

Randomized neural networks for preference learning with physiological data

Davide Bacciu^{a,*}, Michele Colombo^{a,b}, Davide Morelli^{a,b,c}, David Plans^{b,c}

^a*Dipartimento di Informatica, Università di Pisa, Italy.*

^b*Biobeats Ltd, London, UK.*

^c*Center for Digital Economy, University of Surrey, UK.*

Abstract

Blablabla...

Keywords: randomized networks, physiological data, preference learning

1. Introduction

Introduction to the problem and background ([DAVIDE M.] Puoi iniziare tu; io poi ci metto mano una volta finite le altre sezioni)

Heart Rate Variability (HRV) has been shown to be related to several physiological aspects including the activity of the Autonomic Nervous System (ANS) [1] which, among the others, influences the relaxation level of humans. Deep diaphragmatic breathing is known to affect HRV [2]. However, learning a direct correlation between HRV activity and ANS activation is a difficult task given the subjective nature of HRV changes. As a result, typical supervised learning approaches fail to capture such a correlation [3]. An alternative way to tackle the problem addresses it as a preference learning task, where the learning model is provided with partial information according to some subjective preferential ordering between samples, e.g. the fact that two HRV samples from the same subject are taken under different ANS conditions. Such partial, pairwise information is then used to build a total ordering of the samples from all subjects

*Corresponding author. Tel.: +39 050 2212749; fax: +39 050 2212726

Email addresses: `bacciu@di.unipi.it` (Davide Bacciu), `michele@biobeats.com` (Michele Colombo), `davide@biobeats.com` (Davide Morelli), `d.plans@surrey.ac.uk` (David Plans)

according to the unknown total ordering function, e.g. the relaxation level. In this work, we discuss how the problem of learning preferential rankings can be effectively addressed by Extreme Learning Machines (ELMs) [4] by introducing a specialized preference learning objective function coupled with a weight sharing architecture. We provide an experimental assessment of different ELM architectures for preference learning and we show how certain architectural aspects, such as weight sharing, have desirable effects on the realization of the total ordering, despite yielding to slightly less accurate performance on predicting pairwise partial orderings. The experimental assessment exploits heart-rate samples acquired by Biobeats¹ app *Hear and Now*. Particular care is taken to show generalization of the results to completely unseen subjects, also by re-laying on additional external datasets collected under different conditions and throughout different wearable devices.

2. Randomized Neural Networks for Preference Learning

30 Description of learning models and the approach [DAVIDE B]

2.1. Randomized Neural Networks for Vectorial and Sequential Data

Extreme Learning Machines (ELMs) are a family of neural networks for vectorial data based on the concept of building an high dimensional basis expansion of input information through one (or more) hidden layer of randomly initialized and non-plastic neurons, followed by an output layer of plastic neurons which are adapted to provide predictions in accordance to the task at hand. The random untrained nature of the hidden neurons makes training of the ELM computationally efficient, e.g. when dealing with Big Data [5], while they retain universal approximation capabilities [4].

40 The simplest form of ELM network comprises an hidden layer of sigmoid-like neurons which receive in input the data samples and that are connected to an output layer of linear neurons whose number depends on the task at hand. Each

¹<http://www.biobeats.com>

output neuron realizes a weighted combination of the hidden neuron outputs to compute the network predictions. Overall the activity of such network is described as $\mathbf{Y}_{out} = \mathbf{W}_{out}f(\mathbf{W}_{in}\mathbf{X})$, where \mathbf{W}_{in} is the $N_h \times N_{in}$ matrix of randomly-initialized and untrained weights from the N_{in} input neurons to the N_h hidden neurons while \mathbf{W}_{out} is the $N_{out} \times N_h$ matrix of linear combination weights from the hidden to the output neurons. The term \mathbf{X} denotes the $N_{in} \times M$ matrix of M input samples and \mathbf{Y}_{out} are the corresponding predicted outputs. Function $f(\cdot)$ is the hidden neuron activation (e.g. a sigmoid) applied to each element of the matrix in its argument. The \mathbf{W}_{in} matrix is typically initialized by random Gaussian noise with zero mean and given variance. Training of the \mathbf{W}_{out} matrix instead can be casted as a least square minimization problem and, hence, it can be solved by standard techniques such as Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse or its regularized variants.

2.2. Learning Preferential Rankings with Randomized Architectures

ELM networks have found application to several classification and regression problems, including a recent extension in the context of learning to rank [6]. Here ELMs are used to learn an ordering between samples \mathbf{x}_j^i representing the relevance of a document j to a query i using supervised target information y_j^i concerning document-query relevance. This setting is similar to what we want to achieve in this paper, except that in our preference learning setting we do not rely on the availability of a relevance value y_i^j to be used as target for the ELM network output. Instead, we consider a set of M input samples $\mathcal{D} = \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M$ that is provided together with partial supervised information concerning pairwise ordering between them. For instance, the dataset might provide supervised information stating that $\mathbf{x}_1 \leq_p \mathbf{x}_2$ and $\mathbf{x}_1 \leq_p \mathbf{x}_3$, where \leq_p is the preference relation we want to learn, but nothing is stated concerning the relationship between \mathbf{x}_2 and \mathbf{x}_3 . Training a model using only information on pairwise preferences without having it fit to specific relevance/preference values (e.g. y_j^i in the ranking application) is an advantage whenever it does not exist a uniform or consolidated preference function f_p across the samples. This is the

case when the preference function is subjective to the samples such as when a sample represents an individual-related measurement or a self-assessment [3]. In
75 such cases, we cannot expect different individuals to self assess using the same reference scoring functions, hence the necessity of avoiding to use the value of the preference function as a target for the learning model. On the other hand, the preference value can be used to assess the pairwise ordering \leq_p between samples taken from the same individual and which, thus, share the same scoring system.
80 In the following, we discuss two architectural variants of ELM to realize such a preference learning task.

A first, straightforward, way to approach such a problem is to cast it as a classification task where an ELM network receives in input two samples, \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 , and it is trained to predict a binary value determining which sample is to be preferred over the other. More formally, the (scalar) response of the network to a joint input $\mathbf{x}^i = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2]$ is interpreted as follows

$$y_{1,2}^i = \begin{cases} +1: & \mathbf{x}_1 \text{ ranks before or equal to } \mathbf{x}_2 \\ -1: & \mathbf{x}_2 \text{ ranks before than } \mathbf{x}_1 \end{cases}. \quad (1)$$

Such pairwise preference problem is a standard binary classification task on the joint input \mathbf{x}^i with binary target y^i to be interpreted as in (1). A second approach to the task stems from the consideration that the formulation above neglects one key aspect of the problem, that is symmetry. Supposing that \mathbf{x}_1 is to be preferred to \mathbf{x}_2 this means that it can be presented to the network as the joint sample $\mathbf{x}^i = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2]$ with target $+1$ as well as the joint sample $\mathbf{x}^{i'} = [\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_1]$ with target -1 . This aspect suggests that we can put in place a weight sharing approach where a single ELM network computes its output $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_j)$ for each sample $\mathbf{x}_j \in \mathcal{D}$, flipping the sign of $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_j)$ depending on whether \mathbf{x}_j is used as first or second term of the pairwise comparison. This can be interpreted as an extended ELM network with two modules sharing identical \mathbf{W}_{in} weights and sign-complemented \mathbf{W}_{out} weights. Training of a such a network can be achieved by minimization of the following preference learning error [3] with

respect to \mathbf{W}_{out} :

$$E(\mathcal{D}) = \sum_{p,j} \frac{1}{2} \|2 - (\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_p) - \hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_j))\|^2, \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{x}_p and \mathbf{x}_j are sample pairs in \mathcal{D} where \mathbf{x}_p is to be preferred over \mathbf{x}_j . Note how the error function in (2) does not require a target output for the network, whereas the sole preference relation information is used to separate the network
85 outputs for those sample pairs for which a preference relation exists.

3. Learning Relaxation Rankings from Heart-rate Data

Description of the problem, the app and the collected data (features for the vectorial approach, including how computed if it can be disclosed), including all available setups (perhaps in subsections)
90 **[DAVIDE M, MICHELE]**

The two approaches described in the previous section have been applied to learning pairwise preferential rankings between heart-rate samples to learn to assess the effect of breathing exercises on target users. Biobeats released an app for iOS devices, called Hear and Now², that guides users through slow diaphragmatic breathing exercises. In doing so, the app also collects the heart
95 rate variability for 40 seconds before the breathing exercise, and for 40 seconds after the breathing exercise, to measure the effect of the breathing exercise. By these means, we have composed a dataset of 19567 sessions providing pairwise measurements of 10 HRV features before and after each breathing session. These
100 are popular HRV features including, e.g., the standard deviation of the time between heartbeats (SDNN) [7] and the root mean square of successive differences of heartbeats (RMSSD) [1]. Such data has been used as a benchmark to assess the two preference learning approaches in terms of predictive performance, i.e. the ability of telling pre-breathing samples from post ones, as well as in terms of
105 quality of the global order that can be constructed by application of the learned pairwise comparisons.

²<https://itunes.apple.com/us/app/hear-and-now/id977650202>

4. Experimental Analysis

**Exp setup and results. Direi che puoi iniziare [MICHELE] che ci
butta dentro risultati aggiornati e commenti. Poi [DAVIDE B] rivede
scrittura e impostazione discorsi**

A sample of 15% of the original users has been randomly selected with all associated sessions to be used as an external test population to assess the generalization to completely unknown users. By this means, we have composed an hold out test set of 2637 sessions. The remainder of the data has been split
115 into 12079 and 4144 training and validation sessions, respectively.

The experimental analysis compares the two architectural variants in Section ?? referred to as *ELM-WS* and *ELM-BIN*, respectively, for the model with and without weight sharing. Both networks have a single hidden layer and hyperbolic tangent activation both for the hidden and the output neurons,
120 while output weights are trained by stochastic gradient descent with momentum (given the nonlinearity of the output neurons) applied to a mean-squared error loss. Model selection has been performed to select the best hyperparameterization on the validation set, considering hyperparameters such as hidden layer size ($[5000, 7500, 10000]$), learning rate ($[0.01, 1e^{-3}, 1e^{-4}, 1e^{-5}]$), momentum ($[0, 0.3, 0.6]$), error regularization ($[0, 1e^{-2}, 1e^{-3}, 1e^{-4}]$). Three networks
125 have been trained for each configuration and their results averaged. Input data has been normalized by z-scoring.

Table 1 shows the accuracy of the different models in terms of correctly predicted pairwise preferences. Note that, in our preference relation, we assume
130 that the HRV measurement before the breathing exercise (pre) should precede the corresponding HRV after the exercise (post). The intended aim is to exploit preference learning to try to capture an unknown global ordering between HRV measurements based on subject-dependent information on episodic relaxation induced by the breathing exercise. To provide a baseline performance for the
135 ELM, Table 1 also shows the results for an MLP model trained for binary classification (like ELM-BIN) with hidden layer size in $[10, 75]$. Results highlight

that the models are able to generalize the preference relation learned on users in training to unknown subjects in test (cf. the $\approx 4\%$ difference between validation and test set). In particular, the ELM-BIN model seems to have the highest
140 performance in separating pre from post breathing HRV measurements, while the effect of the weight sharing architecture does not seem beneficial this stage. However, being able to detect the correct pairwise preference relation between two HRV measurements from the same session and the same user is not the ultimate goal of our application. Rather, we wish to be able to use the learned
145 pairwise relation to determine a complete ordering of the HRV samples according to the, unknown, joint preference relation across all the users.

In this particular application, this accounts to be able to rank the HRV samples in order from the one corresponding to maximum breathing effect to the one corresponding to minimum breathing effect. In this respect, a *good* learned
150 relation is the one that provides an ordering where the pairwise comparisons are in agreement with each other. Figure ?? shows an example of such a quality measure for the 3 models in Table 1. Each plot is generated by pairwise comparisons of pre or post HRV samples with two randomly selected pivotal measurements (i.e. maintaining one term of the comparison fixed to the pivot
155 and varying the other across all dataset). Samples are ordered on the x-axis accordingly to a pivot measurement, while y-axis values are taken accordingly to the other one. The smoother the line, the more concordant the two orderings generated by the two pivots. The results in Fig. ?? show that ELM-WS yields to orderings that are extremely concordant among pivots thanks to the sym-
160 metry introduced by the weight sharing architecture, while both ELM-BIN and

| | ELM-WS | | ELM-BIN | | MLP | |
|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | <i>val</i> | <i>tst</i> | <i>val</i> | <i>tst</i> | <i>val</i> | <i>tst</i> |
| Acc. (%) | 77.1 (0.7) | 72.8 (0.3) | 77.8 (2.0) | 74.0 (0.8) | 77.0 (0.6) | 73.8 (0.6) |

Table 1: Accuracy in predicting the pairwise preference on the *Biobeats* data: results refer to the best model selected in validation; values are averaged on the 3 model initializations and standard deviation is in brackets.

the MLP yield to poor quality total preference orderings, despite being slightly more precise than ELM-WS in deciding the outcome of a pairwise confrontation (see Table 1).

The significant aspect of the weight sharing architecture seems to be the
165 ability to generalize subjective pairwise relationships to a common total relationship shared by multiple subjects who have no sessions in the training set. To further assess this aspect and to show a potential application of the approach, we have applied the ELM-WS trained on the Biobeats dataset to an external test set collected by Biobeats in collaboration with a corporate partner
170 providing a wrist worn band measuring heart rate 24/7. Continuous heart rate was collected from approximately 500 users over 2 months, while users were also provided with a customized version of Hear and Now guiding them in slow breathing exercises. For every user, HRV features have been computed for times up to 120 minutes before and after each breathing session: Fig. ?? shows the
175 average output predicted by ELM-WS before and after the breathing exercise: here ELM-WS is shown to detect the effects of the breathing exercise, encoded by output values tending more towards -1 . Such result provides an indication of how the ELM-WS approach can generalize to novel devices (i.e. wristband hearts sensor in place of mobile camera) and to completely unknown subject
180 cohorts.

5. Conclusion

[DAVIDE B] poi ALL

We have assessed the realization of a preference learning task on HRV features exploiting two architectural variants of ELM networks. Our analysis suggests that using weight sharing techniques to exploit symmetries in the task
185 induces a smoother total preference relation, learned from potentially very different personal pairwise confrontations. Such performance generalizes very well also to external data taken under different experimental conditions, being able

to track and predict the execution of breathing exercises across the day. Future
 190 work concerns exploring more powerful ELM architectures such as bidirectional
 [8] and fully complex ELMs. Ongoing work is also exploring preference learning
 in the context of another class of random networks from the reservoir computing
 paradigm [9] which allows to process the HRV information in its raw sequential
 form, without the need of extracting engineered features in vectorial form.

195 Acknowledgements

- [1] E. S. Mezzacappa, R. M. Kelsey, E. S. Katkin, R. P. Sloan, Vagal rebound
 and recovery from psychological stress, *Psychosomatic Medicine* 63 (2001)
 650–657.
- [2] G. K. Pal, S. Velkumary, others, Effect of short-term practice of breath-
 200 ing exercises on autonomic functions in normal human volunteers, *Indian*
Journal of Medical Research 120 (2004) 115.
- [3] H. P. Martínez, G. N. Yannakakis, J. Hallam, Don't classify ratings of affect;
 rank them!, *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing* 5 (2014) 314–326.
- [4] G. Huang, Q. Zhu, C. K. Siew, Extreme learning machine: Theory and
 205 applications, *Neurocomputing* 70 (2006) 489–501.
- [5] L. L. C. Kasun, H. Zhou, G. B. Huang, C. M. Vong, Representational
 learning with ELMs for big data, *IEEE Intelligent Systems* 28 (2013) 31–34.
- [6] W. Zong, G. B. Huang, Learning to rank with extreme learning machine,
Neural Processing Letters 39 (2014) 155–166.
- 210 [7] J. P. A. Delaney, D. A. Brodie, Effects of short-term psychological stress
 on the time and frequency domains of heart-rate variability, *Perceptual and*
Motor Skills 91 (2000) 515–524.
- [8] Y. Yang, Y. Wang, X. Yuan, Bidirectional extreme learning machine for
 regression problem and its learning effectiveness, *IEEE Transactions on*
 215 *Neural Networks and Learn Systems* 23 (2012) 1498–1505.

- [9] D. Bacciu, P. Barsocchi, S. Chessa, C. Gallicchio, A. Micheli, An experimental characterization of reservoir computing in ambient assisted living applications, *Neural Computing and Applications* 24 (2014) 1451–1464.