
Direct $\ell_{2,p}$ -Norm Learning for Feature Selection

Hanyang Peng, Yong Fan

National Laboratory of Pattern Recognition, Brainnetome centre,
Institute of Automation, Chinese Academy of Science, Beijing, China, 100190
{hanyang.peng, yfan}@nlpr.ia.ac.cn

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a novel sparse learning based feature selection method that directly optimizes a large margin linear classification model's sparsity with $\ell_{2,p}$ -norm ($0 < p \leq 1$) subject to data-fitting constraints, rather than using the sparsity as a regularization term. To solve the direct sparsity optimization problem that is non-smooth and non-convex when $0 < p < 1$, we provide an efficient iterative algorithm with proved convergence by converting it to a convex and smooth optimization problem at every iteration step. The proposed algorithm has been evaluated based on publicly available datasets, and extensive comparison experiments have demonstrated that our algorithm could achieve feature selection performance competitive to state-of-the-art algorithms.

1. Introduction

Nowadays, we face to handle more and more high-dimensional data in machine learning. Since many features in real applications are not informative, they may lead to over-fitting and deteriorated learning models for small sample size problems. To improve the efficacy of machine learning models, feature selection has been an important tool (Guyon & Elisseeff, 2003).

Feature selection approaches in general can be divided into three groups: filter methods (Kira & Rendell, 1992; Lewis, 1992; Peng et al., 2005), wrapper methods (Guyon et al., 2002), and embedded methods (Cawley et al., 2006; Wang et al., 2008; Xiang et al., 2012). Filter methods use proxy measures that are independent on the learning models to rank features according to their relevancy to the learning problem. Wrapper methods directly utilize a learning model's performance to select features. Therefore, the wrapper methods typically have higher computational cost than the filter methods. Since embedded methods integrate feature selection into the model learning, they typically achieve good performance with moderate computational cost.

As an embedded method, sparse linear model based feature selection has attracted much attention, and many variants have been proposed with different sparsity regularization terms. In particular, ℓ_1 -norm regularization based algorithms, such as Lasso (Tibshirani, 1996) and sparse SVM (Bradley & Mangasarian, 1998; Wang, et al., 2008), have been demonstrated powerful in feature selection. In multi-task learning, various $\ell_{2,1}$ -norm (Liu et al., 2009; Nie et al., 2010; Obozinski et al., 2006) or $\ell_{\infty,1}$ -norm (Liu et al., 2009) based regularization models have been investigated for selecting features with joint sparsity cross different tasks. Moreover, group Lasso based methods (Kong & Ding, 2013; Kong et al., 2014) have also been proposed in recent years. In fact, the multi-task feature selection algorithms have close connection to group lasso based methods. Since non-convex ℓ_p -norm or $\ell_{r,p}$ -norm ($0 < p < 1$) based regularization models can yield more sparse solution with no bias than ℓ_1 -norm or $\ell_{r,1}$ -norm based models (Fan & Peng 2004; Tan et al., 2014), they have gained increasing attention in recent studies (Chartrand & Staneva, 2008; Liu et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2014).

Sparsity regularization based feature selection algorithms typically take a compromise between data-fitting loss function term and sparsity term, therefore there inevitably exists residual in the loss function that will have an impact on feature selection. In this paper, we propose a novel algorithm via directly optimizing sparsity of a linear model with a $\ell_{2,p}$ -norm ($0 < p \leq 1$) based objective function, instead of adopting the sparsity as a regularization term. This direct sparsity optimization method is further enhanced by a large margin model learning technique. We provide an efficient algorithm to solve the non-convex and non-smooth optimization problem associated with the direct sparsity optimization by transforming it to a Frobenius-norm induced problem at each iteration step, which has been proved to converge to the optimal solution.

The proposed algorithm has been evaluated based on 9 publicly available datasets, and extensive comparison experiments have demonstrated that our algorithm could achieve feature selection performance competitive to state-of-the-art algorithms, including ℓ_1 -norm based Lasso (Tibshirani, 1996), $\ell_{2,1}$ -norm

based Robust Feature Selection (RFS) (Nie, et al., 2010; Xiang, et al., 2012), ReliefF (Kira & Rendell, 1992), and mRMR (Peng, et al., 2005).

2. Feature Selection via Direct Sparsity Optimization (DSO-FS)

Throughout this paper, matrices are written in bold uppercase, vectors are written in bold lowercase, and all the scalars are denoted by un-boldface letters. \mathbf{I} denotes an identity matrix and $\mathbf{1}$ denotes a vector or matrix with all the elements equal to 1. Given a matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, the $\ell_{r,p}$ -norm ($r > 0, p > 0$)¹ of \mathbf{A} is defined as:

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_{r,p} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |A_{i,j}|^r \right)^{\frac{p}{r}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (1)$$

where $\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_r$ denotes ℓ_r -norm of the i -th row vector of \mathbf{A} .

Given m training samples $\{\mathbf{x}^i, y^i\}_{i=1}^m$ where $\mathbf{x}^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a data point and y^i is its associated class label in c ($c \geq 2$) classes, the multiclass classification problem can be modeled as a linear learning problem, *i.e.*,

$$\mathbf{X}\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{Y}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}^i\}_{i=1}^m$, $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times c}$ is the weight matrix to be learned, and $\mathbf{Y} = [f^1; \dots; f^i; \dots; f^n] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times c}$ and is a class label matrix with labels rearranged using a one-versus-rest model, *i.e.*, $f^i = [-1, \dots, 1, \dots, -1] \in \mathbb{R}^c$ (the j -th element is 1 and others are -1 for the i -th data point belonging to the j -th class).

To achieve feature selection, \mathbf{W} should have sparse column vectors and share joint sparsity along its row direction since each row of \mathbf{W} corresponds to the same feature. Therefore, we model the feature selection problem as¹.

$$\min_{\mathbf{W}} \|\mathbf{W}\|_{2,0}, \quad s.t., \mathbf{X}\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{Y}. \quad (3)$$

where $\|\mathbf{W}\|_{2,0}$ is the number of rows in \mathbf{W} of which not all the elements are zero.

Solving the optimization problem of Eqn.(3) is NP-hard. Therefore ℓ_p -norm ($0 < p \leq 1$) can be adopted instead, resulting in a relaxed sparsity optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{W}} \|\mathbf{W}\|_{2,p}, \quad s.t., \mathbf{X}\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{Y}, \quad (4)$$

¹ If $0 < r < 1$ or $0 < p < 1$, $\ell_{r,p}$ -norm does not satisfy triangle inequality, but it is not needed in this paper.

¹ For simplicity, the bias of the standard linear regression is absorbed into \mathbf{W} as an additional dimension with all elements equal to 1.

where $0 < p \leq 1$.

Many studies assumed that a $\ell_{2,1}$ -norm used in Eqn. (4) could lead to the sparsest solution (Liu, et al., 2009; Nie, et al., 2010; Obozinski, et al., 2006). However, such a strategy works only under certain conditions (Candes & Tao, 2005). In practice, $\ell_{2,p}$ -norm ($0 < p < 1$) will help get more sparse solution in most cases although it is non-convex.

It is desired that the classification model's margin between classes is as large as possible for obtaining improved generalization performance. Accordingly, the equality constraint in Eqn. (4) is relaxed to be inequality constraints, *i.e.*,

$$\min_{\mathbf{W}} \|\mathbf{W}\|_{2,p}, \quad s.t., \mathbf{Y} \odot \mathbf{X}\mathbf{W} \geq \mathbf{1}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times c}$, and \odot is a Hadamard product operator that makes a direct production within the corresponding elements of both matrices. And the optimization problem of Eqn. (5) can be formulated by introducing slack variables $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times c}$ whose elements have the same positive or negative sign as the corresponding elements of \mathbf{Y} , as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{E}} \|\mathbf{W}\|_{2,p} \\ s.t. \quad \mathbf{X}\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{Y} + \mathbf{E} \\ \mathbf{Y} \odot \mathbf{E} \geq \mathbf{0}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times c}$ and $\geq \mathbf{0}$ denotes that all the elements in the matrix are greater than or equal to 0.

Our strategy to solve the optimization problem of Eqn. (6) are the following. First, we solve the linear equation $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{Y} + \mathbf{E}$ to obtain the solution space of \mathbf{W} . Then, we directly search the solution space to find a solution with the minimum of $\|\mathbf{W}\|_{2,p}$. Note that if linear equation $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{Y} + \mathbf{E}$ is inconsistent, especially when the number of data samples m is greater than the number of features n , least-square solution space of the equation can be substituted. Actually, we just need to solve $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^+(\mathbf{Y} + \mathbf{E})$, where \mathbf{X}^+ is pseudo-inverse. This equation is compatible when $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{Y} + \mathbf{E}$ is consistent, since on this occasion $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^+ = \mathbf{I}$. Gaussian Elimination is a simple and efficient way to obtain the solve space of \mathbf{W} , *i.e.*,

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{X} : \mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^+(\mathbf{Y} + \mathbf{E})] &= [\mathbf{X}_1 \quad \mathbf{X}_2 : \mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^+(\mathbf{Y} + \mathbf{E})] \\ \xrightarrow{\text{premultiply } D} &\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{M} & : & \mathbf{N} + \mathbf{L}\mathbf{E} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & : & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where the rank of \mathbf{X} is m_0 and $n_0 = n - m_0$, $\mathbf{X}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m_0}$, $\mathbf{X}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_0}$, $\mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_0 \times m_0}$, $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_0 \times n_0}$, $\mathbf{N} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_0 \times c}$, and $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^+ \in \mathbb{R}^{m_0 \times m_0}$. Thus, the solution space of \mathbf{W} is

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M} \\ \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{U} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{N} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}\mathbf{E} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_0}$, $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0 \times c}$, $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times c}$, $\mathbf{F} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times c}$, and $\mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0 \times n_0}$.

Finally, the optimization problem of Eqn. (5) can be reformulated as

$$\min_{\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{E}} \left\| \mathbf{P}\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{Q} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}\mathbf{E} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{2,p}, \text{ s.t.}, \mathbf{Y} \odot \mathbf{E} \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad (9)$$

where $0 < p \leq 1$.

3. Solution to DSO-FS

3.1 An iterative algorithm to DSO-FS

We propose an iterative strategy to solve the non-linear optimization problem of Eqn. (9) due to that no analytical solution is available. At each iteration step, we alternately optimize variables \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{E} . An optimization problem with $\ell_{2,p}$ -norm ($0 < p \leq 1$) is non-smooth and non-convex when $0 < p < 1$. To efficiently solving this problem, $\ell_{2,p}$ -norm is reformulated by Frobenius-norm (\mathcal{F} -norm) that is smooth and convex, as

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_{2,p}^p = \|\Sigma\mathbf{A}\|_F^2, \quad (10)$$

where Σ is a diagonal matrix with the i -th diagonal element $\Sigma_{ii} = \mathbf{1}/\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^{1-p/2}$, and $\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2$ is defined in Eqn.(1)². Such a strategy was first developed in FOCal Underdetermined System Solver (FOCUSS) (Gorodnitsky & Rao, 1997), and has been adopted in various $\ell_{2,1}$ -norm regularization based feature selection algorithms (Hou et al., 2011; Nie, et al., 2010; Xiang, et al., 2012; Yi Yang et al., 2011).

Our solution to DSO-FS is summarized in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Feature Selection via Direct Sparsity Optimization (DSO-FS)

Input: data points $\{\mathbf{x}^i\}_{i=1}^m$ ($\mathbf{x}^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$) and their corresponding label $\{y^i\}_{i=1}^m$; norm power p ; number of features d to be selected.

Construct \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} according to Eqn. (2), and \mathbf{L} , \mathbf{M} , \mathbf{N} , \mathbf{P} , and \mathbf{Q} according to Eqn.(7) and Eqn.(8).

Set $k = 0$ and initialize $\Sigma^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with an identity matrix.

repeat

² Actually, $\Sigma = \Pi^{-1}$, where Π is a diagonal matrix with the i -th diagonal element $\Pi_{ii} = \|\mathbf{a}_i\|_2^{1-p/2}$. If any row vector $\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{0}$, we define $\Sigma = \Pi^+$.

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{Q} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}\mathbf{E}^k \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{U}^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{U}} \|\Sigma^k(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{G})\|_F^2$$

$\mathbf{V}^k = \mathbf{M}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^{k+1} + \mathbf{N} + \mathbf{L}\mathbf{E}^k$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^{k+1}$ is the first m_0 row vectors of \mathbf{U}^{k+1}

Update diagonal matrix \mathbf{A}^k , where the i -th diagonal element is $\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{v}_i^k\|_2^{1-p/2}}$

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{M}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}^k + \mathbf{N}$$

$$\mathbf{E}^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{E}} \|\mathbf{A}^k(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{H})\|_F^2, \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{Y} \odot \mathbf{E} \geq \mathbf{0}$$

$$\text{Update } k = k + 1, \mathbf{W}^k = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{U}^k + \mathbf{Q} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}\mathbf{E}^k \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$$

Update Σ^k , where the i -th diagonal element is $\frac{1}{\|\mathbf{w}_i^k\|_2^{1-p/2}}$

until convergence

Sort all features according to $\|\mathbf{w}_i\|_2$ and select the top largest d features.

Note that at each iteration step, for solving the problem $\mathbf{U}^{k+1} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{U}} \|\Sigma^k(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{G})\|_F^2$, an analytical solution is available, *i.e.*,

$$\mathbf{U}^{k+1} = (\mathbf{P}^t \Sigma \mathbf{P})^{-1} \mathbf{P}^t \mathbf{S} \mathbf{G}, \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{S} = (\Sigma^k)^2$

According to Eqn. (8), Eqn. (11) can be reformulated as

$$\mathbf{U}^{k+1} = (\mathbf{M}^t \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{M} + \mathbf{S}_2)^{-1} \mathbf{M}^t \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{K}, \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbf{S}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m_0 \times m_0}$ is a diagonal matrix, of which the diagonal elements are the first m_0 elements of \mathbf{S} , $\mathbf{S}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0 \times n_0}$ is a diagonal matrix, of which the diagonal elements are the last n_0 elements of \mathbf{S} , and $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{N} + \mathbf{L}\mathbf{E}^k (\in \mathbb{R}^{m_0 \times c})$.

If $m_0 < n_0$, we can reduce the optimization problem's complexity with a simple matrix operation

$$\mathbf{U}^{k+1} = \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{M}\mathbf{T} + \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{K}, \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{S}_2^{-1} \mathbf{M}^t \mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_0 \times m_0}$.

For feature selection problems with the number of samples less than the number of features, *i.e.*, $m_0 < m \leq n_0$, updating Eqn. (13) has reduced computational cost than Eqn. (11). It is worth noting that it is not necessary to directly calculate $\mathbf{C} = (\mathbf{M}\mathbf{T} + \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{K}$, which is computationally more expensive than solving the following linear equation

$$(\mathbf{M}\mathbf{T} + \mathbf{I})\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{K}. \quad (14)$$

Although no analytical solution is not available for $\mathbf{E}^{k+1} = \arg\min_{\mathbf{E}} \|\mathbf{A}^k(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{H})\|_F^2$ (s.t. $\mathbf{Y} \odot \mathbf{E} \geq \mathbf{0}$), the problem itself is a smooth and convex optimization problem that can be efficiently solved by existing tools, such as CVX(CVX Research, 2011).

3.2 Convergence proof

Algorithm 1 makes $\|\mathbf{W}\|_{2,p}$ monotonically decreasing with every iteration step and the optimization finally converges to the optimum.

Lemma 1. Given any two vectors \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} , we have

$$(1 - \theta) \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 + \theta \|\mathbf{b}\|_2^2 \geq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^{2-2\theta} \|\mathbf{b}\|_2^{2\theta}, \quad (15)$$

where $0 < \theta < 1$ and the equality holds if and only if $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b}$.

Proof. Since $\ln(x^2)$ is concave, we have

$$\ln((1 - \theta)x_1^2 + \theta x_2^2) \geq (1 - \theta) \ln(x_1^2) + \theta \ln(x_2^2), \quad (16)$$

where $0 < \theta < 1$. The equality holds if and only if $x_1 = x_2$, indicating that

$$(1 - \theta)x_1^2 + \theta x_2^2 \geq x_1^{2-2\theta} x_2^{2\theta}. \quad (17)$$

Then we have

$$(1 - \theta) \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 + \theta \|\mathbf{b}\|_2^2 \geq \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^{2-2\theta} \|\mathbf{b}\|_2^{2\theta}, \quad (18)$$

where the equality holds if and only if $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b}$. \square

Lemma 2. Given an optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{Z}} \|\mathbf{S} \Phi(\mathbf{Z})\|_F^2, \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{F}, \quad (19)$$

where $\Phi(\mathbf{Z})$ is a function of \mathbf{Z} , \mathcal{F} is the feasible region, and \mathbf{S} is a diagonal matrix whose i -th diagonal element is $1/\|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)\|_2^{1-p/2}$ (\mathbf{Z}_0 could be any object in \mathcal{F} , $\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)_i$ is the i -th row vector of $\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)$ and $0 < p \leq 2$), we have that

$$\|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}^*)\|_{2,p} \leq \|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)\|_{2,p}, \quad (20)$$

where \mathbf{Z}^* is optimal solution of the above optimization problem Eqn. (19) and the equality holds if and only if $\Phi(\mathbf{Z}^*) = \Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)$

Proof. Since \mathbf{Z}^* is the optimal solution, we have

$$\|\mathbf{S} \Phi(\mathbf{Z}^*)\|_F^2 \leq \|\mathbf{S} \Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)\|_F^2. \quad (21)$$

Then

$$\sum_i \frac{\|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}^*)_i\|_2^2}{\|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)_i\|_2^{2-p}} \leq \sum_i \|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)_i\|_2^p. \quad (22)$$

where $\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)_i$ and $\Phi(\mathbf{Z}^*)_i$ are the i -th row vector of $\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)$ and $\Phi(\mathbf{Z}^*)$, respectively.

According to Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 - \frac{p}{2}\right) \|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)_i\|_2^2 + \frac{p}{2} \|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}^*)_i\|_2^2 \\ \geq \|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)_i\|_2^{2-p} \|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}^*)_i\|_2^p. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Then dividing the both sides by $\|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)_i\|_2^{2-p}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}^*)_i\|_2^p \leq \left(1 - \frac{p}{2}\right) \|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)_i\|_2^p \\ + \frac{p}{2} \frac{\|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}^*)_i\|_2^2}{\|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)_i\|_2^{2-p}}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

It indicates that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}^*)_i\|_2^p \leq \left(1 - \frac{p}{2}\right) \sum_i \|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)_i\|_2^p \\ + \frac{p}{2} \sum_i \frac{\|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}^*)_i\|_2^2}{\|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)_i\|_2^{2-p}}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Combining (22) and (25), we obtain

$$\sum_i \|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}^*)_i\|_2^p \leq \sum_i \|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)_i\|_2^p. \quad (26)$$

Therefore,

$$\|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}^*)\|_{2,p} \leq \|\Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)\|_{2,p}, \quad (27)$$

where the equality holds if and only if $\Phi(\mathbf{Z}^*) = \Phi(\mathbf{Z}_0)$. \square

Theorem 1. Algorithm 1 makes the objective function of Eqn.(9) decreasing at each iteration step and the solution converges to the optimum.

Proof. Supposing we have obtained the solution \mathbf{U}^k , \mathbf{E}^k , and the objective function \mathbf{W}^k at the $(k+1)$ -th iteration step, we solve the optimization problem $\min_{\mathbf{U}} \|\Sigma^k(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{U} + \mathbf{G})\|_F^2$ to obtain \mathbf{U}^{k+1} by fixing \mathbf{E}^k . According to Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{V}^k\|_{2,s} &= \left\| \mathbf{P}\mathbf{U}^{k+1} + \mathbf{Q} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}\mathbf{E}^k \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{2,p} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{W}^k\|_{2,p}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Then we fix \mathbf{U}^{k+1} , and solve the optimization problem $\min_{\mathbf{E}} \|\mathbf{A}^k(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{H})\|_F^2$ to obtain \mathbf{E}^{k+1} .

According to Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{W}^{k+1}\|_{2,p} &= \left\| \mathbf{P}\mathbf{U}^{k+1} + \mathbf{Q} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}\mathbf{E}^{k+1} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \right\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{V}^k\|_{2,p}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Combining (28) and (29), we obtain

$$\|\mathbf{W}^{k+1}\|_{2,p} \leq \|\mathbf{W}^k\|_{2,p}. \quad (30)$$

Thus at each iteration step, the objective function $\|\mathbf{W}\|_{2,p}$ decreases. Because of the lower bound of $\|\mathbf{W}\|_{2,p}$ is limited, the optimization will converge with iterations. \square

When $p = 1$, Eqn. (9) is a convex optimization problem, hence the solution of Eqn. (9) obtained by using Algorithm 1 may be the global optimum. When $0 < p < 1$, it may converge to a local optimum. However it usually yields more sparse solutions than that obtained with $p = 1$. Moreover, according to Lemma 2, Algorithm 1 can also solve $\ell_{2,p}$ -norm ($1 < p < 2$) based problems.

It is worth noting that Lemma 2 works for sparsity regularization based feature selection algorithms, *i.e.*,

$$\min_{\mathbf{Z}} \sum_i \|\mathbf{A}_i\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{B}_i\|_{2,p} + \lambda \|\mathbf{Z}\|_{2,p}, \quad (31)$$

where λ is the regularization coefficient.

Since Eqn.(31) can be reformulated as

$$\min_{\mathbf{Z}} \left\| \left[(\mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{B}_1)^t, \dots, (\mathbf{A}_i\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{B}_i)^t, \dots, \lambda\mathbf{Z}^t \right] \right\|_{2,p}. \quad (32)$$

The Robust Feature Selection (RFS) (Nie, et al., 2010; Xiang, et al., 2012) is a special case of Eqn.(32) when $i = 1$ and $p = 1$.

4. Experiments

4.1 Experimental datasets and settings

The proposed algorithm has been evaluated based on 9 publicly available datasets, as summarized in Table 1. In particular, 3 datasets were obtained from UCI, including ISOLET, SEMEION and GISETTE³. ISOLET is a speech recognition data set with 7797 samples in 26 classes, and each sample has 617 features. SEMEION contains 1593 handwritten images from ~80 persons, stretched in a rectangular box of 16×16 with a gray scale of 256 values; GISETTE contains 2 confusable handwritten digits: 4 and 9 with 7000 samples and 5000 features. For these three datasets, the number of features are less than the number of their samples. Three datasets were obtained from Bio-microarray datasets, including LUNG

CLL-SUB-111, and TOX-171. For LUNG, genes with standard deviations smaller than 50 expression units are removed and 3312 genes are reserved (Cai et al., 2007). CLL-SUB-111 and TOX-171 are obtained from feature selection @ ASU⁵, which has total 111 samples and 171 samples with 11340 features and 5748 feature, respectively. Our algorithm has also been validated based on 3 image datasets, including UMIST, AR and ORL. In particular, UMIST⁶ includes face images from 20 different persons, and the size of each image is 56×46 . AR⁷ has 130 samples with 2400 features. ORL⁸ includes 400 samples with 92×112 pixels as features.

Table 1. Datasets used in experiments

Data Sets	#Classes	#Features	#Samples
ISOLET	26	617	7797
SEMEION	10	256	1593
GISETTE	2	5000	7000
LUNG	5	3312	203
CLL-SUB-111	3	11340	111
TOX-171	4	5748	171
UMIST	20	2576	575
AR	10	2400	130
ORL	40	10304	400

We compared our methods with two sparsity regularization based feature selection methods, including ℓ_1 -norm based Lasso (Tibshirani, 1996) and $\ell_{2,1}$ -norm based Robust Feature Selection (RFS) (Nie, et al., 2010; Xiang, et al., 2012), where the loss function is also in $\ell_{2,1}$ -norm form for rejecting outliers. Moreover, we also compared our algorithm with well-known filter feature selection methods, including ReliefF (Kira & Rendell, 1992) and mRMR (Peng, et al., 2005).

Classification accuracy was used to evaluate the feature selection method. Particularly, linear SVM (Chang & Lin, 2011) was chosen to build classifiers based on the selected features. The parameter C of linear SVM classifiers were tuned using a cross-validation strategy by searching a candidate set $[10^{-4}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 1, 10^1, 10^2]$. The regularized parameter λ in Lasso and RFS were tuned using the same cross-validation strategy by searching a candidate set $[10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 1, 10^1, 10^2, 10^3]$.

In our experiments, we first normalized all the data to have 0 mean and unit standard deviation for each feature. 10 trials were performed on each dataset. In each trial, the samples of each dataset were randomly spitted into training and testing subsets with a ration of 6:4. For tuning parameters, a 3-fold was used for datasets with less than 200 training samples, and a 8-fold cross-validation was used for other datasets.

⁵ Available at <http://featureselection.asu.edu/datasets.php>

⁶ Available at <http://images.ee.umist.ac.uk/danny/database.html>

⁷ Available at <http://featureselection.asu.edu/datasets.php>

⁸ Available at http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/Research/DTG/at_archive:pub/data/att_faces.zip

³ Available at <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/index.html>

4.2 Effect of parameter p

on the classification performance of the selected

The parameter p of DSO-FS may have a direct impact




Figure 1. Classification accuracy with different numbers of features selected with different values of p . The results shown were obtained based on (a) SEMEION, (b) LUNG, and (c)UMIST.




Figure 2. Average classification accuracy of 10 trials for classifiers built on the selected top 100 features by different algorithms. The results shown were obtained based on (a)SEMEION, (b)ISOLET, (c)GISETTE, (d)LUNG, (e)TOX-171,

(f)CLL-SUB-111, (g)UMIST, (h)AR, and (i)ORL.

Table 2. Mean and standard deviation of the classification Accuracy (%) of Linear-SVM built on the selected top 100 features by different algorithms for datasets: SEMEION, ISOLET, GISETTE, LUNG, TOX-171, CLL-SUB-111, UMIST, AR, and ORL

	mRMR	ReliefF	Lasso	RFS	DLO-FS
SEMEION	87.58±1.34	87.04±0.77	89.50±0.78	89.92±1.62	90.18±0.39
ISOLET	90.82±0.72	89.13±0.53	94.25±0.69	93.72±0.55	95.23±0.44
GISETTE	96.30±0.58	95.90±0.87	95.88±1.22	97.0±1.12	97.30±1.01
LUNG	94.10±2.22	93.44±3.28	93.93±2.32	94.26±1.83	94.59±1.95
CLL-SUB-111	76.47±3.22	68.24±7.30	77.65±3.98	80.59±3.99	81.18±3.99
TOX-171	80.00±5.01	82.90±5.18	74.20±4.39	84.78±3.74	85.07±4.05
UMIST	97.26±0.91	98.48±1.12	96.70±1.53	97.83±1.54	98.48±1.29
AR	86.35±6.11	84.42±5.12	82.31±6.25	89.23±3.67	90.77±3.53
ORL	89.67±4.82	63.83±5.58	85.33±4.32	90.67±3.55	93.58±2.55

features. To investigate how the classification performance is affected by p , we performed experiments based on datasets UMIST, LUNG and SEMEION. We obtained different solutions of W with different setting of $p \in [0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9, 1]$ using Algorithm 1 over the above 3 datasets, and then selected top ranked features according to ℓ_2 -norm $\|w_i\|_2$ to build classifiers. Figure 1 shows the classification accuracy with varying numbers of the selected features and different values of parameter p . The results shown in Figure 1 indicated that p played an important role in the classification performance.

4.3 Comparisons with state-of-the-art methods

We compared the proposed method with mRMR, ReliefF, Lasso, RFS based on 9 datasets detailed in Table 1. Since the classification performance of linear SVM classifiers built on the features selected was hinged on the parameter p , we used a cross-validation strategy to select an optimal value from $[0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9, 1]$.

Figure 2 shows the average classification performance of classifiers built on features selected by different methods in 10 trials. In particular, the average classification accuracy is shown as a function of the number of features used in the classification model in Figure 2. Compared with other methods, the proposed method achieved higher mean classification accuracy on most datasets, indicating that our method had overall better performance than other algorithms.

Table 2 summarizes mean and standard deviation of the classification rates in 10 trails for classifiers built on the top 100 features selected by mRMR, ReliefF, Lasso, RFS and our algorithm. These results demonstrate our algorithm had the best classification accuracy on all the 9 datasets.

5. Conclusions and Discussions

In this paper, a new feature selection algorithm via

direct sparsity optimization was proposed. Different from the sparse regularization based algorithms, our method directly optimizes a large margin linear classification model's sparsity with $\ell_{2,p}$ -norm ($0 < p \leq 1$) subject to a data-fitting constraint. We also proposed an efficient algorithm to solve the non-convex ($0 < p < 1$) and non-smooth optimization problem associated with the optimization problem. The convergence of the proposed algorithm has been rigorously proved. Extensive experiments based on 9 datasets has demonstrated that the proposed method could achieve better than 4 state-of-the-art feature selection algorithms. Our algorithm can be easily extended for solving other sparsity regularization algorithms. In particular, our algorithm could be used to obtain proximal solutions of ℓ_0 and $\ell_{2,0}$ based optimization problems subject to linear constraints by setting p close to 0.

Reference

- Bradley, P. and Mangasarian, O. Feature selection via concave minimization and support vector machines. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 1998.
- Cai, Z.P., Goebel, R., Salavatipour, M.R., Shi, Y., Xu, L.Z. and Lin, G. Selecting genes with dissimilar discrimination strength for sample class prediction. *Proceedings of the 5th Asia-Pacific Bioinformatics Conference 2007*. 5: 81-90, 2007.
- Candes, E.J. and Tao, T. Decoding by linear programming. *Ieee Transactions on Information Theory*. 51: 4203-4215, 2005.
- Cawley, G.C., Talbot, N.L.C. and Girolami, M. Sparse multinomial logistic regression via Bayesian l1 regularisation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*: 209-216, 2006.
- Chang, C.C. and Lin, C.J. LIBSVM: A Library for Support Vector Machines. *Acm Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*. 2, 2011.

- Chartrand, R. and Staneva, V. Restricted isometry properties and nonconvex compressive sensing. *Inverse Problems*. 24, 2008.
- Cvx Research, I. CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 2.0, <http://cvxr.com/cvx>, 2011.
- Fan, J.Q. and Peng, H. Nonconcave penalized likelihood with a diverging number of parameters. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2004.
- Gorodnitsky, I.F. and Rao, B.D. Sparse signal reconstruction from limited data using FOCUSS: A re-weighted minimum norm algorithm. *Ieee Transactions on Signal Processing*. 45: 600-616, 1997
- Guyon, I. and Elisseeff, A. An introduction to variable and feature selection. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*. 3: 1157-1182, 2003.
- Guyon, I., Weston, J., Barnhill, S. and Vapnik, V. Gene selection for cancer classification using support vector machines. *Machine Learning*. 46: 389-422, 2002.
- Hou, C., Nie, F., Yi, D. and Wu, Y. Feature Selection via Joint Embedding Learning and Sparse Regression. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2011.
- Kira, K. and Rendell, L.A. A Practical Approach to Feature-Selection. *Machine Learning*: 249-256 1992
- Kong, D.G. and Ding, C. Efficient Algorithms for Selecting Features with Arbitrary Group Constraints via Group Lasso. *2013 Ieee 13th International Conference on Data Mining (Icdm)*: 379-388, 2013.
- Kong, D.G., Fujimaki, R., Liu, J., Nie, F.P. and Ding, C. Exclusive Feature Learning on Arbitrary Structures via L_{1,2}-norm. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2014.
- Lewis, D.D. Feature-Selection and Feature-Extraction for Text Categorization. *Speech and Natural Language*: 212-217, 1992.
- Liu, H., Palatucci, M. and Zhang, J. Blockwise coordinate descent procedures for the multi-task lasso, with applications to neural semantic basis discovery. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2009.
- Liu, J., Ji, S. and Ye, J. Multi-Task Feature Learning Via Efficient L_{2,1}-Norm Minimization. *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 2009.
- Liu, Y.F., Zhang, H.H., Park, C. and Ahn, J. Support vector machines with adaptive L-q penalty. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*. 51: 6380-6394, 2007.
- Nie, F., Huang, H., Cai, X. and Ding, C. Efficient and Robust Feature Selection via Joint L_{2,1}-Norms Minimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2010.
- Obozinski, G., Taskar, B. and Jordan, M. Multi-task feature selection. *Technical report, Department of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley*, 2006.
- Peng, H.C., Long, F.H. and Ding, C. Feature selection based on mutual information: Criteria of max-dependency, max-relevance, and min-redundancy. *Ieee Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*. 27: 1226-1238, 2005.
- Tan, M.K., Tsang, I.W. and Wang, L. Towards Ultrahigh Dimensional Feature Selection for Big Data. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*. 15: 1371-1429, 2014.
- Tibshirani, R. Regression shrinkage and selection via the Lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B-Methodological*. 58: 267-288, 1996.
- Wang, L., Zhu, J. and Zou, H. Hybrid huberized support vector machines for microarray classification and gene selection. *Bioinformatics*. 24: 412-419, 2008.
- Xiang, S.M., Nie, F.P., Meng, G.F., Pan, C.H. and Zhang, C.S. Discriminative Least Squares Regression for Multiclass Classification and Feature Selection. *Ieee Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*. 23: 1738-1754, 2012.
- Xu, Z.B., Zhang, H. and Wang, Y. L_{1/2} regularization. *Science Chin*. 53: 1159-1169, 2010.
- Yi Yang, Heng Tao Shen, Zhigang Ma, Zi Huang and Zhou, X. L_{2,1}-Norm Regularized Discriminative Feature Selection for Unsupervised Learning. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2011.
- Zhang, M., Ding, C., Zhang, Y. and Nie, F.P. Feature Selection at the Discrete Limit. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2014.
- Zhang, T. Analysis of Multi-stage Convex Relaxation for Sparse Regularization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*. 11: 1081-1107, 2010.