^{\text{col}} = [\![w_{ij}^{\text{col}}]\!] = \frac{1}{c_2} \boldsymbol{P}_c \boldsymbol{P}_c^T$  are some low-rank p.s.d. matrices, and  $c_1 = \|\mathbf{1}_{d_1}^T \boldsymbol{P}_r\|_2^2 > 0$ ,  $c_2 = \|\mathbf{1}_{d_2}^T \boldsymbol{P}_c\|_2^2 > 0$  are two normalizing constants.

Now, we consider the kernel induced by (mapping 1 + low-rank coefficients),

$$\mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{X}') = \langle \Phi_r(\boldsymbol{X}) \boldsymbol{P}_r, \ \Phi_r(\boldsymbol{X}') \boldsymbol{P}_r \rangle + \langle \Phi_c(\boldsymbol{X}) \boldsymbol{P}_c, \ \Phi_c(\boldsymbol{X}') \boldsymbol{P}_c \rangle 
= \sum_{i,j \in [d_1]} w_{ij}^{\text{row}} K_r(i,j) + \sum_{i,j \in [d_2]} w_{ij}^{\text{col}} K_c(i,j),$$
(5)

where  $\boldsymbol{W}^{\text{row}} = [\![w_{ij}^{\text{row}}]\!]$ ,  $\boldsymbol{W}^{\text{col}} = [\![w_{ij}^{\text{col}}]\!]$  are some low-rank p.s.d. matrices.

Two important properties in the induced kernels (4) and (5):

- 1. [Additivity] The new kernel is a linear combination of regular row and column kernels;
- 2. [Low-rank p.s.d.] The weight matrices  $\mathbf{W}^{\text{row}}$ ,  $\mathbf{W}^{\text{col}}$  are low-rank + p.s.d.

Conjecture 1 (From Kernel to Mapping). Let  $\mathcal{K}(\cdot,\cdot)$  be a function that maps a pair of matrices to a real-value. Suppose  $\mathcal{K}(\cdot,\cdot)$  satisfies the above two properties. Then, the kernel  $\mathcal{K}$  induces a decomposable feature mapping in that  $\Phi(\mathbf{X}) = \Phi_r(\mathbf{X}) + \Phi_c(\mathbf{X})$ , where, informally speaking,  $\Phi_r(\cdot)$ ,  $\Phi_c(\cdot)$  are the row- and column-wise mappings, respectively.

The decomposable mapping means the effects from rows and columns are additive/separable. Similar to an ANOVA model  $Y_{ij} = \mu_i + \mu_j$  with marginal effects only. Additivity has useful implications for matrix-based network analysis; see [1].

## References

[1] Peter D Hoff. Additive and multiplicative effects network models. To appear in Statistical Science, arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.08038, 2018.