

All the following is subject to $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s} \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} &= \min_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}} \|\mathbf{M}\mathbf{w}\|^2 + \mu \|\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{s}\|^2 \\
&= \min_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}} \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{w} + \mu ((\mathbf{1}^T - \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{A}^T - \mathbf{s}^T)(\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{s})) \\
&= \min_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}} \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{w} + \mu (\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{s}^T \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{s}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{s}^T \mathbf{s}) \\
&= \min_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}} \mathbf{w}^T (\mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{M} + \mu \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{w} + \mu \mathbf{s}^T \mathbf{I}^T \mathbf{I} \mathbf{s} + \mu (1 - 2\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{w} - 2\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{s} + 2\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{s}) \\
&= \min_{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{y}^T \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{M} + \mu \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} & 0 \\ 0 & \mu \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} + \begin{pmatrix} -2\mu \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{A} \\ -2\mu \mathbf{1}^T \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} + 2\mu \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{s}
\end{aligned}$$

Listing 1: Solving minimization problem with the subset method

```

function [w, Aw, L] = compute_graph(X, kind, mu)
[n, d] = size(X);
m = nchoosek(n, 2);
M = sparse(d*n, m);
U = sparse(n, m);
w = [];
MAX_ITER = 50;
nb_iter = 0;

% At the end, we cannot have more than  $\frac{d+1}{n}$  edges according to
% Theorem 3.1. But we must start with only a small subset of them. So we first
% select randomly 7% of them (for no specific reason but cinematographic
% one). Actually, it may be more sensitive to use some kind of heuristic like
% nearest neighbors at this stage to be more efficient later.

edges = randi(m, 1, 0.07*(d+1)*n);

while (numel(edges) > 0 && nb_iter < MAX_ITER)
    % Remove the multiple of n to avoid self loop (and the first one in case
    % it's 1).
    edges = edges(mod(edges, n) ~= 0);
    edges = edges(2:end);
    % Then we update the corresponding element (i,j) = e of U with
    % respectively 1 and -1.
    vertex_j = rem(edges, n);
    vertex_i = mod(edges, n) + 1;
    positive = bsxfun (@(x,y) sub2ind(size(U), x, y), vertex_i, edges);
    negative = bsxfun (@(x,y) sub2ind(size(U), x, y), vertex_j, edges);
    U(positive) = 1;
    U(negative) = -1;
    A = abs(U);
    assert(sum(A(:))/2 <= (d+1)*n, 'there are too many edges');
end

```

```

T = U'*X; %  $y^{(k)} = U^T x^k$  is thus the  $k$ th column of  $T$ 
% TODO: use parfor
for k=1:d
    first_row = 1 + (k-1)*n;
    last_row = n + (k-1)*n;
    Yk = spdiags(T(:,k), [0], m, m);
    M(first_row:last_row, :) = U*Yk;
end
% Now that we have built our matrices, we can solve the minimization problem
% TODO use SDPT3, although the documentation is quite intimidating:
% http://www.math.nus.edu.sg/~mattohk/sdpt3/guide4-0-draft.pdf
if strcmpi(kind, 'hard')
    % we only want to constrain the nodes that have edges to be of
    % degree at least 1.
    [w, f, flag, output, lambda] = quadprog(M'*M, sparse(m, 1), -A, -(sum(A, 2)>0),
        [], [], [], [], w);
    z = lambda.ineqlin;
    derivative = 2*M'*M*w - A'*z;
else
    % According to the paper, we want to solve
    %  $\min_{w,s} ||Mw||^2 + \mu ||1 - Aw - s||$ 
    % subject to  $w, s \geq 0$ , but I don't see how to formulate that for
    % quadprog or lsqnonneg (see http://math.stackexchange.com/q/545280)
    error(strcat(kind, ' is not yet implemented'));
end
[val, may_be_added]=sort(derivative(find(derivative<0)));
% The paper says: we add to our quadratic program the edges with the smallest
%  $\frac{d\Lambda}{dw_{i,j}}$  values, which I think mean not all. For now,
% let's take half of them. TODO take only the one below average or look at
% diff.
edges = may_be_added(1:end/2);
nb_iter = nb_iter + 1;
end
Aw = A*w;
W = spdiags(w, [0], m, m);
L = U*W*U';

```

Listing 2: Computing hard graph

```

function [w, Aw, L] = compute_hard_graph(X)
    [w, Aw, L] = compute_graph(X, 'hard');
end

```

Listing 3: Computing α -soft graph

```

function [w, Aw, L] = compute_alpha_graph(X, alpha, tol)
[n, d] = size(X);
m = nchoosek(n, 2);
mu = 5*rand();
tau0 = 1.5;

```

```

MAX_ITER = 50;
% Set  $\lambda$  so that  $\tau \geq 1$  with equality at MAX_ITER.
lambda = (tau0 - 1)/MAX_ITER;
can_improve = true;
while (can_improve)
    w, Aw, L = compute_graph(X, 'soft', mu);
    tmp = max(zeros(m, 1), ones(m, 1) - A*w);
    alpha_bar = tmp'*tmp/n;
    % Maybe we don't need this complication and keep a fixed  $\tau = \tau_0$ .
    tau = tau0/(1 + nb_iter*lambda);
    if (alpha_bar < alpha)
        % We want to increase  $\bar{\alpha}$  so we need decrease  $\mu$ , which in
        % turn require  $\tau \leq 1$ 
        tau = 1/tau;
    end
    % It is supposed to correspond to: "we then adjust  $\mu$  up or down
    % proportionally to how far  $\frac{\eta(w)}{n} = \bar{\alpha}$  is from the
    % desired value of  $\alpha$ ."
    mu = tau*abs(alpha_bar - alpha)/alpha
    nb_iter = nb_iter + 1;
    can_improve = abs(alpha_bar - alpha) < tol && nb_iter < MAX_ITER;
end
end

```

Listing 4: Use the built graph to classify samples

```

function result = graph_classify(labelled, label, unlabelled)
n = numel(label);
u = size(unlabelled, 1);
X = [labelled; unlabelled];
[w, Aw, L] = compute_hard_graph(X);
beq = [label; zeros(u, 1)];
Aeq = [eye(n) zeros(n, u); zeros(u, n+u)];
% TODO look at the fast method suggested in the paper: Spielman, D. A.,
% Teng, S.-H. (2004). Nearly-linear time algorithms for graph partitioning,
% graph sparsification, and solving linear systems. Proc. 36th ACM STOC.
x = quadprog(L, [], [], [], Aeq, beq);
result = x(n+1:end) > 0.5;
end

```