

Selecting Features by their Resilience to the Curse of Dimensionality

Maximilian Stubbemann^{1*}, Tobias Hille¹ and Tom Hanika¹

^{1*}Knowledge & Data Engineering Group, University of Kassel,
Kassel, Hesse, Germany.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s):

stubbemann@cs.uni-kassel.de;

Contributing authors: hille@cs.uni-kassel.de;

hanika@cs.uni-kassel.de;

Abstract

Real-world datasets are often of high dimension and effected by the curse of dimensionality. This hinders their comprehensibility and interpretability. To reduce the complexity feature selection aims to identify features that are crucial to learn from said data. While measures of relevance and pairwise similarities are commonly used, the curse of dimensionality is rarely incorporated into the process of selecting features. Here we step in with a novel method that identifies the features that allow to discriminate data subsets of different sizes. By adapting recent work on computing intrinsic dimensionalities, our method is able to select the features that can discriminate data and thus weaken the curse of dimensionality. Our experiments show that our method is competitive and commonly outperforms established feature selection methods. Furthermore, we propose an approximation that allows our method to scale to datasets consisting of millions of data points. Our findings suggest that features that discriminate data and are connected to a low intrinsic dimensionality are meaningful for learning procedures.

Keywords: Feature Selection, Curse of Dimensionality, Intrinsic Dimension

1 Introduction

Contemporary datasets are of high dimension and their complexity continues to increase. Thus, information derived by machine learning procedures is rarely comprehensible or interpretable. This includes even procedures originally categorized as explainable, such as decision trees. Addressing this problem, a variety of works aims to simplify data through methods that reduce size or, in particular, the dimensionality. An important class of such methods has the emblematic name *feature selection* (FS). By simply selecting to be discarded feature dimensions, they preserve the explainability of the remaining original dimensions, in contrast to approaches such as principal component analysis. Although there are supervised and unsupervised types of FS, only unsupervised procedures are suited to improve the understanding of data regardless of a specific learning task. Moreover, they do not require costly label information.

One important phenomenon which underlies the complexity of high dimensional data is the *curse of dimensionality*. The curse of dimensionality is a broad term which is used for different phenomena that arise in the context of high-dimensional data. In this work, we follow the definition of Pestov (2007). According to Pestov, the curse of dimensionality describes the situation where features are concentrated to specific regions and therefore do not allow to discriminate different data points. Data that is strongly affected by this phenomenon is considered to be of high *intrinsic dimension* (ID). Yet, in common feature selection methods, the curse of dimensionality is rarely explicitly accounted for, even though it does a) demonstrably influences learning success in high-dimensional real-world scenarios, and b) potentially prevent common FS methods to choose the best features to learn from. Thus, it is crucial to incorporate the intrinsic dimension into the process of feature selection.

We meet this challenge by proposing an unsupervised feature selection method that picks features based on their measurable ability to discriminate different data points. While other methods are based on feature relevance measures, such as variances, or select features by discarding strongly correlated ones, our method ranks features by their resilience against the curse of dimensionality in the sense of Pestov. For this, we build on recent work (Hanika et al, 2022; Stubbemann et al, 2022) which studies intrinsic dimensionality for *geometric datasets*. By adapting corresponding ideas for computing the intrinsic dimensionality, we derive an algorithm that allows to find precisely those features that are able to tame the influence of the curse of dimensionality. Furthermore, adapting the speed-up techniques proposed in Stubbemann et al (2022) will allow feature selection in settings with large-scale datasets comprised of millions of data points. While (Hanika et al, 2022) and (Stubbemann et al, 2022) are focused on computing the intrinsic dimensionality of datasets, we will rank and select individual features by their ability to discriminate data points. Thus, we identify features that are harmed by the curse of dimensionality by a comparable low extent.

We experimentally show on real-world datasets that features selected by our proposed method are meaningful to learn from. To be more specific, we experiment on the *OpenML-CC18 Curated Classification benchmark* (Open18) (Bischi et al, 2019) and witness that our method is competitive or even outperforms established feature selection methods with respect to feature selection for classification tasks. Furthermore, we use the *Open Graph Benchmark* (Hu et al, 2020) to show that our method is capable of feature selection for large-scale learning with *Graph Neural Networks*. To sum up, our experiments indicate that features that are able to discriminate data and thus weaken the curse of dimensionality are highly relevant for learning tasks. Our code is publicly available.¹

2 Related Work

We focus on unsupervised feature selection, which is an established research topic (Solorio-Fernández et al, 2020; Cai et al, 2018; Alelyani et al, 2018). Established methods are often focused on the identification of outstanding features by identifying the relevant features for clustering (Dy and Brodley, 2004; Breaban and Luchian, 2011; Dutta et al, 2014). Another directions focuses on selecting a subset of important and dissimilar features (Zhao and Liu, 2007; Ferreira and Figueiredo, 2012; Mitra et al, 2002; Hanika et al, 2019). Here, feature importance can for example be measured via variances and similarities via correlation coefficients. While applying such methods may result in a decreasing intrinsic dimensionality, they do not explicitly account for the curse of dimensionality in the selection process.

A small amount of research has incorporated intrinsic dimension estimators into feature selection (Gómez et al, 2010; Golay and Kanevski, 2017; Mo and Huang, 2012; Faloutsos et al, 2010). However, these method either only use the ID to determine the amount of features to select (Gómez et al, 2010) or they are based on recomputing intrinsic dimensionalities after discarding features which limits scalability (Golay and Kanevski, 2017; Mo and Huang, 2012). Even if applicable to larger datasets, these methods build on notions of intrinsic dimensionality that do not aim to quantify the curse of dimensionality (Faloutsos et al, 2010). Instead, these notions work under the assumption that the data lies on a manifold of lower Euclidean dimension. The goal of the ID notion is then to approximate the dimension of this manifold.

In contrast, we build our feature selection procedure on a notion of ID which quantifies the influence of the curse of dimensionality which occurs when data points can not be discriminated. In the works of Pestov (Pestov, 2000, 2007, 2008), all 1–Lipschitz functions are considered as potential features to discriminate data, which often hinders the practical computation. This was tackled by defining intrinsic dimensionality for *geometric datasets* (Hanika et al, 2022), where a set of features to consider can be defined beforehand. The computation

¹<https://github.com/mstubbemann/FSCOD>

and approximation on large-scale real world data has recently been made possible (Stubbemann et al, 2022). We use these findings to incorporate Pestov's notions of the curse of dimensionality in the process of unsupervised feature selection. Note, that Hanika et al (2022) and Stubbemann et al (2022) were solely focused on the intrinsic dimensionality of datasets and thus of the question how all features together can discriminate data points. In contrast, we present a novel approach to rank and select individual features by their ability to discriminate data points.

3 Feature Selection via Discriminability

We present our work in a general setting for datasets, i.e., for *geometric datasets* $\mathcal{D} = (X, F, \mu)$ (Hanika et al, 2022), where X is a set of *data points* and $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^X$ is a set of *feature functions* from X to \mathbb{R} . We require $\sup_{x,y \in X} d_F(x, y) < \infty$, where $d_F(x, y) := \sup_{f \in F} |f(x) - f(y)|$. Furthermore, (X, d_F) has to be a complete and separable metric space with μ being a Borel probability measure on (X, d_F) .

From this point on, we consider the special case of *finite geometric datasets*, i.e., $0 < |X|, |F| < \infty$, with μ being the normalized counting measure. Hanika et al (2022) derived an axiomatization for functions to be *dimension functions* of geometric datasets. This axiomatization is based on the concentration of measure phenomenon (Gromov and Milman, 1983; Milman, 1988, 2000) and its linkage to the curse of dimensionality by Pestov (Pestov, 2000, 2007, 2008, 2010). The latter defines the curse of dimensionality as the phenomenon of features concentrating near their means or medians and not being able to discriminate data. To quantify this phenomenon the *partial diameter* is used, which determines to which extent a feature can discriminate sets of a specific measure α . For finite geometric datasets the partial diameter has the form

$$\text{PartialDiameter}(f, 1 - \alpha)_{\mathcal{D}} = \min_{\substack{M \subseteq X \\ |M| = c_{\alpha}}} \max_{x, y \in M} |f(x) - f(y)|,$$

where $c_{\alpha} := \lceil |X|(1 - \alpha) \rceil$. Based on this, the *observable diameter* reflects how the feature set F can discriminate data of a specific measure. More formally, $\text{ObservableDiameter}(\mathcal{D}, -\alpha) := \sup_{f \in F} \text{PartialDiameter}(f, 1 - \alpha)_{\mathcal{D}}$. This notion allows to determine for a geometric dataset $\mathcal{D} = (X, F, \mu)$ the ability of F to discriminate the data points in X . This is done by considering the Observable Diameter over all possible values for α via

$$\Delta(\mathcal{D}) := \int_0^1 \text{ObservableDiameter}(\mathcal{D}, -\alpha) d\alpha,$$

which has in the case of finite geometric datasets the form

$$\Delta(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{k=2}^{|X|} \max_{f \in F} \min_{\substack{M \subseteq X \\ |M|=k}} \max_{x, y \in M} |f(x) - f(y)|, \quad (1)$$

as shown in [Stubbemann et al \(2022\)](#). With the usage of the notation $\phi_{k,f} := \min_{M \subseteq X, |M|=k} \max_{x, y \in M} |f(x) - f(y)|$, and $\phi_k := \max_{f \in F} \phi_{k,f}$ the discriminability $\Delta(\mathcal{D})$ can be rewritten as

$$\Delta(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{k=2}^{|X|} \max_{f \in F} \phi_{k,f} = \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{k=2}^{|X|} \phi_k. \quad (2)$$

In the following, we consider feature selection with a fixed feature budget in an unsupervised setting, i.e., without any known labels of a specific classification task at selecting time.

Problem Statement.

Given a finite geometric dataset $\mathcal{D} = (X, F, \mu)$ and a natural number $n_F \ll |F|$, select the n_F most important features of F .

3.1 Selection of Discriminating Features

The definition of discriminability as in Equation (1) and Equation (2) quantifies to which extent the set of all features can discriminate data subsets of different cardinality. The main idea of our feature selection algorithm is to rank features by their ability to discriminate data subsets of different cardinality by solely using this feature.

Definition 1 (Discriminability) The *discriminability* of \mathcal{D} with respect to feature $f \in F$ is defined as

$$\Delta(\mathcal{D})_f^* := \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{k=2}^{|X|} \min_{\substack{M \subseteq X \\ |M|=k}} \max_{x, y \in M} |f(x) - f(y)| = \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{k=2}^{|X|} \phi_{k,f}. \quad (3)$$

Enhancing Robustness against Outliers

Note, that one data point with an outstanding value $f(x)$ can have a strong influence on $\Delta(\mathcal{D})_f^*$ via drastically increasing $\phi_{|X|,f}$. To weaken this phenomenon, we propose to weight $\phi_{k,f}$ higher for smaller values of k . This leads to the following definition.

Definition 2 (Normalized Discriminability and Normalized Intrinsic Dimensionality) The *normalized discriminability* of \mathcal{D} with respect to f which we define

Algorithm 1 Feature Selection via Discriminability(FSD)

Require: Finite geometric dataset $\mathcal{D} = (X, F, \mu)$. Natural number $k << |F|$ of features to select from F .

- 1: **for** $f \in F$ **do**
- 2: $\Delta(\mathcal{D})_f := \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{k=2}^{|X|} \frac{1}{k} \phi_{k,f}$
- 3: $\partial(\mathcal{D})_f = \frac{1}{\Delta(\mathcal{D})_f^2}$
- 4: **end for**
- 5: Set l_F as the list of all $f \in F$ ordered by ascending $\partial(\mathcal{D})_f$.
- 6: **return** $l_F[:k]$

as

$$\Delta(\mathcal{D})_f := \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{k=2}^{|X|} \frac{1}{k} \phi_{k,f}. \quad (4)$$

The *normalized intrinsic dimensionality* of \mathcal{D} with respect to f is then given via

$$\partial(\mathcal{D})_f := \frac{1}{\Delta(\mathcal{D})_f^2}. \quad (5)$$

We then can rank features by their discriminability and select the features with the highest discriminability/ lowest intrinsic dimensionality. We call the resulting method *features selection via discriminability* (FSD). It is depicted in Algorithm 1.

3.2 Discarding Highly Correlated Features

Our methods select features by their ability to separate data points. However, it does not consider connections between individual features, as for example correlations. Thus, if for example the two features that separate the data set are nearly identical our method may select both as though selecting one of these features would be sufficient as the second one gives no extra information. To prevent such cases, we propose to incorporate correlation coefficients into our feature selection process, if desired. In order to do so, we define an additional number n_c of features to remove via correlation coefficients. We then iteratively discard one of the two features f_1, f_2 with the maximal pearson correlation coefficient. The version of our algorithm that incorporates this preprocessing is called *Feature Selection via Discriminability and Correlation* (FSDC).

4 Feature Selection for Large-Scale Data

Since computing $\phi_{k,f}$ is in $\mathcal{O}(|X| - k)$ for fixed $f \in F$ (Stubbemann et al, 2022), computing $\Delta(\mathcal{D})_f$ is in $\mathcal{O}(\sum_{k=2}^{|X|} |X| - k) = \mathcal{O}(|X|)$. Hence, we have a worst case runtime which scales quadratic with $|X|$. Thus, FSD(C) is applicable to medium-sized data sets with thousands of data points. However, it is not tailored to large-scale data with millions of data points.

Earlier work (Stubbemann et al, 2022) has used so called *support sequences*, i.e. strictly increasing finite sequences of the form $s = (2 = s_1, \dots, s_l = |X|)$ to approximate $\Delta(\mathcal{D})$ and $\partial(\mathcal{D})$ by only computing $\phi_{s_i, f}$ for $s_i \in s$.

Inspired by this, we approximate the discriminability and intrinsic dimensionality with respect to a feature $f \in F$. The approximation is based on the result, that the map $k \mapsto \phi_{k, f}$ is monotonically increasing (Stubbemann et al, 2022). Using this result, we replace for $s_i < j < s_{i+1}$ the value $\phi_{j, f}$ by $\phi_{s_i, f}$ or $\phi_{s_{i+1}, f}$. More formally, we get the following definition.

Definition 3 (Upper and Lower Normalized Discriminability) For a feature $f \in F$ and a support sequence s we call

$$\Delta(\mathcal{D})_{s, f}^+ := \frac{1}{|X|} \left(\sum_{i=1}^l \frac{1}{s_i} \phi_{s_i, f} + \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} \sum_{s_i < j < s_{i+1}} \frac{1}{j} \phi_{s_{i+1}, f} \right)$$

the *upper normalized discriminability with respect to f and s* and

$$\Delta(\mathcal{D})_{s, f}^- := \frac{1}{|X|} \left(\sum_{i=1}^l \frac{1}{s_i} \phi_{s_i, f} + \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} \sum_{s_i < j < s_{i+1}} \frac{1}{j} \phi_{s_i, f} \right)$$

the *lower normalized discriminability with respect to f and s* .

Definition 4 (Upper, Lower and Approximated Normalized Intrinsic Dimensionality) We define the *upper/lower normalized intrinsic dimensionality with respect to f and s* via $\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s, f}^+ := \frac{1}{(\Delta(\mathcal{D})_{s, g}^-)^2}$ and $\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s, f}^- := \frac{1}{(\Delta(\mathcal{D})_{s, f}^+)^2}$. We then rank the features in descending order by their *approximated normalized intrinsic dimensionality with respect to f and s* which is defined via

$$\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s, f} := \frac{\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s, f}^+ + \partial(\mathcal{D})_{s, f}^-}{2}. \quad (6)$$

The resulting algorithm for large-scale datasets is depicted in Algorithm 2. We rank features via ascending $\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s, f}$. If we want to select k features, we choose the first k features of the resulting order.

4.1 Error Ratios of Approximations

Note, that $\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s, f}$ as defined in Equation (6) only gives an approximation of $\partial(\mathcal{D})_f$ as defined in Equation (5). Thus ranking the features by $\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s, f}$ instead of $\partial(\mathcal{D})_f$ may lead to a different ordering. We are interested in the amount of such changes. Let $l_s := (f_{i_1}, \dots, f_{i_{|F|}})$ be the list of the features in F ordered by ascending $\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s, f}$.

Definition 5 (Error Ratio) The *error ratio of s* is then given by

$$E(s)^* := \frac{2|\{(k, l) \in \{1, \dots, |F|\} \mid k < l \wedge \partial(\mathcal{D})_{f_{i_k}} > \partial(\mathcal{D})_{f_{i_l}}\}|}{|F|(|F| - 1)}. \quad (7)$$

Algorithm 2 Large-Scale Feature Selection via Discriminability(LSFSD)

Require: Finite geometric dataset $\mathcal{D} = (X, F, \mu)$. Natural number $k < |F|$ of features to select from F . Support sequence $s = (2 = s_1, \dots, s_l = |X|)$.

- 1: **for** $f \in F$ **do**
- 2: $\Delta(\mathcal{D})_{s,f}^+ := \frac{1}{|X|} \left(\sum_{i=1}^l \frac{1}{s_i} \phi_{s_i,f} + \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} \sum_{s_i < j < s_{i+1}} \frac{1}{j} \phi_{s_{i+1},f} \right)$
- 3: $\Delta(\mathcal{D})_{s,f}^- := \frac{1}{|X|} \left(\sum_{i=1}^l \frac{1}{s_i} \phi_{s_i,f} + \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} \sum_{s_i < j < s_{i+1}} \frac{1}{j} \phi_{s_i,f} \right)$
- 4: $\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s,f}^+ := \frac{1}{(\Delta(\mathcal{D})_{s,g}^-)^2}$
- 5: $\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s,f}^- := \frac{1}{(\Delta(\mathcal{D})_{s,g}^+)^2}$
- 6: $\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s,f} := \frac{\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s,f}^+ + \partial(\mathcal{D})_{s,f}^-}{2}$
- 7: **end for**
- 8: Set l_F as the list of all $f \in F$ ordered by ascending $\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s,f}$.
- 9: **return** $l_F[:k]$

Computing $\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s,f}$ for all $f \in F$ is especially of interest when computing $\partial(\mathcal{D})_f$ is not feasible. In such circumstances, it is also not possible to compute $E(s)^*$. Hence, we need an approximation or upper bound of $E(s)^*$ which can be computed without needing $\partial(\mathcal{D})_f$.

Definition 6 (Maximal Error Ratio) We define the *maximal error ratio* of s via

$$E(s) := \frac{2|\{(k, l) \in \{1, \dots, |F|\} \mid k < l \wedge \partial(\mathcal{D})_{s, f_{i_k}}^+ > \partial(\mathcal{D})_{s, f_{i_l}}^-\}|}{|F|(|F| - 1)}. \quad (8)$$

The maximal error ratio $E(s)$ can be computed without knowing $\partial(\mathcal{D})_f$ for all $f \in F$. Per definition it holds that $\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s,f}^- \leq \partial(\mathcal{D})_{s,f} \leq \partial(\mathcal{D})_{s,f}^+$. Thus, for given features $f, g \in F$ with $\partial(\mathcal{D})_{s,f}^+ \leq \partial(\mathcal{D})_{s,g}^-$ we can conclude $\partial(\mathcal{D})_f \leq \partial(\mathcal{D})_{s,f}^+ \leq \partial(\mathcal{D})_{s,g}^- \leq \partial(\mathcal{D})_g$. Thus, we get the following corollary.

Corollary 1 For each support sequence s it holds that

$$E(s)^* \leq E(s). \quad (9)$$

To sum up, we now have an approximation algorithm which allow us to rank the features by their intrinsic dimensionality and we can efficiently bound the amount of errors this approximation produces. We denominate this method with *large-scale feature selection via discriminability (and correlation)*(LSFSD(C)).

5 Experiments

In the following we empirically examine the following hypothesis. *Discriminative features are meaningful features with respect to learning performances.*

The aim is **not** to develop a new feature selection procedure that surpasses all established methods. Thus, we do not compare with all state-of unsupervised feature selection procedures. Instead we use a small set of representative baselines that consists of established methods and common-sense baselines based on correlation and variances. Furthermore, we compare our approach to random feature selection to evaluate if our features are indeed meaningful with respect to classification.

In all our experiments, we consider the features F to be the coordinate projections, i.e., the feature functions are given via the data columns. We evaluate our feature selection method regarding to classification performances. We experiment with a Logistic Regression classifier on the *OpenML-CC18 Curated Classification benchmark* (Open18)² (Bischi et al, 2019). To further evaluate our selection procedure on modern large-scale data we also select features for classification with *Graph Neural Networks* (GNNs) on a subset of the *Open Graph Benchmark* (Hu et al, 2020). In both experiments, we evaluate how to classify on a small subset of the features. To be more detailed, we only want to keep 10% of all features. We evaluate our feature selection with and without the preprocessing procedure of Section 3.2. In the case with the preprocessing step, we use it to discard 10% of the features. In both experiments, we will also report results for classification on the full feature set. We evaluate against the following baselines.

- **Random.** Randomly selecting the 10% of features.
- **Correlation Based.** Only use the correlation based feature selection as proposed in Section 3.2 until only 10% of the features are left.
- **Variance Based.** Select the 10% of the features with the highest variance. We choose this baseline because it is a straight forward approach to for selecting features by their individual importance.
- **SPEC.**(Zhao and Liu, 2007) SPEC first builds a complete graph between the individual data points with edge weights indicating similarities of the points and then uses spectral graph theory for estimating feature relevance. In our experiments, we use an RBF Kernel for similarity and evaluate feature relevance via ϕ_2 . For details, we refer to Zhao and Liu (2007). We choose this baseline because it was the univariate filter method with the highest classification accuracy in a recent survey on unsupervised feature selection (Solorio-Fernández et al, 2020).
- **RRFS.**(Ferreira and Figueiredo, 2012) RRFS combines a function @sim which measures similarity of feature pairs and a relevance measure @rel that evaluates the importance of features. It iteratively chooses the next most relevant feature that has a similarity to the last chosen feature which below a specific threshold t . For comparison, we choose t to be the correlation coefficient value of the last pair of features that was used to discard a feature via Section 3.2. We use the Pearson correlation coefficient for similarity evaluation and evaluate the relevance of features via their

²https://www.openml.org/search?type=study&study_type=task&id=99&sort=tasks_included

Table 1 Results on **Open18** experiment. We report the accuracies for our method with (FSDC) and without preprocessing (FSD) via correlation and for all baselines

Task ID	Dataset	F	Full	FSDC	FSD	Random	Corr	Vari	RRFS	SPEC
14	mfeat-fourier	76	.813	.694	.753	.433±.032	.457	.751	.751	.630
16	mfeat-karh.	64	.958	.695	.822	.466±.028	.288	.810	.810	.680
45	splice	60	.918	.531	.611	.580±.026	.534	.725	.647	.806
9910	Bioresponse	1776	.754	.745	.751	.704±.008	.739	.747	.707	.550
9977	nomao	118	.947	.907	.907	.835±.012	.752	.793	.793	.759
9981	cnae-9	856	.944	.884	.884	.391±.032	.404	.888	.144	.128
9985	1st-order	51	.479	.434	.434	.420±.002	.416	.419	.419	.418
167125	Internet-Advertiment	1558	.971	.962	.963	.936±.003	.899	.963	.963	.877

variance. For more details, we refer to [Ferreira and Figueiredo \(2012\)](#). We use this baseline because it was the multivariate filter method with the highest classification accuracy in the survey mentioned above ([Solorio-Fernández et al, 2020](#)).

5.1 Feature Selection for Logistic Regression

We select features as explained above and then use a Logistic Regression classifier. We use the data splits that are provided by Open18 and report mean test accuracies over all splits. We report means over 10 runs of this experiment. Note, that the Logistic Regression of Scikit Learn ([Pedregosa et al, 2011](#)) using the default solver leads to deterministic results. As only the random selection method is non-deterministic, this is the only baseline where results of different repetitions vary.

We only experiment on a subset of **Open18**. To be more detailed, we discard all datasets with NaN values or only binary features. Furthermore, we discard all datasets where the Logistic Regression classifier of Scikit-Learn was not always able to converge on the full feature set. We use default parameters with the exception that we changed the maximal iterations from 100 to 1000 to increase the chance of convergence. Finally, we arrive at 8 out of 72 datasets of **Open18**. The results are depicted in Table 1.

5.1.1 Results and Discussion.

For all datasets, FSD outcompetes the random baseline and for 7 out of 8 datasets FSDC outperforms random selection. Hence, selecting features by their discriminability a reasonable approach to identify relevant features for learning. Furthermore, for 6 out of 8 baselines, FSD surpasses all baselines. This indicates that our selection approach is competitive with established feature selection methods.

Adding the correlation-based feature selection to FSD does not increase performances and feature selection solely based on correlation coefficients leads to comparable low accuracies. Furthermore, RRFS, which, in our configuration, combines feature variances with dropping strongly correlated features does not surpass the selection of features solely based on variance. All this indicates that the incorporation of correlation between features is not useful in this scenario.

Table 2 Results of our experiments on OGBN. We report, the accuracies for our method with (LSFSDC) and without (LSFSD) and for all baselines except of SPEC.

Dataset	$ F $	Full	LSFSDC	LSFSD	Random	Corr	Vari	RRFS
arxiv	128	.691 \pm .006	.536 \pm .005	.543 \pm .005	.500 \pm .021	.461 \pm .006	.543 \pm .008	.534 \pm .003
products	100	.748 \pm .006	.529 \pm .007	.545 \pm .005	.413 \pm .038	.395 \pm .006	.485 \pm .006	.519 \pm .008
mag	128	.387 \pm .004	.292 \pm .005	.283 \pm .005	.274 \pm .006	.269 \pm .004	.292 \pm .002	.282 \pm .004

It also stands out, that FSDC sometimes lead to the same accuracy than FSD. In these cases it stands to reason that FSD does not select any features that are dropped by FSDC as preprocessing.

Overall, selecting only 10% often lead to a high drop compared to the original accuracy, indicating that such a small feature budget often not allows for sufficient feature selection. Thus, our experiment mainly gives insights in cases where feature selection is done because only using a small subset of features is computational feasible or to get new insights into the data and classification behavior. It is primarily not designed for feature selection to enhance classification accuracy. Here, the amount of selected features should be set higher. However, the competitiveness of our approach supports our hypothesis that discriminability of features is connected to their relevance for learning.

5.2 Feature Selection for Graph Neural Networks

We now evaluate to which extent our feature selection methods helps to select features for training Graph Neural Networks. For this, we use *ogbn-arxiv*, *ogbn-mag* and *ogbn-products*³ from Open Graph Benchmark (Hu et al, 2020). These datasets are fundamentally larger then the ones from **Open18**, with a nodeset size of 169,343 (**ogbn-arxiv**), 2,449,029 (**ogbn-products**) and 1,939,743 (**ogbn-mag**).

To use LSFDC we need to choose a support sequence. As in Stubbemann et al (2022), we use log scale spacing. For this, we first choose a geometric sequence $\hat{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_l)$ of length $l = 10,000$ with $s_1 = |X|$ and $s_l = 2$ and use the support sequence s which results from $s' = (\lfloor |X| + 2 - s_1 \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor |X| + 2 - s_l \rfloor)$ via discarding duplicated elements.

For training and classification, we use a plain SIGN model (Rossi et al, 2020) with one hidden-layer of dimension 512 and do 2-hop neighborhood aggregation. We train with an Adam optimizer with learning rate of 0.001 and weight decay of 0.0001. We train for a maximum of 1000 epochs with a patience of 15 epochs with respect to validation accuracy. We use a batch size of 256. We dropout at the input layer with a probability of 0.1, 0.3, 0.5 and at the hidden layer with probability of 0.5, 0.4, 0.5 for **ogbn-arxiv**, **ogbn-products** and **ogbn-mag**, respectively.

³<https://ogb.stanford.edu/docs/nodeprop/>

We report test accuracies, displaying means and standard deviations over 10 rounds. We use all methods and baselines reported above. For SPEC, computation of the RBF kernel was not possible on our Server with 125 GB RAM due to memory costs. This was true for using Scikit-Learn as well with plain numpy. The results are depicted in Table 2.

5.2.1 Results and Discussion.

In this experiment, preprocessing via Section 3.2 indeed can help as LSFSDC lead to higher accuracies then using LSFSD for **ogbn-mag**. LSFSDC also surpasses feature selection based solely on correlations. Note, that RRFS, the other method that combines similarities between features and selection by some measure of feature relevance, do lead to fundamentally worse results. Thus, one can not follow that combining similarity and relevance is the general key to successful feature selection. This is supported by the fact, that feature selection solely based on feature variance leads to high accuracies. For **ogbn-products** and **ogbn-arxiv**, LFSF lead to the best performance, for **ogbn-mag**, the highest accuracy is reached with LSFSDC. In this experiment, our selection method is again competitive with the baselines and surpasses random selection. This supports the hypothesis that selecting features via their discriminability is meaningful.

6 Parameter Study on Maximal Errors

We now study the influence of the lengths of support sequences on the maximal error $E(s)$. For this, we generate the support sequence as in Section 5.2 with varying value l . To be more detailed, we iterate l through $\{\lfloor 0.01 * n \rfloor, \lfloor 0.02 * n \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor 0.2 * n \rfloor\}$, where n is the amount of points in the respective datasets. Here, if $l = \lfloor r * n \rfloor$, we call r the *relative length of l* . Note, that the final support sequence may have a lower amount of elements in l as we discard doubled elements. For all three **ogbn** datasets mentioned above, we display the maximal errors $E(s)$ with the procedure mentioned in Section 3.2 and without. Since for **ogbn-arxiv** the exact computation of $\Delta(\mathcal{D})_f$ is possible, we also compute the “real” error $E(s)^*$ for this dataset.

6.1 Results and Discussion

The results are depicted in Figure 1. We first note that the behavior of the maximal errors is not fundamentally effected by the decision for or against discarding strongly correlated features. In both settings, the curves behave similar. Only the absolute values tend to be lower when no discarding is done. Hence, the following observation and arguments hold for both cases.

For the larger datasets, **ogbn-products** and **ogbn-mag**, the maximal error $E(s)$ is negligible for comparable small relative support sizes. For relative support sizes of 0.1, the maximal mistakes are under 0.01. For **ogbn-arxiv** we have an maximal error of around 0.025 for this relative support size and overall higher maximal errors for all relative support lengths.




Figure 1 The maximal errors $E(s)$ of all **ogbn** datasets. On the left, we display the results without discarding highly correlated features. On the right, we display the results with. For **ogbn-arxiv**, we also display the “real error” $E(s)^*$. The plots in the second row are zooms into the plots in the first row.

Comparing $E(s)^*$ and $E(s)$ for **ogbn-arxiv** it stands out, that the maximal error is a strong overestimation of the error $E(s)^*$. As computing $E(s)^*$ for both other datasets is not feasible, we can not verify whether this is also the case for them. However, we know because of Equation (9), that $E(s)^*$ is bound by the maximal error which is already negligible for **ogbn-products** and **ogbn-mag**.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

We proposed a novel unsupervised feature selection method that accounts for the intrinsic dimensionality of datasets. Our approach identifies those features that are able to discriminate data points and are thus responsible for taming the curse of dimensionality. Our experiments provide evidence that intrinsic

dimension-based selection of features is competitive with well established procedures, occasionally outperforming them. Furthermore, we demonstrated that sampling techniques can be used to scale our feature selection method to more than millions of data points.

We identify as a natural next step for future work scenarios where the features are not given by coordinate projection, i.e., go beyond columns in tabular data. The generality of our modeling of features allows to encode, e.g., edge information for graphs. Thus, our method can be used for edge-sampling procedures that are important for training Graph Neural Networks. However, the question on how to encode graph information via feature functions is open.

While the present work emphasizes on understanding *data* by selecting features that break the curse of dimensionality, future work has to tackle as well the problem of understanding the behavior of specific *model classes*. This helps to further strengthen our understanding on the interplay between the success of learning and the presence of the curse of dimensionality.

Acknowledgement

The authors thank the State of Hesse, Germany for funding this work as part of the LOEWE Exploration project “Dimension Curse Detector” under grant LOEWE/5/A002/519/06.00.003(0007)/E19.

References

- Alelyani S, Tang J, Liu H (2018) Feature selection for clustering: A review. Data Clustering pp 29–60
- Bischl B, Casalicchio G, Feurer M, et al (2019) Openml benchmarking suites. arXiv:170803731v2
- Breaban M, Luchian H (2011) A unifying criterion for unsupervised clustering and feature selection. Pattern Recognition 44(4):854–865
- Cai J, Luo J, Wang S, et al (2018) Feature selection in machine learning: A new perspective. Neurocomputing 300:70–79
- Dutta D, Dutta P, Sil J (2014) Simultaneous feature selection and clustering with mixed features by multi objective genetic algorithm. Int J Hybrid Intell Syst 11(1):41–54
- Dy JG, Brodley CE (2004) Feature selection for unsupervised learning. JMLR 5:845–889
- Faloutsos C, Wu L, Traina A, et al (2010) Fast feature selection using fractal dimension. Journal of Information and data Management 1(1):3–3

- Ferreira AJ, Figueiredo MAT (2012) An unsupervised approach to feature discretization and selection. *Pattern Recognit* 45(9):3048–3060
- Golay J, Kanevski M (2017) Unsupervised feature selection based on the morisita estimator of intrinsic dimension. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 135:125–134
- Gromov M, Milman VD (1983) A topological application of the isoperimetric inequality. *American Journal of Mathematics* 105(4):843–854
- Gómez W, Leija L, Díaz-Pérez A (2010) Mutual information and intrinsic dimensionality for feature selection. In: 2010 7th International Conference on Electrical Engineering Computing Science and Automatic Control, pp 339–344
- Hanika T, Koyda M, Stumme G (2019) Relevant attributes in formal contexts. In: *Int. Conf. on Conceptual Structures, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 11530. Springer, pp 102–116
- Hanika T, Schneider FM, Stumme G (2022) Intrinsic dimension of geometric data sets. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal* 74(1):23 – 52
- Hu W, Fey M, Zitnik M, et al (2020) Open graph benchmark: Datasets for machine learning on graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:200500687*
- Milman V (1988) The heritage of p. lévy in geometrical functional analysis. *Astérisque* 157(158):273–301
- Milman V (2000) Topics in asymptotic geometric analysis. In: *Visions in Mathematics*. Springer, p 792–815
- Mitra P, Murthy CA, Pal SK (2002) Unsupervised feature selection using feature similarity. *IEEE Trans Pattern Anal Mach Intell* 24(3):301–312
- Mo D, Huang SH (2012) Fractal-based intrinsic dimension estimation and its application in dimensionality reduction. *IEEE Trans on Knowl and Data Eng* 24(1):59–71
- Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, et al (2011) Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *JMLR* 12:2825–2830
- Pestov V (2000) On the geometry of similarity search: Dimensionality curse and concentration of measure. *Inf Process Lett* 73(1-2):47–51
- Pestov V (2007) Intrinsic dimension of a dataset: what properties does one expect? In: *IJCNN 2007*. IEEE, pp 2959–2964

- Pestov V (2008) An axiomatic approach to intrinsic dimension of a dataset. *Neural Networks* 21(2-3):204–213
- Pestov V (2010) Intrinsic dimensionality. *ACM SIGSPATIAL Special* 2(2):8–11
- Rossi E, Frasca F, Chamberlain B, et al (2020) SIGN: scalable inception graph neural networks. *CoRR* abs/2004.11198
- Solorio-Fernández S, Carrasco-Ochoa JA, Martínez-Trinidad JF (2020) A review of unsupervised feature selection methods. *Artif Intell Rev* 53(2):907–948
- Stubbemann M, Hanika T, Schneider FM (2022) Intrinsic dimension for large-scale geometric learning. *CoRR* abs/2210.05301. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.05301>
- Zhao Z, Liu H (2007) Spectral feature selection for supervised and unsupervised learning. In: Ghahramani Z (ed) *ICML 2007*, ACM International Conference Proceeding Series, vol 227. ACM, pp 1151–1157