## Multi-Task Feature Selection using the Multiple Inclusion Criterion (MIC)

Paramyeer S. Dhillon<sup>1</sup> Brian Tomasik<sup>2</sup> Dean Foster<sup>3</sup> Lyle Ungar<sup>1</sup>

> <sup>1</sup>Computer and Information Science <sup>3</sup>Statistics, Wharton School University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, U.S.A

<sup>2</sup>Computer Science Department Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA, U.S.A

ECML-PKDD 2009





### **Outline**

- Introduction
- Previous Work
- MIC: The Model
- Experiments
- Conclusion





## Multiple Inclusion Criterion (MIC)

- Addresses Joint feature selection for related tasks
  - A set of related tasks, with shared feature space
  - Large number of available features, only a handful are finally relevant.
  - Goal is better predictive accuracy and interpretability of selected features
  - Example tasks: predict size of the tumor and prognosis, using gene expression values.





## Multiple Inclusion Criterion (MIC)

- Addresses Joint feature selection for related tasks
  - A set of related tasks, with shared feature space
  - Large number of available features, only a handful are finally relevant.
  - Goal is better predictive accuracy and interpretability of selected features
  - Example tasks: predict size of the tumor and prognosis, using gene expression values.
- MIC imposes sparsity at two levels (  $\ell_0 \ell_0$ )
  - Small number of features selected for each task (first  $\ell_0$ )
  - Small number of tasks associated with each feature (second  $\ell_0$ )





### **Previous Work**

- BBLasso [Obozinski, Taskar and Jordan '09]
  - \ell\_1/\ell\_2 penalty to enforce "Block sparsity", feature added to all or none of the tasks.
  - Convex problem.
  - Exact solution to approximate problem





### **Previous Work**

- BBLasso [Obozinski, Taskar and Jordan '09]
  - \ell\_1/\ell\_2 penalty to enforce "Block sparsity", feature added to all or none of the tasks.
  - Convex problem.
  - Exact solution to approximate problem
- Proposed method: MIC
  - uses  $\ell_0 \ell_0$  penalty
  - non-convex problem, but greedy algorithm yields good approximation in practice.
  - Approximate solution to exact problem





## **General Methodology**

- MIC uses MDL based coding scheme to specify a penalized likelihood method.
- The Total Description Length (TDL) can be written as:

$$S = S_E + S_M$$

 $S_E \longmapsto$  # Bits for encoding the residual errors given the model.

 $S_M \longmapsto \#$  Bits for encoding the model





## **General Methodology**

- MIC uses MDL based coding scheme to specify a penalized likelihood method.
- The Total Description Length (TDL) can be written as:

$$S = S_E + S_M$$

 $S_E \longmapsto \#$  Bits for encoding the residual errors given the model.  $S_M \longmapsto \#$  Bits for encoding the model

 Maximize reduction in Description Length when adding a feature 'j' to the model:

$$\max \quad \Delta S_i = \Delta S_{iE} - \Delta S_{iM}$$





## Simple $\ell_0$ regression - Independent MIC (baseline)

• Assume a simple linear regression model:  $Y = WX + \epsilon$ 





ECML-PKDD 2009

## Simple $\ell_0$ regression - Independent MIC (baseline)

- Assume a simple linear regression model:  $Y = WX + \epsilon$
- In this case:  $S_E = -\log\left(exp(-rac{\sum_{i=1}^n(y_i-wx_i)^2}{2\sigma^2})
  ight)$
- $S_M = log(m) + 2$  i.e. bits to code the feature (RIC Penalty) and its coefficient (AIC Penalty).





## Coding Schemes for MIC

• The goal is to maximize  $\Delta S_j^k = \Delta S_{jE}^k - \Delta S_{jM}^k$  i.e. the reduction in TDL by adding a feature 'j' to a subset k of h tasks.





## Coding Schemes for MIC

- The goal is to maximize  $\Delta S_j^k = \Delta S_{jE}^k \Delta S_{jM}^k$  i.e. the reduction in TDL by adding a feature 'j' to a subset k of h tasks.
- The cost to code  $S_{jE}^k$  i.e. the decrease in error by adding the feature to the model of k tasks is:
- $S_E = -\log(P(Y|X, w))$  $P(Y|X, w) = \frac{1}{((2\pi)^h|\Sigma|)^{\frac{n}{2}}} \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n [(y_i - wx_i)^T \Sigma^{-1} (y_i - wx_i)])$

where  $\Sigma$  is the  $h \times h$  covariance matrix.





7/14

## Coding Schemes for MIC contd ...

- The cost to code the model is  $S_{iM}^k$  is  $I_l + I_H + I_\theta$
- Cost to code:
  - The feature being included:  $I_l = log(m)$ .
  - How many and which of the h tasks have that feature  $I_H = log(h) + log(h)$
  - The coefficient of the feature being included:  $I_{\theta} = 2 \times k$ .





### Variations of MIC

#### Full MIC

- A feature is added to all or none of the tasks
- Similar to BBLasso [Obozinski, Taskar & Jordan '09]
- I<sub>H</sub> bits saved in the coding





ECML-PKDD 2009

### Variations of MIC

#### Full MIC

- A feature is added to all or none of the tasks
- Similar to BBLasso [Obozinski, Taskar & Jordan '09]
- I<sub>H</sub> bits saved in the coding

### Independent MIC

- Each task is modeled in isolation.
- I<sub>H</sub> bits saved in the coding





9/14

### Variations of MIC

#### Full MIC

- A feature is added to all or none of the tasks
- Similar to BBLasso [Obozinski, Taskar & Jordan '09]
- I<sub>H</sub> bits saved in the coding

#### Independent MIC

- Each task is modeled in isolation.
- I<sub>H</sub> bits saved in the coding

#### Partial MIC

A feature can be added to all, none or a subset of the tasks.





### **Experimental Setup**

| Name          | # Tasks | # Obs. | # Features | Source                   |
|---------------|---------|--------|------------|--------------------------|
|               | h       | n      | m          |                          |
| Yeast Dataset | 20      | 104    | 6715       | [Litvin et. al. '09]     |
| Breast Cancer | 5       | 100    | 5000       | [van't Veer et. al. '02] |

- We compared the three versions of MIC (Partial, Full and Independent) against BBLasso [Obozinski et. al. '09] and AndoZhang [Ando et. al. '05]
- For BBLasso and AndoZhang we used their standard
   implementations from Berkeley Transfer Learning Toolkit.





### Experiments contd...

Table: 5 fold CV accuracies. *Note:* AndoZhang's NA values are due to the fact that it does not explicitly select features.

| Method        | Test Error                        | # Features Selected | # Active Coefs.                  |  |  |  |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Yeast Dataset |                                   |                     |                                  |  |  |  |
| Partial MIC   | $\textbf{0.38} \pm \textbf{0.04}$ | $4\pm0$             | $22\pm4$                         |  |  |  |
| Full MIC      | $\boldsymbol{0.39 \pm 0.04}$      | $3\pm 0$            | $64 \pm 4$                       |  |  |  |
| Independent   | $\textbf{0.41} \pm \textbf{0.05}$ | $9\pm1$             | $9\pm1$                          |  |  |  |
| AndoZhang     | $\boldsymbol{0.39 \pm 0.03}$      | NA                  | NA                               |  |  |  |
| BBLasso       | $\textbf{0.43} \pm \textbf{0.03}$ | $63\pm14$           | $\textbf{1268} \pm \textbf{279}$ |  |  |  |





### Experiments contd...

Table: 5 fold CV accuracies. *Note:* AndoZhang's NA values are due to the fact that it does not explicitly select features.

| Method                | Test Error                        | # Features Selected. | # Active Coefs. |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Breast Cancer Dataset |                                   |                      |                 |  |  |  |
| Partial MIC           | $\textbf{0.33} \pm \textbf{0.08}$ | $2\pm0$              | 3 ± 0           |  |  |  |
| Full MIC              | $\textbf{0.37} \pm \textbf{0.08}$ | $2\pm 0$             | $11\pm1$        |  |  |  |
| Independent           | $\textbf{0.36} \pm \textbf{0.08}$ | $2\pm 0$             | $2\pm 0$        |  |  |  |
| AndoZhang             | $\textbf{0.44} \pm \textbf{0.03}$ | NA                   | NA              |  |  |  |
| BBLasso               | $\textbf{0.33} \pm \textbf{0.08}$ | $12\pm4$             | $61\pm19$       |  |  |  |





### Conclusion

- MIC gives flexible coding schemes for doing "joint feature selection" in related tasks.
- Coding schemes can easily be customized to fit the problem at hand
- They capture the spirit of Bayesian priors
- Significantly (5% level, paired t-test) better than AndoZhang, on Yeast and Breast Cancer datasets.
- Comparable in accuracy to BBLasso, but provides simpler and sparser models.





ECML-PKDD 2009

# **Thanks**





