

---

# A SOLUTION FOR LARGE SCALE NONLINEAR REGRESSION WITH HIGH RANK AND DEGREE AT CONSTANT MEMORY COMPLEXITY VIA LATENT TENSOR RECONSTRUCTION

---

A PREPRINT

**Sandor Szedmak**  
Department of Computer Science  
Aalto University  
Espoo, Finland  
sandor.szedmak@aalto.fi

**Anna Cichonska**  
Department of Computer Science  
Aalto University  
Espoo, Finland  
anna.cichonska@aalto.fi

**Heli Julkunen**  
Department of Computer Science  
Aalto University  
Espoo, Finland  
heli.julkunen@aalto.fi

**Tapio Pahikkala**  
Department of Computer Science  
University of Turku  
Turku, Finland  
aatapa@utu.fi

**Juho Rousu**  
Department of Computer Science  
Aalto University  
Espoo, Finland  
juho.rousu@aalto.fi

November 21, 2021

## ABSTRACT

This paper proposes a novel method for learning highly nonlinear, multivariate functions from examples. Our method takes advantage of the property that continuous functions can be approximated by polynomials, which in turn are representable by tensors. Hence the function learning problem is transformed into a tensor reconstruction problem, an inverse problem of the tensor decomposition. Our method incrementally builds up the unknown tensor from rank-one terms, which lets us control the complexity of the learned model and reduce the chance of overfitting. For learning the models, we present an efficient gradient-based algorithm that can be implemented in linear time in the sample size, order, rank of the tensor and the dimension of the input. In addition to regression, we present extensions to classification, multi-view learning and vector-valued output as well as a multi-layered formulation. The method can work in an online fashion via processing mini-batches of the data with constant memory complexity. Consequently, it can fit into systems equipped only with limited resources such as embedded systems or mobile phones. Our experiments demonstrate a favorable accuracy and running time compared to competing methods.

## 1 Introduction

The rise of deep learning methods have showed that complex, nonlinear problems can be learned in practice if the model families have sufficient capacity to cover the underlying interdependence. Extending the domain of known approaches further could increase our capability to tackle new challenging problems. In this paper, we study the problem of learning noisy, highly nonlinear multivariate functions from large data sets ( $> 100000$  examples). We assume that the target functions to be learned are real valued and their domain is a bounded subset of finite dimensional Hilbert space. The corresponding training data contains a set of input-output pairs, points of the Hilbert space and the function values (scalar or vector) in those points. To construct the estimates of the functions, we further assume that they are continuous or can be approximated by a continuous function with a fixed  $L_\infty$  norm based tolerance. The continuity assumption allows us to exploit the Stone-Weierstrass theorem and its generalizations [1], namely those function can be approximated by polynomials on a compact subset with an accuracy not worse than a given arbitrary small error. Since every polynomial can be represented by tensors, the function learning problem can be formulated as a

Polynomial from tensor	Tensor from sample examples
Given : $\mathbf{T}$ tensor, $\mathbf{x}$	Given : $\{(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i)   i = 1, \dots, m\}$
Output : $y$	Output : $\mathbf{T}$ tensor
$\begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{T} & \mathbf{x} \\ \downarrow & \downarrow \\ f(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \mathbf{T}, \otimes^{n_d} \mathbf{x} \rangle \Rightarrow y \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{cc} \{y_i\} & \{\mathbf{x}_i\} \\ \downarrow & \downarrow \\ \min_{\mathbf{T}} \sum_i \ y_i - \langle \mathbf{T}, \otimes^{n_d} \mathbf{x}_i \rangle\ ^2 \Rightarrow \mathbf{T} \end{array}$

Table 1: The general scheme of Latent Tensor Reconstruction based regression

tensor reconstruction problem. This reconstruction is a certain inverse of the tensor decomposition, i.e. HOSVD, in which a tensor is built up, for example, from one-rank tensors, see methods such as CANDECOMP/PARAFAC tensor decomposition by [2], [3], or [4].

The tensor reconstruction approach allows to reduce the number of parameters required to represent the polynomials. An arbitrary multivariate polynomial defined on the field of real numbers can be described by  $\binom{n+d}{n}$  parameters, where  $n$  is the number of variables,  $d$  is the maximum degree. Thus the complexity relating to the size of the underlying tensor is  $O(n^d)$ , which increases exponentially in the number of parameters. A properly chosen variant of the tensor decomposition can significantly reduce that complexity. To this end, we consider polynomials of this type

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{t=1}^{n_t} \prod_{d=1}^{n_d} \ell_d^{(t)}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (1)$$

where  $\ell_d^{(t)}(\mathbf{x})$  for all  $d$  and  $t$  are linear forms. This representation is also called polynomial factorization or decomposition problem [5]. The main difference between the HOSVD and the linear form factorization is that in the former the orthogonality of the vectors defining the linear forms is generally assumed, but in the factorization, only the linear independence is expected. A significant advantage of the linear form based representation is that the polynomial function depends only linearly on its parameters. The basic model of this paper is outlined in Table 1.

The motivation of the learning approach presented in this paper comes from several sources. One of the influencing models is the *Factorization machine (FM)* which applies a special class, the symmetric polynomials, see [6], to approximate the underlying, unknown nonlinear functions. It was introduced by [7] and later on, further extensions have been published, such as the higher order case (HOFM) by [8]. The FM itself also has close connection to the Polynomial Networks, [9], as highlighted by [10]. Our approach can be viewed as a reformulation of factorization machines, removing the limiting assumption of the symmetry imposed on the polynomials, and hence extending the range of learnable functions. Furthermore, the latent tensor models [11, 12, 13] also provide important background to the proposed method. In those approaches, the moments, up to third order, of the input data are exploited to yield the tensor structure. In our method, the decomposition of the latent tensor is conditioned on the output data as well, thus it is also a cross-covariance based method.

The latent tensor reconstruction (LTR) based function learning can be interpreted as a certain algebraic alternative of a multi-layered Deep Artificial Neural Network (DNN). In DNN, the linear subproblems are connected by nonlinear activation functions, e.g. sigmoid, into a complete learning system [14]. By contrast, in LTR, the nonlinear subproblems are integrated by simple linear transfer functions. The latter model satisfies the basic principle of the dynamic programming [15], that is, if there are  $N$  subproblems processed sequentially, then after computing  $n < N$  subproblems, the optimization of subproblem  $n + 1$  does not influence the optimum solution computed on the previous  $n$  ones. This fact eliminate the need of backpropagation generally required in the training of an DNN. The LTR model can also be applied as a special type of recurrent module embedded into a DNN based learner. In this paper we focus only on standalone applications.

Our contributions are summarized in the following points:

- LTR incrementally estimates the unknown function, and monotonically reduces the approximation error. This allows to control the exploration of the hidden structure of the function and the underlying tensor as well.
- The proposed method provides a nonlinear, polynomial regression with computational complexity linear in the order of tensor  $n_d$ , in its rank,  $n_t$ , in the sample size,  $m$ , and in the number of variables  $n$ . The LTR is well suited to learn functions whose variables are interrelated.

- By applying mini-batch based processing, LTR also has constant memory complexity similarly to DNN learners. The parameters are stored  $O(n_t n_d n)$  memory in the iterative procedure, and in each step only a fixed size subset, a mini-batch, of the data is required.

**Notation and conventions:** In the text  $\otimes$  is used to denote the tensor product of vectors,  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and  $\| \cdot \|$  stand for inner product and the induced norm in a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . The notation  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is also applied for the Frobenius inner product of tensors,  $\circ$  denotes the pointwise product of tensors with the same shape of any order. The pointwise  $k$  power of a vector or a matrix  $\mathbf{x}$  is given by  $\mathbf{x}^{\circ k}$ . The trace of square matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  is denoted by  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A})$ , and  $\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})$  stands for the column wise vectorization of matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ .  $\mathbf{1}_m$  denotes a vector of  $m$  dimension with all components equal to 1. The word *polynomial* can also mean *polynomial function* depending on the context.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Data representation

In the learning problem we have a sample of examples given by input-output pairs  $\mathcal{S} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) | i = 1, \dots, m, \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}\}$  taken from an unknown joint distribution of input and output sources. The rows of the matrix  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  contain the vectors  $\mathbf{x}_i$ , and similarly the rows of  $\mathbf{Y}$  hold the output vectors,  $\mathbf{y}_i$ , for all  $i$ . In the first part of the paper we deal with the case where  $n_y = 1$ , and in Section 3.3 the extension to the vector valued case is presented.

### 2.2 Polynomials and Tensors

*Polynomials* are fundamental tools of the computational algebra. Let  $x_1, \dots, x_{n_d}$  be a set of variables which can take values of a field  $\mathcal{K}$ , in our case from  $\mathbb{R}$ . A monomial is a product  $x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdot \dots \cdot x_{n_d}^{\alpha_{n_d}}$  where the powers are non-negative integer numbers. With the help of  $n_d$ -tuples  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n_d})$  and  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{n_d})$  a monomial can be written as  $\mathbf{x}^\alpha$ , thus the  $\alpha$  can be applied as a fingerprint of the monomial. Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a finite set of tuples with type of  $\alpha$ , then a polynomial  $f$  is a finite linear combination of monomials defined on the same set of variables,  $f = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}} C_\alpha \mathbf{x}^\alpha$ , where  $C_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ . The degree of a monomial is the sum of the powers of its variables,  $\sum_{d=1}^{n_d} \alpha_d$ . A degree of a polynomial is the maximum degree of the monomials contained. A polynomial is homogeneous if all of its monomials have the same degree.

A non-homogeneous polynomial with degree  $n_d$  can be derived from a homogeneous one of degree  $n_d+1$  by substituting a real number, e.g. 1 into one of the variables, thus  $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n_d})$  is transformed into  $(1, x_1, \dots, x_{n_d})$ . Based on this fact in the sequel we assume that the polynomials are homogeneous.

Let  $\mathcal{X}_k = \mathbb{R}^{n_k}, k = 1, \dots, n_d$  be a set of finite dimensional real vector spaces, and for each  $k$  the set  $\mathcal{X}_k^*$  denotes the dual of  $\mathcal{X}_k$ , the space of linear functionals acting on  $\mathcal{X}_k$ . A tensor  $\mathbf{T}$  as a multilinear form of order  $n_d$  can be defined as an element of  $\otimes_k^{n_d} \mathcal{X}_k^*$ . If a basis is given in each of  $\mathcal{X}_k^*$ , then  $\mathbf{T}$  can be represented by an  $n_d$ -way array  $[T_{j_1, \dots, j_{n_d}}]_{j_1=1, \dots, j_{n_d}=1}^{n_1, \dots, n_{n_d}}$ . In the sequel, we might also refer to the  $n_d$ -way arrays as tensor as well. The tensors form a vector space of dimension  $\prod_{k=1}^{n_d} n_k$ .

We can write the multilinear function,  $f : \otimes_{k=1}^{n_d} \mathcal{X}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , as

$$f(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{n_d} | \mathbf{T}) = \sum_{j_1=1, \dots, j_{n_d}=1}^{n_1, \dots, n_{n_d}} T_{j_1, \dots, j_{n_d}} x_{1, j_1} \dots x_{n_d, j_{n_d}}. \quad (2)$$

If it is not stated otherwise, in this paper we generally assume that the vector spaces  $\mathcal{X}_k, k = 1, \dots, n_d$  are the same and  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$ , thus the indexes of vector spaces can be dropped

$$f(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{T}) = \sum_{j_1=1, \dots, j_{n_d}=1}^n T_{j_1, \dots, j_{n_d}} x_{j_1} \dots x_{j_{n_d}}. \quad (3)$$

Tensor  $\mathcal{T}$  is symmetric if for any permutation  $\sigma$  of the indexes  $j_1, \dots, j_{n_d}$  the identity  $T_{j_1, \dots, j_{n_d}} = T_{j_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, j_{\sigma(n_d)}}$  holds. In some cases this symmetry is called super-symmetry, see [2].

The space of symmetric tensors of order  $n_d$  defined on  $\mathcal{X}$  as vector space is isomorphic to the space of homogeneous polynomials of degree  $n_d$  defined on  $\mathcal{X}$ . Therefore any homogeneous polynomial with variables  $x_1, \dots, x_{n_d}$  and with degree  $n_d$  as multilinear form defined over the field of real numbers can be represented by the help of a symmetric tensor.

### 2.3 Representation of multilinear functions

The tensor  $\mathbf{T} \in \otimes^{n_d} \mathbb{R}^n$  may be given in a decomposed form [3, 2]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{T} &= \sum_{t=1}^{n_t} \lambda_t \mathbf{p}_1^{(t)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{p}_{n_d}^{(t)}, \\ \text{s.t. } &\|\mathbf{p}_d^{(t)}\| = 1, \mathbf{p}_d^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ &t = 1, \dots, n_t, d = 1, \dots, n_d. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

This representation is generally not unique, see for example [3, 16]. By replacing  $\mathbf{T}$  with its decomposed form, the polynomial function of (3) turns into the following expressions

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{t=1}^{n_t} \lambda_t \langle \mathbf{p}_1^{(t)} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{p}_{n_d}^{(t)}, \mathbf{x} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{x} \rangle. \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^{n_t} \lambda_t \langle \mathbf{p}_1^{(t)}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \cdots \langle \mathbf{p}_{n_d}^{(t)}, \mathbf{x} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where we exploit the well known identity connecting the inner product and the tensor products, [4]. This form only consists of terms of scalar factors, where each scalar is the value of a linear functional acting on the space  $\mathcal{X}$ . This transformation eliminates the potential difficulties which could arise in working directly with full tensors. Observe that the function  $f$  is linear in each of the vector valued parameters,  $\mathbf{p}_d^{(t)}, t = 1, \dots, n_t, d = 1, \dots, n_d$ .

### 2.4 Polynomial regression, the generic form

We start on a generic form of multivariate polynomial regression described by a tensor. Let the degree of the polynomial be equal to  $n_d$ , then by the help of (3) we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \min &\sum_{i=1}^m \|y_i - f(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{T})\|^2 \\ \text{w.r.t. } &\mathbf{T} \in \otimes^{n_d} \mathbb{R}^n, j_1, \dots, j_{n_d} \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Here the polynomial is assumed to be homogeneous, for the inhomogeneous case see Section 2.2. Representing functions by polynomials is an attractive approach supported by the Stone-Weierstrass type theorems, [1]. Those theorems connect continuous functions to polynomials. A general form of those theorems is given here for real, separable Hilbert spaces [17],

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a real, separable Hilbert space. The family of continuous polynomials on  $\mathcal{H}$ , restricted to a compact set  $\mathbf{K} \subset \mathcal{H}$ , is dense in the set  $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{K})$  of continuous functions mapping  $\mathcal{H}$  into  $\mathcal{H}$ , and restricted to  $\mathbf{K}$ , where  $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{K})$  carries the uniform norm topology.*

Informally, this theorem states that to any continuous function  $F$  there is a polynomial  $f$  to be arbitrary close  $F$ .

Since the tensor representing a multivariate polynomial defined on the field of the real numbers is symmetric, the number of parameters in the polynomial is equal to  $\binom{n+N-1}{n}$  for the homogeneous case. This number grows exponentially in the number of degree and the variables. To find a sounding polynomial approximation for large scale problems we need to reduce the dimension of the parameter space in a way which preserves the approximation flexibility but the computational complexity in the number of variables, and in the degree, is linear.

### 2.5 Factorization machines

Factorization machines (FM) [7] apply a special class of polynomials, the symmetric polynomials, see [6], to estimate nonlinear functions. FMs were extended to higher order case (HOFM) by [18] and [8]. FMs are closely related to the polynomial networks, see [9] as highlighted by [10].

The model of factorization machine can be described via a compact, recursive form [8]

$$\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{d=1}^{n_d} \left( \frac{1}{d} \sum_{r=1}^d (-1)^{r+1} \mathbf{A}_{d-r} \circ \mathbf{D}_r^{(d)} \right) \mathbf{1}_{n_t}, \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}_{d-r} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_t}$  for  $r = 0, \dots, d$ ,  $(\mathbf{A}_0)_{it} = 1$  for all  $i, t$ , and  $\mathbf{D}_r^{(d)} = \mathbf{X}^{\circ d} (\mathbf{P}^{(t)\circ d})^T$  for all  $d, r$ , and  $\mathbf{P}^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t \times n}$ . This model can be derived from the *fundamental theorem of symmetric polynomials* [6], which states that

every symmetric polynomial can be expressed as a polynomial of the power sums, if the basic field of the polynomials contains the rational numbers. In the case of the FM the power sums are given as  $(\mathbf{D}^{(d)})_{i,t} = \sum_{j=1}^n (x_{ij} p_{tj})^d$ . A function (polynomial) is symmetric if its value is invariant on any permutation of the variables, e.g.  $f(x, y) = xy$ . Symmetric polynomials can well approximate symmetric functions. In the non-symmetric cases the approximation capability of the factorization machine is limited, see the examples in Table 3.

## 2.6 Kernel Ridge regression

The Kernel Ridge Regression (KRR) is a popular alternative to resolve the polynomial regression problem with small to medium-sized data. It can be stated in a matrix form

$$\min_{\alpha} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{K}\alpha\|^2 + C(\alpha^T \mathbf{K}\alpha)^2 \quad (8)$$

For polynomial regression, in the KRR problem, the kernel  $\mathbf{K}$  is chosen as the polynomial kernel  $K_{ij} = ((\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) + b)^{n_d}$ , where  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  is the bias term. For further details of kernel-based learning, see for example [19]. The parameter space of KRR has dimension  $m$  equal to the size of sample and independent from the number of variables. The latter property has an advantage when the number of variables is large. However solving this type of problem assuming dense kernels requires  $O(m^3)$  time, and  $O(m^2)$  space complexity, which is a bottleneck for processing large data sets, although several approaches have been proposed to reduce those complexities, e.g. Nyström approximation and random Fourier features [20].

## 3 Latent tensor reconstruction

We first construct the basic problem where the target function is assumed to be scalar valued. The idea of the learning task is outlined in Table 1. Let  $f^{(t)}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{d=1}^{n_d} \langle \mathbf{p}_d^{(t)}, \mathbf{x} \rangle$ , then the corresponding optimization problem can be formulated similarly to the Kernel Ridge Regression by assuming least square loss and Tikhonov type regularization of the parameters.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \|y_i - \sum_{t=1}^{n_t} \lambda_t f^{(t)}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 + \frac{C_p}{n_t n_d n} \sum_{t=1}^{n_t} \sum_{d=1}^{n_d} \|\mathbf{p}_d^{(t)}\|^2 \\ \text{w.r.t.} \quad & \lambda_t, \mathbf{p}_1^{(t)}, \dots, \mathbf{p}_{n_d}^{(t)}, t = 1, \dots, n_t, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

It is important to mention here that without the regularization of the parameters, the tensor one-rank approximation problem might be ill-posed for certain tensors [16]. We can make an important statement about this problem. The objective function, if all variables,  $\lambda_t, (\mathbf{p}_1^{(t)}, \dots, \mathbf{p}_{n_d}^{(t)})$ ,  $t = 1, \dots, n_t$ , except one are fixed then in that variable the function within the norm is linear, consequently convex. Therefore the objective function in that variable is also convex since the norm and the summation preserve the convexity.

### 3.1 LTR representation vs. factorization machine

In our polynomial representation a matrix is assigned to each variable (component) of the input vectors, namely for a fixed index of the variables  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  we have  $j \rightarrow \mathbf{P}_j = [\mathbf{p}_1^{(j)}, \dots, \mathbf{p}_{n_d}^{(j)}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_d \times n_t}$ . In the Factorization Machine (FM) [8] a vector  $p_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t}$  is assigned to the variable indexed by  $j$ .

The assignment of the LTR allows to decouple the factors of the polynomial, thus the formulation becomes more transparent. The linear dependence on the parameters allows us to use a simple gradient descent algorithm. The increased parameter capacity requires larger sample size to properly estimate the parameters. However when the sample is sufficiently large the LTR performs significantly better than the FM and KRR, see the examples in Section 5.

### 3.2 Learning algorithm

The summary of the basic algorithm and the solution to the rank-one subproblem is outlined in Table 2. The basic rank-wise algorithm follows the scheme of a Singular Value Decomposition by adding the best fitting rank-one layers to the tensor under construction. In the rank-one subproblem, the mini-batch wise processing of the data can be interpreted as a piece-wise polynomial approximation, and also a certain variant of the spline methods [21], where the splines are connected via momentum-based [22, 23], gradient updates, e.g. ADAM [24].

The selection of the mini-batches could follow an online processing scheme, or if the entire data set is available then they can be uniformly randomly chosen out of the full set by imitating a stochastic gradient scheme.

### The basic rank wise algorithm

**Given:** a sample:  $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i), i = 1, \dots, m\}$ ,

Let  $y_i^{(1)} = y_i, i = 1, \dots, m$ .

**For**  $t = 1$  **to**  $n_t$  **do**

Solve rank-one subproblem

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{i=1}^m \|y_i^{(t)} - \lambda_t f^{(t)}(\mathbf{x}_i)\|^2 \\ & + \frac{C_p}{n_d n} \sum_{d=1}^{n_d} \|\mathbf{p}_d^{(t)}\|^2 \\ \text{w.r.t.} \quad & \lambda_t, \mathbf{p}_1^{(t)}, \dots, \mathbf{p}_{n_d}^{(t)}, \end{aligned}$$

Optimum solution:

$$\lambda_t^*, \mathbf{p}_1^{(t)*}, \dots, \mathbf{p}_{n_d}^{(t)*}$$

Deflation of the output:

$$y_i^{(t+1)} = y_i^{(t)} - \lambda_t^* \prod_{d=1}^{n_d} \langle \mathbf{p}_d^{(t)*}, \mathbf{x}_i \rangle, \forall i$$

### Solution scheme for the Subproblem

**Given:**  $\{I_b, b = 1, \dots, n_b\}$

index sets of mini-batches,

$n_e$  Number of epochs,

$\gamma$  Learning speed,

Initialize the variables:  $\lambda_t, \left(\mathbf{p}_d^{(t)}\right)_{d=1}^{n_d}$ ,

the gradients:  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_t}, \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{p}_k^{(t)}}\right)_{d=1}^{n_d}$ , and

the aggregated gradients for ADAM:  $v_\lambda, (\mathbf{v}_d)_{d=1}^{n_d}$ ,

**For**  $e = 1$  **to**  $n_e$  **do**

**For**  $b = 1$  **to**  $n_b$  **do** Process mini-batches

Compute mini-batch relative gradients

Update aggregated gradients,

Update variables  $\lambda_t, \mathbf{p}_1^{(t)}, \dots, \mathbf{p}_{n_d}^{(t)}$

Table 2: The basic rank-wise algorithm of the scalar valued LTR, (*on the left*), and of a solution scheme of subproblem by momentum based gradient update, e.g. ADAM, (*on the right*).

### 3.3 Vector-valued output

The outputs of the learning problem might be given as vectors  $\{y_i | i = 1, \dots, m, \mathbf{y}_i \in \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_y}\}$ . Let the matrix  $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_y}$  contain the vectors  $\mathbf{y}_i$  in its rows for all  $i$ . We can extend the basic scalar valued regression (9) into a vector valued one where the boxes highlights the changes applied on the scalar valued case.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \frac{1}{mn_y} \sum_{i=1}^m \left\| \boxed{\mathbf{y}_i} - \sum_{t=1}^{n_t} \lambda_t f^{(t)}(\mathbf{x}) \boxed{\mathbf{q}^{(t)}} \right\|^2 \\ & + \frac{C_p}{n_t n_d n} \sum_{t=1}^{n_t} \sum_{d=1}^{n_d} \|\mathbf{p}_d^{(t)}\|^2 + \boxed{\frac{C_q}{n_t n_y} \sum_{t=1}^{n_t} \|\mathbf{q}^{(t)}\|^2} \\ \text{w.r.t.} \quad & \lambda_t, \boxed{\mathbf{q}^t} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}, \mathbf{p}_d^t \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ & t = 1, \dots, n_t, d = 1, \dots, n_d. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

The terms in the loss function of the problem can be rewritten in a tensor and in a pointwise product form as well

$$\left\| \mathbf{y}_i - \sum_{t=1}^{n_t} \lambda_t \left\langle \otimes_{r=d}^{n_d} \mathbf{p}_d^{(t)}, \otimes_{d=1}^{n_d} \mathbf{x}_i \right\rangle \mathbf{q}^{(t)} \right\|^2 = \left\| \mathbf{Y} - \sum_{t=1}^{n_t} \lambda_t \left( \circ_{d=1}^{n_d} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{p}_d^{(t)} \right) \otimes \mathbf{q}^{(t)} \right\|^2.$$

In the vector valued formulation the vectors  $\mathbf{q}^{(t)}$  play the role of certain nonlinear principal components of the output vectors. The coordinates of the output vectors with respect to those principal components are expressed by the polynomials defined on the input vectors.

LTR transformation flow:  $\mathbf{Y} \Leftarrow (\mathbf{F} \Leftarrow \circ_d \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P}^{(d)}) \mathbf{D}_\lambda \mathbf{Q}$




Figure 1: The transformation flow of the vector valued, matrix represented LTR learning problem for degree 3.

### 3.4 Matrix representations

Let the following matrices be formed from the data and the parameters:

Parameters	$\mathbf{P}_d = [\mathbf{p}_d^T]_{t=1}^{n_t} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t \times n},$	
	$\mathbf{Q} = [\mathbf{q}^{(t)T}]_{t=1}^{n_t} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t \times n_y},$	
Scaling factors	$\boldsymbol{\lambda} = [\lambda_t]_{t=1}^{n_t} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t},$	
	$\mathbf{D}_\lambda = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_t \times n_t},$	
Polynomial		
complete	$\mathbf{F} = \circ_{d=1}^{n_d} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P}_d^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_t},$	
without $d$	$\mathbf{F}_{\setminus d} = \circ_{k=1, k \neq d}^{n_d} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P}_k^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_t},$	
Error	$\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{F} \mathbf{D}_\lambda \mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_y}.$	(11)

We can write Problem (10) in a compact matrix form.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \frac{1}{2mn_y} \|\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{F} \mathbf{D}_\lambda \mathbf{Q}\|_F^2 + \frac{C_p}{2n_t n_d n} \sum_{d=1}^{n_d} \|\mathbf{P}_d\|_F^2 + \frac{C_q}{2n_t n_y} \|\mathbf{Q}\|_2^2 \\ \text{w.r.t.} \quad & \mathbf{D}_\lambda, \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P}_1, \dots, \mathbf{P}_{n_d}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Based on the notation introduced in (11), the partial derivatives to the problem (12) can be computed in matrix form as well. Let  $h$  denote the entire objective function of (12), hence we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathbf{P}_d} h &= -(\mathbf{F}_{\setminus d}^T \circ \mathbf{D}_\lambda \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{E}^T) \mathbf{X} + \frac{C_p}{n_t n_d n} \mathbf{P}_d, d = 1, \dots, n_d. \\ \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} h &= -(\mathbf{F}^T \circ \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{E}^T) \mathbf{1}_m, \\ \nabla_{\mathbf{Q}} h &= -\mathbf{D}_\lambda \mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{E} + \frac{C_q}{n_t n_y} \mathbf{Q}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

### 3.5 Complexity of the algorithm

In the matrix representation of the optimization problem (12), the predictor function contains only a matrix product and pointwise products of the corresponding matrices, thus the original tensor decomposition form completely disappears from the computation. The transformation flow sending the input matrix into the output one is summarized in Figure 1.

From that transformation flow and from the matrix expressions of the gradient, the time complexity of one iteration can be computed, and we can state

**Proposition 2.** *At fixed number of epochs the time complexity of the gradient based algorithm is  $O(mnn_d n_t)$ .*

*Proof.* Note that the dominating part in (13) is to compute the matrix products. Computing  $\mathbf{F}$  requires  $O(mnn_d n_y)$  operations,  $\mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{E}^T$  have the complexity  $O(mn_t n_y)$ , and finally the product  $(\mathbf{F}_{\setminus d}^T \circ \mathbf{D}_{\lambda} \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{E}^T) \mathbf{X}$  has complexity  $O(mnn_t)$ . Since these products can be evaluated sequentially, thus the complexity of one step is  $O(mnn_d n_t)$ . If the number of epochs is fixed, then this also gives the overall complexity of the entire algorithm.  $\square$

### 3.6 Multi-view case

The basic case can be extended to deal with multiple input sources, where the input matrix  $\mathbf{X}$  is replaced with a set of matrices  $(\mathbf{X}_d | \mathbf{X}_d \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_d})$  with potentially different number of columns. Clearly, the optimization problem (12) can be solved in the same way, thus this extension is a very natural one. To implement the multi-view case, only the loss term of the objective function needs to be changed to  $\left\| \mathbf{Y} - \tilde{\mathbf{F}} \mathbf{D}_{\lambda} \mathbf{Q} \right\|_F^2$  where  $\tilde{\mathbf{F}} = \circ_{d=1}^{n_d} \mathbf{X}_d \mathbf{P}_d^T$ .

### 3.7 Classification problems

In a classification problem, binary or multi-class, the functions connecting the input and the output are generally discontinuous. To learn discontinuous functions the polynomial function  $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{t=1}^{n_t} \lambda_t \prod_{d=1}^{n_d} \langle \mathbf{p}_d^{(t)}, \mathbf{x} \rangle$  can be embedded into a differentiable activation function  $h: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . By applying the chain rule it only adds a scalar factor to the gradients computed for the polynomials. This type of activation function can be applied component-wise in the vector valued prediction as well.

In a classification problem applying the logistic function, the LTR can be embedded into logistic regression by defining the conditional probabilities as a smooth activation

$$P(y = 1|x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-f(\mathbf{x})}} \quad (14)$$

where the original linear form is replaced with a multi-linear one. Then the maximum likelihood problem corresponding to the extended logistic regression can be straightforwardly solved by similar gradient descent approach described for the least square regression case.

## 4 Multi-layered model

A multi-layered version of LTR can handle the trade-off between the complexity of the polynomial function and the approximation error, more the rank less the loss but the generalization performance might deteriorate.

The method presented here can be interpreted as a variant of the general *gradient boosting* framework [25]. Each problem related to a range of ranks might be taken as a weak learner acting on the residue remained after the aggregation of the approximation computed by the previous learners.

In this extension, the rank range  $1, \dots, n_t$  are cut into blocks. Let  $n_1, \dots, n_{N_b}$  be a partition of the rank range  $[1, n_t]$  into disjoint index intervals, i.e.  $n_t = \sum_{b=1}^{N_b} n_b$ . Let  $n_{\leq b} = \sum_{\tau=1}^b n_{\tau}$ , and  $n_{\leq 0} = 0$ . With these notations the multi-layered algorithm can be constructed.

1. Let  $b = 1$ , and  $\mathbf{Y}_b = \mathbf{Y}$ .
2. Initialize  $\mathbf{P}_d^{(b)} = \mathbf{P}_d[n_{\leq b-1} : n_{\leq b}, :]$  for all  $d = 1, \dots, n_d$ ,  
 $\mathbf{Q}^{(b)} = \mathbf{Q}[n_{\leq b-1} : n_{\leq b}, :]$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_b = \boldsymbol{\lambda}[n_{\leq b-1} : n_{\leq b}]$ .
3. Let  $\mathbf{F}_b = \circ_{d=1}^{n_d} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P}_d^{(b)}$ .

4. Solve

$$\min \frac{1}{2mn_y} \left\| \mathbf{Y}_b - \mathbf{F}_b \mathbf{D}_{\lambda_b} \mathbf{Q}^{(b)} \right\|_F^2 + \frac{C_p}{2n_{t_b} n_d n} \sum_{d=1}^{n_d} \left\| \mathbf{P}_d^{(b)} \right\|_F^2 + \frac{C_q}{2n_{t_b} n_y} \left\| \mathbf{Q}^{(b)} \right\|_F^2$$

w.r.t.  $\mathbf{D}_{\lambda}, \mathbf{Q}^{(b)}, \mathbf{P}_1^{(b)}, \dots, \mathbf{P}_{n_d}^{(b)}$ .

5. Deflate output  $\mathbf{Y}_{b+1} = \mathbf{Y}_b - \mathbf{F}_b \mathbf{D}_{\lambda_b} \mathbf{Q}^{(b)}$
6. Let  $b = b + 1$ , If  $b \leq N_b$  Then Go To Step 2.



7. Provide function  $f(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{b=1}^{n_b} \mathbf{F}_b \mathbf{D}_{\lambda_b} \mathbf{Q}^{(b)}$ .

The optimization problem in Step 4 can also be solved on a sequence of mini-batches to keep the input source related memory complexity low.




Figure 2: A simple comparison of the layering strategy of a generic Neural Network and the LTR. The LTR reuses the input in every layer, the output is deflated, only the errors are propagated to the next layer, and error feedback is applied only within the layers. AL() denotes activation+linear layers in the ANN work flow, AP() stands for the activation+polynomial layers in the LTR case.

We could test that adding a new layer of ranks to those accumulated earlier is a reliable step. By assuming that the output is scalar valued then the reliability could be measured by the *correlation ratio (intra-class correlation)*, [26]. Adding a new layer  $t$  to increase the ranks might matter if the change in the output values highly correlate to the sum of those computed by the previous ones. Let  $y_{b,i}$  be the predicted output at sample example  $i$  in layer  $b$ . Then the correlation ratio is given by

$$\eta^2 = \frac{\sigma_b^2 n (\bar{y}_b - \bar{y})^2}{\sum_{b=1}^{n_b} \sum_{i=1}^m (y_{b,i} - \bar{y})^2}, \tag{15}$$

where  $\bar{y}_b = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m y_{b,i}$  is the layer wise mean, and  $\bar{y} = \frac{1}{n_b} \sum_{b=1}^{n_b} \bar{y}_b$  is the total mean computed on all layers.

## 5 Experiments

The experiments contain two main parts: in the first one, tests based on random generated data sets are presented and in the second part, results of experiments on real data sets are performed.

The first collection of tests is generated on simple, two-variable  $x, y$ , polynomials, see Table 3 to demonstrate the basic difference between LTR and the FM. Whilst LTR uses unrestricted polynomials to fit the FM applies symmetric ones, e.g.  $\pi(x, y) = xy$ , which condition limits the potential performance if the polynomial is arbitrary, e.g. anti-symmetric:  $x^2 - y^2$ .

Function	Pearson-correlation (RMSE)			
	LR	KRR	FM	LTR
$xy$	.01(1.00)	1.0(.05)	1.00(.00)	1.0(.01)
$x^2 - 2xy + y^2$	.04(2.80)	1.0(.14)	.69(2.00)	1.0(.02)
$x^2 - y^2$	.06(2.01)	1.0(.09)	.05(2.01)	1.0(.04)

Table 3: Learning simple quadratic functions where the input is generated independently from standard normal distribution *number of folds=5, m=1000, degree=2, rank=2, epoch=10*

To test the general performance of the proposed learning method, samples of randomly generated polynomials are used. The generation procedure is based on 5), where the components of data vectors,  $\mathbf{x}_i$ , the parameter vectors,  $\mathbf{p}_d^{(t)}$ , and rank-wised scalar factors,  $\lambda_t$ , are chosen independently from standard normal distribution. This sample could contain symmetric and non-symmetric polynomials as well. In the experiments, 2-fold cross validation is used to keep the test size high relative to that of the training, thus the distances between the test examples to the closest training ones can be sufficiently large. The results, the mean values, and standard errors are computed on all random examples and at each random sample on all folds.




Figure 3: Accuracy of the prediction as function of the degree of the data and learner ( $n_d$ ) polynomials. Other parameters were fixed to  $m = 10^6$ ,  $n = 10$  and  $n_t = 10$ .

In all tests, only one parameter runs through on a range of possible values while all other ones are fixed. The data related parameters which can influence the performance are: the degree and the rank of the generated polynomials, the number of examples and the number of variables. The parameters of the learner are: the degree ( $n_d$ ) and the rank of the tensor ( $n_t$ ) to be reconstructed, and the number of epochs. Other learner parameters are fixed in all experiments, learning speed is 1, the size of the mini-batches is taken as 500, the regularization constants,  $C_p$  and  $C_q$  are fixed to  $10^{-5}$ . An additional parameter, the noise level, is also used. The noise is generated from Gaussian distribution with zero mean and the standard deviation chosen as the standard deviation of the values of the random polynomials multiplied with the noise parameter. All parameters employed in the experiments are reported on the corresponding figures.

The accuracy is measured by Pearson Correlation between the predicted and the real values.




Figure 4: Accuracy of the prediction as a function of the noise level. Other parameters were fixed to  $m = 10^5$ ,  $n = 10$ ,  $n_d = 3$  and  $n_t = 3$ .

The methods compared are Kernel Ridge Regression with polynomial kernels (KRR), High Order Factorization Machine implemented on TensorFlow (TFFM) [27], Linear Regression (LR), and the proposed Latent Tensor Reconstruction method (LTR). In all experiments, every method applies the same polynomial parameters, degree and rank. In case of the TFFM the mini-batch size is chosen as the same as used by the LTR. The methods are implemented in Python with the help of Numpy package, except the FM where the model also uses the TensorFlow. The tests were run on a HP-Z230 workstation equipped with 8 CPU's and 32GB memory. GPU has not been exploited in the experiments.

Data:(100000,100),Noise:0.10, Degree(rank):3(10),  
 Learning degree(rank):3(10), Epoch:10




Figure 5: Accuracy of the prediction as function of the number of variables. Other parameters were fixed to  $m = 10^5$ ,  $n_d = 3$  and  $n_t = 10$ , noise level = 0.1.

Data:(5000,10),Rank:10, Noise:0.10,  
 Learning Rank:10, Epoch:10




Figure 6: Accuracy of the methods on a relatively small data set ( $m = 5000$ ) as a function polynomial degree. Other parameters were fixed to  $n = 10$ ,  $n_d = 10$  and  $n_t = 10$ .

The second part of the experiments is built on real data sets. We processed three data sets, Corel5k, Espgame and laprtc12 [28]. They are available on the authors web site<sup>1</sup>. The published results on these data sets and the corresponding references are included in Table 5. These data sets consist of annotated images and 15 preprocessed image features. The annotations are vectors of labels identifying the objects appearing on the images. The image features, e.g. SIFT, are provided by authors of [28]. The high sparsity of the label vectors and the strong interrelations between the feature variables make the prediction problem rather challenging. This test is based on the vector output model of the LTR presented in Section 3.3.

### 5.1 Summary of the experiments

Figures 3, 4 and 5 present the better accuracies provided by the LTR compared to the FM on varying degrees, noise levels and on the number of variables, where the data sets contain  $10^5 - 10^6$  examples. These experiments show that the LTR has a sufficient capacity to learn highly complex functions on large data sets at a relatively low number of epochs (10). On small sets (Figure 6) the large parameter space of both the LTR and the TFFM leads to inferior performance compared to KRR, especially when the number of variables is large.

<sup>1</sup><http://lear.inrialpes.fr/people/guillaumin/data.php>




Figure 7: The average execution time of the training to learn polynomials on random samples including Kernel Ridge Regression as a function of polynomial degree ( $n_d$ ). Other parameters were fixed to  $m = 10^4, n = 10, n_d = 10$  and  $n_t = 10$ .




Figure 8: The average execution time of the training to learn polynomials on large scale random samples ( $m = 10^7$ ) as a function of the polynomial degree ( $n_d$ ). Other parameters were fixed to  $n = 10$  and  $n_t = 10$ .

Data set	labels	Number of instances		non-zero labels (%)
		training	test	
Core15k	260	4500	500	1.31
Espgame	268	18689	2081	1.75
laprtc12	291	17665	1962	1.97

Table 4: The size of the data sets, and the number of labels assigned to each image

Label accuracy in F1(%)			
Method	Corel.	Espg.	Iapr.
MBRM [29]	24.0	18.0	23.0
TagProp [30]	37.0	<b>32.0</b>	<b>39.0</b>
JEC [31]	29.0	21.0	23.0
FastTag [32]	37.0	30.0	34.0
LTR	<b>42.7</b>	27.2	37.0

Table 5: Comparison between of LTR and other related methods on the three benchmark databases

Figure 7 shows that KRR has a several times larger time complexity than the LTR or the TFFM. The large scale example, (10M examples), in Figure 8 demonstrates the significant advantage of the LTR method which has a linear time algorithm in the degree of the polynomials. That property is the most critical one in capturing high level interdependence between the variables.

## 6 Discussion

In this paper, a latent tensor reconstruction based regression model is proposed for learning highly non-linear target functions from large scale data sets. We presented an efficient mini-batch based algorithm that has a constant memory complexity and linear running time in all meaningful parameters (degree, rank, sample size, number of variables). These properties guarantee a high level scalability on broad range of complex problems. Our experiments demonstrate high accuracy in learning high-order polynomials from noisy large-scale data, as well as competitive accuracy in some real-world data sets.

## Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the Academy of Finland [Grant No., 311273, 313266, 310107, 313268 and 334790].

## References

- [1] Walter Rudin. *Principles of mathematical analysis*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, third edition, 1976. International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics.
- [2] Tamara G. Kolda and Brett W. Bader. Tensor decompositions and applications. *SIAM REVIEW*, 51(3):455–500, 2009.
- [3] L. De Lathauwer, B. De Moor, and J. Vandewalle. A multilinear singular value decomposition. *Journal of Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 21(4):1253–1278, 2000.
- [4] G. H. Golub and C. F. V. Loan. *Matrix Computations*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 4th edition, 2013.
- [5] Erich Kaltofen and Barry M. Trager. Computing with polynomials given by black boxes for their evaluations: Greatest common divisors, factorization, separation of numerators and denominators. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 9(3):301–320, March 1990.
- [6] David Cox, John Little, and Donal O’Shea. *Ideals, varieties, and algorithms. An introduction to computational algebraic geometry and commutative algebra*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Springer, 2nd ed. edition, 1996.
- [7] Steffen Rendle. Factorization machines. In *Proceedings of the 2010 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining, ICDM ’10*, pages 995–1000. IEEE Computer Society, 2010.
- [8] Mathieu Blondel, Akinori Fujino, Naonori Ueda, and Masakazu Ishihata. Higher-order factorization machines. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’16*, pages 3359–3367, USA, 2016. Curran Associates Inc.
- [9] Roi Livni, Shai Shalev-Shwartz, and Ohad Shamir. On the computational efficiency of training neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 1, NIPS’14*, pages 855–863, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2014. MIT Press.
- [10] Mathieu Blondel, Masakazu Ishihata, Akinori Fujino, and Naonori Ueda. Polynomial networks and factorization machines: New insights and efficient training algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 48, ICML’16*, pages 850–858. JMLR.org, 2016.

- [11] Elizabeth S. Allman, Catherine Matias, and John A. Rhodes. Identifiability of parameters in latent structure models with many observed variables. *Project Euclid*, 37/6A, 2009.
- [12] Animashree Anandkumar, Rong Ge, Daniel Hsu, Sham M. Kakade, and Matus Telgarsky. Tensor decompositions for learning latent variable models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15:2773–2832, 2014.
- [13] Furong Huang, U. N. Niranjan, Mohammad Umar Hakeem, and Animashree Anandkumar. Online tensor methods for learning latent variable models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16:2797–2835, 2015.
- [14] Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep Learning*. The MIT Press, 2016.
- [15] R. Bellman. *Dynamic Programming*. Princeton University Press, 1957. Dover paperback edition (2003).
- [16] Vin de Silva and Lek-Heng Lim. Tensor rank and the ill-posedness of the best low-rank approximation problem. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 30(3):1084–1127, September 2008.
- [17] P.M. Prenter. A Weierstrass theorem for real, separable Hilbert spaces. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 3:341–351, 1970.
- [18] Steffen Rendle. Factorization machines with libfm. *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.*, 3(3):57:1–57:22, May 2012.
- [19] J. Shawe-Taylor and Nello Cristianini. *Kernel Methods for Pattern Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [20] Ali Rahimi and Benjamin Recht. Random features for large-scale kernel machines. In J. C. Platt, D. Koller, Y. Singer, and S. T. Roweis, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20*, pages 1177–1184. Curran Associates, Inc., 2008.
- [21] Jerome H. Friedman. Multivariate adaptive regression splines. *Ann. Statist.*, 1991.
- [22] Boris Teodorovich Polyak. Some methods of speeding up the convergence of iteration methods. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 4(5):1–17, 1964.
- [23] Yu Nesterov. Smooth minimization of non-smooth functions. *Mathematical programming*, 103(1):127–152, 2005.
- [24] Diederik Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 12 2014.
- [25] Jerome H. Friedman. Stochastic gradient boosting. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 38:367–378, 1999.
- [26] A. Rényi. *Probability Theory*. Dover, 2007.
- [27] Alexander Novikov Mikhail Trofimov. tffm: Tensorflow implementation of an arbitrary order factorization machine. <https://github.com/geffy/tffm>, 2016.
- [28] Matthieu Guillaumin, Jakob Verbeek, and Cordelia Schmid. Multiple instance metric learning from automatically labeled bags of faces. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 634–647. Springer, 2010.
- [29] S. L. Feng, R. Manmatha, and V. Lavrenko. Multiple bernoulli relevance models for image and video annotation. In *CVPR*, 2004.
- [30] Matthieu Guillaumin, Thomas Mensink, Jakob Verbeek, and Cordelia Schmid. Tagprop: Discriminative metric learning in nearest neighbor models for image auto-annotation. In *2009 IEEE 12th international conference on computer vision*, pages 309–316. IEEE, 2009.
- [31] Ameesh Makadia, Vladimir Pavlovic, and Sanjiv Kumar. Baselines for image annotation. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 90:88–105, 2010.
- [32] Minmin Chen, Alice Zheng, and Kilian Q. Weinberger. Fast image tagging. In *ICML*, 2013.