

# Graphic Lasso: Membership Constrains for Multi-layer model

Jiixin Hu

January 9, 2021

Suppose we have a dataset with  $p$  variables and  $K$  categories. In multi-layer model, we assume the rank of decomposition  $r$  is known, and the precision matrices are of form

$$\Omega^k = \Theta_0 + \sum_{l=1}^r u_{lk} \Theta_l, \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, K. \quad (1)$$

Let  $\mathbf{u}_l = (u_{1l}, \dots, u_{Kl}) \in \mathbb{R}^K, l \in [r]$ , and  $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_r] \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times r}$ .

## 1 Option 2 (Without Intercept)

Let  $\mathbf{U}$  be positive membership matrix, i.e., for each of  $\mathbf{U}$  there is only 1 positive elements and others remain 0.

**Proposition 1.** Assume  $\mathbf{U}$  is a positive membership matrix, and  $\|\Theta_l\|_{\max} = \alpha_l, l \in [r]$ , where  $\alpha_l$  are fixed constants. Further, assume  $\{\Theta_l\}$  are “irreducible” in the sense that  $\Theta_k \neq C\Theta_l$ , for all  $k \neq l$  and any  $C \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then, the membership matrix  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\{\Theta_l\}$  are identifiable up to permutation.

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbf{U}$  is a positive membership matrix, the model (1) becomes

$$\Omega^k = u_{k,l(k)} \Theta_{l(k)}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (2)$$

where  $l(k) \in [r]$  is the group assignment of the  $k$ -th category. Let  $I_l = \{k | u_{kl} > 0, k \in [K]\}, k \in [r]$ .

Suppose there exist parameters  $(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}, \{\tilde{\Theta}_l\})$  also satisfy the equation (2) with corresponding  $\tilde{I}_l$ . Now, we prove  $(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}, \{\tilde{\Theta}_l\}) = (\mathbf{U}, \{\Theta_l\})$ . We prove by cases.

1. For all  $l \in [r]$ , suppose  $I_l = \tilde{I}_l$ . Without the loss of generality, we consider a category  $k$  with  $l(k) = 1$ . Then, we have

$$u_{k1} \Theta_1 = \tilde{u}_{k1} \tilde{\Theta}_1.$$

Since  $\|\Theta_1\|_{\max} = \|\tilde{\Theta}_1\|_{\max} = \alpha_1$ , we must have  $u_{k1} = \tilde{u}_{k1}$ . Same results apply to all  $k$  with  $l(k) = 1$  and other groups. Therefore, we have  $(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}, \{\tilde{\Theta}_l\}) = (\mathbf{U}, \{\Theta_l\})$ .

2. Suppose not all nonzero set  $I_l = \tilde{I}_l$ . To avoid the permutation case, we assume  $\tilde{I}_l \neq I_k, k \neq l, k \in [r]$ . Without the loss of generality, we assume there exist  $k_0 \in \tilde{I}_1 \cap I_1$  and  $k_1 \in \tilde{I}_1 \cap I_2$ . Then, we have

$$u_{k_0,1} \Theta_1 = \tilde{u}_{k_0,1} \tilde{\Theta}_1, \quad \text{and} \quad u_{k_1,1} \Theta_1 = \tilde{u}_{k_1,2} \tilde{\Theta}_2.$$

The above equations imply that there exists a constant  $C$  such that  $\tilde{\Theta}_1 = C\tilde{\Theta}_2$ , which contradicts to the “irreducible” condition of  $\{\Theta_l\}$ . Therefore, such  $k_1$  does not exist, and thus for all  $l$  we have  $I_l = \tilde{I}_l$ . Then, we go back to case 1, and we have  $(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}, \{\tilde{\Theta}_l\}) = (\mathbf{U}, \{\Theta_l\})$ .

Therefore, the parameters  $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{U}}, \{\tilde{\Theta}_l\}) = (\boldsymbol{U}, \{\Theta_l\})$  are identifiable.

□