
PAC-Bayesian AUC classification and scoring

James Ridgway*

CREST and CEREMADE University Dauphine
james.ridgway@ensae.fr

Pierre Alquier

CREST (ENSAE)
pierre.alquier@ucd.ie

Nicolas Chopin

CREST (ENSAE) and HEC Paris
nicolas.chopin@ensae.fr

Feng Liang

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
liangf@illinois.edu

Abstract

We develop a scoring and classification procedure based on the PAC-Bayesian approach and the AUC (Area Under Curve) criterion. We focus initially on the class of linear score functions. We derive PAC-Bayesian non-asymptotic bounds for two types of prior for the score parameters: a Gaussian prior, and a spike-and-slab prior; the latter makes it possible to perform feature selection. One important advantage of our approach is that it is amenable to powerful Bayesian computational tools. We derive in particular a Sequential Monte Carlo algorithm, as an efficient method which may be used as a gold standard, and an Expectation-Propagation algorithm, as a much faster but approximate method. We also extend our method to a class of non-linear score functions, essentially leading to a nonparametric procedure, by considering a Gaussian process prior.

1 Introduction

Bipartite ranking (scoring) amounts to rank (score) data from binary labels. An important problem in its own right, bipartite ranking is also an elegant way to formalise classification: once a score function has been estimated from the data, classification reduces to chooses a particular threshold, which determine to which class is assigned each data-point, according to whether its score is above or below that threshold. It is convenient to choose that threshold only once the score has been estimated, so as to get finer control of the false negative and false positive rates; this is easily achieved by plotting the ROC (Receiver operating characteristic) curve.

A standard optimality criterion for scoring is AUC (Area Under Curve), which measures the area under the ROC curve. AUC is appealing for at least two reasons. First, maximising AUC is equivalent to minimising the L_1 distance between the estimated score and the optimal score. Second, under mild conditions, Cortes and Mohri [2003] show that AUC for a score s equals the probability that $s(X^-) < s(X^+)$ for X^- (resp. X^+) a random draw from the negative (resp. positive class). Yan et al. [2003] observed AUC-based classification handles much better skewed classes (say the positive class is much larger than the other) than standard classifiers, because it enforces a small score for all members of the negative class (again assuming the negative class is the smaller one).

One practical issue with AUC maximisation is that the empirical version of AUC is not a continuous function. One way to address this problem is to "convexify" this function, and study the properties of so-obtained estimators [Cl  men  on et al., 2008a]. We follow instead the PAC-Bayesian approach in this paper, which consists of using a random estimator sampled from a pseudo-posterior distribution that penalises exponentially the (in our case) AUC risk. It is well known [see e.g. the monograph of Catoni, 2007] that the PAC-Bayesian approach comes with a set of powerful technical tools to

*<http://www.crest.fr/pagesperso.php?user=3328>

establish non-asymptotic bounds; the first part of the paper derive such bounds. A second advantage however of this approach, as we show in the second part of the paper, is that it is amenable to powerful Bayesian computational tools, such as Sequential Monte Carlo and Expectation Propagation.

2 Theoretical bounds from the PAC-Bayesian Approach

2.1 Notations

The data \mathcal{D} consist in the realisation of n IID (independent and identically distributed) pairs (X_i, Y_i) with distribution P , and taking values in $\mathbb{R}^d \times \{-1, 1\}$. Let $n_+ = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{Y_i = +1\}$, $n_- = n - n_+$. For a score function $s : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the AUC risk and its empirical counter-part may be defined as:

$$R(s) = \mathbb{P}_{(X,Y),(X',Y') \sim P} [\{s(X) - s(X')\}(Y - Y') < 0],$$

$$R_n(s) = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{1}[\{s(X_i) - s(X_j)\}(Y_i - Y_j) < 0].$$

Let $\sigma(x) = \mathbb{E}(Y|X = x)$, $\bar{R} = R(\sigma)$ and $\bar{R}_n = R_n(\sigma)$. It is well known that σ is the score that minimise $R(s)$, i.e. $R(s) \geq \bar{R} = R(\sigma)$ for any score s .

The results of this section apply to the class of linear scores, $s_\theta(x) = \langle \theta, x \rangle$, where $\langle \theta, x \rangle = \theta^T x$ denotes the inner product. Abusing notations, let $R(\theta) = R(s_\theta)$, $R_n(\theta) = R_n(s_\theta)$, and, for a given prior density $\pi_\xi(\tilde{\theta})$ that may depend on some hyperparameter $\xi \in \Xi$, define the Gibbs posterior density (or pseudo-posterior) as

$$\pi_{\xi,\gamma}(\theta|\mathcal{D}) := \frac{\pi_\xi(\theta) \exp\{-\gamma R_n(\theta)\}}{Z_{\xi,\gamma}(\mathcal{D})}, \quad Z_{\xi,\gamma}(\mathcal{D}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \pi_\xi(\tilde{\theta}) \exp\{-\gamma R_n(\tilde{\theta})\} d\tilde{\theta}$$

for $\gamma > 0$. Both the prior and posterior densities are defined with respect to the Lebesgue measure over \mathbb{R}^d .

2.2 Assumptions and general results

Our general results require the following assumptions.

Definition 2.1 We say that Assumption **Dens**(c) is satisfied for $c > 0$ if

$$\mathbb{P}(\langle X_1 - X_2, \theta \rangle \geq 0, \langle X_1 - X_2, \theta' \rangle \leq 0) \leq c \|\theta - \theta'\|$$

for any θ and $\theta' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|\theta\| = \|\theta'\| = 1$.

This is a mild Assumption, which holds for instance as soon as $(X_1 - X_2)/\|X_1 - X_2\|$ admits a bounded probability density; see the appendix.

Definition 2.2 (Mammen & Tsybakov margin assumption) We say that Assumption **MA**(κ, C) is satisfied for $\kappa \in [1, +\infty]$ and $C \geq 1$ if

$$\mathbb{E}[(q_{1,2}^\theta)^2] \leq C [R(\theta) - \bar{R}]^{\frac{1}{\kappa}}$$

where $q_{i,j}^\theta = \mathbb{1}\{\langle \theta, X_i - X_j \rangle (Y_i - Y_j) < 0\} - \mathbb{1}\{[\sigma(X_i) - \sigma(X_j)](Y_i - Y_j) < 0\} - R(\theta) + \bar{R}$.

This assumption was introduced for classification by Mammen and Tsybakov [1999], and used for ranking by Cléménçon et al. [2008b] and Robbiano [2013] (see also a nice discussion in Lecué [2007]). The larger κ , the less restrictive **MA**(κ, C). In fact, **MA**(∞, C) is always satisfied for $C = 4$. For a noiseless classification task (i.e. $\sigma(X_i)Y_i \geq 0$ almost surely), $\bar{R} = 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[(q_{1,2}^\theta)^2] = \text{Var}(q_{1,2}^\theta) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{\langle \theta, X_1 - X_2 \rangle (Y_1 - Y_2) < 0\}] = R(\theta) - \bar{R}$$

and **MA**(1, 1) holds. More generally, **MA**(1, C) is satisfied as soon as the noise is small; see the discussion in Robiano 2013 (Proposition 5 p. 1256) for a formal statement. From now, we focus on either **MA**(1, C) or **MA**(∞, C), $C \geq 1$. It is possible to prove convergence under **MA**($\kappa, 1$)

for a general $\kappa \geq 1$, but at the price of complications regarding the choice of γ ; see Catoni [2007], Alquier [2008] and Robbiano [2013].

We use the classical PAC-Bayesian methodology initiated by McAllester [1998]; Shawe-Taylor and Williamson [1997] (see Alquier [2008]; Catoni [2007] for a complete survey and more recent advances) to get the following results. Proof of these and forthcoming results may be found in the appendix. Let $\mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi)$ denotes the Kullback-Liebler divergence, $\mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi) = \int \rho(d\theta) \log\{\frac{d\rho}{d\pi}(\theta)\}$ if $\rho \ll \pi$, ∞ otherwise, and denote \mathcal{M}_+^1 the set of probability distributions $\rho(d\theta)$.

Lemma 2.1 *Assume that $\mathbf{MA}(1, C)$ holds with $C \geq 1$. For any fixed γ with $0 < \gamma \leq (n-1)/(8C)$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$ on the drawing of the data \mathcal{D} ,*

$$\int R(\theta)\pi_{\xi, \gamma}(\theta|\mathcal{D})d\theta - \bar{R} \leq 2 \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{M}_+^1} \left\{ \int R(\theta)\rho(d\theta) - \bar{R} + 2 \frac{\mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi) + \log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon}\right)}{\gamma} \right\}.$$

Lemma 2.2 *Assume $\mathbf{MA}(\infty, C)$ with $C \geq 1$. For any fixed γ with $0 < \gamma \leq (n-1)/8$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ with probability $1 - \varepsilon$ on the drawing of \mathcal{D} ,*

$$\int R(\theta)\pi_{\xi, \gamma}(\theta|\mathcal{D})d\theta - \bar{R} \leq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{M}_+^1} \left\{ \int R(\theta)\rho(d\theta) - \bar{R} + 2 \frac{\mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi) + \log\frac{2}{\varepsilon}}{\gamma} \right\} + \frac{16\gamma}{n-1}.$$

Both lemmas bound the expected risk excess, for a random estimator of θ generated from $\pi_{\xi, \gamma}(\theta|\mathcal{D})$.

2.3 Independent Gaussian Prior

We now specialise these results to the prior density $\pi_{\xi}(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^d \varphi(\theta_i; 0, \vartheta)$, i.e. a product of independent Gaussian distributions $N(0, \vartheta)$; $\xi = \vartheta$ in this case.

Theorem 2.3 *Assume $\mathbf{MA}(1, C)$, $C \geq 1$, $\mathbf{Dens}(c)$, $c > 0$, and take $\vartheta = \frac{2}{d}(1 + \frac{1}{n^2d})$, $\gamma = (n-1)/8C$, then there exists a constant $\alpha = \alpha(c, C, d)$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, with probability $1 - \varepsilon$,*

$$\int R(\theta)\pi_{\gamma}(\theta|\mathcal{D})d\theta - \bar{R} \leq 2 \inf_{\theta_0} \{R(\theta_0) - \bar{R}\} + \alpha \frac{d \log(n) + \log\frac{4}{\varepsilon}}{n-1}.$$

Theorem 2.4 *Assume $\mathbf{MA}(\infty, C)$, $C \geq 1$, $\mathbf{Dens}(c)$ $c > 0$, and take $\vartheta = \frac{2}{d}(1 + \frac{1}{n^2d})$, $\gamma = C\sqrt{dn \log(n)}$, there exists a constant $\alpha = \alpha(c, C, d)$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, with probability $1 - \varepsilon$,*

$$\int R(\theta)\pi_{\gamma}(\theta|\mathcal{D})d\theta - \bar{R} \leq \inf_{\theta_0} \{R(\theta_0) - \bar{R}\} + \alpha \frac{\sqrt{d \log(n)} + \log\frac{2}{\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

The proof of these results is provided in the appendix. It is known that, under $\mathbf{MA}(\kappa, C)$, the rate $(d/n)^{\frac{\kappa}{2\kappa-1}}$ is minimax-optimal for classification problems, see Lecué [2007]. Following Robbiano [2013] we conjecturate that this rate is also optimal for ranking problems.

2.4 Spike and slab prior for feature selection

The independent Gaussian prior considered in the previous section is a natural choice, but it does not accommodate sparsity, that is, the possibility that only a small subset of the components of X_i actually determine the membership to either class. For sparse scenarios, one may use the spike and slab prior of Mitchell and Beauchamp [1988], George and McCulloch [1993],

$$\pi_{\xi}(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^d [p\varphi(\theta_i; 0, v_1) + (1-p)\varphi(\theta_i; 0, v_0)]$$

with $\xi = (p, v_0, v_1) \in [0, 1] \times (\mathbb{R}^+)^2$, and $v_0 \ll v_1$, for which we obtain the following result. Note $\|\theta\|_0$ is the number of non-zero coordinates for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Theorem 2.5 Assume **MA**(1, C) holds with $C \geq 1$, **Dens**(c) holds with $c > 0$, and take $p = 1 - \exp(-1/d)$, $v_0 \leq 1/(2nd \log(d))$, and $\gamma = (n-1)/(8C)$. Then there is a constant $\alpha = \alpha(C, v_1, c)$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$ on the drawing of the data \mathcal{D} ,

$$\int R(\theta)\pi_\gamma(d\theta|\mathcal{D}) - \bar{R} \leq 2 \inf_{\theta_0} \left\{ R(\theta_0) - \bar{R} + \alpha \frac{\|\theta_0\|_0 \log(nd) + \log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon}\right)}{2(n-1)} \right\}.$$

Compared to Theorem 2.3, the bound above increases logarithmically rather than linearly in d , and depends explicitly on $\|\theta\|_0$, the sparsity of θ . This suggests that the spike and slab prior should lead to better performance than the Gaussian prior in sparse scenarios. The rate $\|\theta\|_0 \log(d)/n$ is the same as the one obtained in sparse regression, see e.g. Bühlmann and van de Geer [2011].

Finally, note that if $v_0 \rightarrow 0$, we recover the more standard prior which assigns a point mass at zero for every component. However this leads to a pseudo-posterior which is a mixture of 2^d components that mix Dirac masses and continuous distributions, and thus which is more difficult to approximate (although see the related remark in Section 3.4 for Expectation-Propagation).

3 Practical implementation of the PAC-Bayesian approach

3.1 Choice of hyper-parameters

Theorems 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 propose specific values for hyper-parameters γ and ξ , but these values depend on some unknown constant C . Two data-driven ways to choose γ and ξ are (i) cross-validation (which we will use for γ), and (ii) (pseudo-)evidence maximisation (which we will use for ξ).

The latter may be justified from intermediate results of our proofs in the appendix, which provide an empirical bound on the expected risk:

$$\int R(\theta)\pi_{\xi,\gamma}(\theta|\mathcal{D})d\theta - \bar{R} \leq \Psi_{\gamma,n} \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{M}_+^1} \left(\int R_n(\theta)\rho(d\theta) - \bar{R}_n + \frac{\mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi) + \log\frac{2}{\varepsilon}}{\gamma} \right)$$

with $\Psi_{\gamma,n} \leq 2$. The right-hand side is minimised at $\rho(d\theta) = \pi_{\xi,\gamma}(\theta|\mathcal{D})d\theta$, and the so-obtained bound is $-\Psi_{\gamma,n} \log(Z_{\xi,\gamma}(\mathcal{D}))/\gamma$ plus constants. Minimising the upper bound with respect to hyper-parameter ξ is therefore equivalent to maximising $\log Z_{\xi,\gamma}(\mathcal{D})$ with respect to ξ . This is of course akin to the empirical Bayes approach that is commonly used in probabilistic machine learning. Regarding γ the minimization is more cumbersome because the dependence with the $\log(2/\varepsilon)$ term and $\Psi_{n,\gamma}$, which is why we recommend cross-validation instead.

It seems noteworthy that, beside Alquier and Biau [2013], very few papers discuss the practical implementation of PAC-Bayes, beyond some brief mention of MCMC (Markov chain Monte Carlo). However, estimating the normalising constant of a target density simulated with MCMC is notoriously difficult. In addition, even if one decides to fix the hyperparameters to some arbitrary value, MCMC may become slow and difficult to calibrate if the dimension of the sampling space becomes large. This is particularly true if the target does not (as in our case) have some specific structure that make it possible to implement Gibbs sampling. The two next sections discuss two efficient approaches that make it possible to approximate both the pseudo-posterior $\pi_{\xi,\gamma}(\theta|\mathcal{D})$ and its normalising constant, and also to perform cross-validation with little overhead.

3.2 Sequential Monte Carlo

Given the particular structure of the pseudo-posterior $\pi_{\xi,\gamma}(\theta|\mathcal{D})$, a natural approach to simulate from $\pi_{\xi,\gamma}(\theta|\mathcal{D})$ is to use tempering SMC [Sequential Monte Carlo Del Moral et al., 2006] that is, define a certain sequence $\gamma_0 = 0 < \gamma_1 < \dots < \gamma_T$, start by sampling from the prior $\pi_\xi(\theta)$, then applies successive importance sampling steps, from $\pi_{\xi,\gamma_{t-1}}(\theta|\mathcal{D})$ to $\pi_{\xi,\gamma_t}(\theta|\mathcal{D})$, leading to importance weights proportional to:

$$\frac{\pi_{\xi,\gamma_t}(\theta|\mathcal{D})}{\pi_{\xi,\gamma_{t-1}}(\theta|\mathcal{D})} \propto \exp\{-(\gamma_t - \gamma_{t-1})R_n(\theta)\}.$$

When the importance weights become too skewed, one rejuvenates the particles through a resampling step (draw particles randomly with replacement, with probability proportional to the weights) and a move step (move particles according to a certain MCMC kernel).

One big advantage of SMC is that it is very easy to make it fully adaptive. For the choice of the successive γ_t , we follow Jasra et al. [2007] in solving numerically (1) in order to impose that the Effective sample size has a fixed value. This ensures that the degeneracy of the weights always remain under a certain threshold. For the MCMC kernel, we use a Gaussian random walk Metropolis step, calibrated on the covariance matrix of the resampled particles. See Algorithm 1 for a summary.

Algorithm 1 Tempering SMC

Input N (number of particles), $\tau \in (0, 1)$ (ESS threshold), $\kappa > 0$ (random walk tuning parameter)

Init. Sample $\theta_0^i \sim \pi_\xi(\theta)$ for $i = 1$ to N , set $t \leftarrow 1$, $\gamma_0 = 0$, $Z_0 = 1$.

Loop a. Solve in γ_t the equation

$$\frac{\{\sum_{i=1}^N w_t(\theta_{t-1}^i)\}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N \{w_t(\theta_{t-1}^i)\}^2} = \tau N, \quad w_t(\theta) = \exp[-(\gamma_t - \gamma_{t-1})R_n(\theta)] \quad (1)$$

using bisection search. If $\gamma_t \geq \gamma_T$, set $Z_T = Z_{t-1} \times \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_t(\theta_{t-1}^i) \right\}$, and stop.

b. Resample: for $i = 1$ to N , draw A_t^i in $1, \dots, N$ so that $\mathbb{P}(A_t^i = j) = w_t(\theta_{t-1}^j) / \sum_{k=1}^N w_t(\theta_{t-1}^k)$; see Algorithm 1 in the appendix.

c. Sample $\theta_t^i \sim M_t(\theta_{t-1}^{A_t^i}, d\theta)$ for $i = 1$ to N where M_t is a MCMC kernel that leaves invariant π_t ; see Algorithm 3 in the appendix for an instance of such a MCMC kernel, which takes as an input $S = \kappa \hat{\Sigma}$, where $\hat{\Sigma}$ is the covariance matrix of the $\theta_{t-1}^{A_t^i}$.

d. Set $Z_t = Z_{t-1} \times \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_t(\theta_{t-1}^i) \right\}$.

In our context, tempering SMC brings two extra advantages: it makes it possible to obtain samples from $\pi_{\xi, \gamma}(\theta | \mathcal{D})$ for a whole range of values of γ , rather than a single value. And it provides an approximation of $Z_{\xi, \gamma}(\mathcal{D})$ for the same range of γ values, through the quantity Z_t defined in Algorithm 1.

3.3 Expectation-Propagation (Gaussian prior)

The SMC sampler outlined in the previous section works fairly well, and we will use it as gold standard in our simulations. However, as any other Monte Carlo method, it may be too slow for large datasets. We now turn our attention to EP [Expectation-Propagation Minka, 2001], a general framework to derive fast approximations to target distributions (and their normalising constants).

First note that the pseudo-posterior may be rewritten as:

$$\pi_{\xi, \gamma}(\theta | \mathcal{D}) = \frac{1}{Z_{\xi, \gamma}(\mathcal{D})} \pi_\xi(\theta) \times \prod_{i, j} f_{ij}(\theta), \quad f_{ij}(\theta) = \exp[-\gamma' \mathbb{1}\{\langle \theta, X_i - X_j \rangle < 0\}]$$

where $\gamma' = \gamma/n_+n_-$, and the product is over all (i, j) such that $Y_i = 1, Y_j = -1$. EP generates an approximation of this target distribution based on the same factorisation:

$$q(\theta) \propto q_0(\theta) \prod_{i, j} q_{ij}(\theta), \quad q_{ij}(\theta) = \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\theta^T Q_{ij}\theta + r_{ij}^T \theta\right\}.$$

We consider in the section the case where the prior is Gaussian, as in Section 2.3. Then one may set $q_0(\theta) = \pi_\xi(\theta)$. The approximating factors are un-normalised Gaussian densities (under a natural parametrisation), leading to an overall approximation that is also Gaussian, but other types of exponential family parametrisations may be considered; see next section and Seeger [2005]. EP updates iteratively each site q_{ij} (that is, it updates the parameters Q_{ij} and r_{ij}), conditional on all the sites, by matching the moments of q with those of the hybrid distribution

$$h_{ij}(\theta) \propto q(\theta) \frac{f_{ij}(\theta)}{q_{ij}(\theta)} \propto q_0(\theta) f_{ij}(\theta) \prod_{(k, l) \neq (i, j)} f_{kl}(\theta)$$

where again the product is over all (k, l) such that $Y_k = 1$, $Y_l = -1$, and $(k, l) \neq (i, j)$.

We refer to the appendix for a precise algorithmic description of our EP implementation. We highlight the following points. First, the site update is particularly simple in our case:

$$h_{ij}(\theta) \propto \exp\{\theta^T r_{ij}^h - \frac{1}{2}\theta^T Q_{ij}^h \theta\} \exp[-\gamma' \mathbb{1}\{\langle \theta, X_i - X_j \rangle < 0\}],$$

with $r_{ij}^h = \sum_{(k,l) \neq (i,j)} r_{kl}$, $Q_{ij}^h = \sum_{(k,l) \neq (i,j)} Q_{kl}$, which may be interpreted as: θ conditional on $T(\theta) = \langle \theta, X_i - X_j \rangle$ has a $d - 1$ -dimensional Gaussian distribution, and the distribution of $T(\theta)$ is that of a one-dimensional Gaussian penalised by a step function. The two first moments of this particular hybrid may therefore be computed exactly, and in $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$ time, as explained in the appendix. The updates can be performed efficiently using the fact that the linear combination $(X_i - X_j)\theta$ is a one dimensional Gaussian. For our numerical experiment we used a parallel version of EP Van Gerven et al. [2010]. The complexity of our EP implementation is $\mathcal{O}(n_+n_-d^2 + d^3)$.

Second, EP offers at no extra cost an approximation of the normalising constant $Z_{\xi, \gamma}(\mathcal{D})$ of the target $\pi_{\xi, \gamma}(\theta | \mathcal{D})$; in fact, one may even obtain derivatives of this approximated quantity with respect to hyper-parameters. See again the appendix for more details.

Third, in the EP framework, cross-validation may be interpreted as dropping all the factors q_{ij} that depend on a given data-point X_i in the global approximation q . This makes it possible to implement cross-validation at little extra cost [Opper and Winther, 2000].

3.4 Expectation-Propagation (spike and slab prior)

To adapt our EP algorithm to the spike and slab prior of Section 2.4, we introduce latent variables $Z_k = 0/1$ which "choose" for each component θ_k whether it comes from a slab, or from a spike, and we consider the joint target

$$\pi_{\xi, \gamma}(\theta, z | \mathcal{D}) \propto \left\{ \prod_{k=1}^d \mathcal{B}(z_k; p) \mathcal{N}(\theta_k; 0, v_{z_k}) \right\} \exp \left[-\frac{\gamma}{n_+n_-} \sum_{ij} \mathbb{1}\{\langle \theta, X_i - X_j \rangle > 0\} \right].$$

On top of the n_+n_- Gaussian sites defined in the previous section, we add a product of d sites to approximate the prior. Following Hernandez-Lobato et al. [2013], we use

$$q_k(\theta_k, z_k) = \exp \left\{ z_k \log \left(\frac{p_k}{1 - p_k} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \theta_k^2 u_k + v_k \theta_k \right\}$$

that is a (un-normalised) product of an independent Bernoulli distribution for z_k , times a Gaussian distribution for θ_k . Again that the site update is fairly straightforward, and may be implemented in $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$ time. See the appendix for more details. Another advantage of this formulation is that we obtain a Bernoulli approximation of the marginal pseudo-posterior $\pi_{\xi, \gamma}(z_i = 1 | \mathcal{D})$ to use in feature selection. Interestingly taking v_0 to be exactly zero also yield stable results corresponding to the case where the spike is a Dirac mass.

4 Extension to non-linear scores

To extend our methodology to non-linear score functions, we consider the pseudo-posterior

$$\pi_{\xi, \gamma}(ds | \mathcal{D}) \propto \pi_{\xi}(ds) \exp \left\{ -\frac{\gamma}{n_+n_-} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_+, j \in \mathcal{D}_-} \mathbb{1}\{s(X_i) - s(X_j) > 0\} \right\}$$

where $\pi_{\xi}(ds)$ is some prior probability measure with respect to an infinite-dimensional functional class. Let $s_i = s(X_i)$, $s_{1:n} = (s_1, \dots, s_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and assume that $\pi_{\xi}(ds)$ is a GP (Gaussian process) associated to some kernel $k_{\xi}(x, x')$, then using a standard trick in the GP literature [Rasmussen and Williams, 2006], one may derive the marginal (posterior) density (with respect to

the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure) of $s_{1:n}$ as

$$\pi_{\xi,\gamma}(s_{1:n}|\mathcal{D}) \propto \mathcal{N}_d(s_{1:n}; 0, K_\xi) \exp \left\{ -\frac{\gamma}{n_+n_-} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_+, j \in \mathcal{D}_-} \mathbb{1}\{s_i - s_j > 0\} \right\}$$

where $\mathcal{N}_d(s_{1:n}; 0, K_\xi)$ denotes the probability density of the $\mathcal{N}(0, K_\xi)$ distribution, and K_ξ is the $n \times n$ matrix $(k_\xi(X_i, X_j))_{i,j=1}^n$.

This marginal pseudo-posterior retains essentially the structure of the pseudo-posterior $\pi_{\xi,\gamma}(\theta|\mathcal{D})$ for linear scores, except that the ‘‘parameter’’ $s_{1:n}$ is now of dimension n . We can apply straightforwardly the SMC sampler of Section B.1, and the EP algorithm of B.2, to this new target distribution. In fact, for the EP implementation, the particular simple structure of a single site:

$$\exp[-\gamma' \mathbb{1}\{s_i - s_j > 0\}]$$

makes it possible to implement a site update in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time, leading to an overall complexity $\mathcal{O}(n_+n_- + n^3)$ for the EP algorithm.

Theoretical results for this approach could be obtained by applying lemmas from e.g. van der Vaart and van Zanten [2009], but we leave this for future study.

5 Numerical Illustration

Figure 1 compares the EP approximation with the output of our SMC sampler, on the well-known Pima Indians dataset and a Gaussian prior. Marginal first and second order moments essentially match; see the appendix for further details. The subsequent results are obtained with EP.




Figure 1: EP Approximation (green), compared to SMC (blue) of the marginal posterior of the first three coefficients, for Pima dataset (see the appendix for additional analysis).

We now compare our PAC-Bayesian approach (computed with EP) with Bayesian logistic regression (to deal with non-identifiable cases), and with the rankboost algorithm [Freund et al., 2003] on different datasets¹; note that Cortes and Mohri [2003] showed that the function optimised by rankbook is AUC.

As mentioned in Section B, we set the prior hyperparameters by maximizing the evidence, and we use cross-validation to choose γ . To ensure convergence of EP, when dealing with difficult sites, we use damping [Seeger, 2005]. The GP version of the algorithm is based on a squared exponential kernel. Table 1 summarises the results; balance refers to the size of the smaller class in the data (recall that the AUC criterion is particularly relevant for unbalanced classification tasks), EP-AUC (resp. GPEP-AUC) refers to the EP approximation of the pseudo-posterior based on our Gaussian prior (resp. Gaussian process prior). See also Figure 2 for ROC curve comparisons, and Table 2 in the appendix for a CPU time comparison.

Note how the GP approach performs better for the colon data, where the number of covariates (2000) is very large, but the number of observations is only 40. It seems also that EP gives a better approximation in this case because of the lower dimensionality of the pseudo-posterior (Figure 2b).

¹All available at <http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/>

Dataset	Covariates	Balance	EP-AUC	GPEP-AUC	Logit	Rankboost
Pima	7	34%	0.8617	0.8557	0.8646	0.8224
Credit	60	28%	0.7952	0.7922	0.7561	0.788
DNA	180	22%	0.9814	0.9812	0.9696	0.9814
SPECTF	22	50%	0.8684	0.8545	0.8715	0.8684
Colon	2000	40%	0.7034	0.75	0.73	0.5935
Glass	10	1%	0.9843	0.9629	0.9029	0.9436

Table 1: Comparison of AUC.

The Glass dataset has originally more than two classes. We compare the “silicon” class against all others.




Figure 2: Some ROC curves associated to the example described in a more systematic manner in table 1. In black is always the PAC version.

Finally, we also investigate feature selection for the DNA dataset (180 covariates) using a spike and slab prior. The regularization plot (3a) shows how certain coefficients shrink to zero as the spike’s variance v_0 goes to zero, allowing for some sparsity. The aim of a positive variance in the spike is to absorb negligible effects into it [Ročková and George, 2013]. We observe this effect on figure 3a where one of the covariates becomes positive when v_0 decreases.




Figure 3: Regularization plot for $v_0 \in [10^{-6}, 0.1]$ and estimation for $v_0 = 10^{-6}$ for DNA dataset; blue circles denote posterior probabilities ≥ 0.5 .

6 Conclusion

The combination of the PAC-Bayesian theory and Expectation-Propagation leads to fast and efficient AUC classification algorithms, as observed on a variety of datasets, some of them very unbalanced. Future work may include extending our approach to more general ranking problems (e.g. multi-class), establishing non-asymptotic bounds in the nonparametric case, and reducing the CPU time by considering only a subset of all the pairs of datapoints.

Bibliography

- P. Alquier. Pac-bayesian bounds for randomized empirical risk minimizers. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*, 17(4):279–304, 2008.
- P. Alquier and G. Biau. Sparse single-index model. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 14(1):243–280, 2013.
- C. M. Bishop. *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*, chapter 10. Springer, 2006.
- P. Bühlmann and S. van de Geer. *Statistics for High-Dimensional Data*. Springer, 2011.
- O. Catoni. *PAC-Bayesian Supervised Classification*, volume 56. IMS Lecture Notes & Monograph Series, 2007.
- S. Cléménçon, G. Lugosi, and N. Vayatis. Ranking and empirical minimization of U-statistics. *Ann. Stat.*, 36(2):844–874, 04 2008a.
- S. Cléménçon, V.C. Tran, and H. De Arazoza. A stochastic SIR model with contact-tracing: large population limits and statistical inference. *Journal of Biological Dynamics*, 2(4):392–414, 2008b.
- C. Cortes and M. Mohri. AUC optimization vs. error rate minimization. In *NIPS*, volume 9, 2003.
- P. Del Moral, A. Doucet, and A. Jasra. Sequential Monte Carlo samplers. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B*, 68(3):411–436, 2006. ISSN 1467-9868.
- Y. Freund, R. Iyer, R.E Schapire, and Y. Singer. An efficient boosting algorithm for combining preferences. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 4:933–969, 2003.
- E.I. George and R.E. McCulloch. Variable selection via Gibbs sampling. *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.*, 88(423):pp. 881–889, 1993.
- D. Hernandez-Lobato, J. Hernandez-Lobato, and P. Dupont. Generalized Spike-and-Slab Priors for Bayesian Group Feature Selection Using Expectation Propagation. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 14: 1891–1945, 2013.
- W. Hoeffding. Probability Inequalities for Sums of Random Variables. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 10:293–325, 1948.
- A. Jasra, D. Stephens, and C. Holmes. On population-based simulation for static inference. *Statist. Comput.*, 17(3):263–279, 2007.
- G. Lecué. Méthodes d’agrégation: optimalité et vitesses rapides. Ph.D. thesis, Université Paris 6, 2007.
- E. Mammen and A. Tsybakov. Smooth discrimination analysis. *Ann. Stat.*, 27(6):1808–1829, 12 1999.
- P. Massart. *Concentration Inequalities and Model Selection*, volume 1896. Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 2007.
- D.A McAllester. Some PAC-Bayesian theorems. In *Proceedings of the eleventh annual conference on Computational learning theory*, pages 230–234. ACM, 1998.
- T. Minka. Expectation Propagation for approximate Bayesian inference. In *Proc. 17th Conf. Uncertainty Artificial Intelligence, UAI ’01*, pages 362–369. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 2001.
- T. J Mitchell and J. Beauchamp. Bayesian variable selection in linear regression. *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.*, 83(404):1023–1032, 1988.
- M. Opper and O. Winther. Gaussian Processes for Classification: Mean-field Algorithms. *Neural Computation*, 12(11):2655–2684, November 2000.
- C. Rasmussen and C. Williams. *Gaussian processes for Machine Learning*. MIT press, 2006.
- S. Robbiano. Upper bounds and aggregation in bipartite ranking. *Elec. J. of Stat.*, 7:1249–1271, 2013.
- V. Ročková and E. George. EMVS: The EM Approach to Bayesian Variable Selection. *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.*, 2013.
- M. Seeger. Expectation propagation for exponential families. Technical report, U. of California, 2005.
- J. Shawe-Taylor and R.C. Williamson. A PAC analysis of a Bayesian estimator. In *Proc. conf. Computat. learn. theory*, pages 2–9. ACM, 1997.

- A.W. van der Vaart and J.H. van Zanten. Adaptive Bayesian estimation using a Gaussian random field with inverse Gamma bandwidth. *Ann. Stat.*, pages 2655–2675, 2009.
- M. A.J. Van Gerven, B. Cseke, F. P. de Lange, and T. Heskes. Efficient Bayesian multivariate fMRI analysis using a sparsifying spatio-temporal prior. *NeuroImage*, 50:150–161, 2010.
- L. Yan, R. Dodier, M. Mozer, and R. Wolniewicz. Optimizing classifier performance via an approximation to the Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney statistic. *Proc. 20th Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, pages 848–855, 2003.

A PAC-Bayes bounds for linear scores

A.1 Sufficient condition for Dens(c)

A simple sufficient condition for Dens(c) to hold is that $(X_1 - X_2)/\|X_1 - X_2\|$ admits a probability density with respect to the spherical measure of dimension $d-1$ which is bounded above by B . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\langle X_1 - X_2, \theta \rangle \geq 0, \langle X_1 - X_2, \theta' \rangle \leq 0) &\leq B \frac{\arccos(\langle \theta, \theta' \rangle)}{2\pi} \\ &\leq \frac{B}{2\pi} \sqrt{5 - 5 \langle \theta, \theta' \rangle} \\ &= \frac{B}{2\pi} \sqrt{\frac{5}{2}} \|\theta - \theta'\|. \end{aligned}$$

A.2 Proof of Lemma 2.1

In order to prove Lemma 2.1 we need the following Bernstein inequality.

Proposition A.1 (Bernstein’s inequality for U-statistics) *For any $\gamma > 0$, for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \exp[\gamma |R_n(\theta) - \bar{R}_n - R(\theta) + \bar{R}|] \leq 2 \exp \left[\frac{\frac{\gamma^2}{n-1} \mathbb{E}((q_{1,2}^\theta)^2)}{\left(1 - \frac{4\gamma}{n-1}\right)} \right].$$

Proof of Proposition A.1. Fix θ . Remember that

$$q_{i,j}^\theta = \mathbf{1}\{\langle \theta, X_i - X_j \rangle (Y_i - Y_j) < 0\} - \mathbf{1}\{[\sigma(X_i) - \sigma(X_j)](Y_i - Y_j) < 0\} - R(\theta) + \bar{R}$$

so that

$$U_n := R_n(\theta) - \bar{R}_n - R(\theta) + \bar{R} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq j} q_{i,j}^\theta.$$

First, note that

$$\mathbb{E} \exp[\gamma |U_n|] \leq \mathbb{E} \exp[\gamma U_n] + \mathbb{E} \exp[\gamma (-U_n)].$$

We will only upper bound the first term in the r.h.s., as the upper bound for the second term may be obtained exactly in the same way (just replace $q_{i,j}^\theta$ by $-q_{i,j}^\theta$). Now, use Hoeffding’s decomposition Hoeffding [1948]: this is the technique used by Hoeffding to prove inequalities on U-statistics. Hoeffding proved that

$$U_n = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi} \frac{1}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} q_{\pi(i), \pi(i + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}^\theta$$

where the sum is taken over all the permutations π of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Jensen’s inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \exp[\gamma U_n] &= \mathbb{E} \exp \left[\gamma \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi} \frac{1}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} q_{\pi(i), \pi(i + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}^\theta \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi} \mathbb{E} \exp \left[\frac{\gamma}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} q_{\pi(i), \pi(i + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}^\theta \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We now use, for each of the terms in the sum, Massart's version of Bernstein's inequality Massart [2007] (ineq. (2.21) in Chapter 2, the assumption is checked by $q_{\pi(i), \pi(i+\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}^\theta \in [-2, 2]$ so $\mathbb{E}((q_{\pi(i), \pi(i+\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}^\theta)^k) \leq \mathbb{E}((q_{\pi(i), \pi(i+\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}^\theta)^2)2^{k-2}$). We obtain:

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \left[\frac{\gamma}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} q_{\pi(i), \pi(i+\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}^\theta \right] \leq \exp \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}((q_{\pi(1), \pi(1+\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}^\theta)^2) \frac{\gamma^2}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}}{2 \left(1 - 2 \frac{\gamma}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}\right)} \right].$$

First, note that we have the inequality $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \geq (n-1)/2$. Then, remark that as the pairs (X_i, Y_i) are iid, we have $\mathbb{E}((q_{\pi(1), \pi(1+\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}^\theta)^2) = \mathbb{E}((q_{1,2}^\theta)^2)$ so we have a simpler inequality

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \left[\frac{\gamma}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} q_{\pi(i), \pi(i+\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}^\theta \right] \leq \exp \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}((q_{1,2}^\theta)^2) \frac{\gamma^2}{n-1}}{\left(1 - \frac{4\gamma}{n-1}\right)} \right].$$

This ends the proof of the proposition. \square

The following proposition is also of use in the proof of lemma 2.1.

Proposition A.2 For any measure $\rho \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\Theta)$ and any measurable function $h : \theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\int \exp(h(\theta))\pi(d\theta) < \infty$, we have

$$\log \left(\int \exp(h(\theta))\pi(d\theta) \right) = \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{M}_+^1} \left(\int h(\theta)\rho(d\theta) - \mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi) \right).$$

In addition if h is bounded by above on the support of π the supremum is reached for the Gibbs distribution,

$$\rho(d\theta) \propto \exp(h(\theta))\pi(d\theta).$$

Proof: e.g. Catoni [2007]. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.1 From the proof of Proposition A.1, and using the short-hand q_θ for $q_{1,2}^\theta$, we deduce

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp\{\rho(\gamma(R_n(\theta)) - \bar{R}_n - R(\theta) + \bar{R})\} + \eta(\theta) \right] \leq \exp \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{n-1} \frac{\rho(\mathbb{E}q_\theta^2)}{\left(1 - 4\frac{\gamma}{n-1}\right)} + \rho(\eta(\theta)) \right). \quad (2)$$

Using proposition A.2, and the fact that $e^x \geq \mathbb{1}\{x \geq 0\}$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left\{ \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\Theta)} \rho(\gamma(R_n(\theta)) - \bar{R}_n - R(\theta) + \bar{R}) - \eta(\theta) - \mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi) \geq 0 \right\} \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\pi \left\{ \exp\{\rho(\gamma(R_n(\theta)) - \bar{R}_n - R(\theta) + \bar{R}) - \eta(\theta)\} \right\} \right) \\ & = \pi \left(\mathbb{E} \left\{ \exp\{\rho(\gamma(R_n(\theta)) - \bar{R}_n - R(\theta) + \bar{R}) - \eta(\theta)\} \right\} \right), \text{ by Fubini} \\ & \leq \pi \left\{ \exp \left(\frac{\gamma^2 \rho(\mathbb{E}q_\theta^2)}{(n-1)\left(1 - \frac{4\gamma}{n-1}\right)} - \rho(\eta(\theta)) \right) \right\}, \text{ using (2).} \end{aligned}$$

In the following we take $\eta(\theta) = \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \frac{\gamma^2}{n-1} \frac{\rho(\mathbb{E}q_\theta^2)}{\left(1 - 4\frac{\gamma}{n-1}\right)}$ leading to the following result with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$, $\forall \rho \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\Theta)$:

$$\rho(R_n(\theta)) - \bar{R}_n \leq \rho(R(\theta)) - \bar{R} + \frac{\mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi) + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{\gamma} + \frac{\gamma}{n-1} \frac{\rho(\mathbb{E}q_\theta^2)}{\left(1 - 4\frac{\gamma}{n-1}\right)}. \quad (3)$$

Under **MA**(1, C) we can write:

$$\rho(R_n(\theta)) - \bar{R}_n \leq \left(1 + \frac{\gamma C}{n-1} \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{4}{n-1}\right)} \right) (\rho(R(\theta)) - \bar{R}) + \frac{\mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi) + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{\gamma}.$$

Using Bernstein's inequality in the symmetric case, with probability $1 - \epsilon$ we can assert that:

$$\left(1 - \frac{\gamma C}{n-1} \frac{1}{(1 - \gamma \frac{4}{n-1})}\right) (\rho(R(\theta)) - \bar{R}) \leq \rho(R_n(\theta)) - \bar{R}_n + \frac{\mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi) + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{\gamma}.$$

The latter is true in particular for $\rho = \pi(\theta|\mathcal{S})$, the Gibbs posterior:

$$\left(1 - \frac{\gamma C}{n-1} \frac{1}{(1 - \gamma \frac{4}{n-1})}\right) \left(\int_{\Theta} R(\theta) \pi_{\gamma}(d\theta|\mathcal{D}) - \bar{R}\right) \leq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{M}_+^1} \left\{ \rho(R_n(\theta)) - \bar{R}_n + \frac{\mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi) + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{\gamma} \right\}.$$

Making use of equation (3) and the fact that $\gamma \leq (n-1)/8C$ we have with probability $1 - 2\epsilon$:

$$\left(\int_{\Theta} R_n(\theta) \pi_{\gamma}(d\theta|\mathcal{D}) - \bar{R}_n\right) \leq 2 \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{M}_+^1} \left(\rho(R(\theta)) - \bar{R} + 2 \frac{\mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi) + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{\gamma} \right). \quad \square$$

Lemma 2.1 gives some approximately correct finite sample bound under hypothesis $\mathbf{MA}(1, C)$. It is easy to extend those results to the more general case of $\mathbf{MA}(\infty, C)$. Note in particular that this assumption is always satisfied for $C = 4$.

Proof of Lemma 2.2 First consider in our case that, the margin assumption is always true for $C = 4$, $\mathbb{E}(q_{\theta}^2) \leq 4$, the rest of the proof is similar to that of lemma 2.1. From equation (3) with the above hypothesis:

$$\rho(R_n(\theta)) - \bar{R}_n \leq \rho(R(\theta)) - \bar{R} + \frac{\mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi) + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{\gamma} + \frac{4\gamma}{n-1} \frac{1}{(1 - \frac{4}{n-1})}$$

From the Bernstein inequality with in the symmetric case we get with probability $1 - \epsilon$:

$$\rho(R(\theta)) - \bar{R} \leq \rho(R_n(\theta)) - \bar{R}_n + \frac{\mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi) + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{\gamma} + \frac{4\gamma}{n-1} \frac{1}{(1 - \frac{4}{n-1})}$$

We get, after noting that the Gibbs posterior can be written as an infimum (Legendre transform), with probability $1 - 2\epsilon$:

$$\int (R(\theta) \pi_{\gamma}(d\theta|\mathcal{D}) - \bar{R}) \leq \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\Theta)} \rho(R(\theta)) - \bar{R} + \frac{\mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi) + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{\gamma} + \frac{16\gamma}{n-1}$$

(we also used $\gamma \leq (n-1)/8$).

□

The two above lemma depend on some class complexity $\mathcal{K}(\rho, \pi)$. The latter can be specialized to different choice of prior measure π . In the following we propose two specifications to a Gaussian prior and a spike and slab prior.

A.3 Proof of Theorem 2.3 (Independent Gaussian prior)

For any $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with $\|\theta_0\| = 1$ and $\delta > 0$ we put

$$\rho_{\theta_0, \delta}(d\theta) \propto \mathbf{1}_{\|\theta - \theta_0\| \leq \delta} \pi(d\theta).$$

Then we have, from Lemma 2.1, with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$,

$$\int R(\theta) \pi_{\gamma}(d\theta|\mathcal{D}) - \bar{R} \leq 2 \inf_{\theta_0, \delta} \left\{ \int R(\theta) \rho_{\theta_0, \delta}(d\theta) - \bar{R} + 16C \frac{\mathcal{K}(\rho_{\theta_0, \delta}, \pi) + \log \left(\frac{4}{\epsilon}\right)}{(n-1)} \right\}$$

First, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
R(\theta) &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}\{\langle \theta, X - X' \rangle (Y - Y') < 0\}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}\{\langle \theta_0, X - X' \rangle (Y - Y') < 0\}) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}\{\langle \theta, X - X' \rangle (Y - Y') < 0\} - \mathbb{1}\{\langle \theta_0, X - X' \rangle (Y - Y') < 0\}) \\
&\leq \mathbb{R}(\theta_0) + \mathbb{P}(\text{sign}\langle \theta, X - X' \rangle (Y - Y') \neq \text{sign}\langle \theta_0, X - X' \rangle (Y - Y')) \\
&= \mathbb{R}(\theta_0) + \mathbb{P}(\text{sign}\langle \theta, X - X' \rangle \neq \text{sign}\langle \theta_0, X - X' \rangle) \\
&\leq \mathbb{R}(\theta_0) + c \left\| \frac{\theta}{\|\theta\|} - \theta_0 \right\| \\
&\leq \mathbb{R}(\theta_0) + 2c\|\theta - \theta_0\|.
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence $\int R(\theta)\rho_{\theta_0, \delta}(\text{d}\theta) \leq \mathbb{R}(\theta_0) + 2c\delta$.

The next step is to calculate $\mathcal{K}(\rho_{\theta_0, \delta}, \pi)$. We have

$$\mathcal{K}(\rho_{\theta_0, \delta}, \pi) = \log \frac{1}{\pi(\{\theta : \|\theta - \theta_0\| \leq \delta\})}.$$

Assuming that $\theta_{0,1} > 0$ (the proof is exactly symmetric in the other case)

$$\begin{aligned}
-\mathcal{K}(\rho_{\theta_0, \delta}, \pi) &= \log \pi \left(\left\{ \theta : \sum_{i=1}^d (\theta_i - \theta_{0,i})^2 \leq \delta^2 \right\} \right) \\
&\geq d \log \pi \left(\left\{ \theta : (\theta_1 - \theta_{0,1})^2 \leq \frac{\delta^2}{d} \right\} \right) \\
&\geq d \log \int_{\frac{\theta_{0,1}}{\sqrt{\vartheta}} - \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\vartheta d}}}^{\frac{\theta_{0,1}}{\sqrt{\vartheta}} + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\vartheta d}}} \varphi_{(0,1)}(x) \text{d}x \\
&\geq d \log \left(\frac{\delta}{2\sqrt{\vartheta d}} \varphi \left(\frac{\theta_{0,1}}{\sqrt{\vartheta}} + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\vartheta d}} \right) \right) \\
&\geq d \log \left(\frac{\delta}{2\sqrt{\vartheta d}} \varphi \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\vartheta}} + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\vartheta d}} \right) \right) \\
&= d \log \left(\frac{\delta}{2\sqrt{2\pi\vartheta d}} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\vartheta}} + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\vartheta d}} \right)^2 \right] \right) \\
&\geq d \log \left\{ \frac{\delta}{2\sqrt{2\pi\vartheta d}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{\vartheta} - \frac{\delta^2}{\vartheta d} \right) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{K}(\rho_{\theta_0, \delta}, \pi) \leq -d \log\{\delta\} + \frac{d}{2} \log\{8\pi\vartheta d\} + \frac{1}{\vartheta} + \frac{\delta^2}{\vartheta d}$$

And we can plug the equation above in the result of lemma 2.1 with $\delta = \frac{1}{n}$

$$\int R(\theta)\pi_\gamma(\theta|\mathcal{D}) - \bar{R} \leq 2 \inf_{\theta_0} \left(\mathbb{R}(\theta_0) - \bar{R} + 2c \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2}{\gamma} \left(d \log\{n\} + \frac{d}{2} \log\{8\pi\vartheta d\} + \frac{1}{\vartheta} + \frac{1}{\vartheta d} + \log \frac{4}{\epsilon} \right) \right)$$

Any $\gamma = O(n)$ will lead to a convergence result. Taking $\gamma = (n-1)/8C$ and optimizing in ϑ we obtain a variance of $\vartheta = \frac{2(1+\frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{2}d})}}{d}$.

A.4 Proof of Theorem 2.4 (Independent Gaussian prior)

As was done for the previous lemmas we can lift the $\mathbf{MA}(\infty, C)$ and use the lemma 2.2 instead, which gives rise to Theorem 2.4.

Use Lemma 2.2 and the same steps as in the proof of Theorem 2.3, optimize w.r.t. γ and ϑ to get the result.

We show the same kind of result in the following but for spike and slab priors.

A.5 Proof of Theorem 2.5 (Spike and slab prior for feature selection)

As for the proof of theorem 2.3 we start by defining, for any $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with $\|\theta_0\| = 1$ and $\delta > 0$,

$$\rho_{\theta_0, \delta}(\mathrm{d}\theta) \propto \mathbf{1}_{\|\theta - \theta_0\| \leq \delta} \pi(\mathrm{d}\theta)$$

so that in the end, by a similar argument as previously it remains only to upper bound the following quantity,

$$\mathcal{K}(\rho_{\theta_0, \delta}, \pi) = \log \frac{1}{\pi(\{\theta : \|\theta - \theta_0\| \leq \delta\})}.$$

Let π_0 denote the probability distribution such that the θ_i are iid $\mathcal{N}(0, v_0)$. So:

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{K}(\rho_{\theta_0, \delta}, \pi) &= \log \pi \left(\left\{ \theta : \sum_{i=1}^d (\theta_i - \theta_{0,i})^2 \leq \delta^2 \right\} \right) \\ &\geq \log \pi \left(\left\{ \theta : \forall i, (\theta_i - \theta_{0,i})^2 \leq \frac{\delta^2}{d} \right\} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i: \theta_{0,i} \neq 0} \log \pi \left(\left\{ (\theta_i - \theta_{0,i})^2 \leq \frac{\delta^2}{d} \right\} \right) \\ &\quad + \log \pi \left(\left\{ \forall i \text{ with } \theta_{0,i} = 0, \theta_i^2 < \frac{\delta^2}{d} \right\} \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{i: \theta_{0,i} \neq 0} \log \pi \left(\left\{ (\theta_i - \theta_{0,i})^2 \leq \frac{\delta^2}{d} \right\} \right) \\ &\quad + \log \pi_0 \left(\left\{ \forall i \text{ with } \theta_{0,i} = 0, \theta_i^2 < \frac{\delta^2}{d} \right\} \right) + d \log(1 - p) \\ &= \sum_{i: \theta_{0,i} \neq 0} \log \pi \left(\left\{ (\theta_i - \theta_{0,i})^2 \leq \frac{\delta^2}{d} \right\} \right) \\ &\quad + \log \left[1 - \pi_0 \left(\left\{ \exists i, \theta_{0,i} = 0, \theta_i^2 > \frac{\delta^2}{d} \right\} \right) \right] + d \log(1 - p) \\ &\geq \sum_{i: \theta_{0,i} \neq 0} \log \pi \left(\left\{ (\theta_i - \theta_{0,i})^2 \leq \frac{\delta^2}{d} \right\} \right) \\ &\quad + \log \left[1 - \sum_{i: \theta_{0,i} = 0} \pi_0 \left(\left\{ \theta_i^2 > \frac{\delta^2}{d} \right\} \right) \right] + d \log(1 - p). \end{aligned}$$

Assume first that i is such that $\theta_{0,i} = 0$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0 \left(\left\{ \theta_i^2 > \frac{\delta^2}{d} \right\} \right) &= \pi_0 \left(\left\{ \left| \frac{\theta_i}{\sqrt{v_0}} \right| > \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{v_0 d}} \right\} \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left(-\frac{\delta^2}{2v_0 d} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\sum_{i: \theta_{0,i} = 0} \pi_0 \left(\left\{ \theta_i^2 > \frac{\delta^2}{d} \right\} \right) \leq d \exp \left(-\frac{\delta^2}{2v_0 d} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2}$$

as soon as $v_0 \leq \delta^2/(2d \log(d))$. Then, assume that i is such that $\theta_{0,i} \neq 0$. Now assume that $\theta_{0,i} > 0$ (the proof is exactly symmetric if $\theta_{0,i} < 0$):

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi \left(\left\{ \theta : (\theta_i - \theta_{0,i})^2 \leq \frac{\delta^2}{d} \right\} \right) &\geq p \int_{\frac{\theta_{0,i}}{\sqrt{v_1}} - \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{v_1 d}}}^{\frac{\theta_{0,i}}{\sqrt{v_1}} + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{v_1 d}}} \varphi_{(0,1)}(x) dx \\
&\geq \frac{p\delta}{2\sqrt{v_1 d}} \varphi \left(\frac{\theta_{0,i}}{\sqrt{v_1}} + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{v_1 d}} \right) \\
&\geq \frac{p\delta}{2\sqrt{v_1 d}} \varphi \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{v_1}} + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{v_1 d}} \right) \\
&= \frac{p\delta}{2\sqrt{2\pi v_1 d}} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{v_1}} + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{v_1 d}} \right)^2 \right] \\
&\geq \frac{p\delta}{2\sqrt{2\pi v_1 d}} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{v_1} - \frac{\delta^2}{v_1 d} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Putting everything together:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}(\rho_{\theta_0, \delta}, \pi) &\leq -\|\theta_0\|_0 \log \left(\frac{p\delta}{2\sqrt{2\pi v_1 d}} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{v_1} - \frac{\delta^2}{v_1 d} \right] \right) + \log(2) + d \log \frac{1}{1-p} \\
&= \|\theta_0\|_0 \left[\log \left(\frac{2\sqrt{2\pi v_1 d}}{p\delta} \right) + \frac{1}{v_1} + \frac{\delta^2}{v_1 d} \right] + \log(2) + d \log \frac{1}{1-p}.
\end{aligned}$$

So, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int R(\theta) \pi_\gamma(d\theta|\mathcal{D}) - \bar{R} &\leq 2 \inf_{\theta_0, \delta} \left\{ R(\theta_0) - \bar{R} + 2c\delta \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 16C \frac{\|\theta_0\|_0 \left[\log \left(\frac{2\sqrt{2\pi v_1 d}}{p\delta} \right) + \frac{1}{v_1} + \frac{\delta^2}{v_1 d} \right] + \log(2) + d \log \frac{1}{1-p} + \log \left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon} \right)}{(n-1)} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

B Practical implementation of the PAC-Bayesian approach

B.1 Sequential Monte Carlo

The resampling scheme we use in our SMC sampler is systematic resampling, see Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Systematic resampling

Input: Normalised weights $W_t^j := w_t(\theta_{t-1}^j) / \sum_{i=1}^N w_t(\theta_{t-1}^i)$.

Output: indices $A^i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, for $i = 1, \dots, N$.

a. Sample $U \sim \mathcal{U}([0, 1])$.

b. Compute cumulative weights as $C^n = \sum_{m=1}^n NW^m$.

c. Set $s \leftarrow U$, $m \leftarrow 1$.

d. For $n = 1 : N$

While $C^m < s$ **do** $m \leftarrow m + 1$.

$A^n \leftarrow m$, and $s \leftarrow s + C^m$.

End For

To move the particles while leaving invariant the current target $\pi_{\xi, \gamma}(\theta|\mathcal{D})$, we use the standard random walk Metropolis strategy, but scaled to the current set of particles, as outlined by Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 Gaussian random walk Metropolis step

Input: θ, S ($d \times d$ positive matrix)

Output: θ_{next}

a. Sample $\theta_{\text{prop}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta, S)$.

b. Sample $U \sim \mathcal{U}([0, 1])$.

c. If $\log(U) \leq \log \pi_{\xi, \gamma}(\theta_{\text{prop}} | \mathcal{D}) / \pi_{\xi, \gamma}(\theta | \mathcal{D})$, set $\theta_{\text{next}} \leftarrow \theta_{\text{prop}}$, otherwise set $\theta_{\text{next}} \leftarrow \theta$.

B.2 Expectation-Propagation (Gaussian prior)

EP aims at approximating posterior distributions of the form,

$$\pi(\theta | \mathcal{D}) = \frac{1}{Z_\pi} P_0(\theta) \prod_{i=1}^n t_i(\theta)$$

by approximating each site $t_i(\theta)$ by a distribution from an exponential family $q_i(\theta)$. The algorithm cycles through each site, computes the cavity distribution $Q^{\setminus i}(\theta) \propto Q(\theta) q_i^{-1}(\theta)$ and minimizes the Kullback-Leibler divergence between $Q^{\setminus i}(\theta) t_i(\theta)$ and the global approximation $Q(\theta)$. This is efficiently done by using properties of the exponential family (e.g. Bishop [2006]).

In the Gaussian case the EP approximation can be written as a product of some prior and a product of sites:

$$Q(\theta) \propto \mathcal{N}(\theta; 0, \Sigma) \prod_{i,j} q_{ij}(\theta),$$

for which the sites are unnormalized Gaussians for the natural parametrization $q_{ij}(\theta) \propto \exp(-\frac{1}{2} \theta^T Q_{ij} \theta + \theta r_{ij})$. We can equivalently use the one dimensional representation $q_{ij}(s_{ij}) \propto \exp(-\frac{1}{2} s_{ij}^2 K_{ij} + s_{ij} h_{ij})$, going from one to the other is easily done by multiplying θ by $(e_i - e_j) X$ where $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, e_i is a vector of zeroes with one on the i -th line. Hence we keep in memory only $(K_{ij})_{ij}$ and $(h_{ij})_{ij}$.

While computing the cavity moment we must compute $(Q - (X_i - X_j)(X_i - X_j) K_{ij})$ and its inverse. The latter can be computed efficiently using Woodbury formula. Equivalently one could use similar tricks where only the Cholesky factorisation is saved and updated as in Seeger [2005]. By precomputing some matrix multiplication the later cavity moment computation can be done in complexity $\mathcal{O}(p^2)$.

To update the sites we compute normalizing constant $Z_{ij} = \int \mathcal{N}(s; m^{\setminus ij}, \sigma^{\setminus ij}) t_{ij}(s) ds$ and use properties of exponential families.

Algorithm 4 parallel EP for Gaussian Prior

Input: ϑ, γ

Output: m and V

Init: $V \leftarrow \Sigma, m \leftarrow 0$

Untill Convergence Do

For all sites (i, j) **Do** in parallel

- a. Compute the cavity moments $m^{\setminus ij}, V^{\setminus ij}$
- b. Compute the 1st and 2nd order moments of $q^{\setminus ij}(s_{ij}) t_{ij}(s_{ij})$
- c. Update K_{ij} and h_{ij}

End For

Update $V = (\Sigma^{-1} + \sum_{ij} (X_i - X_j)^T (X_i - X_j) K_{ij})^{-1}$, $m = V (\sum_{ij} (X_i - X_j) h_{ij})$

End While

Normalising Constant The normalizing constant of the posterior can be computed using EP. We have that for each sites $t_{ij}(\theta) = C_{ij}q_{ij}(\theta)$ we replace those sites in integral we wish to approximate,

$$\int \mathcal{N}(\theta; 0, \Sigma) \prod_{ij} t_{ij}(\theta) d\theta \simeq \prod_{ij} C_{ij} \int \mathcal{N}(\theta; 0, \Sigma) \prod_{ij} q_{ij}(\theta) d\theta$$

The integral on the right hand side is a Gaussian convolution and is therefore also Gaussian. The C_{ij} s can be approximated by matching the zeroth order moment in the site update. As noted in the paper we can also compute the derivatives with respect to some prior hyper-parameter (see Seeger [2005]).

B.3 Expectation-Propagation (spike and slab prior)

The posterior can be written as

$$\pi(\theta|\mathcal{D}) \propto \prod_{i,j} t_{ij}(\theta) \prod_{k=1}^d t_k(\theta_k, z_k) \mathcal{B}er(z_k; p),$$

where $z_k \in \{0, 1\}$ codes the origin of θ_k , spike/slab, and where $t_k(\theta_k, z_k) \propto z_k \mathcal{N}(\theta_k; 0, v_0) + (1 - z_k) \mathcal{N}(\theta_k; 0, v_1)$. The approximation given by EP is of the form,

$$Q(\theta, z) \propto \prod_{i,j} q_{ij}(\theta) \prod_{k=1}^d q_k(\theta_k, z_k) \mathcal{B}er(z_k; p_k),$$

where $q_k(\theta_k, z_k) \propto \mathcal{B}er(z_k, p_k) \mathcal{N}(\theta_k; m_k, \sigma_k^2)$, and $t_{ij}(\theta)$ is as in the previous section. The cavity moments are easy to compute as the approximation is Gaussian in θ and Bernoulli in z . In both cases we can deduce cavity moments because division is stable inside those classes of functions. We get some distribution $Q^{\setminus k}(\theta_k) \propto \mathcal{B}er(z_k; p^{\setminus k}) \mathcal{N}(\theta_k; m^{\setminus k}, \sigma^{2, \setminus k})$. We can compute the normalizing constant of the distribution $Q^{\setminus ij}(\theta) t_k(\theta_k, z_k)$, namely,

$$Z_k = p^{\setminus k} \int \mathcal{N}(\theta_k; 0, v_0) \mathcal{N}(\theta_k; m^{\setminus k}, \sigma^{2, \setminus k}) d\theta_k + (1 - p^{\setminus k}) \int \mathcal{N}(\theta_k; 0, v_0) \mathcal{N}(\theta_k; m^{\setminus k}, \sigma^{2, \setminus k}) d\theta_k$$

Where we can find the update by computing the derivatives of $\log Z_k$ with respect to $p^{\setminus k}$, $m^{\setminus k}$ and $\sigma^{2, \setminus k}$


Initialization for the Gaussian is done to a given Σ_0 that will be subtracted later on. The initial p_k s are taken such that the approximation equals the prior p at the first iteration.

C Numerical illustration

Figure 4 shows the posterior marginals as given by EP and tempering SMC. The later is exact in the sense that the only error stems from Monte Carlo; we see that the mode is well approximated however the variance is slightly underestimated.

In Table 2 we show the CPU times in seconds, on all dataset studied. Experiments where run with a i7-3720QM CPU @ 2.60GHz intel processor with 6144 KB cache. Our linear model is overall faster on those datasets. A caveat is that Rankboost is implemented in Matlab, while our implementation is in C.

Figure 4: Comparison of the output of the two algorithms



Comparison of the Gaussian approximation obtained by Fractional EP (green) with the true density generated by SMC (blue) on the Pima indians dataset

Dataset	Covariates	Balance	EP-AUC	GPEP-AUC	Rankboost
Pima	7	34%	0.06	7.75	3.26
Credit	60	28%	1.98	7.59	56.54
DNA	180	22%	11.26	63.47	141.60
SPECTF	22	50%	0.25	63.47	3.55
Colon	2000	40%	636.63	60.99	156.85
Glass	10	1%	0.23	1.33	2.36

Table 2: Computation times in seconds