

# Attention and Self-Attention in Random Forests

Lev V. Utkin and Andrei V. Konstantinov  
Peter the Great St.Petersburg Polytechnic University  
St.Petersburg, Russia  
e-mail: lev.utkin@gmail.com, andrue.konst@gmail.com

## Abstract

New models of random forests jointly using the attention and self-attention mechanisms are proposed for solving the regression problem. The models can be regarded as extensions of the attention-based random forest whose idea stems from applying a combination of the Nadaraya-Watson kernel regression and the Huber's contamination model to random forests. The self-attention aims to capture dependencies of the tree predictions and to remove noise or anomalous predictions in the random forest. The self-attention module is trained jointly with the attention module for computing weights. It is shown that the training process of attention weights is reduced to solving a single quadratic or linear optimization problem. Three modifications of the general approach are proposed and compared. A specific multi-head self-attention for the random forest is also considered. Heads of the self-attention are obtained by changing its tuning parameters including the kernel parameters and the contamination parameter of models. Numerical experiments with various datasets illustrate the proposed models and show that the supplement of the self-attention improves the model performance for many datasets.

Keywords: attention mechanism, random forest, Nadaraya-Watson regression, quadratic programming, linear programming, contamination model, regression

## 1 Introduction

The attention mechanism is an effective method for improving the performance of neural networks. It was proposed to enhance the natural language processing models, and later becomes one of the most effective methods for various machine learning tasks. A neural network with attention-based components can automatically distinguish the relative importance of features or examples by means of assigning the corresponding weights to them to get a higher classification or regression accuracy. The main idea behind the attention mechanism stems from the human perception property to concentrate on an important part of information and to ignore other information [1]. Due to the ability of the attention to significantly improve the neural network performance, a huge amount of attention-based models have been developed to be used in various applications and tasks [1, 2, 3, 4, 5].

In spite of success of many neural attention models in solving various application tasks, attention is a component of neural architectures [2]. This implies that the attention weights are learned by incorporating an additional feed forward neural network within the architectures. The corresponding models meet difficulties of neural networks, including, overfitting, many tuning parameters, requirements of a large amount of data, the black-box nature, expensive computations. Moreover, tabular learning data may be also an important problem encountered with neural networks. There are several deep learning models [6, 7, 8] illustrating efficiency on some tabular datasets. However, other experimental studies [9, 10] give opportunity to conclude that ensemble-based models using decision

trees as weak learners mainly outperform deep neural networks when they deal with heterogeneous tabular data.

Taking the above into account, Utkin and Konstantinov [11, 12] proposed a new model called the attention-based random forest (ABRF) by incorporating the attention mechanism into ensemble-based models such as random forests (RF) [13] and the gradient boosting machine [14, 15]. The original RF is a powerful model which consists of a large number of randomly built individual decision trees such that their predictions are combined, for example, by means of the simple averaging. Decision trees are built by the random selection of different subsamples of examples from training data and different subsamples of the feature space. The main idea behind the proposed ABRF models stems from the Nadaraya-Watson kernel regression model [16, 17], but attention weights used in the Nadaraya-Watson regression are assigned to decision trees in a specific way. The weights can be regarded as the attention weights because they are defined by using queries, keys and values concepts in terms of the attention mechanism. In contrast to weights of trees defined in [18, 19], weights in ABRF have trainable parameters and depend on how far an example, which falls into a leaf of a tree, is from examples which fall into the same leaf. The resulting prediction of ABRF is computed as a weighted sum of the tree predictions.

Three modifications of ABRF were studied in [11, 12]. The first modification called  $\epsilon$ -ABRF uses the Huber’s  $\epsilon$ -contamination model [20] for defining the attention weights. Each weight consists of two parts: the softmax operation with the tuning coefficient  $1 - \epsilon$  and the trainable bias of the softmax weight with coefficient  $\epsilon$ . An important advantage of  $\epsilon$ -ABRF is that attention weights of trees linearly depend on trainable parameters. This property leads to solving the standard quadratic optimization problem which is simply solved.  $\epsilon$ -ABRF avoids using the gradient-based algorithm to compute optimal trainable parameters. Other two ABRF modifications differ from  $\epsilon$ -ABRF by the additional trainable attention parameters incorporated into the softmax operation. These modifications require to apply the gradient-based algorithms to compute optimal attention parameters.

$\epsilon$ -ABRF has demonstrated outperforming results for many real datasets. However, an “unfortunate” selection of a subset of training examples for building a tree can lead to anomalous or incorrect predictions which bias the RF prediction. In order to overcome this disadvantage and following the idea behind  $\epsilon$ -ABRF, we propose to supplement this model by the self-attention mechanism [21] which aims to capture dependencies of the tree predictions and to remove noise or anomalous predictions in  $\epsilon$ -ABRF. The proposed model is called SAT-RF (self-attention-attention-based RF) The main peculiarity of the supplemented self-attention is that it is trained jointly with the attention mechanism, but not sequentially, i.e., we solve a single optimization problem for simultaneous computing trainable parameters of  $\epsilon$ -ABRF and the supplemented self-attention. As a result, both the mechanisms impact each other and can be regarded as a joint attention-based modification. The use of the Huber’s  $\epsilon$ -contamination model with parameter  $\epsilon$  different from  $\epsilon$ -ABRF for defining the self-attention leads to the quadratic or linear optimization problem with trainable parameters of  $\epsilon$ -ABRF and the supplemented self-attention as optimization variables. This is an important property of the proposed model. Moreover, we proposed a specific variant of the multi-head self-attention which allows us to combine knowledge of the self-attention via different representation of its tuning parameters. It is shown that the multi-head self-attention also leads to the quadratic or linear optimization problem for computing trainable parameters of all heads.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

1. A new attention-based RF model is proposed. According to the model, the trainable self-attention mechanism is incorporated into the attention-based RF as an additional component to capture dependencies of the tree predictions and to remove noise or anomalous predictions in  $\epsilon$ -ABRF. It is important that the self-attention and attention components are jointly trained

such that trainable parameters of the attention impact on parameters of the self-attention and vice versa.

2. Three modifications of the self-attention is studied. The first one (SAT-RF-y), is based on comparison of predictions provided by pairs of trees. The second modification (SAT-RF-x) takes into account only distances between mean feature vectors which are determined from all feature vectors which fall into the same leaves with the tested example in pairs of trees. The third modification (SAT-RF-yx) can be regarded as a combination of the first and the second modifications.
3. A specific multi-head self-attention for the RF is proposed. Heads are obtained by changing the tuning parameters of the self-attention. They are trained by solving a single quadratic optimization problem for computing the optimal attention and self-attention weights. It can be said that the whole model is trained “end-to-end” to some extent.
4. Various numerical experiments with real tabular datasets are provided to justify SAT-RF, to study its peculiarities and to compare it with original RFs. Moreover, we investigate two types of RFs: original RFs and Extremely Randomized Trees (ERT). At each node, the ERT algorithm chooses a split point randomly for each feature and then selects the best split among these [22].

The paper is organized as follows. Related work can be found in Section 2. A brief introduction to the attention and self-attention mechanisms is given in Section 3. A general approach to incorporating the attention and the self-attention into the RF is provided in Section 4. Analysis of the attention and self-attention representations by means of the Huber’s  $\epsilon$ -contamination model is given in Section 5. Some questions of applying the multi-head self-attention in the framework of the general approach is considered in Section 6. Numerical experiments with real data illustrating the efficiency of the proposed models for solving the regression problems are provided in Section 7. Concluding remarks can be found in Section 8.

## 2 Related work

**Attention mechanism.** Many attention-based models have been developed to improve the performance of classification and regression algorithms. Surveys of various attention-based models are available in [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 23].

It should be noted that one of the computational problems of attention mechanisms is training through the softmax function. In order to overcome this difficulty, several interesting approaches have been proposed. Choromanski et al. [24] introduced Performers as a Transformer architecture which can estimate softmax attention with provable accuracy using only linear space and time complexity. A linear unified nested attention mechanism that approximates softmax attention with two nested linear attention functions was proposed by Ma et al. [25]. A new class of random feature methods for linearizing softmax and Gaussian kernels called hybrid random features was introduced in [26]. The same problem is solved in [27] where the authors propose random feature attention, a linear time and space attention that uses random feature methods to approximate the softmax function. Schlag et al. [28] proposed a new kernel function to linearize attention which balances simplicity and effectiveness. A detailed survey of techniques of random features to speed up kernel methods was provided by Liu et al. [23].

**Self-attention.** The self-attention was proposed by Vaswani et al. [21] as an important component of a new neural network architecture known as Transformer. It is inspired by the previous

works presented by Cheng et al. [29], where self-attention is called intra-attention, by Parikh et al. [30]. The self-attention aims to capture token dependencies and to relate distinct positions in the input sequence. It has been used in many tasks, for example, sentence embedding [31], in machine translation and natural language processing [32, 33, 34], in speech recognition [35, 36, 37], in image recognition [38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46].

Many survey papers have been devoted to various aspects and applications of attention and self-attention mechanisms, for example, [2, 5, 40, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52].

We use self-attention to remove anomalies in the tree predictions. Similar approaches to image denoising were considered in [53, 54, 55, 56, 57].

It should be noted that the above methods are implemented as a part of a neural network, and they are not studied for application to other machine learning models, for example, to RFs.

**Weighted RFs.** Many models were developed and studied to incorporate weights of trees into RFs. They can be divided into two groups. Models from the first group are based on assigning weights to decision trees in accordance with some criteria to improve the classification and regression models [58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63]. For example, a model proposed in [64] uses weights of classes to deal with imbalanced datasets. However, the assigned weights in models from the first group are not trainable parameters. They can be viewed as tuning parameters. Attempts to train weights of trees were carried out in [18, 19, 65, 66], where weights are assigned by solving optimization problems, i.e., they are incorporated into a certain loss function of the whole RF such that the loss function is minimized over values of weights. Another approach was proposed in [12]. In contrast to the aforementioned models, this approach is based on using the attention mechanism and weights assigned to trees depend not only on trees, but on each example. These weights can be regarded as attention weights. Similar attention-based model for the gradient boosting machine was proposed in [11]

## 3 Preliminaries

### 3.1 Attention mechanism as the Nadaraya-Watson regression

The attention mechanism can be regarded as a tool by which a neural network can automatically distinguish the relative importance of features and weigh the features for enhancing the classification accuracy. It can be viewed as a learnable mask which emphasizes relevant information in a feature map. It is pointed out in [2, 67] that the original idea of attention can be understood from the statistical point of view applying the Nadaraya-Watson kernel regression model [16, 17].

Given  $n$  examples  $S = \{(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1), (\mathbf{x}_2, y_2), \dots, (\mathbf{x}_n, y_n)\}$ , in which  $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{im}) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  represents a feature vector involving  $m$  features and  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$  represents the regression outputs, the task of regression is to construct a regressor  $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which can predict the output value  $\tilde{y}$  of a new observation  $\mathbf{x}$ , using available data  $S$ . The similar task can be formulated for the classification problem.

The original idea behind the attention mechanism is to replace the simple average of outputs  $\tilde{y} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$  for estimating the regression output  $y$ , corresponding to a new input feature vector  $\mathbf{x}$  with the weighted average, in the form of the Nadaraya-Watson regression model [16, 17]:

$$\tilde{y} = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) y_i, \quad (1)$$

where weight  $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)$  conforms with relevance of the  $i$ -th example to the vector  $\mathbf{x}$ .

According to the Nadaraya-Watson regression model, to estimate the output  $y$  for an input variable  $\mathbf{x}$ , training outputs  $y_i$  given from a dataset weigh in agreement with the corresponding input  $\mathbf{x}_i$  locations relative to the input variable  $\mathbf{x}$ . The closer an input  $\mathbf{x}_i$  to the given variable  $\mathbf{x}$ , the greater the weight assigned to the output corresponding to  $\mathbf{x}_i$ .

One of the original forms of weights is defined by a kernel  $K$  (the Nadaraya-Watson kernel regression [16, 17]), which can be regarded as a scoring function estimating how vector  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is close to vector  $\mathbf{x}$ . The weight is written as follows:

$$\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^n K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_j)}. \quad (2)$$

In particular, If to use the Gaussian kernel, then weights are of the form:

$$\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) = \text{softmax} \left( -\frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i\|^2}{2\tau} \right), \quad (3)$$

where  $\tau$  is the tuning parameter.

In terms of the attention mechanism [68], vector  $\mathbf{x}$ , vectors  $\mathbf{x}_i$  and outputs  $y_i$  are called as the *query*, *keys* and *values*, respectively. Weight  $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)$  is called as the attention weight.

Generally, weights  $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i)$  can be extended by incorporating trainable parameters.

Several definitions of attention weights and attention mechanisms have been proposed. The most popular definitions are the additive attention [68], the multiplicative or dot-product attention [69, 21].

### 3.2 Self-attention mechanism as the non-local means denoising

One of the interesting interpretations of the self-attention mechanism is the non-local means denoising [55], which aims to remove noise in an image by computing average intensity of each pixel from a set of neighboring pixels. This idea again stems from the Nadaraya-Watson regression under condition that the query is a key, and each key coincides with the corresponding value.

According to [55], intensity of a pixel with coordinates  $\mathbf{x}$  by using the non-local means denoising is determined as follows:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = y^* = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta(y, y_i) y_i, \quad (4)$$

where weight  $\beta(y, y_i)$  is determined as

$$\beta(y, y_i) = \frac{K(y, y_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^n K(y, y_j)}. \quad (5)$$

If to use the Gaussian kernel, then weights are of the form:

$$\beta(y, y_i) = \text{softmax} \left( -\frac{(y - y_i)^2}{2\kappa} \right), \quad (6)$$

where  $\kappa$  is the tuning or training parameter.

SAT-RF with the above definition of the softmax operation is called SAT-RF-y. Generally, the query  $f(\mathbf{x})$  and values  $y_i$  can be vectors. Moreover, the values can be taken in another form. Variants of the forms are considered below.

## 4 Self-attention-based random forest

The regression problem is to construct a regression function  $f$  such that  $y_i = f(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta) + \xi$ , where  $\xi$  is the random noise with expectation 0 and a finite variance;  $\theta$  is a set of trainable parameter;  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$  is the  $i$ -th example from the training set  $S$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . In a simple case,  $f(\mathbf{x}, \theta)$  minimizes the expected error, for example,  $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - f(\mathbf{x}_i, \theta))^2$  over  $\theta$ .

One of the powerful machine learning models handling with tabular data is the RF which can be regarded as an ensemble of  $T$  decision trees such that each tree is trained on a subset of examples randomly selected from the training set. In the original RF, the final RF prediction  $\tilde{y}$  for a testing example  $\mathbf{x}$  is determined by averaging predictions  $\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_T$  obtained for all trees.

Denote an index set of examples which fall into the  $i$ -th leaf in the  $k$ -th tree as  $\mathcal{J}_i^{(k)}$  such that  $\mathcal{J}_i^{(k)} \cap \mathcal{J}_j^{(k)} = \emptyset$  because the same example cannot fall into different leaves of the same tree. Let us consider an example  $\mathbf{x}$  which falls into  $i$ -th leaf in the  $k$ -th tree. Then we can introduce the mean vector  $\mathbf{A}_k(\mathbf{x})$  defined as the mean of training vectors  $\mathbf{x}_j$  which fall into the  $i$ -th leaf of the  $k$ -th tree, i.e., into the leaf where vector  $\mathbf{x}$  fell into. In the same way, we introduce the mean target value  $B_k(\mathbf{x})$  defined as the mean of  $y_j$  such that  $j \in \mathcal{J}_i^{(k)}$ . In fact, value  $B_k(\mathbf{x})$  in regression coincides with the prediction of the  $k$ -th tree. Formally, we write

$$\mathbf{A}_k(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{J}_i^{(k)}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_i^{(k)}} \mathbf{x}_j, \quad (7)$$

$$B_k(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{J}_i^{(k)}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_i^{(k)}} y_j. \quad (8)$$

By returning to the Nadaraya-Watson regression and notation of the attention mechanism framework, the set of  $\mathbf{A}_k(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, T$ , can be regarded as a set of keys for every  $\mathbf{x}$ , the set of  $B_k(\mathbf{x})$  can be regarded as a set of values. This implies that the final prediction  $\tilde{y}$  of the RF can be computed by using the Nadaraya-Watson regression, namely,

$$\tilde{y} = f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) = \sum_{k=1}^T \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{A}_k(\mathbf{x}), w_k) \cdot B_k(\mathbf{x}). \quad (9)$$

Here  $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{A}_k(\mathbf{x}), w_k)$  is the attention weight with vector  $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_T)$  of trainable parameters assigned to the  $k$ -th tree. One can see that the set of parameters  $\theta$  is replaced with  $\mathbf{w}$ . If  $\alpha$  is the normalized kernel, then it is defined through the distance between  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{A}_k(\mathbf{x})$ , which is defined, for instance, by means of  $L_2$ -norm  $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{A}_k(\mathbf{x})\|^2$ . It is assumed that

$$\sum_{k=1}^T \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{A}_k(\mathbf{x}), w_k) = 1, \quad (10)$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^T w_k = 1. \quad (11)$$

Condition (10) is due to properties of the attention weights in the Nadaraya-Watson regression. Condition (11) is explained below when the Huber's  $\epsilon$ -contamination model will be considered for representing the attention weights.

The above approach to incorporating the attention mechanism into the RF has been proposed in [11, 12]. Our aim now is to supplement it with the self-attention.

We suppose that there may be anomalies among values  $B_k(\mathbf{x})$  or  $\tilde{y}_k$ . In order to cope with the anomalies, we apply the self-attention mechanism which corrects every  $\tilde{y}_k$ . According to the self-attention, each  $\tilde{y}_i$  can be recalculated as follows:

$$y_j^* = \sum_{i=1}^T \beta(\tilde{y}_j, \tilde{y}_i, v_i) \cdot \tilde{y}_i. \quad (12)$$

Here  $\beta(\tilde{y}_i, \tilde{y}_k, v_k)$  is the self-attention weight with vector  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_T)$  of trainable parameters assigned to the  $k$ -th tree such that  $\sum_{k=1}^T v_k = 1$ .

The main idea behind the approach is to use the attention and self-attention simultaneously. Let us substitute (12) into (9) under condition  $B_k(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{y}_k$  as

$$\tilde{y} = f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^T \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{A}_i(\mathbf{x}), w_i) \cdot \beta(\tilde{y}_i, \tilde{y}_k, v_k) \cdot \tilde{y}_k. \quad (13)$$

We get the trainable attention-based RF with parameters  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$ , which are defined by minimizing the expected loss function over set  $\mathcal{W}$  and set  $\mathcal{V}$  of parameters, respectively, as follows:

$$(\mathbf{w}_{opt}, \mathbf{v}_{opt}) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{s=1}^n L(\tilde{y}_s, y_s, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}). \quad (14)$$

The loss function can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s=1}^n L(\tilde{y}_s, y_s, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^n \left( y_s - \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^T \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{A}_i(\mathbf{x}), w_i) \cdot \beta(\tilde{y}_i, \tilde{y}_k, v_k) \cdot \tilde{y}_k \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Optimal trainable parameters  $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}$  are computed depending on forms of attention weights  $\alpha$  and self-attention weights  $\beta$ . Moreover, the computation time for solving the optimization problem (15) also significantly depends on the weights. Therefore, we propose the form which leads to convex quadratic optimization problem.

It can be seen from the above that every value  $y$  is transformed to  $y^*$  in accordance with the difference between  $y$  and other values  $y_i$ . However, the above non-local means denoising does not take into account the distance between the vectors  $A_i(\mathbf{x})$  and  $A_j(\mathbf{x})$ . In other words, it is interesting to take into account how the mean feature vector of all feature vectors which fall into the same leaves with  $\mathbf{x}$  of the  $i$ -th and the  $j$ -th trees, respectively. Hence, we can write the self-attention weight as

$$\beta(A_i, A_j) = \text{softmax} \left( -\frac{\|A_i(\mathbf{x}) - A_j(\mathbf{x})\|^2}{2\kappa} \right), \quad (16)$$

SAT-RF with the above definition of the softmax operation is called SAT-RF-x.

By intuition, if  $A_i(\mathbf{x})$  and  $A_j(\mathbf{x})$  are close to each other, then we can expect that the difference between values  $y_i$  and  $y_j$  is small. If it is large, then the weight of  $y_i$  should be larger than in the

case when the difference between values  $y_i$  and  $y_j$  is small. On the contrary, if  $A_i(\mathbf{x})$  and  $A_j(\mathbf{x})$  are far from each other, then the impact of value  $y_j$  is reduced and the corresponding weight should be decreased even if the difference between values  $y_i$  and  $y_j$  is small. The above reasoning leads to applying the following self-attention weights:

$$\beta(y_i, y_j) = \text{softmax} \left( -\frac{(y_i - y_j)^2}{2\kappa \|A_i(\mathbf{x}) - A_j(\mathbf{x})\|^2} \right), \quad (17)$$

SAT-RF with the above definition of the softmax operation is called SAT-RF-yx.

It should be pointed out that the modifications of SAT-RF do not impact on the general approach, and they define only the softmax operations. Therefore, all expressions will be given using the first modifications, but results of numerical experiments will be considered for every modification.

## 5 Self-attention and the Huber's contamination model

To simplify computations and to get a unique solution for  $\mathbf{w}$ , we propose to use the well-known Huber's  $\epsilon$ -contamination model [20] which can be represented as follows:

$$(1 - \epsilon) \cdot P + \epsilon \cdot Q, \quad (18)$$

where the probability distribution  $P$  is contaminated by some arbitrary distribution  $Q$ ; the rate  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$  is a model parameter which control the size of the solution set.

The use of the  $\epsilon$ -contamination model stems from several reasons. First of all, the softmax function can be interpreted as the probability distribution  $P$  in (18) because its sum is 1. It can be represented as a point in the probabilistic unit simplex having  $T$  vertices. Second, weights  $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{A}_i(\mathbf{x}), w_i)$  also can be interpreted as a probability distribution or another point in the same unit simplex. This point is biased by means of the probability distribution  $Q$  in (18) which is trained in order to achieve the best prediction results. The contamination parameter  $\epsilon$  can be regarded as a tuning parameter of the model. It should be noted that  $\epsilon$  can be viewed as the trainable parameter. However, this case leads to a more complex optimization problem. After substituting elements of  $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{A}_i(\mathbf{x}), w_i)$  into (18), we get

$$\alpha(\mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{A}_i(\mathbf{x}), w_i) = (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \text{softmax} \left( \|\mathbf{x}_s - \mathbf{A}_i(\mathbf{x}_s)\|^2 / \tau \right) + \epsilon \cdot w_i. \quad (19)$$

Let us define the self-attention weights  $\beta(\tilde{y}_i, \tilde{y}_k, v_k)$  in the same way using the Huber's  $\gamma$ -contamination model. In this case, we can write the similar expression:

$$\beta(\tilde{y}_i, \tilde{y}_k, v_k) = (1 - \gamma) \cdot \text{softmax} \left( (\tilde{y}_i - \tilde{y}_k)^2 / \kappa \right) + \gamma \cdot v_k. \quad (20)$$

Here  $\gamma$  is the same parameter of the contamination model as  $\epsilon$ .

After substituting (19) and (20) into (13), we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^T (D_{si} + \epsilon w_i) \cdot (C_{ik} + \gamma v_k) \cdot \tilde{y}_k, \quad (21)$$

where

$$D_{sk} = (1 - \epsilon) \cdot \text{softmax} \left( \|\mathbf{x}_s - \mathbf{A}_i(\mathbf{x}_s)\|^2 / \tau \right), \quad (22)$$



$$C_{ik} = (1 - \gamma) \cdot \text{softmax} \left( (\tilde{y}_i - \tilde{y}_k)^2 / \kappa \right). \quad (23)$$

Expression (21) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^T \tilde{y}_k (D_{si} C_{ik} + C_{ik} \epsilon w_i + D_{si} \gamma v_k + \epsilon \gamma w_i v_k) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^T \tilde{y}_k D_{si} C_{ik} + \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^T \tilde{y}_k C_{ik} w_i + \gamma \sum_{i=1}^T D_{si} \sum_{k=1}^T \tilde{y}_k v_k + \epsilon \gamma \sum_{k=1}^T \tilde{y}_k v_k \\ &= R_s + \sum_{i=1}^T H_i w_i + \sum_{k=1}^T G_{sk} v_k. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where

$$R_s = \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^T \tilde{y}_k D_{si} C_{ik}, \quad G_{sk} = \gamma \left( \sum_{i=1}^T D_{si} + \epsilon \right) \tilde{y}_k, \quad H_i = \epsilon \sum_{k=1}^T \tilde{y}_k C_{ik}. \quad (25)$$

Notations  $D_{sk}$ ,  $C_{ik}$ ,  $R_s$ ,  $G_{sk}$ ,  $H_i$  do not depend on  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  and are introduced for short. It follows from (24) that the optimization problem (15) is represented as

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}} \sum_{s=1}^n L(\tilde{y}_s, y_s, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^n \left( y_s - R_s - \sum_{i=1}^T H_i w_i - \sum_{k=1}^T G_{sk} v_k \right)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

subject to  $w_k \geq 0$ ,  $v_k \geq 0$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, T$ , and  $\sum_{k=1}^T w_k = 1$ ,  $\sum_{k=1}^T v_k = 1$ .

One of the advantages of the proposed SAT-RF is that it is simple from the computational point of view because problem (26) is the standard quadratic programming problem which can be simply solved. Moreover, it has a unique solution.

The optimal trainable parameters  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  can be also computed by solving the linear optimization problem if to use the  $L_1$ -norm for defining the loss function  $L(\tilde{y}_s, y_s, \mathbf{w})$ . In this case, we replace (26) with the following objective function:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}} \sum_{s=1}^n L(\tilde{y}_s, y_s, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^n \left| y_s - R_s - \sum_{i=1}^T H_i w_i - \sum_{k=1}^T G_{sk} v_k \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Denote

$$Q_s = y_s - R_s - \sum_{i=1}^T H_i w_i - \sum_{k=1}^T G_{sk} v_k. \quad (28)$$

Then we can write the following linear optimization problem with variables  $Q_1, \dots, Q_T$ ,  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$ :

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}} \sum_{s=1}^n Q_s, \quad (29)$$

subject to  $w_k \geq 0$ ,  $v_k \geq 0$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, T$ , and  $\sum_{k=1}^T w_k = 1$ ,  $\sum_{k=1}^T v_k = 1$ , and

$$Q_s + \sum_{i=1}^T H_i w_i + \sum_{k=1}^T G_{sk} v_k \geq y_s - R_s, \quad s = 1, \dots, n, \quad (30)$$

$$Q_s - \sum_{i=1}^T H_i w_i - \sum_{k=1}^T G_{sk} v_k \geq -y_s + R_s, \quad s = 1, \dots, n. \quad (31)$$

The above linear optimization problem has  $3T$  variables and  $2T + 3n + 2$  constraints.

## 6 Multi-head self-attention

One of the possible extensions of the self-attention mechanism is the multi-head self-attention which is widely used to combine knowledge of the self-attention via different representation of its tuning parameters. It turns out that the multi-head self-attention can be incorporated into the attention-based RF such that its trainable parameters are computed jointly with parameters of the attention-based RF by solving a single quadratic optimization problem.

Let us return to (13) and rewrite the expression for estimating  $\tilde{y}$  as follows:

$$\tilde{y} = \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{k(1)=1}^T \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{A}_i(\mathbf{x}), w_i) \cdot \beta_1(\tilde{y}_i, \tilde{y}_{k(1)}, v_{k(1)}^{(1)}) \cdot \tilde{y}_{k(1)}, \quad (32)$$

where  $\mathbf{v}^{(1)} = (v_1^{(1)}, \dots, v_T^{(1)})$  is the vector of trainable variable of the first self-attention;  $k(1)$  is the index corresponding to the first self-attention.

Note that  $\tilde{y}_{k(1)}$  as the value in terms of the attention mechanism can be represented by means of the self-attention (12). Hence, (32) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{y} &= \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{k(1)=1}^T \sum_{k(2)=1}^T \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{A}_i(\mathbf{x}), w_i) \cdot \beta_1(\tilde{y}_i, \tilde{y}_{k(1)}, v_{k(1)}^{(1)}) \\ &\quad \times \beta_2(\tilde{y}_i, \tilde{y}_{k(2)}, v_{k(2)}^{(2)}) \cdot \tilde{y}_{k(2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where  $\mathbf{v}^{(2)} = (v_1^{(2)}, \dots, v_T^{(2)})$  is the vector of trainable variable of the second self-attention.

In the same way, we can continue writing self-attention operations and get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{y} &= \sum_{i=1}^T \sum_{k(1)=1}^T \sum_{k(2)=1}^T \cdots \sum_{k(t)=1}^T \alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{A}_i(\mathbf{x}), w_i) \cdot \beta_1(\tilde{y}_i, \tilde{y}_{k(1)}, v_{k(1)}^{(1)}) \\ &\quad \times \beta_2(\tilde{y}_{k(1)}, \tilde{y}_{k(2)}, v_{k(2)}^{(2)}) \cdots \beta_t(\tilde{y}_{k(t-1)}, \tilde{y}_{k(t)}, v_{k(t)}^{(t)}) \cdot \tilde{y}_{k(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

In sum, we get a regression with  $t$  self-attention operations having  $t$  self-attention weights  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_t$  with  $t$  vectors of trainable parameters  $\mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{v}^{(t)}$  and the parameters  $\mathbf{w}$  of the attention.

Let us consider the case when the  $j$ -th self-attention weight  $\beta_j(\tilde{y}_{k(j-1)}, \tilde{y}_{k(j)}, v_{k(j)}^{(j)})$  is represented by the Huber's  $\gamma_j$ -contamination model as

$$\beta_j(\tilde{y}_{k(j-1)}, \tilde{y}_{k(j)}, v_{k(j)}^{(j)}) = (1 - \gamma_j) \cdot \text{softmax}\left(\frac{(\tilde{y}_{k(j-1)} - \tilde{y}_{k(j)})^2}{\kappa_j}\right) + \gamma_j \cdot v_{k(j)}^{(j)}. \quad (35)$$

Here  $\gamma_j$  and  $\kappa_j$  are tuning parameters of the  $j$ -th contamination model. If parameters  $\gamma_j$  and  $\kappa_j$  are differently defined for different  $j = 1, \dots, t$ , then the obtained scheme can be regarded as an analogue of the original multi-head self-attention. The random choice of values of  $\gamma_j$  and  $\kappa_j$  is similar to the random choice of initial weights in the neural network implementation of the multi-head self-attention.

**Proposition 1** *If the self-attention weights  $\alpha(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{A}_i(\mathbf{x}), w_i)$  and  $\beta_j(\tilde{y}_{k(j-1)}, \tilde{y}_{k(j)}, v_{k(j)}^{(j)})$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, t$ , are defined by (19) and (35), then  $\tilde{y}$  in (34) is a linear function of parameters  $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{v}^{(t)}$ .*

**Proof.** Introduce the following notations for short:

$$C_{k(j)} = (1 - \gamma_j) \cdot \text{softmax} \left( (\tilde{y}_{k(j-1)} - \tilde{y}_{k(j)})^2 / \kappa_j \right). \quad (36)$$

Then we write

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{y} &= \sum_{i=1}^T (D_{si} + \epsilon w_i) \sum_{k(1)=1}^T \left( C_{k(1)} + \gamma_1 v_{k(1)}^{(1)} \right) \\ &\cdots \sum_{k(t-1)=1}^T \left( C_{k(t-1)} + \gamma_{t-1} v_{k(t-1)}^{(t-1)} \right) \sum_{k(t)=1}^T \left( C_{k(t)} + \gamma_t v_{k(t)}^{(t)} \right) \tilde{y}_{k(t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Let us consider  $\beta_{t-1}$  and  $\beta_t$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k(t-1)=1}^T \left( C_{k(t-1)} + \gamma_{t-1} v_{k(t-1)}^{(t-1)} \right) \sum_{k(t)=1}^T \left( C_{k(t)} + \gamma_t v_{k(t)}^{(t)} \right) \tilde{y}_{k(t)} \\ &= \sum_{k(t-1)=1}^T \sum_{k(t)=1}^T \left( C_{k(t-1)} + \gamma_{t-1} v_{k(t-1)}^{(t-1)} \right) \left( C_{k(t)} + \gamma_t v_{k(t)}^{(t)} \right) \tilde{y}_{k(t)} \\ &= \sum_{k(t)=1}^T \left( \sum_{k(t-1)=1}^T C_{k(t-1)} C_{k(t)} + \gamma_{t-1} \sum_{k(t-1)=1}^T C_{k(t)} v_{k(t-1)}^{(t-1)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \gamma_t v_{k(t)}^{(t)} \sum_{k(t-1)=1}^T C_{k(t-1)} + \gamma_{t-1} \gamma_t v_{k(t)}^{(t)} \sum_{k(t-1)=1}^T v_{k(t-1)}^{(t-1)} \right) \tilde{y}_{k(t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

It should be noted that  $\sum_{k(t-1)=1}^T v_{k(t-1)}^{(t-1)} = 1$ . This implies that the product of  $\beta_{t-1}$  and  $\beta_t$  linearly depends on  $v_{k(t-1)}^{(t-1)}$  and  $v_{k(t)}^{(t)}$ . Let us rewrite the obtained product as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k(t-1)=1}^T \left( \sum_{k(t)=1}^T \tilde{y}_{k(t)} C_{k(t-1)} C_{k(t)} + \gamma_{t-1} \sum_{k(t)=1}^T \tilde{y}_{k(t)} C_{k(t)} v_{k(t-1)}^{(t-1)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \gamma_t \sum_{k(t)=1}^T \tilde{y}_{k(t)} v_{k(t)}^{(t)} C_{k(t-1)} + \gamma_{t-1} \gamma_t \sum_{k(t)=1}^T \tilde{y}_{k(t)} v_{k(t)}^{(t)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

$$= \sum_{k(t-1)=1}^T \left( G_{k(t)} + r_{k(t-1)}^{(t-1)} \right). \quad (40)$$

where

$$G_{k(t)} = \sum_{k(t)=1}^T \tilde{y}_{k(t)} C_{k(t-1)} C_{k(t)}, \quad (41)$$

is a constant, and

$$\begin{aligned} r_{k(t-1)}^{(t-1)} &= v_{k(t-1)}^{(t-1)} \gamma_{t-1} \sum_{k(t)=1}^T \tilde{y}_{k(t)} C_{k(t)} \\ &+ \gamma_t \sum_{k(t)=1}^T \tilde{y}_{k(t)} v_{k(t)}^{(t)} C_{k(t-1)} + \gamma_{t-1} \gamma_t \sum_{k(t)=1}^T \tilde{y}_{k(t)} v_{k(t)}^{(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

is a new variable instead of  $v_{k(t-1)}^{(t-1)}$  and  $v_{k(t)}^{(t)}$ .

In the same way, we can consider all other multipliers in (37) starting from pair  $\beta_{t-2}$  and  $\beta_{t-1}$ , as was to be proved. ■

The linearity of  $\tilde{y}$  as the function of variables  $\mathbf{w}$ ,  $\mathbf{v}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{v}^{(t)}$  implies that the optimization problem for training these variables can be reduced to the quadratic or linear optimization problems like (26) or (29). However, writing the optimization problem by  $t > 2$  is a hard problem. Therefore, the multi-head self-attention was given to show the fundamental possibility of generalizing the self-attention-based RF. An approach for efficient representation of the multi-head attention can be regarded as a separate problem whose solution is a direction for further research.

## 7 Numerical experiments

In order to study the proposed approach for solving regression problems, we apply datasets which are taken from open sources: the dataset Diabetes is available in the corresponding R Packages; datasets Friedman 1, 2 3 can be found at site: <https://www.stat.berkeley.edu/~breiman/bagging.pdf>; Regression and Sparse datasets are available in package ‘‘Scikit-Learn’’. The proposed algorithm is evaluated and investigated also by the following publicly available datasets from the UCI Machine Learning Repository [70]: Wine Red, Boston Housing, Concrete, Yacht Hydrodynamics, Airfoil. A brief introduction about these data sets are given in Table 1 where  $m$  and  $n$  are numbers of features and examples, respectively. A more detailed information can be found from the aforementioned data resources.

The coefficient of determination denoted  $R^2$  and the mean absolute error (MAE) are used for the regression evaluation. The greater the value of the coefficient of determination and the smaller the MAE, the better results we get. In all tables, we compare  $R^2$  and the MAE for three cases:

1. **RF**, **ERT**: the original RF or the ERT without the softmax and without attention model;
2. **Softmax** model: the RF or the ERT with softmax operations without trainable parameters, i.e., weights of trees are determined under conditions  $\epsilon = 0$  and  $\gamma = 0$ .
3. **SAT-RF-y**, **SAT-RF-x**, **SAT-RF-yx**: the corresponding modifications of the SAT-RF models.

The best results in all tables are shown in bold. Moreover, the optimal values of the contamination parameters  $\epsilon_{opt}$  and  $\gamma_{opt}$  are provided. The case  $\epsilon_{opt} = 1$  means that weights of trees are totally determined by the tree results and do not depend on each example. This case coincides with the

Table 1: A brief introduction about the regression data sets

Data set	Abbreviation	$m$	$n$
Diabetes	Diabetes	10	442
Friedman 1	Friedman 1	10	100
Friedman 2	Friedman 2	4	100
Friedman 3	Friedman 3	4	100
Scikit-Learn Regression	Regression	100	100
Scikit-Learn Sparse Uncorrelated	Sparse	10	100
UCI Wine red	Wine	11	1599
UCI Boston Housing	Boston	13	506
UCI Concrete	Concrete	8	1030
UCI Yacht Hydrodynamics	Yacht	6	308
UCI Airfoil	Airfoil	5	1503

weighted RF proposed in [65]. The case  $\epsilon_{opt} = 0$  means that weights of trees are determined only by the softmax function (with or without trainable parameters). Cases  $\gamma_{opt} = 1$  and  $\gamma_{opt} = 0$  have the same sense.

Decision trees in numerical experiments are trained such that at least 10 examples fall into every leaf of trees. This condition is used to get desirable estimates of vectors  $\mathbf{A}_k(\mathbf{x}_s)$ .

Every RF or ERT consists of 100 decision trees. In order to optimize the model parameters  $\epsilon$  and  $\tau$  in numerical experiments, we perform a 3-fold cross-validation on the training set which consists of  $n_{tr} = 4n/5$  instances. The cross-validation is performed with 100 repetitions. This procedure is realized by considering all possible values of  $\epsilon$  and  $\tau$  in a predefined grid. The testing set consisting of  $n_{test} = n/5$  instances is used for computing the accuracy measures of the whole model.

First, we consider SAT-RF-y. It has four tuning parameters  $\epsilon$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\kappa$  and  $\tau$ , which may significantly impact on predictions. Therefore, the best predictions are calculated at a predefined grid of the parameters  $\epsilon$ ,  $\gamma$ , and a cross-validation procedure is subsequently used to select an appropriate values of  $\epsilon$  and  $\gamma$ . Moreover, parameters  $\kappa$  and  $\tau$  are taken equal to 1. If SAT-RF-y provides outperforming results with fixed  $\kappa$  and  $\tau$ , then optimal choice of these parameters will improve the model.

Measures  $R^2$  and MAE for three models (RF, Softmax and SAT-RF-y) are shown in Table 2. The results are obtained by training the RF and the parameter vectors  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  on the regression datasets. It can be seen from Table 2 that SAT-RF-y outperforms the RF and the Softmax models almost for all datasets. The same results are shown in Table 3 under condition that the RF in experiments is replaced with the ERT. One can again see from Table 3 that SAT-RF-y outperforms the ERT and the Softmax models for most datasets. Optimal values of tuning parameters  $\epsilon$  and  $\gamma$  are also shown in Tables 2 and 3. It is also interesting to point out that SAT-RF-y and Softmax using the RF provide the same measures  $R^2$  or MAE for datasets Diabetes and Sparse. Indeed, it can be seen from Table 2 that  $\epsilon_{opt} = \gamma_{opt} = 0$ . This implies that only softmax operations without trainable parameters define the attention weights. It can be seen from Table 3 that this case does not take place for SAT-RF-y using ERT.

The next modification for studying is SAT-RF-x, The corresponding results of numerical experiments under the same condition as experiments with SAT-RF-y are shown in Tables 4-5. However, if to compare these results with results given in Tables 2-3, then they are mainly inferior to SAT-RF-y and comparable to this modification when the RF is used. The same can be seen from Table 8 where SAT-RF-x is compared with SAT-RF-y and SAT-RF-yx. The results can be explained as follows.

Table 2: Measures  $R^2$  and MAE for comparison of models (the RF, the Softmax model, SAT-RF-y) trained on regression datasets

Data set	$\epsilon_{opt}$	$\gamma_{opt}$	$R^2$			MAE		
			RF	Softmax	SAT-RF-y	RF	Softmax	SAT-RF-y
Diabetes	0	0	0.416	<b>0.424</b>	<b>0.424</b>	44.92	<b>44.66</b>	<b>44.66</b>
Friedman 1	0	1	0.459	0.438	<b>0.470</b>	<b>2.540</b>	2.589	<b>2.540</b>
Friedman 2	0.5	0	0.841	0.849	<b>0.878</b>	111.7	109.5	<b>100.9</b>
Friedman 3	0	1	0.625	0.625	<b>0.682</b>	0.155	0.156	<b>0.133</b>
Regression	0.5	0.25	0.380	0.367	<b>0.454</b>	109.1	110.2	<b>100.5</b>
Sparse	0	0	0.470	<b>0.522</b>	<b>0.522</b>	1.908	<b>1.802</b>	<b>1.802</b>
Airfoil	1	0.75	0.823	0.820	<b>0.843</b>	2.203	2.231	<b>2.069</b>
Boston	0	0.5	0.814	0.818	<b>0.823</b>	2.539	2.508	<b>2.494</b>
Concrete	0	1	0.845	0.841	<b>0.857</b>	4.855	4.948	<b>4.694</b>
Wine	0.25	0.25	<b>0.433</b>	0.423	0.424	<b>0.451</b>	0.460	0.459
Yacht	1	0.5	0.981	0.981	<b>0.989</b>	1.004	1.006	<b>0.787</b>

Table 3: Measures  $R^2$  and MAE for comparison of models (the ERT, the Softmax model, SAT-RF-y) trained on regression datasets

Data set	$\epsilon_{opt}$	$\gamma_{opt}$	$R^2$			MAE		
			ERT	Softmax	SAT-RF-y	ERT	Softmax	SAT-RF-y
Diabetes	0.75	0	0.456	<b>0.458</b>	0.453	44.50	<b>44.38</b>	44.51
Friedman 1	1	0.75	0.471	0.471	<b>0.521</b>	2.502	2.502	<b>2.414</b>
Friedman 2	1	0.25	0.813	0.813	<b>0.939</b>	123.03	122.66	<b>73.77</b>
Friedman 3	0	1	0.570	0.570	<b>0.739</b>	0.179	0.179	<b>0.138</b>
Regression	1	0	0.402	0.403	<b>0.455</b>	106.3	106.2	<b>101.8</b>
Sparse	0	0.25	0.452	0.514	<b>0.531</b>	1.994	1.870	<b>1.830</b>
Airfoil	1	0.75	0.802	0.802	<b>0.837</b>	2.370	2.370	<b>2.127</b>
Boston	0.5	0.75	0.831	0.833	<b>0.837</b>	2.481	2.467	<b>2.453</b>
Concrete	0	1	0.851	0.851	<b>0.869</b>	4.892	4.892	<b>4.650</b>
Wine	1	0.25	0.418	0.418	<b>0.419</b>	0.464	<b>0.463</b>	<b>0.463</b>
Yacht	0	1	<b>0.988</b>	<b>0.988</b>	<b>0.988</b>	0.824	0.824	<b>0.818</b>

Table 4: Measures  $R^2$  and MAE for comparison of models (the RF, the Softmax model, SAT-RF-x) trained on regression datasets

Data set	$\epsilon_{opt}$	$\gamma_{opt}$	$R^2$			MAE		
			RF	Softmax	SAT-RF-x	RF	Softmax	SAT-RF-x
Diabetes	0	0	0.405	<b>0.416</b>	<b>0.416</b>	44.92	<b>44.87</b>	<b>44.87</b>
Friedman 1	0	1	0.459	0.438	<b>0.470</b>	2.540	2.589	<b>2.540</b>
Friedman 2	1	1	0.841	0.834	<b>0.872</b>	111.7	114.5	<b>103.7</b>
Friedman 3	0.5	0.5	0.625	0.623	<b>0.684</b>	0.154	0.156	<b>0.134</b>
Regression	0.75	0	0.380	0.374	<b>0.451</b>	109.1	110.0	<b>100.4</b>
Sparse	0	0	0.470	<b>0.488</b>	<b>0.488</b>	1.908	<b>1.860</b>	<b>1.860</b>
Airfoil	0.25	1	0.823	0.820	<b>0.843</b>	2.203	2.231	<b>2.070</b>
Boston	0.25	0.5	0.814	0.814	<b>0.821</b>	2.539	2.539	<b>2.518</b>
Concrete	0	1	0.845	0.841	<b>0.857</b>	4.855	4.948	<b>4.694</b>
Wine	0	0.75	0.433	0.421	<b>0.422</b>	0.451	0.461	<b>0.459</b>
Yacht	0	1	0.981	0.981	<b>0.989</b>	1.004	1.004	<b>0.787</b>

A large distance between  $A_i(\mathbf{x})$  and  $A_j(\mathbf{x})$  mainly says about a large difference between subsets of examples used for training the  $i$ -th and the  $j$ -th trees. However, this distance does not say about predictions of trees which are transformed by using the self-attention.

Results of numerical experiments with SAT-RF-yx are presented in Tables 6-7. One can see from the tables that SAT-RF-yx outperforms other models. In particular, it is shown in Table 6 that SAT-RF-yx provides better results for all datasets except for the Wine dataset. The same can be said about models constructed by using ERTs. The corresponding results are shown in Table 7. If we compare results from Table 6 with results from Table 7, then it is interesting to point out that the use of ERTs significantly improves the models.

Fig. 1 illustrates how measure  $R^2$  depends on the attention parameters  $\tau$ ,  $\epsilon$  (the left picture) and on the self-attention parameters  $\kappa$ ,  $\gamma$  (the right picture) for the Sparse dataset. It is interesting to see from Fig. 1 that  $R^2$  achieves its maximum by  $\tau = 1$  and  $\epsilon = 0$  or  $\epsilon = 0.25$ . At the same time,  $R^2$  achieves its maximum by  $\kappa < 1$  and  $\gamma = 0.25$ . The optimal values  $\epsilon$  and  $\gamma$  coincide with the corresponding optimal values shown in Table 7. Figs. 2, 3, 4 illustrate the same dependencies for the Friedman 1, Boston, Wine datasets, respectively.

The best results for all modifications are illustrated in Table 8 which aims to compare different modifications of SAT-RF. We can see that SAT-RF-yx outperforms other models for most dataset when RFs are used. The same cannot be concluded when ERTs are used. Indeed, we can see from Table 8 that SAT-RF-yx based on ERTs is inferior other model in half of cases.

It should be noted that SAT-RF is an extension of ABRF under condition that the self-attention is supplemented. Therefore, we compare results of ABRF and SAT-RF for two cases when RFs and ERTs are used. Moreover, we compare SAT-RF with  $\epsilon$ -ABRF because SAT-RF is based on this modification of ABRF. The best results of both models are shown in Table 9. It can be seen from Table 9 that adding the self-attention module to ABRF improves the results. To formally test whether the average difference in the performance of two models, SAT-RF and  $\epsilon$ -ABRF, is significantly different from zero, we apply the  $t$ -test which has been proposed and described by Demsar [71]. Since we use differences between accuracy measures of SAT-RF and  $\epsilon$ -ABRF, then they are compared with 0. The  $t$  statistics in this case is distributed according to the Student distribution with  $11 - 1$  degrees of freedom. Results of computing the  $t$  statistics of the difference are  $p$ -values denoted as  $p$  and the 95% confidence interval for the mean 0.0085, which are  $p = 0.032$  and

Table 5: Measures  $R^2$  and MAE for comparison of models (the ERT, the Softmax model, SAT-RF-x) trained on regression datasets

Data set	$\epsilon_{opt}$	$\gamma_{opt}$	$R^2$			MAE		
			ERT	Softmax	SAT-RF-x	ERT	Softmax	SAT-RF-x
Diabetes	0	0.75	<b>0.449</b>	<b>0.449</b>	0.442	44.41	<b>44.37</b>	44.57
Friedman 1	0	1	0.471	0.471	<b>0.513</b>	2.502	2.50	<b>2.426</b>
Friedman 2	0	1	0.813	0.813	<b>0.930</b>	123.0	123.0	<b>74.50</b>
Friedman 3	0	1	0.570	0.570	<b>0.739</b>	0.179	0.179	<b>0.138</b>
Regression	1	0	0.402	0.443	<b>0.493</b>	106.3	102.5	<b>95.95</b>
Sparse	0	0.25	0.452	0.501	<b>0.518</b>	1.994	1.887	<b>1.851</b>
Airfoil	0.5	1	0.802	0.802	<b>0.837</b>	2.370	2.370	<b>2.128</b>
Boston	1	0.25	0.831	0.835	<b>0.843</b>	2.481	2.447	<b>2.402</b>
Concrete	0	1	0.851	0.851	<b>0.863</b>	4.892	4.892	<b>4.650</b>
Wine	1	0	<b>0.418</b>	0.417	<b>0.418</b>	<b>0.462</b>	0.463	<b>0.462</b>
Yacht	0	1	<b>0.988</b>	<b>0.988</b>	<b>0.988</b>	0.824	0.824	<b>0.818</b>

Table 6: Measures  $R^2$  and MAE for comparison of models (the RF, the Softmax model, SAT-RF-yx) trained on regression datasets

Data set	$\epsilon_{opt}$	$\gamma_{opt}$	$R^2$			MAE		
			RF	Softmax	SAT-RF-yx	RF	Softmax	SAT-RF-yx
Diabetes	0	0	0.416	<b>0.422</b>	<b>0.422</b>	<b>44.92</b>	45.01	45.01
Friedman 1	1	0.75	0.459	0.440	<b>0.489</b>	2.540	2.574	<b>2.509</b>
Friedman 2	1	0.5	0.841	0.788	<b>0.882</b>	111.7	125.0	<b>95.84</b>
Friedman 3	0.5	0.5	0.625	0.628	<b>0.685</b>	0.154	0.155	<b>0.133</b>
Regression	1	0.25	0.380	0.363	<b>0.488</b>	109.1	111.4	<b>96.50</b>
Sparse	0	0	0.470	0.531	<b>0.540</b>	1.908	1.783	<b>1.775</b>
Airfoil	0.25	1	0.823	0.820	<b>0.849</b>	2.203	2.231	<b>2.070</b>
Boston	0.25	0.75	0.814	0.814	<b>0.824</b>	2.539	2.546	<b>2.501</b>
Concrete	1	0.75	0.845	0.841	<b>0.866</b>	4.834	4.921	<b>4.651</b>
Wine	0.25	0.5	<b>0.433</b>	0.422	0.429	<b>0.451</b>	0.461	0.458
Yacht	1	0.5	0.981	0.971	<b>0.989</b>	1.004	1.237	<b>0.790</b>



Table 7: Measures  $R^2$  and MAE for comparison of models (the ERT, the Softmax model, SAT-RF-yx) trained on regression datasets

Data set	$\epsilon_{opt}$	$\gamma_{opt}$	$R^2$			MAE		
			ERT	Softmax	SAT-RF-yx	ERT	Softmax	SAT-RF-yx
Diabetes	0	0	0.438	<b>0.439</b>	<b>0.439</b>	44.55	<b>44.26</b>	<b>44.26</b>
Friedman 1	0	1	0.471	0.471	<b>0.513</b>	2.502	2.502	<b>2.426</b>
Friedman 2	0	1	0.813	0.813	<b>0.930</b>	123.0	123.0	<b>74.49</b>
Friedman 3	1	0.5	0.570	0.570	<b>0.751</b>	0.179	0.179	<b>0.137</b>
Regression	0	0.75	0.402	0.411	<b>0.449</b>	106.3	105.4	<b>101.1</b>
Sparse	0	0.25	0.452	0.518	<b>0.542</b>	1.994	1.863	<b>1.822</b>
Airfoil	0.5	1	0.802	0.802	<b>0.841</b>	2.370	2.370	<b>2.128</b>
Boston	0.75	0	0.831	0.836	<b>0.844</b>	2.481	2.452	<b>2.427</b>
Concrete	1	0.5	0.839	0.839	<b>0.860</b>	5.119	5.128	<b>4.689</b>
Wine	0	0.75	0.418	0.417	<b>0.447</b>	0.464	0.463	<b>0.462</b>
Yacht	0	1	<b>0.988</b>	<b>0.988</b>	<b>0.988</b>	0.824	0.824	<b>0.818</b>




Figure 1: Measure  $R^2$  as a function of the attention parameters  $\tau$ ,  $\epsilon$  (left) and the self-attention parameters  $\kappa$ ,  $\gamma$  (right) for the Sparse dataset and SAT-RF-yx using the ERT




Figure 2: Measure  $R^2$  as a function of the attention parameters  $\tau$ ,  $\epsilon$  (left) and the self-attention parameters  $\kappa$ ,  $\gamma$  (right) for the Fridman 1 dataset and SAT-RF-yx using the ERT




Figure 3: Measure  $R^2$  as a function of the attention parameters  $\tau$ ,  $\epsilon$  (left) and the self-attention parameters  $\kappa$ ,  $\gamma$  (right) for the Boston dataset and SAT-RF-yx using the ERT




Figure 4: Measure  $R^2$  as a function of the attention parameters  $\tau$ ,  $\epsilon$  (left) and the self-attention parameters  $\kappa$ ,  $\gamma$  (right) for the Wine dataset and SAT-RF-yx using the ERT

Table 8: Measure  $R^2$  for comparison of models (SAT-RF-y, SAT-RF-x, SAT-RF-yx) trained on regression datasets

Data set	RF			ERT		
	SAT-RF-y	SAT-RF-x	SAT-RF-yx	SAT-RF-y	SAT-RF-x	SAT-RF-yx
Diabetes	<b>0.424</b>	0.416	0.422	<b>0.453</b>	0.442	0.439
Friedman 1	0.470	0.470	<b>0.489</b>	<b>0.521</b>	0.513	0.513
Friedman 2	0.878	0.872	<b>0.882</b>	<b>0.939</b>	0.930	0.930
Friedman 3	0.682	0.684	<b>0.685</b>	0.739	0.739	<b>0.751</b>
Regression	0.454	0.483	<b>0.488</b>	0.455	<b>0.493</b>	0.449
Sparse	0.522	0.488	<b>0.540</b>	0.531	0.518	<b>0.542</b>
Airfoil	0.823	0.820	<b>0.849</b>	0.802	0.802	<b>0.841</b>
Boston	0.823	0.821	<b>0.824</b>	0.837	0.843	<b>0.844</b>
Concrete	0.857	0.857	<b>0.866</b>	<b>0.869</b>	<b>0.863</b>	0.860
Wine	<b>0.424</b>	0.422	<b>0.429</b>	0.419	0.416	<b>0.447</b>
Yacht	<b>0.989</b>	<b>0.989</b>	<b>0.989</b>	<b>0.988</b>	<b>0.988</b>	<b>0.988</b>

Table 9: Measure  $R^2$  for comparison of models SAT-RF and  $\epsilon$ -ABRF trained on regression datasets

Data set	RF		ERT	
	$\epsilon$ -ABRF	SAT-RF	$\epsilon$ -ABRF	SAT-RF
Diabetes	<b>0.424</b>	<b>0.424</b>	0.441	<b>0.453</b>
Friedman 1	0.470	<b>0.489</b>	0.513	<b>0.521</b>
Friedman 2	0.877	<b>0.882</b>	0.930	<b>0.939</b>
Friedman 3	<b>0.686</b>	0.685	0.739	<b>0.751</b>
Regression	0.450	<b>0.488</b>	0.447	<b>0.493</b>
Sparse	0.529	<b>0.540</b>	0.536	<b>0.542</b>
Airfoil	0.843	<b>0.849</b>	0.837	<b>0.841</b>
Boston	0.823	<b>0.824</b>	0.838	<b>0.844</b>
Concrete	0.857	<b>0.866</b>	0.863	<b>0.869</b>
Wine	0.423	<b>0.429</b>	0.416	<b>0.447</b>
Yacht	<b>0.989</b>	<b>0.989</b>	<b>0.988</b>	<b>0.988</b>

[0.00088, 0.016], respectively. The  $t$ -test demonstrates the outperformance of SAT-RF in comparison with  $\epsilon$ -ABRF for RFs because  $p < 0.05$ . We also compare the same models based on ERTs. We get the 95% confidence interval for the mean 0.0127, which are  $p = 0.0112$  and [0.0036, 0.0219], respectively.

## 8 Concluding remarks

Extensions of the attention-based RF based on joint use of the attention and self-attention mechanisms have been proposed. The attention part plays role of assigning weights to decision trees in the RF, and the self-attention part tries to capture dependencies of the tree predictions and to remove noise or anomalous predictions. They can be regarded as an alternative tool for handling tabular data. The proposed models allow us to avoid using neural networks and gradient-based algorithms. One of the important peculiarities of the models is that the attention and the self-attention are learned jointly by solving the quadratic problem with the attention and self-attention weights as optimization variables.

Advantages of the proposed models are the following. First, the models are simply learned. Second, in contrast to neural networks, the models have a few hyperparameters: parameters of the Gaussian kernels (softmax operations) and the contamination parameters of the Huber’s  $\epsilon$ -contamination model. Third, the attention part allows us to improve predictions and the self-attention part allows to take into account “bad” trees and anomalous predictions. Results of numerical experiments clearly illustrate the above. The proposed models can be extended by adding new self-attention modules which form the multi-head self-attention. However, this extension is rather complex from the implementation point of view.

We have to point out also disadvantages. First, the proposed models are mainly restricted by dealing with tabular data due to the RF basis of the models. Second, in contrast to the attention-based RF, the model has a larger number of training parameters (weights of the attention and the self-attention). If the number of trees in the RF is rather large, then the number of training parameters is significantly increases. This may lead to overfitting. Third, the advantage of the models to handle tabular data can be viewed as its disadvantage because other types of data, for instance, images, graphs, text data may result worse predictions.

Many numerical experiments have demonstrated the outperformance of the proposed models. Moreover, the results have demonstrated that SAT-RFs outperform the attention-based RFs which are the basis for the proposed models. Due to flexibility of SAT-RFs, many modifications can be proposed and studied, for example, various kernel functions, models of weights different from the Huber’s  $\epsilon$ -contamination model. Attention weights as well as self-attention weights can be assigned to subsets of trees. This approach allows us to partially reduce the number of training parameters. It is interesting to develop algorithms for implementing the multi-head self-attention. All the above ideas can be regarded as direction for further research.

## References

- [1] Z. Niu, G. Zhong, and H. Yu. A review on the attention mechanism of deep learning. *Neuro-computing*, 452:48–62, 2021.
- [2] S. Chaudhari, V. Mithal, G. Polatkan, and R. Ramanath. An attentive survey of attention models. arXiv:1904.02874, Apr 2019.
- [3] A.S. Correia and E.L. Colombini. Attention, please! A survey of neural attention models in deep learning. arXiv:2103.16775, Mar 2021.
- [4] A.S. Correia and E.L. Colombini. Neural attention models in deep learning: Survey and taxonomy. arXiv:2112.05909, Dec 2021.
- [5] T. Lin, Y. Wang, X. Liu, and X. Qiu. A survey of transformers. arXiv:2106.04554, Jul 2021.
- [6] S. Arik and T. Pfister. Tabnet: Attentive interpretable tabular learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 6679–6687, 2021.
- [7] L. Katzir, G. Elidan, and R. El-Yaniv. Net-dnf: Effective deep modeling of tabular data. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021*, pages 1–16, 2021.
- [8] G. Somepalli, M. Goldblum, A. Schwarzschild, C.B. Bruss, and T. Goldstein. Saint: Improved neural networks for tabular data via row attention and contrastive pre-training. arXiv:2106.01342, Jun 2021.
- [9] V. Borisov, T. Leemann, K. Sessler, J. Haug, M. Pawelczyk, and G. Kasneci. Deep neural networks and tabular data: A survey. arXiv:2110.01889v2, Oct 2021.
- [10] R. Shwartz-Ziv and A. Amitai. Tabular data: Deep learning is not all you need. *Information Fusion*, 81:84–90, 2022.
- [11] A.V. Konstantinov, L.V. Utkin, and S.R. Kirpichenko. AGBoost: Attention-based modification of gradient boosting machine. In *31st Conference of Open Innovations Association (FRUCT)*, pages 96–101. IEEE, 2022.
- [12] L.V. Utkin and A.V. Konstantinov. Attention-based random forest and contamination model. arXiv:2201.02880, Jan 2022.
- [13] L. Breiman. Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45(1):5–32, 2001.
- [14] J.H. Friedman. Greedy function approximation: A gradient boosting machine. *Annals of Statistics*, 29:1189–1232, 2001.

- [15] J.H. Friedman. Stochastic gradient boosting. *Computational statistics & data analysis*, 38(4):367–378, 2002.
- [16] E.A. Nadaraya. On estimating regression. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 9(1):141–142, 1964.
- [17] G.S. Watson. Smooth regression analysis. *Sankhya: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, pages 359–372, 1964.
- [18] L.V. Utkin, M.S. Kovalev M.S., and F. Coolen. Imprecise weighted extensions of random forests for classification and regression. *Applied Soft Computing*, 92(Article 106324):1–14, 2020.
- [19] L.V. Utkin, M.S. Kovalev, and A.A. Meldo. A deep forest classifier with weights of class probability distribution subsets. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 173:15–27, 2019.
- [20] P.J. Huber. *Robust Statistics*. Wiley, New York, 1981.
- [21] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A.N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5998–6008, 2017.
- [22] P. Geurts, D. Ernst, and L. Wehenkel. Extremely randomized trees. *Machine learning*, 63:3–42, 2006.
- [23] F. Liu, X. Huang, Y. Chen, and J.A. Suykens. Random features for kernel approximation: A survey on algorithms, theory, and beyond. arXiv:2004.11154v5, Jul 2021.
- [24] K. Choromanski, V. Likhoshesterov, D. Dohan, X. Song, A. Gane, T. Sarlos, P. Hawkins, J. Davis, A. Mohiuddin, L. Kaiser, D. Belanger, L. Colwell, and A. Weller. Rethinking attention with performers. In *2021 International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [25] X. Ma, X. Kong, S. Wang, C. Zhou, J. May, H. Ma, and L. Zettlemoyer. Luna: Linear unified nested attention. arXiv:2106.01540, Nov 2021.
- [26] K. Choromanski, H. Chen, H. Lin, Y. Ma, A. Sehanobish, D. Jain, M.S. Ryoo, J. Varley, A. Zeng, V. Likhoshesterov, D. Kalachnikov, V. Sindhvani, and A. Weller. Hybrid random features. arXiv:2110.04367v2, Oct 2021.
- [27] H. Peng, N. Pappas, D. Yogatama, R. Schwartz, N. Smith, and L. Kong. Random feature attention. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2021)*, pages 1–19, 2021.
- [28] I. Schlag, K. Irie, and J. Schmidhuber. Linear transformers are secretly fast weight programmers. In *International Conference on Machine Learning 2021*, pages 9355–9366. PMLR, 2021.
- [29] J. Cheng, L. Dong, and M. Lapata. Long short-term memory-networks for machine reading. arXiv:1601.06733, Jan 2016.
- [30] A. Parikh, O. Tackstrom, D. Das, and J. Uszkoreit. A decomposable attention model for natural language inference. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2249–2255. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2016.

- [31] Z. Lin, M. Feng, C.N. dos Santos, M. Yu, B. Xiang, B. Zhou, and Y. Bengio. A structured self-attentive sentence embedding. In *The 5th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2017)*, pages 1–15, 2017.
- [32] Z. Dai, Z. Yang, Y. Yang, J. Carbonell, Q. Le, and R. Salakhutdinov. Transformer-xl: Attentive language models beyond a fixed-length context. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2978–2988. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019.
- [33] J. Devlin, M.W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. arXiv:1810.04805, Oct 2018.
- [34] F. Wu, A. Fan, A. Baevski, Y. Dauphin, and M. Auli. Pay less attention with lightweight and dynamic convolutions. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2019)*, pages 1–14, 2019.
- [35] D. Povey, H. Hadian, P. Ghahremani, K. Li, and S. Khudanpur. A time-restricted self-attention layer for asr. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 5874–5878. IEEE, 2018.
- [36] K. Shim, J. Choi, and W. Sung. Understanding the role of self attention for efficient speech recognition. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, volume <https://openreview.net/forum?id=AvcfxqRy4Y>, pages 1–19, 2022.
- [37] A. Vyas, A. Katharopoulos, and F. Fleuret. Fast transformers with clustered attention. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 21665–21674, 2020.
- [38] Z. Chen, L. Xie, J. Niu, X. Liu, and L. Wei. Joint self-attention and scale-aggregation for self-calibrated deraining network. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 2517–2525, 2020.
- [39] M.-H. Guo, Z.-N. Liu, T.-J. Mu, and S.-M. Hu. Beyond self-attention: External attention using two linear layers for visual tasks. arXiv:2105.02358, May 2021.
- [40] S. Khan, M. Naseer, M. Hayat, S.W. Zamir, F.S. Khan, and M. Shah. Transformers in vision: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, pages 1–38, 2022.
- [41] Z. Liu, Y. Lin, Y. Cao, H. Hu, Y. Wei, Z. Zhang, S. Lin, and B. Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 10012–10022, 2021.
- [42] P. Ramachandran, N. Parmar, A. Vaswani, I. Bello, A. Levskaya, and J. Shlens. Stand-alone self-attention in vision models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, pages 1–13, 2019.
- [43] Z. Shen, I. Bello, R. Vemulapalli, X. Jia, and C.H. Chen. Global self-attention networks for image recognition. arXiv:2010.03019, Oct 2020.
- [44] F. Wang, M. Jiang, C. Qian, S. Yang, C. Li, H. Zhang, X. Wang, and X. Tang. Residual attention network for image classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 3156–3164, 2017.

- [45] X. Wang, R. Girshick, A. Gupta, and K. He. Non-local neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7794–7803, 2018.
- [46] H. Zhao, J. Jia, and V. Koltun. Exploring self-attention for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10076–10085, 2020.
- [47] G. Brauwers and F. Frasincar. A general survey on attention mechanisms in deep learning. arXiv:2203.14263, Mar 2022.
- [48] T. Goncalves, I. Rio-Torto, L.F. Teixeira, and J.S. Cardoso. A survey on attention mechanisms for medical applications: are we moving towards better algorithms? arXiv:2204.12406, Apr 2022.
- [49] M. Hassanin, S. Anwar, I. Radwan, F.S. Khan, and A. Mian. Visual attention methods in deep learning: An in-depth survey. arXiv:2204.07756, Apr 2022.
- [50] A. Santana and E. Colombini. Neural attention models in deep learning: Survey and taxonomy. arXiv:2112.05909, Dec 2021.
- [51] D. Soydaner. Attention mechanism in neural networks: Where it comes and where it goes. arXiv:2204.13154, Apr 2022.
- [52] Y. Xu, H. Wei, M. Lin, Y. Deng, K. Sheng, M. Zhang, F. Tang, W. Dong, F. Huang, and C. Xu. Transformers in computational visual media: A survey. *Computational Visual Media*, 8(1):33–62, 2022.
- [53] M. Li, W. Hsu, X. Xie, J. Cong, and W. Gao. SACNN: Self-attention convolutional neural network for low-dose CT denoising with self-supervised perceptual loss network. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 39(7):2289–2301, 2020.
- [54] C. Tian, L. Fei, W. Zheng, Y. Xu, W. Zuo, and C.W. Lin. Deep learning on image denoising: An overview. *Neural Networks*, 131:251–275, 2020.
- [55] R. Vidal. Attention: Self-expression is all you need. ICLR 2022, OpenReview.net. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=MmujBClawFo>, 2022.
- [56] J. Yu, Y. Nie, C. Long, W. Xu, Q. Zhang, and G. Li. Monte carlo denoising via auxiliary feature guided self-attention. *ACM Transactions on Graphics*, 40(6):1–13, 2021.
- [57] Z. Zuo, X. Chen, H. Xu, J. Li, W. Liao, Z.-X. Yang, and S. Wang. Idea-net: Adaptive dual self-attention network for single image denoising. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV) Workshops*, pages 739–748, 2022.
- [58] H. Kim, H. Kim, H. Moon, and H. Ahn. A weight-adjusted voting algorithm for ensemble of classifiers. *Journal of the Korean Statistical Society*, 40(4):437–449, 2011.
- [59] H. B. Li, W. Wang, H. W. Ding, and J. Dong. Trees weighting random forest method for classifying high-dimensional noisy data. In *2010 IEEE 7th International Conference on E-Business Engineering*, pages 160–163. IEEE, Nov 2010.
- [60] C.A. Ronao and S.-B. Cho. Random forests with weighted voting for anomalous query access detection in relational databases. In *Artificial Intelligence and Soft Computing. ICAISC 2015*, volume 9120 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 36–48, Cham, 2015. Springer.



- [61] S.J. Winham, R.R. Freimuth, and J.M. Biernacka. A weighted random forests approach to improve predictive performance. *Statistical Analysis and Data Mining*, 6(6):496–505, 2013.
- [62] S. Xuan, G. Liu, and Z. Li. Refined weighted random forest and its application to credit card fraud detection. In *Computational Data and Social Networks*, pages 343–355, Cham, 2018. Springer International Publishing.
- [63] X. Zhang and M. Wang. Weighted random forest algorithm based on bayesian algorithm. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, volume 1924, pages 1–6. IOP Publishing, 2021.
- [64] M.E.H. Daho, N. Settouti, M.E.A. Lazouni, and M.E.A. Chikh. Weighted vote for trees aggregation in random forest. In *2014 International Conference on Multimedia Computing and Systems (ICMCS)*, pages 438–443. IEEE, April 2014.
- [65] L.V. Utkin, A.V. Konstantinov, V.S. Chukanov, and A.A. Meldo. A new adaptive weighted deep forest and its modifications. *International Journal of Information Technology & Decision Making*, 19(4):963–986, 2020.
- [66] L.V. Utkin, A.V. Konstantinov, V.S. Chuknov, M.V. Kots, M.A. Ryabinin, and A.A. Meldo. A weighted random survival forest. arXiv:1901.00213, Jan 2019.
- [67] A. Zhang, Z.C. Lipton, M. Li, and A.J. Smola. Dive into deep learning. *arXiv:2106.11342*, Jun 2021.
- [68] D. Bahdanau, K. Cho, and Y. Bengio. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. arXiv:1409.0473, Sep 2014.
- [69] T. Luong, H. Pham, and C.D. Manning. Effective approaches to attention-based neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1412–1421. The Association for Computational Linguistics, 2015.
- [70] D. Dua and C. Graff. UCI machine learning repository, 2017.
- [71] J. Demsar. Statistical comparisons of classifiers over multiple data sets. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7:1–30, 2006.