

Feature Robust Optimal Transport for High-dimensional Data

Mathis Petrovich^{*1}, Chao Liang^{*2}, Yanbin Liu³, Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai⁴,
Linchao Zhu³, Yi Yang³, Ruslan Salakhutdinov⁴, Makoto Yamada^{5,6}

¹ENS Paris-Saclay, France ²Zhejiang University, China

³University of Technology Sydney, Australia ⁴Carnegie Mellon University, U.S.A.

⁵Kyoto University, Japan ⁶RIKEN AIP, Japan

May 31, 2022

Abstract

Optimal transport is a machine learning technique with applications including distribution comparison, feature selection, and generative adversarial networks. In this paper, we propose feature robust optimal transport (FROT) for high-dimensional data, which jointly solves feature selection and OT problems. Specifically, we aim to select important feature sets and use them to compute the transportation plan. The FROT problem can be formulated as a min-max optimization or a convex minimization problem. Then, we propose a Frank-Wolfe-based optimization algorithm, where the sub-problem can be accurately solved using the Sinkhorn algorithm. An advantage of FROT is that important features can be analytically determined. Furthermore, we propose using the FROT algorithm for feature selection and the layer selection problem in deep neural networks for semantic correspondence. By conducting synthetic and benchmark experiments, we demonstrate that the proposed method can determine important features. Additionally, we show that the FROT algorithm achieves a state-of-the-art performance in real-world semantic correspondence datasets.

1 Introduction

Optimal transport (OT) is a machine learning technique with several applications in machine learning, computer vision, and natural language processing communities. The applications include the Wasserstein distance estimation [1], domain adaptation [2], multi-task learning [3], barycenter estimation [4], semantic correspondence [5], feature matching [6], and photo album summarization [7].

The OT problem is extensively studied in the computer vision community as the earth mover’s distance (EMD) [8]. However, the computational cost of EMD is cubic and is computationally expensive. Recently, the entropic regularized EMD problem was proposed, where the problem can be solved by the Sinkhorn algorithm with quadratic cost [9]. Owing to the development of the Sinkhorn algorithm, researchers have replaced the EMD computation with its regularized counterparts.

More recently, a robust variant of the OT was proposed and used for divergence estimation [10]. In the robust OT framework, the transportation plan is computed with the discriminative subspace of the two data matrices $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ and $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$, where the subspace can be obtained by solving the dimensionality reduction problem. An advantage of the subspace robust approach is that it does not require prior information about the subspace. However, given prior information such as feature groups, we can consider a computationally efficient

^{*}equal contribution




Figure 1: Transportation plans between two synthetic distribution with 10-dimensional vectors $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = (\mathbf{x}^\top, \mathbf{z}_x^\top)$, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = (\mathbf{y}^\top, \mathbf{z}_y^\top)$, where two-dimensional vectors $\mathbf{x} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_x, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x)$ and $\mathbf{y} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_y, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y)$ are true features and $\mathbf{z}_x \sim N(\mathbf{0}_8, \mathbf{I}_8)$ and $\mathbf{z}_y \sim N(\mathbf{0}_8, \mathbf{I}_8)$ are noisy features. (a) OT between the distribution \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} is a reference. (b) OT between the distribution $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$. (c) FROT transportation plan between the distribution $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$ where true features and noisy features are grouped respectively.

formulation. The computation of the subspace can be computationally expensive if the dimensionality of data is high, for example 10^4 .

One of the most common prior information is a feature group. Using a group feature is popular in feature selection problems and extensively studied in Group Lasso [11]. The key idea of Group Lasso is to pre-specify the group variables and select the set of group variables using the group norm (also known as the sum of ℓ_2 norms). For example, if we use pre-trained neural network for a feature extractor and to compute OT using the features, we require a careful selection of important layers to compute OT. Specifically, each layer output is regarded as a grouped input. Therefore, using feature group as a prior is a natural setup and important for considering OT for deep neural networks (DNNs).

This study proposes a feature selection variant of the optimal transport for high-dimensional data utilizing grouped feature prior information. Specifically, we propose a feature robust optimal transport (FROT) problem, where we select distinct group feature sets instead of determining its distinct subsets as proposed in [10]. We formulate the FROT problem as a min-max optimization problem and transform it to a convex optimization problem, where it can be accurately solved by the Frank-Wolfe algorithm [12, 13]. The FROTs sub-problem can be accurately solved by the Sinkhorn algorithm [9]. An advantage of FROT is that we can obtain a globally optimal solution owing to its convexity. Moreover, we can determine the significance of the features after solving the FROT problem without any additional cost; this can aid in interpreting features. Therefore, the FROT formulation is suited for feature selection and layer selection in DNNs. Through synthetic experiments, we initially demonstrate that the proposed FROT can determine important groups (i.e., features) and is robust to noise dimensions (See Figure 1). Then, we use the FROT for high-dimensional feature selection problems. Furthermore, we applied the FROT to a semantic correspondence problem [5] and showed that the proposed algorithm improves semantic correspondence.

Contribution:

- We propose a feature robust optimal transport (FROT) problem and derive a simple and efficient Frank-Wolfe based algorithm. Furthermore, we propose a feature robust Wasserstein distance (FRWD).
- We apply FROT to the high-dimensional feature selection problem and show that FROT is consistent with the Wasserstein distance based feature selection algorithm with less computational cost than the original algorithm.
- We used FROT for the layer selection problem in a semantic correspondence problem and showed that the

proposed algorithm outperforms existing baseline algorithms.

2 Background

In this section, we briefly introduce the OT problem.

Optimal transport (OT): Given independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) samples $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ from a d -dimensional distribution p and i.i.d. samples $\mathbf{Y} = \{\mathbf{y}_j\}_{j=1}^m \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ from the d -dimensional distribution q . In the Kantorovich relaxation of OT, admissible couplings are defined by the set of transportation plan:

$$\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \{\mathbf{\Pi} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times m} : \mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{1}_m = \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{\Pi}^\top \mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{b}\},$$

where $\mathbf{\Pi} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times m}$ is called the transportation plan, $\mathbf{1}_n$ is the n -dimensional vector whose elements are ones, and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m)^\top \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ are the weights. The OT problem between two discrete measures $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}$ and $\nu = \sum_{j=1}^m b_j \delta_{\mathbf{y}_j}$ is to determine the optimal transportation plan of the following problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{\Pi} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \pi_{ij} c(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_j), \quad (1)$$

where $c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is a cost function. For example, the squared Euclidean distance is used, that is., $c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2^2$. To solve the OT problem, Eq. (1), (also known as the earth movers distance) using linear programming requires $O(n^3)$, ($n = m$) computation, which is computationally expensive. To address this, the entropic-regularized optimal transport is used [9].

$$\min_{\mathbf{\Pi} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \pi_{ij} c(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_j) + \epsilon H(\mathbf{\Pi}),$$

where $\epsilon \geq 0$ is the regularization parameter and $H(\mathbf{\Pi}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \pi_{ij} (\log(\pi_{ij}) - 1)$ is the entropic regularization. If $\epsilon = 0$, the regularized OT problem reduces to the EMD problem. Owing to entropic regularization, the entropic regularized OT problem can be accurately solved using Sinkhorn iteration [9] with $O(nm)$ computational cost (See Algorithm 1).

Wasserstein distance: If the cost function is defined as $c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})^p$ with $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ a distance function and $p \geq 1$, then we define the p -Wasserstein distance of two discrete measures $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}$ and $\nu = \sum_{j=1}^m b_j \delta_{\mathbf{y}_j}$ as

$$W_p(\mu, \nu) = \left(\min_{\mathbf{\Pi} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \pi_{ij} d(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_j)^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

3 Proposed Method

This study proposes a feature robust optimal transport. We assume that the vectors are grouped as $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}^{(1)\top}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(L)\top})^\top$ and $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}^{(1)\top}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(L)\top})^\top$. Here, $\mathbf{x}^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\ell}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\ell}$ are the d_ℓ dimensional vector, where $\sum_{\ell=1}^L d_\ell = d$. This setting is useful if we know the explicit group structure for the feature vectors a priori. In an application in L -layer neural networks, we consider $\mathbf{x}^{(\ell)}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{(\ell)}$ as outputs of the ℓ th layer of the network. Specifically, for $d_1 = d_2 = \dots = d_L = 1$ and $L = d$, we consider each feature independently.

Algorithm 1 Sinkhorn algorithm.

1: **Input:** $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{C}, \epsilon, t_{max}$
2: Initialize $\mathbf{K} = e^{-\mathbf{C}/\epsilon}$, $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{1}_n, \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{1}_m, t = 0$
3: **while** $t \leq t_{max}$ and not converge **do**
4: $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{a}/(\mathbf{K}\mathbf{v})$
5: $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{b}/(\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{u})$
6: $t = t + 1$
7: **end while**
8: **return** $\mathbf{\Pi} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{K}\text{diag}(\mathbf{v})$

Algorithm 2 FROT with the Frank–Wolfe.

1: **Input:** $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{\mathbf{y}_j\}_{j=1}^m, \eta$, and ϵ .
2: Initialize $\mathbf{\Pi}$, compute $\{\mathbf{C}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^L$.
3: **for** $t = 0 \dots T$ **do**
4: $\hat{\mathbf{\Pi}} = \text{argmin}_{\mathbf{\Pi} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})} \langle \mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{\Pi}^{(t)}} \rangle + \epsilon H(\mathbf{\Pi})$
5: $\mathbf{\Pi}^{(t+1)} = (1 - \gamma)\mathbf{\Pi}^{(t)} + \gamma \hat{\mathbf{\Pi}}$
6: with $\gamma = \frac{2}{2+t}$.
7: **end for**
8: **return** $\mathbf{\Pi}^{(T)}$

3.1 Feature Robust Optimal Transport (FROT)

The FROT formulation is given by

$$\min_{\mathbf{\Pi} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \Sigma^L} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \pi_{ij} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell c(\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{y}_j^{(\ell)}),$$

where $\Sigma^L = \{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}_+^L : \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{1}_L = 1\}$ is the probability simplex.

The underlying concept of FROT is to estimate the transportation plan $\mathbf{\Pi}$ using the distinct groups with large distances between $\{\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\mathbf{y}_j^{(\ell)}\}_{j=1}^m$. We note that determining transportation plan in non-distinct groups is difficult, because the data samples in $\{\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\mathbf{y}_j^{(\ell)}\}_{j=1}^m$ overlap. In contrast, in the distinct groups, $\{\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\mathbf{y}_j^{(\ell)}\}_{j=1}^m$ are different, and this aids determining an optimal transportation plan. This is an intrinsically similar idea to the subspace robust Wasserstein distance [10], that estimates the transportation plan at the discriminative subspace. In contrast, our approach selects the important groups. Therefore, FROT can be regarded as a feature selection variant of the vanilla OT problem Eq. (1), whereas the subspace robust one is the dimensionality reduction counterparts.

FROT with Frank–Wolfe: An alternative approach can be used to estimate FROT; we initially estimate $\mathbf{\Pi}$ and then $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. However, it can have a local optimal solution due to its non-convexity. Thus, we propose a convex optimization of FROT with Frank–Wolfe. Specifically, we introduce the entropic regularization for $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and rewrite the FROT as a function of $\mathbf{\Pi}$. Therefore, we solve the following problem for $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$:

$$\min_{\mathbf{\Pi} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \Sigma^L} J_\eta(\mathbf{\Pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}), \text{ with } J_\eta(\mathbf{\Pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \pi_{ij} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell c(\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{y}_j^{(\ell)}) - \eta H(\boldsymbol{\alpha}),$$

where $\eta \geq 0$ is the regularization parameter and $H(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell (\log(\alpha_\ell) - 1)$ is the entropic regularization for $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. An advantage of the entropic regularization is that the non-negative constraint is naturally satisfied and the entropic regularizer is a strong convex function.

Proposition 1 *The optimal solution of the optimization problem*

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}^* = \text{argmax}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \Sigma^L} J_\eta(\mathbf{\Pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}), \text{ with } J_\eta(\mathbf{\Pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \phi_\ell - \eta H(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$$

with a fixed admissible transportation plan $\mathbf{\Pi} \in U(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$, is given by

$$\alpha_\ell^* = \frac{\exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\phi_\ell\right)}{\sum_{\ell'=1}^L \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\phi_{\ell'}\right)} \text{ with } J_\eta(\mathbf{\Pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) = \eta \log \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\phi_\ell\right) \right) + \eta.$$

Using Proposition 1 together with the setting $\phi_\ell = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \pi_{ij} c(\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{y}_j^{(\ell)}) = \langle \mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{C}_\ell \rangle$, $[\mathbf{C}_\ell]_{ij} = c(\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{y}_j^{(\ell)})$, the global problem is equivalent to

$$\min_{\mathbf{\Pi} \in U(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})} G_\eta(\mathbf{\Pi}), \text{ with } G_\eta(\mathbf{\Pi}) = \log \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\langle \mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{C}_\ell \rangle\right) \right).$$

This function is the soft-maximum of the transportation costs in each group. The regularization parameter η controls how "soft" the maximum is: if η is small, $G_\eta(\mathbf{\Pi})$ is similar to the maximum whereas if η is large, the function becomes smooth.

Proposition 2 $G_\eta(\mathbf{\Pi})$ is a convex function relative to $\mathbf{\Pi}$.

The derived optimization problem is convex. Therefore, we can determine globally optimal solutions. We employ the Frank–Wolfe algorithm [12, 13], where we approximate $G_\eta(\mathbf{\Pi})$ by linear functions at $\mathbf{\Pi}^{(t)}$ and move $\mathbf{\Pi}$ towards the optimal solution in the convex set (See Algorithm 2).

The derivative of the loss function $G_\eta(\mathbf{\Pi})$ at $\mathbf{\Pi}^{(t)}$ is given by

$$\left. \frac{\partial G_\eta(\mathbf{\Pi})}{\partial \mathbf{\Pi}} \right|_{\mathbf{\Pi}=\mathbf{\Pi}^{(t)}} = \frac{1}{\eta} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{\exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\langle \mathbf{\Pi}^{(t)}, \mathbf{C}_\ell \rangle\right)}{\sum_{\ell'=1}^L \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\langle \mathbf{\Pi}^{(t)}, \mathbf{C}_{\ell'} \rangle\right)} \mathbf{C}_\ell = \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{\Pi}^{(t)}}.$$

Then, we update the transportation plan by solving the EMD problem:

$$\mathbf{\Pi}^{(t+1)} = (1 - \gamma)\mathbf{\Pi}^{(t)} + \gamma \widehat{\mathbf{\Pi}} \text{ with } \widehat{\mathbf{\Pi}} = \underset{\mathbf{\Pi} \in U(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})}{\operatorname{argmin}} \langle \mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{\Pi}^{(t)}} \rangle,$$

where $\gamma = 2/(2+k)$. By the Frank–Wolfe algorithm, we can obtain the optimal solution. However, solving the EMD problem requires cubic computational cost that can be computationally expensive if n and m are large. To address this, we can solve the regularized OT problem.

We propose a p -feature robust Wasserstein distance (p -FRWD).

Proposition 3 For the distance function $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$,

$$\text{FRWD}_p(\mu, \nu) = \left(\min_{\mathbf{\Pi} \in U(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \Sigma^L} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \pi_{ij} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell d(\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{y}_j^{(\ell)})^p \right)^{1/p},$$

is a distance for $p \geq 1$.

3.2 Application 1: Feature Selection

We considered $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ and $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ as sets of samples from classes 1 and 2, respectively. An advantage of the FROT formulation is that we can determine the important features α_ℓ for each grouped features. The optimal important feature is given by

$$\widehat{\alpha}_\ell = \frac{\exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\langle \widehat{\mathbf{\Pi}}, \mathbf{C}_\ell \rangle\right)}{\sum_{\ell'=1}^d \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\langle \widehat{\mathbf{\Pi}}, \mathbf{C}_{\ell'} \rangle\right)}, \text{ with } \widehat{\mathbf{\Pi}} = \underset{\mathbf{\Pi} \in U(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})}{\operatorname{argmin}} \log \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^d \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\langle \mathbf{\Pi}, \mathbf{C}_\ell \rangle\right) \right),$$

where $[\mathbf{C}_\ell]_{ij} = (x_i^{(\ell)} - y_j^{(\ell)})^2$. Finally, we selected top- K features by the ranking $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$. Hence, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ changes to a one-hot vector for small η and $\alpha_k \approx \frac{1}{L}$ for large η .

3.3 Application 2: Semantic Correspondence

We applied our proposed FROT algorithm to semantic correspondence. The semantic correspondence is a problem that determines the matching of objects in two images. That is, given input image pairs (A, B) , with common objects, we formulated the semantic correspondence problem to estimate the transportation plan from the key points in A to that in B , where this framework is proposed in [5]. In Figure 2, we show the overview of our proposed framework.

Cost matrix computation \mathbf{C}_ℓ : In our framework, we employed the pre-trained convolutional neural network to extract dense feature maps for each convolutional layer. The dense feature map of the ℓ th layer output of the s th image is given by

$$\mathbf{f}_{s,q+(r-1)h_s}^{(\ell,s)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\ell}, \quad q = 1, 2, \dots, h_s, r = 1, 2, \dots, w_s, \ell = 1, 2, \dots, L,$$

where w_s and h_s are the width and the height of the s th image, respectively and d_ℓ is the dimension of ℓ th layer’s feature map. Note that because the dimension of dense feature map is different for each layer, we sample feature maps to the size of the 1st layer’s feature map size (i.e., $h_s \times w_s$).

The ℓ th layer’s cost matrix for images s and s' is given by

$$[\mathbf{C}_\ell]_{ij} = \|\mathbf{f}_i^{(\ell,s)} - \mathbf{f}_j^{(\ell,s')}\|_2^2, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, w_s h_s, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, w_{s'} h_{s'}.$$

A potential problem of FROT is that the estimation significantly depends on the magnitude of the cost of each layer (also known as group). Hence, normalizing each cost matrix is important. Therefore, we normalized each feature vector by $\mathbf{f}_i^{(\ell,s)} \leftarrow \mathbf{f}_i^{(\ell,s)} / \|\mathbf{f}_i^{(\ell,s)}\|_2$. Consequently, the cost matrix is given by $[\mathbf{C}_\ell]_{ij} = 2 - 2\mathbf{f}_i^{(\ell,s)\top} \mathbf{f}_j^{(\ell,s')}$. We can use distances such as $L1$ distance.

Computation of \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} with staircase re-weighting: For semantic correspondence, setting $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{h_s w_s}$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{h_{s'} w_{s'}}$ is important because semantic correspondence can be affected by background clutter. Therefore, we generated the class activation maps [14] for the source and target images and use as \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} , respectively. For CAM, we chose the class with the highest classification probability and normalized it to the range $[0, 1]$.

4 Related Work

In this section, we review divergence measures and optimal transport.

Divergence measure and optimal transport: Divergence measures can be categorized into two: f -divergence [15] including the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence [16] and the α -divergence [17, 18], and integral probability metric [19], such as the Wasserstein distance [20].

The KL divergence is a commonly used divergence. A naive approach for estimating the KL divergence between $p(\mathbf{x})$ and $p'(\mathbf{x})$ is to estimate the probability densities $p(\mathbf{x})$ and $p'(\mathbf{x})$ separately using some density estimators and then computing their ratio. However, density estimation is a difficult problem, and the KL divergence estimation can be inaccurate. An efficient approach can be based on density ratio estimation approaches, where we directly estimate the ratio of $p(\mathbf{x})$ and $p'(\mathbf{x})$ without using the density estimations [21]. For the Jensen–Shannon divergence [22], we can use the relative density ratio estimation alternate to the standard density ratio estimation [23]. For non-overlapping distributions, the KL divergence can be infinite. Moreover, in this case, neural network training with KL and JS divergences can be affected by vanishing gradients.




Figure 2: Proposed semantic correspondence framework based on FROT.

To address the instability problem in KL and JS divergences, using a distance based approach is promising. The maximum mean discrepancy (MMD) [24] is a kernel based measure defined as a difference of means of two distributions in a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS), that can be accurately computed without optimization. Another type of distance based measure is the Wasserstein distance [1]. The Wasserstein distance can be determined by solving the OT problem. An advantage of the Wasserstein distance is its robustness to noise; moreover, we can obtain the transportation plan, which is useful for many machine learning applications. To reduce the Wasserstein distance computation cost, the sliced Wasserstein distance is useful [25]. Recently, the tree variant of Wasserstein was proposed [26, 27]; the sliced Wasserstein distance is a special case of this algorithm.

In addition to accelerating the computation, structured optimal transport (SOT) incorporates structural information directly into the OT problems [28]. Specifically, they formulate the submodular optimal transport problem and solve the problem by a saddle-point mirror prox algorithm. Recently, the more complex structured information is introduced in the OT problem such as hierarchical structure [29, 30]. These approaches successfully incorporate the structured information into the OT problems with respect to data samples. In contrast, FROT incorporates the structured information into features.

The most related work to FROT is that a robust variant of Wasserstein distance called the subspace robust Wasserstein distance [10]. The subspace robust Wasserstein distance method computes the OT problem in the extremely discriminative subspace, that can be determined by solving dimensionality reduction problems. Owing to the subspace robust Wasserstein, it can successfully compute the Wasserstein from noisy data. The FROT is a feature selection variant of Wasserstein distance, whereas the subspace robust one is for dimensionality reduction.

OT applications: OT has received significant attention in several computer vision tasks. Applications include the Wasserstein distance estimation [1], the domain adaptation [2], the multi-task learning [3], the barycenter estimation [4], the semantic correspondence [5], the feature matching [6], photo album summarization [7], genera-




Figure 3: Feature selection results. We average over 50 runs of the accuracy (on the test set) of an SVM trained with the top-k features selected by several methods.

Table 1: Computational time comparison (second) for feature selection from biological datasets.

Data	d	n	Wasserstein	Linear	MMD	FROT
Colon	2000	62	21.38 (\pm 4.09)	0.00 (\pm 0.00)	1.36 (\pm 0.15)	0.41 (\pm 0.07)
Leukemia	7070	72	79.86 (\pm 16.95)	0.01 (\pm 0.00)	5.03 (\pm 0.79)	1.13 (\pm 0.14)
Prostate_GE	5966	102	61.05 (\pm 13.67)	0.02 (\pm 0.00)	6.01 (\pm 1.17)	1.04 (\pm 0.11)
GLL85	22283	85	426.24 (\pm 21.45)	0.04 (\pm 0.00)	23.6 (\pm 1.21)	3.44 (\pm 0.36)

tive model [31, 32, 33, 34], and graph matching [35, 36]. Recently, OT was applied to the semantic correspondence problem, and it outperformed existing state-of-the-art semantic correspondence algorithms [5].

5 Experiments

In this section, we initially evaluate the FROT algorithm using synthetic datasets. Then, we demonstrate the performance using feature selection and semantic correspondence tasks.

5.1 Synthetic Data

We compare FROT with a standard OT using synthetic datasets. In these experiments, we initially generate two-dimensional vectors $\mathbf{x} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_x, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x)$ and $\mathbf{y} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_y, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y)$. Here, we set $\boldsymbol{\mu}_x = (-5, 0)^\top$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_y = (5, 0)^\top$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_y = ((5, 1)^\top, (4, 1)^\top)$. Then, we concatenate $\mathbf{z}_x \sim N(\mathbf{0}_8, \mathbf{I}_8)$ and $\mathbf{z}_y \sim N(\mathbf{0}_8, \mathbf{I}_8)$ to \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} , respectively to give $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = (\mathbf{x}^\top, \mathbf{z}_x^\top)^\top$, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = (\mathbf{y}^\top, \mathbf{z}_y^\top)^\top$.

For FROT, we set $\eta = 1.0$ and the number of iterations of the Frank-Wolfe algorithm as $T = 10$. The regularization parameter is set to $\epsilon = 0.02$ for all methods. To show the proof-of-concepts, we set the true features as a group and the remaining noise features as another group.

Fig. 1a shows the correspondence from \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} with the vanilla OT algorithm. Figs. 1b and 1c show the correspondence of FROT and OT with $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$, respectively. Although FROT can identify a good matching, the OT fails to obtain a significant correspondence. We observed that the α parameter corresponding to true group is nearly one.

5.2 Feature selection

Here, we compared FROT with several baseline algorithms in feature selection problems. In this study, we employed the high-dimensional and few sample datasets with two class classification tasks (see Table 1). All the

Table 2: Per-class PCK ($\alpha_{\text{bbox}} = 0.1$) results using the SPair-71k. All models use ResNet101 as the backbone.

Methods		aero	bike	bird	boat	bottle	bus	car	cat	chair	cow	dog	horse	moto	person	plant	sheep	train	tv	all
Authors' original models	CNNGeo [38]	21.3	15.1	34.6	12.8	31.2	26.3	24.0	30.6	11.6	24.3	20.4	12.2	19.7	15.6	14.3	9.6	28.5	28.8	18.1
	A2Net [39]	20.8	17.1	37.4	13.9	33.6	29.4	26.5	34.9	12.0	26.5	22.5	13.3	21.3	20.0	16.9	11.5	28.9	31.6	20.1
	WeakAlign [40]	23.4	17.0	41.6	14.6	37.6	28.1	26.6	32.6	12.6	27.9	23.0	13.6	21.3	22.2	17.9	10.9	31.5	34.8	21.1
	NC-Net [41]	24.0	16.0	45.0	13.7	35.7	25.9	19.0	50.4	14.3	32.6	27.4	19.2	21.7	20.3	20.4	13.6	33.6	40.4	26.4
SPair-71k finetuned models	CNNGeo [38]	23.4	16.7	40.2	14.3	36.4	27.7	26.0	32.7	12.7	27.4	22.8	13.7	20.9	21.0	17.5	10.2	30.8	34.1	20.6
	A2Net [39]	22.6	18.5	42.0	16.4	37.9	30.8	26.5	35.6	13.3	29.6	24.3	16.0	21.6	22.8	20.5	13.5	31.4	36.5	22.3
	WeakAlign [40]	22.2	17.6	41.9	15.1	38.1	27.4	27.2	31.8	12.8	26.8	22.6	14.2	20.0	22.2	17.9	10.4	32.2	35.1	20.9
	NC-Net [41]	17.9	12.2	32.1	11.7	29.0	19.9	16.1	39.2	9.9	23.9	18.8	15.7	17.4	15.9	14.8	9.6	24.2	31.1	20.1
SPair-71k validation	HPF [42]	25.2	18.9	52.1	15.7	38.0	22.8	19.1	52.9	17.9	33.0	32.8	20.6	24.4	27.9	21.1	15.9	31.5	35.6	28.2
	OT-HPF [5]	32.6	18.9	62.5	20.7	42.0	26.1	20.4	61.4	19.7	41.3	41.7	29.8	29.6	31.8	25.0	23.5	44.7	37.0	33.9
Without SPair-71k validation	OT	30.1	16.5	50.4	17.3	38.0	22.9	19.7	54.3	17.0	28.4	31.3	22.1	28.0	19.5	21.0	17.8	42.6	28.8	28.3
	FROT ($\eta = 0.3$)	35.0	20.9	56.3	23.4	40.7	27.2	21.9	62.0	17.5	38.8	36.2	27.9	28.0	30.4	26.9	23.1	49.7	38.4	33.7
	FROT ($\eta = 0.5$)	34.1	18.8	56.9	19.9	40.0	25.6	19.2	61.9	17.4	38.7	36.5	25.6	26.9	27.2	26.3	22.1	50.3	38.6	32.8
	FROT ($\eta = 0.7$)	33.4	19.4	56.6	20.0	39.6	26.1	19.1	62.4	17.9	38.0	36.5	26.0	27.5	26.5	25.5	21.6	49.7	38.9	32.7
	FROT ($\eta = 1.0$)	32.8	19.1	55.8	19.8	39.1	25.7	19.7	61.5	17.2	37.1	35.9	25.1	27.2	25.0	24.7	21.4	47.7	37.8	32.0

feature selection experiments were run on a Linux server with Intel Xeon CPU E7-8890 v4 2.20 GHz and 2 TB RAM.

In our experiments, we initially randomly split the data into two sets (75% for training and 25% for test) and used the training set for feature selection and building a classifier. Note that we standardized each feature using the training set. Then, we used the remaining set for the test. The trial was repeated 50 times and we reported the averaged classification accuracy. Considered as baseline methods, we computed the Wasserstein distance, the Maximum mean discrepancy (MMD) [37], and linear correlation¹ for each dimension and sorted them in descending order. Then, we selected the top- K features as important features. For FROT, we computed the feature importance and selected the features that had significant importance score. In our experiments, we set $\eta = 1.0$ and $T = 10$. Then, we trained 2-class SVM² with the selected features.

Fig. 3 shows the averaged classification accuracy relative to the number of selected features. From Figure 3, FROT is consistent with the Wasserstein distance based feature selection, and outperforms the linear correlation method and the MMD for two datasets. Table 1 shows the computational time (second) of the methods. FROT is about two order of magnitude faster than that of Wasserstein distance and also faster than MMD. Note that although MMD is as fast as the proposed method, it cannot determine the correspondence between samples.

5.3 Semantic correspondence


We evaluated our FROT algorithm for semantic correspondence. In this study, we used the **SPair-71k** [43]. The SPair-71k dataset consists of 70,958 image pairs with variations in viewpoint and scale. For evaluation, we employed the percentage of accurate key-points (PCK), that counts the number of accurately predicted key-points given a fixed threshold α_{bbox} [43]. All the semantic correspondence experiments were run on a Linux server with NVIDIA P100.

For the proposed framework, we employed ResNet101 [44] that are pre-trained on ImageNet [45] for feature and activation map extraction. Note that we did not fine-tune the network. We compared the proposed method to several baselines [43]. In particular, HPF [42] and OT-HPF [5] are state-of-the-art methods for semantic correspondence. The HPF and OT-HPF required the validation dataset to select important layers, whereas FROT did not require the validation dataset. The OT is a simple optimal transport based method without selecting layers.


Table 2 shows the per-class PCK results using the SPair-71k dataset. FROT ($\eta = 0.3$) outperforms most existing baselines including HPF and OT. Moreover, FROT ($\eta = 0.3$) is consistent with OT-HPF [5], which requires the validation dataset to select important layers. In this experiment, setting $\eta < 1$ gives favorable

¹https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/feature_selection.html

²<https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.svm.SVC.html>



(a) FROT ($\eta = 0.3$).



(b) Feature importance of FROT.

Figure 4: One to one matching results of FROT ($\eta = 0.3$) and the feature importance of FROT.

performance. Figure 4a shows an example of the matched key-points using the FROT algorithm. Fig.4b shows the corresponding feature importance. The lower the η value, the smaller number of layers used. The interesting finding here is that the selected important layer in this case is the third layer from the last.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a feature robust optimal transport (FROT) for high-dimensional data, which jointly solves the feature selection and OT problems. An advantage of FROT is that it is a convex optimization problem and can determine an accurate globally optimal solution by the Frank–Wolfe algorithm. Then, we used FROT for high-dimensional feature selection and semantic correspondence problems. By extensive experiments, we demonstrated that the proposed algorithm is consistent with state-of-the-art algorithms in both feature selection and semantic correspondence.

References

- [1] Gabriel Peyré, Marco Cuturi, et al. Computational optimal transport. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(5-6):355–607, 2019.
- [2] Yuguang Yan, Wen Li, Hanrui Wu, Huaqing Min, Mingkui Tan, and Qingyao Wu. Semi-supervised optimal transport for heterogeneous domain adaptation. In *IJCAI*, 2018.
- [3] Hicham Janati, Marco Cuturi, and Alexandre Gramfort. Wasserstein regularization for sparse multi-task regression. In *AISTATS*, 2019.
- [4] Marco Cuturi and Arnaud Doucet. Fast computation of wasserstein barycenters. *ICML*, 2014.
- [5] Yanbin Liu, Linchao Zhu, Makoto Yamada, and Yi Yang. Semantic correspondence as an optimal transport problem. In *CVPR*, 2020.
- [6] Paul-Edouard Sarlin, Daniel DeTone, Tomasz Malisiewicz, and Andrew Rabinovich. SuperGlue: Learning feature matching with graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.11763*, 2019.

- [7] Yanbin Liu, Makoto Yamada, Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai, Tam Le, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Yi Yang. Lsmi-sinkhorn: Semi-supervised squared-loss mutual information estimation with optimal transport. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.02373*, 2019.
- [8] Yossi Rubner, Carlo Tomasi, and Leonidas J Guibas. The earth mover’s distance as a metric for image retrieval. *International journal of computer vision*, 40(2):99–121, 2000.
- [9] Marco Cuturi. Sinkhorn distances: Lightspeed computation of optimal transport. In *NIPS*, 2013.
- [10] François-Pierre Paty and Marco Cuturi. Subspace robust wasserstein distances. In *ICML*, 2019.
- [11] Ming Yuan and Yi Lin. Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 68(1):49–67, 2006.
- [12] Marguerite Frank and Philip Wolfe. An algorithm for quadratic programming. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 3(1-2):95–110, 1956.
- [13] Martin Jaggi. Revisiting frank-wolfe: Projection-free sparse convex optimization. In *ICML*, 2013.
- [14] Bolei Zhou, Aditya Khosla, Agata Lapedriza, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba. Learning deep features for discriminative localization. In *CVPR*, 2016.
- [15] Syed Mumtaz Ali and Samuel D Silvey. A general class of coefficients of divergence of one distribution from another. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, pages 131–142, 1966.
- [16] Thomas M Cover and Joy A Thomas. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- [17] Alfréd Rényi et al. On measures of entropy and information. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Contributions to the Theory of Statistics*. The Regents of the University of California, 1961.
- [18] Barnabás Póczos and Jeff Schneider. On the estimation of alpha-divergences. In *AISTATS*, 2011.
- [19] Alfred Müller. Integral probability metrics and their generating classes of functions. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 29(2):429–443, 1997.
- [20] Cédric Villani. *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [21] Masashi Sugiyama, Shinichi Nakajima, Hisashi Kashima, Paul von Bünau, and Motoaki Kawanabe. Direct importance estimation with model selection and its application to covariate shift adaptation. In *NIPS*, 2008.
- [22] Bent Fuglede and Flemming Topsøe. Jensen-shannon divergence and hilbert space embedding. In *ISIT*, 2004.
- [23] Makoto Yamada, Taiji Suzuki, Takafumi Kanamori, Hirotaka Hachiya, and Masashi Sugiyama. Relative density-ratio estimation for robust distribution comparison. *Neural computation*, 25(5):1324–1370, 2013.
- [24] Arthur Gretton, Karsten M Borgwardt, Malte J Rasch, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Alexander Smola. A kernel two-sample test. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(Mar):723–773, 2012.
- [25] Soheil Kolouri, Yang Zou, and Gustavo K Rohde. Sliced wasserstein kernels for probability distributions. In *CVPR*, 2016.

- [26] Steven N Evans and Frederick A Matsen. The phylogenetic kantorovich–rubinstein metric for environmental sequence samples. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 74(3):569–592, 2012.
- [27] Tam Le, Makoto Yamada, Kenji Fukumizu, and Marco Cuturi. Tree-sliced approximation of wasserstein distances. *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [28] David Alvarez-Melis, Tommi Jaakkola, and Stefanie Jegelka. Structured optimal transport. In *AISTATS*, 2018.
- [29] David Alvarez-Melis, Youssef Mroueh, and Tommi S Jaakkola. Unsupervised hierarchy matching with optimal transport over hyperbolic spaces. *AISTATS*, 2020.
- [30] Mikhail Yurochkin, Sebastian Claiici, Edward Chien, Farzaneh Mirzazadeh, and Justin M Solomon. Hierarchical optimal transport for document representation. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [31] Martin Arjovsky, Soumith Chintala, and Léon Bottou. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In *ICML*, 2017.
- [32] Charlotte Bunne, David Alvarez-Melis, Andreas Krause, and Stefanie Jegelka. Learning generative models across incomparable spaces. In *ICML*, 2019.
- [33] Ishan Deshpande, Yuan-Ting Hu, Ruoyu Sun, Ayis Pyrros, Nasir Siddiqui, Sanmi Koyejo, Zhizhen Zhao, David Forsyth, and Alexander G Schwing. Max-sliced wasserstein distance and its use for gans. In *CVPR*, 2019.
- [34] Jiqing Wu, Zhiwu Huang, Dinesh Acharya, Wen Li, Janine Thoma, Danda Pani Paudel, and Luc Van Gool. Sliced wasserstein generative models. In *CVPR*, 2019.
- [35] Hongteng Xu, Dixin Luo, and Lawrence Carin. Scalable gromov-wasserstein learning for graph partitioning and matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.07645*, 2019.
- [36] Hongteng Xu, Dixin Luo, Hongyuan Zha, and Lawrence Carin Duke. Gromov-wasserstein learning for graph matching and node embedding. In *ICML*, 2019.
- [37] Arthur Gretton, Kenji Fukumizu, C. Hui Teo, Le Song, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Alex Smola. A kernel statistical test of independence. In *NIPS*, 2007.
- [38] Ignacio Rocco, Relja Arandjelovic, and Josef Sivic. Convolutional neural network architecture for geometric matching. In *CVPR*, 2017.
- [39] Paul Hongsuck Seo, Jongmin Lee, Deunsol Jung, Bohyung Han, and Minsu Cho. Attentive semantic alignment with offset-aware correlation kernels. In *ECCV*, 2018.
- [40] Ignacio Rocco, Relja Arandjelović, and Josef Sivic. End-to-end weakly-supervised semantic alignment. In *CVPR*, 2018.
- [41] Ignacio Rocco, Mircea Cimpoi, Relja Arandjelović, Akihiko Torii, Tomas Pajdla, and Josef Sivic. Neighbourhood consensus networks. In *NeurIPS*, 2018.
- [42] Juhong Min, Jongmin Lee, Jean Ponce, and Minsu Cho. Hyperpixel flow: Semantic correspondence with multi-layer neural features. In *ICCV*, 2019.

- [43] Juhong Min, Jongmin Lee, Jean Ponce, and Minsu Cho. Spair-71k: A large-scale benchmark for semantic correspondence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10543*, 2019.
- [44] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, 2016.
- [45] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *CVPR*, 2009.

Appendix

Proof of Proposition 1

We optimize the function with respect to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \quad & J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{1}_K = 1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \phi_\ell - \eta \sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell (\log \alpha_\ell - 1). \quad (2)$$

Because the entropic regularization is a strong convex function and its negative counterpart is a strong concave function, the maximization problem is a concave optimization problem.

We consider the following objective function with the Lagrange multiplier ϵ :

$$\tilde{J}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \phi_\ell - \eta \sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell (\log \alpha_\ell - 1) + \epsilon (\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{1}_K - 1)$$

Note that owing to the entropic regularization, the non-negative constraint is automatically satisfied.

Taking the derivative with respect to α_ℓ , we have

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{J}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}{\partial \alpha_\ell} = \phi_\ell - \eta \left(\log \alpha_\ell - 1 + \alpha_\ell \frac{1}{\alpha_\ell} \right) + \epsilon = 0.$$

Thus, the optimal α_ℓ has the form:

$$\alpha_\ell = \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \phi_\ell\right) \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon}{\eta}\right).$$

α_ℓ satisfies the sum to one constraint.

$$\exp\left(\frac{\epsilon}{\eta}\right) = \frac{1}{\sum_{\ell'=1}^L \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \phi_{\ell'}\right)}$$

Hence, the optimal α_ℓ is given by

$$\alpha_\ell = \frac{\exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \phi_\ell\right)}{\sum_{\ell'=1}^L \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \phi_{\ell'}\right)}.$$

Substituting in to Eq.(2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{\exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \phi_\ell\right)}{\sum_{\ell'=1}^L \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \phi_{\ell'}\right)} \phi_\ell - \eta \sum_{\ell=1}^L \frac{\exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \phi_\ell\right)}{\sum_{\ell'=1}^L \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \phi_{\ell'}\right)} \left(\log \left(\frac{\exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \phi_\ell\right)}{\sum_{\ell'=1}^L \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \phi_{\ell'}\right)} \right) - 1 \right) \\ &= \eta \log \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \exp\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \phi_\ell\right) \right) + \eta \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the final objective function is given by

$$J(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) = \eta \log \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \exp \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \phi_{\ell} \right) \right) + \eta$$

□

Proof of Proposition 2

Proof: For $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \exp(\langle \theta \boldsymbol{\Pi}_1 + (1-\theta) \boldsymbol{\Pi}_2, \mathbf{D}_{\ell} \rangle) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L \exp(\theta \langle \boldsymbol{\Pi}_1, \mathbf{D}_{\ell} \rangle + (1-\theta) \langle \boldsymbol{\Pi}_2, \mathbf{D}_{\ell} \rangle) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L \exp(\langle \boldsymbol{\Pi}_1, \mathbf{D}_{\ell} \rangle)^{\theta} \exp(\langle \boldsymbol{\Pi}_2, \mathbf{D}_{\ell} \rangle)^{1-\theta} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \exp(\langle \boldsymbol{\Pi}_1, \mathbf{D}_{\ell} \rangle) \right)^{\theta} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \exp(\langle \boldsymbol{\Pi}_2, \mathbf{D}_{\ell} \rangle) \right)^{1-\theta} \end{aligned}$$

Here, we use the Hölder's inequality with $p = 1/\theta$, $q = 1/(1-\theta)$, and $1/p + 1/q = 1$.

Applying logarithm on both sides of the equation, we have

$$\log \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \exp(\langle \theta \boldsymbol{\Pi}_1 + (1-\theta) \boldsymbol{\Pi}_2, \mathbf{D}_{\ell} \rangle) \right) \leq \theta \log \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \exp(\langle \boldsymbol{\Pi}_1, \mathbf{D}_{\ell} \rangle) \right) + (1-\theta) \log \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \exp(\langle \boldsymbol{\Pi}_2, \mathbf{D}_{\ell} \rangle) \right)$$

□

Proof of Proposition 3

For the distance function $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, we prove that

$$\text{FRWD}_p(\mu, \nu) = \left(\min_{\boldsymbol{\Pi} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \Sigma^L} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \pi_{ij} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_{\ell} d(\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{y}_j^{(\ell)})^p \right)^{1/p}$$

is a distance for $p \geq 1$.

It is clear that $\text{FRWD}_p(\mu, \nu)$ is symmetric and $\text{FRWD}_p(\mu, \mu) = 0$.

Triangle inequality

Let $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \delta_{\mathbf{x}_i}$, $\nu = \sum_{j=1}^m b_j \delta_{\mathbf{y}_j}$, $\gamma = \sum_{k=1}^u c_k \delta_{\mathbf{z}_k}$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \Sigma^L$, we prove that

$$\text{FRWD}_p(\mu, \gamma) \leq \text{FRWD}_p(\mu, \nu) + \text{FRWD}_p(\nu, \gamma)$$

To simplify the notations in this proof, we define \mathbf{D}_{ℓ} the distance "matrix" such that $[\mathbf{D}_{\ell}]_{ij} = d(\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{y}_j^{(\ell)})$ is the i th row and j th column element of the matrix \mathbf{D}_{ℓ} , $[\mathbf{D}_{\ell}]_{jk} = d(\mathbf{y}_j^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{z}_k^{(\ell)})$ and $[\mathbf{D}_{\ell}]_{ik} = d(\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{z}_k^{(\ell)})$. Moreover, note that \mathbf{D}_{ℓ}^p , the "matrix" where each element is the element of \mathbf{D}_{ℓ} raised to the power p .

Consider $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ the optimal transportation plan of $\text{FRWD}_p(\mu, \nu)$ and $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$ the optimal transportation plan of $\text{FRWD}_p(\nu, \gamma)$. Similarly to the proof for Wasserstein distance in [1], let $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{P} \text{diag}(1/\tilde{b}) \mathbf{Q}$. We can show that $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c})$.

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\min_{\mathbf{R} \in \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c})} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \langle \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{D}_\ell^p \rangle \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \langle \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{D}_\ell^p \rangle \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \sum_{ik} S_{ik} [\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{ik}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \sum_{ik} [\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{ik}^p \sum_j \frac{p_{ij} q_{jk}}{\tilde{b}_j} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \sum_{ijk} [\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{ik}^p \frac{p_{ij} q_{jk}}{\tilde{b}_j} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \sum_{ijk} ([\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{ij} + [\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{jk})^p \frac{p_{ij} q_{jk}}{\tilde{b}_j} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \end{aligned}$$

By letting $g_{ijk\ell} = [\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{ij} (\alpha_\ell p_{ij} q_{jk} / \tilde{b}_j)^{1/p}$ and $h_{ijk\ell} = [\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{jk} (\alpha_\ell p_{ij} q_{jk} / \tilde{b}_j)^{1/p}$, the right-hand side of this inequality can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \sum_{ijk} ([\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{ij} + [\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{jk})^p \frac{p_{ij} q_{jk}}{\tilde{b}_j} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &= \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{ijk} (g_{ijk\ell} + h_{ijk\ell})^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{ijk} g_{ijk\ell}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{ijk} h_{ijk\ell}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \sum_{ijk} [\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{ij}^p \frac{p_{ij} q_{jk}}{\tilde{b}_j} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \sum_{ijk} [\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{jk}^p \frac{p_{ij} q_{jk}}{\tilde{b}_j} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \end{aligned}$$

by the Minkovski inequality.

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\min_{\mathbf{R} \in \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c})} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \langle \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{D}_\ell^p \rangle \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \sum_{ij} [\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{ij}^p p_{ij} \sum_k \frac{q_{jk}}{\tilde{b}_j} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \sum_{ik} [\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{jk}^p q_{jk} \sum_j \frac{p_{ij}}{\tilde{b}_j} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \sum_{ij} [\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{ij}^p p_{ij} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \sum_{ik} [\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{jk}^p q_{jk} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \left(\max_{\alpha \in \Sigma^L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \sum_{ij} [\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{ij}^p p_{ij} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\max_{\alpha \in \Sigma^L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_\ell \sum_{ik} [\mathbf{D}_\ell]_{jk}^p q_{jk} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \text{FRWD}_p(\mu, \nu) + \text{FRWD}_p(\nu, \gamma) \end{aligned}$$

This inequality is valid for all α , therefore we have

$$\text{FRWD}_p(\mu, \nu) \leq \text{FRWD}_p(\mu, \nu) + \text{FRWD}_p(\nu, \gamma)$$

□

Min/Max formulation

We define the max-min formulation of the FROT as

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \Sigma^L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \alpha_{\ell} \min_{\Pi \in U(\mathbf{a}_{\ell}, \mathbf{b}_{\ell})} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \pi_{ij} c(\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}, \mathbf{y}_j^{(\ell)}),$$

where $\Sigma^L = \{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}_+^L : \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \mathbf{1}_L = 1\}$ is the probability simplex, the set of probability vectors in \mathbb{R}^L .

This problem can be solved by computing the group that maximizes the optimal transport distance $k^* = \operatorname{argmax}_k W_1(\mu^{(\ell)}, \nu^{(\ell)})$ and then by taking $\alpha^* = \delta_{k^*}$ as a one-hot vector.

The result of this formulation gives an intuitive idea (same as for the robust Wasserstein method). Hence, we maximize the group (instead of the subspace) that gives the optimal result. However, the formulation requires solving the OT problem L times. This approach may not be suitable if we have large L . Moreover, the argmax function is generally not differentiable.