CCA

In PCA we looked at only the input X to carry out dimensionality reduction and is unsupervised in that sense. CCA adds invariance and incorporates the labels y into the analysis.

```
In [0]: import numpy as np
         from sklearn.cross_decomposition import CCA
In [0]: # some dummy data for showing the process of running CCA
        X = \text{np.array}([[0., 0., 1.], [1.,0.,0.], [2.,2.,2.], [3.,5.,4.]])
        y = np.array([[0.1, -0.2], [0.9, 1.1], [6.2, 5.9], [11.9, 12.3]])
         print(X)
        print(y)
        [[0. 0. 1.]
         [1. 0. 0.]
         [2. 2. 2.]
         [3. 5. 4.]]
        [[ 0.1 -0.2]
         [0.9 \ 1.1]
         [ 6.2 5.9]
         [11.9 12.3]]
In [0]: cca = CCA(n_components=1)
        cca.fit(X, y)
Out[0]: CCA(copy=True, max_iter=500, n_components=1, scale=True, tol=1e-06)
In [0]: | # more useful than simply the fit, the actual transformation from our computed C
        X_c, y_c = cca.fit_transform(X, y)
         print(X_c)
        print(y_c)
        [[-1.3373174]
         [-1.10847164]
         [ 0.40763151]
         [ 2.03815753]]
         [[-0.85511537]
         [-0.70878547]
         [ 0.26065014]
         [ 1.3032507 ]]
```

To demonstrate why CCA is more powerful, let's examine scaling the data.

1 of 2 1/12/20, 3:27 PM

```
In [0]: X_c, y_c = cca.fit_transform(2*X, 2*y)
    print(X_c)
    print(y_c)

[[-1.3373174 ]
      [-1.10847164]
      [ 0.40763151]
      [ 2.03815753]]
      [[-0.85511537]
      [-0.70878547]
      [ 0.26065014]
      [ 1.3032507 ]]
```

As we see, scaling both by 2 doesn't change the transform at all. Going further:

Even scaling separately, the transformation remains the same. This shows a very important porperty of CCA - it's invariant to affine transformations (scaling or addition).

Proof:

Proof Source: EECS 189 Course Notes

2 of 2 1/12/20, 3:27 PM